

BALKAN HISTORY AT THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION MEETING

The 79th Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, held on 28-30 December 1964 in Washington, included a session of outstanding interest to Balkan scholars. Entitled "Religious Diversity and National Conformity in South-Eastern Europe," this session dealt with a subject too often bypassed by scholars. Let us hope that these papers represent the beginning of systematic study of the effects of religion on modern Balkan history.

Professor Radu Florescu of Boston College opened the session with "The Uniate Church — Catalyst of Romanian National Consciousness." This theme provided a springboard for a detailed study of cultural and intellectual currents (and their political consequences) in the Romanian lands during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Florescu disputed the emphasis of traditional Romanian historiography on Orthodoxy as embodying and preserving Romanian nationality, pointing out that the Church's conservatism and its use of a Cyrillic script and a Slavonic language showed its disinterest in the Romanian language and nationality. This situation, he argues, grew worse under the Hellenization that accompanied Phanariote rule in the eighteenth century. By default, therefore, the way lay open for the development by Romanian intellectuals from Transylvania of a nationalist ideology. Their conflict over the centuries with the Hungarians, Szeklers, and Saxons, combined with the use of the Romanian language by the missionaries of both the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, had greatly increased their cohesiveness and national consciousness. The enlightened despotism of Maria Theresa and Joseph II had introduced them to progressive Western ideas. Florescu suggests that even the Orthodox Church in Transylvania was receptive to Romanian nationalism, but does not really connect this movement with the Uniates. He shows clearly, however, that the new Romanian nationalism was definitely not revolutionary, but merely sought equality with the three recognized nations of Transylvania. The question remains: how did this quest for equality in terms of privilege transform itself into the true nineteenth century nationalism of land and people? Florescu finds an answer in "Romanianism"—the belief developed from Moldavian chronicles by Romanian seminary students in Rome that the Romanians were descendents of Roman settlers in Dacia and thus the heirs of Latin, Western civilization. It is Florescu's judgement that these intellectuals, by formulating this doctrine and spreading it through schools and books in a Romanian literary language which they also created, exercised a truly decisive (though certainly not exclusive) influence on the ideological evolution of Romanian nationalism.

Professor James Clarke, of the University of Pittsburgh, followed with "J" for Yugoslavia: The Reforms of Vuk Karadžić." After testifying to the way in which religion and language have been the principal indices of nationality among the Balkan peoples, Clarke shows how Karadžić (1787-1864) prepared the way for a unified Yugoslavia by developing a Serbo-Croat literary language which eventually gained preeminence from the Sava to the Morava. One stage in Karadžić's campaign was the introduction into the Serbian orthography of the Croat (and Western) letter "j"; hence the title of Clarke's paper. The furor which this stirred among conservative, ultra-Orthodox Serbs, who viewed all things Croat as contaminated by Catholicism and Austrophilism, was only one of the cultural and political battles in which Karadžić participated, often with the backing of the Slovene philologist, Jernej Kopitar. Clarke suggests that Kopitar's influence on Karadžić has been underestimated by nationalist Yugoslav scholars, who are repelled by Kopitar's Austrophilism. Karadžić also had important enemies, especially among the Orthodox clergy. They were firmly supported by the Russophiles within Serbia, who proposed a firm political and cultural alliance with Russia against the Ottomans and Hapsburgs. Thus Karadžić's intellectual career illustrates how the inherent tensions of a static, traditional society undergoing rapid change can make even linguistic reform a matter of violent controversy. Nevertheless, Karadžić won, thus removing language as a divisive element in cultural relations between the Serbs and Croats. Thenceforth the burden of cultural separation was carried by religion alone.

Clarke paints this picture in broad strokes, presenting a general survey of Karadžić's intellectual activity and urging Western scholars to use Karadžić's voluminous collected writings as the basis for a long-overdue systematic study of this vital figure in Yugoslav history.

Professor Traian Stoianovich of Rutgers University commented on both papers in "Religion and Nationalism in the Balkans Since the Sixteenth Century." Addressing himself first to Clarke's paper, Stoianovich went beyond an inquiry into linguistic reform per se, drawing on evidence derived from the religious conflicts in Croatia, Slovenia, and the Romanian lands during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to suggest that Karadžić's linguistic proposals meant far more than a change in the script. Not only were these reforms viewed by Orthodox conservatives "as one more great threat of the kind that had menaced Orthodoxy since... the religious crisis of the sixteenth century," but also as an attempt "to finish the unfinished Serbian revolution" by attacking the power of the clergy and thus striking at the stratified, rigid, oligarchic, essentially anti-democratic society of estates which prevailed in Hungary, and which threatened to spread to the newly-independent Serbian

state. Karadžić's alternative was a liberal intelligentsia on the Western model rationalistic, democratic, egalitarian, and open to men of talent.

Stoianovich continued his analysis of social classes and ideologies in commenting on Florescu's paper. He sees the Transylvanian Uniates of the late eighteenth century, not as advocates of nationalism, but as conservative traditionalists, whose attempt to gain recognition and parity within the existing estates system runs counter to modern conceptions of equality before a single, over-riding legal code. Stoianovich agrees with Florescu (and thus explicitly disputes the view advanced by George Arnakis in the essay on "The Role of Religion in the Development of Balkan Nationalism" in *The Balkans in Transition*) that the Orthodox Church of the eighteenth century, with its Phanariote leadership, deep concern for material goals, and accommodation to Ottoman power, was in no way suited to lead either revolution or the new, Western-style nationalism. This leadership could be provided only by a modern, secularized intelligentsia.

In his comments, Stoianovich follows the route he has previously charted (most notably in his essay in *The Balkans in Transition*), urging us to view Balkan history of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as gradually drawing closer to the mainstream of Western history, above all that of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. It follows that a scholar investigating the modern Balkans should study not only Iorga, Xenopol, Jovanovic and Cvijić, but Michelet, Max Weber, and R.R. Palmer. In thus arguing for scholarly cosmopolitanism rather than localism, Stoianovich presents ideas deserving the most serious scrutiny, analysis, and refinement.

Carnegie Institute of Technology

LEONARD BUSHKOFF

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PROJECT ON THE HISTORY OF EAST CENTRAL EUROPE

An important obstacle to the further development in the English-speaking world of the systematic, integrated, and balanced study of Eastern Europe has been the absence of comprehensive and detailed histories of the region. While there are several general accounts (Dvornik's *The Slavs in European History and Civilization*, Halecki's *Borderlands of Western Civilisation: A History of East Central Europe*, and, above all Stavriano's masterful *The Balkans Since 1453*, all come to mind), there is no equivalent of, say, *The Cambridge Modern History*, to which the interested student, the inquisitive layman, or even the specialist seeking precise data can turn for help.