

*Also by Silvana Patriarca*

ITALIAN VICES

Nation and Character from the Risorgimento to the Republic

NUMBERS AND NATIONHOOD

Writing Statistics in Nineteenth-Century Italy

*Also by Lucy Riall*

GARIBALDI, INVENTION OF A HERO

RISORGIMENTO

The History of Italy from Risorgimento to Nation-State

SICILY AND THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

Liberal Policy and Local Power, 1859-66

# The Risorgimento Revisited

## Nationalism and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Italy

Edited by

Silvana Patriarca

*Professor of History, Fordham University, New York, USA*

and

Lucy Riall

*Professor of History, Birkbeck, University of London, UK*

palgrave  
macmillan

'Europe and the Dilemmas of Greek Conscience', and G. Varouxakis, 'The Idea of "Europe" in Nineteenth Century Greek Political Thought', both in P. Carabott (ed.), *Greece and Europe in the Modern Period: Aspects of a Troubled Relationship* (London, 1995), at 1–15. and 16–37.

70. J. Plamenatz, 'Two Types of Nationalism', in: E. Kamenka (ed.) *Nationalism: The Nature and Evolution of an Idea* (Australian University Press, 1973), 22–37.

71. See, for instance, Mazzini, to his mother, in Mazzini, *Letters*, introduction and notes by B. King (Westport, 1979), 98. 'Politica internazionale' [1871], in *Scritti Editi e Inediti* (Imola, 1906), XCII, 143–170, now also republished as *Principles of International Politics* [1871], in Recchia and Urbinati, *A Cosmopolitanism of Nations*, 224–240, quotation at 238–239. On Mazzini's colonial vision see also Recchia and Urbinati, *Ibid.*, 29–30.

72. See D. Natali, *Un programma coloniale. La Società Geografica Italiana e le origini dell'espansione in Etiopia (1867–1884)* (Rome, 2008). M. Nani, *Ai confini della nazione. Stampa e razzismo nell'Italia di fine Ottocento* (Rome, 2006), 52–54.

73. An example of a work inspired by Gioberti is L. Campo Fregoso, *Del primato italiano sul Mediterraneo* (Turin, 1872). On the reference to the Risorgimento in the post-unification period see G. Volpe, *Italia Moderna, 1815–1915* (3 vols., Florence, 1943–1952), I, 152–153, and Chabod. For later manipulations of the Risorgimento to advocate empire see now G. Finaldi, *Italian National Identity in the Scramble for Africa. Italy's African Wars in the Era of Nation Building, 1870–1900* (Bern, 2009).

# 13

## The Risorgimento: A Multinational Movement

Dominique Reill

Forty years ago, Giuseppe Prezzolini published a book review entitled 'Vita d'un Mostro' ('Life of a Monster').<sup>1</sup> Prezzolini's trademark sarcasm and hyperbole centred on a recent biography of the life and works of one of the Risorgimento's most famous Catholic-Romanticist republicans, Niccolò Tommaseo.<sup>2</sup> Prezzolini spent most of his review of Raffaele Ciampini's excellent biography praising how Ciampini had 'disinfected' Italian studies of the undeservedly heroic Tommaseo legends and replaced it with a truer vision of the famous Dalmatian, "Tommaseo the monster".<sup>3</sup>

The characterization of Niccolò Tommaseo as a mutant beast might seem a fair assessment to those familiar with Tommaseo's private life and penchant for playing the *enfant terrible*. After all, the hyper-Catholic linguist was known to say and do some fairly ruthless things to gain attention in the newspapers or to seek revenge when he felt slighted. Some of the most famous 'outrages' committed by Tommaseo included his scribbles of anti-Semitic remarks made while his one-time friend and collaborator, Daniele Manin, spoke to the 1848–49 Venetian Assembly, his reporting of a fellow writer to the Habsburg censors for liberal propagandizing, and his comment that Alessandro Manzoni's instant classic *I Promessi sposi* (*The Betrothed*) was nothing but a 'rag for gossiping women'.<sup>4</sup> Even today, Tommaseo is still loathed by admirers of the poet Giacomo Leopardi for his distasteful remarks mocking Leopardi because he was a hunchback.<sup>5</sup>

But Prezzolini's attack on Tommaseo focused less on his crimes and more on his contradictions – on his exaggerated religious orthodoxy and his insatiable appetite for whores, his liberalism and his refusal to renounce Austrian citizenship, and above all on his half-breed status. In Prezzolini's estimation, Tommaseo was a monster because he was, and proudly identified himself as, half-Italian and half-Slavic, a *national hermaphrodite* to use Julia Kristeva's term.<sup>6</sup> Because of this, Prezzolini pronounced that in Italian literature Tommaseo had the air of a 'foreigner' who should be exorcized from the position of '*santino per le scuole*,' or cutesy schoolchild Risorgimento saint.<sup>7</sup>

Regardless of Prezzolini's repugnant characterizations of Slavic speakers as oversexed 'equivocators', the conviction that a man was somehow 'unnatural' or 'monstrous' if he considered himself equally member and leader of Balkan and Italian national movements is reflective of a wider problem in trying to understand the Risorgimento. To put it more clearly, scholarship on the Risorgimento, especially in light of the recent studies on nationalism stimulated by the writings of Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm and Miroslav Hroch, have focused on how and why nineteenth-century thinkers and activists worked to create a separate and unified *nation*, both in cultural and political terms.<sup>8</sup> Consolidation, diversification, and independence seem to be the three central tenets of the Risorgimento, as was the case for most nineteenth-century national movements throughout Europe. If forced to find a commonality shared by all nineteenth-century framers of *nazionalità*, from Mazzini to Garibaldi, Manzoni to Manin, Cattaneo to Gioberti, I would have to say that all consistently and unquestionably identified themselves nationally as Italians, and only Italians, though many were multilingual and spent much of their lives living outside the Italian peninsula. Tommaseo, by contrast, proudly declared himself a member and promoter of the Slavic *and* the Italian nations. So what do we do with this national hermaphrodite? Do we push him off the shelf of the champions of the Italian nation, as Prezzolini suggested? Or do we try to extend the Risorgimento to include a corps of so-called 'monsters', with Tommaseo as one of its patron saints – a 'monster corps'?

Knocking Tommaseo off the shelf is deeply problematic, if for no other reason than during the nineteenth century anyone interested in Risorgimento thought or action identified Tommaseo as a prominent voice in the movement. One could even say that his writings belonged to a 'Risorgimento canon'.<sup>9</sup> So, if Tommaseo stays on the shelf of *santini*, exactly what was he the patron saint of?

In the following, I make two central arguments. Firstly, I show that amongst nineteenth-century intellectual elites and local activists on the peninsula and in the southern provinces of the Habsburg Empire, Niccolò Tommaseo acted not only as a representative of a republican, federalist, social Catholic Risorgimento. He also helped lead the way to conceiving nation-formation (and more specifically Italy-formation) as a process of interdependence with neighbouring peoples and cultures. To be clear, others, most famously Giuseppe Mazzini and Vincenzo Gioberti, conceived of the Italian nation in relation to other European peoples. But, unlike these rival Risorgimento leaders, Tommaseo, in his writings and actions, focused on where nations overlapped and how coexistence could be harmonized.<sup>10</sup>

Second, I argue that Tommaseo's multinational Italo-Slav approach was meaningful inasmuch as it stimulated others to collaborate with his project. To give an example of this, I focus on one case where Tommaseo's words and example prompted a foot soldier in the Risorgimento's 'monster

corps' – Slavic- and Italian-speaking Dalmatian businessman, journalist, linguist, and politician, Stipan Ivčević<sup>11</sup> – to formulate an astounding solution for how national coexistence could be regulated. I conclude by arguing that this methodology – of analyzing the 'monster corps' within the Italian Risorgimento – reveals an element of Risorgimento nationalism overlooked in some of the latest scholarship. My work suggests that the Risorgimento, far from being just a movement for the creation of an independent Italy, was also concerned with binding the fate of the peninsula with neighbouring peoples, instead of separating it from them. But first let us take a look at this patron saint of monsters.

Niccolò Tommaseo, as mentioned earlier, was one of the pre-eminent authors, journalists, and political activists within the mid-nineteenth-century Risorgimento movement. Much has been written on him and endless numbers of publications exist offering an interested reader updated and contextualized versions of his dictionaries, novels, poetry, memoirs, diaries, personal letters, and political tracts on education, religion, penitentiary and governmental reform. Here is not the place to offer a biography of this fascinating, cranky, incredibly prolific individual. Suffice it to say, Niccolò Tommaseo (1802–74) was a true child of the Napoleonic Wars – born to subjects of the former Venetian Republic in the sleepy port town, Šibenik/Sebenico, in the eastern Adriatic province of Dalmatia (now situated in the modern state of Croatia). Tommaseo was raised within a traditionalist, Catholic-oriented world in which 'liberty' was understood to mean municipal freedoms and 'republic' was a world of oligarchies and special privileges. Within the context of his parents' eighteenth-century world, Tommaseo imbibed the promises of the French Revolution and tried throughout his life to break down the hierarchies remnant from the eighteenth century. In their place, he sought a liberal, decentralized form of republicanism, where all men would have equal rights to self-improvement and self-promotion under the protection of a socially oriented Catholicism, a Catholicism in which non-Catholics would be included in the community regardless of their different religious beliefs. Despite his anti-Semitic jibes at Daniele Manin, Tommaseo was a vociferous advocate for Jewish emancipation.

Tommaseo was raised bilingually, speaking at home both his Dalmatian dialect of Italian and a dialect of what is today classified as Serbo-Croatian (which Tommaseo and his contemporaries termed 'Slavic', 'South Slavic', or 'Illyrian'). During the course of his life, Tommaseo also learned French, Latin and Classical Greek. Before the age of 20, he forsook the dream of his father, a small-time merchant, that he would become a lawyer in Dalmatia and, instead, pursued the risky career of a man of letters. He did so with no family fortune or connections. Poor throughout his life, Tommaseo made a name for himself by creating scandals within the peninsula's literary scene. He wrote for one of the most important pre-1848 journals, Florence's *Antologia*, and he published extensively on how the Italian language should

be standardized. Politically, he is most famous for his role as second-in-command of Venice's 1848–49 revolution. His political and cultural activities were often at odds with the Habsburg administration that governed much of the Italian peninsula and the eastern Adriatic, a situation that forced him into exile for most of his life. When in exile he lived in Paris, Corsica, Corfu and Turin. When not in exile, home for Tommaseo alternated between Šibenik, Dalmatia (his boyhood home), Venice (the home of his greatest influence), and Florence (the home where he made his name and where he lived out his old age).

Two clarifications need to be made about *'Il Dalmato'*, the nickname most contemporaries used when referring to Tommaseo. First, unlike Mazzini who has come to dominate the most recent scholarship on the early years of the Risorgimento, Tommaseo was not a revolutionary. He believed that *Progress*, with a capital P, was only possible through the slow moral and intellectual transformation of society from below. He frequently criticized Mazzini, Garibaldi and the like for trying to form a nation through insurrections, wars, and politics centred round a core elite. Tommaseo pushed instead for the Church, the schoolroom, the dinner table and the fireside to serve as the sites for a *Risorgimento* of an Italian nation.

Secondly, it is important to emphasize that though born in the Balkan peninsula to a Slavic-speaking mother and an Italian-speaking father, it was not until his late thirties that Tommaseo became the 'monster' Prezzolini so abhorred. At the beginning of his career, Tommaseo viewed the non-Italian elements of his background and formation as valuable only inasmuch as they related to the Italian national movement, not for any value in and of themselves. For example, as a journalist in Florence in the 1820s and 1830s, he signed his articles with the initials KXY. The choice of this *nom de plume* was symbolic, for as Tommaseo explained to his editor, '[t]hese three letters that don't exist in the Italian alphabet are meant to indicate, in case you didn't know, that the writer of this article was not born Italian'.<sup>12</sup> Tommaseo as KXY saw himself as the missing ingredient needed to complete 'Italy', the extra letters that would totalize 'Italy's' alphabet of options and directions. Until the early 1840s, Tommaseo accentuated his quality as Italian outsider because he believed that this highlighted how his dedication to the Italian national movement was objectively founded on his belief in its possibilities and not on self-interest. Tommaseo loved *Italia* because of what it was and what he thought it could be. He did not love it because he was born to it. As such, Tommaseo consistently relegated any connections to peoples and worlds that might have cast him as a Slavic or Balkan insider. Prezzolini could not have approved more of such an 'unmonstrous' stance.

Thus, the half-Italian/half-Slavic Tommaseo was not born under the hand of a midwife during the Napoleonic Wars. Instead, it was the experience of exile in Corsica in 1837–38 that marked the birth of a man who, by the late 1840s, would sign his letters (written in Italian) '*Nicolò Tommaseo, uno slavo*'.

Tommaseo's conversion to Slavic nationalism was the fruit of suffering. His father and mother had just died. He had contracted a particularly nasty case of syphilis while living in exile in Paris. His Risorgimento comrades scorned what he considered his magnum opus for the Italian national movement, *Dell'Italia*. He was poor; he was sick; he was lonely. The dual traumas of his parents' deaths and his contraction of syphilis created a particular nostalgia for the simple and puritanical ways of his Dalmatian childhood. In essence, he believed that if he had fulfilled his parents' expectations of being a provincial lawyer in Dalmatia, firmly rooted to hearth and home, he would not have gone to Paris, he would not have taken up with prostitutes and, therefore, would not have contracted syphilis. After four miserable years in Paris, he travelled to Corsica hoping the Mediterranean island's sea air, mountainous landscape, and practical peasantry would make him feel closer to home, to Dalmatia, and to *Italia*.

Once in Corsica, Tommaseo found all that and German Romanticism, too. On the island he struck a friendship with the British consul to Corsica, the German-born Adolf Palmedo. Together they read and reread Johann von Goethe, Alberto Fortis, and Johann Gottfried von Herder. Over late night chats and country walks, Palmedo introduced Tommaseo to German Romanticism's love of all things Slav. Tommaseo caught nineteenth-century Romanticism's Slavophile bug through Palmedo, and he took this new fascination and applied it to two of his oldest loves, his memories of his Slavic-speaking mother and the theories of Giambattista Vico. By the time he left Corsica in 1838, Tommaseo had determined to rediscover his Slavic roots and work towards helping his 'mother' nation, *Slavia*. The 'monstrous', binational Tommaseo, thus, was not a product of breeding or context. His was a chosen multinational stance.

As space is short, it is best now to jump to the heart of the matter and look at what I consider the three most important aspects of Tommaseo's conception of nation-formation that offered a means to build a multinational variant of nationalism. Firstly, Tommaseo insisted that all nations, and the Italian nation specifically, were not and could not be, homogeneous wholes. In his dictionaries, journalistic work, books on popular ballads and his 1835 political tract *Dell'Italia*, Tommaseo maintained that cultural varieties within a nation were the result of the 'transmission of civilization between one people and another'.<sup>13</sup> Italy served as a prime example of his point. He wrote that Italy could *only* be understood by extending one's ear 'to the distant voices of the Ligurian mountains that echoed those of Iberia, to the voices of Sicily that could be found in the heart of Italy, of those coming from the Alps that resounded within the Tuscan hills'.<sup>14</sup> For Tommaseo, a people was formed as much by its periphery as by its centre, and within that periphery the influence of the Iberian peninsula via Liguria, North Africa via Sicily, the Germanic peoples via the Alps, were incontrovertible and significant. This variety was not only important in realizing the true

soul of Italy but also served as the foundation for his arguments in favour of a federal, decentralized structure for a future Italian nation state. An Italian nation state, and in fact all nation states, Tommaseo argued, should work according to the rubric 'unity in origin, variety in means, and unity in aim'.<sup>15</sup> Tommaseo interpreted cutting variety out of the equation as a desire for domination, not unification. The different 'dialects, physiognomies, races, lands, customs, history'<sup>16</sup> of Italy needed to be acknowledged, otherwise the peninsula would be a land oppressed by one '*città dominante*' or metropole.<sup>17</sup> Over and over again he repeated, 'variety is the only condition for true effectiveness'.<sup>18</sup>

Secondly, one of the most important means through which Tommaseo believed variety within a nation could be revealed and harmonized was through language. Again, Tommaseo insisted that the easiest way to recognize variety was to 'extend one's ear'. Working from his self-professed intellectual guides, Dante and Vico, Tommaseo believed that by 'extending one's ear' to the vernacular, one could obtain insights into the soul of a people.<sup>19</sup> The variety of Italian dialects, thus, represented the particularities of different communities throughout the peninsula. They also reflected the interrelationships with other peoples. Dictionaries of standardized or state languages should not trump dialects. Instead, the two needed to feed off each other. Citing Dante in his exposition of the relationship between language and dialect, Tommaseo wrote 'a grammar establishes a language, but it does not create it ... And just as without common people (*uomini volgari*) there is no city, so without vernacular ways of speaking (*modi volgari*) there is no grammar'.<sup>20</sup> To vitalize standardized languages through their continued enrichment by 'vernacular ways', Tommaseo insisted that it was necessary to start compiling '[d]ictionaries of every dialect, not just provincial ones, but also municipal ones'.<sup>21</sup> Thus, the politics of language would secure the egalitarian basis of nationhood.

Thirdly, Tommaseo's own experience of national conversion from being an Italian outsider (*à la KXY*) to being a proud member of both an Italian and a Slav nation, convinced him that linguistic assimilation within multilingual, multi-ethnic communities was to be avoided. As mentioned earlier, until his thirties Tommaseo regarded his Slavic-language background as something to be overcome. While still an adolescent, Tommaseo bragged to a school friend that over the summer holidays he had succeeded to 'deilyrianize myself and [to] make myself Italian, all the way to my nerves, fibres, bones, and the makeup of my soul ... all completely Italian'.<sup>22</sup> Until the 1840s, he had considered the Slavic language of his hometown, Šibenik, to be little more than a simple dialect of the poor, a meagre communication system used by 'servants and peasants'.<sup>23</sup> However, after his personal conversion to the precepts of Slavic nationhood, Tommaseo reconsidered his position and saw that Dalmatia's two languages revealed the existence of two different, equally precious, nations. Without the continuance of

bilingualism, Dalmatia would be caught in a 'war between the mountain and the sea'.<sup>24</sup> With two languages, the province and its people would be forced to acknowledge their joint ties to both worlds, ties that could promise Dalmatia the special status of 'bridge' between West and East, between Latin and Slavic, between Italian and South Slav. As such, to counter the mistakes of his own upbringing and to secure future bilingualism, Tommaseo set out to demonstrate that the Slavic dialects of Dalmatia should not be seen solely as a vernacular of subalterns, but instead as a window into another world of mores, beliefs, emotions, and poetry, where Slavic was neither inferior nor peripheral to its Italian equivalent.

Niccolò Tommaseo's ideas about the inherent heterogeneity of nations, the importance of language as a means to recognize and harmonize variety, and the need to buttress multilingual communities are interesting not only in terms of his own thought and writings. They are even more important because they influenced a host of other proponents of 'nation', especially within the Adriatic worlds of Venice, Trieste, and Dalmatia. Here, I would like to take a moment to look at one of the more fascinating cases of Tommaseo's influence, that of the Slavic- and Italian-speaking businessman, journalist, politician and amateur linguist, Stipan Ivičević.

Though an unknown figure in the historiography of the Italian Risorgimento, Ivičević's life was formed and informed by the peninsula's national movement. Born just a year before Tommaseo in the third-tier Dalmatian port town, Makarska/Macarsca, just south of Split/Spalato, Ivičević was son of a Slavic-speaking, small-land-owning family. By his early teens, Ivičević was fluent in both Italian and Slavic, read and wrote in both languages, and could brag of a graceful penmanship. His background and his intellectual abilities all seemed to promise him a secure position within the new Habsburg administration of his Dalmatian homeland. These hopes were dashed before he reached the age of 20, however, when he was imprisoned for 20 months under suspicion of partaking in the secret Italian nationalist society, the Carbonari.

Once released from prison, Ivičević changed his life path and worked at taking over his father's small agricultural business. In his free time, he devoted himself to literature- and language-reform initiatives, with special emphasis on standardizing his Slavic dialect. His 20-month incarceration repelled him from the idea of 'revolution,' and for the rest of his life, like Tommaseo, he pushed for progress through educational initiatives, journalism, and political activities (when they were legal). He served as mayor of Makarska on many occasions, was the editor of several Italian- and Slavic-language Dalmatian periodicals, worked on various education and economic boards in conjunction with the Habsburg administration, served as delegate to the 1848–49 Vienna and Kremsier diets, and was elected a member of Dalmatia's own diet in the 1860s and 1870s. Ivičević also published the first South Slavic translation of Dante's *Inferno*.

Stipan Ivičević was one of Tommaseo's most fervent admirers and stalwart collaborators. Ivičević insisted that when citing Tommaseo it 'seems to me that I am citing the best and the most true'.<sup>25</sup> Tommaseo reciprocated, saying that Ivičević's writing, compared to other Slavic authors in Dalmatia, was one 'of the most pure and fluent; and at the same time the most beautiful'.<sup>26</sup> The two men wrote to each other regularly throughout the 1840s. Whenever Tommaseo was in Dalmatia, Ivičević made it a priority to pay his friend and idol a visit.

Ivičević's friendship and collaboration with Tommaseo centred mostly on their joint conviction that language politics was the core issue in nation-formation. Tommaseo invited Ivičević to join him in his campaign to aggregate dictionaries of dialects. He also helped Ivičević gain commissions to publish Italian-Slavic school texts and dictionaries, insisting that Ivičević 'could do a great service to Dalmatia and all the Slavic peoples by compiling a dictionary of our beautiful dialect'.<sup>27</sup> Ivičević followed Tommaseo's suggestions and delighted in his encouragement, but he was not satisfied that collecting dictionaries of Dalmatia's Slavic tongue would secure a system of balanced bilingualism in his province or multi-lingualism throughout Europe. Instead, Ivičević wrote Tommaseo, stating that 'other ideas of my own making' began to take precedence over the specific, local tasks that his mentor had set for him.<sup>28</sup> His own project: to create and disseminate his own universal system of written communication, which he called *Pangrafia universale*.

The idea behind Ivičević's universal language project was born through reading Tommaseo, especially Tommaseo's seminal treatise on the science and standardization of languages, the 1841 *Nuova proposta di correzioni e di giunte al dizionario italiano (The New Proposal on Corrections and Additions to the Italian Dictionary)*. Ivičević made this clear in the introductions to the many different versions of his *Pangrafia* as well as in letters to Tommaseo in which he wrote 'I must confess – publicly and openly (*coram populo*) – that it is your Book [*Nuova proposta*] that inspired me, for (as always!) your words have a great, magnetic influence on my heart and my Spirit'.<sup>29</sup>

Chapters Three and Four of *Nuova proposta*, in which Tommaseo discussed the methodologies and difficulties in standardizing a language, mesmerized Ivičević the most. He consistently cited the passages where Tommaseo explained that 'it would be less difficult, perhaps, to carry out the ancient desire of establishing, I would not say a language, but a universal system of communication (*linguaggio*)'.<sup>30</sup> Ivičević eagerly read how Tommaseo, in the *Nuova proposta*, argued that thinking about creating a universal language system was not as bizarre or implausible as one might first expect, because, as Tommaseo explained,

one can already spot a nice and completed universal language system (*linguaggio*), and not only one, but hundreds: all you need is peoples'

consensus (*consenso degli uomini*). One need only take Italian, Cossack, or Bolognese and say: in this language we scholars (*dotti*), we politicians, we merchants will write and speak so as to be understood throughout the whole world: there, that's it (*ecco fatto*). It takes just as long to learn Bergamasco as it takes to learn an artificial language created from scratch (*di pianta*)... The problem, you will say, lies in arriving at consensus. – But in the case of an invented language the difficulties are doubled: for you have to find consensus in the act of creating the language system (*linguaggio*), and then in finding the appeal for universalizing it. Whoever selects Bergamasco or Chinese is already halfway done.<sup>31</sup>

In an 1847 letter, Ivičević admitted to Tommaseo that after having read and reread this passage, '[b]y chance, some sparks (*scintille*) came to my mind; then a ray; then a light; and I think that I have devised a System for Universal Writing that is both very easy and very reasonable (*soddisfacente*): – not numerical, but legible like any other language'.<sup>32</sup>

*Pangrafia* – this Tommaseo-inspired System for Universal Writing – was a passion project for Ivičević. He began sending out exemplars of its methodology a few months before the 1848–49 revolutions broke out. Upon his death 30 years later, Ivičević was still fine-tuning it. His dedication to *Pangrafia* was based on what he hoped it could achieve. Overall, Ivičević's universal language system was meant to bridge divides inherent in a multilingual environment. At the beginning of every exemplar to *Pangrafia*, Ivičević quoted Tommaseo's words indicating that a universal language was dependent on and would reinforce a universal community of (national) brotherhood. In a metaphor that would make most modern-day readers blush, Tommaseo wrote (and Ivičević cited): 'And with this I mean to say that when mankind learns to love each other, it will also have a common means of communication (*linguaggio*). Give me a heart, and I will give you my lips. When opinions coincide (*combiaciano*), people embrace each other (*gli uomini s'abbracciano*), and then mouths and words draw up together (*si accostano*) as well: because with the lips one speaks and one kisses'.<sup>33</sup>

A universal language system would not just consolidate the 'embrace' between different linguistic groups' opinions and interests; it would also insure that language speakers closest to the centres of power would not enjoy privileges to the detriment of others. A case in point, in Ivičević's mind, were the obvious advantages enjoyed by Italian speakers in Dalmatia compared to their Slavic-speaking compatriots, or German speakers compared to everyone else in the Habsburg Empire. Ivičević did not believe that the best way to resolve these injustices was through separating out language groups and assigning them different territories. He did not echo Mazzinian chants of 'out with the foreigners'. Instead, like Esperanto's inventor, L.L. Zamenhof, 30 years later, Ivičević considered a universal

language system as the most fruitful means to defuse the conflicts inherent in a multilingual environment.

Fear of linguistic hegemony and the desire to ensure that nation-formation would not translate into nation-isolation were the foundational concerns of Ivičević's *Pangrafia*. Following Tommaseo's directives, Ivičević did not formulate a new artificial language from scratch. Instead, he developed a formula of translation between different languages – a writing system that worked much like a calculator. By simplifying a grammar system and alphabet, Ivičević proposed that people use his translation tables to move between their languages and his *Pangrafia*, communicating through linguistic conversion and deciphering. With his translation tables at hand, people of all languages could communicate in writing. No one language – not Italian, German, English, French or even South Slavic – would need to be adopted by all. No one group would have more control or mastery of the language of trade or government. A clear separation would be placed between languages, an *interlingua* so to speak, allowing communication without assimilation. Ivičević argued that the only means to secure co-beneficial interactions among Europe's peoples was to filter between languages and national groups. Thinking of his own province, he imagined Slavic-speakers no longer limited to manual labour because they were incapable of utilizing the languages of governance. With *Pangrafia*, Slavic-, Italian-, and German-speakers would be able to work together without any one group being privileged or disadvantaged.

Ivičević's formulaic translation scheme did not come with a newly invented vocabulary. Interestingly enough, it was Italian which would serve as the base lexicon for his *interlingua* calculator. His choice, he explained, was based on the fact that he believed Italian 'the easiest and most adaptable language... and understood by those who know Latin, the language of science'.<sup>34</sup> How would Italian function as a lexicon and not a language? Simple. To communicate between languages, all that was necessary was for people to have at hand a crossover dictionary of their language and Italian. Users of the Pangraphic system just needed to plug Italian words into the simplified *Pangrafia* grammar, and voilà! Universal communication. A Russian speaker from the Baltics could negotiate shipping terms with a Greek speaker from the Mediterranean as long as Russian-Italian and Greek-Italian dictionaries were on hand. The only benefit Italian speakers would find in this arrangement was that they would have to look up fewer words (though they would have to be careful to use standardized idioms and not dialectal ones). Everyone would be equally advantaged or disadvantaged by their knowledge of *Pangrafia*'s rules.

Ivičević was convinced that *Pangrafia* would be an invaluable tool, both to the Habsburg Empire and to Europe more generally. In fact, he exclaimed, it could be used 'by the great European family. And then when you think

about the Europeans scattered all over the world? ... The idea is as big, as I am little'.<sup>35</sup>

Like any struggling businessman trying to sell his olive oil in an increasingly globalized market, the commercial possibilities of connecting languages particularly excited Ivičević. As Eric Hobsbawm and Ernest Gellner would undoubtedly appreciate, at heart *Pangrafia* was not just the key to how sister nations could 'embrace' and bureaucracy could function. It also promised to resolve the problem of economic and commercial modernization in an increasingly 'nationally' diverse Europe. Ivičević described his universal system as an enormous 'factory of language', in which all the standardized languages and dialects of Europe would be compared and combined. Words in these 'factories' were just 'industrial materials', the primary materials manufactured and transformed through the sub-factories of individual languages and then packaged by the super factory, *Pangrafia*.<sup>36</sup> In *Pangrafia* no one locality-language group would be superior to the other, for Ivičević announced '[j]ust as the new metric system equalizes all the measurements of the different countries, so does the System of *Pangrafia* equalize all of the languages'.<sup>37</sup> To detractors, who would argue that the reinforcement of linguistic diversity was just another Tower of Babel, Ivičević responded: 'tower of Babel, if you will, but not one of confusion; on the contrary, it is one of reunion'.<sup>38</sup>

Tommaseo doubted that the world was ready for Ivičević's unifying tower of Babel. Ivičević ignored his friend's unease, and proceeded to try to sell his system to publishers, academies and governments throughout Europe. Alas, Tommaseo proved right. Nobody – not Emperor Franz Josef, Bismarck, Napoleon III, private publishers or universities (all of whom he contacted throughout his lifetime) – took up Ivičević's *Pangrafia*. The world was not ready for a language superfactory.

Nonetheless, Ivičević's Pangraphic attempt reveals much and points to new questions. First, figures like Stipan Ivičević force us to question who belongs within a history of the Risorgimento. Ivičević, after all, was not born in the peninsula, dedicated his life to promoting the national reawakening of *slavismo*, and except for perhaps an early escapade within the Carbonari, spent his time trying to reform the Habsburg Empire from below, not get out of it. Nonetheless, he (probably) did participate in the Carbonari, his work and ideas were a direct consequence of his familiarity with Risorgimento ideas and figures, and he promoted a world system of communication deeply rooted in Italian. Do we exclude him because his ideas did not influence those who would one day become Italians? Or do we include him because he functioned within a Risorgimento universe?

One compromise could be that we place Ivičević on the outskirts of the Risorgimento, on the periphery, so to say. But I would warn against such a compromise. To be on the periphery of the Risorgimento would suggest that

in the first half of the nineteenth century there was one main road, a clear path towards nationhood and all that it encompasses. A quick glance at the ideas and efforts of such distinctly different 1848–49 leaders as Mazzini, Gioberti, Cattaneo, Manin, Garibaldi, d'Azeglio, and Guerrazzi makes clear that there was no one way that Italian nationalists imagined (making) a nation state. And the radically different 1848–49 experiences of communities in Palermo, Naples, Ancona, Rome, Florence, Genoa, Bologna, Trento, Venice, Milan, Turin, Nice, Trieste and all the townships and countryside surrounding them show the inherent difficulties of creating a common Risorgimento narrative. How could Ivičević and his brethren be placed on the outskirts if there was no centre?

Instead, I would argue that by placing people like Ivičević (and there were many) into the central mix, with Tommaseo as their patron saint, a new shade of the Risorgimento comes into sight, one in which the fascination with the idea of Europe that Chabod so famously discussed, is not primarily of Mazzinian inspiration but, instead, attests to a broader, inherent concern of a post-Napoleonic generation with the idea of a holistic nation.<sup>39</sup> Figures like Tommaseo and Ivičević feared the idea of an independent, homogeneous and isolated nation. And both worked in concert with many others (in Dalmatia, Trieste, Istria, Venice, Milan, Turin, Florence, Vienna, and Paris) to forestall the dangers of homogenization by promoting a politics of interdependence.<sup>40</sup>

Finally, the fact that Ivičević's *Pangrafia* failed, as did most of the 'utopian' projects hatched by 'the monster corps' surrounding Tommaseo, does not warrant their dismissal or marginalization. For, after all, in Congress of Vienna Europe the Italian national project was utopian. It existed nowhere and was more a product of Romantic dreams than of lived realities, as Paul Ginsborg has made clear.<sup>41</sup> The only difference here is that these dreams were also firmly situated as a happily ever-after of an already present nightmare — one in which, as Alberto Mario Banti rightly pointed out, *fratelli italiani* chanted 'out with the barbarians, out with the foreigners, and *viva i morti*!'<sup>42</sup> In many ways, Tommaseo's monsters were dreaming out of concern that their *fratelli italiani* (and Prezzolini's forefathers) might want to disintegrate the nation-dream of their presence.

As such, by firmly placing the monstrous Tommaseo on the shelf of *santini*, with his motley crew of like-minded foot soldiers behind, we gain a necessary reminder that some dreamers-agents of the Risorgimento were just as much against national independence as they were for it. They were motivated by anxiety over the potential for violence and domination within the national project almost a hundred years before Europe experienced some of nationalism's worst outrages. A history of the Risorgimento, and of nationalism in general, would do well to include among its narratives of the champions for national independence those of the worriers who feared its consequences and pushed for interdependence.

## Notes

1. Giuseppe Prezzolini (1882–1982) was an Italian novelist, critic, journalist, and publisher, most famous for his publication of the pre-WWI literary journals *Leonardo* and *La Voce*, his role in sponsoring Italian studies in the United States from the 1930s–1950s, and his byline in the Italian newspaper *Il Resto del Carlino*.
2. Niccolò (also Nicolò) Tommaseo (1802–1874) was a Dalmatian-born poet, linguist, novelist, religious reformer, and liberal politician active throughout most of the nineteenth century, publishing and residing in the Italian peninsula, Dalmatia, Corsica, the Ionian islands, and France. He is most famous for writing the pre-eminent Italian dictionary of the nineteenth century, acting as the co-leader of the 1848 revolution in Venice, and for his many initiatives to formulate a Christian 'brotherhood of nations' throughout Europe. Though old, still the best biography of Tommaseo's life is R. Ciampini, *Vita di Niccolò Tommaseo* (1945).
3. G. Prezzolini, 'Vita d'un Mostro', *Italica* 25, 3 (1948), 261–264.
4. Historians and literary critics' outrage was also fuelled by the fact that Manzoni and Tommaseo were friends — and on more than one occasion Manzoni had acted as Tommaseo's champion in times of need. Tommaseo's irreverence for Manzoni's masterpiece *I Promessi Sposi* and his general disregard for his friend were made even more blatant with the publication of one of his private letters to his Dalmatian friend, Antonio Marinovich, dated April 1, 1828. Tommaseo wrote: '... I am ever more convinced that that [*I Promessi Sposi*] is a poorly made, poorly written book, which will be unbearable to read in the not so distant future. A Tuscan lady, who is neither literary nor noble, who barely knows how to read and yet possesses natural good sense, put it to me in these terms: "With all those minute details he believed he was making masterful strokes. How can a man write such things that wouldn't be worth telling to vulgar women? That Agnese Renzo: they make you sick to your stomach, that dumb-ass (*coglioncello*) him a jerk to his face!" Exactly like that, with these exact phrases, with this tone. The sentence is severe but not unjust...' R. Ciampini, *Vita di Niccolò Tommaseo* (1945), 161–162.
5. Tommaseo's brutal attacks on fellow writers, their works, and their entire philosophy of literature and language are infamous. Historians of nineteenth-century Italy have understandably voiced a general feeling of distaste for his unnecessarily callous and sometimes pretentious statements. Tommaseo is also a favourite bad-guy for Leopardi fans because of his characterization of Leopardi as being nothing but a man of 'false and narrow-minded intelligence.'
6. J. Kristeva, *Time & Sense: Proust and the Experience of Literature, European perspectives* (New York, 1996). I use the term 'Slavic' instead of Croatian, Yugoslav, South Slav, Serb, or Illyrian because this was the national identification that Tommaseo and his Dalmatian compatriots used most often to identify their nationhood and language. Using any other term for the first half of the nineteenth century would be ahistorical and offer more confusion than clarification, as the words 'Croatian,' 'Yugoslav,' and 'Serb' denoted particularly different qualities in the early nineteenth century than they do today.
7. G. Prezzolini, 'Vita d'un Mostro'.
8. Calling these works 'recent' is a relative term, as they are by now considered classics among scholars of nationalism. Italian historical studies have, however, only begun to take account of these authors over the last ten years.



9. A. M. Banti, *La nazione del risorgimento: parentela, santità e onore alle origini dell'Italia unita*, (Turin, 2000)
10. It is generally accepted that in many ways *Dell'Italia* – Tommaseo's opus dedicated solely to his vision of how an Italian nation should be reformed, fostered and structured – was formulated as a direct response against ideas promoted by Mazzini and *Giovine Italia*. First and foremost, Tommaseo rejected Mazzini's strategies of using violence and secret societies to achieve national liberation. Second, he objected to Mazzini's arguments that Catholicism was an intrinsically negative element within the Italian national movement. Third, he criticized Mazzini's ideas of creating a centralized, unitary state based on an already existing 'common will' and identity among 'Italians.' Before Tommaseo had started writing most of *Dell'Italia*, he wrote a letter to Mazzini after their meeting in Switzerland in 1834, describing these ideological differences. See: N. Tommaseo, 'Un Affetto: Giuseppe Mazzini' in P. Trompeo and P. Ciureanu (eds), *Poesie e prose di Niccolò Tommaseo* (Turin, 1966).
11. Stipan Ivičević [Stefano Ivicevich] (1801–1878) was a Makarska businessman, journalist, translator, amateur linguist, mayor (*podestà*), and parliamentarian at the Vienna Diet of 1848 and in the Dalmatian Diets of the 1860s–1870s. As a possible aid to the reader, the pronunciation of this name for an English speaker would be something like: EE-VEE-TCHE-VITCH.
12. R. Ciampini, *Vita di Niccolò Tommaseo*, 147; J. Pirjevec, *Niccolò Tommaseo* (Venice, 1977), 22
13. N. Tommaseo, *Giovan Battista Vico e il suo secolo* (Palermo, 1985), 86
14. *Ibid.*, 87; The *alpi Retiche* denotes the north-western section of the Alps bordering today's Switzerland and Austria, comprising the mountainous regions of eastern Lombardy and the Trentino, famous for the strong Germanic influences in the region.
15. *Ibid.*, 87
16. N. Tommaseo, *Dell'Italia* (Turin, 1920), 228
17. *Ibid.*, 231
18. *Ibid.*, 228
19. N. Tommaseo, *Giovan Battista Vico e il suo secolo* (Palermo, 1985), 87
20. N. Tommaseo, *Nuova proposta di correzione e di giunte al Dizionario italiano*, N. Tommaseo, Nuovi Scritti, vol. 3, (Venice, 1841), 79
21. *Ibid.*, 137–138.
22. R. Ciampini, *Vita di Niccolò Tommaseo*, 147, 233; J. Pirjevec, *Niccolò Tommaseo tra Italia e Slavia* (Venice, 1977), 43–4; By 'deillyrianize' Tommaseo means 'deslavize.' 'Illyrian' was a commonly used name for the South Slavic language today called Serbo-Croatian.
23. N. Tommaseo, *Memorie poetiche*, ed. G. Salvadori (Florence, 1917), 9.
24. N. Tommaseo, *Scintille: Traduzione dal serbo-croato con introduzione storico-critica di Luigi Voinovich; Prefazione di Giorgio D'Acandìa, La Giovine Europa* (Catania, 1916), 84–85 Though obviously dated, this edition of Tommaseo's *Scintille* is particularly useful for the scholar as it also incorporates and indicates the differences between the first published Italian version of the text (*Scintille*) and the later published Slavic version (*Iskrice*), with some indicators of what Tommaseo's unpublished manuscripts also indicated.
25. S. Ivičević, 'Letter from Stipan Ivičević to Niccolò Tommaseo, Makarska: April 16, 1846' (Firenze- Biblioteca Nazionale: Tommaseo Carteggi 92.72.8, 1846).
26. N. Tommaseo, 'Letter from Niccolò Tommaseo to Stipan Ivičević, Venice: March 14, 1845' (Firenze- Biblioteca Nazionale: Tommaseo Carteggi 92.73.2, 1845).
27. *Ibid.*: April 28, 1846' (Firenze- Biblioteca Nazionale: Tommaseo Carteggi 92.73.9, 1846).
28. S. Ivičević, 'Letter from Stipan Ivičević to Niccolò Tommaseo, Makarska: January 6, 1846' (Firenze- Biblioteca Nazionale: Tommaseo Carteggi 92.72.7, 1846).
29. *Ibid.*, 'Ivičević to Tommaseo: November 29, 1847' (Firenze- Biblioteca Nazionale: Tommaseo Carteggi 92.72.11, 1947)
30. N. Tommaseo, *Nuovi Scritti*, (Venice, 1841), 20.
31. *Ibid.*
32. S. Ivičević, 'Ivičević to Tommaseo: November 29, 1847'
33. N. Tommaseo, *Nuovi Scritti*, (Venice, 1841), 20–21.
34. S. Ivičević, 'Letter from Stipan Ivičević to Niccolò Tommaseo, Makarska: January 6, 1846'
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*
39. F. Chabod, *L'idea di nazione*, ed. A. Saitta and E. Sestan (Bari, 1967), 79; Federico Chabod (1901–1960) was one of Italy's most eminent historians. Professor at the universities in Milan and Rome, important contributor to the *Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani*, resistance fighter in Val d'Aosta from 1943–1945, after World War II Chabod directed Benedetto Croce's new Istituto per gli studi storici. In 1955 he was elected president of the Comité international des sciences historiques. Chabod is famous for being one of the first historians to dedicate a large portion of his research to tracing the intellectual and political foundations of the idea of Europe and the nation. See especially F. Chabod, *Storia dell'idea d'Europa* (Bari, 1961).
40. Some of the most consistent collaborators in this project to mutually develop interdependent nations include Francesco Carrara (Dalmatia), Medo Pucić (Dalmatia), Ivan August Kaznačić (Dalmatia), Vincenzo Solitro (Dalmatia and Venice), Spiridione Radissich (Dalmatia and Vienna), Pacifico Valussi (Trieste and Venice), Francesco Dall'Ongaro (Trieste and Venice), Vicenz Klun (Istria), Caterian Percota (Friuli), Cesare Cantù (Turin), Lorenzo Valerio (Turin), Adam Mickiewicz (Paris), Robert Cyprien (Paris).
41. I refer to Paul Ginsborg's opening address to the April 2008 conference 'The Risorgimento Revisited; 19th-century Italian nationalism and the intersection of cultural and political history' held at the Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America. See also his article on Romanticism in A. M. Banti and P. Ginsborg (eds), *Storia d'Italia, Annali 22. Il Risorgimento* (Turin, 2007), and his chapter in this book.
42. I refer to Alberto Banti's keynote address to the April 2008 conference 'The Risorgimento Revisited.' For an analysis of the inherently violent nature of Italian national thought, see A. M. Banti, *Il Risorgimento Italiano* (Rome and Bari, 2004); and Banti, *La nazione del risorgimento*.