

Inter-texts of identity

The origins of the ‘Identity Reader’

The history of this ‘Reader’ goes back to a meeting of a group of young scholars at the Balkan Summer University in Plovdiv in 1999. The lively interaction and debates engendered by this occasion highlighted the necessity of creating a common regional framework of intercultural dialogue. A year later, meeting in the same place, the idea of a ‘Reader’ containing a representative collection of fundamental texts that had contributed to and/or reflected upon the formation of narratives of national identity in Central and Southeast Europe was conceived. We envisioned this ‘Reader’ as a new synthesis that could challenge the self-centered and ‘isolationist’ historical narratives and educational canons prevalent in the region. We thought, too, that such a collection of texts could also be useful as a university textbook both in Central and Southeast European countries and in Western universities, making the intellectual map of Europe more diversified.

Although at the beginning it was more of an informal exchange, things became much more tangible when the Center for Advanced Study in Sofia, which was a newly established institution, agreed to host the project and when, with the help of Diana Mishkova and Wouter Hugenholtz, our project proposal reached the Dutch Prince Bernhard Foundation and received a generous grant. The ensuing research project, ‘Regional Identity Discourses in Central and Southeast Europe, 1775–1945,’ which soon came to be nicknamed the ‘Identity Reader Project,’ sought to provide a framework for discussing our respective intellectual traditions in a comparative manner.

A further ambition of the project was to enhance academic co-operation beyond the original group and to respond to the absence of more encompassing frameworks for studying the variety of national narratives of Central and Southeast Europe. Without such frameworks, it is difficult to compare different cultural phenomena in the region and to create a ‘meta-language’ that could adequately describe the common and specific features of these national traditions. This became obvious in the process of selecting the representative

texts. At first we were thinking about bringing together a number of ‘our’ key texts, but we soon realized that we needed a more systematic approach of selecting and commenting on these excerpts. Accomplishing such an endeavor not only required strenuous individual research activity, but also necessitated new analytical tools of comparative analysis, overwriting the ones rooted in traditional nation-state centered narratives.

The historiographical context

Since 1989, there have been numerous attempts to incorporate Central and Southeast European political and intellectual traditions into a synthetic volume.¹ However, the conceptual frameworks that were formulated during the Cold War have often prevailed. Many of the works dealing with this context were marked by the perspective of Area Studies, constructing a relatively homogenous image of the region and concentrating more on political and social issues, without taking into account *longue durée* cultural-ideological structures.²

Conversely, when produced by scholars from Central and Southeast Europe, these collective volumes tended to represent ideological and political interests. This is not to say that in the last 50 years the ambition of presenting the interconnection between these cultures was altogether lacking. As is well known, after the Second World War historians from the Eastern block published extensively, for example, on the “traditions of co-operation” among their countries.³ At the same time, the countries of the non-communist camp, Austria, Greece and Turkey, were often left out of any broader frame of comparison involving other countries of the region.⁴ Gradually, however, this imposed collaboration was abandoned and, often in line with the increasing nationalist tinge of late-Communist political discourse, the respective historiographies returned to the traditional symbolic geographies, seeking to document the privileged relationship of their culture with the Western European ‘core,’ or developing a self-centered—often outspokenly protochronist—narrative.⁵

After 1989, resting on similar Western experiences of “coming to terms with the past,” as in the exemplary French-German case, conferences and books started to proliferate in Central and Southeast Europe aiming at exploring the overlapping histories of two or more neighboring countries.⁶ In addition, as a reaction to what was perceived as the “monolithic vision dictated by the Communist Party,” much of the recent comparative work in and on

Central and Southeast Europe has focused on hitherto ‘marginalized’ topics, such as minority issues, gender relations, and sub-national or supra-national regional identities.⁷ The principal merit of these ventures, namely, that they focus on ‘non-mainstream’ intellectual traditions, also poses a serious limitation to their influence, as they are not tackling the core of the national discourse. Furthermore, the comparative aspect often appears only at the level of choosing the topic of research, but in fact the interpretations, provided by mainstream historians coming from the respective countries, follow the lines of the self-centered historiographies the present editors wish to replace. Moreover, the majority of volumes with ‘synthetic’ ambitions, be they textbooks, specialized volumes or historical essays written in and on the region during the last decade, also assume implicitly (if not explicitly) the exceptionality of the national perspective by partitioning their material according to “national stories.”⁸

From this point of view, the ‘Identity Reader,’ while drawing on the results of these comparative ventures, offers a radically different method of presenting and comparing various texts crucial for the understanding of the national traditions of Central and Southeast Europe. In other words, it suggests a re-conceptualization of the reader’s relationship with these cultures and insists on rethinking them in an intra-regional context. By making such a collection of texts available, the ‘Reader’ seeks to propose a set of analytical tools for the reconsideration and re-evaluation of certain key tenets of the ‘local’ historiographies, challenging the purported uniqueness and incomparability of the respective national cultures. Furthermore, by outlining the evolution and vicissitudes of regional self-assertion and the mechanisms of mimetic competition and ‘rejection,’ such a source-collection also helps to put the topic of national identity into its proper historical perspective.

At this point, a short note about the *geographical* dimension of the ‘Reader’ is necessary. The project brought together scholars from Austria, Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, the Republic of Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, and Turkey. While we sought to invite representatives from all of these countries, we wanted to avoid essentializing the actual political geography. In some cases, texts from other ‘national canons’ were also included—‘canons’ that in a particular historical moment corresponded to the ‘core’ cultures of the project (for example, some Lithuanian political writings related to the Polish identity discourse), but, unfortunately, their complex interplay with the ‘national canons’ in question could not be fully taken into account. Apparently, the geographical contours of this project resemble, to a

certain extent, the borders of the two empires of Central and Southeast Europe, the Austro-Hungarian and the Ottoman. There is, however, no essentialism in this historical reference—as a matter of fact, any selection would have overlapped with a past or present political configuration and thus also with a potential ideological ‘ordering.’⁹

Even though we tried to include some texts of regional movements (Moravia, Transylvania, nineteenth-century Macedonia), which were articulated in contrast to the thrust of nation-building, we could not offer an adequate treatment of cultural traditions which were linked to non-state-building ethnicities in the region, such as the Jews, Roma, Ruthenians, Armenians, Kurds, Transylvanian Saxons or Macedonian Vlachs (Aromanians). Their absence in the ‘Reader’ is not the result of any professed attempt on our behalf to retrospectively ‘homogenize’ and ‘nationalize’ these regions; it is mostly due to the lack of human and institutional resources needed to involve specialists who would have been able to elaborate on these cases. We are conscious that the parallel processes of nation-formation in the region deeply affected all these cultures; in some cases this catalyzed comparable nation-building narratives (such as the case of Zionism), while in other cases (Vlachs or Saxons) the external pressure of nationalization aimed at superseding these communal identities. We can only hope that another project will follow in the footsteps of this one, mapping the discourses of identity of various ethnic and linguistic communities that could not be included in the ‘Reader.’

The main aim of our venture was to confront ‘mainstream’ and seemingly successful national discourses with each other, thus creating a space for analyzing those narratives of identity which became institutionalized as ‘national canons.’ However, the heuristic value of the project lies not in a mere compilation of national identity-discourses, but rather in the intensity and frequency of scholarly interaction, opening up these traditions to each other. For this reason, the experience of interpretative ‘negotiation’ and the final product of the project, the ‘Reader,’ are of equal importance. Furthermore, the intellectual co-operation engendered by this project demonstrates the importance of personal relations and academic exchange. The series of workshops organized and co-organized by the members of the Project group (hosted, in turn, by the Central European University, Budapest; the Sabancı University, Istanbul; the Huizinga Institute, Amsterdam; NIAS, Wassenaar; and the Center for Advanced Study, Sofia) helped create and develop a broader network of young scholars dealing with the issues of national identities in Central and Southeast Europe.

On the whole, the 'Reader' is expected to fill in the lacunae concerning the knowledge of Central and Southeast Europe pertinent to the very core of the schooling process and academic socialization in the respective countries. It is hoped that our project will broaden the field of possible comparisons and make researchers look at the process of nation-building in Central and Southeast Europe from a comparative perspective. Along these lines, the methodological approach suggested here could be useful not only within the geographical or chronological frames of this project, but could also serve as an incentive for other comparative 'identity readers' dealing with other places and different times.

Methodological considerations

The main ambition of the 'Reader' is to contribute to the emergence of a non-nationalist vision that refutes the restraints of national grand narratives. It seeks to investigate cross-cultural links and shared experiences; while, at the same time, remaining attentive to the plurality and specific characteristics of the various cultural and political identities under consideration. We sought to achieve this goal with the help of methodological precepts elaborated during our discussions. A field of historical scholarship that was especially helpful in shaping the theoretical foundations of our research was the intellectual history cultivated at several research and university centers in Europe and North America. One can roughly distinguish three main paradigms: the so-called 'Cambridge school' of early modern political thought represented, among others, by Quentin Skinner and J. G. A. Pocock; the influential German *Begriffsgeschichte* approach represented, above all, by Reinhart Koselleck; and finally, the French 'post-Annales' history of *mentalités* and socio-cultural history of writing and reading.¹⁰ Many of their common features notwithstanding, these approaches are rooted in their respective institutional backgrounds, cultural settings and historiographical traditions. As the encounters and debates of their representatives in the last decades have proved, they show significant divergences in many aspects, despite efforts to bring closer if not harmonize these methodologies.¹¹ Aware of these complexities, we preferred to avoid subscribing to a particular school or theoretical perspective. Nevertheless, we remained sensitive to the theoretical and methodological contributions of these traditions and reflected on the possible application of this eclectic methodological agenda to the Central and Southeast European context.

In contrast to the traditional history of political ideas concentrating on the ‘eternal dialogue’ of great thinkers from Plato to Heidegger, the ‘new intellectual history’ emphasizes the historical context of the given thinker or intellectual tradition. At the same time, this ‘contextualization’ does not prioritize institutional structures, mechanisms of political decision-making, or specific political group interests in understanding a given ideological statement, but concentrates on the formation and development of the political and cultural discourses and the role of concepts working within them. Such an interpretative approach does not intend to provide an exhaustive description of the given historical phenomena; instead it defines the respective discursive fields by analyzing representative ‘meaning-producing’ texts and situating them with respect to their multiple, interacting contexts of creation and reception. On the whole, intellectual history does not disregard the social, political, and institutional structures, but seeks as well to profit from the prolific dialogue with other approaches of recent historical scholarship, above all, the various schools of cultural history.¹²

By employing mostly ‘West-European’ historical scholarship, we were aware of the fact that the research on the political and social thought in Central and Southeast Europe reveals several peculiar features. One has to reflect on two phenomena in particular: first, there are discontinuities in terms of economic and cultural development, including the emergence and evolution of political cultures, that appear in the background of the relatively linear pattern of modernization in the assumed ‘core’; second, the asymmetric process of cultural transmission in which the semantic structures of modern political and social identities and ideological options are formed in constant interaction with the familiar though external ‘Western’ semantic frameworks. Thus, a situation emerges where different layers of modernity with their reflective and normative elements incorporated within an ‘abbreviated’ time-frame are often coexisting and/or clashing with each other. The emergence of political modernity in the region relates to the import and adaptation of the political and meta-political discourses from outside the region and reflects how modernity itself became a peculiar ‘language of politics’ or matrix of political languages. In this sense, our project sought to contribute to the rethinking of the very notion of modernity, in line with some major tendencies in contemporary political philosophy.¹³

One of the results of the coexistence of various social temporalities and semantic fields is the emergence of antagonistic conceptual structures, such as the duality of the terminology of statehood and nationhood. The symbolic confrontation of ‘state’ and ‘community’ gave birth to two relatively com-

pact and differentiated ‘political languages.’ The state-oriented discourse related to the introduction of modern political forms, their legal-constitutional framework and legitimizing structures; in contrast, the community-oriented discourse, often ‘imported’ as well, focused on ‘autochthonous’ foundations, the organic and anti-political capacities of the historical and metaphysical being of the community.

These considerations about the nature of political thought in the region provide a starting point to further enquiries concerning the analytical tools and methodological strategies used in the research. First, we had to reach a consensus on various concepts such as ‘identity’ and ‘canon of identity-building texts’ that organized the methodological framework of the ‘Reader’ as a whole. Secondly, we had to confront the idea of national uniqueness, paramount in the self-definition of these cultures. Finally, we had to inquire into the nature of historical comparison.

Some words of caution are needed here with respect to the central notions in the present work, namely, *identity* and *canon* of ‘identity-building texts.’ The concept of identity has a long and complex history and its meanings in different historical contexts are often incompatible. It emerged as one of the central categories of modern logic with Leibniz and Locke and later became an important concept in German idealist philosophy, especially in the works of Schelling and Hegel. In the twentieth century the notion expanded, and through the mediation of psychology it became virtually omnipresent in the contemporary academic discourses of political, social and cultural studies.¹⁴ Such a hypertrophied usage eventually devalued the term. For this reason employing this concept is a risky endeavor. One should be aware of the fact that especially the formula *national identity* is a recent meta-linguistic formation, which should not be ‘ontologized’ but used as an operational tool. In turn, our approach was based on a functional, pragmatic and—more importantly—*epistemological* compromise. In general, the referential schemes employed in the ‘Reader’ are considered as operational tools, which could be transformed according to the new phenomena to be investigated, rather than the opposite—transforming the phenomena according to our theoretical and referential schemas. For the same reason, some of the overburdened notions, such as ‘discourse,’ are used out of necessity in the present context, as semantically ‘open’ concepts rather than as fixed concepts with rigid formulations. We hope that such a use can only improve their operational value and their descriptive and analytical flexibility.

‘National identity,’ as a sort of collective identity, is constituted by the ‘discursive’ practices rooted in but not derivable from the social praxis.¹⁵ This dis-

cursive construction of national identity formats the temporal axes of past, present and future by organizational criteria, such as ‘origin,’ ‘tradition,’ ‘change,’ ‘eternity,’ ‘anticipation’—relating them to a particular community.¹⁶ The process of national identification is thus characterized by the discourse of national ‘uniqueness,’ which is, after all, a relational term similar to ideas of ‘sameness’ and ‘difference.’¹⁷ In this respect, ‘identity-building texts’ do not refer only to political writing or literature. From the perspective of the identity-building process, the genre of the chosen texts is less important. What matters is the ideological function and appropriation of the text.¹⁸

In order to establish the ideological function of these texts, they need to be localized—put ‘on the map’ of ideological traditions. Moreover, apart from *diachronic* conceptual transformation, we should also be aware of *synchronic* divergences in a given tradition, due to the incompatibility of the different discursive modes related to different genre-practices. From this point of view, one has to ask again, what kind of texts are to be identified. The answer is quite simple: ‘identity-building texts’ are practically *any kind* of texts. To give one example, even texts which do not have an explicit public function, such as private correspondence, autobiographical notes and so on, could be invested *a posteriori* with ideological function in terms of collective identity. Hence, our collection of texts extends from national anthems and constitutions to revolutionary songs and historical novels, from political or cultural manifestos to philosophical treatises. The ‘Reader’ refers virtually to any written text that significantly contributed, in one way or another, to the process of national and regional identity formation. However, this does not imply that only ‘canonized’ texts, subsequently mythologized and/or institutionalized by their respective national traditions, were to be collected. Texts that attempted to formulate alternative projects of collective identity or critically examined the contemporary mainstream were also included. This brings us to two crucial methodological points, namely, the disposition of the ‘national canon’ and the text-context relationship.

The ‘national canon’ in ‘text and context’

How can one propose a balanced selection of texts representing a ‘national canon?’ First, the crucial notion of *canon* is another one which should be used with caution. After all, we share the epistemological skepticism about this notion, used, and abused, to some extent, in the literary theory of the last few decades. However, it seems to be the most appropriate term for our purposes.

Canon refers to an ensemble of texts with a certain grade of ‘representativity’ and a clear normative effect. Every attempt to construct a canon is already a *(re-)construction*—and it is this paradoxical situation that guarantees its existence. However, one of the main tasks is to be attentive to the various aspects of representativity and, consequently, to select texts presenting not only the dominating national narrative (which is always related to a given historical moment and ideological trend), but also the competing attempts at creating a ‘canon,’ or the suppressed side of a given canon. In addition, one should not forget the process of historical mimicry of the canon, the fluctuations in its composition. Being in a process of constant retrospective (re-)production, the canon allows us no possibility of viewing it as an a-temporal structure.¹⁹

Consequently, only texts that are mediated by other texts were selected. In other words, only the relationship between a text and other texts could prove its ‘canonical’ function. On the other hand, the typical canonical texts are supplemented with a number of texts which are relatively unknown and which were not so influential in the process of identity-, and canon-building, but are crucial for understanding that very process. These texts reflect the identity and the making of the canon. Moreover, in order to locate the texts as accurately as possible, they should be analyzed in their content and form—here different kinds of discursive strategies could be discerned, namely, constructive, justifying, transformative, destructive and so on—but there should also be an outline of how extra-, and intra-cultural transmission occurred and of the processes of cultural institutionalization and canonization. It is thus possible to ‘negotiate’ and compare differences and similarities as well as to reconsider these canons within broader—transnational—cultural and political frameworks.

This does not mean, however, that the project intends to construct a supra-national canon (or even identity) by domesticating the specificity and idiosyncratic nature of local traditions. This collection of texts aims at giving voice to collective features and local specificities as well as at exploring the complexity of the process of canon formation and the competition of alternative normative formulations of the given community. It is nonetheless important not to *discipline* the local projects by undermining their potentiality and creativity. We hope to have avoided projecting a universal teleological scheme of development on these cultures, and, conversely, we are suggesting a framework that strives to combine two crucial aspects: *the transformation of cultural patterns* (e.g., Enlightenment and Romanticism) and *the emergence of national ideologies and movements* (i.e., the organizational phases of ‘nationalization’).

The second methodological question concerns the relationship between text and context. Most historians tend to establish “a hierarchical dichotomy between texts and contexts,” stressing the abstraction of most texts and the essential reality of social or political contexts. In contrast, our examination of the selected texts sought to take into account the auto-referential and productive power of ideological and/or figural discourses. In this respect we tried to base our work on a textualist approach, not without influence from those models that employ the methods of literary studies in analyzing historical problems and texts.²⁰ In other words, although we took the socio-cultural context into account, we did not seek to construct it as a reality that exists beyond interpretation or outside the text. In many ways, we were aiming at an “inter-textual reading” of these cultures, a reading that re-positions the relationship between text and context.

Our approach is thus *textual*: it collects identity-building texts and does not seek to introduce a sample of the “representative figures” of the national canons *through* texts. Thus, the figures of the canon are important only through their textual being—their *textualization*. One example is illuminating: Vasil Levski, the canonical figure of the Bulgarian national tradition, wrote no programmatic text that could have become an ‘identity-building element’ as a text, so he could not be presented in the ‘Reader’ as an ‘author.’ However, some of the most famous works of Bulgarian national romanticism were devoted to him, which means that he is part of the Bulgarian national canon and, respectively, of the ‘Reader’ as a literary but not as a historical figure, as a textual object but not a subject. In this sense, the textual canon we are suggesting is in pronounced opposition to the accepted national ‘pantheon.’ To put it differently, what is suggested in the ‘Reader’ is an alternative perception or rethinking of the standard concept of the unity of national history. Largely, this constituted one of the main ideological implications of our research. By unveiling the heterogeneity of the canons and of the process of identity-building, and by pointing out the composite nature of national identity itself, the ‘Reader’ questions the metaphysical boundaries that underlie every nationalist project.

Anthologies of ‘Identity-Building’ texts:

The idea of an ‘Identity Reader’ is far from being a novelty in the region. In their original form, however, such works often served the canonization of the mainstream national discourse, as a kind of popular national breviary,

rather than promoting any sort of critical perception. The examples from the interwar period usually fall into this category. The underlying political agenda varied, of course, very significantly. In some cases the main aim was to support the newly established statehood by historical arguments, the most illustrious examples of which were the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav political projects.²¹ In other cases such readers were the results of an endeavor to codify an 'orthodox' reading of the respective nation-building process.²²

After the Second World War it became possible to produce such readers with a less explicit political agenda. Thus, collective projects emerged, which sought to incorporate more than one national case,²³ while a number of national 'readers' aimed at 'substantiating a scholarly venue' for mapping the varieties of intellectual history of the given culture.²⁴ As the communist regimes in the region had a highly ambiguous relationship to the national discourse, it is not an accident that many of the 'Identity Readers' were published outside of these countries. This also meant a shift in the targeted audience: while the earlier examples we came across were aimed at the 'nationalization' of the local population, these editions usually sought to display the 'national canon' to an external—Western—audience, stressing the importance and richness of local traditions and, by implication, asserting the cultural—and often political—independence of these countries.²⁵ At the same time, however, there were also the attempts of Communist parties to accommodate the proverbial 'progressive' national traditions as a legitimization tool, which found its expression *inter alia* in officially supported publications of such national identity readers.²⁶

In contrast to the communist camp, in the Greek case collections of identity building texts had different ideological functions. The search for ideological references following the Civil War between communists and royalists (1944–49) generated, mainly in the 1960s, ambitious multi-volume projects, primarily concerned with publishing primary sources.²⁷ These collections contained strong ideological statements about the fundamental values of the Greek national character in a period when Greek nationalism was challenged by the communist ideology. In Turkey, on the other hand, with the dissolution of the single party regime and the rising tenor of populism following the Second World War, there was a growing tendency to embrace and eulogize the Ottoman Empire as a unique and exclusive political-cultural entity. The trend reached its climax under the auspices of the 1980 junta, and was enhanced thereafter with the overtones of a distinctive Turco-Islamic identity. While the authority of nationalism (under different forms) was undisputed throughout the Republican years, the production of a comprehensive body of

texts on national identity was never realized, possibly due to the continued existence of multiple (and sometimes contesting) loci of identity (the Ottoman realm, pre-Ottoman Islamic dynasties, Central Asia, Anatolia).

In addition to the collections of texts explicitly meant as compendia of national identity, we can also classify some of the thematic anthologies published in and on these countries as 'Identity Readers.' A good example is provided by the collection offering an insight into the Hungarian debate on regional identity in the twentieth century, which was connected to the re-emergence of the idea of Central Europe.²⁸ In a similar vein, a number of historical collections transcended the national boundaries, trying to encapsulate the question of national identities in their former imperial setting, as was the case with the Habsburg successor states.²⁹

The 1970s and 1980s was a period of an increasing crisis of legitimacy of the communist regimes. The public sphere became open, once again launching the quest for an 'authentic' national canon supposedly falsified or deformed during previous decades.³⁰ These offers were all the more ambiguous as the rekindling of national identification was part of the mobilization technique of late-Socialist political management all over the region. In other cases, these attempts had a more state-oriented character aiming at corroboration of the desired identification with the particular 'national' state.³¹ A similar renegotiation took place in Greece as well during the last years and after the fall of the military junta (1967–1974). A series of critical editions of important texts of the eighteenth, nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, whose authors had only a marginal place in the national canon, seemed to fill an intellectual gap regarding the historical origins of liberal, democratic and socialist ideas in modern Greek society.³² Moreover, the old debate on *Hellenicity* which had taken place in the 1930s was critically reviewed under the pressing need of getting rid of its nationalist ballast.³³

The variety of uses of such 'readers' testifies to the profound ambiguity of canon-building in the region. A case in point is the monumental four-volume anthology edited by the Romanian literary historian Iordan Chimet, entitled 'The Right to Memory,' offering a wide panorama of Romanian discourses of identity throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Conspicuously enough, the editor collected these materials in the early 1970s, when the independentist turn of First Secretary Nicolae Ceaușescu encouraged a number of previously marginalized intellectuals to come to the fore with their project of recovering the national tradition suppressed by the Stalinist regime. The hopes of Chimet and many of his contemporaries proved illusory—while the regime welcomed the re-narration of national identity, it also sought to con-

trol it ideologically. When Chimet refused to take out from his collection some of the—émigré—authors who were unacceptable to the regime, the manuscript was shelved and could only be published two decades later.³⁴

After 1989, projects of compiling a collection of formative texts of national and/or state identity could be found in virtually every country of Central and Southeast Europe. Again, this time many such readers became part of the effort to root the legitimacy of newly established states in history, more obvious in cases of the former federal states.³⁵ It is not surprising that the most extreme example of the renewal of the older paradigms of national identity as opposed to the previous official identity discourse is to be found among the successor states of the former Yugoslavia.³⁶ Simultaneously, however, one could witness the emergence of scholarly endeavors aimed at a critical reflection on the formation and historical development of national identity in Central and Southeast Europe. An especially successful attempt along these lines was the volume titled 'The Slovak Question in the twentieth century,' which featured a representative selection of texts illustrating Slovak identity options, and which was published by a Hungarian editing house in Bratislava, in two languages (Slovak and Hungarian).³⁷ Another intriguing example is the Bulgarian anthology edited by Ivan Elenkov and Roumen Daskalov.³⁸ The volume comprises texts mainly from the first half of the twentieth century presenting a set of debates on national character. In a similar vein, the collection edited by the Czech sociologist-historian Miloš Havelka depicted the alternative conceptions of identity through a particular debate, in this case the polemic about the meaning of Czech history launched by T. G. Masaryk in the mid-1890s,³⁹ while the Serbian Miroslav Jovanović brought together and interpreted the formative texts of the debate on the making of the Serbian literary language at the beginning of the nineteenth century.⁴⁰ Another exemplary project is the Ukrainian 'Identity Reader' edited in Canada, which had a broader temporal ambit than the ones mentioned above, offering an overview from the eighteenth century onwards.⁴¹

In Greece, although the 1990s were obviously not marked by the same impetus of transformation, we come across collective works which encapsulate the social and cultural transformations triggered by the experience of accession to the European Union, a process marking the fulfillment of efforts of westernization related with the nation-state building project ever since the foundation of the Hellenic republic.⁴² Parallel to and as a reaction to this, a renewed interest in Orthodoxy resulted in reproductions of texts that underlined the non-Western character of the Greek nation.⁴³ Finally, the 1990s brought a transformation of the identity-discourse in Turkey as well, leading

to new projects of canonization. The rising prestige of identity politics, the pressing anxieties of the Kurdish question and the prospects of integration into the European Union catalyzed a more open debate on the make-up of the Turkish national identity⁴⁴ and the representativeness of its formative texts.⁴⁵

The broadening of geographical and thematic perspectives in the 1990s also witnessed the emergence of a number of scholarly projects, which sought to encapsulate the self-identification of cultures other than that of the country of origin of the editor. Attempts to map debates on identity often sought to transcend national frameworks, such as the collection of László Péter focusing on the Hungarian-Romanian historical polemic about Transylvania.⁴⁶ In other cases, the editors made an attempt to encapsulate in one volume of primary texts some key features of the debate on identity and modernity in a given national culture, often with the aim of trying to bring closer two traditions that were previously featured as antagonistic in relation to one another.⁴⁷ The 'archeological' search for precursors of the (re)emerging cultural-political camps also led to text collections focusing on ideological traditions, such as liberalism, with a special eye on their relationship with national identity.⁴⁸

As can be seen from these examples, the idea of compiling a collection of texts on national identity is far from new. What is, however, unprecedented is the temporal and territorial scope, the number of participants from different countries and the interpretative aspect of these volumes. While most of the previous 'Readers' sought to encapsulate one national canon, the present work breaks through the boundaries of a single national project and seeks to analyze and present the texts in dialogue with each other.

The temptation of 'national uniqueness' and making comparison possible

One important aspect that needs highlighting is that we did not intend to locate texts from every culture for every thematic and generic category in the 'Reader.' Rather, we sought to register the conspicuous absence of certain discursive traditions in the given cultures. Furthermore, we aimed at developing an interpretative framework that would be sensitive to the profound discontinuities and 'displacements' in these cultures, which means that certain discourses or genres were more important in some traditions than in others.

At this point, one cannot avoid the problem of similarities (or differences) in national developments within the region. Claims of national uniqueness were prevalent in every national culture. There are texts included in the 'Reader' that are usually portrayed by the locals as difficult for foreigners to understand or poems that "cannot be translated into English." By including them, the 'Reader' intentionally crossed the border of seemingly self-sufficient national cultures. As will be elaborated below, instead of national headings the texts were divided into typological groups (Enlightenment, Romanticism, Modernism), while their description, interpretation, as well as their very selection was the result of 'cross-cultural negotiation' between the members of the research group. This meant looking at the respective national canons through the ideological and cultural frames of other traditions. From this perspective, the 'Reader' aims at revisiting precisely these conceptions of national uniqueness by highlighting not only the situational, but also the discursive-structural similarities between the respective traditions. It is often claimed that the process of creating national identity or political culture in Central and Southeast Europe should be treated as exceptional. To quote one characteristic example: when discussing the problem of liberal traditions in nineteenth-century Poland, some participants denied the very existence of such a political phenomenon by implying the lack of institutional conditions comparable to 'classical' English liberalism.⁴⁹

In our opinion, trying to understand these cultures merely from the standpoint of their internal referential systems is a limited enterprise; while trying to explain them from an ideal-typical 'Western perspective' is an oversimplification. In order to find a middle way and to place these narratives of identity in a more encompassing Central and Southeast European setting, we located our research at the intersection of several scholarly contexts. Recently, one could witness a series of discussions on the construction of 'otherness within Europe'—both in terms of the mechanisms of symbolic exclusion employed by the center⁵⁰ and in terms of local instrumentalization of identity-building mechanisms aimed at devising local canons of self-representation. There are also valuable interpretations on the internalization of the 'external' that point out the complexities of the formation of cultural identity.⁵¹

The second scholarly context refers to various ways in which local identity-discourses were configured into canons of (modern) cultural and political legitimacy. In regard to South-East and Central Europe, this was often described in terms of the conflict between 'Westernizer' and 'Autochthonist' paradigms.⁵² This dichotomy, however, tends to arrange rather divergent in-

terpretations into monolithic counter-positions, operating according to the 'logic of asymmetric counter-concepts' (Reinhart Koselleck). The reading of East European cultures, in particular, as marked by a duality of polarized intellectual traditions, has been an established blueprint of local and external interpretations. But, when contextualized from a different perspective—stressing the structural similarities between these discourses and trying to locate them in their own intellectual horizons the relationship between the two positions does not appear to be so antagonistic. The emerging discourses of national identity had many faces—democratic and anti-democratic, liberal and anti-liberal, Westernizer and autochthonist.

There is a pressing need for an interpretative framework that abandons the usual (self-)descriptions of local elites in terms of an eternal fight between 'emulation of the European core' and its 'repudiation.' This is what brings to the forefront the question of the emergence of political modernity and its ambivalent interaction with local frameworks. A body of literature produced mainly in the 1970s that followed Immanuel Wallerstein's influential approach has sought to grasp the common patterns of belated modernization projects in the framework of the economic dependency of the periphery.⁵³ These studies were in many ways captured by the paradigm of 'backwardness,' studied according to a linear trajectory of modernization. Recently, these approaches have been in many ways supplemented by case studies that put more emphasis on the internal political and cultural dynamism of these countries, thus contextualizing the emergence of political modernity in East Europe in view of the intertwining of social and intellectual processes.⁵⁴

In order to place our findings in a comparative setting, special attention was paid to the new literature on the methodological debates of comparative history⁵⁵ as well as to the novel research into cultural transfers and entangled histories.⁵⁶ In this respect, we are aware that the choice of a comparative framework defines the terms of the debate.⁵⁷ We also made use of the literature on 'multiple modernities'⁵⁸ and the various collective ventures analyzing European cultural-political phenomena in a 'national context.'⁵⁹

On the whole, however, we tried to avoid overburdening the 'Reader,' which is ultimately meant for didactic use, with references to secondary literature. To help further orientation, a short bibliography is included as an appendix at the end of the fourth volume, as it was not possible to provide a full bibliography on the wide range of topics, particularly the historical regions and periods, encompassed by the 'Reader.' The same applies to the 'contextualization' of texts. While we obviously drew on the existing interpretative literature on the texts we included, to have provided detailed refer-

ences to the secondary literatures in more than a dozen of languages would have over-burdened the 'Reader' and the readers. Therefore, we tried to keep the references implicit, except for certain specific cases where the interpretation provided by a given historian was considered crucial for the 'itinerary' of the text—its re-discovery, canonization or its fundamental reconsideration for the 'national canon.'

To sum up, the main preoccupation of our venture was to avoid both the exclusive projection of the ideology of national uniqueness and the structuring of the European space in an East-West dichotomy. While taking into account unilinear as well as mutual transfers, we sought to abandon the 'Platonic' image dividing the continent in two ontologically incompatible worlds: the transcendent world of the Real—the Occident, and its ontologically inferior imitation—the Orient, the 'Remainder of Europe.' To complicate the issue further, it can be said that the very process of nation-building is a mirror-process that can be seen through the prism of the Girardian conception of 'mimetic desire.' This means that one can speak about West-West, West-East and East-East relations as proliferating chains rather than depicting them as two-layered hierarchies and mirror-worlds. In this way, we sought to avoid the simple border-tracing and leave aside the East/West opposition, which is constructed, of course, not on a geographical but on an ideological basis, and to a large extent reproduces the split from the time of the Cold War.

At the same time certain incompatibility between historical processes in the 'Eastern periphery' and the 'European core' does indeed exist. Just assuming it, however, does not imply that national developments in Central and Southeast Europe do not have their counterparts in the West, or the other way round. Similarly unsatisfactory is it to suggest that the nature of historical processes in Central and Southeast Europe is the same. Therefore, the 'Reader' does not aim to prove that structural similarities prevail over national differences but rather suggests a broadening of the scope of regional comparison.

The structure of the 'Reader'

Our work was aiming at the elaboration of regionally encompassing frameworks of interpretation based on a comparative approach. A look at the organizational principles of the selection of the texts will shed some light on this issue. The grouping of the texts followed neither national provenience, nor *stricto sensu* chronological order. It was determined more by thematic

similarities and resonances. These “meta-themes/periods” are the following: Late Enlightenment (the emergence of the modern ‘National Idea’), National Romanticism (the formation of national movements); Modernism (the full development of national movements and often the creation of national states); and ‘Anti-Modernism’ (which is in many ways intertwined with the ‘Modernist’ section, concentrating mainly on the radical ideologies of the inter-war period.)

Within these thematic units the project analyzes various aspects of identity-construction, such as ‘symbolic geography,’ the symbolic representation of the national community, images of the past and the production of cultural markers (i.e. national language or national character), as well as the images of the other and the production of identity in religious and nationalist contexts—domains that themselves exhibit revealing similarities, notably in the relationship between nationalism and state-making. This framework challenges the usual taxonomies, (in fact, most of the texts fall into more than one category), through the *dis-aggregation* of a nominally unified past. In particular, this perspective questions the idea of a single point of departure that we are confronted with in nationalist histories. In fact, most of the texts selected consciously participate in many registers of identity-construction, seeking to turn the entire symbolic framework of collective identities into a more dynamic vision. Questioning the fixed canons of national identity by historicizing their formation, the ‘Reader’ points out the symbolic ambiguities, negotiations and discursive plurality that characterize these cultures.

As far as the practical side of this approach is concerned, in an effort to create a common basis for the analysis of the collected texts a short questionnaire was devised, registering the basic information about each of the given texts. The questionnaire consists of five sections. The first section refers to the bibliographical data containing the language in which the text was written, its author and the publishing house; this data is complemented by short information about the author, such as his (her) place of birth and death and main works. The second section contains a short ‘contextualization’ of the text, describing its political and social background and the intellectual environment in which it originated. Then the textual analysis, and a description of its ideological tendencies and historical influence and its function in the respective canon follow. In addition, the most important interpretations of the text are provided. The third section groups the key terms of the text and gives a short explanation of their meaning and function, while the fourth aims at the potential grouping of the text (e.g., period, thematic unit). Finally, the fifth section is a resume of the text. Upon completion of the research work,

naturally, the last three categories fell out, as they contained information which were then incorporated into the very structure of the 'Reader' and the corresponding auxiliary materials.

While elaborating on our individual cases and also trying to compare the texts stemming from various cultural contexts to each other, we were faced with a number of methodological and technical dilemmas. First of all, we had to agree upon the relative proportions of various national selections, and also about the relative weight of a specific discursive tradition in view of the *longue durée* of the given national tradition. Obviously, some of the cultures in question produced more complex debates than others, some periods saw a proliferation of discourses in one culture, while others almost completely lacked any activity. It would have been meaningless to allocate the same amount of space to 'Macedonian Romanticism' as to Polish Romanticism, and Czech modernism was evidently more representative than Czech anti-modernism. On the whole, we decided to allocate more space to the Polish and Austrian cases, and to come up with a fair representation for all the others. We also created a flexible framework of internal proportions whereby we could indicate the relative weight of a given meta-discourse. Thus, for instance, we have only one Slovak 'Late Enlightenment' text in contrast to six Greek ones, but in the chapters on National Romanticism the proportions are more balanced. In order to offer a more comprehensive treatment of the given period in cases where we did not include too many samples, we decided to offer a broader historical contextualization (such as in the case of the Albanian files).

The 'Questionnaire' was also used in the process of selecting the texts, preparing the commentaries and creating a taxonomy of key concepts. While not aiming at creating any sort of Central and Southeast European *Begriffsgeschichte*, we considered the issue of conceptual transformation as one of the keys to the historical material analyzed in our project. As a result, in order to substantiate the theoretical assumptions of the 'Reader,' a multi-lingual glossary of key notions was also compiled (to be found as an appendix to Volume IV). The glossary is meant to identify the main discursive figures relating to collective identity and to register, on a comparative basis, the convergences and divergences between different national cultures.

From the very beginning, we were aware of the problematic nature of the meta-categories according to which we structured our research. While the sequence of the four categories made perfect sense in some cases, it was far from obvious in other cases. Our Turkish colleagues, for example, called our attention to the fact that the late-nineteenth century writer and politician

Namık Kemal fits discursively into all our categories at the same time—producing plays which bear the stamp of the Enlightenment, Romantic poems, modernist political articles and, finally, a diary that often reflected on the impossibility of the Westernization of the Ottoman Empire, i.e. prefiguring the anti-modernist argumentation. In general, of course, we could not help projecting these overlapping temporalities and ‘asynchronic synchronicities’ on a temporal continuum, while at the same time remaining conscious of the constructed nature of the categories used in the ‘Reader.’ While we had to make practical decisions, we also sought to question traditional taxonomies. As a matter of fact, the very category of ‘Late Enlightenment’ served such a purpose, as very often the local interpretative traditions written from a retrospective point of view with the intention of ‘canonizing’ the national ideology fused the texts written in the late-eighteenth century with the 1830–1840s, presuming a kind of teleology in the formation of a modern national consciousness. By drawing attention to the Enlightenment intellectual influences and paradigms, we hope to question this vision of unproblematic evolution and to indicate the cleavages between ‘Enlightenment’ and ‘Romantic’ projects.

Sometimes we chose to indicate the ambiguity of some of the key authors by placing their works under different categories. For instance, in the case of Hristo Botev we placed his revolutionary poetry into the Romantic setting, but his more theoretical article explaining his views on Socialism into the modernist frame. Needless to say, we often came across cases where the same text could also be read from different perspectives and one could have placed it under different headings. In these cases, we had to make a decision, but we sought to indicate that there is a mixture of different ideological references. As a matter of fact, it turned out that the overlapping of categories is rather rule than exception—most of the texts we came across are transitional, formatted by different, often contradictory discursive traditions.

We also had to agree about the relationship between the canonical and non-canonical texts to be included in the ‘Reader.’ Our aim was to open the ‘Reader’ to alternative debates about national canons, without disregarding the mainstream discourses of identity. Obviously, we did not want to reproduce just the institutionalized self-image of these national cultures, which would have meant an almost total preponderance of ‘National Romanticism’ in most of the cases. We agreed that approximately two-thirds of the texts selected would represent the mainstream, which would be commonly the core of the educational curriculum, forming part of the pool of references even of an averagely educated person in the given national context. The rest

of the selected files include those texts which are rather ambiguous in this respect: either forming part of traditions which became marginalized in the process of canon-building, or eccentric but nevertheless telling perspectives on central issues of the self-narration of a given culture. Along these lines, we sought to include some representative texts from regional intellectual canons that were related to nation-building projects but not necessarily completely overlapping with them, such as the Dalmatian, Transylvanian or Moravian ones. Although we could not aim at an exhaustive treatment of all these regional variants, we were trying to indicate that the actual nation-state framework is far from being the only imaginable setting to represent the plurality of collective identities.

While we were coming up with our own lists of texts at the beginning of the project, the process of negotiation meant that the final set of authors was significantly divergent from our original offers. While subsuming the texts from different backgrounds under thematic headings, we paid special attention to the cultural dialogue between certain texts. In many cases, by comparing texts to each other we became aware how a given text had been omitted from the respective national tradition. By identifying and excavating those themes and discourses that existed in the national traditions but were retrospectively marginalized, we sought to contribute to the rethinking of the entire tradition. A sense of divergence between different canons was, however, preserved and we emphatically resisted the temptation of 'generating' counterparts for certain discursive genres from all traditions we were working with, as we thought that this would have led to an artificial fusion of texts with very different relative weight. The effort of keeping a certain level of representativeness prompted us to select published texts rather than private correspondence, although in some cases we included also sources of a more private nature. While identifying our primary excerpts, we sought to bring together texts that have not been translated into English before, although with certain key texts we made an exception to this rule.

In general, our aim was to incorporate as many national narratives as possible rather than creating one homogenized supra-national narrative. We sought to retain this plurality in the use of geographical and personal names as well.⁶⁰ In the case of some files some members of the group worked together, since the themes included there overlapped in different traditions (e.g. Greek scholars active in the Danubian Principalities). The most interesting cases were the ones where the overlapping national narratives created two almost incompatible visions. The most striking instance is probably that of the Albanian Sami Fräsheri or the Ottoman Şemseddin Sami, where it re-

quired considerable alertness to realize that the two biographies refer to one and the same person. In this case we sought to draw up a 'negotiated' biography and created an opportunity for the Albanian and Turkish contributors of the project to compare their narratives and create a mutually acceptable version.⁶¹ On the other hand, in cases of conflicting narrative traditions we sought to retain a certain level of incompatibility. Rather than creating a politically correct image of peoples loving each other but just being manipulated by corrupt politicians, we did not want to hide the fact that some of the national canons in the region were indeed turned against each other and had often devised their own identity-discourse in mimetic competition with their neighbors. What we nevertheless sought to attain with our contextual introductions and with the very selection of the samples was a re-evaluation of these identity-constructions—showing that what became the eventual mainstream was actually part of a horizontal dialogue of alternative conceptions, and often the national framework itself that eventually became the organizing principle of the discussion was just one of the discursive options. The same agenda of contextualization was crucial not only as a tool to problematize the national framework but also to question the essentialist narratives that turn concepts such as the Enlightenment or 'national revival' into historical agents rather than interpretative models.

Facing such dilemmas concerning the selection of excerpts and the elaboration of interpretation, we sought a balance between the different possible strategies. We distanced ourselves from the self-reproducing national canons, but we also tried to signal that the national framework was indeed crucial in the history of self-understanding in the region. We hoped to coin supra-national references to locate our texts, but we resisted the temptation of creating a 'Grand Narrative' of how things happened in the region, and rejected the possibility of just 'discovering' one fitting text, no matter how relevant or irrelevant, from every country under every category. As reflected in the 'Reader,' our methodological 'middle ground' is not the outcome of hesitation or indecision, but an attempt at an appropriate representation of the different temporalities of the intellectual traditions and national cultures in the region. By engaging each of the participants in a long-term process of exploring the dialectic between 'our own' culture and that of the 'others,' we sought to challenge the reductionist claims usually heard when talking about Central and Southeast Europe: namely, that all these cultures were either completely alike, simple variations on the same theme of peripheral nation-building, or completely untranslatable into each other's terms, featuring a veritable Babylon of incompatible and mutually antagonistic narratives of identity.

Needless to say, the ‘Reader’ is in many ways a work in progress. It is a document of a process of cultural negotiation, which is not something to be just accomplished and forgotten but a life-experience and a fundamental existential challenge to all of its participants. The editors very much hope that, beyond the textual selections and contextualizations, those who use the ‘Reader’ will take a glimpse at the ‘invisible’ side of this project as well: the never-ending debate and a permanent play, not only with our national traditions, but also with our own personal identity.

Notes

- 1 The most recent example is the volume edited by Richard Frucht, *Encyclopedia of Eastern Europe: From the Congress of Vienna to the fall of communism* (New York and London, 2000).
- 2 See especially the books produced for the ‘Western’ public, such as Philip Longworth, *The making of Eastern Europe: From prehistory to postcommunism* (London, 1992); Joseph Rotschild, *Return to diversity: A political history of East Central Europe since World War II* (Oxford, 1993); Zbynek A. Zeman, *Making and breaking of communist Europe* (Oxford, 1991).
- 3 This could be merely ideological, but often expressed a genuine interest in transgressing the nationalist framework of pre-1945 historiography. See, for example, the Hungarian series on Hungarian-Slovak and Hungarian-Romanian ‘common pasts’: István Borsody, *Magyar-szlovák kiegyezés* [The Hungarian-Slovak compromise] (Budapest, 1945); László Makkai, ed., *Magyar-román közös múlt* [The Hungarian-Romanian common past] (Budapest, 1948). In the 1950–60s, however, no matter how benevolent these ventures might have been, they were heavily influenced by official ideology, contrasting the instinctive ‘internationalist’ inclination of the ‘working people’ with the nationalism of the elites, thus making them blind to the complexity of intellectual traditions in the region. A peculiar branch of this literature was the one focusing on the often highly virtual “historical friendship” with Russia and the Soviet Union. See, for example, Ludwik Bazyłow, ed., *Z dziejów współpracy rewolucyjnej Polaków i Rosjan w drugiej połowie XIX wieku* [On the history of the revolutionary cooperation of Poles and Russians in the second half of the 19th century] (Wrocław, 1956); Jiří Sedláček and Josef Vávra, ed., *Za zemi milovanou. Z bojů o československo-sovětské přátelství* [For the beloved country. Struggles for the Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship] (Prague, 1960); Zdeněk Konečný, ed., *Revoluční hnutí v Československu a jeho vztahy k SSSR: Morava a Slezsko – dokumenty 1879–1938* [The revolutionary movement in Czechoslovakia and its links with the USSR: Moravia and Silesia – documents 1879–1938] (Prague, 1960).
- 4 At the same time, the well-established ‘imperial’ (Habsburg and Ottoman) studies continued to have an impact, but they were mostly cultivated by scholars stemming from the imperial centers or by ‘Western’ scholars. Some of the paradigms developed by these historians (embodied in a veritable cult of the *fin-de-siècle* in Central Europe, initiated by Carl E. Schorske) reached East-Central Europe al-

- ready in the 1980s, serving as a new symbolic geographical offer challenging the East-West divide.
- 5 Cf. Katherine Verdery, *National ideology under socialism. Identity and cultural politics in Ceausescu's Romania* (Berkeley, 1991).
 - 6 Among the most visible examples are the works on the Hungarian-Romanian “entangled history.” See, for instance, Béla Borsi-Kálmán, *Liaisons risquées: Hongrois et Roumains aux XIXe et XXe siècles* (Pécs, 1999); and his *Nemzetfogalom és nemzetstratégiák: A Kossuth-emigráció és a román nemzeti törekvések kapcsolatának történetéhez* [The concept of the nation and national strategies: On the history of the interaction of the Kossuth-emigration and Romanian national movement] (Budapest, 1993); Ambrus Miskolczy, *Eszmék és téveszmék: Kritikai esszék a román múlt és jelen vitás kérdéseit tárgyaló könyvekről* [Ideas and misconceptions: Critical essays on books dealing with debated issues of the Romanian past and present] (Budapest, 1994); Balázs Trencsényi, Dragoș Petrescu, Cristina Petrescu, Constantin Iordachi and Zoltán Kántor, eds. *Nation-building and contested identities: Romanian and Hungarian case studies* (Budapest and Iași, 2001); Toader Nicoară, *Transilvania la începuturile timpurilor moderne (1680–1800): Societate rurală și mentalități colective* [Transylvania at the beginning of modern times, 1680–1800: Rural society and collective mentalities] (Cluj, 1997); Melinda Mitu, *Problema românească reflectată în cultura maghiară din prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea* [The Romanian problem reflected by Hungarian culture in the first half of the 19th century] (Cluj, 2000). Particularly productive, too, has been the Czech-German partnership in historiography, which, however, concentrated almost exclusively on the history of Bohemian lands. See e.g. the production of the Czech-German Commission of Historians at <http://www.dt-ds-historikerkommission.de/>.
 - 7 For attempts at dis-centering the homogenizing national narrative in the research on Turkish and Greek national identity see Richard Clogg, ed., *Minorities in Greece: Aspects of a plural society* (London, 2002), Ayhan Aktar, *Varlık Vergisi ve ‘Türkleştirme’ Politikaları* [The Assets Tax and policies of ‘Turkification’] (Istanbul, 2000) on the discriminatory taxation on the non-Muslim minorities during the Second World War, and Baskın Oran, *Kürüselleşme ve Azınlıklar* [Globalization and minorities] (Istanbul, 2004). On the images of the Greek and Turkish ‘Others’ in both literary traditions see the studies by Herkül Millas, *Türk Romani ve ‘Öteki’ – Ulusal Kimlikte Yunan imajı* [The Turkish novel and the ‘Other’ – The image of the Greek in national identity] (Istanbul, 2000), and *Εικόνες Ελλήνων – Τούρκων-σχολικά βιβλία, ιστοριογραφία, λογοτεχνία και εθνικά στερεότυπα* [Images of Greeks and Turks – school textbooks, historiography, literature and national stereotypes] (Athens, 2001). The experience of the exchange of populations in 1922–23 has also become the focus of academic projects, such as Renée Hirschon, ed., *Crossing the Aegean: An appraisal of the 1923 compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey* (New York, 2003); and Giorgos Tzedopoulos, *Πέρα από την Καταστροφή: Μικρασιάτες πρόσφυγες στην Ελλάδα του Μεσοπολέμου* [Beyond the Catastrophe: Asia Minor refugees in Greece during the inter-war period] (Athens, 2003). Despite the fact that the French-German model has been frequently evoked as an example for Greek-Turkish reconciliation, the few concrete examples of this approach have been Faruk Birtek and Thalia Dragnas, eds., *Citizenship and the nation-state in Greece and Turkey* (London and New York, 2005) and a special issue of *Cahiers Balkaniques* n° 33: “Turquie, Grèce: un passé commun, des nouvelles perspectives,” edited by Faruk Bilici (Paris, 2005).

- 8 This is the case with even such ‘non-partisan’ ventures as Chantal Delsol and Michel Maslowski, eds. *Histoire des idées politiques de l’Europe centrale* (Paris, 1998).
- 9 Financial, linguistic and spatial limitations made it impossible for us to include Ukraine and the Baltic states, marked by political traditions that reveal many similarities with the national traditions presented in the ‘Reader.’ Also, it was due to organizational reasons rather than any underlying ideological agenda that we had to accept the loss of Slovenia from our territorial grasp in the first two volumes even though a number of Slovenian intellectuals, such as Jernej Kopitar, played an important role in mediating among various emerging ‘national cultures’ in the region. After contacting several colleagues, we simply failed to find any Slovenian scholar who was willing to submit the required excerpts.
- 10 See esp. Quentin Skinner, *Foundations of modern political thought* (Cambridge, 1979); James Tully, ed., *Meaning and context: Quentin Skinner and his critics* (Cambridge, 1988); Anthony Pagden, ed., *The languages of political theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987); J. G. A. Pocock, *Politics, language and time: Essays on political thought and history* (London, 1972); and his *Virtue, commerce and history: Essays on political thought and history, chiefly in the eighteenth century* (Cambridge, 1985); Otto Brunner, Werner Conze and Reinhart Koselleck, eds., *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur Politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, 8 vols (Stuttgart, 1972–1992), Reinhart Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt a. M., 1979); Roger Chartier, *Les origines culturelles de la Révolution Française* (Paris, 1991); Roger Chartier and Guglielmo Cavallo, eds., *Histoire de la lecture dans le monde occidental* (Paris, 1997).
- 11 Melvin Richter, *The history of political and social concepts* (Oxford, 1995); Iain Hampsher-Monk, Karin Tilmans and Fred Van Vree, eds., *History of concepts: Comparative perspectives* (Amsterdam, 1998).
- 12 For theoretical reflection and general methodological problems of the Western intellectual history research in the last decades, see Dominick LaCapra and Steven L. Kaplan, eds., *Modern European intellectual history: Reappraisals and new perspectives* (Ithaca and London, 1982); Hans E. Bödeker, ed., *Begriffsgeschichte, Diskursgeschichte, Metapherngeschichte* (Göttingen, 2002); Hellmuth Eckhart and Christoph von Ehrenstein, “Intellectual History Made in Britain: Die Cambridge School und ihre Kritiker,” in *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 2001/I, pp. 149–72.
- 13 On political modernity, see Claude Lefort, *L’invention démocratique* (Paris, 1981); Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe, *La fiction du politique* (Paris, 1987) and also his *L’imitation des modernes* (Paris, 1986). For a recent critical reinvestigation of the notion of modernity, see Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer* (Torino, 1995), and Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge and Oxford, 2001).
- 14 See the general though sometimes one-sided critique by Lutz Niethammer and Axel Doßmann, *Kollektive Identität. Heimliche Quellen einer unheimlichen Konjunktur* (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 2000), esp. pp. 9–66; but also Scott Lash and Jonathan Friedman, eds., *Modernity and identity* (Oxford, 1992); Ernesto Laclau, ed., *The making of political identities* (London, 1994); and Anthony Giddens, *Modernity and self-identity* (Stanford, 1991). For the concept of narrative identity see Paul Ricoeur, *Soi-même comme un autre* (Paris, 1990).
- 15 See Reinhart Koselleck, “Social History and Begriffsgeschichte,” in Hampsher-Monk et al., *History of Concepts*, pp. 23–35.

- 16 On the social aspects of temporality, see Krzysztof Pomian, *L'Ordre du temps* (Paris, 1984); Paul Ricoeur, *Temps et récit*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1983–1985); Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt and Margaret Jacob, *Telling the truth about history* (New York, 1994); Reinhart Koselleck, *Zeitschichten: Studien zur Historik* (Frankfurt a. M., 2000). For an anthropological perception of historical time, see Marshal Sahlins, *Islands of history* (Chicago, 1987).
- 17 For a thorough elaboration on identity building and discursive practices, see the first part of Ruth Wodak et al., *Zur diskursiven Konstruktion nationaler Identität* (Frankfurt a. M., 1998). A theoretical reflection on discursive practices from a comparative perspective based on historical material is contained in Miroslav Hroch, *In the national interest* (Prague, 2000).
- 18 Needless to say, our conception of nation is inspired by authors who describe the nation as an “imagined community” (Benedict Anderson) or a “system of cultural representations” (Stuart Hall). This understanding of the notion emphasizes its dynamic character revealed as the “permanent positioning” of symbolic meanings.
- 19 On the problems of canon and canonicity, see Jan Gorak, *The making of the modern canon. Genesis and crisis of a literary idea* (Athlone, N.Y. & Amsterdam, 1991); John Guillory, *Cultural capital: The problem of literary canon formation* (Chicago, 1993); Harold Bloom, *The Western canon. The books and school of the ages* (New York, 1994).
- 20 See Dominick LaCapra, *Rethinking intellectual history: Texts, contexts, language* (Ithaca, NY, 1983); idem, *History and criticism* (Ithaca, NY, 1985); Hayden White, *Tropics of discourse: Essays in cultural criticism* (Baltimore-London, 1992).
- 21 Karel Doskočil, ed., *Listy a listiny z dějin československých (869–1938)* [Documents and records from Czechoslovak history, 869–1938] (Prague, 1938); Viktor Novak, ed. *Antologija jugoslavenske misli i narodnog jedinstva (1390–1930)* [The Anthology of the Yugoslav thought and national unity, 1390–1930] (Belgrade, 1930); Slavko Ježić, ed., *Ilirska antologija: književni dokumenti hrvatskog preporoda* [The Illyrian anthology: Literary documents of the Croatian Revival] (Zagreb, 1934).
- 22 In these cases the underlying political agenda could be very divergent. While the volume edited by József Halasy-Nagy, *Magyar önismeret* [Hungarian self-knowledge] (Budapest, 1939) was a reflection of the official nationalist ideology; Tibor Joó's *Vallomások a magyarságról: A magyar önismeret breviáriuma* [Confessions on Hungarianness: The breviary of Hungarian self-knowledge] (Budapest, 1943), tried to prove that there was a specific Hungarian nationalism based on multi-ethnic cooperation, in contrast to Western nation-state building and totalitarian ethno-politics—thus turning the autochthonist rhetoric in an anti-Fascist direction.
- 23 Stanislaus Hafner, Otto Turecek and Günther Wytrzens, eds., *Slavische Geisteswelt*, vol. 2, *West- und Südslaven: Staatlichkeit und Volkstum* (Baden-Baden, 1959).
- 24 The classic of the genre, falling out of the geographical scope of our project, is undoubtedly Marc Raeff, ed., *Russian intellectual history: An anthology* (New York, 1966).
- 25 See, for example, Krystyna Olszer, ed., *For your freedom and ours: Polish progressive spirit from the 14th century to the present* (New York, 1981), which was a re-edition and partial extension of a propagandistic collection of texts published

- during the Second World War; and Adam Bromke, ed., *The meaning and uses of Polish history* (Boulder, 1987), who envisioned a *longue durée* thread of intellectual continuity between the nineteenth century and *Solidarność*. See also Mieczysław B. Biskupski and James S. Pula, *Polish democratic thought from the Renaissance to the Great Emigration* (Boulder, 1990).
- 26 Václav Husa and František Kutnar, eds., *Naše národní minulost v dokumentech* [Our national past in documents] (Prague, 1954); Ilija Mamuzić, ed., *Antologija ilirskog pokreta* [The anthology of the Illyrian Movement] (Belgrade, 1953); Ján Tibenský, ed., *Chvály a obrany národa slovenského* [Praises and apologies of the Slovak Nation] (Bratislava, 1965); Ján V. Ormis, ed., *O reč a národ: Slovenské národné obrany z rokov 1832–1848* [For language and nation: Slovak national defenses from 1832–1848] (Bratislava, 1975); Manfred Kriedl and Władysław R. Malinowski, eds., *Polska myśl demokratyczna w ciągu wieków: Antologia* [Polish democratic thought through the ages: An anthology] (Warsaw, 1983).
- 27 The most well-known being Apostolos Daskalakis, *Κείμενα-πηγαί της ιστορίας της ελληνικής επανάστασεως* [Source-texts of the history of the Greek Revolution] (Athens, 1966), and Apostolos E. Vakalopoulos, *Πηγές της ιστορίας του νέου Ελληνισμού* [Sources of the history of the New Hellenism] (Thessaloniki, 1966). The second one especially seeks to provide a panorama of the cultural and political continuity of the Greek nation after the fall of Constantinople and until the 19th century.
- 28 Éva Ring, ed., *Helyünk Európában* [Our place in Europe] (Budapest, 1986).
- 29 Hartmut and Silke Lehmann, eds., *Das Nationalitätenproblem in Österreich, 1848–1918* (Göttingen, 1973).
- 30 See, for instance, Sándor Lukácsy, ed., *Nemzeti olvasókönyv* [National reader] (Budapest, 1988).
- 31 See the official post-1968 Czechoslovak publication *Minulost našeho státu v dokumentech* [The past of our state in documents] (Prague, 1971).
- 32 For instance, Konstantinos Dimaras, *Δημήτριος Καταρτζής. Ευρισκόμενα* [Dimitrios Katartzis' extant works] (Athens, 1970); Rena Stavridon-Patrikion, *Δημοτικισμός και κοινωνικό πρόβλημα* [Demoticism and the social question] (Athens, 1976); Panayotis Noutsos, *Η σοσιαλιστική σκέψη στην Ελλάδα* [Socialist thought in Greece] 2 vols (Athens, 1993). Special reference should be made to Richard Clogg, ed., *The movement for Greek independence 1770–1821: A collection of documents* (London: 1976). This was the first important collection of Greek identity-building texts translated into English.
- 33 The more important being Dimitris Tsaousis, *Ελληνισμός–ελληνικότητα: ιδεολογικοί και βιοματικοί άξονες της νεοελληνικής κοινωνίας* [Hellenism-Hellenicity: ideological and practical aspects of neo-Hellenic society] (Athens, 1983); Nasou Vagena, Taki Kagiali, Mihali Pieri, *Μοντερνισμός και Ελληνικότητα* [Modernism and Hellenicity] (Iraklion, 1997).
- 34 Iordan Chimet, ed., *Dreptul la memorie*, 4 vols. [The right to memory] (Cluj-Napoca, 1993).
- 35 See, e.g., Zdeněk Veselý ed., *Dějiny českého státu v dokumentech* [The history of the Czech state in documents] (Prague, 1994); Dušan Čaplovič et al., eds. *Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti* [Documents of Slovak national identity and statehood] (Bratislava, 1998).
- 36 Ivan Martinčić, ed., *Hrvatski preporod: Temeljni programski tekstovi* [The Croatian Revival: Basic programmatic texts] 2 vols (Zagreb, 1994); Miroslav Šicel, ed., *Programski tekstovi hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic texts of the Croa-

- tian National Revival] (Zagreb, 1997). For a collection of formative texts of Illyrianism in German, see Anna Pia Maisen, ed., *Wie ein Blitz schlägt es aus meinem Mund: Der Illyrismus, die Hauptschriften der kroatischen Nationalbewegung 1830–1844* (Bern, 1998). For the Serbian side, the new history of statehood contained a number of textual excerpts: Radoš Ljušić, Dejan Medaković, Ljubodrag Dimić et al., *Istorija srpske državnosti*, 3 vols (Novi Sad, 2001). The volume edited by Bojan Jovanović, *Karakterologija Srba* [Serbian characterology] (Beograd, 1992), provides an example of the revival of an entire scholarly tradition of national self-description: i.e. the interwar canon of ‘national characterology.’ Probably the most spectacular venture was the two-volume (1500 pages) collection of texts published at the peak of nationalist hysteria at the beginning of the Yugoslav conflict. It contains the most important ‘canonical’ texts, especially from the interwar period, followed by treatises of the most outspoken nationalists of the 1980s and 1990s. The latter brought together geopolitical, historical and ‘nation-building’ texts, one next to another from different periods, without any explanation or critical reference and with an ‘ahistorical’ ambition of celebrating the eternal Serbian nation and laying a curse on all its enemies. See Predrag Dragić-Kijuk, *Catena mundi*, 2 vols (Kraljevo, 1992). The editors would like to thank Teodora Shek Brnardić and Bojan Aleksov for their generous help and extensive comments on the Croatian and Serbian references in the present introduction.
- 37 Rudolf Chmel, ed., *Slovenská otázka v 20. storočí* [The Slovak question in the 20th century] (Bratislava, 1996), published also in Hungarian under the title *A szlovákkérdés a XX. században* (Bratislava, 1996).
- 38 Ivan Elenkov and Roumen Daskalov, eds., *Защо сме такива? В търсене на българската културна идентичност* [Why are we like that? In search of Bulgarian cultural identity] (Sofia, 1994).
- 39 Miloš Havelka, ed., *Spor o smysl českých dějin* [Debate on the meaning of Czech history] (Prague, 1995), see also his interpretation, *Dějiny a smysl* [History and meaning] (Prague, 2001).
- 40 Miroslav Jovanović, ed., *Protiv Vuka: Hrestomatija* [Against Vuk: A chrestomathy] (Belgrade, 2004), and his interpretative monograph, *Jezik i društvena istorija: Društvenoistorijski okviri polemike o srpskom književnom jeziku* [Language and social history: The social-historical context of the debate on the Serbian literary language] (Belgrade, 2002).
- 41 Ralph Lindheim and George S. N. Luckyj, eds. *Towards an intellectual history of Ukraine: An anthology of Ukrainian thought from 1710 to 1945* (Toronto, 1996). The publication of this volume, making a huge number of key texts available in English, made our eventual choice of leaving Ukraine out from the project considerably less problematic.
- 42 See Harald Heppner and Olga Katsiardi-Hering, eds., *Die Griechen und Europa: Aussen- und Innensichten im Wandel der Zeit* (Vienna, 1998), A similar concern has only recently started developing in Turkey; see, for instance, Çağlar Keyder, *Memalik-i Osmaniye'den Avrupa Birliği'ne* [From the Ottoman domains to the European Union] (Istanbul, 2003).
- 43 Two typical examples are Johannes Magendorf, *Βαλκάνια και Ορθοδοξία* [Balkans and Orthodoxy] (Athens, 1993) and Christos Giannaras, *Το αλφάβηταρι του Έλληνα* [The alphabet of the Hellenes] (Athens, 2002). By contrast, Paschalis Kitromilidis and Thanos Veremis, eds., *The Orthodox Church in a changing world* (Athens, 1998) addresses more critically the whole issue.

- 44 See, for instance, Stefanos Yerasimos et al., *Türkiye’de sivil toplum ve milliyetçilik* [Civil society and nationalism in Turkey] (Istanbul, 2001); Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman past and today’s Turkey* (Leiden, 2000).
- 45 In this respect, the first publication that includes and critically addresses a comprehensive body of formative texts on Turkish national identity is Murat Belge (series editor), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce* [Political thought in modern Turkey], 9 vols (Istanbul, 2001–2004).
- 46 Laszlo Peter, ed., *Historians and the History of Transylvania* (Boulder, 1992); in a similar vein, see Robert Elsie, ed., *Kosovo: In the heart of the powder keg* (Boulder, 1997).
- 47 Imre Pászka, ed., *Román eszmetörténet, 1866–1945: Önismeret és modernizáció a román gondolkodásban* [Romanian intellectual history, 1866–1945: Self-knowledge and modernization in Romanian thought] (Budapest, 1994); Marek Klecel, ed., *Polen zwischen Ost und West: Polnische Essays des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt, 1997), published as part of the *Dedecius Polnische Bibliothek* Series.
- 48 See the attempt to represent the indigenous Czech liberal political tradition in a reader edited by Milan Znoj, Jan Havránek and Martin Sekera, *Český liberalismus: Texty a osobnosti* [Czech liberalism: Texts and personalities] (Prague, 1995); and for the Polish liberal tradition, Wojciech Bernacki, ed., *Liberalizm polski: Antologia* [Polish liberalism: An anthology] (Rzeszów, 2003); for the Serbian one, Jovica Trkulja and Dragoljub Popović, eds., *Liberalna misao u Srbiji – Prilozi istoriji liberalizma od kraja 18. do sredine 20. veka* [Liberal thought in Serbia – Contributions to the history of liberalism from the end of the 18th to the mid-20th century] (Belgrade, 2001); for the Croatian tradition, Andrea Feldman, Vladimir Stipetić and Franjo Zenko, eds., *Liberalna misao u Hrvatskoj: Prilozi povijesti liberalizma od kraja 18. do sredine 20. stoljeća* (Liberal thought in Croatia: Contributions to the history of liberalism from the end of the 18th to the mid-20th century) (Zagreb, 2000), and Tihomir Cipek and Josip Vrandečić, eds., *Hrestomatija liberalnih ideja u Hrvatskoj* (Chrestomathia of liberal ideas in Croatia) (Zagreb, 2004); as well as the otherwise very problematic Hungarian volume edited by László Tökéczki, *Magyar liberalizmus* [Hungarian liberalism] (Budapest, 1993). For a similar venture focusing on Romanian conservatism, see Ioan Stanomir and Laurențiu Vlad, eds., *A fi conservator* [To be conservative] (Bucharest, 2002).
- 49 See the article by Nikodem Bończa-Tomaszewski—a young historian and editor of the rightist magazine *Frona*—criticizing the book by Maciej Janowski on Polish liberalism in the nineteenth century. While Janowski put Polish liberalism into the Central European context, Bończa-Tomaszewski, using the definitions of Western liberalism, claimed that none of the Polish political thinkers fulfilled the conditions of being liberal. See Nikodem Bończa-Tomaszewski, “Narodziny polskiego liberalizmu. Analiza metod wyjaśniania historiografii polskiego liberalizmu,” [The birth of Polish liberalism. Analysis of the explanations of liberalism in Polish historiography], in *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (February 2001), pp. 83–99; and Maciej Janowski, “O historię liberalizmu polskiego w XIX wieku (w odpowiedzi na artykuł Nikodema Bończy-Tomaszewskiego),” [On the history of Polish liberalism in the nineteenth century – answer to the article by N. Bończa-Tomaszewski], in *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (February 2002), pp. 101–118.
- 50 Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The map of civilization on the mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, 1994); Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (Oxford, 1997).

- 51 Sorin Mitu, *National identity of Romanians in Transylvania* (Budapest, 2001); Victor Neumann, *The temptation of Homo Europaeus* (New York, 1993); Brian Porter, *When nationalism began to hate: Imagining modern politics in nineteenth-century Poland* (Oxford, 2000); Gregory Jusdanis, *Belated modernity and aesthetic culture: Inventing national literature* (Minneapolis, 1991); Stathis Gourouris, *Dream nation: Enlightenment, colonization, and the institution of modern Greece* (Stanford, 1996).
- 52 See, most importantly, Andrej Walicki, *The Slavophile controversy: History of the conservative utopia in nineteenth-century Russian thought* (Notre Dame, 1989); *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The case of Poland* (Notre Dame, 1982); Katherine Verdery and Ivo Banac, eds., *National character and national ideology in interwar Eastern Europe* (New Haven, 1995); Sorin Antohi, *Civitas imaginalis: Istorie și utopie în cultura română* (Bucharest, 1994), also the French version, *Imaginaire culturel et réalité politique dans la Roumanie moderne: le stigmate et l'utopie* (Paris, 1999); Alexandru Dușu, *Ideea de Europa și evoluția conștiinței europene* [The idea of Europe and the evolution of European consciousness] (Bucharest, 1999); Vladimir Macura, *Znamení zrodu: České obrození jako kulturní typ* [Birthmark: The Czech revival as cultural type] (Prague, 1995); idem, *Český sen* [Czech dream] (Prague, 1998); Robert B. Pynsent, *Questions of identity: Czech and Slovak ideas of nationality and personality* (Budapest, 1994); Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *The Enlightenment as social criticism: Iosipos Moisiodax and Greek culture in the eighteenth century* (Princeton, 1992); John S. Koliopoulos and Thanos Veremis, *Greece: the modern sequel. From 1831 to the present* (London, 2002); Şerif Mardin, *Religion, society and modernity in Turkey* (Syracuse, 2003); Selim Deringil, *Well-protected domains: Ideology and the legitimisation of power in the Ottoman Empire – 1876–1909* (London, 1998).
- 53 Kenneth Jowitt, ed., *Social change in Romania 1860–1940: A debate on development in a European nation* (Berkeley, 1978); Andrew C. Janos, *The politics of backwardness in Hungary, 1825–1945* (Princeton, 1982); Iván T. Berend, *The crisis zone of Europe: An interpretation of East-Central European history in the first half of the twentieth century* (Cambridge, 1986); Nicos P. Mouzelis, *Modern Greece: Facets of underdevelopment* (New York, 1978); Kostas Vergopoulos, *Le capitalisme difforme et la nouvelle question agraire: l'exemple de la Grèce moderne* (Paris, 1977); Huri İslamoğlu-Inan, *The Ottoman Empire and the world-economy* (Cambridge and Paris, 1987); Çağlar Keyder, *State and class in Turkey: A study in capitalist development* (London, 1987).
- 54 Jerzy Jedlicki, *A suburb of Europe: Nineteenth-century Polish approaches to Western civilization* (Budapest, 1999); Andrzej Walicki, *Russia, Poland and universal regeneration: Studies in Russian and Polish thought of the Romantic epoch* (Notre Dame, 1991); Jiří Kofalka, *Tschechen im Habsburgerreich und in Europa 1815–1914: Sozialgeschichtliche Zusammenhänge der neuzeitlichen Nationsbildung und der Nationalitätenfrage in den böhmischen Ländern* (Vienna, 1991); Catherine Durandin, *Révolution à la française ou à la russe: Polonais, Roumains et Russes au XIXe siècle* (Paris, 1989); Diana Mishkova, *Приспособяване на свободата: Модерност—легитимност в Сърбия и Румъния през XIX век* [Domestication of liberty: Modernity and legitimacy in Serbia and Romania in the 19th century] (Sofia, 2001); Latinka Perović et al., *Srbija u modernizacijskim procesima 19. i 20. veka* (Serbia in the modernization processes of the 19–20th centuries), 3 vols (Belgrade, 1994–2003).

- 55 See, most recently, Christoph Conrad and Sebastian Conrad, eds., *Die Nation schreiben: Geschichtswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich* (Berlin, 2002).
- 56 Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, eds. *Transferts: Les relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand (XVIIe–XIXe siècle)* (Paris, 1988); Michel Espagne and Matthias Middell, eds., *Von der Elbe bis an die Seine: Kulturtransfer zwischen Sachsen und Frankreich im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1993); Etienne François, Hannes Siegrist and Jakob Vogel, eds., *Nation und Emotion: Deutschland und Frankreich im Vergleich 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1995); Shmuel Eisenstadt, Wolfgang Schluchter and Björn Wittrock, eds., *Collective identities and public spheres* (New Brunswick, 2000); Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Ronald Robertson, eds., *Global modernities* (London, 1995). The most recent attempt, from the perspective of comparative literature, to construct a synthetic picture of East-Central European cultures with respect to the interferences and 'overlapping pasts' is Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer, eds., *History of the literary cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and disjunctures in the 19th and 20th centuries* (Amsterdam, 2004).
- 57 Social, political and economic phenomena in Greece and Turkey, for instance, have been studied as parallel to similar developments in South Europe and the Mediterranean or the Middle East rather than Central Europe and the Balkans; see Giovanni Arrighi, Çağlar Keyder and Immanuel Wallerstein, eds., *Southern Europe in the world-economy in the twentieth century: Political and social transformations* (Binghamton, 1983); Jacques Revel and Giovanni Levi, eds., *Political uses of the past: The recent Mediterranean experience* (London, 2001); Leila Tarazi Fawaz and C. A. Bayly, eds., *Modernity and culture from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean* (New York, 2002). Interesting exceptions here are Richard Clogg, ed., *Balkan society in the age of Greek independence* (Totowa, N.J., 1981), and Nicos P. Mouzelis, *Politics in the semi-periphery: Early parliamentarism and late industrialization in the Balkans and Latin America* (New York, 1986). It is only in the 1990s, for obvious reasons, that a new comparative framework has been established, see: Th. D. Sfikas and Ch. Williams, eds. *Ethnicity and nationalism in East Central Europe and the Balkans* (Aldershot, 1999); Carl Brown, ed., *Imperial legacy: The Ottoman imprint on the Balkans and the Middle East* (New York, 1996); Fikret Adanır and Suraiya Faroqui, eds., *The Ottomans and the Balkans: A discussion of historiography* (Leiden, 2002); Gerasimos Augustinos, ed., *Diverse paths to modernity in Southeastern Europe: Essays in national development* (New York, 1991); idem, *The national idea in Eastern Europe: The politics of ethnic and civic community* (Lexington, 1996); Dimitris Tziouvas, *Greece and the Balkans. Identities, perceptions and cultural encounters since the Enlightenment* (Aldershot, 2003).
- 58 "Multiple Modernities," *Daedalus*, Winter 2000.
- 59 Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich, eds., *Romanticism in national context* (Cambridge, 1988); Peter F. Sugar, ed., *Eastern European nationalism in the twentieth century* (Washington, 1995); Claus Björn, Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer, *Nations, nationalism and patriotism in the European past* (Copenhagen, 1994); Dennis Deletant and Harry Hanak, eds., *Historians as nation-builders: Central and South-East Europe* (Basingstoke, 1988).
- 60 By asserting the multiplicity of terminology we were able to emphasize the plurality of historical perspectives and rival national projects that sought to homogenize retrospectively the given territory or historical figure. Thus, in the first reference to a place we enumerate all its names in the relevant languages. For a small num-

ber of major cities (Vienna, Warsaw, Bucharest, etc.) the internationally recognized name was kept. However, in the case of cities where this name was simply internalizing the name of the 'winners,' or there was a specific historical-contextual reason, the name of the time of the text was retained, i.e. a Hungarian born in 1887 in Transylvania was born in Kolozsvár (*Rom.* Cluj, *Ger.* Klausenburg; present-day Romania).

- 61 See Bülent Bilmez, "Mythologization of an Ottoman intellectual in the modern Turkish and Socialist Albanian historiographies based on 'selective perception': Sami Frashëri or Şemseddin Sami Bey?" in *Balkanologie* vol. VII, no 2 (December 2003), pp. 19–46.

