Whose Enlightenment?

Franz L. Fillafer

The Enlightenment seems out of kilter. Until fairly recently, its trajectories were beguilingly simple and straightforward. Devised by Western metropolitan masterminds, the Enlightenment was piously appropriated by their latter-day apprentices in Central and Eastern Europe. This process of benign percolation made modern science, political liberty, and religious toleration trickle down to East-Central Europe. The self-orientalizing of nineteenth-century Central European intellectuals reinforced this impression, making concepts that were ostensibly authentic and pristine at their "Western" sources seem garbled and skewed once appropriated in their region.

Today science, liberty, and toleration are recognized to have also been much patchier and more "provincial" at their putative chief sources in England, France, and the Netherlands. The once stable assumptions of Cold War histories of science and ideas seem increasingly untenable. Over the past two decades, the coherence and "Western" credentials of modernity have waned, and so has its essentially anti-clerical thrust.[1] Historians have done much to dispel clichés about the Enlightenment fabricated by nineteenth-century liberals who drew on its legacy and thereby belittled collateral heirs' claims to the same heritage. Conservative and religious varieties of the Enlightenment have re-emerged from the shambles of the liberal narrative,[2] religion is being rediscovered as a "chrysalis" rather than as a mere "casualty of modernity."[3]

---

[1]See, for example, John Tutino, *Making a New World: Founding Capitalism in the Bajío and Spanish North America* (Durham, NC, 2011).

[2]See Ulrich Lehner, *The Catholic Enlightenment: The Forgotten History of a Global Movement* (Oxford, 2015). On the Bohemian version of this conservative Enlightenment, see Franz L. Fillafer, "Leo Thun und die Aufklärung: Wissenschaftsideal, Berufungspolitik und Deutungskämpfe," in *Die Thun-Hohensteinschen Universitätsreformen 1849–1860: Konzeption—Umsetzung—Nachwirkungen,* ed. Brigitte Mazohl and Christof Aichner (Vienna, 2017), 55–75. On Hungary, see Kalatin Gillemot, *Gróf Széchényi Ferenc és bécsi köre* [Count Ferenc Széchényi and his Viennese circle] (Budapest, 1933); Ambrus Miskolczy, "Az 'ismeretlen' Széchényi Ferenc 'ismert' munkálata a Habsburg birodalom hungarizálásáról" [A 'well-known' work of the 'unknown' Ferenc Széchényi on the Hungarization of the Habsburg Empire], *Levéltári Közlemények* [Archival releases] 77 (2006): 13–53.

[3]See Dale Van Kley, "Christianity as Casualty and Chrysalis of Modernity," *American Historical Review* 108 (2003): 1081–1104; Dror Wahrman, "God and the Enlightenment," *Historical Review* 108 (2003): 1057–60; Knud Haakonssen, *Enlightenments and Religions* (Athens, 2010); Patricia U. Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America,* rev. ed. (New York, 2003), 188.

Austrian History Yearbook 48 (2017): 111–125 © Center for Austrian Studies, University of Minnesota 2017
doi:10.1017/S0067237817000017

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This fresh take on the Enlightenment does not mean that it is unmoored from its hinges, that it becomes a concept too totalizing and shapeless to have interpretive purchase.[4] Instead, studies like the ones collected in this forum help us to appreciate that the Enlightenment was many before it became one. They invite us to recover the rival species of Enlightenment that proliferated and vied for preeminence before being restructured around the doctrinal pivots of rationalism, natural law, deism, and popular sovereignty after 1789.[5] A new approach along these lines permits us to recognize the post-revolutionary history politics at play in this reconstruction, a series of alignments that retroactively created a uniform Enlightenment that was the same in Edinburgh and Prague, Saint Petersburg and Naples, and codified the history of its diffusion from the west to the east and the south. The articles assembled in this collection contribute to this reappraisal. Refraining from the kind of intellectual history that traces self-propelling ideas, they instead throw into relief the structures, spaces, and translations that made different types of Enlightenment work and interact in Central Europe. These articles thereby help us to identify the strands of what came to appear as a unitary, well-integrated whole in the nineteenth century, when the Enlightenment emerged as a historical legacy.

Structures

The structural dimension is fleshed out with an admirable grasp of the sources by Marija Petrović, whose fine article focuses on the material prerequisites and the media of the Enlightenment, in this case Joseph Kurzböck's Cyrillic printing shop in Vienna.[6] Petrović's line of enquiry parallels the work of Petér Király's research group on the multilingual university printing plant of Buda.[7] Her article uses the setup and output of Kurzböck's shop to highlight the intricacies of the Habsburg ruler's arrogated state magistracy over the Serbian Orthodox Church. Petrović seeks to unravel the Enlightenment's function in the management of imperial diversity, and she has a sharp eye for the social history of the institutions entrusted with this task.[8] Petrović speaks of a "top down" dissemination process,

[4]See Franz L. Fillafer and Jürgen Osterhammel, "Cosmopolitanism and the German Enlightenment," in *Oxford Handbook of Modern German History,* ed. Helmut Walser Smith (Oxford, 2011), 119–43; John G. A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. I: *The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon 1737–1794* (Cambridge, 1999), 9.

[5]See Franz L. Fillafer, "Die Aufklärung in der Habsburgermonarchie und ihr Erbe: Ein Forschungsüberblick," *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 40 (2013): 35–97; Annelien De Dijn, "The Politics of Enlightenment: From Peter Gay to Jonathan Israel," *The Historical Journal* 55 (2012): 785–805.

[6]See Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton, 2007).

[7]Ivan Mokuter, "Jezička obeležja srpskih izdanja budimske univerzitetske štamparije u periodu od 1796. do 1814. godine" [The characteristic features of the Serbian-language publications issued by the Buda University printing shop between 1796 and 1814], in *Typographia universitatis Hungaricae Budae: 1777–1848* [The printing press of the Hungarian University at Buda: 1777–1848], ed. Petér Király (Budapest, 1983), 377–85; Imre Ress, "Serbische Gründungsversuche von Druckereien und die Universitätsdruckerei Ofen im Vormärz," in *Typographia universitatis Hungaricae Budae: 1777–1848,* ed. Petér Király (Budapest, 1983), 395–400; Petér Király, *A kelet-közép-európai helyesírások és irodalmi nyelvek alakulása: A budai Egyetemi Nyomda kiadványainak tanulságai, 1777–1848* [The orthographical and literary development of the languages of East Central Europe: Lessons from the publications of the Buda University press] (Nyíregyháza, 2003).

[8]Her essay is particularly strong on the history of censorship. The recruitment of a well-read, polyglot Serbian Orthodox cleric with impeccable moral conduct was a protracted process due to candidates' dubious credentials: some of the eligible clerics were adulterers or muckrakers whose squabbles with superiors made them notorious, others wished to convert to Catholicism. Indeed, the final appointee Atanasije D. Sekereš did convert in 1776

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but read together with some other good recent studies on the Enlightenment among the Serbs, her own work shows that this conception is flawed. Instead, her article permits us to interrogate received wisdom about "influences" and "receptions." The function of Kurzböck's printing shop was far from unique. There were many conduits and catalysts of "refinement" among the Serbs, and the question of where the origins of Enlightenment lay and who its chief enablers were became a politically charged issue in the early nineteenth century.

Kurzböck's printing shop must be situated at the crossroads of two large-scale processes: The Catholic Enlightenment as an imperative of belated "confessionalization," and the Habsburg court offices' policing of the Serbian Orthodox Church.[9] Throughout Maria Theresa's reign, Habsburg authorities worked for the demise of old Church Slavonic in the Russian recension among the Serbs. Thereby they sought to thwart Serbian Orthodox believers' self-Russification, which stemmed from the Serbs' quest for the preservation of their faith, and to end the capital drain caused by the purchase of Russian breviaries and prayer books.[10] For several decades, the court offices gave leverage to Greek Catholics' proselytizing among the Orthodox Serbs, and this attitude tarnished Kurzböck's reputation. Given Kurzböck's exclusive privilege for the printing of Cyrillic books for both Orthodox and Uniate congregations, his shop was accused of tacitly inserting "papist" doctrines into the catechisms and edifying literature it produced.

Kurzböck's venture shows the continuities that connected two models of pan-monarchical unity in the eighteenth century. The first is the model of confessional unification that received Enlightenment props in the 1750s and 1760s.[11] Here the fight against "superstition," social unrest, and irregular practices of worship was boosted by the superiority enlightened Catholics claimed over allegedly obscurantist Orthodoxy with its suspicious ties to Russia.[12] In the 1770s this enlightened confessionalism was surreptitiously replaced with the second model of unity, the inculcation of ideas of useful and virtuous citizenship across the empire. However, this new regime continued the emphases and media of the earlier confessionalist

---

when he had been censor for two years, but he was to hold office until his death (in 1794 or 1800). It would be very rewarding to study the lopsided, segmented, and hierarchized "confessionalization" of Habsburg ecclesiastical censorship. In the case of some denominations Habsburg legislation ascertained the respective censors' capacities for judgment based on their belief in the religion whose ecclesiastical scholarship they vetted and sifted, while for other religions no comparable requirements of faith were enacted. Very little work exists on these issues beyond the mid-eighteenth-century *cause célèbre*, the wresting of *general* censorship from the Catholic Church in the 1750s, see Grete Klingenstein, *Staatsverwaltung und kirchliche Autorität: Das Problem der Zensur in der theresianischen Reform* (Vienna, 1974). Cf. the engrossing study by Iveta Cermanová and Jindřich Marek, *Na rozhraní křesťanského a židovského světa: Příběh hebrejského cenzora a klementinského knihovníka Karla Fischera (1757–1844)* [At the border of the Christian and Jewish worlds: The history of the Hebrew censor and Clementinum librarian Karl Fischer (1757–1844)] (Prague, 2007).

[9]Robert J. W. Evans, "Comment," *Austrian History Yearbook* 30 (1999): 229–35.

[10]Vladimir Vukašinović, *Srpska barokna teologija: Biblijsko i svetotajinsko bogoslovlje u Karlovačkoj mitropoliji XVIII veka* [Serbian baroque theology: Biblical and sacramental theology in the metropolitanate of Karlovci in the 18th century] (Trebinje, 2010), 311.

[11]Franco Venturi, *Italy in the Enlightenment: Studies in a Cosmopolitan Century* (London, 1972), 103.

[12]Mitja Kostić, *Carski duhovnici propagatori unije među Srbima* [Imperial priests as propagators of the union among the Serbs] (Sremski Karlovci, 1922), 8; Vukašinović, *Srpska barokna teologija*, 88–132. On the shift from the Christian to the enlightened credentials of "Europeanness" defended at the *propugnaculum/antemurale Christianitis* and the concomitant revamping of baroque "Slavonic reciprocity," see Persida Lazarević di Giacomo, "Poetska ispisivanja jedne društvene krize: Austrijsko-rusko-turski rat (1787–1791/1792) u južnoslovenskim književnostima" [Poetic descriptions of a social crisis: The Austro-Russian-Turkish War (1787–1791/1792) in South Slavonic literatures], in *Društvene krize i (srpska) književnost i kultura* [Social crisis and (Serbian) literature and culture], ed. Dragan Bošković and Maja Andjelković (Kragujevac, 2011), 225–62.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

framework. Cast in this light, the story of Kurzböck's printing shop illustrates a crucial aspect of the history of the Serbian Enlightenment. The tightening grip of Habsburg governmental control over Orthodox believers slowly created a space for vernacularized and secular learning among the Serbs. This was an unintentional byproduct of the assertion of state magistracy over the church, rather than a preordained result of the process per se.

By the same token, this insight helps to debunk claims about the overriding importance of the Austrian Enlightenment as Serbs' high road to progress and improvement. The experiences of Zaharija Stefanovič Orfelin and Dositej Obradović cut against the grain of this narrative and reveal the significance of the "Orthodox commonwealth," which remains sorely underappreciated in much of the existing literature.[13] Orfelin, who served for a short time as a proofreader at Kurzböck's shop, was a calligrapher, engraver, poet, and part-time winegrower. He also founded the first Serbian journal in Venice and prepared a booklet against the pope modeled after Joseph Valentin Eybel's *Was ist der Pabst?*[14] Orfelin's work shows the significance of Kievan church humanism for Serbian culture. The Habsburg Serbs established grammar schools in which Latin was the main subject, alongside Church Slavonic. These institutions were modeled after Ukrainian archetypes in predominantly Roman Catholic Poland. While older Serbian literati had praised this model as a way of tapping into Latinate culture while defending the Orthodox faith in a Catholic environment, Orfelin criticized the emphasis on Latin learning as symptomatic of the Ukrainian clergy's fear of the Enlightenment.[15] Orfelin's critique of Latin was a touchstone for a larger reorientation. Orfelin's promotion of the vernacular was a potent weapon against Catholic pretensions to cultural supremacy. A novel, vernacular Serbian liturgy was to replace its Church Slavonic predecessor, and this vernacular liturgy would also be superior to the inane Latin pericopes and prayers rattled off by Catholic priests for congregations as ignorant of the language as most priests themselves.[16]

Dositej Obradović's early life spent between the Vojvodina and the Aegean is equally significant here. Obradović imbibed the pure milk of seventeenth-century Kievan humanistic church literature at his monastery of Hopovo, where he discovered his lifelong love for Erasmus. He delved into Greek Orthodox learning during his stints at Smyrna and on Corfu, before going on to study in Vienna, London, Halle, and Leipzig.[17] When it comes to the Austrian Enlightenment's function as a filter between the West and the Serbs, Obradović's

[13]See Paschalis Kitromilides, ed., *Enlightenment and Religion in the Orthodox World* (Oxford, 2016).

[14]On the foundation of the first Serbian journal in Venice, see Jelena Todorović, *An Orthodox Festival Book in the Habsburg Empire: Zaharija Orfelin's Festive Greeting to Mojsej Putnik (1757)* (Aldershot, 2006), 26–27. On the Serbian translation of Eybel's pamphlet, see Mitja Kostić, "Odjeci Ajblove knjige protiv papstva među Srbima" [Echoes of Eybel's book against the pope among the Serbs], *Godišnjak Skopskog Filozofskog Fakulteta* [Yearbook of the Skopje faculty of philosophy] 1 (1930): 63–70. Orfelin's manuscript has only recently come to light; it was discovered in the context of a digitizing project pursued by the library of the Serbian Patriarchate, Serbian Orthodox Church, accessed 5 January 2017, http://www.spc.rs/sr/pronadjena_rukopisna_knjiga_zaharije_orfelina.

[15]Nenad Ristović, "Latin and Vernacular Relations in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: The Serbian Case," in *Latin at the Crossroads of Identity: The Evolution of Linguistic Nationalism in the Kingdom of Hungary,* ed. Gábor Almási and Lav Šubarić (Leiden, 2016), 268.

[16]Ristović, "Latin and Vernacular Relations," 269.

[17]See Vladimir Bošković, "'Za sobedesovati s Musami i Gracijami': O Dositejevim vezema s novim helenstvom ranoj recepciji njegovog dela kod Grka" ['The discourse with the muses and graces': On Dositej's links to modern Hellenism and the early reception of his Œuvre among the Greeks], in *Dositej u srpskoj istoriji i kulturi* [Dositej in Serbian history and culture], ed. Dušan Ivanić (Belgrade, 2013), 359–90; Nikifor Vukadinović, "Dositejeva Hristoitija i njeni uzori" [Dositej's Christoitheia and its models], *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* [Contributions to literature, language, history, and folklore] 3, no. 1–2 (1923): 48–81.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

life shows the limited validity of this model, but also permits us to gauge how this cliché was fabricated in the context of Balkan "nesting orientalisms."[18] Much celebrated during his lifetime, Dositej Obradović was immortalized as the reformer of Serbian culture in the early nineteenth century, and his fame served to enhance the prestige of Habsburg Serbian literati who positioned themselves as Dositej's heirs. They fashioned themselves as intermediary benefactors who bestowed the blessings of higher learning and refined taste on the less fortunate Serbs under Ottoman suzerainty.[19]

It was through the activities of Orfelin, Obradović, and their contemporaries that the Enlightenment in the vernacular became a valid alternative to earlier, confessionalist schemes. Kurzböck's printing press was a key element in the reading revolution that was to spawn this transformation. The connection between printing, vernacularizing, and anti-confessionalist cultural politics remained a strong and durable one in the Balkans. When Bartholomäus Kopitar, the imperial court librarian, censor, and famous supporter of Vuk Karadžić's Serbian language reform, briefly entered into the service of the Holy See in the early 1840s, he urged Gregory XVI to found a Ukrainian seminary and a printing press for all Slavonic languages at Rome.[20] Kopitar's historical account of the primacy of the Latin over the Byzantine rite during the early Christianization of the Slavs chimed with the Vatican's anti-Orthodox geopolitics in the Adriatic littoral. But Kopitar was no dour, curmudgeonly clericalist: Indeed, he wished to replace earlier Catholic proselytism among the Orthodox with the unification of the Southern Slavs through a common vernacular.[21]

While Petrović's article reveals the subtexts and infrastructures of the emerging vernacular Enlightenment among the Serbs, Olga Khavanova's pioneering study focuses on the training of those who governed the empire and sheds rich light on the microphysics of state formation. Khavanova's subject has been given short shrift in the existing literature. Waltraud Heindl's classic study provides an in-depth exploration of civil servants' professional ethos, echelons, and salary scales. She discusses patterns of sociability, connubial and commensural habits, as well as—the much disliked—service uniforms,[22] whereas John Deak's recent book teases out the bureaucracy's key role in transforming the monarchy from a patchwork of territories with discrete sovereignties into an "infrastructure state."[23] Both Heindl and Deak point to the significance of Joseph von Sonnenfels's sciences of the state, but Khavanova is the first to transcend the metropolitan focus that has pervaded scholarship so far. Vienna features prominently in her study, but this is not the city of high officials and courtiers. Khavanova's Vienna is a student metropolis teeming with youngsters from the

[18]Milica Bakić-Hayden, "Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia," *Slavic Review* 54 (1995): 917–31.

[19]See the excellent study by Wladimir Fischer, *Dositej Obradović als bürgerlicher Kulturheld: Zur Formierung des serbischen bürgerlichen Selbstbildes durch literarische Kommunikation, 1783–1845* (Frankfurt, 2007).

[20]Angelo Tamborra, "Jernej Kopitar a Roma (1842–1843): La politica slava di Gregorio XVI," [Jernej Kopitar at Rome (1842–1843): The politics of Gregory XVI toward the Slavs] in *Storiografia e storia: Studi in onore di Eugenio Duprè Theseider* [Historiography and history: Studies in honor of Eugenio Duprè Theseider] (Rome, 1974), 947–74.

[21]See Sergio Bonazza, "Bartholomäus Kopitars Rolle in der Kirchenunion in Dalmatien (Ein Beitrag zum Austroslawismus)," in *Festschrift für Wolfgang Gesemann*, vol. 3: *Slawische Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte* (Munich, 1986), 27–51; Konrad Clewing, *Roher Diamant Dalmatien: Die habsburgische Verwaltung, ihre Probleme und das Land, wie beschrieben von seinem Gouverneur Lilienberg für Kaiser Franz I. (1834)* (Munich, 2015), 18.

[22]Waltraud Heindl, *Gehorsame Rebellen: Bürokratie und Beamte in Österreich*, 2nd ed. (Vienna, 2013), 263–71.

[23]John Deak, *Forging a Multinational State: State Making in Imperial Austria from the Enlightenment to the First World War* (Stanford, 2015), 131.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

provinces who arrived with little or no knowledge of German and sought to eke out their living while scrambling for government bursaries.

Khavanova shows how Vienna was styled into the chief imperial fulcrum of the sciences of the state. Bursaries with national quotas were offered to enable students from all realms and ranks to attend Sonnenfels's lectures in Vienna, thereby acquiring the skills that made them recruitable for office. Commoners, impoverished nobles, as well as the parish clergy—for priests it was mandatory to demonstrate knowledge of state sciences when they took their examinations, the *Pfarrkonkurse*[24]—received their training in Vienna's lecture halls. Khavanova's essay is an extremely important addition to a substantial yet compartmentalized literature which anachronistically slices Sonnenfels's legacy into "national" contexts.[25] I should like to highlight six broader themes Khavanova's findings impinge upon.

First, Khavanova alerts us to the combination of the state sciences with imperial state law, which meant the law of the Holy Roman Empire with some interspersed digressions on special prerogatives of the Hereditary Lands. The "tools of knowledge" produced by this cross-fertilization were used well beyond the dissolution of the empire in 1806. So, despite the fact that the doctrines of imperial state law were excluded from the curriculum in 1810, the techniques and legal instruments it had spawned lived on in Austrian state science and administrative practice.[26]

Second, Robert Evans devoted his 2003 Kann lecture to the connections between language and state building in the Habsburg Lands, and the state sciences provide a salient link between these two terms.[27] As Khavanova reminds us, German was used to instruct future state officials, but it was also the template language for their exercises in bureaucratic style (*Geschäftsstil*), and thus the language was surreptitiously advertised as *Monarchiesprache*.[28] Very little is yet known about the precise contours of polyglotism and language skills in the

[24]Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Vienna, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Studienhofkommission Fasz. 10, Polizei- und Kameralwissenschaften, an die Niederösterreichische Regierung, 3/1770.

[25]Jiří Krameš, *Kameralismus a klasická ekonomie v Čechách* [Cameralism and classical economy in Bohemia] (Prague, 1998), 22, 34; Andor Csizmadia, "Igazgatástudomány a XIX. század elején: Reviczky József" [The science of administration in the early 19th century: József Reviczky], in *Jogi emlékek és hagyományok: Esszék és tanulmányok* [Legal memories and traditions: Essays and studies] (Budapest, 1981), 246; József Szaniszló, *A közigazgatás-tudomány oktatásának és tanszékeinek története az ELTE Jog- és államtudományi Karán 1777–1977 között* [History of the education in administrative science at the ELTE faculty of law and state sciences 1777–1977] (Budapest, 1977), 84–87; Sándor Eckhardt, *A francia forradalom eszméi Magyarországon* [The ideas of the French Revolution in Hungary] (Budapest, 1924), 32; Márton Szilágyi, "Szempontok a magyar Sonnenfels-recepció újragondolásához" [Aspects of the Hungarian reception of Sonnenfels], in *On the Road— Zwischen Kulturen Unterwegs,* ed. Ágoston Zénó Bernád, Márta Csire, and Andrea Seidler (Vienna, 2009), 37–43.

[26]On the ecclesiastical law of the Holy Roman Empire and its refractions in Habsburg usage after 1806, see Franz L. Fillafer, *Escaping the Enlightenment: Liberal Thought and the Legacies of the Eighteenth Century in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1780–1848* (Ph.D. diss., University of Konstanz, 2012), 73–82.

[27]R. J. W. Evans, "Language and State Building: The Case of the Habsburg Monarchy," *Austrian History Yearbook* 35 (2004): 1–24.

[28]For the term *Monarchiesprache,* see Ignaz Cornova, *Paul Stransky's Staat von Böhmen*, vol. 1 (Prague, 1792), 330. For the promotion of German in the primary schools, see Milan Šmerda, "Integrační snahy v habsburské monarchii v době formování novodobých národů" [Efforts at integration in the Habsburg monarchy during the formative period of modern nations], *Slovanské historické studie* [Slavonic historical studies] 12 (1979): 155–56, n. 10 (Tobias von Gebler in August 1780); Pavel Bělina, "Teoretické kořeny a státní praxe osvícenského absolutismu v habsburské monarchii" [Theoretical currents and state practice of enlightened absolutism in the Habsburg monarchy], *Československý časopis historický* [Czechoslovak historical magazine] 29 (1981): 904; Clara Reiter, "'Wo der Dollmetsch allzeit interpretiret…' Das Hofdolmetscheramt am Wiener Hof: Vom Karrieresprungbrett zum Abstellgleis," *Lebende Sprachen* 58 (2013): 197–220, focuses mainly on technicalities divested of their sociocultural context, adding little to our knowledge of the interplay of languages used at the Habsburg court.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

different branches of the civil and military administration,[29] but Khavanova reveals a plethora of interstitial sites where German was the key language of administrative knowledge and, equally crucial, where Latin served as an intermediary auxiliary language. Sonnenfels's adjunct, Anton Dobokai, prepared Latin digests of his mentor's lectures for newcomers who began to attend classes, and Adalbert Bárics at Varaždin produced a Latin manuscript version of Sonnenfels's *Grundsätze* for teaching purposes. Overall, the promotion of German was uneven. Joseph II had sailed the choppy waters of Hungarian resistance to his 1784 German language decree, but once it was rescinded in 1790, the new subjects of state sciences at the university of Pest were to be taught in Latin. This also applied for the *Geschäftsstil* (*stylus curialis*), yet for want of an adequate Latin textbook Magyar exercises were held instead.[30]

Third, devoting special attention to the recruitment of nobles for the state administration, Khavanova's contribution also assesses the relationship between inherited social prestige and proficiency requirements. As Khavanova shows, Sonnenfels and his assistants held sought-after private lessons for noble students and noble officeholders who did not wish to mingle with commoners in the lecture halls but could no longer afford to show less proficiency in the new sciences of the state than their social inferiors.

Fourth, Khavanova provides a fascinating glimpse into the language used in the bursary petitions. The candidates had evidently internalized the language of utility to a high degree, and they knew very well how to capitalize on the plurality within the empire, deftly turning this situation into a competitive advantage. For instance, Theodor Jankovics from Novi Sad canvassed his desire to serve the monarch as a useful citizen and as the first "Illyrian" to do so since the nation's pledge of allegiance to the House of Austria.

The fifth aspect of Khavanova's findings concerns the intricate institutional structure upon which the teaching of the state sciences depended. Vienna became the power node for the education of modern civil servants, but similar chairs mushroomed at all institutions of higher learning in the monarchy. Indeed, the incorporation of these sciences into the curriculum of universities and colleges elsewhere, for example at Buda, Zagreb, and Varaždin, soon provoked skirmishes over the function of these institutions as "feeder schools" for the metropolitan Viennese courses in state sciences or as non-subordinate, autonomous high schools. It should be noted that the *Arcièren* noble guards for all realms founded under Maria Theresa also possessed small, separate, college-like institutions with courses in the state sciences. Yet, while Hungarian guardsmen like György Bessenyei and Ferenc Kazinczy are well known,[31] the education of the noble guards from Galicia, Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia—they were taught by such excellent scholars as the Smithian Johann Nepomuk Zizius at Vienna—remain understudied.[32] The significance of this

[29]But see Elek Csetri, "Az erdélyi központi hatóságok tisztviselőinek nyelvtudásáról a XVIII. század végén" [The language knowledge among the officials of the Transylvanian central authorities at the end of the 18th century], in *Europa és Erdélyi* [Europe and Transylvania] (Kolozsvár, 2006), 109–17.

[30]Magyar Országos Levéltár [Hungarian national archives], Budapest, Helyartót, 17808, Kari. prot. 702 [25 June 1790]; Ferenc Eckhart, *A Jog- és Allamtudományi kar története*, *1667–1935* [History of the faculty of law and state science, 1667–1935] (Budapest, 1936), 205.

[31]István Fried, "Die ungarische Literatur im Zeitalter der Königin Maria Theresia," in *Maria Theresia als Königin von Ungarn,* ed. Gerda Mraz (Eisenstadt, 1984), 355–72.

[32]Fillafer, *Escaping the Enlightenment*, 281–82. Zizius served at the Galician branch of the *Arcièren* guards. For the guards see Andreas Gestrich, "Die galizischen adeligen Leibgarden am Wiener Hof: Ein Beispiel habsburgischer Inklusionspolitik nach den Teilungen Polen-Litauens," *Militär und Gesellschaft in der Frühen Neuzeit* 17 (2013): 41–64.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

training for political languages available later in Galicia and Croatia has remained unexplored so far.[33]

Finally, Khananova draws attention to the conceptual resources provided by the state sciences and their local appropriations. Designed as a buttress of pan-monarchical knowledge about the empire's realms and their management, the state sciences invited scorn because of their lack of empirical grounding since the 1760s. As they grew more empirical and statistical in the following decades, the state sciences became increasingly "patriotic" in their scope and policy recommendations, sowing for "national revivalists" of the early nineteenth century to reap; Hungary around 1800 is an excellent example here.[34] Indeed, a case could be made for the statistical brand of Sonnenfelsian *Staatswissenschaft,* which was practiced at all higher schools of the empire and became a distinct variety of patriotic science in the early nineteenth century, as a political language that was at odds with the respective ancient constitutionalism of each crownland.[35]

Spaces

Sonnenfels's mercantilism also provides a good keyword for assessing the next dimension illuminated by our forum, the metrics of space.[36] A sprawling recent literature seeks to recover the rival conceptions of mercantilist ecology and natural history, their taxonomies, regimes of resource extraction, protection, and substitution.[37] Mercantilist economists propagated the optimized harnessing of riches, and this chief aim is being reappraised as a cornerstone of imperial Enlightenment. A growing body of studies asks to what extent human and natural resources were regarded as equally transformable by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century economists, civil servants, and state farmers,[38] and whether "superintendence" (food-, water-, and timber management) or "free competition" was best

[33]Dalibor Čepulo, "Razvoj pravne znanosti u Hrvatskoj 1776–1914" [The development of legal science in Croatia, 1776–1914], in *Hrvatska i europa, kultura, znanost i umjetnost, sv. 4: Moderna kultura od preporoda do moderne (19. stoljeće)* [Croatia and Europe, culture, science, and the arts, vol. 4: Modern culture from the revival to modernity (19th century)], ed. Mislav Ježić (Zagreb, 2010), 831–36.

[34]Mária Hidvégi and Borbála Zsuzsanna Török, "Grundlagen des modernen Regierens. Wissensaggregieren und Wissenslücken der ökonomischen statistischen Werke in Ungarn, 1770–1848," in *Berechnen/Beschreiben: Praktiken statistischen (Nicht-)Wissens 1750–1850,* ed. Gunhild Berg et al. (Berlin, 2015), 97–120. In Hungary, patriotic statisticians could draw on eighteenth-century collections of ethnographic and normative sources compiled by the Hungarian clergy that defended their autonomy from the state church erected in the Hereditary Lands, see *Mandata regia per excelsum consilium locumentiale regium* [Royal mandates for the Stateholder Council], 4 vols. (Vacii, 1775); cf. Martin Schwartner, *Statistik des Königreichs Ungern*, vol.1, 2nd ed. (Ofen, 1809), 14.

[35]Josef Volf, "Přednášky o českém státnín právu na Pražské universitě 1782 až 1824" [Lectures on Bohemian state law at the University of Prague from 1782 to 1824], *Sborník věd právních a státních* [Proceedings of legal and state sciences] 21 (1921): 159–65; Valentin Urfus, "Profesor českého státních práva Josef Veith a osvícenský patriotismus v Čechách na přelomu 18. století" [The professor of Bohemian state law Josef Veith and enlightened patriotism in Bohemia at the end of the 18th century], *Acta Universitatis Carolinae—Historia universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* [Journal of Charles University—History of Charles University in Prague] 10 (1969): 31–46.

[36]See Charles W. J. Withers, *Placing the Enlightenment: Thinking Geographically about the Age of Reason* (Chicago, 2007).

[37]Lisbet Koerner, *Linnaeus: Nature and Nation* (Cambridge, 1999); Staffan Müller-Wille, "Walnut-Trees at Hudson Bay, Coral Reefs in Gotland: Linnaean Botany and Its Relation to Colonialism," in *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World,* ed. Londa Schiebinger et al. (Philadelphia, 2005), 34–48.

[38]Alex Drace-Francis, "A Provincial Imperialist and a Curious Account of Wallachia: Ignaz von Born," *European History Quarterly* 36 (2006): 80.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suited for civilized and subaltern subject populations alike.[39] So far very little is known about the linkages between Habsburg ecologies and those of other empires, about the interactions between political economies developed in different locations, about the templates and toolkits available across adjacent imperial spaces, as well as about the challenges to universal nomenclatures, particularly when it comes to the epistemic connections between the knowledge and preservation of "local nature" and "local" indigenous peoples.[40]

Heather Morrison's article focuses on the naturalist Franz Joseph Märter and his voyage to the young United States. Märter worked at the interface of natural history, Josephinian masonry, and Austrian imperial-mercantile pursuits.[41] Märter's reports were published in the *Physikalische Arbeiten der einträchtigen Freunde in Wien*, the journal that documented the Viennese masons' pursuits in the sciences. Märter's notes contain fascinating material for the study of phantom spaces of democracy. Here was a lopsided republican democracy: it disenfranchised those "noble savages" whose life approximated the very "state of nature" from which the democratic constitutional order derived its framework of rights.[42] Furthermore, Märter's perceptions were colored by a view of the American hemisphere as a zone of dispossession (the Amerindian freedom from property as a state of grace was a crucial trope of scholastic and post-scholastic theology).[43] Märter described Pennsylvania as a utopian garden of bounty where nature's generosity rendered human industriousness, toil, and inventiveness superfluous. He gave evocative sketches of the lack of general cultivation and of the deficiencies of livestock breeding. The limited exploitation of resources, the absence of a regular currency (bills of receipt were used instead, tobacco prizes served as a value scale), and the jumbled mode of steering the polity were all connected in Märter's account. But here several interpretive problems arise: Is Märter's depiction of natural, effortless plenty and of Indian idleness really as straightforward as Morrison seems to suggest? Märter spoke about the "hard-working Indians" subjugated by Columbus. Is this a mere example of the Josephinian denigration of Catholic sloth, or does it amount to a more profound observation about the specificities of *Catholic* colonialism?[44] If so, how can it be squared with the theme of continuous natural plenty?

Also, Märter's enlightened absolutist credentials need a better grounding in reflections on the significance of "natural equality." Natural equality was the shibboleth of the language of natural law in general, but it is less convincing when applied to Josephinian contractualists who acutely

[39]See Frederick Albritton Jonsson, "Rival Ecologies of Global Commerce: Adam Smith and the Natural Historians," *American Historical Review* 115 (2010): 1342–63; S. Ambirajan, *Classical Political Economy and British Policy in India* (Cambridge, 1978), 59–61.

[40]See, for example, Roberto Moreno, *Linneo en México: Las controversias sobre el sistema binario sexual, 1788–1798* [Linnaeus in Mexico: The controversies over the binary sexual system, 1788–1798] (Mexico City, 1989); Dorothy Tanck de Estrada, "Justas florales de los bótanicos ilustrados" [Floral jousts of enlightened botanists], *Díalogos* 18 (1982): 19–31.

[41]For the broader context, see Fulvio Babudieri, *L'espansione mercantile austriaca nei territori d'oltremare nel XVIII secolo e suoi riflessi politici ed economici* [The Austrian mercantile expansion in overseas territories in the eighteenth century and its political and economic effects] (Milan, 1978).

[42]For Austrian perceptions of the early United States, see Hedwig Benna, *Contemporary Austrian Views of American Independence—A Documentary on the Occasion of the Bicentennial* (Vienna, 1976); Paul Köpf, *Wir haben Nachricht aus Amerika. Der amerikanische Revolutionskrieg in zeitgenössischen Wiener Zeitungen 1774–1781* (Magister thesis, University of Vienna, 2009).

[43]See Julia McClure, *The Franciscan Invention of the New World* (Basingstoke, 2017).

[44]For the Josephinian critique of Catholic idleness, see Christine Schneider, *Der niedere Klerus im josephinischen Wien zwischen staatlicher Funktion und seelsorgerischer Aufgabe* (Vienna, 1999); Peter Hersche, *Muße und Verschwendung: Europäische Gesellschaft und Kultur im Barockzeitalter,* vol. 1 (Freiburg, 2006), 605–44.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reflected on every citizen's class-specific functional role in a society of ranks and orders. Märter was hardly a Rousseauist who held civilization responsible for a—baleful—decrease of natural equality in society. For Märter, civilization was a mode of compensation. It mitigated inequality as it fostered the development of skills in the prudent pursuit of artificial wants; it stimulated acquisition, consumption, and meritorious competition. A second qualification is in order: Märter is portrayed as an adherent of Sonnenfels, who advocated small-scale subsistent farming (*petits cultures* based on peasant property of their plots). His views are juxtaposed to those of British and American physiocratic abolitionists and defenders of slavery, who allegedly tended to large-scale agriculture across the board, but this distinction fails to hold water.[45]

If Märter really saw the young United States as a garden of abundance that lacked human ingenuity, how can this be connected to his anthropology? Civilization seems a product of toil beyond the instinctual satisfaction of primary needs, but this is difficult to reconcile with Märter's remarks on "hard-working" Indians as well as with his occasional notes on technological innovations (e.g., on anvil-free production). How was this account of natural plenty connected to Märter's imagination of the pre-Columbian society and economy, and to the role of the Catholic church in the conquest of the Americas? Did Märter parallel the Amerindian "noble savages" with the "barbarous" peoples of the Habsburg Lands who populated his colleagues' travelogues back home, for example, his mentor Ignaz von Born's account of recalcitrant, backward Wallachia? Did he liken the American slaves to the serfs of Hungary?[46]

One may suspect that the ambiguities of Märter's account also express a deep-seated tension between his enlightened absolutist proclivities and the idealization of the state of nature. This conflict cuts to the very heart of the mercantilist paradigm that envisaged the smooth imperial processing of natural and human resources in the service of superior aims. If—as in the case of the Wallachians studied by Märter's mentor Born—certain populations of Europe defied inner colonization by the old monarchies of the continent, what was one to think of the life expectancy of a young republic that excluded its Amerindian and slave inhabitants from the polity?[47] Märter's work raised burning issues: the stability of monarchical and republican polities marked by great degrees of internal civilizational diversity, and the transferability of European institutions to American contexts. These questions remained hot topics throughout the nineteenth century, and the legacy of the Habsburg expeditions of the 1780s would merit comparison with those undertaken thirty years later, for example with Johann Natterer's travels to Brazil.[48]

Translations

The last article of our collection, Gábor Vaderna's piece on József Dessewffy's defense of the liberty of the press, elegantly surveys another imaginary landscape, the realm of Anglophilia,

[45]Manuale Albertone, *National Identity and the Agrarian Republic: The Transatlantic Commerce of Ideas between America and France (1750–1830)* (Burlington, 2014), 54.

[46]Drace-Francis, "A Provincial Imperialist." It would be worthwhile to compare Born's writings with those of Balthasar Hacquet, an itinerant military surgeon and prolific ethnographer of the Habsburg realms who also held strong notions of civilizational superiority and inferiority. On Hacquet's account of the South Slavs, see Ivan Pederin, "Balthasar Hacquet, prvi folklorist i etnolog hrvatskih krajeva" [Balthasar Hacquet, the first folklorist and ethnographer of the Croatian regions], in *Radovi—Filozofski Fakultet, Sveučilište u Zadru* [Works of the philosophical faculty, University of Zadar] 11 (1973): 421–40.

[47]See Alan Taylor, *American Revolutions: A Continental History, 1750–1804* (London, 2016).

[48]See Kurt Schmutzer, *Der Liebe zur Naturgeschichte halber: Johann Natterers Reisen in Brasilien, 1817–1835* (Ph.D. diss., University of Vienna, 2007), 159–75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and assesses its significance for the conservative Enlightenment in Hungary.[49] Continental Anglophilia was a comfortably large umbrella under which different groups jostled cheek by jowl. While some Anglophiles praised the liberties of the commoners, the "freeborn Englishmen" and admired their freedom of the press, others extolled the place of the hereditary nobility in the non-codified and "balanced" English constitution.[50] Indeed, comparisons of Hungarian civil life with its English equivalent provided warp and woof to defenses of the "ancient constitution" in the Hungarian lands.[51] The conceptual freight of this comparison weighed heavily on the lower orders: The Hungarian discourse of the ancient constitution linked noble self-governance and tax exemption under an accountable king to the suppression of the peasantry and to the limited rights of city burghers. Gregor von Berzeviczy, erstwhile supporter of the Hungarian Jacobins and shrewd political economist, delivered a blistering critique of self-congratulatory Anglophilia. The English constitution, Berzeviczy wrote, "resembles the Hungarian in many respects, but they differ when it comes to the most salutary parts of the former: 1. The English people consists of citizens (*ist Staatsbürgerlich*). 2. The English aristocracy is subjected to public taxation (*Staatslasten*) as is the people, but no levy is lawful except the ones the entire nation imposes upon itself through parliament. 3. Freedom of the press is guaranteed in England. 4. The laws are being scrupulously observed in England. 5. Elected judges pass their judgments publicly."[52] Berzevizcy jotted down these remarks in the second half of the 1810s, at a time when disenchanted Josephinians and reformist nobles developed a new solution to these problems: the extension of noble rights to the commoners within the inherited constitutional framework.

The 1817 manuscript notes of József Vay, judge at the supreme court of Hungary, the *tabula septemviralis*, support the conclusion that the "reform age" of the 1820s did not appear out of the blue.[53] Vay wrote: "It can be clearly seen that the genius of the century, the spirit of reform, if to be realized in certain respects, cannot be <attained> through a restriction of liberties and immunities established by the law, nor by the destruction of the constitution, but by the extension of the security of personal rights and property … to every inhabitant of the Kingdom."[54] Like Vay, Vaderna's protagonist József Dessewffy found the veneration of the

[49]Zoltan Gábor Szűcs, "Magyar protokonzervatívok" [Hungarian protoconservatives], *Kommentár* [Commentary] 4 (2009): 18.

[50]See, for example, Michael Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen, 1987); Michael Maurer, ed., *O Britannien, von deiner Freiheit einen Hut voll! Deutsche Reiseberichte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1992).

[51]This subject awaits its historian. Compare Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *A pozitivista történetszemlélet a magyar történetirásban* [The positivist conception of history and Hungarian historiography], vol. 2 (Budapest, 1973), 471. A helpful bibliography may be found in György Bónis, "Az angol alkotmánytörténetírás tegnap és ma" [The historiography of the English constitution yesterday and today], *Századok* [Centuries] 74 (1940): 181, n. 1.

[52]"Die Ungrische Constituzion hat viele Aehnlichkeiten mit der englischen, aber gerade in dem heilsamsten Theil giebt es Verschiedenheiten. 1. Das Volk in England ist Staatsbürgerlich. 2. Der Englische Adel ist so wie das Volk den Staatslasten unterworfen, aber keine Last ist Gesetzmäßig, als die sich die ganze Nazion selbst durch das Parlament auferlegt. 3. In England ist Pressfreyheit. 4. In England werden die Gesetze pünctlich beobachtet. 5. Selbst gewählte Richter, richten öffentlich." From Berzeviczy's manuscript "Geschichte von Grossbritannien" [presumably written after 1816], Magyar Országos Levéltár, Budapest, P 53, Fsz. 130, quoted after Moritz Csáky, *Von der Aufklärung zum Liberalismus: Studien zum Frühliberalismus in Ungarn* (Vienna, 1981), 84, n. 81.

[53]Csáky, *Von der Aufklärung zum Liberalismus.*

[54]József Vay, "Reflexiones ad recensionem operis Piringeriani Ephemeridibus Viennensibus, Anno 1816. Nris 104 et sequent. Insertam" [1817]: "Illud clarum esse videtur, genium seculi, reformationem, si quae in quibusdam suscipienda videretur, non per coarctionem libertatis et immunitatum jam lege stabilitarum, non per constitutionis ruinam, sed per personalis ac proprietatum securitatis, pro ratione conditionis singulorum, ampliorem ad omnes

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"noble republic" as the last stand of Hungarian sovereignty unsatisfactory.[55] Instead of genuflecting before this noble republic with its emblematic virtues (frugality, participation, and the critique of luxury), Dessewffy reworked the tradition he operated in, becoming the most articulate Hungarian defender of freedom of the press in the 1820s. Dessewffy was particularly impressed by the works of Edmund Burke, a preference he shared with many other distinguished enlightened conservatives on the continent. As Wolfram Siemann's massive new biography impressively shows, young Clemens Metternich's 1794 sojourn in England was punctuated by encounters with Edmund Burke. Burke figures here as a great orator, whose performance during the final sessions of the spectacular Warren Hastings trial at Westminster was followed by Metternich from the gallery. Metternich also devoured and annotated the first edition of the *Reflections on the Revolution in France*.[56]

József Dessewffy, too, took his cues from Burke and Montesquieu when he argued that censorship crippled the nation by hampering its advancement. Censorship makes the nation unable to learn from its own history, which should serve as the inventory, enunciator, and disseminator of truthful experience. Censorship renders the nation unable to develop institutions adequate to its spirit and following its specific rhythm; it cannot refine domestic culture through the confrontation of different tastes, let alone absorb the results of foreign scholarship. According to Dessewffy, it was selfish and cowardly to begrudge one's fellow citizens the fruits of one's reflections and to avoid the open competition of thoughts,[57] which according to his equilibrist framework was connected to the emulation of classical examples in education.[58] Dessewffy argued that this package would ensure moderation. In tune with the older discourse of ancient constitutionalism, Dessewffy emphasized that the Hungarian king was not *legibus solutus*; he did not stand above the law (I:9, § 4 Tripartitum). Freedom of the press could, by extension, be derived from the constitutional rights whose observance was demanded by the Hungarian counties. Dessewffy's reflections on liberty of the press culminated in the separate vote he prepared for the public-law subcommittee after the diet of 1825/27.

In this famous separate vote, Dessewffy maintained that the monarch violated the constitution by blocking the natural evolution of the nation's intellectual and affective powers. The second layer of Dessewffy's argument was crucially important in the context of the Habsburg restoration: The royal prerogative used to curb the freedom of expression also

Regni Incolas extensionem <posse obtineri> poscere. [the last words amended with blue ink], Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kezirattár, Budapest, Quart. Lat. 2163. 12; cf. Ambrus Miskolczy, "Povedomie Hungarus v 19. storoči" [Hungarus's consciousness in the 19th century], *Historický časopis* [Historical magazine] 59 (2001): 224, n. 34.

[55]On Hungarian noble republicanism, see József Takáts, "Politikai beszédmodok a magyar 19. század elején" [Political modes of speech in Hungary at the beginning of the 19th century], *Irodalomtörténeti közlémenyek* [Notes on the history of literature] 5/6 (1998): 668–86. Cf. Lájos Csetri's remarks on the aspect of military valor in noble republicanism ("Spartan Branch of Plutarchism"), Csetri, *'Nem sokaság, hanem lélek': Berzsenyi-tanulmányok* ['Not multitude, but spirit': Berzsenyi-studies] (Budapest, 1986), 64; Ágoston Nagy, "'Rómát, Athenát, Spártát álmodtam…': Spárta toposza a 18–19. század fordulójának magyar politikai irodalmában" ["I dreamt of Rome, Athens, Sparta…": The topos of Sparta in Hungarian political literature at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries], in *"Politica philosophiai okoskodás": Politikai nyelvek és történeti kontextusok a középkortól a 20. századig*, ed. Gergely T. Fazekas et al. (Debrecen, 2013), 193–207.

[56]Wolfram Siemann, *Metternich: Stratege und Visionär* (Munich, 2016), 139–45.

[57]Compare Alois Blumauer, *Beobachtungen über Österreichs Aufklärung und Litteratur* (Vienna, 1782), 33: "Auf die nämliche Art, wie die Wilden in Amerika Feuer machen, erhielten die Europäer Aufklärung und Licht, sie rieben Geist auf Geist, wie jene Holz auf Holz. Widerspruch erzeugt Anstrengung des Geistes, öffnet neue Aussichten, treibt den Geist in unbekannte Gegenden und verlängert und verstärkt die Kette des menschlichen Wissens. Die Geschichte aller Wissenschaften bestätiget diese Wahrheit."

[58]Gyula Kornis, *Ungarische Kulturideale, 1777–1848* (Leipzig, 1930), 419.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stymied the nation's anti-revolutionary potential and impeded the spontaneous, free adjustment of its institutions to recent challenges. According to Dessewffy, the social contract may entail the forfeiture of natural liberties, but self-perfection and advancement (also through vice) were irrepressible. Freedom of expression was a cornerstone of national self-perfection, and it extended even further, to the publication of the deliberations held by the nations' representative assemblies.

In the early 1840s, József's son Aurél Dessewffy, the leading light of the Hungarian young conservatives, reassessed his father's defense of liberty of the press. Aurél invoked Sonnenfels to buttress his argument that censorship was salutary, as it protected the nation from all the products of the mind for which it was not yet ready. Aurél acutely reflected on the volatility of public opinion under conditions of pluriculturality and on the coincidence of social and language frontiers, as in the case of the Upper Hungarian Slavic commoners under Magyar manorial lords. If all censorship restrictions were waived, these commoners would deploy the countless polemical texts that described the Hungarian "Asiatic" system of rule based on the conquest by predatory, illegitimate tribesmen. Older patriotic Slovak scholars had sought to deduce ancient rights from an empire by invitation—Slovaks' quasi-contractual, voluntary, and lawful submission to the Magyar conquerors—and they had stressed the co-opting of a multilingual landed class welded together by shared corporate rights of the noble *natio*.[59] By contrast, present-day political discourse seemed to have little patience with such niceties.[60]

At the same time, Aurél radicalized his father's historicizing approach. Aurél re-particularized József's argument that post-publication penalties were preferable to preventive censorship; according to Aurél, the validity of this rule also depended on the political and moral makeup of the respective societies. It suited some while being baleful for others. In Aurél's riposte to József Dessewffy's separate vote, liberty was no longer an end in itself that would yield moderation if properly pursued. Instead, Aurél perceived liberty as a means to certain—contested—ends in need of definition, formulation, and implementation. In order to successfully enter into this contest, the "landed interest" had to abandon the epistolary and sentimental culture of the late eighteenth century that was still cultivated by József Dessewffy and his friends in the 1820s. Instead of clinging to Burke's "mixed system of opinion and sentiment,"[61] which was derived from chivalrous manners, Aurél exhorted the conservatives to enter into the daily battle for the hearts and minds of the citizens. The political conflicts of the modern age had to be fought with the specific means of modern journalism but in the protected environment of censored speech. Thereby, the conservatives of the 1840s could make selective use of the media revolution brought about by a versatile class of unpropertied, profit-seeking intellectuals—the "nabobs" of Europe as Burke called these adventurers and

[59]Mária Vyvíjalová, "Anton Bernolák a osvietenstvo" [Anton Bernolák and the Enlightenment], *Historicky Časopis*, 28 (1980): 77–78; Jan Tibenský, "Veľkomoravská a cyrilometodejská tradícia v živote slovenskej feudálnej národnosti" [The great Moravian and Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in the life of the feudal Slovak nationality], *Veľká Morava a naša doba: K 1100. výročiu príchodu Cyrila a Metoda* [Great Moravia and our time: The 1100th anniversary of the arrival of Cyril and Methodius], ed. Jozef Butvin (Bratislava, 1963), 76; Štefan Eliáš, *Uhorské vlastenectvo a Slováci: Syntéza historickej dimenzie* [Hungarian patriotism and the Slovaks: Synthesis of the historical dimension] 2 vols. (Košice, 1991) (I had to rely on Emil Niederhauser's review of this work in *Történelmi közlemények Abaúj-Torna vármegye és Kassa múltjából* 1, no. 1 [1997]: 262–81); Benjamín Pravoslav Červenák, *Zrcadlo Slovenska* [Mirror of Slovakia] (Pest, 1844), 84.

[60]For a refreshing corrective to the older narrative on Slovak political life before 1848 that posits the predominance of Slovak national ideology and Magyar repression, see József Demmel, *A szlovák nemzet születése: Ľudovít Štúr és a szlovák társadalom a 19. századi Magyarországon* [The birth of the Slovak nation: Ľudovít Štúr and Slovak society in 19th- century Hungary] (Pozsony, 2011).

[61]Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* [1790], ed. J. G. A. Pocock (Indianapolis, 1987), 67.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stockbrokers of public opinion[62]—while preserving the ancient constitution based on the interlocking rights of king and diet.

Two broader consequences follow from this. On the one hand, Hungarian conservative Anglophiles were eager to exculpate the gallant and patriotic English nobles and therefore failed to recognize the collusion of the "landed" and the "moneyed" interests that animated the British blend of "gentlemanly capitalism" and made a counterrevolutionary crusade ideologically unfeasible.[63] On the other hand, Vaderna's article forcefully demonstrates that the sociable elite culture of the Enlightenment was unmade by modern political life.

Concluding Remarks

The studies of this forum redress the habitual imbalance of an Enlightenment historiography mainly focused on Vienna and on the other main cities of the Habsburg Lands. Moving beyond the metropolitan fixation on the "Austrian" Enlightenment, they indicate novel ways of situating the Habsburg possessions in European and transatlantic spaces and encourage much-needed comparisons within the Central European region.[64]

The broader historiographical significance of the forum lies in its emphasis on structures, spaces, and translations. The studies assembled here refrain from tracing the trajectories of deracinated ideas and from extracting philosophical "tenets" that can be recombined to form a usable Enlightenment past, as in Jonathan Israel's Spinozist "radical Enlightenment." This "radical Enlightenment" is materialist, anti-colonialist, democratic, feminist, and atheist—quite simply too good to be true. In his sequence of impressive, densely researched tomes, Israel seems to apply the geometric-rationalist epistemology he ascribes to his Spinozist heroes to deduce the existence of a "radical Enlightenment," a necessary progression of interlocking, abstract universals whose coherence can be evinced *more geometrico*.[65] The "radical Enlightenment" package hereby resurrected is presented as a panacea to the ills of our present world, namely to relativism and fundamentalism. The significance of custom, skepticism, as well as of the passions for the Enlightenment was acutely recognized in the eighteenth century, but these emphases cannot be squeezed into a "radical Enlightenment" schema built around the preeminence of abstract reasoning.

The essays of this forum demonstrate the limited usefulness of an approach that is based on "philosophical" positions distilled from very different sources. We cannot afford to neglect the social and scholarly structures that shaped the Enlightenment and it is equally misleading to ignore the specificities of different genres, to approach a letter with the same method as a treatise or a picaresque novel. What is more, the extraction of reified philosophical tenets is

[62]Sunil Agnani, "Jacobinism in India, Indianism in English Parliament: Fearing the Enlightenment and Colonial Modernity with Edmund Burke," *Cultural Critique* 68 (2008): 131–62.

[63]See Peter J. Cain and Anthony G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion 1688–1914*, 2 vols. (London, 1993–94) (a third, updated edition was published in 2016 with Routledge); Siemann, *Metternich*, 143, on Metternich's excerpt of Burke's letter to William Elliot from 1795, Národní archiv Praha, Rodinný archiv Metternichů [The National Archives Prague, Metternich Family Archive]—Acta Clementina II, kt. 2, 49.

[64]See Maciej Janowski, "Pitfalls and Opportunities: The Concept of East-Central Europe as a Tool of Historical Analysis," *European Review of History* 6 (1999): 91–100.

[65]Jonathan Israel, *The Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650–1750* (Oxford, 2001); Jonathan Israel, *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man* (Oxford, 2006). Cf. Manfred Walther, "Spinozissimus ille Spinoza oder wie Spinoza zum 'Klassiker' wurde—zur Etikettierungs-, Rezeptions- und Wirkungsgeschichte Spinozas im europäischen Vergleich," in *Beobachter und Lebenswelt: Studien zur Natur-, Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaft,* ed. Helmut Reinalter, (Thaur, 1996), 183–238.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also informed by a hidden evaluative strategy: "Radical enlighteners" allegedly shaped political thought, while moderate or "conservative" enlighteners were ensnared by tradition both political and philosophical, by monarchism and metaphysics. Here, the premise that "progress" depends on the purity of thought replicates the hierarchy discussed above, the distinction between game-changing Western innovation and second-rate Central European imitation.

Throughout the nineteenth century, Central European heirs and detractors of the Enlightenment alike have looked for deviations from an alleged "Western" standard, for quirks and irregularities that characterized the local appropriation of an ostensibly universal and pure body of doctrines. Now we are in a better position to question the narrative conceit built into this account of incompleteness and truncation and to retrieve the specific cultural geography that authorized it. Once we supersede Central European self-orientalizing, we begin to see that the Enlightenment in Western Europe and in the Habsburg lands existed under connected and comparable conditions.

A study of rival Enlightenments has to locate the different disciplinary and religious milieus in which they originated. Connected by overarching conceptual resources (e.g., natural law and natural religion), these Enlightenments can be distinguished by the specific use they made of these shared devices. Also, it is crucial to recognize the debt enlighteners owed to traditions of scholarship that lie beyond Spinozist "radicalism," that are neither predicated on an epicurean anthropology nor on mechanistic natural philosophy, for example, the philological critical method with its clearly apologetic underpinnings. Designed as a defense of revelation, the critical method was developed into a tool that made the scriptural substance of revealed religion gradually melt into air, leaving a morally edifying "hypertext" divested of its historical media of transmission.[66] This philological "radicalism" was a byproduct of apologetics, and the deconstruction of the biblical narrative that ensued resulted from the reciprocal critique rival Christian theologies leveled against each other's findings; this process led to a "secularization by default."[67] These reservations are important because they demolish the cultural dichotomy between the West and the "rest," but also because they make it more difficult to deploy the Enlightenment as a usable past. Instead of invoking its "radicalism" to combat relativism, self-interrogation and critical uncertainty should be discovered as important legacies for today.[68] Thereby, the Enlightenment can be recognized not so much as a set of Western European values, but rather as a principle of reflection by which everybody can acquire the courage to use her or his own understanding.

Franz L. Fillafer (Dr. phil.) is a lecturer in modern and contemporary history at the University of Konstanz, a position he took up in 2015 after having held a Max Weber Fellowship at the European University Institute in Florence. He specializes in the history of Central Europe since the eighteenth century. His most recent publications include *Josephinismus zwischen den Regimen: Eduard Winter, Fritz Valjavec und die zentraleuropäischen Historiographien im 20. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 2016) (edited with Thomas Wallnig), and the essay "Österreichislam," in *Habsburg neu denken: Vielfalt und Ambivalenz in Zentraleuropa. 30 kulturwissenschaftliche Stichworte,* ed. Johannes Feichtinger and Heidemarie Uhl (Vienna, 2016), 163–70.

[66]See Fillafer, *Escaping the Enlightenment*, 103–5.

[67]See Béatrice Guion, "Bossuet historien," in Gérard Ferreyrolles, Béatrice Guion, and Jean-Louis Quantin, *Bossuet* (Paris, 2008), 97–195; cf. William M. Reddy, "The Eurasian Origins of Empty Time and Space: Modernity as Temporality Reconsidered," *History and Theory* 55 (2016): 354.

[68]Anthony La Vopa, "A New Intellectual History? Jonathan Israel's Enlightenment," *Historical Journal* 52 (2009): 738.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237817000017 Published online by Cambridge University Press