

Traian Stoianovich

Society and the Reason of Language*

The European Enlightenment found root in the Balkans, a backwater of Europe, even a non-Europe, in response to the common interest of European and Balkan thinkers in proxemics or the interrelationships between language and space. Balkan proponents of Enlightenment thought, in effect, reconceptualized the place of their own cultures in the world by reference to what Georg Simmel called “centripetality”. But their centripetality was not a simple identification with the European centers and cultures of their admiration. It also included embracing the Enlightenment mode of thought as a way of thinking specifically about language and space. As a result, they rethought their own languages and territories¹.

The Enlightenment outlook introduced among its Balkan proponents, as in western Europe, an era of rising expectations and new “imaginaries” —new representations of the world, new beliefs and desires. For the secularized monk Dositej Obradović (ca. 1742-1811), the foremost Serb representative of the Balkan Enlightenment in its incipi-

* At the conference on “Enlightenment and Post-Enlightenment”, Speros Basil Vryonis Center for the Study of Hellenism, held in cooperation with the Humanities Department, California State University, Sacramento, January 11-12, 1997, I presented a paper entitled “Travel Eastward, Travel Westward: A Common European Home”. Both that paper and the present essay are part of a longer manuscript entitled “Balkan Participation in an Incipient New Axial Age: New Imaginaries, Great Expectations”. I may eventually revise the longer manuscript and expand it into a book. My thanks go to the discussants at the conference and, for their thoughtful comments on the longer manuscript and/or the present essay, to Rudolph M. Bell, William J. Connell, Matt K. Matsuda, and James J. Reid.

1. Edward T. Hall, “Proxemics”, *Current Anthropology* IX 2-3 (April - June 1968) 83-84 (83-95); Georg Simmel, *Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*, Berlin 1968⁵, pp. 461-467. Chapter nine (pp. 461-526) of this book, the first edition of which was published in 1908, is devoted to “Space and the Spatial Orderings of Society”. See also John A. Armstrong, *Nations Before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, [1982]), pp. 7-10; Predrag Piper, “Language in Space and Space in Language”, in Milorad Radovanović, ed., *Yugoslav General Linguistics* (Amsterdam, Philadelphia 1989), pp. 247-248, 255 (241-263).

ent form, the Enlightenment heralded an end to “the time of weeping and lamentation, hunger and wailing; in a word, of the Lenten fast, when the haricot is king and its sister the lentil [or duckweed] and peas and cabbage govern the earth”. Bursting into frenzied didactic poetry, he mistook the triumph of the Serb burgher class of Habsburg Hungary in reducing the number of Orthodox Christian fast days for a general victory of the people, who often hungered even when they did not have to fast:

Now is a time golden and joyous,
 No more is food prohibited to us!
 Evangelical freedom doth now reign...
 O golden epoch! o delectable times!²

The verse reflects the gathering of sentiment among Serb, Greek, and Romanian thinkers, in the final decades of the eighteenth century, aspiring not only to personal or physical wellbeing and pleasure —*eudaimonia*, as perceived in classical Greek antiquity— but also to “human happiness”. As reinterpreted toward the end of the eighteenth century along with the new idea of fashion (*modha, mode*), *eudaimonia* acquired both a secular and utilitarian sense. In the translation into Greek in Venice, in 1711, of Francesco Loredano’s *De gli Scherzi Geniali* (1678), for example, rhetoric had been conceived primarily as an avenue of pleasure or delectation. In 1811, on the other hand, in a work published in Greek in Vienna, the Hellenized Vlach Dimitrios Darvaris took on the task of showing readers how to find happiness by being socially useful, turning the quest for happiness thereby into a method of eudaemonics³.

By voicing such Enlightenment ideas, southeastern Europeans began to join western Europe in a new Axial Age, the third in human history. The first Axial Age was the neolithic era, marked by man’s indelible signature upon the earth —the domestication of plants and animals and introduction of settled communities. At elite levels, the Second Axial Age

2. Dositej Obradović, letter to Haralampije, Leipzig, April 13, 1783, in *Dela Dositeja Obradovića*, edited by Jovan Skerlić, Milutin K. Dragutinović, and Miloš Ivković, Belgrade: Državna Štampanija Kr. Srbije, 1911⁵, p. 3 (3-6).

3. C. Th. Dimaras, “Dix années de culture grecque dans leur perspective historique (1791-1800)”, *Balkan Studies* IX₂ (1968) 326-328 (319-334); Alexandru Duțu, “Ethics, Scherzi, and Delectation: A Chapter in the History of South-East European Mentality”, *Balkan Studies* XIII₂ (1972) 272, 274 (265-277).

dethroned mythology, depriving shamans, according to the eighteenth-century German thinker Johann Gottlieb Georgi, of “texts and schools” misrepresenting shamanistic beliefs, forcing the logic of myth to turn into “contradictory idol-worship and superstition”⁴. With a basis in the rise of empires—in Western Asia, China, India, and the Mediterranean—in the improvement of communication and transportation, and in a growing critique (we shall return to this word) of localism, this was the Axial Period of which Karl Jaspers wrote. Its creations were ecumenicist religions, science, and philosophy⁵.

In the engagement between philosophy, religion, and science, religion finally carried the day by the spread of Christianity and Islam. Conflict between diverse religious outlooks never ceased, but the muted conflict between philosophy, science, and religion found voice again in the sixteenth and especially seventeenth century. What made possible the Third Axial Age, however, the Age of Enlightenment, were the discoveries and explorations, the mental outlook that promoted them, including the desire for goods and the yearning to know the wonders of the world, and the improvement of communication—the introduction and diffusion of the printing press—and transportation, first by sea and then by land, river, and canal.

The Enlightenment made inroads into the Balkans only after 1740. Even as late as 1800, however, it lay largely outside the territories of the Ottoman Empire or only slightly inland from its Adriatic, Aegean, and Euxine coastal and insular territories. Its continental limits did not extend much to the south of the Save and Danube rivers. Its deepest inland penetration into the Balkans may have been in Epirus and southwestern Macedonia and Thessaly, largely because of the commerce of these re-

4. Gloria Flaherty, *Shamanism and the Eighteenth Century*, Princeton 1992, pp. 74, 85-86.

5. Karl Jaspers, *The Origin and Goal of History*, translated from the German by Michael Bullock (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), pp. 1-21; Roland Barthes, “Le mythe aujourd’hui”, *Mythologie*, Paris 1957, pp. 213-268. In “Les trois formes des Lumières”, translated by Anne-Marie Roviello, in *Annales de l’Institut de Philosophie et des Sciences Morales, Université Libre des Bruxelles, Lumières et romantisme* (Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1989), pp. 11-16, Hans Georg Gadamer entertains a view of “the three forms” or moments of the Enlightenment—the classical Greek, the European (in the seventeenth century), and the (presumably American) advances in science, technology, and communications since World War II. The conception is not without merit.

gions with Italy by sea and with Hungary, Germany, and Russia by sea and by land. Until 1800, the Enlightenment encircled Turkey-in-Europe but penetrated only weakly or not at all into its interior regions. To the south and east, it affected Smyrna (Izmir), Kydoniai (Ayvalik), Chios (Scio), Patmos, several other Aegean islands, Mount Athos, Pera or Constantinople (Istanbul), and the Danubian principalities (Wallachia and Moldavia). It avoided the interior regions of Anatolia. Enlightenment ideas penetrated into the Balkan interior only after the French Revolution of 1789 and, for the most part, only after 1800 or even 1830.

The European Model: Modern Philosophy

To comprehend the proxemics of the Enlightenment, one must have recourse to the “anatomistic”, thought of the Scottish philosopher David Hume on the effect of varying degrees of biological, sociological, and spatial “contiguity” or closeness on the potency of the language of the human passions. Hume knew little about the Balkans, but his conceptions of human nature and little societies were wondrously applicable to the peoples of the area. They provide a reconciliation with, and a correction of, the views of the London physician Bernard Mandeville on the role of the passions, which, by a yet closer view of their anatomy, Hume perceived as ameliorating as society expands⁶.

Human nature is both selfish and generous. Perhaps only a rare person, wrote Hume, “loves any single person better than himself; yet 'tis [also] rare to meet with one, in whom all the kind affections, taken together do not over-balance the selfish”. The human emotions are thus “partial and contradictory”. They may easily change into their opposites given the *scarcity* of “external objects... in comparison to the wants and desires of men”. The two “qualities of the human mind”, *selfishness* and *limited or confin'd generosity*, consequently are conducive to the formation of little societies. But the little compartmentalized societies generally prevailing in most parts of the world until Hume's time—but perhaps nowhere in Europe more than in the Balkans—were contrary to the needs of “large societies”, which require “*extensive sympathy*” instead of a “*limited generosity*”.

6. E. G. Hundert, *The Enlightenment's "Fable": Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society*, Cambridge 1994, pp. 59-60, 65-67, 82-86.

Every group tends to be partial and irregular in the distribution of its affections. The only counterweight to partiality and irregularity is “judgment and understanding”, and stability and fairness in the acquisition and exchange of goods⁷, the very conditions lacking in the Ottoman Balkans. According to Constantin-François Chasseboeuf de Volney, moreover, impartiality could not have prevailed in the Balkans for any considerable length of time precisely because the Ottoman Empire was territorially a “great state”, an empire of old type. Its very ability as a great state to command “millions of men dispersed over a great space” was “pernicious”⁸, allowing it to sow discord among the human groups under its authority. States of that kind promote the growth of small partial societies of “confin’d generosity”, to which privileges are extended and from which they are withdrawn according to the needs, whims, and power of those who rule and administer. Without the argument of climate, Volney’s thesis was a restatement of Montesquieu’s principle of territoriality, his association of republics with small states, monarchy with states of intermediate size, and “despotism” with territorially vast states⁹.

Volney further argued, however, that European social organization

7. David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, reprinted from the original edition in three volumes and edited, with an analytical index, by L. A. Selby-Bigge (Oxford, [Eng.]: Clarendon Press, first edition 1896, impression of 1928), Book II, part 1, section 11, “Of the Love of Fame”, pp. 316-318; *ibid.*, Book II, part 2, section 4, “Of the Love of Relations”, p. 352; *ibid.*, Book II, part 3, section 5, “Of the Effects of Custom”, p. 422; *ibid.*, Book II, part 3, section 7, “Of Contiguity, and Distance in Space and Time”, pp. 427-432; Book III, part 2, section 4, “Of the Origin of Justice and Property”, pp. 486-496; Book III, part 3, section 1, “Of the Origin of the Natural Virtues and Vices”, p. 586. For a discussion of Hume’s views, see also Gilles Deleuze, *Empirisme et subjectivité: essai sur la nature humaine selon Hume*, Paris 1953, pp. 23-29; Philippe Raynaud, “Les philosophes et la civilité”, in Philippe Roger, dir., *L’homme des Lumières de Paris à Pétersbourg: actes du colloque international (automne 1992)*, Biblioteca Europea, 6 (Napoli: Vivarium, 1995), pp. 276-280 (273-290). For a consideration of both rational and irrational self-interest and rational and irrational deviations from narrow self-interest as motors of human behavior, particularly as portrayed in Hume’s writings, see Stephen Holmes, “The Secret History of Self-Interest”, in Jane J. Mansbridge, ed., *Beyond Self-Interest*, Chicago 1990, pp. 267-286. I am grateful to William J. Connell for directing my attention to this last study.

8. Constantin-François Chasseboeuf de Volney, *Considérations sur la guerre actuelle des Turcs*, London 1788, pp. 75-76.

9. Emmet Kennedy, *A “Philosophe” in the Age of Revolution: Destutt de Tracy and the Origins of “Ideology”*, Philadelphia 1978, p. 171.

can free itself of the previous solutions by its propensity to evolve toward a new form of sociability to which Claude-Adrien Helvétius and the marquis de Mirabeau gave the name *grande société*¹⁰. For other thinkers, the new sociability was the nation. Yet others, like Volney, envisioned a hierarchy of societies —a nation, a *grande nation* (a term introduced perhaps in 1798 by the poet Marie-Joseph Chénier), and ultimately, at a world level, a *grande société*. The words society, nation, grand nation, and grand (or great) society were well chosen. For it was not the state to which Volney made reference. He had in mind, instead, a system of intercommunication closely and regularly linking the little groups to the large one(s) by means of voluntary associations, that is, groups of individuals who came together as their interests converged and dissociated as their interests diverged.

The most important form of voluntary association in France between the mid-eighteenth century and the French Revolution was the *société de pensée*, known also as a *société libre* or philosophical society. With the aid of the printing press, conceived at least at that point in time as a generally “liberating art”, such associations diffused their ideas widely and quickly. Readily identifying fellow travelers in thought, they created a generation of like-minded thinkers attentive to *public opinion*, a new concept, defined not as what uncritical people believe but what a critical enlightened public *thinks*. Crisis, critical, criticize, critique, from Greek *krinein*, to sift, these words define a special way of perceiving, evaluating, and re-evaluating ideas or representations and situations and events, giving rise in western Europe, toward the end of the seventeenth century, to a *crise de conscience* —a “crisis of mind, conscience, and consciousness”¹¹, out of which evolved a long succession of crises of con-

10. Undated letter from Claude-Adrien Helvétius to B.-J. Saurin, in Édouard Laboulaye, ed., *Oeuvres complètes de Montesquieu, avec les variantes des premières éditions, un choix des meilleurs commentaires et des notes nouvelles*, 7 vols., Paris 1875-1879, VI, pp. 319-322; Victor Riqueti de Mirabeau and François Quesnay, *Philosophie rurale, ou Économie générale et politique de l'agriculture, réduite à l'ordre immuable des loix physiques et morales, qui assurent la prospérité des empires*, Amsterdam 1763, p. 4. According to Daniel Gordon, *Citizens without Sovereignty: Equality and Sociability in French Thought, 1670-1789*, Princeton 1994, pp. 58-59, one of the earliest authors to use the term *sociabilité* in print — in 1705— was the Paris police commissary, Nicolas Delamare.

11. Paul Hazard, *La crise de conscience européenne (1680-1715)*, 3 vols., Paris 1935. See also Herbert Dieckmann, “Themes and Structure of the Enlightenment”, in Herbert

sciousness in the larger Europe that itself was extended—both eastward and westward—by means of the new state of mind. Disagreeing about details, thinkers joined in a common endeavor to encourage an *esprit de société*—a spirit of participation, circulation, and communication, creative both of individuality and society by its new understanding of language and serving as a check upon uncontrolled appetites¹².

From the efforts of such individuals and groups evolved what Armand Louis de Gontaut (duc de Lauzun, afterwards duc de Biron, 1747-1793) called “modern philosophy” whose advocates aspired to apply to all spheres what they called the *philosophical* method, which the German lexicographer Johann Christoph Adelung applied to language and defined as “that method of treating a subject..., where we not only describe the phenomena as they exist, but inquire also, how they came to be what they are, and why they are so”¹³. Such thinkers sought to promote the arts and crafts, improve agriculture, and extend commerce. By extolling liberty, talent, and personal merit, and by defending the idea of the circulation of elites on the basis of individual talent, they raised the expectations of their publics¹⁴. A possible prelude to a civil society, the

Dieckmann, Harry Levin, and Helmut Motekat, *Essays in Comparative Literature*, St. Louis 1961, pp. 48-51 (41-72).

12. Victor Riqueti de Mirabeau, *L'Ami des hommes*, première partie: *Traité de la population*, Avignon 1756, pp. 2-6; [Victor Riqueti de Mirabeau and François Quesnay], *Éléments de la philosophie rurale* (La Haye: chez les Libraires Associés, 1767), pp. vi, xiii; [Claude-Adrien Helvétius], *De l'Esprit*, Paris 1758, pp. 53, 177, 189, 297, 314, 321, 326, 330, 344, 350-356; François Furet, *Penser la Révolution française*, new revised and corrected edition, Paris 1983, pp. 39-40, 47, 49-51, 56-61, 213, 222-225; Nicole Hafid-Martin, *Voyage et connaissance au tournant des Lumières (1780-1820)*, forming Vol. XX of *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford 1995, p. 10; C.-F. [Chasseboeuf de] Volney, *Leçons d'histoire, prononcées à l'Ecole Normale en l'an III de la République française*, Paris, an VIII, pp. 56-59; Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence, Cambridge 1991, pp. 92, 95-96.

13. Johann Christoph Adelung, “A Philosophical View of the English Language”, in A. F. M. Willich, *Elements of the Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant, to which are added Three Philological Essays*, chiefly translated from the German, of John Christopher Adelung, London 1798, pp. lxxxviii (lxxxviii-cxx).

14. Armand-Louis de Gontaut (duc de Lauzun, afterwards duc de Biron), “De l'opinion publique en France à l'époque de la Révolution”, in Gaston [Pierre-Marc-Gaston] duc de Lévis, *Souvenirs et portraits, 1780-1789*, nouvelle édition augmentée d'articles supprimés par la censure de Buonaparte, Paris 1815, pp. 312-314, 319 (309-328).

“public sphere” they created was no guarantor, however, of the immediate formation of such a society¹⁵. For while civil society collaborates with, it is also a critic of, and remains separate from, both the state and the economy or market¹⁶.

One of the three proposed ways of constituting society was to change the character both of the state and the little societies by tightening the relations of the state with the owners of property without recognizing the propriety of intermediate authorities or voluntary associations. A second way was to change the character both of the state and the little societies by introducing a civil society between the state and the economy. In the thought of a former French consul to Salonika (Thessaloniki), Louis-Auguste Félix de Beaujour, there was also a compromise solution: separate the executive and legislative powers at the level of the state but combine them at the level of the family. The concentration of the executive and legislative powers in the hands of the husband/father at the level of the little society of the family would serve to assure the maintenance of stability. In other words, the conflict of interests arising at the level of the little societies that one freely joined and departed from—the voluntary associations— would not be allowed at the level of the conjugal family, defined as a corporate person—an individual—in which authority was vested in the husband/father¹⁷.

The (*grande*) *société* and the little societies of the three proposed new ways of organizing society differed from the empires and little societies of the past¹⁸. Indeed, the “great states” of old type lacked society

15. Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane, Durham and London 1991, pp. 20, 35.

16. Jürgen Habermas, *Theory and Practice*, trans. John Viertel, Boston 1973, pp. 77-78; Jürgen Habermas, “Taking Aim at the Heart of the Present: On Foucault’s Lecture on Kant’s ‘What Is the Enlightenment?’ ” and “The New Intimacy between Politics and Culture: Theses on Enlightenment in Germany”, *The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism and the Historian’s Debate*, edited and translated by Shierry Weber Nicholsen, introduction by Richard Wolin, Cambridge 1989, respectively pp. 173-179 and 196-205; Robert Wuthnow, “The Voluntary Sector: Legacy of the Past, Hope for the Future?” in R. Wuthnow, ed., *Between States and Markets: The Voluntary Sector in Comparative Perspective*, Princeton 1991, pp. 7 (3-29).

17. Louis-Auguste Félix, baron de Beaujour, *Théorie des gouvernements, ou Exposition simple de la manière dont on peut les organiser et les conserver dans l’état présent de la civilisation en Europe*, 2 vols, Paris 1823, I, 3-6, 11-12, 19-23; II, 27.

18. Constantin François Chasseboeuf de Volney, *The Ruins, or a Survey of the*

altogether if one accepts Volney's definition of society as "nothing other than the *easy and free communication of persons, of thoughts and of things*, while the whole art of government is reduced to *impeding the violent frictions*" that might put an end to regular peaceful intercommunication¹⁹. According to Victor Hugo, therefore, one of the basic causes of the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire —and, by extension, of other "great states" or empires of old type— was the lack of intercommunication between the little societies and the states, a fault that arose from the Ottoman failure to foster a common speech, art, and literature²⁰.

Modern philosophy culminated after 1795 in *idéologie* or a "science of ideas", as developed in particular by Antoine-Louis-Claude Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836) and other members of the learned society of the Observateurs de l'Homme (1799-1805)²¹. A science of ideas can emerge, however, according to Destutt de Tracy, only upon discovery of the code or explanatory principle that links one fact to others. Its emergence represents an extension of the scientific outlook of the physical and biological sciences to social, moral, and political questions. It emphasizes, however, the centrality of language in the elaboration of a science of man, or "history of our intelligence considered in relation to its means of knowing"²².

Revolutions of Empires, London 1811⁵, pp. 61-65. The French original was entitled *Les ruines, ou méditations sur les révolutions des empires*, Paris 1791.

19. Volney, *Leçons d'histoire*, p. 58. On states and society, see also Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*, Stanford 1994, p. 320; *Les Écrits de Fernand Braudel*, II. *Les ambitions de l'histoire*, édition établie et présentée par Roselyne de Ayala et Paule Braudel, préface de Maurice Aymard, Paris 1997, pp. 430 (422-446) —Chapter One ("L'État sera-t-il omnipotent?") of the third part of Fernand Braudel's unfinished *L'identité de la France: la France dans sa plus haute et sa plus brillante histoire*. On the use in eighteenth-century France of such terms as *société*, *sociabilité*, *esprit de société*, *police* and *policé*, *humanité*, and the invention of society, see Gordon, *Citizens without Sovereignty*, pp. 6, 9, 28-31, 43-44, 51-54, 58-59, 64-66, 73, 77, 144-145, 187.

20. Victor Hugo, *Le Rhin*, 3 vols., Paris 1842, III, pp. 165, 170-171, 174-176, on reasons for the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire.

21. Jean Jamin, "Naissance de l'observation anthropologique: la Société des Observateurs de l'Homme (1799-1805)", *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie* LXVII (1979) 313-335; Hafid-Martin, *Voyage et connaissance au tournant des Lumières*, p. 173.

22. Brian W. Head, *Politics and Philosophy in the Thought of Destutt de Tracy*, New York and London 1987, pp. 20-25, 81-82, 90.

The application of linguistic theory to a specific society is particularly notable in the thought of the American schoolmaster, Noah Webster, who wrote to John Canfield in 1783 that “America must be as independent in literature as she is in politics —as famous for arts as for arms”. Published during the same year, his elementary spelling book was designed to duplicate at the level of linguistic discourse what was being done at the political level. Both efforts had as their goal the creation and consolidation of a new nation and new type of state, the representative empire, which Webster associated with youth, vigor, patriotism, virtue, innocence, freedom, wisdom, human dignity, literary industry, and civil and ecclesiastical constitutions. Under the direct or indirect influence of the *abbé* Raynal’s *Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes*, he contrasted the former with an old, decrepit, decaying old-regime Europe of folly, corruption, tyranny, debasement, and what was then believed to be a declining literature²³.

Insisting also on the “uniformity and purity of language” he defended “national usage” as against “local usage”. In the preface to the 1840 edition of his *American Dictionary of the English Language*, he explained why an American dictionary of the English language was necessary:

It is not only important but in a degree necessary, that the people of the country should have an American Dictionary of the English Language; for, although the body of the language is the same as in England, and it is desirable to perpetuate that sameness, yet some differences must exist. Language is the expression of ideas; and if the people of one country can not preserve an identity of ideas, they can not retain an identity of language. Now, an identity of ideas depends materially upon a sameness of things or objects with which the people of

23. Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783*, New York 1970, pp. 568-569. The first edition of the spelling book appeared as part of a three-volume work: Noah Webster, Jr., *A Grammatical Institute of the English Language, Comprising an Easy, Concise, and Systematic Method of Education*, in 3 parts, Part 1: *Containing a New and Accurate Standard of Pronunciation*, Hartford 1783. Part 2, a grammar, and Part 3, moral lessons presumably for children, were published respectively in 1784 and 1785; Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis, Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society*, translated from the German, Cambridge 1988, pp. 177-178.

the two countries are conversant. But in no two portions of the earth, remote from each other, can such identity be found. Even physical objects must be different. But the principal differences between the people of this country and of all others, arise from different forms of government, different laws, institutions, and customs²⁴.

Balkan Example: Topos and Logos

Looked at simply as a seventeenth and eighteenth-century phenomenon, the Enlightenment varied in intensity from one state, province, or locality to another. It attained the greatest intensity in France. England preceded France as a precocious source of new ideas. France organized and systematized the new ideas. Scotland was a source of originality. Prussia was not far behind. Italy is difficult to place but occupied a high position. In the lead at the level of literature and the painterly arts, France yielded to Austria, the German states, and Italy in the acoustical arts. Strongly affected at the political level was the United States. Less strongly affected in a general sense were Austria, Russia, Sweden, Spain, and the Netherlands. At the bottom, apart from the wholly Asian and African worlds, stood the Ottoman Empire.

An Enlightenment culture did not spread, however, from one community to another simply as an act of diffusion. Its affirmation was a process both of diffusion and historical convergence. The precondition for the assertion of an Enlightenment culture among the Serbs of Austria and Hungary—in the county of Srem, in the Banat of Temevar, in Slavonia, in the Croatian Military Frontier, in Buda, Pest, Trieste, and Vienna—thus was the emergence, between 1740 and 1770, of a Serbian burgher class, or *graždanstvo* (in the common spoken and later literary language, *gradanstvo*). Literally, a *polis*-oriented class or *Stadtbürger-tum*, the *graždanstvo* had come into control of much of the commerce of Hungary. Some of its members—four thousand families by 1800—were the privileged holders of a patent of citizenship of a particular place (*Bürgerbrief*). Others entered into commercial and marital alliances with coreligionist Greek and Macedo-Vlach merchants. Yet others patronized

24. Noah Webster, *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, revised and enlarged by Chauncey A. Goodrich, Springfield 1850, "Author's Preface", pp. xii (xi-xiv); "Introduction", pp. lxx (xxiii-lxxx).

the authors who sprang up in their midst and whose work turned increasingly to secular subjects. The county fairs were an important outlet for the writings of these authors²⁵.

In 1769, in response to their own growing wealth and increasingly secular way of life²⁶, the Serbian burgher class of the Habsburg monarchy rallied to the church and educational reforms —*ratio educationis*— of Maria Theresa. Designed to “rationalize” religion by forming subjects who were more useful to the state, the religious reforms reduced the number of Orthodox monasteries, limited the wanderings of monks, eliminated 56 Orthodox holy days (27 of them in honor of Russian saints), and drastically cut the number of days of fasting. Between 1774 and 1786, thirty-five more holy days were abolished. The educational reforms also set limits on the importation of books from Venice and Russia, authorized a printing press in Vienna for books in Serbian (Cyrillic), placed schools under state supervision, stipulated that teachers should be Habsburg subjects, and fostered the Germanization of language and manners²⁷.

The reforms in Srem county and in the Banat of Temesvar provided incentive for the reforms of the protopope Matija Nenadović in the Valjevo district of the Ottoman pashalik of Belgrade. A short residence in the Serb districts of the Habsburg monarchy gave Nenadović a model of “rationalization” to be applied to his own district. To combat the shoving, pushing, and quarreling over who should enter church first, and the loud talking during church services in his district (as in other parts of

25. George Rapall Noyes, “Introduction” to *The Life and Adventures of Dimitrije Obradović, Who as a Monk Was Given the Name Dositej*, Written and Published by Himself, translated from the Serbian, and edited, with an Introduction, by George Rapall Noyes, University of California Publication in Modern Philology, vol. XXXIX, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1953, pp. 35, 133; Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *The Enlightenment as Social Criticism: Iosipos Moisiodax and Greek Culture in the Eighteenth Century*, Princeton 1992, pp. 47-50, 95-96, 102, 109-110 (1-127).

26. Milorad Pavić, *Istorija srpske književnosti klasicizma i predromantizma: klasicizam*, Belgrade 1979, pp. 27-37.

27. Mita Kostić, “Zapadnoevropska kulturnoistorijska raskrsnica Srba u XVIII veku (nova koncepcija srpskog XVIII veka)”, in *Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, Spomenica u čast novoizabranih članova Srpske Akademije Nauka i Umetnosti*, Posebna izdanja, knj. CCCLXXVII, Spomenica, knj. 26, Belgrade 1964, pp. 119-129; George Barany, “Hoping against Hope: The Enlightened Age in Hungary”, *American Historical Review* LXXVI₂ (April 1971) pp. 333-334 (319-357).

the Ottoman Empire), he introduced —with the aid of his father the district notable (*knez*)— the kind of order that he had observed in the parishes of the Habsburg monarchy²⁸.

It would be misleading, however, to interpret the initiation of the “cultural Westernization of the Balkans” as an act of “de-Byzantinization” or turning away from the old Byzantine or medieval culture of southeastern Europe and southwestern Asia²⁹. Obradović’s autobiography suggests that the diffusion of enlightenment among the Serbs began with an intensification of their intellectual connections with the Greek past in its Byzantine as well as Hellenic forms. In 1765, for example, when Obradović’s childhood curiosity of the world and zeal to become a monk and saint turned into a yearning to learn by reading and traveling, he departed from his monastery in the Banat to go to Split (Spalato), Corfu (Kerkyra), Patras, Nafplion, Mount Athos, and Smyrna (Izmir). Remaining in this last place for three years to study at the Smyrniot Evangelical School, he was deeply influenced by his teacher, Hierotheos Dendrinos. He also admired his Corfiot teacher, Andreas Petritsopo[u]los.

The Smyrniot Evangelical School seems to have been patterned on the model of the school at Patmos, which included the study of Homeric, Attic, and Byzantine authors. Obradović and the Serb culture consequently were introduced to enlightenment not only by the religious and educational policies of the enlightened despots Maria Theresa and Joseph II (representatives of the incipient Third Axial Age) but by the science, ethics, and philosophy of the ancient Greeks (the Second Axial Age). George Alfred Noyes consequently errs in describing Obradović as “in spirit an eighteenth-century rationalist” by the time of his departure from Smyrna in 1768³⁰. For was not Dendrinos, the object of Obradović’s admiration, suspicious of Greeks who studied in the West, espe-

28. Matija Nenadović, *Memoari*, Belgrade 1947, pp. 52-57; *The Memoirs of Prota Matija Nenadović*, edited and translated from the Serbian by Lovett F. Edwards, Oxford 1969, pp. 19-23.

29. Fritz Valjavec, “Südosteuropa und Balkan”, in F. Valjavec, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, edited by Karl August Fischer and Mathias Bernath, “Südosteuropäische Arbeiten”, 60, München 1963, p. 66 (65-71).

30. Noyes, “Introduction” to *The Life and Adventures of Dimitrije Obradović*, pp. 76-81, 87-88.

cially at the University of Padua, which he regarded as a hotbed of atheism³¹? Moreover, the dispute among Greek theologians between the “grammarians”, who continued to trust Aristotle, and the “mathematicists”, who preferred Newton, Leibniz, Descartes, Locke, and Voltaire, had not yet assumed an intense form. A Greek version of what in the West was known as the “quarrel of the ancients and moderns” reached its height among the Greeks only after Obradović’s departure from Smyrna, to wit, from the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-1774 to the French Revolution and Napoleonic era³².

Without identifying specifically either with the “grammarians” or “mathematicists”, Obradović regarded Greece as “the natural home and most agreeable habitation of the muses”. Since many Greeks were not ashamed of imitating European examples and identifying with Europe, he saw no reason why Serbs should not do likewise³³. Shunning the quarrel of the ancients and moderns, Obradović was in quest not of rupture but of continuity. Viewing the Serbian culture as a European culture that had been largely cut off from the European experience by Ottoman rule, he and other Serb intellectuals aspired to renew the union at the cut-off points. One such point was the latter half of the sixteenth century, when all the portable Cyrillic printing presses imported into the Serb lands from Venice between 1521 and 1566 were melted down for war purposes or otherwise lost or destroyed³⁴.

Following his return from Greece, therefore, while he was in Dalmatia, Obradović translated into Serbian a work by Erasmus entitled *De Civilitate Morum Puerilium* (On Good Manners for Boys), the first printing of which dated back to 1526. Entitled “Hristoitija [Chrestoe-theia], that is to say, Good Manners Most Necessary and Useful to

31. Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “Europe and the Dilemmas of Greek Conscience”, in Philip Carabott, ed., *Greece and Europe in the Modern Period: Aspects of a Troubled Relationship*, London 1995, pp. 8-9 (1-15).

32. Raphael Demos, “The Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment (1750-1821)”, *Journal of the History of Ideas* XIX (1958) 523-541; C. Th. Dimaras, “Notes sur la présence de Voltaire en Grèce”, in Theodore Besterman, ed., *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. LV, Genève 1967, pp. 439-444.

33. Jovan Deretić, “Esej o ‘starima i novima’ ”, *Dositej Obradović i njegovo doba*, Filozofski Fakultet Beogradskog Univerziteta, Monografije, knj. XXXIII, Belgrade 1969, pp. 109-120.

34. Lazar Plavšić, *Srpske štamparije od kraja XV do sredine XVI veka*, Belgrade 1959.

Youth”, Obradović’s translation was made from a copy of an eighteenth-century manuscript translation of the essay into literary Greek by Antonios, a teacher of grammar at the Patriarchal School in Constantinople. The Antonios translation, however, was a translation from an earlier translation into colloquial Greek by an anonymous author³⁵. As a result, Obradović’s translation does not closely follow the original. It does reflect his concern for humanism and civility.

Obradović’s first published work, an autobiography entitled *Život i priključenija Dimitrija Obradoviča: nim istim spisat i izdat*, appeared in Leipzig in 1783. His twofold purpose in writing it was “first, to show the uselessness of monasteries for society; and second, to show the great need for sound learning, as the most effective method of freeing men from superstition and of guiding them to a true reverence for God, to rational piety, and to enlightened virtue, whereby a man gifted with reason enters on the true path of his temporal and eternal welfare”. In part, the book was the product of study during the latter part of 1782 at the University of Halle, where, after shedding forever the habit of an Orthodox monk, dressed henceforth “in sinful lay costume, like the rest of humanity”, he enrolled in courses on philosophy, aesthetics, and “natural theology”³⁶.

Halle was then one of the centers of German pietism. Its intellectual and commercial leaders were imbued with the sense of a civilizing mission. In fulfillment of that mission, they exported westward, eastward, and southeastward, especially by way of the Leipzig fairs, their pietistic ideas along with the goods of central Germany³⁷. The Leipzig fairs were then one of the main centers of congregation of the Orthodox merchantry of Balkan and southeastern Europe³⁸.

In his second book, *Sovjeti zdravago razuma* (Counsels of Sound

35. Noyes, “Introduction” to *The Life and Adventures of Dimitrije Obradović*, pp. 87-88.

36. Obradović, “Život i priključenija”, part 2, letter 10, Leipzig, October 20, 1788, in *Dela Dositeja Obradoviča*, p. 80; English translation in Noyes, ed., *The Life and Adventures of Dimitrije Obradović*, pp. 282, 284.

37. Marc Raeff, “Les Slaves, les Allemands et les ‘Lumières’”, *Canadian Slavic Studies, Revue canadienne d’études slaves* 1₄ (Winter 1967) pp. 526-529 (521-551).

38. Traian Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant”, *Between East and West: The Balkan and Mediterranean Worlds*, 4 vols., New Rochelle 1992-1995, II, pp. 25, 28, 54 (1-77).

Reason), published in 1784, similarly in Leipzig, Obradović explains how difficult it is to arrive “at clear, definite, and constant ideas — *k ponjatijam čistim, izvesnim i postojanim*”³⁹. The subject of his discourse, “sound reason” — *zdrav razum*— was a direct translation of Greek *sophrosyne*, which originally had meant “sound midriff” but had acquired in classical Greek philosophy the sense of sound reason⁴⁰. Aids to going beyond mere knowledge to understanding, he posited, were a “sensitive [‘sensible’, in common eighteenth-century usage] heart — *čuvstvitelno srce*”, memory (*pamet*), and mind and know-how (*um*)⁴¹. Egoism or an excess of self-love, on the contrary, engenders prejudice, superstition, laziness, carelessness, and bad customs, all of which impede personal freedom. The prerequisite to personal freedom is freedom of thought and expression and a readiness to engage in dialog. The ability to carry on dialog is itself dependent on a propensity to “doubt” everything, to be rational and critical⁴².

Two of Obradović’s Balkan contemporaries —the Greek (by culture if perhaps not by ethnicity) monk Iosipos Moisiodax (ca. 1725-1800), in a book on geography published in Vienna in 1781, and the Serb philosopher historian and copperplate engraver Zaharije Orfelin (1726-1785), in his *Večni kalendar* (1783) —welcomed the heliocentric theory as a new paradigm⁴³. The contribution to science of Obradović himself, on the other hand, focused on the problem of cognition, with emphasis of

39. Obradović, “Sovjeti zdravago razuma”, *Dela Dositeja Obradovića*, pp. 119A (95-131); Noyes, ed., *The Life and Adventures of Dimitrije Obradović*, p. 194 n. 54.

40. Traian Stoianovich, *Balkan Worlds: The First and Last Europe*, Armonk 1994, pp. 253-254.

41. Jovan Deretić, “Strašan iguman i ‘Nevton’ [Newton]”, *Dositej i njegovo doba*, pp. 89-92; Jovan Deretić, “Dositej kao ‘čovek osećanja’ (analiza jednog čuvstvitelnog naravoučenija)”, *ibid.*, pp. 165-188.

42. Jovan Deretić, “O metodi slobodnog mišljenja”, *ibid.*, pp. 73-88; Jovan Deretić, “Dositej i Ruso [Rousseau]”, *ibid.*, pp. 133-163; Jovan Deretić, *Istorija srpske književnosti*, Beograd 1983, pp. 194-196.

43. Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “The Idea of Science in the Modern Greek Enlightenment”, in Pantelis Nicolacopoulos, ed., *Greek Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science*, Dordrecht, Boston, London 1990, pp. 189-193 (187-200); E. Turczynski, “The Role of the Orthodox Church in Adapting and Transforming the Western Enlightenment in Southeastern Europe”, *East European Quarterly* IX₄ (1975) pp. 424, 432 (415-440). On Vienna as a center of eastward diffusion of an Enlightenment culture, see Nicolae Iorga, “Vienne comme centre des idées de l’Occident et de l’esprit révolutionnaire”, *Revue historique du Sud-est européen* I (1924) 23-36.

the view that an “enlightened” (*prosvešten*) reason can attain maximum social value only by its culmination in *slovesnost*⁴⁴.

Borrowed from Russian, the term *slovesnost* (now obsolete in Serbian but not in Russian) had many meanings —literature, philology, linguistics, and rhetoric. The closest English translation, however, may be rhetoric, which contains a similar variety of senses. Citing George Campbell’s *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776) and essentially rejecting the view of Plato, Descartes, Locke, Mandeville, and Kant that rhetoric is necessarily a deceiver and seducer, Jeremy Bentham portrayed rhetoric as the art of communication. As such, its intention was to enlighten the understanding, please the imagination, move the passions, and influence the will. Paul Ricoeur has similarly argued that rhetoric properly includes arguments and proofs, style, and composition. He further infers a certain correspondence between argumentation and philosophical vision, and concludes that the reduction of rhetoric to style or composition has deprived it of “the nexus that bound it through dialectic to philosophy⁴⁵.”

Without directly borrowing from Canfield or Bentham, Obradović ascribed all four meanings to *slovesnost*. He similarly emphasized that true *slovesnost* can never exclude the enlightening of the understanding by the practice of rational-critical thought. He knew that there can never be an exact correspondence between words or representations and the things and/or actions they represent. Language is an act of medi-

44. See n. 42.

45. Jeremy Bentham, *Chrestomathia*, edited by M. J. Smith and W. H. Burston, Oxford 1983, pp. 199-201. On rhetoric as an alternative theory of cognition to philosophy and/or science, see William J. Connell, “Introduction” to an issue on “Lorenzo Valla: A Symposium”, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, LVII₁ (January 1996) pp. 1-7; Riccardo Fubini, “Humanism and Truth: Valla Writes against the Donation of Constantine”, *ibid.*, pp. 79-86; Vasile Florescu, “Rhetoric and Its Rehabilitation in Contemporary Philosophy”, *Philosophy and Rhetoric* III₄ (Fall 1970) pp. 193-224; Allan Megill and Donald N. McCloskey, “The Rhetoric of History”, in John S. Nelson, Allan Megill, and Donald N. McCloskey, eds., *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences: Language and Argument in Scholarship and Human Affairs*, Madison 1987, pp. 222 (221-238). See also Paul Ricoeur, “Between Rhetoric and Poetics”, in Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, *Essays on Aristotle’s “Rhetoric”*, Berkeley, Los Angeles 1996, pp. 324-327 (324-384). On a metonymic strategy of rhetoric, utilitarian rhetoric, and the rhetoric of social revolution, see William H. Sewall, Jr., *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution: The Abbé Sieyès and “What Is the Third Estate?”*, Durham and London 1994, pp. 133-134, 141-143, 198-204.

ation between the observer and the things and actions observed, between word, sign, and deed on the one hand, and signification on the other. To improve understanding, realize the goal of uplifting the people, one must improve language by inventing new words by borrowing from other cultures, clarifying the meanings of old words, and, above all, combining words in a discourse ever more conducive to understanding⁴⁶.

Obradović himself was one of the first persons to introduce into Serbian literature the words *nacionalni ponos* (national pride or dignity, sense of national duty), *moda* and *kapital* (capital, in the sense of wealth used to generate more wealth), and *naci(j)a* (with the meaning of nation as against *narod*, which denotes both people and nation), respectively in 1784, in 1788, and on January 1, 1789. He perhaps borrowed the term *kapital* from the Hellenized Vlach Dimitrios Darvaris, who wrote alike in Serbian and Greek and employed the word *to kapitali* in a dictionary of the Greek language published in Vienna in 1785⁴⁷.

Along with other Serb and Balkan contemporaries, however modestly, Obradović initiated in the Balkans a process of “inflation verbale”, which Fernand Braudel has associated in the French case with the idea of a new beginning⁴⁸, the new beginning that we have related to a new Axial Age. In pre-1821 Macedonian Kozani, for example, the presumed members of a Greek “philosophical society” showed their awareness of the new era by identifying themselves as *Gallophrones*, “people who think like the French” or possess the cast of the French [Enlightenment and/or revolutionary] mind⁴⁹. Other Greeks, as on the island of Samos, or other Aegean islands, and in Epirus marked their association with a new era in the time of Napoleon not by the language of words and

46. Deretić, “O metodi slobodnog mišljenja”, *Dositej i njegovo doba*, pp. 73-88; Deretić, “Dositej i Ruso”, *ibid.*, pp. 152-154.

47. Obradović, “Život i prikućenija”, part 2, in *Dela Dositeja Obradovića*, pp. 61, 82, 93 (pp. 50-93); Obradović, “Sovjeti zdravago razuma”, in *ibid.*, p. 110; Richard Clogg, “The Greek Mercantile Bourgeoisie: ‘Progressive’ or ‘Reactionary’?” in R. Clogg, ed., *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, Totowa 1981, pp. 97 (85-110); Stoianovich, *Balkan Worlds*, p. 239.

48. *Les écrits de Fernand Braudel*, II. *Les ambitions de l’Histoire*, edited by R. de Ayala and P. Braudel, p. 432.

49. Michael Sakellariou, “Hellenism and 1848”, in François Fejtö, *The Opening of an Era: 1848; an Historical Symposium*, with an introduction by A. J. P. Taylor, London 1948, p. 379 n. (377-393).

thought but by that of dance and symbol —by wearing a tricolor cockade and/or dancing the *carmagnole*. In subsequent decades, the Balkan peoples showed whether they identified with the old or new by wearing a fustanella or a riding coat, *jupons bouffants* or peasant dress, a Turkish fez or a Russian cap, etc.⁵⁰ The speech of dress, dance, symbol, and style of life is not a superficial phenomenon. The adoption by some Balkan individuals of “the black redingote, beds, and chairs”, and of the practice of allowing women to eat at table together with men was not, as one scholar argues, little more than a “formal act, without deeper roots, a kind of *mimikeia*, accepting the color of the environment” so as more resolutely to resist its signification⁵¹. It was often a declaration of a desire to achieve a new identity.

Characteristic of the thought of Pierre Bayle and Immanuel Kant, Obradović’s commitment to rational-critical thought further required openness to the idea of enlightenment not as a phase of experience to which there must be an end but as an ever-continuing process. For, in Kant’s words, enlightening (*Aufklärung*), is the act of “man’s quitting the nonage” of dependence on the understanding of others in order to “make use of one’s own understanding”⁵².

As in western Europe, part of the process of moving toward a quitting of the nonage of dependence among the Serbs of the Habsburg monarchy was the imagination of a “public sphere” —*opštество* in Obradović’s *Sovjeti zdravago razuma*— itself contingent upon the formation of “public opinion” and resultant in the formation of a partly autonomous “civil society”. A precondition to the rise of a civil society was the affirmation of a “voluntary sector” that was both distinct from and able to act upon the “political” and “economic” society, or state and market⁵³.

50. Stoianovich, *Balkan Worlds*, p. 173; Traian Stoianovich, “Material Foundations of Preindustrial Civilization in the Balkans”, *Between East and West* III, 24-26 (1-47).

51. Dimitrije Djordjevic, “Balkan versus European Enlightenment: Parallelism and Dissonances”, *East European Quarterly* IX₄ (Winter 1975) p. 493 (487-497).

52. Frank E. Manuel, ed., *The Enlightenment*, Englewood Cliffs 1965, pp. 34-41; Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis*, p. 108.

53. Habermas, *Theory and Practice*, pp. 77-78; Robert Wuthnow, “The Voluntary Sector: Legacy of the Past, Hope for the Future?” in R. Wuthnow, ed., *Between States and Markets*, p. 7 (3-29); Obradović, “Sovjeti zdravago razuma”, in *Dela Dositeja Obradovića*, pp. 102-103.

The civil society arose among the Habsburg Serbs out of the new *graždanstvo* by the formation in its midst of an “intellectual class” with goals that might converge with, but also diverge from, the goals of state, church, and market. The new sociability to which such intellectuals aspired was *society* itself, defined not by immediate locality nor even by kinship but, on the one hand, by the affirmation of freedom and, on the other, by the recognition of their own role as agents of communication and mediation.

Emphasizing that the new sociability required the extension of formal education to women, he urged that schools be established for girls aged five to twelve with courses of study four hours a day, six days a week, in history, geography, logic, and moral philosophy. A people that does not extend enlightenment to women, he warned, will remain forever barbarian⁵⁴.

In some parts of the Balkans, as in the Morava valley until after the wars of Serbian independence, the farming culture valued certain “matriarchal” underpinnings⁵⁵. One of the so-called nineteenth-century “women’s songs” of that region, in which Marko probably represents an ancient male deity (rather than the historical but legendary Prince Marko) and the Morava Maid an ancient feminine deity, provides an example of a presumably archaic feminism:

The Morava Maid prays in aid to God,
Give me, o God, a cool breezy summer,
And in the summer a fulsome harvest,
That I beat Marko, too, with the sickle.
She talked God into granting her prayer,
God gave her a cool breezy summer,
And in the summer a fulsome harvest,
The race with Marko, too, with the sickle.
The Morava Maid was a wily girl,
While following Marko to the water,
She stole many armfuls of his sheaves.

54. Obradović, “Sovjeti zdravago razuma”, in *Dela Dositeja Obradovića*, pp. 103-104.

55. Yvonne Castellan, *La culture serbe au seuil de l'Indépendance (1800-1840); essai d'analyse psychologique d'une culture à distance temporelle*, Paris 1967, *passim*.

Marko reaped two hundred and two sheaves,
The Morava Maid, three hundred and three⁵⁶.

In England already during the seventeenth century, in France after 1750, and soon thereafter throughout Europe, a virocentric outlook spread with the growing affirmation of the authority of male bourgeois⁵⁷. Serbian and other Balkan cultures underwent a similar virocentrism, particularly after the Serbian and Greek revolutions. Believed by males to be incorrigibly superstitious, Balkan women obtained only a limited access to the precepts of the Enlightenment.

Albeit oriented in an ideal sense toward humanity, the communicators of Enlightenment values were steered toward a variant societal goal by the very, nature of the relatively new mode of communication—the printing press—of which they made use. From 11 printed books a year between 1741 and 1750, publications in Greek rose to 65 a year between 1801 and 1820. Books in Serbian in the Cyrillic script grew from 6 a year between 1761 and 1785 to 19 a year between 1786 and 1820, 37 a year between 1821 and 1840, and 61 a year between 1841 and 1850⁵⁸.

The print technology made books cheaper and available sooner in larger quantities, thereby creating a demand for more writers but also engendering more competition among writers for readers and buyers.

56. Savatije M. Brbić, *Srpski narodni običaji iz sreza Boljevačkog*, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, "Srpski Etnografski Zbornik", knj. xiv, Belgrade 1909, p. 265.

57. Traian Stoianovich, "Gender and Family: Myths, Models, and Ideologies", *The History Teacher* 15 (November 1981) pp. 67-117.

58. C. Th. Dimaras, "L'apport de l'*Aufklärung* au développement de la conscience néohellénique", in Association Internationale d'Études du Sud-Est Européen, *Les Lumières et la formation de la conscience nationale chez les peuples du sud-est européen*, Actes du colloque international organisé par la Commission de l'AIÉSEE pour l'histoire des idées, sous les auspices et avec le concours financier de l'UNESCO, Paris, 11-12 avril 1968 (Bucarest 1970), p. 54 (53-72); Clogg, "The Greek Mercantile Bourgeoisie", p. 96; Katherine Koumariou, "The Contribution of the Intelligentsia towards the Greek Independence Movement", in Richard Clogg, ed., *The Struggle for Greek Independence: Essays to Mark the 150th Anniversary of the Greek war of Independence*, London and Basingstoke 1973, p. 70 (67-86); Philip J. Adler, "Notes on the Beginnings of Modern Serbian Literature: The Kurzbeck Press and Its Successors, 1779-1800", *Southeastern Europe*, I₁ (1974) p. 45 (34-45); Drago Rokсандić, *Vojna Hrvatska: La Croatie Militaire; krajiško društvo u Francuskom Carstvu (1809-1813)*, 2 vols., Zagreb 1988, II, p. 145, based on data in Georgije Mihailović, *Srpska bibliografija XVIII veka*, Belgrade 1964, and Ljubomir Durković-Jakšić, *Istorija srpskih biblioteka (1801-1850)*, Belgrade 1963.

Writers were increasingly prone, therefore, both to write in a language in which they were fully competent and which was close to that of their intended readers. The foregoing combination of circumstances favored by and large the formation of territorial publics defined by language as well as, and often rather than, religion. Religion drew together groups of people who practiced certain common rites, held certain common beliefs, and/or had a common sacred language. As communicators to whom only a territorially limited public was available and lacking a state specifically disposed in their favor, Balkan writers were inclined to postpone the goal of a universal civilizing mission. They opted instead for a national mission—a mission of the nation itself as the *society* to which they aspired. Their constant object, therefore, was to expand their public and the resources or territory over which the language with which they identified could be made to prevail. That goal inevitably brought them into conflict with communicators holding rival territorial claims and national goals.

For Obradović, vocabulary and syntax were practical instruments to be used to enhance human reason. They should be close to the language of the people if the purpose is to promote reason among them with ease. On the other hand, they do not have to be an exact replica of the popular or spoken tongue. Their proper function is to expand the reason first of all of the individuals and small groups to whom the communication of clear, definite, and constant ideas can be made with the least effort. The diffusion of clear ideas to a larger portion of the population will follow as more people became capable of absorbing them.

Obradović was not primarily concerned with language as an aesthetic phenomenon, that is, with its function, in the eyes of romantics, as the greatest spiritual treasure of a people. On the other hand, attentive to the views of the lexicographer Johann Christoph Adelung (1732-1806), Aulic Counsellor and First Librarian to the Elector of Saxony, the theologian Sava Mrkalj (d. 1833) proposed to his countrymen, the Serbs of the Habsburg monarchy, that they employ as a literary vehicle the spoken language of their own people.

Even if not the stated goal of such an innovation, a by-product might be the freeing of a people from entrenched special interests in favor of new unrecognized interests. As one might expect, therefore, Mrkalj's proposal encountered fierce opposition from the Orthodox

hierarchy, cantered at Sremski Karlovci. The old interests subsequently focused their attack on the medieval Latin “j” and the systematized linguistic reforms of Vuk Karadžić. The innovations, they warned, would turn the Serbs from their orthodox culture toward a European —German, Latin, or modern— identity⁵⁹.

Karadžić, on the other hand, an exile in post-Napoleonic Vienna, enjoined people to write as they speak and, in the revised Cyrillic alphabet, pronounce a text as it is written. Many early advocates of a Serb language close to that of the people —the monk Sava Mrkalj, Pavle Solarić, Jovan Došenović, and Luka Milovanov Georgijević— came not from the central or eastern Serb districts but from the western Serb regions —from districts of the ijekavski dialect and far removed from Sremski Karlovci, *topos* and *logos* (a territory or “topography” and its language or logic, its “topology”) of religion, from the Russified language of Vojvodina burghers, and from the dialectal diversity of Vojvodina. One of the main centers of Serbian and Croatian linguistic reform was the bustling Sava-Kupa river port of Karlovac (Carlstadt), a *topos* and *logos* of exchange both of ideas and goods⁶⁰. Similarly, some of the strongest support for demotic Greek came from regions distant from the imperial and ecclesiastical *topos* and *logos* of Constantinople/Istanbul and close by land and sea alike to the *topos* and *logos* of Europe, namely, the Ionian Islands, Epirus, Thessaly, and Macedonia.

The publication and circulation of books also had their special topographies and topologies. Books in Greek and Serbian alike were published for the most part in the Habsburg monarchy, in Italy, in Germany, elsewhere in Europe, and in Wallachia and Moldavia. They circulated from the ports of Europe to Ottoman ports, among them Arta in Epirus, and by way of the fairs of Hungary, Slavonia, Transylvania, and Wallachia and Moldavia, to the Balkan fairs⁶¹. As of mid-century, sub-

59. Jovan Deretić, “Problemi književnog jezika (Analiza eseja ‘Jest li polezno u prostom dijalektu na štampu što izdavati?’ ”, *Dositelj i njegovo doba*, pp. 47-69; Jovan Deretić, “Mrkaljev azbukoprotres”, in *ibid.*, pp. 195-225.

60. Roksandić, *Vojna Hrvatska*, II, pp. 147-149; André Blanc, *La Croatie occidentale: étude de géographie humaine*, Paris 1957, pp. 276-277. On topologies and topographies, see Artemis Leontis, *Topographies of Hellenism: Mapping the Homeland*, Ithaca and London 1995, pp. 3-4, 9.

61. Kitromilides, *The Enlightenment as Social Criticism*, pp. 38-39, 47-50, 95-96, 102, 109-110; Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “Cultural Change and Social Criticism: The Case of

scribing to a learned book prior to its publication became a “status symbol”, —enhancing the honor of a merchant subscriber. For authors and publishers, subscriptions were a way of ascertaining a book’s marketability. Loci of the smallest number of subscribers, on the other hand, may have been the Peloponnesus (Morea) and the pashalik of Belgrade, foci of the later Serbian and Greek wars of independence, in which armed action was an easier road to honor⁶².

Knowledge, wrote Karadžić, is a liberator. It can become the heritage of an entire people, however, only if the people is free to think, speak, and write in its own tongue —even though that tongue be a “cowherd’s tongue— *govedarski jezik*” as the spoken language of the Serbs was called by an otherwise not unenlightened Orthodox ecclesiastic⁶³. Conservatives, liberals, and populists, Serbs and Greeks, resorted to the same frame of reference. The language of preference of each proponent —the letters of antiquity, a language of archaisms or of the church, a citified language, a Russified language, a less Russified Slaveno-Serbian, the speech and idiom of the people or nation —was for its partisans, in the words of Adamantios Korais in defense of his own choice, “a sacred property”. In terms of “the totalizing logic of identity/alterity”, the language of choice was “the Other to all Others”⁶⁴.

The rules of Karadžić favored the popular idiom while allowing for diversities of dialect. They also laid a foundation for the participation of

Iossipos Moisioudax”, *History of European Ideas* X₆ (1989) 667-668 (667-676); Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant”, *Between East and West* II 31, 37-42; Stoianovich, “Model and Mirror of the Premodern Balkan City”, *Between East and West* II 109-113 (79-119); Stoianovich, *Balkan Worlds*, pp. 189-190.

62. Philippe Iliou, “Pour une étude quantitative du public des lecteurs grecs à l’époque des Lumières et de la Révolution (1749-1832)”, in Association Internationale des Études Balkaniques et Sud-Est Européennes, *Actes du premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes*, IV. *Histoire (XVIIIe-XIXe ss.)*, Sofia 1969, pp. 475-480.

63. Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *Pisma*, Belgrade 1947, pp. 161-182, Karadžić to Prince Miloš, Zemun, April 12, 1832; Boris Unbegaun, *Les débuts de la langue littéraire chez les Serbes*, Paris 1935, pp. 73-74; Stoianovich, *Balkan Worlds*, pp. 274-275.

64. Stathis Gourgouris, *Dream Nation: Enlightenment, Colonization, and the Institution of Modern Greece*, Stanford 1996, pp. 98, 93-102, 275, for a brilliant conceptualization of the role of language in the Enlightenment and the conception of romanticism as part of an Enlightenment dialog.

the observers of the rules in the development of a “dialogical culture”⁶⁵, a culture of the exchange and circulation of opinions. Though representing a plea for communication on the basis of national language in opposition to the language of ecumenical religion, whether Orthodoxy, Latin Christendom, or Islam, they also failed to resolve the problem of how to teach language and literature in the schools. They were also closer than the views of Obradović to the conception of Immanuel Kant’s contemporary and rival, Johann Georg Hamann. Like Johann Gottfried Herder, Hamann held that music, poetry, painting, and drawing were early manifestations of language and that reason does not precede but rather derives from, and varies with variations in, language.

Volney himself described language as “a complete history, ...the picture of all the ideas of a people”, while Étienne Bonnot de Condillac, Denis Diderot, Herder, and Alexander and Wilhelm von Humboldt portrayed it as a people’s representation of the world at any given moment. According to a manuscript dating back to the late 1850s, Marx held a similar opinion: “Language as the product of an individual is an absurdity... [It] is just as much the product of a community as in another respect it is the existence of the community: it is, as it were, the communal being speaking for itself”. Logically, therefore, reason cannot be universal so long as people speak different languages with foundations in different customs and different cultural, social, and historical experiences, or—in Volney’s words— not at least until the discovery of a common code to every language or invention of a “universal alphabet”⁶⁶.

But as one may infer from Johann Gottlieb Fichte, progenitor of the idea of the nation state (as opposed to the fundamentally French concept of the state nation), that is precisely what cannot occur because language is the collective product of a people that occupies a particular space or *topos* and whose experiences differ from those of other peoples who oc-

65. Edgar Morin, *Penser l’Europe*, Paris 1987, pp. 127-129.

66. Hundert, *The Enlightenment’s “Fable”*, pp. 98-202; Volney, *Leçons d’histoire*, pp. 222-223 (in the page numbering, page 222 follows 201); Otto Mann, *Hamann, Magus des Nordens: Hauptschriften*, Leipzig, pp. 126, 129, 151, 301, 381; Frederick C. Beiser, *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte*, Cambridge 1987, pp. 3, 9, 16-18, 27-28, 34, 40-41, 130-145; Hafid-Martin, *Voyage et connaissance au tournant des Lumières*, pp. 134-145; Karl Marx, *Pre-capitalist Economic Formations*, edited and with an Introduction by E. J. Hobsbawm, translated by Jack Cohen, New York 1964, first U.S. edition 1965], p. 88. I am grateful to William J. Connell for the reference to Beiser.

copy other or even the same spaces. A further consequence of this way of thought was to emphasize the heterography and even heterology of the *self*, the self as the cultural and historical product of many layers of accretion of *others*⁶⁷.

In 1812, the Slovenian philologist Bartholomäus (Jernej) Kopitar (1780-1844) discovered Volney's *Simplification des langues orientales* (1795), in which Volney had proposed a rational transliteration of the Turkish, Persian, and Arabic scripts. Persuaded of the validity of Volney's linguistic principles if not of Volney's practical applications⁶⁸, Kopitar may later have communicated his thoughts on this subject to his protégé, Vuk Karadžić.

The shift during the final decades of the eighteenth century and early decades of the nineteenth primarily from a discourse of philosophy, under which language was subsumed, to a discourse of language, to which philosophy could not but be subservient, represents in part a swing in Hamann's direction. This occurrence did not imply, however, that most Europeans did not have much in common, including a possible common original language and a similar folklore, which, allowed Madame de Staël to implore her readers to "think in European"⁶⁹.

Destutt de Tracy's discourse on *idéologie* allowed a yet more complete convergence of language, ideas, and society. Responding similarly to similar sensible experiences, he maintained, people develop a similar language of action. They give a similar if not exactly the same meaning to each particular sign. For thinking is feeling, expressed by the operation of four or five faculties —the primary related faculties of sensibility and motility, the latter defined as the ability to distinguish between one's own movements and resistance to such movement by ex-

67. Gunnar Beck, "From Kant to Hegel - Johann Gottlieb Fichte's Theory of Self-Consciousness", *History of European Ideas* XXII₄ (July 1996) pp. 275-294.

68. Miodrag Ibrovac, "Kopitar i Francuzi: prilog biografiji, sa neizdatom prepiskom", Beograd, Univerzitet, Filozofski Fakultet, *Zbornik Filozofskog Fakulteta* 2 (1953) pp. 176, 179 (95-233); Jean Gaulmier, "Un admirateur de Volney: le Slovène Kopitar", *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg* XXXIX (1960-1961) 273-274.

69. Giuseppe Cocchiara, *The History of Folklore in Europe*, translated from the Italian by John N. McDaniel (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, copyright 1971 by Editore Boringhieri; English translation copyright 1981 by ISHI), pp. 273-274. I am not certain that this is a correct translation of Madame de Staël's language, but it correctly represents her thought.

ternal objects; the faculty of recalling a past sensation (memory); judgment, or the faculty of comparing, distinguishing, and combining past sensations and memories, with a foundation in the faculty of motility; and will, or the faculty of preferring one sensation or set of sensations to another⁷⁰. The inclusion of action and gesture as a part of language, however, was not new. Embodied in the logic of Mandeville and Hume alike, as in that of Bishop William Warburton, Condillac, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, was the hypothesis not only that they were part of language but that “the language of action” and gesture was the essential part from which mankind had proceeded first to speech and then to “letters”⁷¹.

Unlike Hamann, however, Destutt de Tracy based his ideas on Aristotelian and Lockean empiricism and the kindred thought of Helvétius and the *abbé* Condillac. Seeking to grasp each idea in its pure or natural state, emptied of idolatry, prejudice, superstition, and religion, he paradoxically intended to return to the *tabula rasa* of the state of nature by means of a form of education and communication that produced not only new knowledge but also a civic, societal, and national consciousness. In other words, *idéologie* would serve the cause of forming, reforming, and reinforcing *society* as defined by Volney and his fellow *idéologues* (called *idéologues* by Napoleon and other opponents)⁷². If not altogether in Destutt de Tracy’s sense, ideology in its posterior manifestations would perform simultaneously a globalizing, deforming, competing (not only with other ideologies but also with variant ideological representations aimed at different cultural levels or different interest,

70. Head, *Politics and Philosophy in the Thought of Destutt de Tracy*, pp. 94-97, 102, 105-108, 113, 143-145; Kennedy, *A “Philosophe” in the Age of Revolution*, pp. 112, 115.

71. Hundert, *The Enlightenment’s “Fable”*, pp. 100-102, 106-113.

72. [Antoine-Louis-Claude] Destutt, comte de Tracy, *Éléments d’idéologie*, 4 vols., Paris 1970, I, pp. 26-27; Ferdinand Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à nos jours*, IX. *La Révolution et l’Empire*, deuxième partie: *Les événements, les institutions et la langue*, Paris 1967, p. 847; Émile Durkheim, *Les règles de la méthode sociologique*, Paris 1947, pp. 17-18; Alvin W. Gouldner, *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology: The Origins, Grammar, and Future of Ideology*, New York 1976, p. 11; Kennedy, *A “Philosophe” in the Age of Revolution*, pp. 89, 104-105, 332-345, on the vicissitudes of “ideology”. On this latter subject, see also Richard Bendix, “The Age of Ideology: Persistent and Changing”, in David E. Apter, *Ideology and Discontent*, New York 1964, pp. 294-327; George Lichtheim, “The Concept of Ideology”, in George H. Nadell, ed., *Studies in the Philosophy of History: Selected Essays from “History and Theory”*, New York 1965, pp. 148-179.

ethnic, or social groups), stabilizing, and hope-raising function⁷³.

In eighteenth-century French and English discourse, certain key words, among them sensibility, movement, mobility, circulation, and communication, describe the western European cultures of the time. Louis Sébastien Mercier, for example, observed in the early 1780s that the “giddiness”, briskness, nimbleness, and mental “vibrations” of the people of Paris were the direct consequence of a great division of labor. They were the sensual translations of the realities of the city’s arts and crafts. “All the senses” he wrote, “are interrogated at every instant. One smashes, polishes, and fashions. Metals are tormented into all sorts of forms. The hammer is untiring, the crucible ever aglow, the poignant file always in action, flattening, melting, and tearing up materials or combining and blending them”⁷⁴. As a result, what Pierre Bayle had called the “reign of critique” or criticism had entered into the very objects that one made. Diderot, indeed, gave a theoretical formulation to this fact by his concept of the “universal sensibility” of matter—in an active form in organic matter and in an inert, latent, or potential form in inorganic manner—or instability of all things, ever subject to change⁷⁵.

Obradović may not have found the foregoing conceptions, particularly Destutt de Tracy’s, alien to his own way of thought, but they seem to have been unknown to him. Although known to Adamantios Korais, the distinguished Greek intellectual who lived in exile in Paris and was familiar with and even frequented the circle of the Observateurs de l’Homme, Destutt de Tracy’s thought did not reach southeastern Europe much before the end of the Napoleonic era⁷⁶. In effect, the first Balkan

73. Georges Duby, “Ideologies and Social History”, in Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora, eds., with an introduction by Colin Lucas, *Constructing the Past: Essays in Historical Methodology*, Cambridge 1985, pp. 152-154, (151-165), translated from *Faire de l’histoire*, Paris 1974.

74. Louis-Sébastien Mercier, *Tableau de Paris*, new corrected and enl. ed., 12 vols., Amsterdam 1782-1788, I, pp. 3-5.

75. Denis Diderot, “D’Alembert’s Dream”, in *Rameau’s Nephew and D’Alembert’s Dream*, translated with introductions by Leonard Tancock, London and New York 1966, pp. 174-177, 180-182 (165-223); Diderot, “Le rêve de d’Alembert”, in *Oeuvres philosophiques*, ed. Paul Vernière, Paris 1961, pp. 299-300, 305, 310-313 (285-371); Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis*, pp. 107-108, 112-113; Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, p. 92.

76. Pascal [Paschalis] M. Kitromilides, “Le retentissement des idées de Jean-Jacques Rousseau au sein du radicalisme balkanique à l’époque de la Révolution française”, in *Studies*

scholar to produce a unified theory of cognition with a basis in the thought of Locke, Condillac, and Destutt de Tracy, was Veniamin Lesvios (Benjamin Lesbios, 1759-1824), a teacher at schools in Kydoniai, Bucharest, and Smyrna. A borrowing from Destutt de Tracy, Lesvios's designation for the new science of ideas was *idealogia* (*ιδεαλογία*), the subject of his *Stoicheia tes metaphysikes* (Vienna, 1820)⁷⁷.

The turn toward language during the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth century was part of a continuing Enlightenment search for meaning. Assuming a different form in each generation, it has culminated in the twentieth century in competition between generations and between rival intellectual disciplines to find meaning—in speech, written language, works of art, works of science, everyday things, gestures, symbols, signs, beliefs, monuments and memories, concepts, actions, rites and rituals, institutions, events, and “total history”, usually with the assumption that one way is a superior or the only right way to meaning—or to deny or question the existence of any overall meaning⁷⁸.

Identity: An Expanded Europe

In the Enlightenment search for meaning, Europe itself was reconceived to embody Enlightenment aspirations. Until the sixteenth century, the common name for what now is known as Europe had been Christendom (*christianitas, terra* or *respublica christiana*). Such terms identified a territory whose populations embraced a set of common moral principles. Under that term, however, many western Europeans understood only western or Latin Christendom. The term Europe, on other hand, referred to a geographic area with highly uncertain eastern fron-

on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, CCCXXIV, Oxford 1994, p. 128 (121-139); Vlad Georgescu, *Political Ideas and the Enlightenment in the Romanian Principalities (1750-1831)* (Boulder, Colo.: East European Quarterly, distributed by Columbia University Press, New York, 1971), pp. 69-70.

77. Kitromilides, “The Idea of Science in the Modern Greek Enlightenment”, pp. 188-197.

78. My interpretation after reading several articles: Roger Chartier, “Intellectual History or Sociocultural History? The French Trajectories”, in Dominick LaCapra and Steven L. Kaplan, eds., *Modern Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives*, Ithaca 1982, pp. 15-22 (13-46); Martin Jay, “Should Intellectual History Take a Linguistic Turn? Reflections on the Habermas-Gadamer Debate”, in *ibid.*, pp. 86-110; Richard Rorty, “Metaphysical Difficulties of Linguistic Philosophy”, in R. Rorty, ed., *The Linguistic Turn: Recent Essays in Philosophical Method*, Chicago 1967, pp. 1-39.

tiers. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, however, humanist thinkers gave it also a moral sense, associating it with an area in which a high value was placed on the concepts of civility and utility and in which the forms of political organization differed from those prevalent in Asia. But the centuries-long split between Greek and Latin Christianity, the continuing inclination of Latin Christians to associate Byzantium and Greeks with subtlety, perfidy, and duplicity, and the sixteenth and seventeenth-century split of Western Christendom into one area of mostly Germanic speech and another of mostly Romance speech, hindered the spread of the term "Europe" to wide segments of the European population, while the term "Christendom" often excluded the Greek, Roman(ian), and Slavic worlds of Orthodox Christianity. Except among cartographers and some historians and other scholars, including Francis Bacon—in 1623, Bacon employed the phrase *nos Europäi*, "we Europeans"—the term Europe was of slow and reluctant acceptance⁷⁹. Its ultimate success was a product of the linkage of the idea of Europe, in England and the United Provinces in the 1670s and 1680s, to the ideas of balance of power (on land), commercial liberty, and religious toleration.

From this last perspective, Europe was a small region, excluding alike the territories of the house of Habsburg and of Louis XIV. By 1706, however, in the words of Lord Shaftesbury, "a mighty light" had begun to spread outward, including under its gaze an ever larger territory⁸⁰. Widespread acceptance of the idea both of a wider Europe and of a European geographic and moral identity owes much, however, to Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des lois* (1748), which defined Europe by a set of common traits: a common climate, a common "general spirit", government of law, a climate and geography inimical alike to despotisms

79. Federico Chabod, *Storia dell'idea d'Europa*, a cura di Ernesto Sestan ed Armando Saitta, Bari 1961, pp. 23-25, 33, 39, 43, 48, 51, 113-114, 123; Denys Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*, revised edition, Edinburgh 1957, 1968, pp. 22-30, 37, 51, 54-60, 77-80, 86-89, 101-115; John Hale, *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance*, New York, London, Toronto 1993, pp. 3-5 (on Bacon), 11-39. For the views of Europe of cartographers, see W. H. Parker, "Europe: How Far?", *Geographical Journal* CXXVI part 3 (September 1960) 278-297.

80. D. H. Schmidt, "The Establishment of 'Europe' as a Political Expression", *Historical Journal* IX₂ (1966) 172-178; Roy Porter, "The Enlightenment in England", in Porter and Teich, *The Enlightenment in National Context*, p. 4 (1-18), for the statement by Shaftesbury.

and vast states or empires, a religion (unlike Islam) favoring moderate government, and a balance of power between the interests of monarchy, nobility, and commerce, as well as customs and manners conducive to intercommunication —and, consequently, liberty and innovation⁸¹.

The opposite of a system of commercial liberty was despotism⁸². The word “despotism” itself was new. Derived from Greek δεσπότης, the term “despot” sometimes had been used by Aristotle to identify a ruler who governed at least some subjects, notably conquered populations, as if they were slaves. That practice was common, according to Aristotle, among “barbarians” and the peoples of Asia. Albeit intelligible to scholars in the Latin West, however, the words “despot” and “despotic” (or *despotically*, *despotico*, and *despotizzare*) were slow to gain wide currency. Their use by Hobbes, Milton, and Locke finally promoted their diffusion to a wider public. The introduction of the term *despotisme* into French may date back to before 1698. Its acceptance by Pierre Bayle as early as 1704 put it in good standing among liberals, but not so much as a description of “Oriental governments” as in denunciation of “absolute monarchy” and especially the government of Louis XIV since the suppression of the Fronde(s)⁸³.

The Turkish threat to Europe, indeed, and, until the end of the seventeenth century, Turkey’s example of military prowess and political achievement provided a model of absolutism for Europe. The inclination of some European observers, as of Giovanni Botero and Trajano Boccalini, to look upon the Ottoman Empire during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the embodiment of reason of state, and upon the Turks as the “new Romans”, despite the counterarguments of Pietro Foscarini, facilitated the imposition of stronger state authority in

81. Montesquieu, *De l'esprit des lois*, book 17, chapter 3; book 19, chapters 4 and 12, in Laboulaye, ed., *Oeuvres complètes de Montesquieu*, IV, pp. 240-250, 307, 318-319; book 24, chapter 3, in *ibid.*, V, pp. 119-121.

82. M. E. Yapp, “Europe and the Turkish Mirror”, *Past and Present* 137 (November 1992) 141-148.

83. R. Koebner, “Despot and Despotism: Vicissitudes of a Political Term”, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* XIV, 275-302; Lucette Valensi, *The Birth of the Despot: Venice and the Sublime Porte*, translated by Arthur Denner, Ithaca and London 1993, pp. 74-77, 92-99; Lucette Valensi, “The Making of a Political Paradigm: The Ottoman State and Oriental Despotism”, in Anthony Grafton and Ann Blair, eds., *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe*, Philadelphia 1990, pp. 173-203.

France, the Habsburg dominions, and other European states⁸⁴.

As the despotism of European princes became more “enlightened”, however, both a cause and effect of the emergence of a European “republic of letters”⁸⁵, the main thrust of the critique of despotism by the advocates of a Europe of commercial liberty and religious toleration —if one overlooks the Sinophilia of Physiocracy— shifted to “Oriental despotism”. Around 1750, Turgot further identified despotism with the imposition of restrictions by bodily stronger persons and groups —that is, by bodies that have the support of arms, custom, and law— upon the bodily weaker. He consequently linked despotism not only with the imposition of penalties upon conquered populations but also with limitations upon the rights of women, most particularly through the institution of polygamy. A century later, Louis de Bonald identified polygamy as a “domestic despotism” that fortifies “political despotism”⁸⁶.

European critiques of despotism gave the emergent group of south-eastern European thinkers an opportunity to join in a similar appeal for the unfettered circulation of ideas as of goods, in opposition to “Oriental despotism” or mix of tyranny, controls, and abuses, of the Ottoman Empire, with which their own peoples were familiar. At the same time, European thinkers redefined Europe itself as the area of contiguous terri-

84. Hans Sturmbeger, “Das Problem der Vorbildhaftigkeit des türkischen Staatswesens im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert und sein Einfluss auf den europäischen Absolutismus”, in Comité International des Sciences Historiques, XIIe Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, Vienne, 29 août - 5 septembre 1965, *Rapports*, IV. *Méthodologie et histoire contemporaine*, Horn / Wien 1965, pp. 201-209; Hale, *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance*, pp. 38-43.

85. Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*, pp. 122-123.

86. [Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot, “Plan de deux discours sur l’histoire universelle: plan du premier discours, sur la formation des gouvernements et le mélange des nations”, in *Oeuvres de Turgot*, nouvelle édition classée par ordre de matières, avec les notes de Dupont de Nemours, augmentée de lettres inédites, des questions sur le commerce, et d’observations et de notes nouvelles par M. Eugène Daire et Hippolyte Dussard et précédée d’une notice par M. Eugène Daire, 2 vols., Paris 1844, II, pp. 628-642; Vicomte Louis de Bonald, “Du divorce considéré au XIXe siècle relativement à l’état public de la société”, in *Oeuvres de M. de Bonald: Essai analytique sur les lois naturelles de l’ordre social; Du divorce considéré au XIXe siècle relativement à l’état domestique et à l’état public de société; Pensées sur divers sujets; Discours politiques*, Paris 1847, p. 175 (123-278). In Gustave Schelle, *Oeuvres de Turgot et documents le concernant avec biographie et notes*, Paris 1913, I, pp. 277-298, Turgot’s same essay is dated “vers 1751” instead of 1750. See also Stoianovich, *Balkan Worlds*, pp. 119-120.

tories in which Enlightenment ideas prevailed or could be made to prevail. As a result, Europe as a cultural or civilizational unit —as the “wondrous whole” or *bewunderswürdiges Ganze* of Adelung or the “common European home” of a twentieth-century Russian political leader⁸⁷ —began to comprehend the territories of the three Christian faiths that previously had been divided from each other —Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, and Orthodox Christianity.

Twentieth-century thinkers sometimes criticize the eighteenth-century *philosophers* for their Eurocentrism. The travel of some of the most *famous philosophes*, it is true, was confined to western Europe. Their interest, however, extended to most parts of the world to which travel by land or sea was then feasible. They traveled vicariously⁸⁸. They were Eurocentric not in the sense that their interests did not embrace the world but by their identification of one of the world’s civilizational units —their own, the extended Europe of our concern— with Enlightenment goals, and by their inclination to associate other “continents, subcontinents”, or regions with other identities⁸⁹.

The “Orientalization” of the orient in Edward Said’s sense of the gathering and structuring of information, whether by Europeans or others, that directly or indirectly enhanced the power of Europe or of some particular European state or culture, had to follow the “Europeanization” of Europe itself. As Stuart Woolf explains, it had to follow the

87. Johann Christoph Adelung, *Pragmatische Staatsgeschichte Europens*, 2 vols., Gotha 1762-1769, I, “Vorläufige Einleitung”, p. 4, cited by Paul Hazard, *La pensée européenne au XVIIIe siècle de Montesquieu à Lessing*, 3 vols., Paris 1946, II, p. 221; Paul Hazard, *European Thought in the Eighteenth Century from Montesquieu to Lessing*, trans. J. Lewis May, Cleveland and New York 1963, p. 437; Mikhail Gorbachev, *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World*, New York 1987, pp. 104-195. The phrase “common European home” is Gorbachev’s, but the idea of a culturally extended Europe is an Enlightenment outlook.

88. René Pomeau, “Voyage et Lumières dans la littérature française du XVIIIe siècle”, in Edward Besterman, ed., *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, LVII (Genève 1967), pp. 1280, 1285-1286 (1269-1289).

89. Jean Gaulmier, “Volney et ses *Leçons d’histoire*”, *History and Theory: Studies of the Philosophy of History* II₁ (1962) 54 (52-65), on Volney’s “universalist” concerns. On the tradition of cultural distinction by continent, see P. J. Marshall, “Asia and the Progress of Civil Society”, in P. J. Marshall and Glyndwr Williams, *The Great Map of Mankind: British Perceptions of the World in the Age of the Enlightenment*, London, Melbourne, and Toronto 1982, p. 128 (128-154).

elaboration of “a unifying grid of civilization”, namely, an identification and appraisal of the cultural, social, political, and ecological or spatial characteristics of Europe, “against which all other cultures could be classified”⁹⁰. It could not be said to have had much coherence before Montesquieu’s *De l’esprit des lois* (1748), and it could not take the form of a program until after the appearance of Volney’s *Les ruines, ou méditations sur les révolutions des empires* (1791).

A self-Europeanizing by Balkan and southeastern European elites of Orthodox Christian tradition accompanied the “orientalizing” by western Europeans of the regions to the east of the zone of penetration of the Enlightenment. The self-Europeanizing was not primarily a concession to European political and economic hegemony but rather a matter of choice. Two centuries later, on the other hand, in April 1975, at the international colloquium of Orientalists at the University of Skopje, point of convergence of the Islamic, Orthodox Christian, and Roman Catholic faiths, the idea of civilizational units or culture areas, epitomized by the Serbian/Yugoslav geographer Jovan Cvijić and the French historian Fernand Braudel, came under sharp attack. In a concomitant act of “political correctness” the use of the term Orientalism was proscribed. The motivations of such acts are complex. Reflecting the new mania in western scholarship for fragmentation, “immediate history” and deconstruction, and the rejection by youth of the notion of hierarchy, one goal may have been to discredit the general idea of wholeness. A further aim may have been to disparage the notion of correspondence between Europe and the zone of eastward and southeastward extension of the Enlightenment, and to weaken thereby the authority of Europe⁹¹.

90. Stuart Woolf, “The Construction of a European World - View in the Revolutionary - Napoleonic Years”, *Past and Present* 137 (November 1992) 89 (72-101).

91. On the identification of southeastern Europeans with the European cultures, see Iorga, *Les voyageurs français dans l'Orient européen*, pp. 113-116; Alexandru Duțu, “Tradition and Innovation in the Romanian Enlightenment”, *Romanian Studies* II (1972) 113 (104-119); Alexandru Duțu, “National and European Consciousness in the Romanian Enlightenment”, in Theodore Besterman, ed., *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, LV (Genève 1967), pp. 473-475 (463-479). On the proscription of the term “Orientalism”, see Ehsan Naraghi, *L'Orient et la crise de l'Occident*, preface by Alfred Sauvy, translated from the Persian by Brigitte Simon in collaboration with Thierry Lemaesquier, Paris 1977, pp. 159-161. On the rejection of the notion of hierarchy and the rebellions of 1968, see Pierre Daix, *Braudel*, Paris 1995, pp. 427-438.