The Fall of the Dubrovnik Republic and the Establishment of the French Administration in Dubrovnik in 1808 and 1809

Ćosić, Stjepan

Source / Izvornik: **Dubrovnik annals, 1998, 55 - 98**

Journal article, Published version
Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:111:847158

Rights / Prava: In copyright / Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-03-28**

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU
HRVATSKI STUDIJI
UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB
CENTER FOR CROATIAN STUDIES

Repository / Repozitorij:

Repository of University of Zagreb, Centre for Croatian Studies

DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJI

Original Paper
UDC 949.713-2Dubrovnik "18"

THE FALL OF THE DUBROVNIK REPUBLIC AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FRENCH ADMINISTRATION IN DUBROVNIK IN 1808 AND 1809

STJEPAN ĆOSIĆ

ABSTRACT: This paper is concerned with the state of social and political affairs in Dubrovnik prior to the abolishment of the Republic. It further illustrates the first phase of the organization and exertion of the new French administration in 1808 and 1809.

In order to provide a more complete and objective insight into the significance of the French abolishment of the Republic of Dubrovnik (Ragusa) as well as to grasp the social, political and administrative changes which followed, it is necessary to elucidate Dubrovnik at that time in its broader social, economic, and political context.[1]

Stjepan Ćosić, member of the Institute for Historical Sciences of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Dubrovnik. Address: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU, Lapadska obala 6, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia.

A longer version of this article has already been published in Croatian under the following title: »O slomu Republike i ustroju francuske uprave u Dubrovniku 1808. i 1809.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 33 (1995): pp. 177-203.

Social and historical background preceding the fall of the Republic

The turn of the eighteenth century witnessed some radical social changes throughout the European continent. The ideas of the French revolution, post-revolutionary events, and the Napoleonic campaigns enforced a considerable incursion upon the European political layout, thus introducing the concept of liberty with a profoundly new ideological meaning.

After its long history as an independent city-state, Dubrovnik was to experience several dramatic years in which its long-lasting tradition as a free aristocratic republic would be dissolved. At first, the Ragusans struggled to maintain neutrality, using the best of their diplomatic abilities to evade the hostile interests of the European powers. Furthermore, due to such policy, the Ragusan fleet expanded enormously at the close of the eighteenth century. These positive processes, however, proved short-lived and deceitful, for with the fall of the Republic of Venice in 1797, the entire Adriatic shoreline was drawn into the whirlpool of deep European changes. The agony of the Dubrovnik Republic took place in the shadow of the European struggles for power over the eastern Adriatic coast, which was but one episode of the lasting conflict in the Mediterranean induced by Franco-English antagonism, and Napoleon's campaigns to the east.

In 1804 and 1805, Dubrovnik found itself in the middle of diplomatic conflicts. Napoleon's ambitious plans regarding the Levant were to meet serious opposition in the Austrian urge for survival and the Pan-Slavic imperialism of the Russian tsar Alexander. The dynamic political situation during the war with Austria in 1805 drew Napoleon's attention to the eastern coast of the Adriatic giving rise to invasive aspirations, and its annexation to the

[1] This part discusses certain social events and issues which directly induced the fall of the Republic, and the establishment of the French administration that have not been sufficiently referred to in the literature so far. The last years of independence, French subjugation, the occupation, and the abolishment of the Dubrovnik Republic are the subject matters which have been treated extensively to date. For a general survey and some basic facts, cf. Lujo Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika, I -II.* Zagreb: Auktorova naklada, 1908; Paul Pisani, *La Dalmatie de 1797 à 1815.* Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1893: pp. 350-398; Tullio Erber, »Storia della Dalmazia dal 1797 al 1814« in: *Programma dell'i. r. ginnasio superiore in Zara* (1886/7), (1888/9), (1889/90), (1891/2); Harriet Towers Bjelovučić, *The Ragusan Republic victim of Napoleon and its own conservatism.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970; Vinko Foretić, *Povijest Dubrovnika do 1808, II.* Zagreb: NZMH, 1980. Several shorter works by Z. Šundrica, Ž. Muljačić and V. Ivančević cast light on some particular features of the period involved.

newly established French Kingdom of Italy. Such a strategic move would enable the French to encircle one more coastal area, and thus gain supremacy over numerous ports which would serve as strongholds in their campaign to the east across the Balkan peninsula. This French goal was practically accomplished by the Peace of Pressburg on 25 November 1805. According to the treaty, France was to overtake Dalmatia and Boka Kotorska (The Bay of Kotor) from the Habsburgs as parts of the former Venetian Republic which had been governed by Austria during the short interval since 1797. This triggered off quite a few diplomatic problems that were to affect the future of the Dubrovnik Republic, and which inevitably led to the French occupation of the former. Namely, the important economic and strategic territory of the Adriatic coast could not have remained divided, and the Ragusan neutrality represented an obstacle to both parties. At the time, due to the English counter-blockade, and the war in the Mediterranean, the prosperity of the Ragusan fleet declined drastically, leaving the Republic without its most profitable financial resource.

The Russian Baltic fleet took over Boka Kotorska from Austria, and managed to head off the French armies which were advancing across the Dalmatian mainland.[2] The Republic, therefore, found itself between the two powers, whose conflict would inevitably take place on its territory. In hope of an easy takeover of Boka from the Russians, the French general Lauriston invaded Dubrovnik with slightly more than 1,000 soldiers on 27 May 1806. This was the beginning of an occupational regime which was to last until the Republic's formal abolishment on 31 January 1808. During two years, the Republic of Dubrovnik underwent economic, financial, and political decline, while its old aristocratic order deteriorated.

The downfall of the Republic was induced by a number of interrelated causes in terms of foreign and domestic policy, and social and economic affairs. For centuries, state institutions had functioned without any changes, but the end of the eighteenth century brought some issues to which the petrified political apparatus could not respond. The patrician families which were the sole political subject in control of the social life, were slowly dying out. Unable to adjust, they found it difficult to keep pace with all the new social

[2] On the conflict related to the handing of Boka to the Russians see Stjepan Antoljak, »Predaja Dalmacije Francuzima.« Rad JAZU 288 (1952): pp. 192, 193.

and political changes. The patriciate kept exhausting itself in futile attempts to preserve its inner solidarity (which was already disturbed by growing differentiation), cushioning themselves from the political ferment and ideological changes which had partly affected the Ragusan society, too. Numerous were the reasons for the rather slow progress of social changes in Dubrovnik, one of them being its peripheral position. The system of privileges fruited legal particularism, the result of which was that the Ragusan political and social system had never actually undergone a proper separation of powers. Its powerful hereditary aristocracy, as holder of sovereignty, and its Catholic cultural and religious pattern founded on traditionalism, represented two ideological systems immune to new approaches. Confined to a small territory, and with the existing social background, every new form of integration was difficult to achieve.

The rise of Ragusan shipping toward the close of the eighteenth century was more the result of short-term fluctuation engendered by war rather than of policy. This development proved that the social stratum that was engaged in shipping and trade could always easily adjust to the economic conjuncture leading again to social and internal changes. At the end of the eighteenth century, the Republic had about 30,000 inhabitants in all, while the city itself including the suburbs had around 4,400 people.[3] The power of the Ragusan economy, founded on a shipping and maritime commerce was in contrast with the size of its area and population. Despite the general static view, the structure of Ragusan society was becoming more complex toward the turn of the century.[4]

The patriciate, burdened with political and economic responsibility, was experiencing a serious crisis. In 1800, the Major Council numbered 120

[3] Estimated values as referred in the Historical Archives of Dubrovnik (hereafter cited as HAD), *Cathasthicum*, vol. 12 (*Maestrello della Città e Borgo*).

[4] Voluminous data on Ragusan society in the latter half of the 18th century can be found in the following works by Žarko Muljačić: Ž. Muljačić, »Istraga protiv Jakobinaca u Dubrovniku 1797.« *Anali Historijskog instituta JAZU u Dubrovniku* 2 (1953): pp. 235-252; »Tko je dubrovački Montesquieu.« *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu* 2 (1955): pp. 173-182; »Salamankezi i Sorbonezi.« *Filologija* 2 (1959): pp. 161-173; »O strankama u starom Dubrovniku.« *Anali Historijskog instituta JAZU u Dubrovnik* 6-7 (1959): pp. 25-40; *Tomo Basiljević Baselji predstavnik prosvjećenja u Dubrovniku*. Beograd: SANU, 1958.

members, but its sessions were usually attended by less than 50 patricians.[5] The outdated and routine methods exerted in foreign policy over the centuries proved effectiveless in the new European political environment, and so did the old methods of social control over the economically advancing bourgeoisie and the discontented peasantry. The exertion of a new and consistent policy was hampered by conflict between the "old" and the "new" aristocracy, as well as by a series of political and ideological differences which disbalanced the inner coherency of the patriciate. In the political struggle between the two main cliques, the *Sorbonezi* and the *Salamankezi*, the criterion of blood succession was predetermined to disappear by the close of the eighteenth century, giving way to differing ideological and political views inside both groups. Due to the unstable political circumstances, and the waging of wars throughout Europe, the members of the nobility polarized in accordance with their favourized superpower, thus creating Francophile, Austrophile, and Russophile circles. In addition, the internal stability of the state was to suffer a far more dangerous rift within the nobility between a conservative group consisting of the landed aristocracy, and the somewhat smaller group of *marittimi*, that is, the wealthy aristocracy oriented towards maritime commerce, whose intention was to coordinate the government with its own objectives. The old order still survived to a certain extent, for the *Sorbonezi* were mostly Francophiles, while the *Salamankezi* were conservatives. The development of shipping stirred up the conflict between the nobility even further. Namely, some patricians became the owners of *karats*, that is the share of vessels and cargo. They represented a specific group within the above-mentioned *marittimi*. In the Senate, this group promoted bourgeois interests as well, since the shipowners came mostly from the ranks of commoners. Furthermore, a major part of the state income derived from shipping, the commoners found support among the ranks of the empoverished aristocracy whose main source of income was their sinecure. All the above reasons led the once compact nobility to ideological animosity. Furthermore, a number of cosmopolitan patricians pursued the modern ideas of the Enlightenment and the changes it introduced. The gap between the members of the nobility reached its climax in the final years of the Republic. A change in the social stratification was inevitable, and a mainly passive pressure of the new commercial classes upon the existing government was evident. Aware of the loss

[5] Ž. Muljačić, »Istraga protiv Jakobinaca«: p. 235

of its leading economic position, the aristocracy managed to moderate the coming social changes by means of statutes and decrees related specifically to shipping and commerce.[6]

Meanwhile, the urban population was experiencing drastic economic differentiation. A social eager of prosperous shipowners and merchants isolated itself from the rest of the population. Formally all the citizens were legally equal before the government; that is, they were all subjects but had no share in government. However, it must be noted that the financially powerful commoners had de facto considerable political influence and aspirations. Fraternities, societies that were characteristic of Mediterranean communities, played an important role in Ragusan social life. By keeping artifice control over the activities and membership of the fraternities of St. Anthony and St. Lazarus and its fellows, the Senate kept a close watch over the commoners, while the honours and privileges of the fellowship in the fraternities created a certain kind of "amity" with the aristocratic regime as well as a particular feeling of loyalty and patriotism, which resulted in a relatively passive attitude on the part of the commoners in the struggle for power. The rest of the commoners included the middle-scale merchants and craftsmen, small-scale merchants and middlemen, and the lowest social class, consisting of servants, sailors, laborers etc. The Ragusan Jews represented a specific community of merchants. Their status was legally specified by provisional decrees. The community was legally represented by a Jewish fraternity which, following the example of others, managed the complete affairs and activities of the Ragusan Jews.

The peasantry was neither socially compact nor equally treated by the authorities. Such a state resulted from the complex property laws. Various parts of the Republic were populated by freemen, semi-free peasants, serfs as well as those subject to special military and other obligations. As a rule, only the nobility and citizens were allowed to own real estate, with the exception of the free peasants in Astarea and the islands. Morewell of peasants often evaded the law by settling in the city, purchasing land, and leaving it

---

[6] Some clauses in the navigation regulations of the Dubrovnik Republic (*Regolamenti della Republica di Ragusa per la navigazione nazionale*) represent striking examples of the means of control over the growing concentration of wealth among the citizens. Regulations were frequently altered during the eighteenth century, and were printed in 1784 and 1794.

to their relatives in the country. This was particularly the case with those who had acquired their wealth by shipping. There also existed an institution of "life-long rent", which actually meant its transfer of ownership. The conservative part of the nobility failed to make large investments in shipping, as they received their income from the land and by performing government services (the so-called *Barnabotti*). Their intention was to land the peasants as much as possible, although no concrete legal conditions were prepared. Contrarily, in need of funds, enterprising patricians allowed the serfs to be redeemed. The right to acquire real property was granted to the citizens of Cavtat and Orebići in 1800, since the two places witnessed a considerable inflow of maritime capital, which enabled the captains to purchase the land of their ancestors.[7]

In such a traditional system of ownership, land was yet to find its place on the market and gain value. Furthermore, the authorities supported all the local patterns and customs, and due to the scattered patches of land and the discrepancy in rights and obligations, there existed no conditions for peasants to integrate. The development of the fleet failed to bring prosperity to the farmers, who were falling into an ever deepening crisis. This rural unrest culminated in a rebellion in Konavle in 1799/1800, which coincided with minor uprisings in Župa and Lastovo. Migration of the rural population to the urban area, and the rise in birthrates were to engender, at the dawn of the nineteenth century, a rapid increase of the city's population. The lack of cattle and fertilizers resulted in the decrease of rural population who, having fled to the city, settled on maritime jobs and manual work, increasing the problems of the poverty-stricken urban population. In order to supress the migrations, the Republic issued a decree by which Konavle peasants were forbidden to serve aboard ships.[8] Meanwhile, the housing problem worsened, while the prices of commodities of all kinds rose. A shortage of food represented a major problem for the government supply office, forcing the Senate to intervene on several occasions, promising fellowship of St. Anthony and St. Lazarus fraternity as a reward to those merchants who would ship the food to the city under most favourable terms. Due to the downfall of the trade

---

[7] HAD, *Cosilium Maius*, vol. 66, ff. 116v-117v.

[8] Josip Luetić, »Obrisi ekonomsko-društvenih prilika u Dubrovačkoj Republici 1797.-1807.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Istraživačkog centra JAZU u Dubrovniku* 21 (1983): p. 85.

colonies in the hinterland, deficient domestic production, and the need to import enormous amounts of food, the Dubrovnik government was constantly suffering from a trade deficit. Cereals, rice, meat, coal, and luxury goods were mostly imported, and in the last years of the Republic this trend was particularly prominent, as the deficit amounted to ás much as 1,385,750 piasters.[9]

The total state expenditure was covered by the shipping income, which represented the branch of the Republic's economy, and its most lucrative source of income. The vast majority of the maritime commercial income (with a total of 3,025,000 piasters was obtained by the long-distance shipping, and only 700,000 piasters by cabotage and inland trade. Their profit was distributed in the form of 15% interest in the capital invested into 270 vessels (about 2,025,000 piasters), as well as the salaries for 3000 seamen aboard the Ragusan vessels, amounting approximately to 1,000,000 piasters. Bettera writes that the Republic had as many as 350 ships, 80 of which were for coastal navigation (up to 16 tons dead weight), and 270 ocean liners with an average dead weight of 250 tons. The shipment of goods contributed to the state budget by means of an annual tax (arboratic) which varied according to the capacity and the exploiting of the ship. According to the official record of *Arboraggi*, a continual increase in the number of ships was evident from the beginning of the nineteenth century to 1805, when 278 ships were registered with a total dead weight of 24,772 carriages.[10]

On account of war risks, the shipping lease and the freight charges were rather high, to the benefit of the shipowners. At the end of the eighteenth century, the Republic of Dubrovnik was the only neutral state in the Mediterranean that enjoyed specific privileges, which accounts for why its ships were seen Europewide. Because of this, and the fact that Genoa and the Republic of Venice no longer presented dangerous competition, new markets opened up before the Ragusan merchant fleet, which began to speed up its development. Ragusan vessels sailed to Constantinople, Alexandria, Livorno,

---

[9] The state of Ragusan economy prior to the French occupation is well-documented in: Bogdan Krizman »Memoire Bara Bettere austrijskom generalu T. Milutinoviću g. 1815.« *Anali Historijskog instituta JAZU u Dubrovniku* 1 (1952): pp. 423-464. The data referential to income and expenditure fully correspond to an earlier report on the same matter by D. Garagnin, which he dispatched to the French authorities in Zadar on 13 September 1810 (HAD, *Acta Gallica*). All the data further cited is based on Bettera's report.

[10] HAD, *Navigatio*, vol. 16. (*Arboraggi*).

Marseille, and the Spanish coast. Maritime activities were supported by the diplomatic efforts of the Republic which organized a widespread consular network in an attempt to gain exclusive trading rights.

Although considerable, the maritime industry alone was unable to create sufficient and solid economic foundations, social stability and prospects. Military campaigns halted sea-traffic, thus causing great government expenditures, and the changeable political circumstances were no liable guarantee for the success of maritime enterprises. Had the political conditions been more stable, Dubrovnik would have met up against strong competition from the Atlantic states, which had growing aspirations in the Mediterranean. In the city itself, by reason of the petrified political system, capital funds were not redirected into other economic activities. As a result, shipping, the main economic activity, folded together with the Republic. As private ownership in the classical meaning of the word, and capital as such did not actually exist, hardly any progress was being made in the manufacturing business. The income was mainly deposited in foreign banks, invested into the enlargement of the fleet, or used for the purchase of luxury commodities.[11] Disadvantaged by such conditions, the Republic's prospects seemed rather vague. The patriciate was most anxious about the change in the rigid social system necessitated by the reproduction of capital, foreign creditors, and local commoners acquiring great wealth. Owing to the limiting conditions of capital investment, and in fear of being attacked by neighbouring countries, the Ragusans preferred to deposit money into several foreign banks rather than in their own. The majority of the deposits belonged to various ecclesiastical and government foundations but some of them were private accounts. The annual government income from the funds deposited in Vienna, Naples, Rome, and the Venetian Republic amounted to 63,222 ducats, and represented by far the greatest income source of the budget. This sum was followed by the annual tax collected from shipping, with a total of 54,260 ducats, the salt monopoly (30,000), the wine and liquour trade (26,095), customs duty (23,025), tax charges of the Levant consulates (15,350), and a number of minor revenues of 1,000 or 2,000 ducats. With regard to the gross national product and the

[11] Some Ragusans passionately disapproved of lavish expenditure on luxuries. In 1803, Mato Pozza, who, in the spirit of true physiocracy, wrote a pamphlet spiced with characters from the Roman past which bitterly criticized Ragusan bon vivants, HAD, *Katić legacy* R.O. 170, CXCIV no. 9.

income per inhabitant, the Republic occupied one of the leading positions among the highly developed countries at the close of the eighteenth century.

With regard to the maritime ownership structure, it is worth-while noting that in the early nineteenth century the newly shaped stratum of wealthy commoners was establishing itself as a financial elite, but with no access to political power. It controled about 75% of the shipping business. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, 300 ship share-holders were registered from the ranks of commoners, and as few as 80 among the patricians.[12] Apparently, this disbalance in favor of the commoners had no decisive effect upon their gaining political power. The reasons seem to have been manifold, some of which have already been dealt with. The fact that the Republic occupied a small territory helped the aristocracy to control it without difficulty, and to prevent any undesirable actions which might occur. Their traditionally incorporated sense of loyalty discouraged the Ragusan plebeians to take advantage of their majority, and from using it in political causes. Legal particularism was based on the system of privileges, thus producing a blending of the old "jus", and the new "lex". The aristocracy resorted to all the legal devices in order to obstruct the development of the private ownership, and the citizens' right to associate and organize freely. On account of the nature of its maritime economy, Dubrovnik could not witness the prevailing of private ownership in the true sense, but rather it was ownership of the corporate bonds type which functioned mainly on the basis of family capital, which acted as a kind of insurance and guarantee in case of business risks. These conditions, regardless of the existence of inital financial funds, could not stimulate the creation of complete market system, the basis of a developed system of labor distribution.

Viewed generally, the social consciousness in the Republic was at the prepolitical level, and engendered very slow reforms. There is ground to believe that part of the urban population was willing to follow the changes, but not to initiate them. The peasants' discontent could not have been characterized as political support to the urbanized classes, as there were no integrative features of the two social groups. Contrarily, some citizens kept serfs, and half-

[12] Josip Luetić, *O pomorstvu Dubrovačke Republike u XVIII. stoljeću.* Zagreb-Dubrovnik: JAZU, 1959: pp. 98, 99. From the karat evidence in the sub-series HAD, *Navigatio,* vol.14-18 (*Ruoli*), it should be noted that the citizens increased their ship-holding shares as much as 80% in the period from 1800 to 1806.

free peasants on their estates. The miserable living conditions of the peasantry in the neighboring Turkish lands and in Venetian Dalmatia, as well as the hovering threat of the hostile states in question, represented a strong enough argument for the official policy to discourage the peasants from any kind of rebellion, imposing upon them the idea that their freedom depended entirely on the current regime.

There is no doubt that the actual economic and social system, exacerbated by the occurances in foreign relations, influenced the rapid fall of the Republic after the French occupation. The most fatal mistake of all was the exclusive reliance on maritime economy, for when that collapsed the Republic had little chance of rehabilitation and revitalization after Napoleon's downfall. The Senate strained to adjust to the new political situation in France, and gain trust of the current civil government, while at the same time, it worked hard on the supression of every revolutionary and democratic idea in Dubrovnik. However, the French influence over the commoners and the patriciate alike was immense in all the domains of public life. French fashion, language, and appearances were symbols of something new and avantgarde, while the works of the French writers had already found their place on the shelves of Ragusan libraries. The patrician cliques of the *Salamankezi* and the *Sorbonezi* no longer corresponded to Austrophile and Francophile circles, but gave rise to numerous conflicts within the groups themselves. It should, however, be noted that no particular political force acted openly on the downfall of the Republic. Differing views of the groups could also be seen in their attitude to international foreign policy. Which of the power states would offer more appropriate support to the Republic was the issue mostly argued about. This ancient political pattern, wavering and void of every initiative, hastened the collapse of Dubrovnik.

Owing to their well-developed consular and diplomatic network, and in particular to the activities of the representatives F. Favi in Paris and S. Ayala in Vienna, the Senate was well informed about current political activities in Europe. However, this did not prove sufficient in surmounting the series of critical events occurring from 1797 till 1806, which eventually resulted in the economic failure of the Republic, shortly succeeded by its political collapse. After the brief visit of a French squadron in September 1797, the so-called Jacobinic scandal broke out, which was to reveal to the public a number of distinguished persons who advocated liberal bourgeois ideas. At the same time, this very affair triggered a most serious argument among the members

of the Senate which went so far as to involve the Habsburg Court, too.[13] The first major contribution was required by the French commissary, Commeyras from the Ionian islands in 1798 amounting to 600,000 Turin liras, which the Republic managed to lower to three hundred Turkish groschens.[14] Before the year 1801, there is record of several disbursements of minor contributions, "loans", or tokens to Russian and Austrian agents in Boka, and the French consul and aga in Trebinje.[15] Severe conflicts in the Mediterranean from 1789-1801 caused the Ragusan maritime commercial income to decrease. Its poor financial state impelled the Republic to turn to the Vatican for help, with Benedict Stay acting as mediator. The insufficient financial resources brought into question the maintainance of the convents of St. Clare and St. Catharine, and by the approval of the pope Pius VII, the Benedictine monastery on the island of Lokrum was shut down, and let out to prosperous citizens.[16] One of the methods the Republic employed in its attempt to improve its budget were increasing indirect taxes on shipping stocks, selling land, and importing goods, as well as raising price of salt. The discontent of the peasantry stirred by a government decree by which they were obliged to purchase state manufactured salt was instrumentalized by the Austrian authorities in Boka Kotorska, resulting in the Konavle uprising in 1799/1800. The counter-effects of the latter required further financial undertakings, and the Republic had already drawn too much attention from European diplomatic circles as it was.[17] The Treaty of Amiens and Paris in 1801 recovered the overseas trade

---

13 Ž. Muljačić, »Istraga protiv Jakobinaca«: passim.

14 P. Pisani, *La Dalmatie*: p. 128. In the instructions given to A. Sorgo by the Senate, the payment of a total sum of 600,000 liras was to take place. HAD, *Isprave i akti 19 st.*, 8590/1 no. 114, I-IV.

15 The Russian envoys Iveljić and Stankovski received a sum of 2,000 zechins each, whereas the others were satisfied with smaller amounts. HAD, *Consilium Rogatorum*, vol. 204, f. 28v; vol. 205, f. 27r; vol. 206, ff. 12v, 13r; vol. 207, ff. 28r, 61r.

16 V. Foretić, *Povijest Dubrovnika II*: p. 336; An interesting poetic account of the period is to be found in the hexametrical poem *Periegesis orae Rhacusinae* of the Latinist Đuro Ferić, in which he describes the gloomy prospects of the Republic's economy, farming in particular. Although being a member of the clergy, Ferić was among the accused in the Jacobinic affair, the fact that most certainly explains the author's attitude in the poem. Cf. Ivan Pederin, »Đuro Ferić kao pjesnik hrvatskih fiziokrata i jedan od začetnika hrvatskoga narodnog preporoda.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Istraživačkog centra JAZU u Dubrovniku* 21 Dubrovnik (1983): pp. 225-250.

17 Stjepan Antoljak, »Konavoska buna u središtu jednog dijela evropske diplomacije 1799.-1800.« *Rad JAZU* 286 (1952): pp. 107-141.

in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, but Dubrovnik came into conflict with Russia on account of the latter's consul, Fonton. The two sides agreed to compromise in 1804.[18]

Diplomatic tensions which took place in Dubrovnik in 1804/1805 were tending to make the Republic an object of the compensation of the great powers.[19] From then on, the Senate was dominated by the Francophile forces headed by Tomo Bassegli and Antun Sorgo, with adherents from the patriciate ranks who promoted the literary and philosophical postulates of the Enlightenment, but not the radical secular Jacobinic principles. That was the spirit in which Basegli conceived his 1804 tractate, *Le plan de réforme de la constitution de la République de Raguse*, in which he advocates from the rationalistic and bourgeois points of view, the social reforms void of revolutionary methods.[20]

Despite its neutral foreign policy and declaratively amicable relations with France, the events which succeeded inevitably marred the well-being of the Republic. This started shortly after the ratification of the Peace of Pressburg on 1 January 1806, by which France was to come into possession of Dalmatia and Boka. Namely, in excuse of the protection of Turkey, Napoleon's intention was to push Austria back, launch an offensive to the east, and reach an agreement with Russia at Turkey's expense, or vice versa. Having anticipated these plans, Sankowsky, the Russian envoy to Boka, acting according to the instructions of Czartoryski, and with the approval of Austria, managed to win over the Montenegrin ruler Petar I while preparing for the arrival of the Russian fleet under admiral Senjavin. The interests of the great powers in the Adriatic dictated the conflict which necessarily involved the Republic of Dubrovnik.[21] Shuttled between the French army in Dalmatia and the Rus-

---

18 V. Foretić, *Povijest Dubrovnika II*: p. 435. The conflict was caused by the traditional banning of Orthodox church services in the city, as well as the graffiti on the Orthodox chapel. Although consistent in such matters, the republic had to give way, since the privilege of sea-traffic in the Black sea was of graver importance. The latter was accomplished thanks to the Prussian envoy to Constantinople, the Ragusan Miho Božović.

19 On the intelligence of the great powers operating in the Dubrovnik region cf. Tomo Matić, »Izvještaj austrijskog političkog emisara o Dubrovniku i njegovom balkanskom zaleđu iz 1805.« *Starine JAZU* 37 (1934): pp. 177-188, and Mihailo Gavrilović, »Ispisi iz pariskih arhiva.« *Zbornik za istoriju jezik i književnost SANU* (1904): pp. 10-20.

20 Ž. Muljačić, *Tomo Basiljević Baselji:* p. 45.

sians in Boka, the Republic made every diplomatic effort possible to maintain its non-respected neutrality which required extra financial means.[22] The role of Austria in handing Boka over to the Russian fleet, and the disbursal made to the French general Molitor on behalf of the Ragusan representatives Bassegli and Zlatarić, along with similar attempts occasioned by the Konavle count Sigismund Sorgo toward the Russians, are the most disputed moments prior to the French invasion of the city.[23] However, the French intention to occupy the Republic on their way to Boka is beyond all dispute. According to Molitor's itinerary, the burst of the French army was to take place as early as 2 February. In support of this is Talleyrand's letter to consul Raymond, who was preparing for the mission to Dubrovnik, and to his colleague Ruffin in Constantinople. In the correspondence he discloses the strategic interests of the French.[24]

The rapid sequence of events caught the senators by surprise, and the majority gave their votes for the French troops to enter the city on 27 May 1806. Such a voting result must have been obtained due to the Francophile majority.[25] The Senate's estimation was based on the supposition that a French occupation was by far a less painful experience than what the Republic might undergo after a possible invasion of the Russians and Montenegrins. The aristocracy confided in the alleged promise that the Republic's sovereignty would not be put at stake, in hope of the protection of its interests in the fu-

---

21 On French and Russian geopolitical interests, see E. Driault, *La politique orientale de Napoléon: Sebastiani et Gardane*. Paris, 1904; P. Mackesy, *The War in the Mediterranean 1803-1810*. London, 1957; N. E. Saul, *Russia and the Mediterranean 1797-1807*. Chicago, 1970.

22 At the beginning of 1806, the Senate repeatedly ratified the credit payments for the French, Austrian and Russian envoys. The Austrian envoy to Boka, Cavalcabo, was to receive 12,000 florins. The Russian envoys to Boka, Baily and Sankowsky, were rewarded with 1,000 golden Venetian zechins each, in line with captain Vojnović, prince Petar and the French consul Bruère. The greatest sums were planned for the possible transportation of the French troops by sea from Ston to Boka (30,000 ducats on two occasions). HAD, *Consilium Rogatorum*, vol. 210, ff. 17, 20v, 21r, 23rv, 25rv.

23 HAD, *Isprave i akti 19. st.*, 8, 590/1 no. 27, 31, 28, 40, 44 (mission Bassegli-Zlatarić); ib. 30, 39 (mission Sorgo); ib. 28, 43 (letters of the Republic to Molitor who was to receive 300,000 francs withdrawn from the state deposit account in Vienna with the aid of the Austrian banker Schuller on 30 April, 5, 15 and 20 May). See note 22.

24 S. Antoljak, »Predaja Dalmacije«: p. 45.

25 The Senate assembled on 26 May, but no resolutions were recorded, HAD, *Consilium Rogatorum*, vol. 210, f. 30v.

ture negotiations. One must not fail to observe the fact that the French were advancing across battle fields in much of Europe. Their estimations proved reasonable, but unfortunately the Republic failed to state its position in relation to the French and other hostile parties, persisting in its non-effective neutral policy.

With the arrival of the French armies, life in the city experienced a tremendous change: and almost all the convents were converted into barracks, the troops even to occupied the churches themselves, but only those where the Holy Sacrament was not performed.[26] The officers moved into the better dwellings of the patricians and commoners, and by the order of Lauriston, the Ragusan College was converted into a military hospital. The French troops, not extensive in number, were undertrained, exhausted and insufficiently provided for. The whole of their southern Adriatic campaign was superficially planned and rashly carried out. The French strategists hopefully relied upon the financial support of the Republic even at the cost of the latter's economic self-destruction. June of 1806 saw the culmination of the Franco-Russian conflict, when the Russian troops in Boka, aided by the navy and the Montenegrin military, forced their way into Konavle and Župa to the city precincts, which they kept under siege. The primitive mental pattern dazzled by the riches of Catholic Dubrovnik spurred the Orthodox population of the eastern Herzegovina to join the agressors, providing this conflict with a religios dimension, too.[27] In June, the whole territory of the Republic turned into a scene of crime and plunder, the reported real property losses reached the enormous sum of 8,827,524 ducats.[28] A French reinforcement of about 1,600 soldiers under general Molitor managed to push back the agressors by the beginning of July, after which victory the whole city rejoiced.

---

[26] The French military occupied as many as 15 church buildings in Dubrovnik. Most of them served as ammunition store-houses or lodgings. As a result, they were severely devastated. The French made use of public buildings, as well, such as the Rector's Palace and Sponza, while the theater was turned into an army bakery. HAD, *Acta Gallica* (hereafter cited as *A. G.*), 1810, no.48, FII, 577 (*Stato delle Case e fabricati nazionali ocupati gratuitamente dalli stabilimenti e servizio publico*).

[27] The most complete account of the siege is to be found in the diary notes of Francesco Maria Appendini, *Ratovanje oko Dubrovnika 1806.* Dubrovnik, 1906.

[28] HAD, *A. G.*, 1810, no.58, FXI, 10, on the damages estimated by the Dubrovnik tribunal in the first days of May 1810, on the occasion of the departure of the Dubrovnik mission for an audience with Napoleon in Paris. Several issues were on the agenda, including the failure of reparations.

The similarity of the social and religious background of the invader and the invaded, both faced with a common enemy, contributed to the strenghtening of the French rule in the period to come. These relations were being further warmed up by the continual skirmishes with the Russians on Ragusan territory and in Boka, under the successful command of general Marmont which began in August 1806.[29] Similar conditions lasted until the signing of the Treaty of Tilsit on 7 July 1807, by which some new spheres of interest were determined. According to the above agreements, in which Dubrovnik is nowhere to be explicitely cited, Russia yielded to the French interests in the Adriatic, which undoubtedly marked the turning point of the French policy concerning the Republic's sovereignty.

The aim of the French policy in Dubrovnik in 1806/1807 was to force the Senate to cease with every form of activity, a method which they previously tested with Genoa and Venice, and make way for the Ragusan Francophiles to carry out a "spontaneous revolution". However, in order to provide stronger foundations for the future government, time played an important role, and thus, Ragusan sovereignty along with its symbols was abolished gradually. At the same time, the French military authorities under the command of General Lauriston, by means of increasing contributions almost completely exhausted the remainder of the Ragusan financial funds. The military and political layout in the Mediterranean, combined with anything but pragmatic decisions of the French in Dubrovnik, induced the definite collapse of the commercial fleet, the basis of the Ragusan economy.

The sovereignty of Dubrovnik was to the purpose of the French only when the Senate served as means of forwarding French political interests. The best proof of the mentioned is to be found in 77 letters by Lauriston addressed to the Senate during the occupation.[30] He took immediate steps towards the Republic's financing of the army, organizing its provision, maintainance of hospitals, road and sea traffic for military purposes as well as the responsibility for public services and sanitation. The biggest blow was his demand for a one-million-franc contribution.[31] With the arrival of general Marmont

---

[29] Auguste Marmont, *Memoari*. Split: Logos, 1984: pp. 47-55. Marmont gives a critical account of the state of the French troops in Dubrovnik, blaming it on Lauriston's incompetence, as he holds the latter responsible for the unnecessary sacrifice of men, p. 28.

[30] HAD, *Isprave i akti 19. st.*, 18, 600/I, no. 1-77.

in August and the continuance of the hostilities against the Russians, the expenditures of the Republic increased due to extensive fortification works. First, Marmont came before the Senate with a demand for a "loan" of 16,000 piasters, to be suceeded by another 32,000 ducats. In order to meet this, the Senate asked for a loan from the wealthy aristocracy and prosperous citizens; the proposition was accordingly denied by Lauriston. Intending to financially impair the nobility, Lauriston rejected a broader contribution, demanding, in the best manner of Jacobinism, that only five of the wealthiest citizens act as money lenders to the state.[32] The Senate agreed to direct negotiations with Marmont, who was stationed in Konavle, and their envoy Niko Pozze made their final financial proposal of 10,000 piasters as the bottom line of their finances.[33] Marmont agreed upon the suggested amount, and from then on tried to spare the treasury. His intention, however, was to establish amicable relations with the aristocracy and the wealthy commoners, a matter upon which he and Lauriston greatly disagreed, since the latter's intention was to burden these very two classes.

By July 14, the Republic had disbursed 258,084 ducats from its treasury, 109,384 in cash and the rest in goods. The remainder of the contribution, amounting to 273,000 francs, was paid off by means of withdrawing capital deposits in foreign banks and selling government securities, which required more time.[34] By the middle of November, the Republic's expenditures rose to as much as 535,461 ducats. The mentioned total with all the due accounting was presented in a letter addressed to the newly appointed envoy in Paris, Antun Sorgo.[35] The instructions to A. Benvenuti, representative in Rome, confirm that the Republic had emptied all its treasuries, that it had further

---

31 HAD, *Consilium Rogatorum*, vol. 210, ff. 50r-51r, 53v, 54r. The complete payment of this enormous sum could not have taken place on such short notice, so the Senate managed to collect 40,000 ducats within 24 hours. The treasurers were ordered to collect the silverware from the city's churches.

32 HAD, *Consilium Rogatorum*, vol. 210, ff. 60rv; *Isprave i akti 19. st.* 18.600/1 no. 23-25.

33 HAD, *Consilium Rogatorum*, vol. 210, f. 68v, 69r; *Isprave i akti 19. st.* 8-2.590 no. 39.

34 HAD, *Isprave i akti 19. st.*, 8-2.590, no. 25. Almost identical data was presented by general Lauriston in his report to the Viceroy Eugene. Cf. H. T. Bjelovučić, *The Ragusan Republic*: p. 109.

35 Austrian consul Timoni estimated the total material and financial losses of the Republic to 12 million ducats. Cf. H. T. Bjelovučić, *The Ragusan Republic*: p. 363.

withdrawn 164,337 florins from Vienna deposit funds, and also obtained 36,195 escudos from the melting of church silverware.[36]

In addition, on 9 August, the Senate was forced to issue a decree to all its captains and consuls, directing them to dismiss the crews, conserve the ships, and await further instructions.[37] French occupation, war campaigns, and pirating in the Mediterranean engendered a rapid and complete collapse of the Ragusan fleet. Vessels which sailed along routes from the Black Sea to the Apennine peninsula, and from north Africa to the western Mediterranean found themselves amid war activities, and were confiscated by various warring parties. During the Russo-Montenegrin siege, the vessels harboured in the home port suffered severe damage, as did the Adriatic coastal liners. In 1806 and 1807 alone, the Russians seized as many as 43 Ragusan vessels. Piracy continued in subsequent years but now culprits were Englishmen. The Ragusan Mediterranean fleet was to endure even greater losses. Shortly after the decree concerning the conservation of boats, the majority of the vessels were sold and the crews dismissed. Large-scale confiscation followed Lauriston's order of 21 December 1807 calling for the raising of the flag of the Kingdom of Italy aboard all the Ragusan ships, which made them easy prey for the English pirates.[39] The damage the Republic had suffered was irrevocable. Almost 150 liners had been lost, and the part of the fleet which had managed to escape confiscation was decaying in ports Europe-wide. In less than two years' time, the Republic lost all of its regular maritime income, while the seamen, share-holders, and all those whose well-being depended upon shipping commerce were left without any income.[40]

---

36 HAD, *Isprave i akti 19. st.*, 8, 590 no. 27.

37 HAD, *Isprave i akti 19. st.*, 8, 590/1 no. 114 I-IV. The Senate instructions given to A. Sorgo contain a detailed history of events, describing all the contributions made from the day of the French arrival in Dalmatia, with references to the subjugation of Dubrovnik, and the conflict with the Russians and Montenegrins.

38 Stjepan Vekarić, »Podaci o Dubrovačkim brodovima za vrijeme i nakon francuske okupacije.« *Anali Historijskog instituta JAZU u Dubrovniku* 2 (1953): p. 361; HAD, *Navigatio*, vol. 16 (*Arboraggi*).

39 HAD, *Isprave i akti 19. st.*, 18. 600/1. no. 70. This gave rise to vigorous protests by the Senate the following day, b. 8-2.590, no. 55.

40 S. Vekarić, »Podaci o Dubrovačkim brodovima«: pp. 366, 367; Vinko Ivančević »Prilog poznavanju dubrovačkog pomorstva u razdoblju francuskog zaposjednuća (1806-1813).« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti IC JAZU u Dubrovniku* 17 (1979): pp. 366-369.

Arduous diplomatic efforts on the Republic's behalf failed to give results, but led to direct conflict with the French in 1807. Some French officials already considered the Republic nonexistent. This was quite evident from the Talleyrand's instructions dispatched to the Constantinople envoy Sebastiani. This document contained a plan for the abolishment of the Republic, and its annexation to the Kingdom of Italy. The letter also gave instructions in case of a Turkish protest in which Talleyrand anticipated the diplomatic actions of Dubrovnik.[41] The incidents which immediately preceded the abolishment of the Republic were not the result of the vitality of the government, but that of a desperate reaction of an out-dated system, which triggered Marmont's act of abolishment.[42]

This act, read before the Senate on 31 January 1808, stirred no direct reaction either in the city itself or in the surroundings, as it actually sanctioned the already existing situation.[43] The financial collapse, enormous losses, and the strenghtening position of the French during the occupation completely diminished and neutralized the resistance occasioned by the abolishment. Considering that Marmont did abolish the Republic according to his own free decision, he informed Napoleon of his actions and the reasons for them immediately after the event itself. Meanwhile, with no knowledge of the abolishment, Napoleon, too, reacted to the protests of the Ragusan Senate with Turkey. In his letter of 10 February, he commands Marmont to carry out preventive arrests of three senators, take hold of the government records, and threaten with the death penalty those who were keeping any kind of foreign correspondence. The order to abolish the Republic had not yet been given by Napoleon. After having received Marmont's letter, Napoleon approved of this action in a brief note dating 18 February, suggesting the arrest of ten senators so as to avoid possible uprisings.[44]

---

41 M. Gavrilović, »Ispisi«: p. 325.

42 Refers to the refusal of using the Italic flag, (HAD, *Isprave i akti 19. st.*, 8-2, 590.2, no. 62 for 1807); Protest against levying the navy (Ib., 590.3, no. 1, 2 for 1808); Diplomatic conspiracy in Bosnia and Constantinople (A. Marmont, *Memoari*: pp. 103, 119), and the list of Francophile families allegedly to be expelled from the city or even killed by order of the Senate (M. Gavrilović, »Ispisi«: pp. 237, 238.)

43 The documents related to the abolition of the Republic and the speech of captain Delort have not been preserved in the original. Three identical contemporary copies are kept in the HAD, *A. G.* 1808, no. 1, FI, 9; *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 1rv, and they have been repeatedly published; see L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika II*: pp. 77-81.

44 A. Marmont, *Memoari*: p. 121.

Contrary to Napoleon's expectations, the Senate made no attempt to exhibit open protest against the abolishment, neither with the French nor their opponents. The literature, especially that of earlier date, refers to the matter of abolishment within the context of international law based on the supposition that in the case of Dubrovnik, the French violated international legal rules. This argument however ignores the fact that international law is a legal system in the making, and that its codification did not begin until the latter half of the nineteenth century. Only a limited number of international legal principles were in effect at the time, having existed dispositively, and not by established formulae. Therefore, in this case we cannot apply the norms and the spirit of an international law created much later around the turn of the following century. In the period concerned, international arbitration was not commonplace, and the involvement of a neutral state in war was entirely possible. Regarding the terms of international law in the strict sense, the invasion of the Republic and its abolishment is not to be viewed as an example of occupation, but rather debellation, i. e., subjugation. In addition, according to the principle of efficacy of government, after 26 May 1806 the Senate cannot be recognized as a form of government. In the political sense, the Republic issued no official statements concerning these events, and according to the regulations of international law of that time, a passive attitude and silence implied consent of the present condition. When viewed from the standpoint of international law, there were no grounds for reparation, damage compensation, and restoration of the former Republic's regime, as such institutions did not exist at the time. After all, the Republic of Dubrovnik had never formally declared war on France, and even if the former had been present at the Vienna Congress, it would not have been in a position to appeal to any international law of war.[45]

[45] Juraj Andrassy, *Međunarodno pravo*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1980: pp. 25, 262.

The organization of the French administration in Dubrovnik in 1808 and 1809

Upon the abolishment of the Republic, Dubrovnik's territory was not annexed to Dalmatia, where the organization of authority was entrusted to the French governor, Vicenzo Dandolo. Because of its historical tradition as an independent state, specific strategic significance, and Marmont's personal grudge against Dandolo, the former Dubrovnik Republic became a special French creation, subordinate to the Italian viceroy in Milan.[46] The element of subordinance was not of much importance, however, for the civil administrator in Dubrovnik had a fairly high level of discretion. However, in everyday life he was often forced to submit to the military authorities, who were superior to all civil institutions.

As a special territorial and administrative unit, the Dubrovnik region remained under French rule until January 1814. Those years were to witness several reorganizations of the judiciary and administration in accordance with political events and the expansion of the French territories. In spite of its short rule, the French government initiated a number of changes in all the segments of public and political life, as well as the economy.

The process of the establishment of the French government in Dubrovnik can be divided into two stages:

The first stage includes the years 1808 and 1809, that is, from the abolishment of the Republic to the formal proclamation of the Illyrian Provinces. During this period, the French introduced civil administrative and judicial institutions. It definitely marked the dawning of a new time which was to minimize traditional social norms in favor of a society oriented towards the individual and modern democratic ideas. The society founded on personal ties, feudal privileges, and immunities characteristic of the Ancien Régime was gradually abolished, along with medieval public institutions. These events were to launch a truly new historical era, whose ideological and spiritual elements had actually existed much earlier. However, it is necessary to note

[46] The period of French rule, the changes it introduced, and the organization of the new government in particular have not yet been investigated very thoroughly. A number of shorter works by Z. Šundrica and V. Ivančević will be referred to hereafter. The documents related to this period are housed in the funds of the French administration (*Acta Gallica*) and the Dubrovnik Commune in the Historical Archives of Dubrovnik. Some minor sources are kept in a number of series of the fund related to the Dubrovnik Republic.

that for Dubrovnik (and for that matter in much of Dalmatia), these changes were not revolutionary in character, but that primarily the collapse of economy, insufficient resources, and unfavorable war circumstances had all contributed to the Republic's economic decline and its continuing stagnation for many years to come.[47]

The second stage covers the years from 1810 to1814, that is, from the beginning of the functioning of the Illyrian Provinces until the French defeat and the establishment of Austrian rule in the Dubrovnik region. This period is characterized by a series of governmental experiments on behalf of the French authorities which failed to define and implement the basis of a new social order, primarily by reason of insufficient support of the bourgoisie, and the very strong traditional social background. The French rule experienced popular discontent as early as 1810, spurred by the new tax system and military draft regulations. Unable to defend the system by other means save force, the French administartion was doomed to fall.

This part of the study will deal with the first period, namely, the establishment of the French administration in 1808 and 1809. The key role in this process was played by the French general (later to become marshal) and the duke of Dubrovnik, Auguste de Marmont, and the civil governor of Dubrovnik and the region of Boka Kotorska, Ivan Dominik Garagnin.[48] Marmont's position of the protector and creator of the new government in Dubrovnik emerged from his personal ambition as Napoleon's favorite having abolished the Republic upon his free will. His work was additionally burdened with the strategic importance of the Dubrovnik region, recognized as such by Napoleon himself.[49]

---

[47] Cf. Šime Peričić, »Prvobitna proizvodnja Dubrovačkog okružja od 1815. do 1848.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Istraživačkog centra JAZU u Dubrovniku* 21 (1983): pp. 251-269.

[48] Ivan Dominik Garagnin (1761-1848), born in Trogir, educated Francophile and physiocrat. Marmont had perfect trust in him, and he was appointed delegate to Makarska and Split from 1806 to 1808. From 1808 till the end of 1811 Garagnin occupied the leading position in the French civil administration in Dubrovnik, where he proved to be a skillful politician and organizer. On account of his responsibility in the performance of his duty and loyalty, Napoleon awarded him the title of baron. He was also decorated with the Legion of Honor. At the end of 1811 he retired from political life to his estate in Trogir. Austrian consul Timoni sees him as an intelligent, witty, and sensible politician.

[49] A. Marmont, *Memoari*: pp. 87, 88. From 1806 to 1814, Dubrovnik saw as many as 31 French generals, cf. the list in the calendar *L' Epidauritano lunario raguseo* (1895): pp. 51-58.

Immediately upon the issuing of the abolishment act on 31 January, Marmont personally issued a number of decrees related to the establishment of the new order. That very day, a commission was organized with the purpose of taking inventory of all the existing official documents in the notary chamber, chancellery, and the dragoman's office. This was preceded by a strict order for posting of guards, and the sealing of all the entrance doors to the chambers and stores of the Republic. A decree concerned with taxes and fees, the major sources of the new government budget, was issued by Marmont on 3 February 1808.[50]

Article 5 of Marmont's decree of the abolishment of the Republic enabled the constitution of the judicial council of the provisional administration consisting of four judges: Jakov Natali, Petar Stulli, and Antun Chersa, with Niko N. Pozza presiding. The aged French consul Bruère Desrivaux was appointed temporary chairman. The judges were entrusted with the governmental offices of the former Republic with all the pertaining documents, while the employees were expected to wear cockades of the Italian Kingdom on their hats.[51] Shortly after these initial steps, Marmont left Dubrovnik for a certain period of time.

As early as 9 February, Marmont issued a decree by which he appointed a new civil administrator of the Dubrovnik region, Ivan Dominik Garagnin. The enormous energy and skill of this Trogir-born official marked the following three years of the French administration in Dubrovnik. It was with his arrival on 15 March that the new French administration in the Dubrovnik region began functioning, and from then on, its protocolled documents can be traced. That same day saw the proclamation of Garagnin's appointment to the post and the start of the new administration. According to Marmont's order, Garagnin's monthly pay amounted to 1,000 francs, while the president of the tribunal earned 6,000, and judges 4,000 Venetian liras annually, all from the budget of the former Republic.[52]

On 18 March Marmont was issued a new decree concerning government organization in Dubrovnik as a distinct unit within the Italian Kingdom. Major

---

50 The Dubrovnik Scientific Library, MS. 917/1,2; HAD, *A. G.* 1808, *Special positions*.

51 HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 5v-6v.

52 *A. G.* 1808, no.1, Fl, 1, 3, 4. According to the record of 14 February 1808 the treasury of the Republic had 38,613 ducats.

administrative and judicial issues were regulated by this decree, which consisted of 20 articles. The previous appointment of the judges, who were to act in accordance with former laws, was confirmed, and Bruère was named the Empire's commissioner to the court. The complete administration was inherited from the former government, as well as the staff of the financial department, charity organizations, and local administration, who all were subordinate to the civil administrator, Garagnin. His line of duty also included the organization of the local armed forces, consisting of one hundred gendarmes posted in Dubrovnik, Cavtat, Slano, and Orebić. Gendarmes were to be chosen among persons of confidence, and half of them would be engaged on a full-time basis with regular salaries. All the taxes, debts, dues, payments, and obligations were to be dealt with in the former way, while the total government expenditures and those of the administration and the judiciary were to be covered from the state budget. This document also gave Dubrovnik particular military weight, as the final article explicitely stated that the civil administrator was directly subject to the military official in charge of the French forces, General Clauzel, who was granted superior authority over all the matters. From the very first days of the new administration Marko Milli Bošković and Jakov Betondi both occupied the post of the accountant, and shortly preceded the establishment of the civil police office led by the commissioner Angelo Frezza, who was authorized by the new government to issue all personal documents and passports. The police office was also in charge of the inventory and enumeration of all the houses in town, primarily for the purpose of the accomodation of the French officers and soldiers in the homes of the citizens of Dubrovnik.[53]

The abolishment of the Republic and introduction of the French government brought an end to the medieval communal type of administration by which the state was territorially divided into the city area and the countryside, with an overall administration. The French introduced two levels of administration which were to experience several reforms.

I. The Central Administration (*Intendanza, Proveditoria generale, Amministrazione generale*) was the higher level of administration and had central offices, and courts which were established over the years. The head position was occupied by a civil administrator, later known as intendant (*Proveditore,*

[53] *A.G.* 1808, no.1, Fl, 9, 11, 15; HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 2v-5v.

Intendante generale), often referred to in documents as administrator (*Amministratore*). The authority of the Central Administration was exerted over the whole territory of the former Republic of Dubrovnik, Boka Kotorska, and the island of Korčula. At first this authority was of purely formal character, but it became effective in 1810. All the territorial and communal forms of administration were subject to the Central Administration. In some cases, the civil administration did none other than to render services to the army (contribution, drafting soldiers, providing accomodation for the troops, etc.)

II. The Communal Administration (*Amministrazione comunale*) included the city area and its precincts, and was completely subject to the Central Administration. The head office of the Communal Administration, which eventually underwent a number of changes, was occupied by a governor, who shared its responsibilities with a communal council consisting of 12 members. This form of local administration was first established in Dubrovnik, and later in Kotor and Korčula. At the same time, administrative and judicial bodies were being organized in the rural areas.[54]

The Central Administration, with Garganin in charge, worked intensively on establishing a government based on modern bourgeois principles. Still, changes were never that radical, as both Marmont and Garagnin were fully aware of the fact that the feudal system had to be maintained to a certain extent, this being a general condition of the pacification of the whole area. That is the reason why the French failed to introduce any serious agricultural reforms. Forced labor imposed upon some men from Konavle, and their refusal to do it, encouraged Marmont to confirm that all the former acts regarding land ownership were to remain in effect.[55] It took quite a while for the distinct separation of legislative and executive powers between the legislature and the executive to be established, French laws taking effect as late as 1813. The old order managed to provide essential social security and welfare for the majority of population, although basically on a very low level, but the customs and traditional values of the old world, and its long life con-

[54] It is interesting to note that during 1808 and 1809 the newly established French government tolerated the functioning of the Minor Council of the former Republic. The issues it dealt with were of minor importance, such as charity, family and guardian matters. Cf. HAD, *Consilium Minus*, vol. 115 (1805-1809).

[55] HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 71rv.

tributed to its becoming sacred and invulnerable. In such social circumstances, a possible revolution in legislative matters would have accomplished little and lost much, and therefore, all the changes took place gradually and slowly. The major achievement of the new government was the introduction of elementary civil rights, equality, and emancipation of all the classes, as well as the steps taken to disempower the aristocracy, an exclusive political subject until that moment. For all the reasons mentioned above, the form of government before the establishment of the Illyrian Provinces can be regarded as provisional.

Marmont's return revisit at the close of May saw the initial outlines of the new government, and by the end of 1808, the provisional French administration was completely constituted, after which it underwent some additional alterations in the course of 1809.

At first, Garagnin was willing to accept the old territorial forms of local government, that is, the division into counties and captaincies, counting upon the adhesion of at least part of the patriciate. Some of the magistrates withdrew from their posts immediately after the abolishment of the Republic, whereas others put themselves at the service of the French government. Among those who withdrew were Vlaho Kaboga, count of Konavle, Juraj Ghetaldi, count of Župa, Jere Natali, count of Orebić, Sigismund Ghetaldi, count of Lopud, and Šimun Natali Saraka, count of Šipan, who was dismissed from his post by the order of Lauriston, and was eventually succeeded by Mateo Saraka. These patricians persisted in their discontent with the new French government throughout the years to come. However, those who willingly accepted the positions offerred them in the state service were: Martolica Cerva, captain of Cavtat, Palo Gozze who was transferred from Mljet to hold the position of the count of Slano, Marin Pozza, captain of Janjina, Vlaho M. Kaboga, count of Lastovo, and Luko Gozze, appointed governor of the Ston salt-works. All the vacant positions were filled during April and May, so that the new authorities were able to exert its civil power over the whole territory of the former Republic.[56] The counts were in charge of maintaining the present state of affairs, and were obliged to send Garagnin a weekly report on the current events, supplemented by the local registry statistics (births,

[56] *A. G.* 1808, Special positions, *Territoire de Raguse, Denomination des Contes*; *A. G.* 1808, no.1, FI, 75, 129; no.12, FV, 8.

deaths, marriages). All the counts were assisted by chancellors. A similar territorial distribution continued to exist even when the new administrative and judicial functions were introduced.

Garagnin strove to gather all the available statistical data in order to familiarize himself with the territory of which he was in charge. Therefore, on 23 March he despatched a circular to all the vicars and counts in the Dubrovnik region with the intent of collecting statistical data concerning population, property and income. These data were further completed by the data acquired from French sources as well as the census of 1807, so that Garagnin had a full insight into the number of people and their property. This information served as a basis for the making of a territorial administrative map of the Dubrovnik area, which Garagnin, following the example of Dandolo in Dalmatia, divided into 3 districts, 10 cantons, and 35 communes, with 72,000 inhabitants in all. The Dubrovnik district included the cantons of Dubrovnik, Cavtat, Mljet, and Slano (25,125 inhabitants). The Kotor district included the cantons of Kotor, Herceg Novi, and Budva (33,109 inhabitants), and the district of Korčula had the cantons of Korčula, Orebić, and Lastovo (13,636 inhabitants). Such an administrative division proves that Garagnin had control over Boka Kotorska and the island of Korčula from the very beginning, although none of the correspondence, acts, and reports related to the two areas are dated earlier than 1809.[57]

Garagnin simultaneously took steps at organizing the rural areas and the Central Administration in the city itself. The seat of the administration was located in the Rector's Palace, and in the course of time, several commissions and offices in charge of various state affairs were established. On 19 March, Garagnin and Clauzel came to the joint decision of establishing the Commission of Public Welfare and *Opera Pia*. As part of the Central Administration, this commission was responsible for the welfare of all the fraternities, hospitals, orphanages, poor houses, churches, schools, and other institutions cared for by specially appointed officials of the former government. Archbishop Nikola Bani, Baltazar Gozze, Nikola Grmoljez, and Nikola

[57] *A. G.* 1810, no. 44, FII, 62, *Tavola statistica Generale...* according to which the city of Dubrovnik had 4,175, Pile 1,165, and Ploče 365 residents. Total of 6,705; *A. G.* 1808, no.1, FI, 128, *Tableau présentant la division de la Province de Raguse...* According to this administrative distribution and the related data, the Dubrovnik district was somewhat larger than the former Republic's territory.

N. Gozze were appointed members of the Commission. By means of a special decree, Garagnin regulated the Commission's authorities and its financing from budget.[58]

The Health Commission was established on March 21. It consisted of four members: Petar M. Sorgo, Ivan Kaznačić, Tomo Tromba and Vlaho Stulli. Due to the importance and the responsibilities of this commission, it was presided by Garagnin himself. The Commission overtook the duties from the former health officials, and was additionally authorized with some extra ones. Great attention had to be paid to preventive sanitary measures, as the town was swarming with soldiers, merchants, and seamen, and no risk could be taken with possible infectious deseases. In collaboration with the port captain in Gruž, the members of the Commission were in charge of issuing health cards and ship patents approved by the new authorities. The Commission's work proved quite efficient as early as April when there was an outbreak of smallpox. Owing to the prompt measures taken by the Commission and the city physicians, no epidemic took place. A sanitary cordon was established, and the majority of the population was vaccinated. The most prominent role in the Commission's work was played by the super-intendant of Health Vlaho Stulli, who made a draft of the city's communal and heath regulations in June that same year, upon the approval of Marmont. This draft was most illustrative of the city's acute health problems. Once the city's pride, the state of public health had been utterly neglected. The Lazareti quarantine lost its purpose, and was completely abandoned. In one part of the building the army troops opened a tavern, the rest of the premises served as stores and warehouses, while the most outward part of the building was used as a slaughterhouse. Stulli advocated for the restoration and reopening of Lazareti so that they could serve its original purpose. It was to house the sanitary ward, whereas the slaughterhouse was to remain in the same building with some minor alterations. The work of the Commission gave fruit in 1808/1809 which is all most sufficiently documented.The circumstances in Lazareti improved, while sanitary checks were organized to supervise the port and the newly arrived vessels. Twelve health officials were engaged in the control of disease in the field.[59]

---

58 *A. G.* 1808, no.5, FII, 5, 24, 25, 26.

59 *A. G.* 1808, no.13, FVII, 1, passim; On the activities of the Health Commission in 1808, see Zdravko Šundrica, »Osnivanje Zdravstvene komisije u Dubrovniku i njen rad 1808.« *Acta historica medicinae, pharmaciae, veterinae* 1-2 (1964): pp. 60-74.

In order to hasten trade and economic progress on 5 April 1808, Garagnin issued a decree on the establishment of the Trade Commission. The establishment itself was initiated by the merchant Miho Skurić, who was appointed secretary. Its members were the most distinguished tradesmen Josip Maškarić and Abraham Pardo, the latter being the first Jew in the service of the new government. The Commission was responsible for the organization of trade, supply, and the transport of goods as well as price regulations, and thus functioned as a chamber of commerce, but subordinate to the Central Administration and operating according to its instructions. A commission of a similar kind was established by the order of Garagnin in Kotor on 15 May. In 1811, the Trade Commission became an independent body, and with the admission of new members was converted into the Chamber of Commerce.[60]

As the French government was supported extensively from the income of the abolished convents of St. Mary and St. Clare, 11 April saw the establishment of the Commission for the Welfare of Convent Property, operating within the Central Administration. Three members of the Commission, Stjepan Chersa, Baldo Trojani, and Ivan Bozdari operated under the direct supervision of Garagnin, and forwarded all the income from the convent properties into the account books of the new government.[61] At the beginning of June, the members of the Mljet Benedictine congregation were officially appointed administrators of the monastery estate, since their income also contributed to the state funds.[62]

The final reorganization of the central government office took place in May 1808. On 25 May, Garagnin was first to elaborate in writing and propose the office's organization, its personnel, and their earnings, which was ratified by Marmont the following day. Josip Tromba was appointed first secretary, with an annual salary of 1,470 piasters. His brother, Tomo Tromba, was appointed chancellor for civil process, and Đuro Perić for the criminal process. The rest of the members were named on 30 May, as follows: Bonaventura Vidović as second secretary, Frano Liepopilli in charge of protocol, Antun Koludrović as scribe, and Nikola Grmoljez as accountant. The estimate budget expendi-

60 *A. G.* 1808, no.1, FI, 103; no.13, FVII, 22; *A. G.* 1811, no.90, Tit.XV, rub.10.

61 *A. G.* 1808, no.14, FIX, 5.

62 *A. G.* 1808, no.5, FII, 87.

tures for the wages of the central office staff, as presented by the treasurer, amounted to 4,000 ducats a year.[63]

Marmont's decree set the bases for the military organization which took effect on 27 March. Being guided by territorial principles, the new government established units of gendarmes who were drafted from the local population. These units carried out police and patrol tasks, and were organized in Dubrovnik (for the city area, Župa and Zaton), in Cavtat (for Cavtat, Pridvorje, and Pločice), in Slano (for Slano, Brsečine, and Smokovljani), and in Orebići (for Orebići, Ston, and Crna Gora). In command of the gendarmerie units were captains Josip Vodopić in Dubrovnik, Ivan Remedelli in Cavtat, Sebastian Gradi in Slano, and Vice Agustinović in Orebići, all of whom were subordinate to the commander-in-chief, General Clauzel.[64]

For the first time in the history of the Dubrovnik region an attempt was made on behalf of the French authorities to organize general elementary education. By the decision brought about by Garagnin and Clauzel on 27 March, primary schools were opened in Cavtat, Ston, and Orebići, in line with the already existing one in Dubrovnik. The aim of these actions was to teach the population to read and write, and to learn the basic of mathematics. Four teachers were appointed with a salary of one piaster a day. They were directly responsible to the central administration. On 24 April, the Piarists, the monks in charge of the Dubrovnik College prior to the abolishment of the Republic, came forward with their own scheme regarding the work of public schools, which implied the resetting and reorganization of higher education in Dubrovnik. As few were in favor of the idea, it was but partially realized later, with the opening of lycée.[65]

While revisiting Dubrovnik, from the end of May to July 1808, Marmont reached several decisions to strengthen the administration, one of them being the introduction of a new judiciary, making no attempt at changing the old laws. The new judicial and administrative decree (*Piano organico*) was issued on 31 May, and took effect the following day.[66] Brnja Kaboga, Marko

---

[63] *A. G.* 1808, no.2, FI, 368, 385, 396, 397, 398.

[64] *A. G.* 1808, no.1, FI, 36.

[65] *A. G.* 1808, no.5, FII, 13, 44, 48.

[66] *A. G.* 1808, no.2, FI, 402, only a draft of the order has been preserved. The complete text is to be found in HAD, *Criminalia*, 24, ff. 55v-57r; clauses 1 to 7 refer to the organization of the judiciary, while clauses 8 to 15 pertain to executive administration.

Milli Bošković, Luigi Cosinti, and Ivan Bosdari were appointed vice-judges to the originally appointed four judges, together with whom, if necessary, they could operate as the Tribunal court i.e., court of appeal (*Tribunale civile*). The lowest courts were presided by justices of the peace (*Giudici di pace*), whose responsibilities were described by Marmont in a special decree containing 22 articles.[67] The magistrates were in charge of all civil law suits in the units under their jurisdiction. Cases estimated up to 26 piasters or less were settled without the right of appeal, whereas cases involving up to 260 piasters could appeal to the Tribunal in Dubrovnik. All disputes that involved sums above the latter amount, as well as all criminal cases, were decided at the lower by the Dubrovnik Tribunal, appropriately called *Tribunale di prima Istanza*. On 5 July, Marmont reconsidered the list of judges, and added the names of Sigismund and Petar Sorgo, Martolica Cerva, Ivan Betondi, Rado Andrović, and Nikola Šodrnja. Along with the secretary, Baldo Sivrić, they represented the Appeal Commission, or court of last resort, which was presided by Orsat Ragnina.[68] While dealing with the appeals, the provisional character of this court must be stressed. Namely, more complex judicial matters, as well as some private petitions, were decided upon by direct decrees of Garagnin and Marmont. All the judges in the regular procedure acted accordingly to the old Dubrovnik laws. Revisional procedure was carried out at the Supreme Court of the Kingdom of Italy in Milan.[69]

On 5 July 1808 justices of the peace were appointed: Miho Giorgi in Dubrovnik, and Božo Saraka in Ston, to be shortly followed by Frano Gozze, the local count of Župa, who was appointed justice on Lastovo island.[70] Each of the magistrates had an assistant also appointed by the same decree. In the first year of its activity (until February 1809), the Dubrovnik Tribunal delivered sentence in 28 criminal cases, 130 offences, and 141 cases dealing with maritime and commercial law matters. All the magistrates were responsible

---

67 *A. G.* 1808. no.2, FI, 404; HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 59v-62r, *Atribuzioni del Giudice di Pace.*

68 *A. G.* 1808, no.3, FI, 578; HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 73v, 74r.

69 The former system of laws remained in effect long after the abolishment of the Republic. This was explicitly stated in a document of the Dubrovnik Court on 30 April 1811, *A.G.* 1811, no. 81, Tit.X, Rub. 2. Although French laws were introduced, the two systems continued to overlap as confirmed by the decree of 30 September 1811.

70 *A. G.* 1808, no.2, FI, 404, 420.

to the central administration, that is, to Garagnin himself, the addressee of their regular reports.[71]

According to the new reorganizations, political and administrative power was to be exercised by delegates instead of the former local counts and captains. Thus, on 3 June, the former local count of Konavle, Antun Kaboga, was appointed delegate in Cavtat, Lukša Gozze delegate in Ston, and Nikola Faccenda on Lopud. Frano Gozze occupied two posts: he was both justice of the peace and delegate on Lastovo.[72] Therefore, from the administrative and judicial point of view, the whole territory was divided into several administrative units which later gradually corresponded to the original draft of the territorial distribution. The delegate in Ston was in charge of the complete territory of Pelješac, and Primorje, while the justice in Ston had jurisdiction also on Elafit islands, since the posts of the local count in Slano and the captain in Janjina had been eliminated. The delegate on Lopud exercised authority over the Elafits and Mljet, while the Cavtat delegate was in charge of Konavle. The Dubrovnik justice of the peace was responsible for the city and Konavle until 1809, when a magistrate was appointed in Cavtat. Being at the remote outskirts of the country, Lastovo was the only unit where administrative and judicial functions overlapped and represented one. At the delegate seats, and in Župa, Slano, Janjina, and Šipan, the subordinate communal authority was represented by *sindaci*, while in 34 villages, head of villages (*anziani*) were in charge. The final appointment of all the delegates, *sindaci* and *anziani* took place on 3 August.[73] The former were obliged to despatch regular periodic reports to Garagnin. The Ston delegate earned 4 ducats a day, the one in Cavtat 3, and in Lopud 2. The justices of the peace in the city of Dubrovnik, in Ston and on Lastovo received 3 ducats a day.[74]

Meanwhile, steps were also being taken to organize administration at the communal level. On April 1, despite his absence, Antun Sorgo was appointed governor of the communal board (*podestà*), the members (*savi*) of this body were the patricians and Francophiles Sabo Giorgi and Marin Zlatarić, Baldo Trojani, who was a passionate French adherent, and Rado Andrović, one of

---

71 *A. G.* 1809, no.33, FXII, 37.

72 *A. G.* 1808, no.2, FI, 420, 421, 422, 423.

73 HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 85r-86r.

74 *A. G.* 1808, no.6, FIII, 131.

the wealthiest citizens.[75] The new board was pledged to impecable loyalty and devotion to the French policy, which soon caused inner conflicts resulting in the resignation of Marin Zlatarić. Marmont promptly found his replacement and appointed Niko Sorgo to the post.[76] Josip Branković exercised the duties of the secretary of the communal board, and the inaugural session took place on 4 April in Garagnin's flat. On account of Sorgo's absence, Sabo Giorgi temporarily occupied the former's position as *podestà*. Garagnin delivered an occasional speech, glorifying Napoleon and the French government, after which Giorgi submissively confirmed the loyalty of the people of Dubrovnik to Napoleon. On 12 April, the newly established communal board issued a proclamation informing the citizens of the beginning of its work.

One of the first responsibilities of the board was to organize a welcome celebration for General Marmont on the occasion of his arrival in Dubrovnik. Namely, the more French authority in Dubrovnik strengthened, the greater Marmont's popularity and influence seemed to be. It was on 1 March 1808 that Marmont received the title of Duke of Dubrovnik (*Duc de Raguse*) by Napoleon. On his way to Dubrovnik, Marmont had studied the possibility of constructing a road in the Neretva valley. He finally reached Dubrovnik on 20 June. A communal delegation was launched to greet him half way, and his grandiose welcoming party lasted for two days. A report of the event was even published in *Kraglski Dalmatin*. Touched by the magnificent welcome in his honour, Marmont decided to organize a formal ball for over 300 guests on 24 May. The board rounded off the celebrations on 30 June with a literary academy organized by the Piarists.[77]

Besides the communal board, on 26 May Marmont named the members of the Communal Council (*Consiglio communale*), twelve in all: Baldo Gozze, Niko Pozza Sorgo, Ivo Maškarić, Vlaho Menze, Nikola Giorgi, Kristo Lupi, Stjepan Chersa, Jakov Betondi, Ivan Vlajki, Ivo Pasarević, Vlaho Kaboga, and Dživo Gozze, to be joined in June by Sabo's son, Miho Giorgi.[78] This

---

[75] *A. G.* 1808, no.17, FXII, 1. Antun Sorgo (1775-1841), former Ragusan envoy to Paris. Sorgo's appointment by the French was proof of their high opinion of him, which clouded his former merits for the Republic. Sabo Giorgi (1745-1821), the last rector of the Republic, was among the first to shift his political position. During the years of French rule, he occupied the office of *podestà*.

[76] *A. G.* 1808, no.17, FXII, 21, 23.

[77] *Kraglski Dalmatin* 16 (1808): p. 24; *A. G.* 1808, no.1, FI, 148, 149.

[78] *A.G.* 1808, no.17, FXII, 22.

time, too, Marmont chose six distinguished patricians, and six wealthy Francophile commoners. The Council's duty was to control the expenditures and provide suggestions for the improvement of public services. All the expenditures as well as the approval of the budget, which in the early days amounted to 8,000 ducats, were managed and supervised by Garagnin himself. On 5 April he issued a set of regulations for the coordination of the communal board which could be recognized as a form of communal statute.[79] The first part (articles 1-9) treats general issues, whereas the second part (10-39) sets the bases for the duties and rights of the communal board. The board was responsible for all the administrative affairs, and represented the authorities in the city area, Pile, and Ploče. The complete board, including all the officials, was directly responsible to Garagnin, to whom they delivered regular reports of their work. The board was responsible for the transfer and execution of the regulations set by higher authorities, public services, cooperation with the courts, supplies, social issues, and public order. The board was further in charge of inspections, the supervision of fraternities and societies, the accomodation of the troops, etc. On 31 May, on the occasion of some additional alterations of the central administration, Marmont issued a decree concerning the operative organization of the communal board. The decree elaborated the authorities of the communal board and its governor, and inclined a list of communal officials. This included Branković, the secretary, two police officers, an official in charge of army accomodation, and a person whose duty was to take care of lighting in the the streets. The seat of the communal board was located on the ground floor of the Rector's palace. Garagnin's instructions for the coordination of the board were drafted according to the general pattern applied in all the communes under French rule.[80] The overall functioning of the communal institutions, which was entrusted with minimal autonomy, depended entirely upon Garagnin as the primary official of the central administration. It was the accomodation of the French troops that caused the most problems for the board. Namely, the latter had to resolve numerous unpleasant disputes between the owners and the French officers lodged at their

[79] HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 27r-34v, *Istruzione per L'Amministrazione Comunale della Città di Ragusa e Borgo.*

[80] The first days of the Commune have been exhaustively studied by Z. Šundrica, »O osnivanju i radu Dubrovačke općine.« *Dubrovnik* 2 (1965): pp. 52-70; Z. Šundrica, »Dokumenti o osnivanju Dubrovačke općine.« *Arhivski vjesnik* 9 (1966): pp. 111-127.

houses, since the former did not approve this form of "lodging".[81] For the purpose, the board worked out a facility plan containing 337 houses, classified into 6 categories. The accomodation facilities were distributed among the officers according to their rank. The provision of food for the troops also represented a major problem, along with sanitation, the use of public grounds and market places, etc.[82] One of the foremost responsibilities of the board at this difficult moment was that of supplying food for the town, wheat and oil in particular. To solve this problem, the board did not hesitate to turn to the military authorities for help. Garagnin issued a general licence to bake and sell bread, and he set the prices for three types of bread. Apart from the price of bread, other basic food items were being sold at fixed prices so as to avoid a black market and smuggling. Garagnin's instructions brought to the fore the role of the communal board in the coordination and control of fraternities.[83] Since the latter were the only surviving social institutions from the time of the Republic, the board took every opportunity to police their work. Extensive board records from the day display the diversity of office and notary activities the board was concerned with. The communal board despatched correspondence and reports to the Central Administration; issued various certificates to the public; kept death, birth, and marriage registers; printed advertisments and proclamations. It was also in charge of the organization of balls, celebrations in honour of either Napoleon or Marmont, and lighting in the town.[84] The fund of 8,000 ducats proved to be insufficient for such a long list of activities, and Garagnin was asked to allow extra expenditures. The assets were provided from the fund established from the sale of the Lokrum property, and the income from the Pelješac and Primorje estates.[85]

The new administration was challenged with a series of financial and organizational problems. The most difficult task was changing the norms and customs in the civil service. The transition from the old to the new communal system did not take place over night on account of a number of funda-

---

81 Z. Šundrica, »O osnivanju«: p. 63.

82 Z. Šundrica, »O osnivanju«: pp. 64, 65.

83 Z. Šundrica, »O osnivanju«: pp. 60, 61.

84 *A. G.* 1808, no.1, FI, 147, 149.

85 Z. Šundrica, »O osnivanju«: p. 70.

mental discrepancies between the antiquated aristocratic society and the modern bourgeois principles the French were eager to establish. As the state of public consciousness was rather moderate, Marmont and Garagnin decided on the combined system of administrative and judicial institutions which were being filled equally by patricians and commoners, under the condition that they would be loyal subjects to the French regime, and would abide by bourgeois principles.

The days to come were devoted to the further strenghtening of the new government in the domain of economy. Marmont and Garagnin again played a decisive role by issuing decrees. Salt production and its trade, the most important remnant of the former economy, was coordinated by Garagnin's orders. He also introduced regulations concerning the salt-works in Ston.[86] According to the above, all the affairs concerned with the manufacture, storing or trade of salt were placed under the immediate control of the central administration, and were regarded as a government monopoly and a valuable source of income. The construction of roads, routed along the Dubrovnik territory, were to be financed from a special fund created within the Central Administration by order of Marmont on 22 June. With the purpose of creating a stable economy and commerce, and due to increasing government expenditures, the Customs Office was established on 23 June. Instead of the former magistrates from the ranks of the nobility, Garagnin named Ivan Luka Drobac the director, Petar Čingrija the inspector, and Josip Vodopić the customs officer. These men were superior to the former customs officers in the region of Dubrovnik and Boka Kotorska, as they also supervised the work of the special inspector in charge of the domestic wine trade. The Customs operated in accordance with the list of tariffs already established by Marmont.[87]

The equalization of monetary values of the Dubrovnik treasury with those in Dalmatia and Italy, based on the value of the Ragusan ducat, was carried out on 30 June. Having taken this into account, secretary Tromba reported on the state of the treasury on 1 July. The general fund contained 24,371

---

86 *A. G.* 1808, no.10, FIV, 309, 310, 311.

87 *A. G.* 1808, no.10, FIV, 304, 357, *Tarifa Generale della Dogana da essere indistintamente esatta per tutto lo Stato di Ragusa*. Most food products, luxury goods and other commodities had unequal tariffs charged according to the estimated value of the goods or in Ragusan ducats. Customs violations were treated in accordance with a special decree made by Marmont containing 29 articles (HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 74v-76r).

ducats, *Opera pia* treasury contained 43,691; the cathedral treasury 1,389; roads fund 11,416; the wheat fund 7,214; and the Customs fund 1,493 ducats.[88] These assets were used to finance all the public utilities. It was due to Marmont's edicts that the Public Welfare Commission took over the hospital and orphanage funds. The members specially appointed for the task were Baldo Gozze and Nikola Pozza, while Jakov Bettondi was named the treasurer of the charitable funds, which comprised a considerable source of income for the hospital. In addition, Marmont came forward with an order by which part of the *Opera pia* treasury, formerly intended for the redemption of captives, should contribute 4,000 ducats to the Public Welfare Commission in order to provide the furnishings for the hospital. Meanwhile, hospital regulations were also drawn up. The hospital was able to admit 40 patients, and the regulations offered detailed and modern instructions concerning all the technical and medical aspects, from the type of equipment, treatment of patients and food, to the staff and board regulations, including the visiting hours.[89]

The remainder of the 4,000 ducats of the captives' redeem fund, Marmont intended for the improvement of education in Dubrovnik. Namely, while he was in Dubrovnik, Marmont was on familiar terms with the Ragusan intellectuals, and had already taken an interest in the Croatian language.[90] Since the lectures at the College run by the Piarists had been brought to a halt, in May, on the initiative of the Appendini brothers, Marmont accepted the patronage of the foundation of a new *lycée* and boarding school for the students from Boka Kotorska and Dubrovnik. The building of the old college was converted into a military hospital, and the school furnishings were temporarily stored in Sponza. The redecorating of St. Clare's convent was launched with intent of opening a school modelled upon the French *lycée*. This was to be financed by the income earned from the secularized property of the monasteries of St. Mary and St. Clare on Šipan, in Zaton, Petrovo Selo, and Konavle, and partialy from the Benedictine estate on Mljet. All of the above was clearly stated in Marmont's decree. Shortly before the edict, F.

---

88 *A. G.* 1808, no.10, FIV, 372, 373.

89 *A. G.* 1808, no.5, FII, 102, 104, 105, 106.

90 Frano Baras, »Maršal Marmont i hrvatski jezik.« *Radovi Pedagoške akademije u Splitu* 2 (1977): pp. 57-79.

M. Appendini was awarded 400 piasters on account of his assidious pedagogical work.[91] The *lycée* regulations were approved by Marmont on 6 July. The renowned Brnja Zamagna was named inspector of the *lycée*, and F. M. Appendini rector. Contrary to the Zadar *Lycée*, which owing to Dandolo's conception had all the characteristics of an Italian school, the Dubrovnik *lycée* opened its doors to the Croatian language. In his letter to Appendini and Zamagna dating 20 December, Marmont gave permission for the opening of the school, which had admitted its first students as early as 2 December. The school was allowed board its students at a fee of 800 ducats, with 10 places free of charge being reserved for poor students.[92] The work of the *lycée* was under the complete government control, which in the period of the Illyrian Provinces underwent a number of changes.

Being the major exponent of the French administration, Marmont did not hesitate to engage in other cultural activities. He is to be given credit for the publishing of Appendini's *Gramatica della lingua Illirica*, and for giving support to the edition of the third volume of the three-lingual dictionary of Joakim Stulli, an immense contribution to the study and affirmation of the Croatian language. Marmont provided Stulli with a 100-ducat award and a 300-ducat annual pension so that he could indulge in his research.[93] As a theater-lover, Marmont had the Major Council hall redecorated "at his expense", as a theater which was to host companies from Zadar, with free performances for the public and the troops.[94]

In the hope of returning, the Duke of Dubrovnik left the city for Zadar in July 1808, and soon proceded to Erfurt, and joined Napoleon due to the rising hostilities. Shortly before his departure, he organized one more contribution which amounted to 57,000 francs, the contributors being 26 patricians, 63 commoners, 4 priests, and 27 Jews. In the course of 1811 and 1812 these creditors made futile attempts at making their claims.[95] Although absent,

---

91 *A. G.* 1808, no.5, FII, 99, 100, 103, 104.

92 *A. G.* 1808, no.5, FII, 107, 114, 155; *A. G.* 1809, no.25, FIV, 3. On the organization of education and the differences in relation to the Zadar *Lycée*, Vicko Adamović, *Gragja za istoriju dubrovačke pedagogije II.* Zagreb, 1892: pp. 17-28.

93 *A.G.* 1808, no.6, FIII, 78.

94 *A. G.* 1809, no.39, FXVI, 85.

95 L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika II:* p. 109.

Marmont's authority in Dubrovnik was not any less, as his regular correspondence with Garagnin enabled him to use his influence upon all the activities in the city.[96] Nevertheless, it did not keep him from reaching a number of new decisions which were to round off the establishment of the French administration in Dubrovnik. By his decree issued on 20 October 1808, and became effective on 1 January 1809, Marmont finally managed to establish the territorial jurisdiction of the justices of the peace. This was of particular importance, since many of the law suits were resolved at this lowest level. Three judicial districts were determined: Cavtat, Dubrovnik, and Ston with approximatelly equal population. The former delegate on Lopud, Nikola Facenda, was appointed justice of the peace in Cavtat with the jurisdiction over Konavle. For the district of Pelješac and Mljet, a former officer of the Central Administration, Frano Ljepopilli, was appointed in Ston, instead of Božo Saraka. The justice of the peace in Dubrovnik, Miho Giorgi, resumed the post, having jurisdiction over the entire city area from Župa to Trsteno.[97] On 17 February, Marmont granted the request of the Tribunal by appointing Luigi Consinti, the former principal of the law school, the fifth judge.[98]

Being quite remote from Dubrovnik, and due to specific circumstances, Lastovo was exempt from the judicial and administrative system. On 7 January 1809, Marmont issued a decree by which he entrusted Lastovo to the governor Vlaho M. Kaboga.[99] The latter was charged with the defence of the island against English corsairs. For this purpose he was placed in command of the island's National guard. Prior to the establishment of the guard, Kaboga and the local population had successfully defended the island against English attacks. The English blockade of the Pelješac-Korčula channel was so strong that sea traffic was completely halted. Trade was minimized down to the most essential town supplies such as wheat, and salt for the purpose of

---

[96] In his letter of 18 September 1808 to Garagnin, Marmont expresses his content with regard to the Garagnin's work and the establishment of the administration in the Dubrovnik region. *A.G.* 1808, no. 4; F.I.849.

[97] *A. G.* 1809, no.33, FXII, 1, 2.

[98] *A. G.* 1809, no.33, FXII, 34.

[99] *A. G.* 1809, no.39, FXVI, 1; Cf. Josip Lučić, »Prilike na Lastovu početkom 1808. (Izvještaj lastovskog kneza Vlaha Marina Kaboge).« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovnik* 30 (1992): pp. 117-125.

exchange and trade with the hinterland. In order to grasp the seriousness of the situation, one should draw attention to Marmont's order by which every collaboration or offering of help to the English was forbidden under penalty of death.[100]

April 1809 saw the outbreak of another war between Austria and France. Marmont and the Dalmatian troops advanced from Zadar, forcing the Austrian forces to withdraw across Lika and Carniola. On 23 April, he despatched a proclamation to the Ragusans from Ostrovica, calling upon them to join Napoleon's invincible army.[101] A small number of French soldiers were to stay behind in Dalmatia and Dubrovnik. In the last summer days of 1809, the city witnessed the departure of General Clauzel, whereas an incomplete Dalmatian and French brigade remained on Dubrovnik territory under the command of General Deviau.[102] In the course of his stay in Dubrovnik, Clauzel was fully aware of the shortcomings of the French defence in the region, particularly due to the constant English hostilities at sea. Thus, as early as 13 February, he ordered the organization of the Dubrovnik National guard.[103] According to the mobilization orders, all men between the age of 18 to 50 from the city and its surroundings were called up for service in these units. Clauzel's order also regulated the wages for a certain number of officers and non-commissioned officers. This measure aroused great interest among the commoners and even patricians which is indicative of the financial position of the patricians of the day. Acting as auxiliary French troops, the members of the National guard were assigned with round-the-clock watch duties in town, as well as patrolling the surrounding area. In command of the three town companies was Lukša N. Pozza. Similar units were also organized in Pelješac and Konavle. A coast guard was organized on Lastovo with the task of observing English vessels. The command of all the units of the National guard in the Dubrovnik region was entrusted to the French Major Doderlein. All of the activities of the guard were under control of the military authorities, although Garagnin, too, was to receive reports.[104]

---

100 *A. G.* 1809, no.39, FXVI, 2.

101 *A. G.* 1809, no.40, FXVI, 308.

102 A. Marmont, *Memoari:* p. 129.

103 *A. G.* 1809, no.41, FXVII, 1.

104 *A. G.* 1809, no.41, FXVII, 24, 26, 54. The city unit of the National guard included 727 men.

Dalmatia again found itself in somewhat similar circumstances as those of 1797. Public opinion was dramatically shifting against the French, placing the scarce French troops before crowds of irritated natives who were waiting for Austrian intervention to take place. And it did, in July 1809, following the attack of General Knežević. He was joined by the rebels thus forcing the representatives of the French administration to relinquish all of Dalmatia, save Zadar and Knin. However, once again Austria failed to meet the hopes of the local population. Namely, the Austrian army was heavily defeated at Wagram on 6 July 1809, and six days later a truce was declared in Znojmo, which has to be followed by the agreement by Generals Maurellian and Knežević in Zadar to break the hostilities. However, fighting between the French and the local rebels failed to cease. Being cut off from Split, the delegates from Makarska and Neretva's valley had to post their reports to Garagnin in Dubrovnik. On 6 August French commander in Ston reported on the handing over of Klis, and the French retreat across Omiš and Makarska towards Dubrovnik, where eventually some of the troops were to arrive.[105] On 21 September, Garagnin was informed by the Makarska delegate that the town was surrounded by 800 rebels who were expected to advance further. Gangs of plunderers entered Turkish territory in Herzegovina, about which Clauzel had been fully informed by the captain of Stolac and aga of Hutovo. In fear of possible conflicts, Clauzel repeatedly despatched the Ragusan Ivan Luka Zuzzeri to Zadar with demands for help. As the town was cut off, the French appealed to the Mostar Janissary aga.[106] Had the peace not been signed, the conflicts would most certainly have spread to the Dubrovnik region which was harbouring the majority of the French military stationed in Dalmatia.

Timoni, the Austrian envoy to Dubrovnik was forced to leave his position due to the hostilities. His last reports were concerned with the tensions in Boka, and Paštrovići in particular. He records the discontent of the peasants, and the overall anti-French climate, predicting that if Austria were to win the war, it could easily establish its rule in Dubrovnik.[107] Nevertheless, the situation on the battlefield proved different, and by the Treaty of Schönbrunn

---

105 *A. G.* 1809, no.40, FXVI, 308.

106 *A. G.* 1809, no.40, FXVI, 386; HAD, *Legacy Bizzaro,* R.O. 158, no. 4, vol. 2.

107 H. T. Bjelovučić, *The Ragusian Republic:* pp. 176, 177.

signed on 14 October, Austria was obliged to renounce a part of its territory, including the passage to the Adriatic sea.

During the 1809 war, Dubrovnik witnessed no political tensions, nor were any violent attempts made in order to depose the French authority. City life went through its everyday routine, marked with regular celebrations of French victories Europe-wide. The only unusual feature was the alertness of the National guard and the French troops in Ston. The lectures at the *Lycée* were given according to the normal schedule, and two literary academies were organized in honour of Marmont and Deviau. The victory at Wagram and Marmont's promotion to marshall were considered worthy of a celebration, which took place on 17 July. On 27 October, Garagnin issued a proclamation of the Austrian capitulation and the Treaty of Schönbrunn, which was accordingly celebrated to the sound of cannonade, music, and fireworks while a High Mass was said by Archbishop Bani.[108] In this period of time, only one diplomatic move taken by the aristocracy can be traced, as they were fully aware of the fact that they alone did not even have the power to handle the weakest enemy. David, French consul to Travnik, was informed by the Turkish vizier of a visit paid to the latter by the Ragusan patricians with a request for the Mostar ayn, with whom they acted in collusion, to free them from the French. According to their scheme, he was to raise 5,000 soldiers with a pretense of launching an offensive against Montenegro, while the true purpose of the activities would be an attack against the scarce French troops in Dubrovnik. The goal of this plan was to resume Ottoman sovereignty over Dubrovnik.[109] The vizier was expected to approve these actions undertaken by the ayn. Either because of his loyalty to the French, or the empty Dubrovnik treasury, the vizier discouraged his inferior from further actions, and disclosed the whole plan to David. Despite its failure, this attempt indicates that as early as 1809 some patricians were impatiently waiting for the French to fall, and dreamed of the re-establishment of the Republic.

The administrative and judiciary pattern established on the territory of Dubrovnik in 1808/1809 remained the same throughout the whole period of French rule except for some minor personnel changes, the introduction of a number of new offices, and the territorial reorganization of the rural areas.

---

[108] *A. G.* 1809, no.39, FXVI, 200; *A. G.* 1809, no.40, FXVI, 393.

[109] M. Gavrilović, »Ispisi«: pp. 455, 459.

This took place after the establishment of the Illyrian Provinces, while some major judicial reforms occurred in the last days of the French administration in 1813. In this second period, a more prominent role was played by the Dubrovnik civil governor in the region of Boka Kotorska and Korčula. Keeping in mind the overall government organization of the first period, it cannot but be observed that Dubrovnik was to experience the first steps in a separation of powers. In fact, however, only formal attempts were being made in order to separate the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary, while in practice, all the decisions were made directly by Garagnin, Marmont or, most often, the French military commanders. Furthermore, a special French officer (*Commissario di guerra*) was placed in charge of relations with civil authorities.

The legislation in the course of the first two years of French rule was rather scarce, but considering the circumstances, it should be mentioned. General civil and religious emancipation took place, related primarily to the Jewish community consisting of about 220 members. The Jews experienced the fall of the Republic as a step toward egalitarianism, and on 22 June they sent Marmont a petition in which he was formally required to recognize their civil rights.[110] The very next day Marmont issued a decree declaring that all the citizens were to be equal before the judicial authorities, Jews included, as well as all of the social and religious communities that had been deprived of their rights in the former Republic.[111] Civil marriage was introduced for the first time, and burial within the church building was forbidden due to sanitary reasons. Secularization of the extensive monastery property required a great effort on behalf of the French authorities which they willingly undertook.[112]

During the first years of French rule, Dubrovnik was on the verge of disaster, and had no economic prospects. The impoverished population was forced to accept financial help from the French. The oral tradition has it that

---

110 *Kraglski Dalmatin* 29 (1808): pp. 231, 232; HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, ff. 71rv.

111 *A. G.* 1808, no. 2, FI, 511, 514; HAD, *Criminalia*, vol. 24, f. 73.

112 Not a single document of the French government contains explicit orders regarding the confiscation of church property, but the commission's records testify that the earnings of the ecclesiastical properties were collected by the state. Thus, in the first days of the French administration several old nunneries were abolished, leaving no trace of such an act in the official documents.

the French were excessively lavish in their costly extravagance towards the lower classes.[113] Due to the undermined shipping and trade business, as well as enormous state deficits during the two-year occupation, the number of bankrupt commoners and patricians increased, while the once politically active members of the society accepted the situation with resignation. Enthusiasm and resoluteness, evident shortly after the abolishment, were no more than a closing act of the antiquated aristocracy, which in the new circumstances lived a retired and passive life. Social movement, however, resumed from where they had occurred earlier. Some members of the patriciate, and particularly some commoners with a propensity to political power, entered the French administration in order to secure their status. They were loyal to the French government, and they calmly watched the Republic fall. The majority of them had previously belonged to the Francophile circle, which had recruited members for the newly founded Freemasons lodge, a branch of the Grand Orient de France.[114] Furthermore, in order to secure governmental continuity, the only educated social group the French could rely on were the patricians and a few commoners. Among the Austrophile aristocracy there still existed those who lived in hopes of restoring the Republic's sovereignty, even in a restricted sense, which they expected to take place after the change of political balance in favour of Austria. The Austrian consul Timoni reported in his despatches from the beginning of 1809 that the general Ragusan public was inclined toward the French, although this attitude did not result from political consciousness, but opportunism initiated by the circumstances, which in this case were characterized by the hovering hostilities of the Montenegrins and Russians.[115]

As the French administration was established during the two years of occupation, politically active patricians and commoners surrendered to the events which followed. The idea of an independent aristocratic republic could not survive. The basis for an alternative viable state were not created and thus the 1813/14 uprising failed.

---

[113] *A. G.* 1809, no.25, FIV, passim. Cf. Josip Bersa, *Dubrovačke slike i prilike*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1941: pp. 29-45.

[114] France Kidrič, »Framasunske lože hrvaških zemlj Napoleonove Ilirije.« *Rad JAZU* 206 (1915): p. 36. Almost all the members of the lodge occupied very high administrative and judicial positions during the French rule. Considering they were later to be found as buttresses of the Austrian bureaucratic apparatus, little can be said of their strong political principles.