

## Discussion

**Rebecca Spang:** Good morning; welcome. As you settle in with your coffee and second breakfast, I want to start by reflecting on how appropriate it is that Hospitality as a theme was brought to us by a guest: Scott [Juengel] suggested it at last year's workshop, thereby showing himself to be an exemplary guest in more ways than one—and how appropriate it is that no member of the IU faculty has presented a paper for discussion. As a good hostess, we serve ourselves last.

That is not to say, however, that the Center, any more than “the Tahitians” or the Delaware, truly speaks with a single voice. The point Mary [Favret] made in her comment yesterday about “scale” is crucial, I think, in reminding us that hospitality is nearly always represented as the virtue of *one*—indeed, can only be a virtue because others do not offer it. (Imagine the Levite, his female concubine, his servant, and his asses in the town square, with all the Benjaminites vying to host them.) So the guest-host dyad needs to be understood as constituted by (and constitutive of) other distinctions: guest/not guest; host/*not* host; hospitable/inhospitable.

But if hospitality is almost always *represented* as a singular virtue, in truth there can be multiple hosts (and if you look at Bougainville arriving in Tahiti, you see there are as many Tahitians as French). What happens then? What happens when we have lots of hosts? Well, when a “host” is understood to be a computer that serves files to anyone who wants them, then multiple hosts make for faster downloads but they are presumed and required to serve the *same* thing (borrowing from another register of metaphor, one website is said to be the mirror of another). So, in this first panel of the morning where we have twice as many hosts as guests, we might all say the same thing. Or we could, like the famous *salonnières* of eighteenth-century Paris, compete to outdo each other (a competition, it occurs to me, that has little in common with that exemplar of agonistic hospitality: the potlatch]. Who knows! We have not compared our comments in advance. I do not know which of the two will happen. Like a dinner party, we are all assembled around a table. Now we will see what the conversation brings!

Let me briefly make some (re)introductions. Burcu Gürsel is a comparativist, one of several people here with an undergrad degree from the University of Chicago and the only one, I think, with a PhD from the University of Pennsylvania. She was a postdoctoral fellow at the Freie Universität in Berlin and is now an independent scholar living in Istanbul. She has presented papers at the ACLA, the MLA, and at ASECS and is working on a book manuscript entitled *Invasive Translations: The False-Colonial Performative in French-Ottoman Relations*. Heather Morrison is a historian, with an undergrad degree from IU and a PhD from Louisiana State (where she studied with Sue Marchand, the woman who really put German Orientalism and philhellenism on the map), and is now Associate Professor at SUNY-New Paltz. She has published in the *Journal of Social History*, in *Central European History*, and in *Eighteenth-Century Studies* and is editor of the HABSBERG e-mail list and website. And our host of *hosts* includes Fritz Breithaupt from Germanic Studies, Alex Tipei from History, Guillaume Ansart from French and Italian, and lastly myself. Each commentator will speak for no more than three or four minutes, we will go boy-girl-boy-girl [laughter]—that's the point of the seating plan!—and Fritz, I invite you to first.

**Fritz Breithaupt:** First?! Okay, right. So, you heard it. Three or four minutes, that is all we get. So you have heard of speed dating, this is speed commentating. It's about speed, it isn't about justice! [see his text]

**Alex Tipei:** So, where some people saw differences, I saw similarities. [see her text]

**Guillaume Ansart:** Well, I saw both similarities and differences. I started from the recognition that these two papers deal with two different aspects of hospitality—one in the context of international relations and one in a more private context. But what I saw in both, is that they at least implicitly both trace the formalization of hospitality. Traditionally, hospitality has resisted formalization—formalization through the rules and rituals of diplomacy or through commercialization. In the natural law tradition of political thought from Grotius to Kant, hospitality belongs to the domain of natural, as opposed to positive, law. Pufendorf for example places hospitality along with compassion, liberality, beneficence, among the general duties of humanity. But both papers show the tendency to formalize relations of hospitality. For instance, that someone can become *persona non grata* shows the notion—or the emergence of the notion—of diplomatic immunity. The diplomat, I guess, is immune from punishment (it’s a privilege) and so is expelled instead of punished. In Heather’s paper, she shows the existence of a hospitality industry (at least in Europe). And of course a hospitality industry might be, if you look at hospitality from a traditional perspective, it might be a contradiction in terms. So on the one hand, a more regulated aspect of hospitality and on the other, a formalization through commercial transactions. But both point to the end of the traditional (or fetishistic), *jus naturalis*, notion of hospitality.

**Spang:** For myself, I saw difference. In fact, you could say these two papers have very little to do with each other. You could even go so far—and I guess this would actually be a perception of sameness—as to say that both of them have very little to do with the question of “hospitality” as we discussed it yesterday. They don’t quite return us to the sort of diplomatic encounters that were the focus of the first panel, nor do they return us to hospitality as a form of charity (the theme that seemed to run most strongly through the second panel). In fact, neither of their decidedly peculiar protagonists uses the language of hospitality (unlike the texts about Cameron or the novel studied by Ana Rueda).

But, so then, what are we to do? Declare the papers to be outlaws to each other? *Hors la loi* meaning that they are outside the law, that the law does not apply to them. Does this mean they cannot judge each other? Should we summarily execute them? Would it not be more hospitable to welcome the papers—and the papers’ authors—on their own terms, not trying to force their interests to match those of other papers but acknowledging a difference that is not, maybe, so very great as it initially appears. And now I want to focus very briefly on Heather’s paper. For me, what is most striking is that Dr. Stupitz whines and moans about South Carolina because of the absence of *commercial* hospitality. So I want to repeat what I said yesterday about the possibility that hospitality can only become such an issue in the eighteenth century as a response to increasingly commercialized society. And I wonder if this gives us another way to think about the association of women with hospitality at least in the eighteenth century. The *salonnière*, or the women in *Anastasia*, or in the text Sarah cited—these figures are all quite different from the sociability of seventeenth-century men of letters. And I wonder if this happens (here a nod to the panel that follows this one), if perhaps “hospitality” comes to be marked “feminine” in this period, because an increasingly commercial, patriarchal society knows full well *but cannot admit to itself* that it is women (like words, or goods) who are exchanged. And since it cannot be admitted that women are being exchanged (even though they are), women are instead marked as the domestic, the hospitable, that which stays in its place and receives visitors?

We have had our speed comments. So we will see if our authors want to respond, and then open up for discussion.

**Heather Morrison:** OK. Do you want to go first or shall I, Burcu?

**Burcu Gürsel:** Um . . . well . . . [group chuckles]

**Morrison:** I think I was thinking that . . . I knew the whole, the commercial focus of the hospitality in this paper would come up for discussion, and one thing I started thinking about was Habermas' public sphere argument and how the public sphere originates in coffeehouses and print markets, you know. And so he establishes this economic origin for what becomes this modern exchange of ideas. So does that commercial foundation for the public sphere taint it in some way, you know? And so, I've been really resisting this idea of hospitality being in some way un-pure or not true, which are some of the terms that came up yesterday, if it is a part of a commercial exchange.

And so, that's one thing that I have been thinking about. But in terms of the, you know . . . I think that Dr. Stupicz's, you know, awkward movements through Europe and North America are commercial hospitality but he's also, in part, engaging in diplomatic hospitality. He is one of five men sent by the Holy Roman Emperor, the Habsburg monarch, to go on a botanical imperial expedition. You know, this is meant to be this grand endeavor to replenish the plants, the animals, the minerals of the court collection. And yet, that part of the expedition, too, in many ways shows the limits of empire and the limits of diplomacy. The court decided to send off this group not in their own ship, like Cook had, you know, not within their own vessel. They took post roads, you know, they had letters of credit that were fancy, you know, they were meant to look pretty cool [laughter]. They had seals on them and signatures and a fleur-de-lis watermark and all that sort of stuff, but they're still basically a letter of credit that a private person would've traveled with. And despite being these imperial representatives, they're constantly struggling with finding financing. Two of the gardeners ended up stuck in a shack with a bunch of escaped slaves in Nicaragua for a while, starving over the course of a winter because nobody would recognize these very fancy letters of credit.

And so, this is one thing that, you know, is really interesting to me. That the diplomatic hospitality networks that this group would've expected to be there were not, but commercial hospitality was something that they could rely on. So, I guess that was my attempt to bring together several strings, so I'll stop with that now and let you go, Burcu.

**Gürsel:** Well, the commercial aspect, I think, is an important element to d'Ohsson's relations, too. Both as an individual, which [to Breithaupt] in your comment you pointed to him as an ironic figure who plays with identity, perhaps it's most intimately related to his, you know, incentive for financial gain. But, I think dwelling on his competence with the play of identity raises the question again of (and this is coming from the conference I just went to in Turkey I have to say) the associating of such play with identities particularly with minorities. To this day, I think, it's actually a major part of the stigma that goes with non-Muslim minorities in Turkey; especially as they can be perceived practically in these terms as "privileged," as necessarily privileged minorities, and that goes against historical facts in many ways.

In your comments [to Ansart], actually, I was reminded of the fact that in this case of a diplomatic version of hospitality it's not, perhaps, so much about the inclusion of the stranger into the laws of local governance but actually, like you brought up, an immunity from, perhaps, the local law. So, an inclusion in which the privilege consists of the person's existence in that socie-

ty, but as withheld from the laws that apply to the society in general. So, I think maybe that's something, yet another paradox or contradiction, that I should emphasize more and perhaps develop more.

And, with your [to Tipei] comments, I'm, ... Well, the idea of a multi-ethnic or multi-cultural empire "before the fall"... it is just so compelling, but. ... I'd like to better articulate my position on that in the future, but for now I find myself resistant to that notion because I feel that a switch doesn't just happen, you know. It's not just rupture but we have to think about the continuity, right. So, one question that needs to be answered is how does this, how does this turn come about? What are there roots in this switch to hostility toward what becomes "minority" and how is that hostility rooted in the past?

And, of course, d'Ohsson with his fall from grace and everything is actually one of the lucky ones, perhaps. There's a long list of translators executed brutally in the public eye, etcetera. And, it's interesting that precisely because they lived among Christians and Jews, that's already a point against translators, it makes them potential traitors, right? And every once in a while for no real good reason, actually, no established crime or betrayal, one will be hung, kind of as an example of ... well, an example of this is what *can* happen. So, that has a longer history, right, and that raises the question of, you know, how much is that multiethnic, multicultural empire an established institution, an established fact?

Yeah. Thank you so much.

**Spang:** Scott? I think I had Scott first and then Oz with a little one.

**Scott Juengel:** If it's a little one that follows then go ahead.

**Oz Kenshur:** Well, actually it's just an observation about Dr. Stupicz. It strikes me that he was parodied *avant la lettre* by Swift when it comes to these unnecessary details and that he was satirized by Sterne in *A Sentimental Journey* in the person probably of Mundungus who's a bleaker traveler. And Stupicz somehow manages to amalgamate both of these things that have already been attacked *avant la lettre*. [laughter].

**Breithaupt:** Quite an accomplishment. [laughter].

**Kenshur:** Quite an accomplishment, yes.

**Spang:** Right. If Dr. Stupicz had not existed, Swift and Sterne would have had to have invented him!

**Juengel:** This is maybe more of a comment than anything, but particularly reading Heather's paper and then listening to the discussion a little bit... I'm interested in tracking hospitality's eventfulness because I think it's interesting in Dr. Stupicz's case that, on the one hand as Fritz says, he's boring and bored and obsessed with, sort of, banalities. And I feel like one of the things we're seeing over the course of the papers is the way in which, sort of, the formalization, that sense in which one can begin to *expect* certain codes of hospitality. If we go back to, like, the safe houses [in Dana Rabin's paper], then there has to be this kind of networking that's building up. As opposed to the *Anastasia* case where, as Mary called it, it's an instance of a strategic exemption, in which hospitality is this allegorical, you know, overloaded enterprise.

And so, I'm sort of interested in what makes hospitality an event? What makes it remarkable? Increasingly as we're getting into this—obviously I'm going to be talking [in my paper] about the hospitality industry which is a kind of, you know, anomalous idea. But, part of what it's doing is to secure the idea that hospitality *will* be there when you travel and I feel like Dr. Stupicz is, kind of, giving us the sense, on one hand, that hospitality is to be assumed, it's not particularly extraordinary, but, at the same time, it's so necessary to actual travel. And so, I'm just wondering if you've thought a little bit about how it might be changing in terms of that formalization (I like that word a lot for thinking about how extraordinary or expected it might be)?

**Morrison:** I think I'll tie this back to Alex's point, too, that I didn't quite get to before, when—and Fritz's as well—when comparing how Stupicz and the painter Moll settled very differently into Charleston. Charleston itself is very much structured on welcoming people from outside: it's a trade town and there's a lot of movement in and out. There's organizations entirely structured on welcoming people: there's a German friendly society, the freemasonic lodges bringing people with their letters of recommendation, you know, there's all sorts of these organizations that tie people together. So, there's not really in any way a city or a town that actually is hostile because of the recent war to outsiders, it's very much bringing people in as much as possible for money-making purposes.

For Stupicz, he seems to just see these repeated events as failures of hospitality: you know, the town can't even get fireworks right, and Vienna has, you know, fireworks that are really quite amazing, they give whole theatrical presentations in the form of fireworks in the Prater, but they're celebrating the recent war in Charleston and it's just like phhhhhp [fireworks noise] and then nothing [laughter]. So, the, he keeps coming at these events after events that are not remarkable enough for him and yet he stays, you know, he still seems to settle in. He never does learn English; he settles into the German communities there, but he finds a way to make money. You know, he practices as a doctor, he establishes a close male friend who erects his gravestone, so there's not much known about him out there after he stays.

But he is less of an example of an immigrant, I think, than Moll would be because Moll, like his brother, had always been interested in the idea of adventure and the idea of going elsewhere and setting up elsewhere. So, I think he joined the expedition with the intention of staying in North America, and from the start of his arrival in the U.S. he was trying to make money doing cut-paper miniature silhouettes of the elite in both Philadelphia and Charleston. He set up a drawing academy, he settled in with a free black woman, I believe. And so, his settling in Charleston and taking advantage of the institutions there was very much intentional. I think Dr. Stupicz really settled into North America out of distemper [group laughter].

**Juengel:** Or lack of imagination! [group laughter]

**Morrison:** So rather than, you know, opportunity and freedom (the stereotypical reasons), he was disenchanted with his pay and he did enjoy the legal system of the newly formed United States to sue the leader of the expedition twice [group laughter] and trying to prevent it from moving on; and, he also fundamentally did not want to get on board another ship again [group laughter]. Moll described his journey across the Atlantic as, he wrote, “Stupicz did nothing but whimper and pray” [group laughter]. So, you know, I think in a way he was grumpily assessing all these instances of experiencing, you know, the individual events of hospitality. But collectively it was all better than going back. [group chuckles]

**Juengel:** Right.

**Spang:** Sarah?

**Sarah Knott:** So I think these are maybe a collection of comments, but they flow somewhat from what Scott was saying. The first has to do with commercial hospitality, and it seems right to hold onto the possibility of commercial hospitality, right, to allow it not to be an anachronism, in a sense. But I wonder if, at the same, we want to continue to insist that—as I think we did yesterday—that hospitality is always relational, right. It's always social. And so, we can think of a commercial hospitality made up of taverns and social events, but maybe not a commercial hospitality that extends to roads and to infrastructure. Right? Those seem to me to be different. So that's a sort of... that would narrow where hospitality plays in your paper [Heather].

But then, conversely, I want to ask whether—I know hospitality is not your guys' term, it's yours, so that makes it more complicated—but I also wanted to, I was also wondering about whether there's a way of thinking about landscapes as hospitable. And one of the reasons I ask this is imagining what the historian of science would ask in this room, right. So, what's the classic story from the history of science about the eighteenth century? Well, it would be the new world as extraordinary, fertile place of stuff to be gathered, right; a hospitable environment, in other words, to be gathered to be taken back to the old world. And you have moments of this, right, where your German expedition encounter, rely on, in some ways, enslaved peoples. But this is the story that, sort of, historians of science in early America want to tell, right; they want to tell the story of Native Americans and enslaved blacks as adepts who would form European science, right. And part of the implication there is, perhaps, of a uniquely hospitable landscape for the inquiries of science.

So, I guess my question there is to do with: are we interested in expanding hospitality in that way? Right, by thinking about landscape, and if we are, does that shift some of the kind of comparative story that you're telling here, right, of an early America that is essentially always lagging and always behind progress?

**Morrison:** I briefly in the paper mention the other travel writer and *he* explicitly, over and over and over again over a couple hundred pages of discussing traveling through the United States, does explicitly weigh nature against European conveniences. He complains there's not a single copy of Linnaeus to be had in Philadelphia, yet the abundance of nature there is just so thrilling to him and you know this travelogue talks with a great deal of excitement about all of the things that he sees. But he certainly is one who just wants to gather the material, critique American economic practices and slavery and all those things, but bring it back to Europe.

So, not sure how I would conceptualize the landscapes as hospitality. There's another interesting thing that they're discussing is... looking at this I'm trying to figure out: is this botanical expedition, you know, the disastrous failure I first thought it was when I first flipped through these pages or, you know, it does seem there are many ways in which it can be viewed as a success. And, natural scientists in the late eighteenth century are increasingly saying that for European botanical gardens, you know, for the development of natural history back in Europe they need to pay more attention to areas that are in the same general, you know, climate. And so, people are heading to North America from France, from the Hapsburg monarchy, and England in order to get seeds and plants that would do well in Europe rather than, you know, the Pacific Ocean

world or somewhere in South America where plants would really have to be excessively cared for. So, there seemed to be some sort of affinity, too, between North America and Europe; kind of in the same way that there's more affinity between the culture . . .

**Spang:** Which is why the pineapple<sup>1</sup> [laughter] is the litmus test, because to grow a pineapple in the British isles—which becomes, sort of, the marker of really being able to offer great aristocratic hospitality—requires you to build a glass house and to heat it through the winter; and, thermometers in the nineteenth century even have a marking on them: pineapple temperature (which is how hot you've got to keep your greenhouse). [laughter].

**Juengel:** Talk about a fetish. [laughter].

**Breithaupt:** This is not my question, but it prompts me there was a German solution to this issue [laughter]. I'm going to tell an anecdote, it's not eighteenth-century: but when the German Wall fell (I mean between East and West Germany), there was also, of course, the tropical fruits and so on that were not available in East Germany.

**Spang:** Yes.

**Breithaupt:** So, the cover of a famous cartoon magazine in Germany then showed a typically East German girl holding a cucumber peeled like a banana saying, "Susie from the Zone has her first banana." [laughter]. So, they found a different solution. [laughter].

**Spang:** That's not a pinecone, it's a pineapple. [laughter].

**Breithaupt:** What I just learned from the discussion was something that I admit hadn't been clear to me. I think Guillaume put it in good terms: that both papers are actually concerned with the transition from some older system to a new system connected with hospitality. In the case of Burcu's paper, the diplomats in the old age would be executed; I mean they were stand-ins for the foreign dignitary, the monarch, and if something went wrong in the inter-state relationships or something like that they would be executed. And suddenly, we have this new age of diplomatic immunity where no, the represented and the re-presenter are seen as separate roles, there's a certain expectation of safety. You can get expelled, you know—this case is slightly different because d'Ohsson got expelled for money reasons (well, also for diplomatic ones, I mean he may have sided with the wrong French side) —but nevertheless, I mean—and so on, and so on.

So, suddenly there's a transition on that side. And Heather's paper, of course, also deals with a transition from an old system of hospitality that was very active in Germany where doors were open, anyone could expect... Well, there were two systems; there was the class system that you could always go if you were middle class or whichever class, you could always open the doors of the people in the lower class and they would host you, that was the system. And then there was this apprentice system where you had these hiking people [Ed. note: "journeymen"] who would roam and so on and so on. There was this very well established system and suddenly with the postal service you get a new expectation. This becomes institutionalized; you pay money, but then everyone, it works differently.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Ed. note] Pineapples featured in the graphic design for the conference and were central to Spang's introductory comments.

So then, here's the question for me: if you have this new shift to a new form of hospitality and both of these figures are now actually seen as the first ones, they both actually see that they can make demands, they have rights in it. We have so far in the workshop talked mostly about losses of hospitality and nostalgia for the old form of hospitality, but what we see here is actually much more self-confidence: these people are demanding their rights, they demand hospitality, they expect it. Even the legal suing case, that was actually wonderful to think about too. I mean, actually he's not that stupid. East Germans! [laughter].

The question for me is whether we are really talking about a new age of hospitality? One where you lament the past in order, maybe, only to demand even more.

**Spang:** Lauren?

**Lauren Miller:** Just building on that, too. One of the things in reading both papers that came out for me is the question of religion, and the expectation of hospitality to one's religion. And, you commented, I think, in the case of Dr. Stupicz on his expecting to find a church there in a town that is very different, and even with the legal framework of the paper talking about the understanding of religious toleration or the expectation of—what were the words you used?—"freedom of religious practice" that was built into the legal framework. And I was just... is religion part of this new kind of formulation of hospitality, and to what extent is it expected and/or accommodated? That was just something that I, in reading, was interested in.

**Spang:** Burcu, you have something to say about this or...?

**Gürsel:** Well, it's interesting. I think that traditionally... my sense is that in the Ottoman Empire, you know, the position of the ambassador is just as kind of, an envoy of good will; the ambassador is not expected to engage in any substantial, personal cultural exchange, you know. So then a lot of that duty fell on the translator. And so, to me that's very interesting because of the whole linguistic nexus of the translator and his betrayals, you know, you end up signing a treaty and woops there's this clause there you never intended to put there and everything. There are actual historical incidents like that, I think; some even lead to executions and everything.

But, there's definitely a transition, I think, that the kind of position that this figure, that d'Ohsson, can occupy: it wouldn't be possible just fifty years later. Not only because he's an Ottoman who's then treated as the ambassador of the state, but maybe... You can think of it as in a certain historical era you can have these intermediaries occupying every which position as kind of normalized or normal. But, in the nineteenth century you have to know where you belong, and I think this is actually a cut-off in the empire where you just, you have to kind of be certain that a representative, it's not even what is felt to be self-or-other, but you just have to know now, you have to have a clear boundary of who belongs and who doesn't. And it's very interesting that the minorities could occupy the position of intermediary (even if, with this, you know, sword hanging above your head), but afterwards the institution was abolished, so this ambiguity had to be gotten rid of. You could have your *own* people speaking the other's language, and the other would have their own people speaking *your* language...but the sides are clear.

And, I think a lot of the legalization that those sort of preoccupied with... You're right there's a demand, a clear demand of what kind of hospitality should we be entitled to, what should be our expectation? But, at the same time, this possibility of demand comes with the letter of the law, you have to have it spelled out in legal form and you have to have it made known to, not

just official personalities, but known to the general public through a book like this, a multi-volume book that centers so much on the notion of the law. So, that the demand is vocalized through its standardization and legalization.

**Spang:** Rob? Rob, I think . . .

**Robert Schneider:** Well, yeah, Fritz mentioned rights, and I think it's very interesting to think about hospitality in terms of rights, but I think that also there's another register and that is of privilege. And, we've spoken of this in ways that seem rather ad hoc, but, of course, in an Old Regime society or a court society, privilege was not natural law, but positive law... and yet it was something that was conferred. It had a legal standing, in a sense, but it could be withdrawn, and it just infiltrated all of society in terms of adjudicating and organizing relative sorts of access to power and the like. And, it seems to me that hospitality and even, you know, what we would call (retrospectively) citizenship for people, for foreigners, for Jews, for groups of students was all based upon the privilege of residing. But, of course, the problem with that (and this comes to a head in the eighteenth century), is that because it is a privilege it can be withdrawn and therefore it's seen to be arbitrary and an aspect of absolutism and there's a great push back against that; and so, the emergence of modern notions of citizenship emerged from that.

But, it seems to me that d'Ohsson—without denying the specificity and the uniqueness of the Ottoman political context—really is a sort of another variation on that theme only in terms of the court. I mean, it's common in court societies (I think it's pretty much expected when you enter a court) that you have a great risk. You're an ambassador; you're a courtier; that means you can fall. It's not always execution, it's exile, it's fall from grace, it's expulsion, it's becoming a *persona non grata*, you know, at court; that's just part of the rules of the game. I think he's a very interesting variation on someone who has the privilege of being there, who has hospitality in the court, but knows he's walking a high wire (just like everyone else). And the same goes...

I mean I think that's extended beyond the court in terms of privileged groups in a society which does not recognize rights in the sense that we understand in more modern terms. That the hospitality that you enjoy is provisional and can be withdrawn: that's a different kind of hospitality, but I think it's something that, you know, certainly, it's not just arbitrary, it's codified, it does have a sort of legal status, but it obviously comes to an end at a certain period. I think the court is a particularly pressure-cooker kind of example of that.

**Morrison:** Building on this comment and Fritz's... I think it's even more fitting for these issues to consider the role of the two gardeners who went on this expedition. They were—one was a junior journeyman and one was an *Obergeselle*, the head journeyman of the imperial gardens—and [inaudible due to cough] as they were traveling across Europe and then across the Atlantic they were very much in a serving position. Their rank was sort of like a domestic servant, they were seen as not being independent. They were given passage on board ship as servants, so that when Moll talks about Stupicz shivering and praying, he talks about the gardeners as starving. They were treated poorly and given poor provisions in all sorts of different contexts.

But they, once in America, they continuously acted independently to gather plants. They designed the trunks to send seeds and things back on their own and commissioned carpenters to do it and acted outside the authority of the director; they accompanied shipments back to Vienna and were celebrated upon their return there. And so, when the expedition ended, it was the gardeners who were seen as the successful members of the trip. And, Joseph II wrote on some of the

private discussions of the expedition that the head director would become “nothing but what he was before.” So, he would receive no favors, no advancement, no money from the court, but the gardeners would successfully come to become directors of the Imperial garden at Schönbrunn. In the freemasonic lodge in Vienna they had been taken in as servants, as serving brothers rather than full brothers, but in participating in the lodge in Charleston they had been recognized as full and equal members so when they returned to Vienna that lodge had to recognize them as full master-level masons. So these lower-class people who were seen as not the equals of the others ended up gaining much more in this atmosphere of rights and gaining self-confidence in the whole expedition and Märter certainly did fall in esteem.

**Spang:** Burcu?

**Gürsel:** Yeah, one interesting aspect of privilege here...As you point out, to be a courtier: it's got its own rules, individual privilege, etcetera. But when you look at the group (as I tried to do), as you enlarge the entity that gets privileged, things get more complicated. For instance, the other side... the *underside* of d'Ohsson's privilege is that (as he explains) there's international capitulation context, too, that... also brings in the commercial, international relations aspect. And there, you have a set of privilege that seems to be, you know, granted by the sovereign, but really he's constrained to give these and he really doesn't have much of a choice. So, in that kind of macro-economical aspect, that sort of privilege, economic privilege which individuals can enjoy because of their status as a group... for merchants it's something that the sovereign is constrained to give. So, it's something that's granted, but really not a matter of choice, it's above the Sultan's head, in a sense. So . . .

**Spang:** So Johannes wants to come in with a small comment, and then I've got Jason, Evan, David Clark, and Jimmy.

**Johannes Türk:** Right; small to midsized. [group laughter]. I just want to say... it seems to me that in both papers some questions came up, actually, about where is the *place* of [hospitality]? And I think one way of thinking about it is, you know: it's about a sort of diplomatic immunity—so what happens if people are in a different space? What laws exist? How actually... what is the dimension in which claims (and in which transactions) can take place?

And I think that in the case of, you know, diplomacy has a long history and I'm not sure that... I mean, messengers are killed, but envoys not really. And I think in Ancient Greece it is Hermes, actually, and he's a god, so it's in a way a divine instance that guarantees messengers' safety on a territory that's not part of their culture of origin. And then later it's privilege, so it's the sovereign. And somehow after the Thirty Years' War (when international law comes in), I think that is when the question is discussed: actually, What is diplomatic immunity? And there are two different solutions to it: one is to declare the embassy actually a sovereign territory, so part of the territory of the other country. The other is to see the diplomat as a representative of a foreign sovereign. There's a whole debate in Grotius and others about what the status actually is of someone who is abroad,

And in a certain strange way I ask myself, you know: what is actually the case of someone travelling to the colonies? Because, on the one hand, there's the economy and is the economy actually taking over burdens of hospitality that are no long part of a certain sovereign welcome? right? For example, the way we see it in the *Odyssey*, the way that just the guy from the next

city-state receives someone, which includes nourishing him, which includes giving him a certain security... So, is the economy just picking up on something that's no longer part of it? And how is it actually ...if you make claims within the legal system of the place you travel to, you know, are you still an envoy somehow, are you still considered a representative? And that's when the question of empire in the modern sense massively comes in, right? What is the status—and to this day, right, there are only a few countries in the world where you can actually process claims that concern wrongdoing in other countries. Is that international law or is it not?

So, the relationship between the economy, international law, and imperialism seem to me something that comes up to me as a question, and I phrased it as a comment because it seemed to me to also have a lot to do with what different people in the discussion have said. So, sorry for being mid-sized. [group laughter].

**Spang:** So, I want to move us along quickly. So, Ana if your comment is really a little one. [group laughter].

**Ana Rueda:** Yes. Now?

**Spang:** Now.

**Rueda:** Well, I kept thinking as I read through Heather's paper the parallel with the Spanish botanical expedition in Spanish America. It was a huge, huge imperial enterprise even though Spain was already on the decline as an empire. But, I think that these enterprises both the one you described, the botanical enterprises, which I think were successful in the Spanish context because they populated the botanical gardens in Madrid (which you can still see). And so, the questions that I have has to do with first the concept of success and failure, which you described earlier and I felt some hesitancy on your part, and I would like for you to elaborate a little bit more on that. And then, I have a question about—another small question if I may?

**Spang:** This has already gotten rather long, and I've got four people ready to go. Jason?

**Jason Kelly:** Yeah, I'm thinking of Heather's paper specifically here and the philosophical voyages of the period, which this botanical voyage kind of fits into which is, you know, not just a way of describing what you see, but also a mode of traveling, a mode of seeing, perhaps, and engaging with that world. And, you know, part of me, I want to defend Dr. Stupid a little bit here [laughter] and maybe try to frame him in this context. I'm wondering, you know, he's spending all this time talking about roads and hospitality, for example, and it's very clearly a proxy for state centralization and power and authority and control. And maybe this is where his philosophy is coming in, in this kind of very empirically boring way, maybe there is a philosophical framework that he's putting together here.

You know, I'm thinking of travel to other places as well, not just what this voyage is doing, but what other voyages do. For example, the travel in the Ottoman Empire that begins in the 1750s—the British start traveling not just for trade, but for exploration and study of classical remains—the *fermans* granted by the Ottoman authorities are meant to guarantee hospitality. But in regions where hospitality isn't extended it is considered an indication of loss of control. And what's kind of interesting is that it isn't just the *ferman* that's guarantying protections and hospitality, but it's also the British government which is sending letters to its ambassadors and their

consuls and these are often negotiated. I'm thinking specifically of one voyage in the 1750s, these two travellers (James Stuart and Nicholas Revett) are actually sending letters back to James Porter (the ambassador) and they're saying the consul needs to be providing us with hospitality. Tensions actually continue to rise, because James Porter is unable to control his consul and one of the travelers actually punches the consul and then has to leave Athens for fear of reprisal. So, anyway... I'm just thinking [of hospitality in relation to] state centralization and control of authority.

**Morrison:** Yeah. You know, earlier Sarah had challenged the idea of infrastructure being a part of hospitality ... but really thinking about the roads leading to Schönbrunn: those are explicitly designed for processions and for displaying order and imperial order and control over nature and they are very rigorously kept up to make sure they are smooth, that people are comfortable coming in. And, you know, in other cases, where Stupicz was mentioning the paved roads, the use of stone on roads, it does seem that's a sign of organization—you know, some sort of political ability to create that—or economic wealth. And those paved roads are things that are proffered to people. They are enjoyed by locals, but they're out there for people coming in.... And I think very much... Yeah, I would agree that either lack of control or, you know, power and wealth are in some ways interpreted by Stupicz as . . .

**Spang:** Sarah wanted to say something again.

**Knott:** Yeah, just to respond to that. It seems to me that if you were to go and ask about hospitality in the early American state, the young United States, that you would go to two places: you would go to immense concern about what should be the ritual, the diplomatic rituals of the young republic and you would go to discussions of asylum, and, in particular, the young republic's determination for Europeans to have the right of expatriation. So that you can shed your affiliation with the British crown in order to become a U.S. citizen, right? So there's much more concern about expatriation than about policing citizenship in the early republic. But, I think if you were going to go to that same set of political texts and ask about infrastructure what you would find is not a rhetoric of hospitality, but rather one of improvement. And so, we might want to think about what kind of other concepts jostle up against "hospitality" when we think about issues of infrastructure. And, you know, I don't think—for example, the discussion around the foundation of the U.S. Postal Service and the taverns and roads that support it, right, in 1789—is a discussion about hospitality. At least, it wasn't for the actors concerned.

**Spang:** Erin?

**Erin Myers:** I'd like to return to what Jason said and maybe ask if there's another way to think about the "boring" journals. I kind of have two questions: one is whether he was writing something else at the same time. So that the letters that he wrote represent more of a juicy intellectual experience as opposed to the journal? And then, also, maybe can we think of the journal as a sort of mnemonic? So everything that he records is a way of marking the passage of time and reassuring himself that he still exists [group laughter].

**Morrison:** There does not seem to be... I've run across *one* mention of a letter that he wrote and that's it! The letter he wrote was to the vice-chancellor of the state in the Hapsburg monarchy

complaining about the director of the expedition. [group laughter]. So everybody seems to want to defend him to me... I love him, he's wonderful [group laughter], but I think he's a sort of charming, grumpy complainer. It does make him entertaining.

But, yeah, I think there is a difference of intention between the two travel narratives: the one marking his progress across Europe versus the one of him in the surrounds of Charleston. The one that's him going across Europe (from what Märter writes about it when he sends it back to the vice-chancellor), it seems to be that he intended this to be his big scientific contribution. So, [she laughs] he... There was a great deal of tension between Stupicz and Märter because Märter was named the director; Stupicz was not. But Stupicz had been recommended by the head botanist—then the most prominent botanist in the Habsburg monarchy—over Märter. At the Charleston phase of things: there Märter actually was requesting that Stupicz keep the journal, so Märter could try to keep him on task and make him actually do the work of collecting. So, he was requested to write this one, and that's why I think there are so many mentions of sweating, “it was hot ... I was wet... [group laughter] ...it was a horrible inconvenience to sleep on the ground.” So, in the European stage of the travel narrative he's recording the situations of eating and sleeping in different places, but it seems to be of a different tone; whereas, the Charleston's surrounds are, you know, “I'm trying very hard here, but it's horrible” sort of tone there.

**Spang:** We've got less than fifteen minutes, and I have at least three more major question/comments. Evan?

**Evan Haefeli:** The thing that struck me—and I'm also in the pro-Stupicz camp, if only because he's a fabulous source and I'm sure you're having a lot of fun with that. He pays attention to little things and little people and their interactions... And my basic point or question (or what I see going on here) is the importance of class in shaping the experience and nature or predicaments of hospitality that one can and cannot have. I'm wondering if that might... I have no clue, but Stupicz, it seems that some of his problem is that he's not, you know, he's not that high up on the social [ladder], so he's paying attention to all these little things. And, I'm wondering if Fritz's typology of you know—d'Ohsson, the ironic shape shifter, unreliable guy; or Stupicz—if that isn't also partly a reflection of that issue. That it's, it's ...the social position of the characters as well as the kind of cultural flexibility or cultural, yeah, malleability that they have.

**Morrison:** Yeah, I think that's true. He's paying very close attention to what respect is accorded to him and what he receives. I think it's class, but it's also region: he's actually not German, he's from Transylvania or some people argue he may be Croatian. No one's really sure! There aren't many records out there of him, but German is his second language and it's not very good. And, yeah being from one of these outlier states and having lived—

**Breithaupt:** German is his second language? Because his first name is German, at least that's the German spelling—

**Morrison:** Yeah, yeah, but from it appears to me from his writing that's it's very clearly a second language, yeah. The person who recommended him claimed that he spoke eight languages fluently. So that seems to indicate Slovakian languages, including German and Latin, but he did not speak English or French.

**Spang:** David?

**David Clark:** Thank you. I know we're running out of time, but I'll speak very quickly. Just—

**Spang:** No, that's not necessary.

**Clark:** First of all, for Dr. Stupicz. I wonder if there's a way of thinking about the banality of the record otherwise than as privation? In that, is he creating a kind of space for the unremarkable, you know, the non-thrilling? That there's a place in the world and in life and in letters (and in the life of letters) for the non-thrilling, or perhaps there should be [group chuckles]. ... For those, you know, little unremembered acts of annoyance and difficulty. You know, the little difficulties, not the consequential difficulties, but the... in other words, the everyday difficulties. And, I wonder whether or not there's a kind of way the text or the narrative clears the space for that, but that because of what we are and the expectations that we bring to these archives we're hoping and we're looking for the assertive, the agentive, the thrilling and maybe miss these smaller details—one.

Two: I hope we over the next many hours get to the return to what is for me Sarah's wonderful question. And I guess when we get to animals, that's where we'll circle back to the question [of whether] hospitality is irreducible to humanity? If hospitality is only about human beings what... in other words, if hospitality is a human privilege or a human problem what does that do to hospitality? In other words, what happens when it's so closely identified with humanity that it's only imagined to be a human possibility? And, what happens generally to hospitality when we start to think about the possibility of non-human forms of hospitality? And not only non-human in the sense of environments—although I think that is a fascinating possibility, and the animals that live in that environment—but also things like conceptual forms of hospitality and inhospitality? The concepts that are hospitable or inhospitable, not easily or simply identified as human, but as something non-anthropological. In other words, I wonder about centering hospitality on the *anthropos* and making discussions of hospitality anthropological or only anthropological in nature.

But one more—and this I suppose is the largest question and really just a kind of open question for me: is hospitality irreducible to its codification? We've heard lots here about how it's almost impossible to think about it, except in terms of its codification and its commercialization, its historical specificity, and I think these are all extraordinarily important... but I also wonder whether we strip hospitality of something if we only think of it as reducible to its practices. Or, is there something—and maybe this returns to Scott's, you know, opening point that there is an event-like quality to hospitality—analogue in my mind to a kind of act of faith or a wager or a crediting? I'm thinking of these letters of credit and how they didn't work and the ways in which that only reminds me repeatedly of the risk, the event-like risk, that goes with hospitality (offered or taken up) that isn't, strictly speaking, about exchange. Even though (in our world) risk, speculation, wagering seem almost always to do with commercialization, commodification, the making and taking of money...but there is also... I'd like to believe that there are also acts of faith, exhibitions of the Self to the Other that are passive and wagered and... therefore, always exposed to the possibility of violence and of disavowal that aren't reducible to codes and transactions and so forth.

**Spang:** Now, suddenly this is about the “Play” workshop *and* about “Exemplarity” [group laughter].<sup>2</sup> Tracey, five minutes ago, you wanted to say something little about the little and the uneventful?

**Tracey Hutchings-Goetz:** Yeah, well and it’s linked to the ending of your comment and to Scott’s... and it concerns the idea of ease and, you know, Dr. Stupicz’s inability to be easy (basically). I mean, that text is, in many ways, inhospitable in its repetition of all of these details, right? And he’s in some ways just a bad guest, because he won’t be easy and commercial hospitality is in so many ways about making the guest easy, erasing labor, right. To make it seem like, “oh, this [chocolate] mint just appeared!” right? You know, no one put it there. So, I just wanted to kind of throw that out there and see if others found it productive?

**Spang:** And then I also have Scott and Dana wanting to make small comments.

**Juengel:** Just very quickly and David sort of got there in his third point... I’ve been thinking a lot about whether hospitality requires locality, like requires a place? And I feel like we’re moving into an affective register more and more. I think there’s a kind of, I mean, even when we’re talking about the novel we need frames. Like we can talk about the novel being inviting, but we need some sort of spatialization. It makes me wonder: do you have to have something to be host to, in some sense? Or at what point does it... what is the critical threshold that it lets loose of locality in some way? So . . .

**Dana Rabin:** And I just wanted to add to risk and credit: trust. That it’s about that door will be open. So adding to a series of . . .

**Spang and Rabin:** Trust.

**Spang:** So that if you’re risking, there’s also some element of trust that allows you to get to the point of being willing to risk. Is that it?

**Rabin:** Or your expectation is based on that.

**Spang:** Some minimal level of trust. David? ... Oh everybody wants to go [group laughter]. Does someone have one big question and I’m going to end on that and then segue into the next one, but right now I have David, Ana, and Adela all wanting to make very short comments. [group laughter].

**Clark:** I just... Well, yes, trust, with labor and risk, and I’m just thinking of how Kant finishes the very last and obviously sort of separated-out paragraph of *Towards Perpetual Peace*. He’s imagining, you know, can there... is there such a thing as peace? and he says that, you know, we hope for peace and then the German unfolds in such a way that it becomes actually “what I have is a hope for hope for peace.” Which to me is a lovely, process of conceptual contraction down to some nub about a trust. That little unremarkable, but extraordinary thing fundamental to sociality—

---

<sup>2</sup> See *The Workshop* 1 (June 2013) and 2 (June 2014) for abstracts and discussions from the two previous Indiana Center for Eighteenth-Century Studies workshops.

**Rabin:** To all...

**Clark:** Trust.

**Spang:** Ana, Adela?

**Rueda:** OK, I will try to say this fast. As far as the banality of the record: I think this has to be discussed in the context of the conventions of the European travelogues by national identities because you cannot generalize. In... there are certain conventions about how you record these things, and often it's nature, it's the landscape that's friction, that stops your progress or makes it difficult to advance and to move from place A to place B and all of those things become horribly annoying. The pebble in the shoe, the bump in the road, the bad wine: OK, so those things are conventionally inscribed in these narratives as part of generic conventions and they're different for British travelers, for German travelers, for Spanish travelers, for Italian travelers.

**Spang:** Adela?

**Adela Maria Ramos:** Yeah, I waited until the end for a reason, which is because I think that the conclusion of your [of Heather's] paper opens up an interesting question about the post-history or the history of post-hospitality or when the guest becomes an immigrant or becomes a citizen. And, it's interesting that this particular guest chooses not to learn the language and kind of opens up a retroactive questioning of what kind of traveler and guest he is, if as a citizen he refuses to learn the language.

**Spang:** Jimmy? and then we must end.

**Jimmy Casas Klausen:** Yes, so just very quickly I wondered actually if, well actually I want to respond to the thing about whether hospitality is only human. Because it's in the eighteenth century—the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—that we get all these wild stories about the wild children of Lithuania or Hestia, but those are stories of adoption.... And so, adoption, getting adopted by the bears or adopted by the wolves is sort of an interesting question and is that hospitality or not?

But then, I wondered, actually if we could think about d'Ohsson as also a collector, a collector of languages? And how that might—how thinking about translation in those terms—might actually sort of bring the papers together in sort of an interesting way. There's no time to discuss that, [group laughter] but I think it might be interesting...

**Spang:** We have *collected* some really fascinating comments I think, so let's thank the paper authors and everyone who participated. [applause] We will take a fifteen minute break.