



ETHNOGRAPHIA

ET FOLKLORISTICA

Carpathica
19.

Approaches to
Historiography

ETHNOGRAPHICA ET FOLKLORISTICA
CARPATHICA 19.

2016

Ethnographica et Folkloristica Carpathica 19.

Edited by
Vilmos Erős
Róbert Káli
László Dávid Törő
Máté Kavecsánszki



Debrecen, 2016

Ethnographica et Folkloristica Carpathica 19.
Műveltség és Hagyomány XXXVII.

Approaches to Historiography

Head of the Editorial Board
Elek Bartha (Debrecen)

Editorial Board
Veikko Anttonen (Turku)
Matthias Gorzolja (Würzburg)
Róbert Keményfi (Debrecen)
Gülay Mirzaoglu (Ankara)
Flavius Solomon (Iași)

Publication Sponsored by
OTKA, NKFIH K115886; MTA-DE Ethnology Research Group, Department of Ethnology
University of Debrecen,

Publisher's readers
Vilmos Erős
Endre Kiss
András Lajos Kiss
Csaba Lévai
Ferenc Velkey

ISSN 0139–0600 Ethnographica et Folkloristica Carpathica
ISSN 0580–3594 Műveltség és Hagyomány
ISBN 978-963-473-951-7
© Authors, 2016
© Department of Ethnology, University of Debrecen, 2016

Cover design by: József Török
Arch of Ianus sketch by Giovanni di Velabro (1700's); Statue of Ianus found in Regöly, Hungary

DEPARTMENT OF ETHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF DEBRECEN
Egyetem tér 1.
H-4032 Debrecen
Hungary

Printed in Debrecen by Kapitális Ltd.

CONTENT

<i>Foreword</i> (Vilmos Erős)	7
<i>László L. Lajtai</i> : Some of the key concepts of national history in the Hungarian history textbooks during the long nineteenth century	12
<i>Jo Tollebeek</i> : A Domestic Culture. The mise-en-scène of modern historiography	28
<i>Endre Kiss</i> : Le nouveau modèle de l'histoire et Hermann Broch	44
<i>László Dávid Törő</i> : Der Streit zwischen Harold Steinacker und Ákos Tímon	54
<i>Radu Márza</i> : The Romanian Historians and the Propaganda: Five Profiles (1914–1946)	67
<i>Greta-Monica Miron</i> : Between Scientific Rigor and Patriotic Duty. The Historical Discourse of the Romanian Scholars from Cluj during the Interwar Period	93
<i>Vilmos Erős</i> : Spiritual history/Geistesgeschichte-cultural history-intellectual history-postmodern.	105
<i>Áron Szele</i> : The historical teleology and worldview of Hungarian fascism in the 1930's–1940's	115
<i>András Lajos Kiss</i> : Probleme der Tatsache in der russischen, ostdeutschen und polnischen geschichtswissenschaftlichen Epistemologie (1960–1985)	141
<i>Róbert Káli</i> : To the History of Quantitative and Social History in Hungary in the 1960–70s	155
<i>Martina Pillíngová</i> : The Comparison of current Slovak and Hungarian history textbooks for grammar schools.	168
<i>István M. Szijártó</i> : The capacities of microhistory	191
<i>Appendix</i>	199
1. Literature about the medieval Hungarian historical writing and thinking in foreign languages	199
2. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking during the 16th-18th centuries in foreign languages	201
3. Literature about the Transylvanian Saxon historical writing and thinking in foreign languages	204

4. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking in the 19th century and during the dualism in foreign languages	210
5. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking during the interwar period in foreign languages	218
6. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking after 1945 in foreign languages	221
7. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking after 1990 in foreign languages	226
<i>About the Authors</i>	227

Foreword

The content of this book is based on the conference held on 13–14th November, 2014 at the University of Debrecen. It was organized by our work-group in historiography, which operates in the Institute of History of the same university.

First of all, we would like to offer a few introductory remarks regarding the work-group. It was established in 2007 to provide a forum for the representatives of different humanities and social sciences (history, literature, classical philology, ethnography, sociology, philosophy etc.) to exchange ideas and formulate a common network for discussion.¹ The work-group operates on different levels. We are holding lecture series, book presentations, workshops,² and the members of the group also participate at conferences on the subject of historiography regularly. Some members of the work-group are doctoral students, and we also discuss the dissertation proposals of them at our meetings. We regularly organize conferences, which provide us the opportunity to summarize the work recently carried out in the field of historiography, and also to establish new forms and directions of collaboration. We have already held four conferences. Our first conference commemorated the work of the noted Hungarian historian Bálint Hóman (1885–1951)³ on the occasion of the 125th anniversary of his birth. We discussed different aspects of historiography at our second conference, which was held in Debrecen in 2011.⁴ Our third conference was jointly organized by our work-group and the Atelier workshop of the Loránd Eötvös University of Budapest. The topic of this conference was historical writing and thought during the post World War II period in Hungary.⁵ This conference was held in Budapest and could attract a wide audience from Hungary and abroad.

¹ See more: Erős, „Egy historiográfiai munkacsoport születése.” As well as Erős–Takács (eds.), *Tudomány és ideológia között*, 3–5.

² Cf. *Roumanian History written by Hungarians in foreign languages*. (Writing the Roumanian History Abroad. Workshop, Debrecen. 12-th. February, 2013); As well as Porciani–Raphael, *The Making of a Profession* (2010); Historiography workgroup, Debrecen. 2013. September. Workshop with Jo Tollebeek.

³ See more about Hóman Cf. Újváry–Csurgai (eds.) *Hóman Bálint, a történész és a politikus* (2011).

⁴ Cf. Erős–Velkey (eds.), „A historiográfia műhelyében” (2012).

⁵ Cf. Erős–Takács (eds.), *Tudomány és ideológia között* (2012).

All these developments and activities provided us the opportunity to establish an international network of scholars. This is the reason why we decided to organize our first international conference in 2014. Many well-known Hungarian and foreign experts of the field had shown interest in the conference, but due to limited funding, we were forced to reduce the extent of the conference. Under such circumstances we decided to focus on the mutual connection of Austrian and Hungarian historiography as the new central topic of the conference. This idea was not completely new. It is among the original aims of our work-group to establish scholarly cooperation with such institutions as the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Loránd Eötvös University of Budapest, Central European University (Budapest), and the National Archives of Hungary. On the occasion of his scholarly trips to Vienna the writer of the present lines had already met with such representatives of the Austrian profession as Professor Gernot Heiss and Dr. Karel Hruza, and we discussed the feasibility of common projects with the mutual participation of Austrian and Hungarian colleagues. As the first sign of such cooperation Professor Alois Kernbauer invited me and one of my doctoral students to present papers at the University of Graz about historical writing and thought in Hungary.⁶

The program of the international conference reflects these developments. The presentations of the first day of the conference addressed the problems of historical writing and thought in Romania and Hungary and in the wider sense of the word in Eastern Europe in general. There were papers about the relationship of Romanian historians and Transylvania, the problems of microhistory, the correlation of spiritual history with cultural history and postmodern. Other colleagues presented papers about the methodological development of history in Eastern Europe after 1945, and the attempts to introduce quantitative methods of economic history in Hungary during the 1960–70s.

The working language of the first day was English. Due to the fact that the second day was about the connections of Austrian and Hungarian historiography, the working language of this day was German. The participants lectured on Aurél Ignác Fessler, the so called "labanc" historians (János Majláth, Alajos Mednyánszky) who belonged to the circles of Joseph von Hormayr, the debate between Harold Steinecker and Ákos Timón about the Hungarian constitutional history, Max Weber, the different Austrian interpretations of 1848/49 and the perception of history by the leaders and ideologists of the social democratic movement in Austria.

⁶ The volume is under publication. The conference in Kufstein in 2014 was a part of the cooperation of the study of the relationships between Austrian and Hungarian historians. More about the conference Cf. Böröndi–Deák, „Háború és béke” (2015).

Similarly to many such conference volumes, this book does not contain all the papers presented at the conference, since some participants decided not to submit edited studies of their conference presentations. On the other hand, we decided to include studies of such historians (László L. Lajtai, Martina Pillingova, Áron Szele, Jo Tollebeek) who for different reasons did not participate at the conference. The reason of this is that these scholars had already established strong connections with our work-group. We discussed the book of one of them (László L. Lajtai), and some others presented papers at one of our meetings or published studies in one of our publications.

The title of this volume is „Approaches to Historiography”. It refers to one of the most important lessons of our previous events: there are many ways and methods of dealing with historiography. Some of the contributors to this volume argue that historiography is rather close to the history of ideas or at least their writings are inspired by it or rely on conceptual history and hermeneutics (the studies of László L. Lajtai and Pál S. Varga can be mentioned here). According to some others the anthropological aspects of historiography recently came to the fore (Jo Tollebeek), and there are scholars who imply that the philosophy of history and epistemology could be integral parts of historiography (Endre Kiss, András Kiss Lajos, Vilmos Erős). Some of them maintain that one of the main tasks of historiography is to discover the antecedents of modern social and economic history (Róbert Káli), and some others are trying to analyze the different national discourses and are drawing lessons from them (Greta Miron, László Dávid Törő). There are also historians who examine interactions between politics and historical writing (Radu Mârza); and there is a comparative analysis of how national ideologies affected modern high school textbooks of history in Hungary and Slovakia (Martina Pillingova).

Naturally one of the studies does not fully represent the author's comprehensive view (if she or he has one at all) about the message of historiography, but it can be an indication and a starting point for future orientations. One of the common features of most of the contributions is that they investigate historiography from a *historical* and not from a *normative* point of view.⁷ But there is one exception. On the basis of his ideas developed in his former studies and books,⁸ István M. Szijártó is trying to conceptualize a kind of *Historik*.⁹ According to him microhistory is not a historical, but a normative phenomenon. He argues that microhistory is superior to previous approaches to

⁷ Cf. Erős, „*Van-e a történelemnek elmélete?*” 55–63.

⁸ See Magnússon–Szijártó: *What is Microhistory?* (2013).

⁹ See Droysen, *Grundriss der Historik* (1868).

history, and as a result, future historians should accept and pursue this paradigm.¹⁰

We attached to the essays an appendix containing the literature on Hungarian historical writing published in foreign languages. This bibliography is far from complete, of course. Nevertheless, we deem it as a first step towards one of the main aims of our work-group, namely to compose a comprehensive database of the scholarly literature concerning Hungarian historical writing and thought.

Still, this bibliography in its present state could serve as a valuable tool for those scholars who do not read Hungarian. But it is important for some other reasons. We can address by the help of it such questions as how the language of this scholarly literature of historiography has changed during time, or the role of emigrant historians, who composed their works in somewhat marginal position. Does immigrant historians belong to the historical profession of Hungary or the country in which they are working? Should we consider the histories of the national minorities of historical Hungary (e. g. the works of the Saxons of Transylvania) an integral part of Hungarian historical writing, or not? How should we interpret the oeuvre of such persons, who were not professional historians (István Bibó, György Lukács, László Németh, Oszkár Jászi), but had a deep effect on historical writing and thought in Hungary and abroad?

It is our deep conviction that the addressing of these problems bring us closer to answering the major question if Hungarian historical writing is embedded in European historical writing, or not? Recently, this became a major issue in Hungarian historical profession.¹¹ The present bibliography is certainly far from complete, and is clearly not sufficient to become a basis of the thorough analysis of these problems. Nevertheless, it is good enough to be the starting point of such investigations, and to inspire scholars to amend it.

¹⁰ Cf. my notes about this problem in the study of Vilmos Erős.

¹¹ Cf. for example the studies in Századok, 2013. Kövér, "Fordulat, forradalom után? A magyar gazdaságtörténet-írás a nemzetközi trendek tükrében" Századok, 189–204. Gyáni, "A posztmodern és a magyarországi történetírás" Századok 177–188. Pók, "Eszmetörténeti kutatások a nemzetközi és hazai történettudományban" Századok 205–213. Frank, "Magyarország az újabb angol-amerikai történeti irodalomban" Századok 215–223. Ormos, "Lebet-e magyar történelmet írni egyetlenes történelem nélkül?" Századok 167–176.

Bibliography

- Böröndi, Lajos – Deák, Ernő. „Háború és béke”. *Az I. világháború (1914–1918) előzményei, lefolyása és következményei*. Felsőpulya/Oberpullendorf, 2014. szeptember 6–7. Wien/Bécs: Sodalitas, 2015.
- Droysen, Johann Gustav. *Grundriss der Historik*. Leipzig: Veit, 1868.
- Erős, Vilmos. „Egy historiográfiai munkacsoport születése”. In: *A historiográfia műhelyében*. Edited by Erős, Vilmos – Velkey, Ferenc, 5–8. Történeti Tanulmányok, XIX. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet, 2011 (2012).
- Erős, Vilmos – Takács, Ádám (eds.), „*Tudomány és ideológia között. Tanulmányok az 1945 utáni magyar történetírásról.*” Budapest: ELTE Eötvös Kiadó, 2012.
- Erős, Vilmos – Velkey, Ferenc (eds.), „*A historiográfia műhelyében.*” Történeti Tanulmányok, XIX. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet, 2011 (2012).
- Erős, Vilmos: „Van-e a történelemnek elmélete?” In: *Mikes International. Hungarian Periodical for Art, Literature and Science.* (2014): 55–63.
- Frank, Tibor. „Magyarország az újabb angol–amerikai történeti irodalomban”. *Századok*, 147/1. (2013): 215–223.
- Gyáni, Gábor, „A posztmodern és a magyarországi történetírás.” *Századok*, 147/1. (2013): 177–188.
- Kövér, György, „Fordulat, forradalom után? A magyar gazdaságtörténet-írás a nemzetközi trendek tükrében.” *Századok*, 147/1. (2013): 189–204.
- Magnússon, Sigurður Gylfi– Szijártó, M István, *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Ormos, Mária: „Lehet-e magyar történelmet írni egyetemes történelem nélkül?” *Századok*, 147/1. (2013): 167–176.
- Pók, Attila, „Eszmetörténeti kutatások a nemzetközi és hazai történettudományban.” *Századok*, 147/1. (2013): 205–213.
- Porciani, Ilaria – Raphael, Lutz. *The Making of a Profession. Atlas of European Historiography. (The Making of a Profession 1800–2005.)*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Ujváry, Gábor – Csurgai, Horváth József (eds.). *Történeti átértékelés. Hóman Bálint, a történész és a politikus*. Budapest: Ráció Kiadó, 2011.

Some of the key concepts of national history in the Hungarian history textbooks during the long nineteenth century

In this paper, we propose to outline the development of some key concepts of Hungarian national history based on a particular set of sources being of crucial importance for the inculcation of the cultural nation-building process. After providing the reader with a sketch of the conceptual background and the institutional framework of teaching the own history of the people/country, some topics of central ideological importance will be exposed and made decipherable by scrutinizing a multitude of texts of history textbooks which were effectively in use between the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 20th century in Hungary.

A conceptual framework in change

Undoubtedly, it is the abrupt dissolution of the Kingdom of Hungary or “Lands of the Crown of St Stephen” (i.e. Hungary proper along with Croatia-Slavonia and Transylvania) at the end of the First World War that constitutes the most obvious landmark in the centuries old evolution of the Hungarian concept of nation. However, from the viewpoint of conceptual history and cultural history in general the outset of the transmutation of the traditional concept of nation in Hungary can be traced back to a much earlier date, at least to the last decades of the 18th century and is closely connected with the multifaceted challenges brought about by the deployment of modernity. Therefore, it seems perhaps not completely irrelevant to draw a parallel between the chronology of the maturation of the concept of modern nation in Hungary and the temporal framework of the liminal period called *Sattelzeit* or *Schwelienzeit*,¹ between the middles of the 18th and 19th centuries.

As a result of some decades of travail, the concept of modernizing nation in Hungary widened itself considerably in political sense from 1848 onwards by

¹ Brunner-Conze-Koselleck (eds.), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (1972–1992); Koselleck, *Futures Past* (1985).

incorporating all the inhabitants of the country, on the one hand, while being narrowed down gradually, on the other, along linguistic boundary lines. In regard to conceptual history, it is not less illuminating, however, to focus our attention on a persistent structural analogy as well, which can be unfolded if one carefully compares the centuries old, though never defined, pre-modern Hungarian concept of nation (*natio Hungarica*) with its direct inheritor, usually called after its legal wording by the Act XLIV of 1868 (*On the equality of rights of the nationalities*) as “one nation in political respect”. The traditional division, pertaining to the inhabitants of Hungary concerning their exercise of political rights, between *populus* (i.e. *natio* in the sense of people representing the entire population of the country in the Diet) and *plebs* (i.e. people without any collective or individual political rights) succeeded by another asymmetry, from this time on chiefly not of legal and social but of cultural relevancy due to the overall result of the Hungarian language reform dating from the late 1770s and the introduction of Magyar as official language of the public sphere in Hungary.² The new distinction was between the *politically unitary nation* or, in shorter form, “political nation” encompassing all citizens of the country regardless of any social, denominational or ethnic distinction and the so-called *nationalities* deprived of collective political rights in spite of being fully recognised as distinct ethno-cultural unities within the Hungarian state. As a consequence, the comprehensive renewal of the concept of nation in Hungary entailed the inevitable revaluation of the official language bringing about the challenge of (self-)Magyarization more and more difficult to escape for those who were not captivated by the prospects of the cultural outcome of a dominantly Magyar-speaking Hungarian nation-building project.

Moreover, the process of gradual Magyarization confined not only to the public life but affected the practice of underlying Magyarization of the collective memory, too, since the symbolic efficiency of it started to become ideologically and politically overburdened and even undermined as a logical consequence of the ongoing split by ethno-cultural lines of the previously more or less

² Reacting initially against the josephinist language reform (1784) which tried to Germanize the education and public administration even in Hungary, the Hungarian Diet commenced enacting the so-called „laws on language” as early as from 1791 on. It is after more than fifty years long “tug-of-war” between the Diet and the court of Vienna that the former’s efforts were crowned by the success of the Act II of 1844 (*On the Hungarian language and nationality*) resulting that instead of the Latin Hungarian became the official language in Hungary (except in the *Militärgrenze* and some central public institutions continuing to use German). During the neo-absolutism the German administration returned for some years and finally the Austro-Hungarian Settlement restored the official status of the Hungarian within the Kingdom of Hungary (with the exception of Croatia-Slavonia where the Croatian became official after the *Nagodba* – Act XXX of 1868). Szekfű, *Iratok* (1926).

unanimously professed traditional Hungarian patriotism. The latter has been recently called by the Hungarian historiography as “*Hungarus* consciousness” or “*Hungarus* patriotism”. Their adherents (the so-called *Hungari*) were recruited mostly from those early intellectuals who studied abroad during the long period when it was not allowed to establish protestant universities in Hungary and defended vehemently the cultural achievements of their beloved country against any intellectual disdain coming from abroad. Most of them were Lutherans and originated from the western and northern part of the kingdom.³ As they usually came from regions where the knowledge of Hungarian language was quasi-absent or rather poor, their common *lingua franca* was Latin (and later on but only temporarily German). While the 18th century can be assessed as the heyday of “*Hungarus* patriotism”, the end of the century made it already clear that the cultural nation-building in Hungary was about to commence so their “days were numbered”.⁴ By the 1830s it became obvious that from that time on only those intellectual performances and artefacts could be regarded as pertaining to the genuine Hungarian national heritage which were articulated in (the renewed) Hungarian language,⁵ so the last of the *Hungari* became forced to take either the road of modern Hungarian nationalism along with its full-fledged (self-)Magyarizing program or that of the Austrian imperial patriotism and, as a consequence, the moral alienation from the national-liberal public opinion getting increasingly stronger in the 1840s. Nevertheless a third way opened up, too, by cultivating rather any of the other vernaculars spoken in Hungary and striving to raise it to a position of equal rank with the successfully self-officialising Hungarian. This latter option meant, however, the inevitable way of gradual emotional dissimulation from the common country and its past, just as the uneasy endurance of the culturally second-rate role falling to those who became part one of the nationalities’ intelligentsias.

³ Tarnai, *Extra Hungariam*, (1969).

⁴ It is important, however, to clarify that we have actually no knowledge of any coherent political program elaborated by the so-called *Hungari*, which could have served as viable alternative challenging the way of modernization proposed chiefly by cultural nationalists. The only seeming exception is the example of the enlightened economist, Gergely Berzeviczy (1763–1822), but his failure pointed out how obsolete the underlying conception became when he combined in several drafts the more and more pressing economic reforms with political post-josephinism and the use of Latin in the public sphere (proposing this latter even for the European diplomacy) as late as the end of the 1810s. Cf. Miskolczy, “*A ‘Hungarus-tudat.’*”

⁵ Varga, *A nemzeti költészet csarnokai*, 159–231.

Programs and standards of how to teach the history of Hungary

Although the enlightened idea of a centrally regulated education in Hungary was never perfectly realized,⁶ the schooling has ceased to be a „private matter” of the autonomous confessions or denominations from 1777 on.⁷ Since this date every secondary and higher school of Hungary was obliged to teach the history of the country.⁸ The royal decree aimed at bringing up “honest citizens and loyal subjects with virtue and fatherland inscribed in their heart”⁹ who could serve as reliable clerks for the central administration. Even though this all-embracing regulation did not become nationally universal (not being introduced in the Principality of Transylvania¹⁰ and refused by the Protestants) and was slightly modified after the conservative turn of the central government during the Napoleonic wars,¹¹ it still worked as a norm firmly determining the institutional framework of the educational system and its basically *Hungarus*-oriented content¹² until 1848.

After the fall of the revolution in August 1849, the Austrian educational regulation¹³ became the compulsory norm for Hungary, too. As it was designed for solidifying a uniform *Gesamtösterreich* the teaching of Hungarian history as a separate subject was cancelled for a decade. It was not banned, of course, but became subsumed in the teaching of the general imperial history. As the project had failed (probably in many schools it was never actually introduced or effectively counter-balanced by local curricula) and was revoked already in 1861, the teaching of Hungarian history became restored well before the Compromise.

During the dualist era we can observe one major shift from the part of the official educational policy regarding the importance of the teaching of national history. While the legislation on the primary schools (Act XXXVIII of 1868),

⁶ Puttkamer, *Schulalltag und nationale Integration in Ungarn* (2003).

⁷ *Ratio Educationis* (1777).

⁸ Nevertheless in most of the Roman Catholic and Protestant schools the history of Hungary was already taught well before 1777. Balassa, *A történettudás multja*, (1929).

⁹ *Ratio educationis* of 1777 (§122).

¹⁰ Here another central regulation came into force since 1781 with the compulsory teaching of the history of Hungary (and, of course, that of Transylvania after 1526) notwithstanding. Cf. *Norma Regia pro Scholis Magni*, 56, 58, 60, 62, 69, 71.

¹¹ *Ratio Educationis* (1806).

¹² However, some modest shifts from the rather ethno-culturally neutral *Hungarus* stance to the culturally nationalist requirements can already be detected between the two decrees. While in that of 1777 the teaching of the national history begins with the rule of St Stephen, in the decree of 1806 the starting point is the arriving of the Hungarians in the territory of the country. *Ratio educationis* of 1806 (§58 *et passim*).

¹³ *Entwurf der Organisation der Gymnasien und Realschulen*, (1849).

prepared by the expert of the *Nationalitätenfrage*, József Eötvös, and the curricula of the 1870s, elaborated by the recognized educational specialist Mór Kármán, considered universal history as a solid point of departure and laid particular stress on cultural history for the teaching of Hungarian history, too, the public opinion started to change concerning the importance of teaching national history about the last decades of the 19th century. As a result, both the new curricula for the secondary and for the primary schools (passed respectively in 1899 and 1905) were centered on the implementation of a so-called properly “national education” by which they meant inculcating effective patriotic feelings and national spirit upon the future generations.

Evaluating the corpus and some history textbooks with their impact on the evolving national discourse

Being short of full-scale researches one could at best estimate the number of authors who wrote textbook on the history of Hungary between 1777 and 1918. Relying on the available sources and our own investigation, we have knowledge of 34 authors writing on the topic in question before 1848,¹⁴ which is not a negligible number if we compare it with the 86 other ones who published their history of Hungary compiled for educational use for the first time only after 1849.¹⁵ As lot of them were reedited, more or less revised, extended or even abridged, the difficulties are piling up if one tries to guess the effective number of books from which the history of the country was being taught in the different schools¹⁶ during the 140 years under study. All in all, it seems no exaggeration to estimate the sum total of the books of this kind at about several hundred (including, of course, their different versions).

Here we cannot discuss, on the whole, more than three types of them succeeding chronologically. The first one was reedited certainly the most times,

¹⁴ Balassa, *A történettanítás multja*, (1929); Bíró, *Történettanításunk* (1960); Fehér, *Magyar nyelvű tankönyvek*, (1995). The figure above includes those whose texts were available only in Latin (six authors), German (two authors) or bilingual editions (two author's) or even remained in manuscript (in the case of five authors) and had been composed before 1777. Cf. Lajtai, „Magyar nemzet vagyok,” 199–207.

¹⁵ Cf. Unger, *A történelmi tudat alakulása* 1976; Farkas, *Történelemtanítás a népiskolákban* (2005). (This latter number nevertheless does not encompass but those who worded their textbook in Magyar.)

¹⁶ Let alone the fact that our investigation passes over the textbooks used at the universities. On the contrary, the above mentioned total sum involves the primary schoolbooks as the teaching of Hungarian history took part of the curriculum for the primary schools after 1868 (although in some primary schools, mostly in the bigger towns, it had been taught before 1848 as well).

the second one can be considered as the most effective summary of the modernizing national master-narrative and, finally, one can observe a whole new type of history textbooks emerging from the last years of the 19th century without being able to have preference for one single book or author among them.

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the *Hármas Kis Tükör* (HKT) edited for the first time even before the *Ratio educationis* of 1777.¹⁷ Summarizing the up-to-date findings of the 18th century Hungarian erudite historiography in vernacular, formulated mainly in Latin, it is thanks to its ever extending text and more than seventy known re-editions that the Hungaro-centric history teaching became firmly established even in Hungarian throughout the country at the of the eighteenth century and first part of the nineteenth century. This is why it was taught in almost every kind of school (being written originally by a Calvinist pastor notwithstanding) and remained in use even after its prohibition short after the revolution. In the course of time its size multiplied and became a popular family reading as well, while absorbing from the multitude of contemporary political languages and a wide range of patriotic literary inter-texts during the 1840s.¹⁸

At first sight it is a rather modest textbook published in its first version¹⁹ in the early 1840s by a Roman Catholic priest and liberal politician Mihály Horváth (1809–1878)²⁰ that fundamentally renewed and influenced the way of writing history textbooks in Hungary. His *œuvre majeure*, of which the above mentioned schoolbook was the firstling,²¹ did not less than couched the future oriented Hungarian national master-narrative with the history of the organic-autopoietic²²

¹⁷ Losontzi, *Hármas Kis Tükör* (1773). Its basic version had already been published in 1771, but since 1773 it became a classical tripartite by being completed with the geography, history and polity of Transylvania.

¹⁸ Kiss, *Losontzi István* (1905). Nevertheless, his latest edition in 1868 made it clear that after the Compromise the HKT became definitively obsolete.

¹⁹ Horváth, *A Magyarok története* (1841).

²⁰ In 1848 he was promoted bishop unexpectedly, then minister of religion and education in the second revolutionary government before being forced into exile. Rehabilitated no sooner than 1867, he assisted to establish the first professional association of historians in Hungary (Magyar Történelmi Társulat) in the same year.

²¹ Horváth had already compiled during the 1840s three summaries of Hungarian history of different type and size, among which the second and largest one (written originally between 1842 and 1846) reached its ultimate version in 1872 being extended at about 8000 pages and 14 volumes (containing also the pieces on the history of the 25 years preceding the revolution and those relating the „war of independence” in 1848–1849). At any rate, the latter was not meant to be a textbook, while the two others were written definitely for and used by the primary, secondary and higher schools.

²² By autopoiesis one should understand, according to the systems theory of Niklas Luhmann, a system that is self-creating, -correcting and reproducing itself.

development of the nation in its center, understood primarily as a continuous and inherent moral evolution. With the dialectic structure, based on alternate influences of inherent and foreign origin, and clear-cut narrative panels of his work, Horváth exercised an overwhelming impact on the following generations (there are almost unaltered re-editions of his masterpiece in the 1890s with the quasi-religious commentary of the renowned historians of the time). Horváth combined with great talent the methodological innovations and far-reaching findings of his predecessors (many of them studying at Göttingen at the end of the 18th and in the first decades of the 19th century), the revolutionary approach to the past of the nascent *Historismus* and the logic of the Herderian concept of nation. He was able to integrate all this into a rounded whole by adapting to the Hungarian history, which he narrated in a coherent, easy-flowing and clear style.

This romantic-autopoietic national master-narrative started to be corrected step by step from around the 1880s on by the first generation of the professional historians. This was the heyday of piling up every accessible data source even in the textbooks which resulted in destroying or at least questioning many facts until that time too dear to the national self-esteem. The situation was seemingly comparable to the overcritical period of the historiography of the Enlightenment but, this time, the myth-destroying endeavor originated mainly from within. Then, from the last years of the 19th century on, one can also observe an ever strengthening discursive strive for introducing a more patriotic discourse so as to combat or at least somehow attenuate the threats coming from the changes in the foreign policy and the radicalization of the domestic policy.²³ The most conspicuous elements of this renewed patriotic discourse was suggesting assimilation as moral duty for each citizen of the Hungarian state and the appearance of quite a combative rhetoric against those who disputed the concept of the Hungarian political nation. Probably this is why one can find more and more appealing pictures, photos and maps in the textbooks of the period by which the editors aimed at underpinning the richness and cultural variety of the thousand-year-old state and nation by sense impression in order to durably instill the feeling of belonging together.

²³ In this regard one can take into consideration the increasing irredentism in the ascendant neighbor countries after having been internationally recognized in 1878, the emergence of a new politician generation recruited from the nationalities who overtly refused the dualist system, the strengthening of the left-wing (agrarian socialist, social democrat, radical progressist) and antiliberal (catholicist) political movements along with the breaking down of the hegemony of the national-liberal institutions during the constitutional crisis of 1905–1906 and so forth. Cf. Trencsényi, *A nép lelke*, 345–355.

Defining and narrating the nation in the Hungarian history textbooks before 1918

In addition to unfold the definition in use of some abstract notions concerning *nation-* and *statehood*, one must carefully read through the whole narrative of many a textbook so as to decode the slightest shifts taken place during the decades in the underlying national master-narrative. Different threads of this entangled national meta-narrative to be unraveled are numerous and relate to both main features of the very core of any comprehensive concept of nation,²⁴ that is the ethnic and civic poles of it.

In terms of the practice of how to entitle a history textbook on the nation's own past before 1918, three major types can clearly be discerned. Most of them applied a title composed of the elements of either the history/story (or even *historia/stories* as it had been typical before 1848) of Hungary or of the Hungarians/Hungarian nation. Actually, all of them can be considered synonyms since, following the traditional Hungarian pre-modern and modern understanding of the nation, none of the authors made any conceptual difference between the history of the country, the nation and the Hungarian people.

It becomes more complicated, however, if one takes into account some of the definitions of nation formulated in the body texts. The part dealing with the history of Hungary in the *HKT* starts exactly by the following telling question-response:

“Q. Of what nation are you? R. I am (of) Hungarian nation/born.”²⁵

While in the beginning of the 1770s the wording of the above cited idea looks as if it had gone without saying, some decades later the editors had to state precisely in order not to let room for mistakes. However, in the textbooks written before 1848 one could hardly find any precise definition of what might be understood by the adjectival construction of “Hungarian nation”.²⁶

²⁴ Koselleck, et al., “*Volk, Nation, Nationalismus, Masse*,” 141–431; Dieckhoff, “*Beyond Conventional Wisdom*,” 62–77.

²⁵ Losontzi, *Hármas Kis Tükör*, 68. Although the genuine Hungarian word for nation had acquired a plenty of nuances of meaning before the breakthrough of the discursive modernity (Cf. e.g. the 14 different meanings in the *Erdélyi Magyar Szótörténeli Tár*, 618–622), even nowadays it is only the consonant length that differentiates the noun (*nemzet*) from the participle (*nemzett* – with the meaning of ‘being begotten’).

²⁶ Even the *HKT* does not define it conceptually. And what is more, one can find for instance three different words as virtually perfect synonyms for the traditional corporative communities of the estates in Transylvania: *náció* (from the Latin term *natio*), *nemzetség* (ca. ‘clan’) and *nemzet* (‘nation’). This part of the book will not be changed in more than 70 years but at one point in the edition of 1849–1850: the term *náció* become replaced by the neologism of *főnemzet* (‘principal nation’).

In regard to the semantic field of *nationality*, it seems evident that before 1848 its use in our textbooks had strictly been confined to the revitalization of the traditional Hungarian concept of nation.²⁷ Once the teaching of Hungarian history recommenced in the beginning of the 1860s, the new textbooks paid usually more attention to clarifying what should have been meant by nation and nationality and what their proper correlation was. For instance, in the introduction of a five-volume textbook of the professor of a Calvinist college the term “people” (meant in political sense) is understood as a higher category than “nation” which is a synonym for the ethno-cultural community; therefore, in this view, the “people of Hungary” for the time of St Stephen is deliberately “multinational”.²⁸ The usage of the Hegelian historian of law, Bocsor by all means is quite original in his time, yet, after the Compromise, more and more history textbooks’ authors resort to the typical superiority-inferiority relationship between the (politically) *unitary* nation and the nationalities in plural. It is by this time that the meaning of nationality became gradually subsumed within the semantically renewed Hungarian concept of nation and, in the long run, lost its originally dynamic semantic potential (ca. ‘modern nationhood in the making’) by narrowing itself down to the reduced meaning of “a fragmentary populace of a distinct *ethnie*”.²⁹ At first, in some of the textbooks of the epoch one can read neutral fact-findings affirming that the Hungarian nation is linguistically divided because its members, the inhabitants of the country, speak more languages while still being part and parcel of the nation. Later on, the authors pay more attention on underlining the role of the common rights and duties which apply equally to every member of the nation, then assess the nationalities one by one according to the more or less propensity of their members for learning the Hungarian language. Interestingly enough, the fundamental semantic breach between the pre-modern and modern version of the Hungarian concept of nation is quite

²⁷ Although the first appearance of the word had already been registered at the end of the 18th century (Szabó, *Kisded Szótár*, 157.), there was no Hungarian politician or writer before 1848 who admitted that in Hungary other nationality than the Hungarian would be imaginable (except perhaps one writing of István Széchenyi, but it remained unpublished until the late 1850s). This stance was even theorized by the philosophe Gusztáv Szontagh who affirmed that “Nationality is founded by a people obtaining a homeland and establishing a state.” Szontagh, *Propylaeumok*, 164.

²⁸ Bocsor, *Magyarország történelme*, 1.

²⁹ The first Hungarian dictionary where the second meaning of the term can already be found is published not earlier than 1873 (Ballagi, *A magyar nyelv teljes szótára*, 328.). It seems, however, to be the case that the use of the words of *nation* and *nationality* remained to a certain extent interchangeable even after the law on the nationalities, so the *political* attribute of the nation in the wording of the Act XLIV of 1868 was by no means pleonasm. Cf. Mikó, *Nemzetiségi jog és nemzetiségi politika*, 331.

seldom mentioned³⁰ and, if so, mainly somewhat in terms of the history of Transylvania.³¹

As far as the ethnic components of the national master-narrative are concerned, the ethnic genesis of the Hungarians, the linguistic affinity of the Magyar and the location of the original homeland(s) of the Hungarian *ethnie*³² raised much more questions than furnished reassuring answers during the whole period under study, so the pedagogic gain of touching upon these issues in schools proved to be at best ambivalent. The traditional narrative of ethnic descent, written down for the first time in the late 13th century and based on the Hunnish-Hungarian ethnic continuity or kinship,³³ first started to become relativistic in the second part of the 18th century³⁴ insofar as in the 1830s and 1840s some of the textbooks deal with this topic rather reluctantly. After the fall of the revolution, however, it became quite fashionable again due, on the one hand, to the symbolic resistance against the Austrian repression and the political usage of rival ancestry myths by the nationalities and, on the other, to the international renown of the findings of a recognized French historian of the time, Amédée Thierry.³⁵ Then, by the 1880s, another turn of the tide took place owing to the strenuous victory in the so-called “Ugric-Turkic War” of those having been arguing in favor of the Finno-Ugrian linguistic affinity of the Magyar. In the textbooks of the period concerned one might therefore read that the researches of Pál Hunfalvy had undoubtedly cleared up that the Hunnish-Hungarian ethnic continuity was an *a posteriori* invention of the medieval chroniclers compiling, in addition, from foreign sources, and what is more, even

³⁰ The exception that proves the rule is the textbook of P. Király who considers the role of the traditional corporative Hungarian concept of nation analogous with that of the antic *civis Romanus*. Cf. Király, *Magyarország története*, 272–273.

³¹ „Transylvania proper was composed of three distinct parts: the lands of the Hungarian, the Szekler and the Saxon nations. These three »nations« did not mean three separate peoples with own language, because the Szeklers were Hungarians as well.” Szigethy, *Magyarok története*, 26.

³² „[...] *ethnie* (ethnic communities) may [...] be defined as named human populations with shared ancestry myths, histories and cultures, having an association with a specific territory and a sense of solidarity.” Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, 32.

³³ Keza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, 144–148 (*et passim*).

³⁴ While having gathered an ever growing number of primal sources of various types by generations of erudite historians and travelers in Hungary and abroad concerning the remote traces of the ancient Huns and Hungarians the spatial horizons of their supposedly common ethno-genesis widened considerably (from China to Lapland). Meanwhile, the sudden appearance, in 1748, of the text of an unknown medieval historiographer (probably from the 12–13th century) caused a great sensation and “blurred the lines” as this famous Anonymus not only related in minute details the way of how the ancient Hungarians had conquered the territory of the future Hungary but did not mention the Huns at all. Anonymus, *Gesta Hungarorum*, 33–117.

³⁵ Thierry, *Histoire d'Attila* I–II, (1856), (1865)³.

the ethnic origins of the Szeklers, with their status of being remnants of the ethnic Huns which had never been questioned till that time, became an unresolved scientific problem. Around the turn of the century and in the following years, finally, a double structure of narrating the beginnings of the ethnic community starts to catch on in the textbooks: telling the story according to the (venerable or refutable) national traditions (1), then, next to it, lining up the evidences in the light of recent scholarship (2).

The questioning of the centuries old tradition of the Hunnish-Hungarian kinship and of the reliability of the first Hungarian historiographer affected sensibly the new scholarly interpretation of the pre-history of the Hungarian territory before the arrival of the ancient Hungarians. While there is no textbook until the 1880s in which this heroic land-taking operation (*bonfoglalás*) would not be interpreted as a complicated armed conflict between the erstwhile Hungarians and the direct ancestors of the nationalities, around the turn of the century an opposite narrative gain suddenly terrain, namely that the ancestors of the contemporary nationalities came into the country (with few exceptions) only *after*³⁶ the arrival of the Hungarians. All in all, after the conquest of the territory at the end of the 9th century and before the tragic ethnic collisions of the revolution of 1848–1849 (provoked, allegedly, by the anti-liberal and anti-revolutionary camarilla in Vienna), there is no any other event in connection with which one could read in the textbooks that anybody has ever been harmed in Hungary because of his or her ethnic/linguistic belonging.

As for the pedagogical-ideological role of the remarks about the Hungarian national character, it is to stress that in time a spectacular change took place in this respect. Before the revolution such reflections occur quite seldom and, curiously enough, concern rather negative than positive traits. Their pedagogical message, however, is clear: it is by overcoming the weaknesses and inherited difficulties that the latent inherent capacities of the regenerating nation can freely blossom out. After 1849 the textbooks seem to abandon more and more the moralizing self-critique, chiefly in the dualist era, when, on the contrary, the socially and militarily advanced state of the ancient Hungarians (comparable to their Western neighbors³⁷) and the intellectual superiority of them (compared with the conquered peoples) will be increasingly emphasized. It is concerning the latter faculty that the importance of the Hungarians and Hungary is being judged from the viewpoint of world history and is basically twofold: being able to establish and maintain continuously a solid statehood in a region of geopolitically

³⁶ Be they deliberately called as settlers (mostly from the West) or lodged as refugees (mainly from the East and South) by the Hungarian rulers (or, as in some cases, infiltrators noticed only later).

crucial importance and, as a consequence, operating as a “membrane”³⁷ between the West and the East by defending the former and transmitting the cultural achievements to the latter.

As time went by, the political character of the Hungarian nation- and statehood became much more relevant than the ethnically “pure” features of them (which were never stressed indeed). Therefore, by the end of the 19th century, it is not at all unusual to read such affirmations in some of the textbooks according to which the Hungarian nation enriched substantially in material, intellectual and demographic respect thanks to the defeated and lodged peoples (assimilating them or tolerating their ethnic isolation) not only after the conquest and the foundation of the state, but it had already come into being even as an amalgam and its original ethnic traits faded long ago away,³⁸ thus, as we might add, their scientific reconstruction is practically useless and of no importance.

In fact, it is concerning two distinct material and immaterial symbols of crucial importance in regard to the public law by which the continuity of the thousand-year-old statehood was especially celebrated: the constitution and the Holy Crown. The former is primarily associated, since the emergence of the fabulous gesta of Anonymus,³⁹ with the seven chieftains of the Hungarian tribes who had concluded an alliance before electing a prince among themselves at the eve of the conquest and laying by this solemn act the bases of the Hungarian constitution⁴⁰ which survived, of course meanwhile countlessly modified, until the present of the textbooks. The latter is attached to the first king, St Stephen who converted the Hungarians to Christianity and received a crown from the pope as recognition of his apostolic deed. Although a full-fledged public law doctrine of the Holy Crown as the central tenet of the history of the Hungarian constitution became elaborated only around the turn of the 19th century,⁴¹ the crown’s medieval cult had generated many of a texts considering, as early as the beginning of the 17th century, the Holy Crown as the very protagonist of the history of Hungary that incorporates the sovereignty of the pre-modern Hungarian nation⁴². There is practically no history textbooks during the 140 years under discussion that would not mention the crown in connection with the first Christian ruler (attributing at least one of its two parts to St Stephen’s time

³⁷ Laurentzi, *Magyarország oknyomozó története*, 133–134.

³⁸ Mangold, *A magyarok oknyomozó történelme (1887)*, 15; Jászai, *Magyarország oknyomozó története*, 12–13.

³⁹ Anonymus, *Gesta Hungarorum*, 39–41.

⁴⁰ The interpretation of the famous five points of Anonymus as the starting point of the Hungarian constitutional evolution was already worked up by the most influential Hungarian historian of the 18th century: Pray, *Historia regum Hungariae*, IV–XXXII.

⁴¹ Timon, *Magyar alkotmány és jogtörténet (1902)*; Cf. Eckhart, *A szentkorona-eszme története*, 316–333; Péter, “*The Holy Crown of Hungary*”, 478–486.

⁴² Tészelszky, *Az ismeretlen korona (2009)*.

since the source criticism discovered that they had been joined later), it happens still only rarely that its special meaning of symbolizing the territorial integrity of the Hungarian state takes place.⁴³ Nevertheless, after 1900 even the doctrine of the Holy Crown can be found in some textbooks affirming that it incarnates, as supreme guardian of the laws, the constitution and liberty of the Hungarian nation,⁴⁴ or that the ruler (at least from the 14th century on) gains his or her power from the Holy Crown thus he or she cannot pass laws only together with the nation in the Diet or Parliament.⁴⁵

Finally, one of the most original innovations that the textbooks of the dualist era brought in the national discourse was the idea of an ethnically ever neutral Hungarian state which at all times approved the voluntary assimilation, but never forced it violently. As the pre-modern nation in Hungary was practically identical with the nobility, its socio-cultural role as a melting pot became of vital importance from the nationalistic regard on which the textbooks of the late dualism endeavored to largely capitalize. A classic example for illustrating the meritocratic upward mobility with national connotation was furnished by the slightly refashioned interpretation of the paradigmatic course of life of John Hunyadi. However, until the Romanians were traditionally considered as an indigenous population in Transylvania, reinforced by the authority of Anonymus among others, there was no question about the ancestors of the great commander and statesman or it was even accentuated that he was born in a Hungarian noble family of Transylvania. As soon as the immigrationist theory on the late medieval Vlach infiltration from the Balkans became ingrained thanks mostly to the writings of Pál Hunfalvy in the 1880s, a considerable part of the new textbooks do not fail to mention that the biggest hero of medieval Hungarian patriotism was actually a descendant of a modest gentry family immigrated from Wallachia and thereby instilling the underlying message that by the way of devoted assimilation even the highest place could be attained in Hungary.

Conclusion

Examining the Hungarian history textbooks relating the own past written before the disintegration of the „Lands of the Crown of St Stephen” raise the

⁴³ Spányik, *Magyarország oknyomozó története*, 99; Bocsor, *Magyarország történelme*, 1.; Török, *Magyarország történelme* 183, 194.

⁴⁴ Sebestyén, *A magyar nemzet története*, 82.

⁴⁵ Mangold, *A magyarok oknyomozó történelme (1903)*, 416; Bruckner, *Közintézményeink fejlődése és történelmi összefoglalások*, 80–83.

question of the share they might have had in creating, strengthening or reshaping the so-called national identity. In this respect their importance can even be compared to previous or contemporary literary texts since they had to furnish, for obvious pedagogical reasons, unified, value-loaded and reliable stories. As we have seen, however, not only the Hungarian concept of nation became soundly reinterpreted but the textbooks' thematic focus was also on several occasions recomposed as time went by. While the first Hungarian history textbook, for instance, seems to bear a decisive part in disseminating the vogue of Hunnish-Hungarian ethnic golden age, the growing attention paid to the thousand-year-old values of the common fatherland suggests assuredly the authors' underlying anxiety about the future soon after the euphoria of the Hungarian millennium passed.

Bibliography

- Anonymus. „Gesta Hungarorum.” In: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum: Tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum (SRH)*, vol. I, Edited by Szentpétery, Imre, 33-117. Budapest: MTA, 1937–1938.
- Balassa, Brunó. *A történettanítás multja hazánkban*. Pécs: Dunántúli Egyetemi Nyomda, 1929.
- Ballagi, Mór. *A magyar nyelv teljes szótára. vol. II*. Pest: Heckenast Gusztáv, 1873.
- Baróti, Szabó Dávid. *Kisdud Szótár*. Kassa: J. Ellinger, 1792.
- Bíró, Sándor. *Történettanításunk a XIX. század első felében: A korabeli tankönyvirodalom tükrében*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1960.
- Bocsor, István. *Magyarország történelme különös tekintettel a jogfejlésre: Főtanodai, s magányhasználatul, vol. I*. Pápa: L. Magda, 1861.
- Bruckner, Győző. *Közintézményeink fejlődése és történelmi összefoglalások: Érettségi segédkönyv középiskolák számára*. Budapest: L. Kókai, 1913.
- Brunner, Otto–Conze, Werner–Koselleck, Reinhardt (eds.). *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, I–VII*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1972–1992.
- Dieckhoff, Alain. “Beyond Conventional Wisdom: Cultural and Political Nationalism Revisited”. In: *Revisiting Nationalism: Theories and Processes*, Edited by Dieckhoff, Alain–Jaffrelot, Christophe, 62-77. London: Hurst & Company, 2005.
- Eckhart, Ferenc. *A szentkorona-eszme története*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1941.
- Entwurf der Organisation der Gymnasien und Realschulen in Oesterreich*. K. u. k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1849.
- Farkas, Mária. *Történelemtanítás a népisiskolákban a dualizmus kori Magyarországon: Szemléletformálás és értékközvetítés tantervek, olvasó- és történelemtankönyvek tükrében*. Budapest: Trezor, 2005.
- Fehér, Erzsébet. *Magyar nyelvű tankönyvek: 1777–1848*. Budapest: OPKM, 1995.
- Horváth, Mihály. *A Magyarok története Európába költözősöktől mostanig: A tanuló ifjuság számára*. Pest: J. Eggenberger & G. Heckenast, 1841.
- Jászai, Rezső. *Magyarország oknyomozó története: A középiskolák VIII. osztálya számára*. Budapest: Róbert Lampel, 1904.
- Kees, Teszelszky. *Az ismeretlen korona: Jelentések, szimbólumok és nemzeti identitás* (Trans. by Gabriella Trostovszky). Pannonhalma: Bencés, 2009.

- Kézai, Simon. „Gesta Hungarorum.” In: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum: Tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum (SRH)*, vol. I, Edited by Szentpétery, Imre, 141–194. Budapest: MTA, 1937–1938.
- Király, Pál. *Magyarország története a középkorok felső osztályainak használatára*. Budapest: R. Lampel, 1897.
- Kiss, Áron. *Losontzi István életrajza*. Budapest: Lampel R., 1905.
- Koselleck, Reinhart et al. “Volk, Nation, Nationalismus, Masse.” In: *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland vol. VII*. Edited by Brunner, Otto–Conze, Werner–Koselleck, Reinhart, 141–431. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1992.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time (Trans. by Keith Tribe)*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.
- Lajtai, L. László. „Magyar nemzet vagyok”: *Az első magyar nyelvű és hazai tárgyú történelemtankönyvek nemzetdiskurzusai*. Budapest: Argumentum, 2013.
- Laurentzi, Vilmos. *Magyarország oknyomozó története: Hetvenöt kérdésben*. Herz: Brassó: Herz, 1912.
- Losontzi, István. *Hármas Kis Tükör, mely I. A’ Szent Históriait, II. Magyar Országot, III. Erdély Országot, annak földével, polgári- állapotjával, és históriájával [...] ki-mutatja*. Pozsony: M. Landerer, 1773.
- Mangold, Lajos. *A magyarok oknyomozó történelme: A középkorok VIII. osztálya számára*. Budapest: Franklin, 1887².
- Mangold, Lajos. *A magyarok oknyomozó történelme: A középkorok VIII. osztálya számára*. Budapest: Franklin, 1903⁴.
- Mikó, Imre. *Nemzetiségi jog és nemzetiségi politika: Tanulmány a magyar közjog és politikai történet köréből*. Kolozsvár: Minerva, 1944.
- Miskolczy, Ambrus. “A ‘Hungarus-tudat’ a polgári-nemzeti átalakulás sodrában”. *Magyar Kisebbség*, 3–4. (2012): 163–205.
- Norma Regia pro Scholis Magni Principatus Transilvaniae*. Hermannstadt: Hochmeister, 1781.
- Péter, László. „The Holy Crown of Hungary. The visible and invisible.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 81 (2003): 421–510.
- Pray, Georgius. *Historia regum Hungariae*, vol. I. Buda: 1801.
- Puttkamer, Joachim von. *Schulalltag und nationale Integration in Ungarn: Slowaken, Rumänen und Siebenbürger Sachsen in der Auseinandersetzung mit ungarischen Staatsidee 1867–1914*. München: R. Oldenbourg, 2003.
- Ratio Educationis publicae totiusque rei literariae per Regnum Hungariae et Provincias eidem adnexas*. Buda: Typ. Reg. Univer. Hung., 1806.
- Ratio Educationis totiusque rei literariae per Regnum Hungariae et Provincias eidem adnexas*. Vindobonae: J. Th Trattner, 1777.
- S. Varga, Pál. *A nemzeti költészet csarnokai: A nemzeti irodalom fogalmi rendszerei a 19. századi magyar irodalomtörténeti gondolkodásban*. Budapest: Balassi, 2005.
- Sebestyén, Gyula. *A magyar nemzet története a mobácsi véstől napjainkig: A gymnasium és reálskola IV. osztálya számára*. Budapest: Franklin, 1901.
- Smith, Anthony D.. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- Spányik, Glycér. *Magyarország oknyomozó története*. Buda: Magyar Királyi Egyetem, 1845.
- Szabó, T. Attila (ed.). *Erdélyi Magyar Szótörténeti Tár, vol. I*. Bukarest, Kriterion, 1975.
- Szekfű, Gyula. *Iratok a magyar államnyelv kérdésének történetéhez, 1790–1848*. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1926.
- Szigethy, Lajos. *Magyarok története, Part two*. Budapest: Singer és Wolfner, 1901.
- Szontagh, Gusztáv. *Propylaeumok a társasági philosophiához, tekintettel hazánk viszonyaira*. Buda: G. Emich, 1843.
- Tarnai, Andor. *Extra Hungariam non est vita... (Egy szállóige történetéhez)*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1969.
- Thierry, Amédée. *Histoire d’Attila et de ses successeurs jusqu’à l’établissement des Hongrois en Europe suivie des légendes et traditions, I–II*. Paris: Didier, 1856, 1865³.

Some of the key concepts of national history in the Hungarian history textbooks...

- Timon, Ákos. *Magyar alkotmány és jogförténet, különös tekintettel a nyugati államok jogfejlödésére*. Budapest: Politzer Zsigmond és Fia kiadása, 1902.
- Török, István. *Magyarország történelme a középiskolák III. és IV. osztályai számára*. Budapest: R. Lampel, 1901³.
- Trencsényi, Balázs. *A nép lelke: Nemzetkarakterológiai viták Kelet-Európában*. Budapest: Argumentum, 2011.
- Unger, Mátyás. *A történelmi tudat alakulása középiskolai történelemtankönyveinkben a századfordulótól a felszabadulásig*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1976.

A Domestic Culture The mise-en-scène of modern historiography

At the conclusion of her autobiographical sketch published a few years ago, the Italian historian Ilaria Porciani, living in Florence but working in Bologna, writes:

‘Like many Italian historians, I am a commuter. The saying that every Italian academic carries a train timetable could not be truer. The conversations which take place on Eurostars turn out to be a sort of extension of faculty or department meetings and (...) this is usually the right time not only to complain about the new reforms and shortage of money but also to discuss a new book or a project. (...)’

But I also think that I have also been a “*passer*” as the French would say: a traveller between different cultural traditions and countries. I have often missed the stability of a single school and a linear track. But I have enjoyed the much richer liberty of diverse approaches.

Since I have spent and spend so much time commuting and travelling, maybe it will not come as a surprise that I started this contribution on a plane and that I have continued to write it – like others of my work – at least partly on trains: so mobile is our historians’ workshop nowadays.¹

‘Self portrait of an Italian historian as a woman on the train’ thus seems to end in a world of placeless scholarship, where the historian, forever on the move, contemplates reality on the basis of ‘the view from nowhere’, to borrow the title of Thomas Nagel’s well-known book from 1989. In what follows, the mise-en-scène of modern historiography will be central, and by extension the culture of the humanities that speaks from this mise-en-scène. Historiography, as we will see, underwent a clear process of self-localisation in its first phase of professionalisation, between 1870 and 1914. It was practised at precisely identifiable places, in workshops with concrete, tangible practices. But just as Porciani’s mobile workshop refers to a specific type of historiography – cosmopolitan, eclectic, open to innovation – so the workshops of the decades

¹ Porciani, “*Self portrait of an Italian historian*,” 152.

around 1900 also represent specific historiographical ideals. Hence the use of the term 'mise-en-scène': the discipline's locations are not chosen by chance, and are not neutral, but are meaningful sites at which the production of knowledge – in this case historical knowledge – responds to or is supposed to respond to specific ambitions. They are real locations, but also counterlocations, and sometimes virtual locations too, shaped by dreams whose conversion into reality lies in the future. Their culture defines modern historiography, and *mutatis mutandis* the other humanities disciplines too – archaeology, art history and musicology, literary studies, philology and linguistics, philosophy and theology. Even the mind has its fixed abode.

Three iconic places will be examined here: the attic room or garret of the university building, the study in the professor's home, and the laboratory. Together, they form the disciplinary landscape in which modern historiography took shape around 1900, a 'geography of scientific knowledge', in David Livingstone's formulation.² In these garrets, studies and laboratories, historical research took shape, but what was more, a form of education was created there whose purpose was to make a *nouvelle histoire* possible. The web of meaning that was woven around these places was extensive: they were about a rejection of showmanship and a yearning for authenticity, about masculine detachment and family involvement, about prestige and progress, and above all about a desire for domesticity and the nostalgia that this ultimately entailed.

The garret: the rhetoric of modesty

The historical discipline in the late nineteenth century underwent a process of transformation into a science and professionalisation: it acquired a method and became a profession. These changes were coupled with academisation. This meant that from around 1870 the universities – and no longer the societies, traditional academies or clubs – became the *hauts lieux* of the historical discipline, and that from then on, the tone in the profession was set by university professors. The situation was similar in the other humanities disciplines too. It was not just that the number of professors grew in these disciplines: the universities also exerted a greater power of attraction in the subject. In literary studies, for example, writers and critics who not long before had denied the professors any say in literary questions sought to secure a university chair of their own after 1900. At the same time, the university became a place of research: the professors increasingly started to focus on research, specialising and forming

² Livingstone, *Putting science in its place* (2003).

research groups or schools. In the natural sciences, this led to a new and powerful paradigm: laboratory science.

In the historical discipline, this research-oriented development assumed its most explicit form in – as is well-known – the seminar, which claimed a position alongside and opposite the traditional lecture.³ In the lecture, an overview of (part of) the past was offered *ex cathedra*. This form of instruction did not disappear after 1900. It has indeed been pointed out recently how tedious the basis of many of these lectures was: the reading out of the same lecture notes time and time again.⁴ The seminars offered an alternative, however. Here, the students were trained as independent researchers by discussing a specific historical problem together on the basis of a number of documents selected by the professor. They learnt what source criticism was and received training of a highly technical nature.

The contrast between these two educational forms was accentuated by locating them in different places. This mise-en-scène was the work of those who championed the further spread of the ‘practical classes’. One of these was the Ghent professor Paul Fredericq. This specialist in the history of the Inquisition was to acquire international fame primarily as a result of the reports that he published in the 1880s and 1890s on his tours of German, French, British and Dutch universities. For Fredericq’s European and American readers, these *Notes et impressions de voyage* were a showcase in which they could see which practices were in the ascendancy in modern historiography.⁵

Fredericq found the traditional lectures most obviously represented in the large auditoria and amphitheatres, with their podiums and lecterns, in the Collège de France in Paris.⁶ These were stately and imposing lecture halls, in keeping with the majestic, sweeping vistas that were presented there. Listeners would walk in and out from hall to hall, just as they went from chapel to chapel in churches. They were not just students – quite the contrary: the majority of the audience for these lectures consisted of tourists, persons of independent means and passers-by, noted Fredericq. Nor did he hesitate, in a display of misogyny, to comment that quite a few of the lectures mainly drew women: *beaucoup de dames et même un certain nombre de prêtres*.⁷ But the Collège de France did not have a monopoly on such practices. In Berlin, Heinrich von Treitschke gave his famous

³ Lingelbach (ed.), *Vorlesung, Seminar, Repetitorium* (2006). For the origins of the “research seminar”: Clark, *Academic charisma*, 141–182.

⁴ For the procedure at the University of Amsterdam in particular: Knegtmans, “*Liefde voor de wetenschap*”, 13–16.

⁵ For Fredericq’s own efforts in this area: Tollebeek, “*Pirenne and Fredericq*”, 383–409.

⁶ For the following, see: Tollebeek, *Fredericq & Zonen*, 51–58.

⁷ Fredericq, *L’enseignement supérieur de l’histoire*, 54.

Vorlesungen in the so-called Barakken-Auditorium, which could seat no fewer than seven hundred and fifty listeners (and the hall was too small even so).⁸ In England, where the 'German' seminars did not enjoy much popularity, the lectures to large audiences were laconically justified with a reference to the goal of education: 'We make not books but men.'⁹

How different the situation was with the seminars ... Often, they were held in small rooms in the university library, because it was easier to have access to the necessary study material there. Fredericq himself originally chose such a location for his 'practical classes'. But he knew that the premises were often even more cramped. In Paris, he had to climb the stairs of the Sorbonne to finally reach the fourth floor. There, below the roof, the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes organised its seminars, in small, low-ceilinged rooms, *presque des mansardes*. Fredericq described the *chambrettes* in detail: how they were packed from top to bottom with books, the dark furniture and simple inkpots, the white porcelain stove, the view of the Sorbonne's peaceful *cour*, the clock. In 1898 his Ghent colleague, Henri Pirenne, similarly recalled the *cours pratique* that he had attended under Godefroid Kurth in Liège: a small room on the second floor of the university building, with a stove, a few decrepit benches, one chair. There had been a view of the garden of the Ecole des Mines, with its old machinery, and of the Meuse, 'from which the whistle-blasts of the steamboats rose'.¹⁰ Simple but picturesque places, then, where time was forgotten: 'The business was carried out,' said Fredericq, 'like all important business: modestly, without any fuss, in a small corner of the university.'¹¹

The garret versus the amphitheatre – the rhetoric of modesty that permeated the Paris and Liège vignettes revealed a vision of science, didactics, 'epistemological style' (the term is borrowed from Michèle Lamont¹²) and ethics. Whereas the lectures were presented as events with all the features of that spectacular amusement for which there was such a taste in the *fin de siècle*,¹³ and where the ultimate aim was pseudo-science, the seminars appeared to be humble contributions to 'true' science: serious work was done there, without disruption by outsiders to that science. The didactics differed just as much: whereas the panoramic overviews were presented in the amphitheatres in a monologue with beguiling rhetoric, knowledge was sought in the garrets in discussions between the professor and the students (although the reality did not always live up to the

⁸ See the anecdote in Ahrens, *Gelehrten-Anekdoten*, 74–75.

⁹ Quoted in Moretti, "A new community of scholars", 298.

¹⁰ Pirenne in *A Godefroid Kurth*, 157.

¹¹ Fredericq in *A Godefroid Kurth*, 174.

¹² Lamont, *How professors think*, 54.

¹³ Schwartz, *Spectacular realities*. (1999).

ideal, with tongue-tied students who could not resist applauding the professor as though they were in an auditorium).

There were still more differences. The proceedings in the amphitheatre revealed a hierarchical world in which scientific authority was only conferred on whoever stood on the podium or behind the lectern. In the roof of the university building, by contrast, the professor sat in the midst of his students, not on a raised platform. As a matter of principle, he showed respect for what others had to say, for knowledge was not regarded as a given or as immutable; it originated in discussion, and even the students' work represented fully valid contributions to this. What the students learnt there for themselves was not an elaborate method (although this was codified in textbooks towards the end of the nineteenth century¹⁴). Rather, they learnt a trade, with skills, ways of doing things and best practices. However, these were guided by certain epistemic virtues: suspicion towards the transmitted documents, criticism, impartiality. At the same time, an ethic was acquired – a bourgeois ethic: science was a matter of self-discipline, steadfastness, character.

The garrets were sites where the historical discipline renewed itself. By stressing the modesty of these places, Fredericq and his allies emphasised the revolutionary character of what was conveyed in the seminars. In the *mansardes*, on the margin, a break was made with the establishment.

The study: the rituals of intimacy

Much of what took place in the university garrets (or in the side-rooms of university libraries) could be found in intensified form in the place that was naturally perceived as more personal: the professor's own home, and the room that was regarded as the heart of that home, the study. For virtually all historians around 1900, the study was still the self-evident place where they carried out their research; despite the academisation of the historical discipline, it remained a community of 'home workers'. In fact, the professor's house often had an extensive library and gave its owner the atmosphere that he apparently needed for his work. Anyone who sought routine and regularity could find it there: both the Leiden professor P.J. Blok and Pirenne would withdraw at set times every day into the *cabinet de travail* of their town house to write their great national history.¹⁵ Others found peace and quiet in the study of their dwelling located out of town. Johan Huizinga, who was a professor in Groningen, expressed his

¹⁴ Torstendahl, "From all-round to professional education", 17–31.

¹⁵ Tollebeek, "Exegi monumentum?", 120–121.

exultation to a friend after moving out of the town in 1911: 'From my study I can see for miles; all the way to the Himalayas if I wish.'¹⁶

The study was the Holy of Holies. So it had been for a long time already. When, in around 1500, a separate *museum* or *studiolo* (to quote the Latin terms for the room) was defined in the scholar's house for the first time, its express purpose was to guarantee the scholar a detached existence: the study was a protection against the intrusion of worldly affairs into his life. This was no longer so starkly expressed in the nineteenth century, but the longing for separation was never far away. It could also apply to whole enterprises: the *gelehrte Gehilfe* of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, the great German series of editions, worked under the direction of both Georg Heinrich Pertz and Georg Waitz in the director's official home in Berlin; the former even regarded the *Monumenta* as *sein Hausvermögen*.¹⁷

Modern historiography too was thus – from a research viewpoint – still a domestic discipline. This distinguished it (and the other humanities disciplines) from the natural sciences, which in the course of the nineteenth century had generally become laboratory sciences, located outside the home. To be sure, Victorian biographers succeeded in 'domesticating' the heroes of science, such as Isaac Newton: as depicted in their history of science, in some cases they went from being godlike geniuses to domestic figures in dressing gowns, with children playing around them.¹⁸ But the natural sciences were only really domestic – biology among the Cambridge geneticists around 1900 being a case in point¹⁹ – when their research was regarded as too marginal to be eligible for the 'ordinary' infrastructure to be allocated to it, and in such cases women too started to play a more than 'ordinary' role in the design and execution of the research. Humanities disciplines such as history were domestic as a matter of principle rather than from necessity; their house, as was said about the professors of Leiden in the late nineteenth century, was their bulwark.²⁰ This was not completely self-evident, for since Leopold von Ranke historiography had to a significant extent borrowed its identity as a discipline from the archive work that it performed. This had turned it too into a sometimes adventurous fieldwork discipline.²¹

¹⁶ Hanssen–Krul–Van der Lem (eds.), *Briefwisseling*, vol. 1, 121, also quoted in Idem, *Joban Huizinga. Leven en werk*, 124.

¹⁷ Fuhrman, „Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen“, 36–40 and 45–49 (for the *gelehrte Gehilfe*: 77–90).

¹⁸ See the example in Daston–Galison, *Objectivity*, 216 and 218–219.

¹⁹ Richmond, "The 'domestication' of heredity", 565–605.

²⁰ Otterspeer, *De wieslag van hun geest*, 395–396.

²¹ Eskildsen, "Leopold Ranke's archival turn", 425–453. See also Müller, "Doing historical research in the early nineteenth century", 81–103. More in general, Huistra–Paul–Tollebeek (eds.), *Historians in the archive*. 3–148.

This domesticity recalls the long history traced out by Gadi Algazi: how could the scholar, who since the late fifteenth century had exchanged his life as a bachelor for a householder's life (a *Prozess der Familiarisierung*), maintain his status as a scholar?²² Or, from another perspective: what was the position of the woman – the wife or in some cases the sister – in this constellation? The outcome was usually clear: the woman was, like the maid who was always present in the professor's home, denied access to the study – the Holy of Holies. A wife 'who will never invade my study' was how it was put by the young English historian John Richard Green, preparing for marriage.²³ So what was expected of the woman? Fredericq, who had remained single and lived with two sisters, associated them with the hearth of his home: the woman created the possibility for the man – for the historian – to work comfortably.²⁴ The romantic *ateliers* in which man and wife worked closely together, as had been the case with Jules Michelet and Athénaïs Mialaret, seemed to have no further place at the end of the nineteenth century.²⁵ But the wives of Blok, Pirenne and indeed of Green – his wife was Alice Stopford, who would also publish herself – in fact often did more than tend the hearth: it was not uncommon for them to take on the task of preparing their husband's manuscript for printing.²⁶

All of this was connected with the research that the historian performed. However, the professor's house was also a place of instruction in the decades around 1900 – instruction that was far harder to separate from research at that time than was the case later on, as Mauro Moretti has recently emphasised on the basis of, among other sources, Friedrich Meinecke's memoirs.²⁷ In other words, historical instruction also had a domestic character. This was less true of the lectures, although these too were given by some professors at the end of the nineteenth century in their own home – in a specially equipped 'lecture room'.²⁸ Above all, it was true of the seminars. This was how they had originated in Germany: Ranke, Johann Gustav Droysen and Waitz had set up their *historische Uebungen* (*exercitationes historicae*) as *private Gesprächszirkel* and received the students who attended them in their own *Studierzimmer*.²⁹ Their example was followed: towards the end of the nineteenth century, professors of all descriptions left the

²² Inter al. Algazi, "Scholars in households", 9–42; Idem, "Geistesabwesenheit", 325–342.

²³ Quoted in Smith, *The gender of history*, 79.

²⁴ See Tollebeek, *Fredericq & Zonen*, 99–109.

²⁵ Smith, *The gender of history*, 83–102. For a case study: Tollebeek, "Writing history in the salon vert", 35–40.

²⁶ See for example Keymeulen–Tollebeek, *Henri Pirenne, historian*, 29–30.

²⁷ Moretti, "A new community of scholars", 291–312, especially 293–295. On such memoirs: Popkin, *History, historians, & autobiography* (2005).

²⁸ For example, the Leiden professor Robert Fruin did this; see Tollebeek, "Fruin's aristocracy."

²⁹ Inter al. Eskildsen, "Leopold von Ranke", 462–482.

library rooms and garrets to hold their seminars in their own homes. In Paris, Gabriel Monod taught students the *métier* in an apartment – a modest one of course, for the same rhetoric applied – which was also referred to as an offshoot of Waitz's seminar.³⁰ In Belgium, Kurth and Fredericq now also received students at home. The image arose of a European chain of houses and apartments in which documents were discussed.

In this domestic setting, the seminars gained a specific, domestic character.³¹ The number of students admitted to the classes in the professor's house was small. It was a group that regarded itself as the elect, and could experience the sensational proximity of the discipline in the study: on Waitz's desk the proofs of the next volume of the *Monumenta* lay ready ... The room emanated warmth and life. The intimacy was reinforced by the manner in which the study was fitted out for the seminars. The students took their places around a long table, in the half-light, between the packed bookcases. The documents to be discussed – whether originals or copies – lay on the table, together with the most important reference works and several folio editions of sources. In this intimate setting, the discussion got underway, always remaining informal.

Simply by virtue of the place where it occurred, the seminar was a private affair: *privatissime*, as it was called in Berlin. This privacy was confirmed in many ways. The members of the company became acquainted with the secrets of the craft in weekly sessions (*séances*) in a private room. They were inducted into the discipline. Religious terms were often employed: they were 'novices', who were 'initiated' (among other things into the rules of source criticism) and underwent a *rite de passage*. Together, they formed a 'brotherhood', a company that shut itself off from the world. The creation of the group's own history was another element of this: after each meeting, a previously designated member of the group recorded in detail what had been discussed and what had taken place. The scientific work was also combined with forms of sociability: there was drinking and smoking, and a camaraderie arose (of an exclusively masculine character), which could be developed further on excursions. Thus the aspiring historians were also socialised. In a domestic culture, with the professor as role model, they were taught not just techniques, but also values.

Modern historiography was a domestic science, practised *comme en famille*, as the metaphor had it.³² The setting in which many of the seminars took place also made it possible to understand the image literally: the students came into contact with the professor's family. The boundary between private and public was not

³⁰ Hartog, *Le XIX^e siècle et l'histoire* 98.

³¹ See Tollebeek, *Fredericq & Zonen*, 86–99.

³² Fredericq, "L'origine et les développements des cours pratiques d'histoire en Belgique", 66–67.

drawn sharply. The mere fact that the seminars were arranged in a private house which also acquired public significance through the instruction that was given there created an ambiguity. But if one passed in the professor's house from the study room to the living-room, this was a transgression. Nevertheless, such a transgression was not uncommon. After a visit to the study (whether or not in connection with a seminar), a student might be invited into the living-room. There, he could be introduced to the professor's wife, converse with her or listen to her playing the piano, or dine with other guests.³³ In this convivial atmosphere, further socialisation took place – in a family setting.

Even those who did not have the opportunity to do this could be included in what has been referred to as the professor's 'extended family'.³⁴ For example, Ranke was a *Doktorvater* who very explicitly regarded all his students as family members.³⁵ The relationship between teacher and pupil could indeed be close to that between father and son. This could be expressed in dramatic ways. When Pirenne lost his favourite pupil Guillaume des Marez in 1931, he said in his funeral address: 'It is monstrous that a father has to survive his son, just as that a professor survives his student.'³⁶

In this 'extended family', the professor acted as mentor and patron. He placed his pupils in the professional field (usually in education or the world of archiving), and launched them in their academic career (by opening the doors of the new academic journals to them). As *paterfamilias*, he also felt responsible if they (or their family members) experienced financial or other adversity. For their part, the *protégés* were expected to show affection and respect for the paternal professor – and loyalty. They were supposed to belong to their patron's 'party'. That 'party' rarely if ever had a precise organisational structure or an elaborate ideology (on methodological issues, for example). It was unified not around a programme, but around a figure. It formed a clan. Clearly, then, communities in modern historiography (and by extension in the humanities in general) did not just arise on rational grounds. It was often a matter of honour and loyalty. This sometimes made the historians a turbulent family.³⁷

The image of the family – in a metaphorical sense – was also apt for describing a variety of aspects of discipline- and community-building in historiography (and the humanities). Historiography acquired – like other

³³ For a case study see: Tollebeek, *Mannen van karakter*, 40–46.

³⁴ Kelley, *Fortunes of history*, 174–175.

³⁵ Weber, *Priester der Klio*, 216. For the ambiguity of the relationship between the *Doktorvater* and his (subordinate) pupil, see Bourdieu, *Homo academicus*, 88.

³⁶ Lyon, "Guillaume des Marez and Henri Pirenne: a remarkable rapport", 1076; Billen–Boone, "Pirenne in Brussels before 1930," 459.

³⁷ For an example see: Tollebeek, "A stormy family", 58–72.

subjects – fathers of the discipline, usually in a context of national historiography (for example Robert Fruin became ‘the father of Dutch historiography’).³⁸ The celebrations of anniversaries or retirements were characterised as ‘family celebrations’. The photographs of colleagues from home and abroad that were collected and hung up in the study or in the university building’s seminar room in order to demarcate the discipline’s space served as ‘family portraits’. In the seminars themselves, finally, the students were constantly informed of all kinds of ‘family news’.³⁹ This family atmosphere had also found its way into the laboratories, incidentally. There too, the head of the community could act as a true *paterfamilias*, family ideals could prevail and suitable photographs in a pantheon could suggest the existence of a family community that extended far outside the laboratory.⁴⁰

The laboratory: the representation of modernity

That the domesticity that was so closely bound up with the humanities, with its complex rituals of intimacy, was also able to become an element of the laboratory culture in the natural sciences, is one thing. But the reverse can be documented even more tellingly: the humanities culture of domesticity was affected by the existing culture of the natural sciences and was weakened by it. Already by the end of the nineteenth century, instruction in the professor’s home – both lectures and seminars – was being referred to by the historians themselves as a *vieille tradition*, an *antique usage*.⁴¹

Remaining in the professor’s study, for teaching purposes at least, came to be regarded, for various reasons, as an anachronism. The first of these reasons was simple: the growing number of students and the fact that seminar exercises had been made an obligatory part of the historian’s training made it harder to receive the students in the professor’s private study. A second reason was more subjective in nature: it was the desire to be modern. The proponents of the seminars – who viewed the showpieces in the amphitheatres with horror – felt themselves to be an academic elite, an aristocracy, leading a group of selected pupils. But they also wanted to be an avant-garde, members of a movement in keeping with the spirit of the age. In this progressivist discourse there was no room for *antiques usages*.

³⁸ See inter al. Paul, “Voorbeeld en voorganger,” 30–53; Idem (ed.), „*Fathers of history: genealogies of the historical discipline*,” 225–293.

³⁹ Tollebeek, *Fredericq & Zonen*, 67, 174–186 and 193–199.

⁴⁰ Inter al. Bosstraeten, „*Dogs and Coca-Cola*,” 1–30.

⁴¹ Fredericq, *Notes et impressions de voyage*, 46 and 179.

Thus the return to the university buildings was embarked upon. But this time, it was not the *mansardes* that were sought out. The representation of modernity found its focus in the laboratories in the sciences and medicine, the disciplines that by around 1900 were starting to make an ever stronger mark on the university landscape. An historian such as Fredericq was very familiar with these laboratories: one of his brothers had a brilliant career at the university of Liège in experimental physiology and biochemistry, and moved into a brand-new Institut de Physiologie in the late 1880s. These were prestigious institutions. Among the historians (and other practitioners of the humanities), the desire grew for something comparable. In their focus on the practice of historical research, could the seminars not also be seen as laboratories?

Again, it was the German historians who took the lead, just as they had done in the 1830s when Ranke had established the first *historische Uebungen*. Now they – or some of them at any rate – called for institutionalised seminars, where with the government's financial support properly equipped rooms could be fitted out for practical instruction in history. The term 'seminar' now began to be used of these institutions rather than of the associated form of instruction.⁴² It was Heinrich von Sybel, a pupil of Ranke and professor in Munich, who was the first to establish such a 'laboratory': with the Bavarian government's support, in 1856 he was able to create a fixed infrastructure for his practical instruction. When he was appointed at Bonn several years later, a seminar was established there too. But it was above all Carl von Noorden, who between 1868 and his death in 1883 was successively professor in Greifswald, Marburg, Tübingen, Bonn and Leipzig, that spread the system of 'state seminars'. The most modern complex was built in Leipzig. It comprised five rooms: a study for the professors, a room in which atlases and palaeographical and epigraphical albums were kept in drawers, and three rooms for the students, each of whom had his own desk and where the necessary reference works were also available. The complex was open until late in the evening. The professors called in every day to guide the students in their work.

Leipzig became a model, including in the survey presented by Fredericq, who himself attempted to institutionalise his 'practical courses' in Ghent and obtain an annual government subsidy for them. Eventually, through his efforts, a wooden building was erected near the university's Aula several years before the First World War. It was not much. But the optimism did not waver: the *Arbeits-Zimmer* as designed by Von Noorden would become the rule in the future, it was said. It was an optimism borne along by a desire for modernity. The German 'state seminars' offered work premises that were hygienic, well heated and well lit

⁴² The following sketch is based on Fredericq, *Notes et impressions de voyage*, 44–47.

(as laboratories). Fredericq contrasted these contemporary rooms in his report with the *étroites chambrettes* and *mansardes misérables* in which the students usually lived. But the difference with those other *mansardes* also claimed attention: the garrets in the roof of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, which were praised for their irreplaceable style in the same *Notes et impressions de voyage*.

But not everyone was as enthusiastic about the efforts to institutionalise the *Übungen* in modern seminars of this kind. Ranke himself refused to give his *exercitationes* (which he was also unwilling to call ‘seminars’) anywhere other than in his own study. It was his favourite pupil Waitz who, in 1867, on the occasion of a celebration of his teacher, summed up the points of criticism: in the new seminars, permanent guidance from the professors took away from the pupils any chance of autonomous development, the increase in scale was associated with mediocrity, the financial support provided to the students threatened to make greed a reason for starting such a course of education. Ranke and Waitz only wanted a few students, men with a true vocation, who were not motivated by financial gain. These men of character could only develop in a private education, not in the factories of Von Noorden that were being promoted. It showed how much the critics were living in the past, with a discipline that had not yet been corrupted by an industrial habitus and with historians who had not yet become *Beamte*.⁴³ They clung to their domesticity like the Victorian men described by John Tosh in *A man's place* (1999): the ‘hardness’ of the world of work outside the home made them see their own home as a place of peace, love and comfort, where higher morals held sway, yet everyone could be themselves.⁴⁴ Ranke and Waitz felt alienated from the new educational world – and turned inwards in order to find themselves there alone.

This uneasiness would persist. It carried on for generation after generation. It led to a broad nostalgia for places of science that no longer existed or had been changed beyond recognition, and with these places, it was sadly noted, a scientific culture was disappearing too. The Austrian historian Hans Pirchegger recalled in his autobiography, written in 1950, how the changes had also reached Marburg, where he had studied. In 1895, a new university building had been opened, where the historians and geographers had more space, proper lighting had been introduced and the seminar library had become more accessible. But, Pirchegger added, the old feeling of homeliness – *Gemütlichkeit* – had never returned.⁴⁵

⁴³ For this last: Daunton, ‘Introduction’, 19.

⁴⁴ Tosh, *A man's place* (1999).

⁴⁵ Grass (ed.), *Österreichische Geschichtswissenschaft vol. 1*, 79. See also Tollebeek–Porciani, ‘Institutions, networks and communities’, 9. For the term ‘Gemütlichkeit’: Schmidt-Lauber, *Gemütlichkeit* (2003).

With the First World War came irreversible changes. The professors' prosperity decreased, as did their status.⁴⁶ Domesticity now completely disappeared from the world of university education, including in the humanities. There was no longer any teaching at home. Examinations formed one exception to this. In some countries and for certain groups, these were still taken in the professor's house. The democratisation of education and the advent of the mass university in the 1960s would put an end to this too. The old custom of the professor inviting students to tea on a Sunday and receiving them together with his wife had long since vanished.⁴⁷

Epilogue

In the years 1870–1914, historians sought and found their ideal discipline in university garrets, in studies in private homes and in seminars that were modelled on natural science laboratories. These were not empty places, nor were they undisputed. They played a crucial role in the *mise-en-scène* of the professional historical discipline, which in this way achieved precise characterisation: no showmanship, fed by intimate discussions, a modern setting. This last point pushed the domesticity of the discipline, academised though it was, into the background, at least on the teaching front. Because this remained a remarkable constant: as researchers, the historians continued for many more decades to be 'home workers'. Their study at home remained for them 'the navel of the world'; their room in the university was in fact just a subsidiary office. As a result, public and private remained interconnected in the university world for a long time.⁴⁸

But this too came to an end. After the Second World War, the presentism in historiography became more pronounced. The historian was expected to engage in the great social projects that were under construction.⁴⁹ He could be an armchair scholar no longer. The rector of the University of Amsterdam reassured his listeners: the modern professor, it was said in 1948, was no longer 'the absent-minded professor, who from his peaceful study would from time to time dispatch a new section of his life's work into the light of day'.⁵⁰ As a result, the study fell into disrepute even as a place of research: it symbolised a private, asocial discipline. Leave that room!, was the insistent advice.

⁴⁶ See the sketch in Moretti, *"A new community of scholars"*, 291–292.

⁴⁷ See the example in Rietveld–Wingerden, *"Jan Waterink"*, 111–113.

⁴⁸ Berkel, *Academisch leven*, 22–27.

⁴⁹ See inter al. Witte, *Voor vrede, democratie, wereldburgerschap en Europa* (2009).

⁵⁰ Quoted in Blaas, *Henk Hoetink (1900–1963)*, 126.

But what could the historian do out in the wide world? 'If he leaves the house of his subject and goes out into the street, the winds of doubt and contradiction confront him,' noted an ironic commentator a quarter of a century ago.⁵¹ For Porciani it was therefore clear: the contemporary historian is a *passer*, and in none of the old places does she still feel at home.

Bibliography

- A Godefroid Kurth, professeur à l'Université de Liège, à l'occasion du XXV^e anniversaire de la fondation de son cours pratique d'histoire.* Liège: H. Poncelet, 1898.
- Ahrens, Wilhelm. *Gelehrten-Anekdoten.* Berlin–Schöneberg: Sack, 1911.
- Algazi, Gadi. "'Geistesabwesenheit'. Gelehrte zu Hause um 1500". *Historische Anthropologie. Kultur-Gesellschaft-Alltag* 13 (2005): 325–342.
- Algazi, Gadi. "Scholars in households. Refiguring the learned habitus, 1480–1550." *Science in Context* 16 (2003): 9–42.
- Berkel, Klaas van. *Academisch leven. Over geschiedenis, karakter en veerkracht van de Nederlandse universiteit.* Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 2009.
- Billen, Claire-Boone, Marc (eds.), *Fathers of history: genealogies of the historical discipline*, thematic section in *Storia della Storiografia* 59–60. (2011): 225–293.
- Billen, Claire-Boone, Marc. "Pirenne in Brussels before 1930. Guillaume des Marez and the relationship between a master and his student." In: *Henri Pirenne (1862–1935): a Belgian historian and the development of social and historical sciences*, thematic issue *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Nieuwste Geschiedenis / Revue belge d'Histoire contemporaine* 41, n. 3–4. (2011): 459–485. Edited by Boone, Marc.–Billen, Clarie – Keymeulen, Sarah.
- Blaas, P.B.M. *Henk Hoetink (1900–1963), een intellectuele biografie. Recht en geschiedenis.* Hilversum: Verloren, 2010.
- Bosstraeten, Truus van. "Dogs and Coca-Cola. Commemorative practices as part of laboratory culture at the Heymans Institute Ghent, 1902–1970". *Centaurus* 53 (2011): 1–30.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Homo academicus.* Cambridge–Oxford: Polity Press, 1988.
- Clark, William. *Academic charisma and the origins of the research university.* Chicago–London: Chicago University Press, 2006.
- Daston, Lorraine J. –Galison, Peter. *Objectivity.* New York: Zone Books, 2010.
- Dauntton, Martin. "Introduction". In: *The organisation of knowledge in Victorian Britain*, Edited by Idem, 1–27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Eskildsen, Kasper Risbjerg. "Leopold Ranke's archival turn. Location and evidence in modern historiography." *Modern Intellectual History*, 5 (2008): 425–453.
- Eskildsen, Kasper Risbjerg. "Leopold von Ranke, la passion de la critique et le séminaire d'histoire." In: *Lieux de savoir. Espaces et communauté*, Edited By Jacob, Christian, 462–482. Paris: Albin Michel, 2007.
- Fredericq, Paul. *L'enseignement supérieur de l'histoire. Notes et impressions de voyage. Allemagne – France – Ecosse – Angleterre – Hollande – Belgique.* Ghent–Paris: Alcan, 1899
- Fuhrman, Horst. 'Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen.' *Gelehrtenleben im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert dargestellt am Beispiel der Monumenta Germaniae Historica und ihrer Mitarbeiter.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 1996.

⁵¹ Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780–1980*, 372–373.

- Grass, Nikolaus (ed.). *Österreichische Geschichtswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen. Vol. 1.* Innsbruck: Wagner, 1950.
- Hanssen, Léon – Krul, Wessel – Van der Lem, Anton (eds.). *Johan Huizinga: Briefwisseling, vol. 1: 1894–1924.* Utrecht: Uitgeverij L J Veen, 1989.
- Hartog, François: *Le XIXe siècle et l'histoire. Le cas Fustel de Coulanges.* Paris: PUF, 1988.
- Huistra, Pieter – Paul, Herman – Tollebeek, Jo (eds.). *Historians in the archive. Changing historiographical practices in the nineteenth century*, special issue *History of the Human Sciences* 26, n. 4. (2013): 3–148.
- Kelley, Donald R. *Fortunes of history. Historical inquiry from Herder to Huizinga.* New Haven – London: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Keymeulen, Sarah – Tollebeek, Jo. *Henri Pirenne, historian: a life in pictures.* Leuven: Lipsius Leuven, 2011.
- Knegtmans, P.J. "Liefde voor de wetenschap. Het negentiende-eeuwse universitaire onderwijs en de scheiding tussen wetenschappelijke vorming en wetenschappelijk beroepsonderwijs." In: *Van Lectio tot PowerPoint. Over de geschiedenis van het onderwijs aan de Nederlandse universiteiten*, Edited by Dorsman, L.J. – Knegtmans, P.J., 11–24. Verloren: Hilversum, 2011.
- Kossmann, Ernst Heinrich. *De Lage Landen 1780–1980. Twee eeuwen Nederland en België. Vol. 2.* Amsterdam–Brussel: Elsevier, 1986.
- Lamont, Michéle. *How professors think. Inside the curious world of academic judgment.* Cambridge MA–London: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Lingelbach, Gabriele (ed.). *Vorlesung, Seminar, Repetitorium. Universitäre geschichtswissenschaftliche Lehre im historischen Vergleich.* Munich: Martin Meidenbauer Verlagsbuchhandlung, 2006.
- Livingstone, David Noel. *Putting science in its place. Geographies of scientific knowledge.* Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2003.
- Lyon, Bryce Dale. "Guillaume des Marez and Henri Pirenne: a remarkable rapport". *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis / Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 77 (1999): 1051–1078.
- Moretti, Mauro. "A new community of scholars. The university professors at work." In: *Setting the standards. Institutions, networks and communities of national historiography*, Edited by Porciani, Ilaria–Tollebeek, Jo. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Müller, Philipp. "Doing historical research in the early nineteenth century. Leopold Ranke, the archive policy, and the *Relazioni* of the Venetian Republic." *Storia della Storiografia* 56 (2009): 81–103.
- Otterspeer, Willem. *De wickslag van hun geest. De Leidse universiteit in de negentiende eeuw.* The Hague: Stichting Hollandse Historische Reeks, 1992.
- Paul, Herman. "Voorbeeld en voorganger. Robert Fruin en Godefroid Kurth als vaders van de geschiedwetenschap." *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden / The Low Countries Historical Review*, 126 (2011): 30–53
- Popkin, Jeremy D. *History, historians, & autobiography.* Chicago–London: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Porciani, Ilaria. "Self portrait of an Italian historian as a woman on the train". In: *Making sense, crafting history. Practices of producing historical meaning*, Edited by Agárdi, Izabella – Waaldijk, Bertheke – Salvaterra, Carla, 129–154. Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2010.
- Richmond, Marsha L. "The 'domestication' of heredity. The familial organization of geneticists at Cambridge University, 1805–1910." *Journal of the History of Biology*, 39 (2006): 565–605.
- Schmidt-Lauber, Brigitta. *Gemütlichkeit. Eine kulturwissenschaftliche Annäherung.* Frankfurt am Main–New York: Campus Verlag, 2003
- Schwartz, Vanessa R. *Spectacular realities. Early mass culture in Fin-de-Siècle Paris.* Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press, 1999.
- Smith, Bonnie G. *The gender of history. Men, women, and historical practice.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Tollebeek, Jo. "A stormy family. Paul Fredericq and the formation of an academic historical community in the nineteenth century." *Storia della Storiografia*, 53 (2008): 58–72.

- Tollebeek, Jo. "Exegi monumentum. The great syntheses of national history." In: *Setting the standards. Institutions, networks and communities of national historiography*, Edited by Porciani, Ilaria–Tollebeek, Jo, 105–130. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Tollebeek, Jo. "Fruin's aristocracy. Historiographical practices in the late nineteenth century." In: *The history of Dutch philology*, Edited by Kalmthout, T. van– Zuidervaart, H. Forthcoming.
- Tollebeek, Jo. "Pirenne and Fredericq. Historiographical ambitions around 1900." In: *Henri Pirenne (1862–1935): a Belgian historian and the development of social and historical sciences*, thematic issue *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Nieuwste Geschiedenis / Revue belge d'Histoire contemporaine* 41, n. 3–4 (2011): 383–409. Edited by Boone, Marc.–Billen, Cl.–Keymeulen, Sarah.
- Tollebeek, Jo. "Writing history in the salon vert". *Storia della Storiografia* 46 (2004): 35–40.
- Tollebeek, Jo. *Fredericq & Zonen. Een antropologie van de moderne geschiedwetenschap*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2008.
- Tollebeek, Jo. *Mannen van karakter. De wording van de moderne geesteswetenschappen*. Amsterdam: Prometheus, Uitgeverij, 2011.
- Tollebeek, Jo–Porciani, Ilaria. "Institutions, networks and communities in a European perspective". In: *Setting the standards. Institutions, networks and communities of national historiography*, Edited by Porciani, Ilaria – Tollebeek, Jo, 3–26. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Torstendahl, Rolf. "From all-round to professional education. How young historians became members of an academic community in the nineteenth century." In: *Een goede historicus? Negentiende-eeuwse idealen en praktijken*, special issue *Leidschrift* 25, n. 1. (2010): 17–31.
- Tosh, John. *A man's place. Masculinity and the middle-class home in Victorian England*. New Haven–London: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Van der Lem, Anton. *Johan Huizinga. Leven en werk in beelden & documenten*. Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 1993.
- Weber, Wolfgang. *Priester der Klio. Historisch-sozialwissenschaftliche Studien zur Herkunft und Karriere deutscher Historiker und zur Geschichte der Geschichtswissenschaft 1800–1970*. Frankfurt am Main–Bern–New York: Lang, 1984.
- Wingerden, Marjoke Rietveld-van. "Jan Waterink als docent en vernieuwer van universitair onderwijs." In: *Van Lectio tot PowerPoint. Over de geschiedenis van het onderwijs aan de Nederlandse universiteiten*, Edited by Dorsman, L.J. – Knegtmans, P.J., 101–114. Verloren: Hilversum, 2011.
- Witte, Els. *Voor vrede, democratie, wereldburgerschap en Europa. Belgische historici en de naoorlogse politiek-ideologische projecten (1944–1956)*. Kapellen: Pelckmans, 2009.

Le nouveau modèle de l'histoire et Hermann Broch

L'Epoque Moderne (que ce soit la notion originale, résumant la littérature et l'art moderne ou la notion socio-philosophique un peu élargie de Max Weber „le désenchantement”) apporta une modification décisive également dans l'examen fondamental des définitions spécifiques de ce modèle, sur la base duquel on constitua jusque là théoriquement l'histoire.¹ La contrepartie directe de ce nouveau modèle n'était pas l'un des plus nombreux modèles d'histoire théoriques de la tradition philosophique initiale, mais celui de „la philosophie de l'histoire universelle”, précédant historiquement immédiatement l'Epoque Moderne (esthétique comme socio-philosophique), dans laquelle nous résumons le modèle historique dynamique des Lumières, tout comme la philosophie de l'histoire universelle de l'idéalisme classique de Herder et de Kant jusqu'à Hegel et Marx.²

Ce qui est donc entendu comme inhérent à l'Epoque Moderne, est un changement de modèle historique, philosophique et théorique.

Ainsi, nous ne thématisons pas les longues séries successives de modèles de base historico-théoriques, mais nous mettons au centre de notre investigation un changement concret entre le modèle de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle et le soi-disant „modèle actuel de l'histoire.” Nous faisons cette comparaison cette fois-ci avec l'objectif de gagner, par cette confrontation, de nouveaux aspects en vue de l'interprétation de la théorie des valeurs profondément motivée historiquement et philosophiquement de Hermann Broch.³

¹ La constitution de ces notions et idées, à l'aide desquelles nous constituons „l'histoire”, est évidemment en premier lieu un processus théorique, même une notion abstraite de l'histoire se référant cependant à un empirisme historique et social.

² Dans le modèle appliqué dans cet essai, apparaissent dans le même groupe les *Lumières* et la *Philosophie de l'Histoire Universelle* de l'idéalisme classique. Dans un autre contexte théorique, ce ne serait évidemment pas permis..

³ D'une manière générale appropriée, à ce stade nous mettrions déjà en évidence, que la relation spécifiquement étroite de la philosophie des valeurs et de la philosophie de l'histoire chez Hermann Broch (qui n'est à vrai dire pas du tout dans la tradition philosophique une variante élargie) serait déjà à expliquer par son profond ancrage dans le modèle présent. A propos des cadres généraux de l'interprétation de Broch aussi concernés dans ce travail, v. Kiss, *Philosophie et Littérature de l'Universalisme négatif* (2001).

Le modèle de la „philosophie de l'histoire universelle” peut être écrit comme un système dynamique, comme un héraclitisme grandissant seulement consciemment et lentement pour les acteurs historiques. En lui, se trouve le processus historique, qui attribue aux divers acteurs leur place et leur mission. C'est de plus aussi le processus historique comme un tout, qui permet de montrer dans le chaos de l'histoire les contours d'un ordre téléologique. Les contours de cet ordre téléologique n'effacent nullement le rayons d'action des divers acteurs libres. Le libre jeu des acteurs libres est ce qui est positif. La totalité du processus historique intègre complètement le social et l'anthropologique. Se combinent avec lui le vécu et l'expérience de la croissance et de l'accumulation. Le processus historique constitue dans une abstraction ultime société et esprit, dans et au travers duquel cependant, une nouvelle rationalité ouvre la voie.

Pendant que, dans le cas des Lumières (que nous venons d'inclure dans la philosophie de l'histoire universelle), la rationalité moderne fonctionne en tant que Moviens de tout le processus historique, le contexte tourne à la philosophique classique allemande, où le processus historique inclus comme un tout est celui, qui fait évoluer la rationalité moderne d'une manière très particulière. L'histoire se déroule au travers de l'espace imaginaire des actions historiques complexes uniformément perçues et assigne leurs rôles à tous les participants. Dans ce cadre, l'histoire ressemble à des corps célestes, qui constitue par leurs mouvements des structures de temps. Ce modèle de base intègre divers modèles, qui à maints autres égards sont même en concurrence. Dans les contextes dynamiques, une téléologie s'impose toujours, qui ne revient sur aucune systématique ou métaphysique précédente.

De notre point de vue actuel, ceci est la qualité prépondérante de ce modèle historique. L'histoire, en tant que véritable lutte de véritable forces, est parfaitement désanthropomorphisée (Herder) et considérée sans téléologie, alors que dans cette histoire vécue comme une nature se présentant a-téléologique (et donc sans illusion), elle devient perceptible simultanément en tant que croissance de la conscience de la liberté, mais aussi de la rationalité. Dans la mesure où la conscience du travail de l'histoire universelle est prise en considération, les hommes admettent aussi consciemment le rôle qui leur est assigné par l'histoire universelle et se définissent libres en lui.

L'histoire, à tous égards, en tant que force „objective” produit liberté et émancipation, en examinant de plus près ses lois, l'interdépendance, sinon l'interaction consciente devient, entre liberté humaine et nécessité objective, même plus grande. Cette „composante rationnelle” de la „ruse de la raison” n'est cependant pas si importante pour la formation de notre modèle, sont plutôt plus importants les contextes fonctionnels objectifs, qui constituent ce modèle

spécifiquement *européen*. Le processus historique caractérise toute dimension du monde objectif. Il intègre le passé et porte l'avenir en son sein. Plus cette facette est consciemment reconnue, plus cette philosophie de l'histoire universelle gagne cependant en potentiel critique, elle ne comporterait dans d'autres comparaisons pas seulement aucune utopie, mais aucune orientation future particulière.

Dans son attitude immanente vis-à-vis du futur, la dynamique historique garde un caractère inévitable critique, sinon même juste quasi-politique⁴. Ceci signifie cependant aussi, que le modèle de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle peut encore adjuger leurs fonctions et missions, pas seulement aux acteurs du présent, mais aussi dans de nombreux cas à ceux de l'avenir. Si l'avenir poursuit les tendances déjà connues, alors le processus de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle devient déjà „en lui-même”, c'est-à-dire dans sa forme originale une „amélioration”, une „évolution”, cependant aussi une „promesse”. Le présent devient dans ce modèle la transition, il est déjà meilleur que le passé, mais encore certaine pire que le futur. Il faut une halte comme un énorme corps céleste dans l'espace de l'histoire mondiale, pendant que les acteurs du présent respectif grandissent inextricablement ensemble avec leur satellite, comme ce devrait être le cas dans l'espace véritable.

Depuis les années 50 et 60 du XIX^{ème} siècle, ce modèle historique disparaît cependant rapidement et presque sans traces tangibles.

Le présent n'apparaît plus comme une étape actuelle dans le terrible cours du processus historique universel. Il apparaît essentiellement comme une structure déjà terminée qui, dans beaucoup de comparaisons décisives, montre la qualité de l'optimalité, ou de l'optimum historique, déjà dans son statut en tant que présent. Cette présence de l'idée d'un optimum historique (ou historiquement possible) ne signifie cependant pas, que ses représentants auraient pensé à Maître Pangloss, ils vivent dans le meilleur de tous les temps possibles. Dans ce contexte, une *nouvelle variante significative de l'optimum* est réalisée. Elle implique que, de façon déterminante, les changements révolutionnaires sortant du cadre du présent ne sont plus possibles et si elles étaient encore possibles d'une certaine manière, elles conduiraient (pourraient conduire) à l'élimination (aussi involontairement) des accomplissements déjà réalisés civilisationnels ou émancipateurs. Cette attitude s'étend aussi aux institutions sociales et politiques directrices. Le nouveau modèle ne peut certainement plus représenter l'attente avec conviction, de nouvelles institutions pourraient essentiellement mieux résoudre, que celles existantes, les dilemmes fondamentaux dans les circonstances données de la transition. Cet élément était

⁴ C'est la vraie raison d'une problématique historico-philosophique et sociologique du savoir sinon seulement très difficile à exploiter, spécialement par le fait, que la vision historique exacte d'un grand nombre de concepts philosophiques était et est le réel critère de vérité.

cependant aussi la plus importante raison de tout le modèle historique universel. Il ne contient aucun optimum de valeurs ou de conditions, il incarne et réalise *un optimum spécifique des relations à interpréter structurellement ou fonctionnellement*. Le présent peut se constituer différemment de ce qui fut le cas dans le modèle de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle. Le présent reste une partie de l'histoire, dont la vitesse s'est cependant fortement ralentie. Le processus de l'histoire universelle n'assigne plus aux acteurs leurs missions et fonctions, contraintes sociales, nécessités itales et liberté individuelle s'emparent de ce rôle, surtout dans une société dont les structures et contextes internes ont été caractérisés par une relative constance.⁵

Si nous réalisons l'essentiel de ce changement entre le modèle de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle et le modèle historique du présent, alors apparaît dans l'ère donnée seulement une seule exception pertinente, qui pourrait à elle seule déjà critiquement mettre en danger notre construction en raison de sa pertinence historique unique. Au vrai sens du terme, ce contre-exemple frappant est Karl Marx. Il y a indubitablement une série d'oeuvres philosophiques, dans lesquelles il se révèle en tant que représentant de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle. Ces oeuvres (d'une manière totalement évidente, par exemple, le *Manifeste communiste*) réalisent comme exemplairement le modèle de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle dans la constitution de la téléologie et des idéologies, dans l'assignation des rôles et tâches historiques, mais aussi dans la possibilité de l'évaluation et de l'interprétation suivantes de faits et actes historiques individuels.

Marx serait une véritable contre-preuve pour ce changement de modèle si essentiel aussi pour Hermann Broch. Dans cette situation, un autre Karl Marx doit cependant aussi nécessairement apparaître, qui tenait dans un sens les dimensions civilisatrices du capitalisme exactement pour „optimales”, dans lequel nous avons récemment évoqué cette nouvelle vision de l'optimum historique. Ce Marx-là rend la véritable maîtrise historico-philosophique du capitalisme dépendante de la naissance d'une dimension technico-civilisatrice parfaitement nouvelle. Le fait qu'un „optimum” parfaitement nouveau soit nécessaire pour le remplacement du capitalisme reconstructible actuel, prouve indirectement, que la situation historique présente est déjà, dans un sens concret, „optimale”. Dans ce contexte, Marx s'attache donc au changement de modèles historiques. Comment Marx réconcilie l'acceptation du „modèle présent” avec d'autre part sa situation

⁵ Nous devons faire la différence entre la dynamique de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle (premier modèle) et la dynamique sociale et économique du modèle actuel, alors que des institutions et structures sont entrées dans ces conditions quasi-optimales (second modèle).

effectivement toujours maintenue de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle, est effectivement une autre question.⁶

Le présent différemment interprété devient donc „l'histoire”, la théorie du présent ainsi compris devient la philosophie de l'histoire. Nous considérons le présent comme une émanation du passé et le futur existant déjà dans le présent.

Le présent a sa dynamique, c'est cependant une dynamique très ralentie et, en de nombreux contextes, même „désenchantée”. Ce n'est plus un processus historique pensé universellement, qui délivre des définitions causales, il y a les activités actuelles devenues toujours plus incalculables, par lesquelles, les individus en viennent aussi à l'efficacité historique, tout en poursuivant leurs intérêts actuels.

Le présent arrive à une *indépendance* spécifique, qui délivre, dans sa nouvelle dynamique, un nouveau modèle de la philosophie de l'histoire. Il *déshistorise* le passé de manière croissante. Comme il ne vit plus lui-même, en tant qu'indépendant, comme membre de la continuité historique, il extrait tous les moments spécifiques de la continuité historique et fait de ces moments des composantes décisives de la discussion actuelle d'intérêt vital. Pendant que, par exemple, Friedrich *Nietzsche* argue avec la *généalogie* de la morale dans le contexte de l'émergence du christianisme dans le déclin de l'Empire Romain, il n'est pas guidé par l'intention d'interpréter ce moment historique comme exclusivement historique ou de l'insérer alors dans tout un processus de l'histoire universelle. Il considère – déjà guidé par l'esprit et la méthodologie du nouveau modèle – ce problème comme une partie de la discussion actuelle à propos de la morale. Il déshistorise alors le sujet (bien que son caractère réel historique reste intouché) et fait de lui une partie du présent omnipotent.⁷

Le modèle de présent change cependant aussi fondamentalement sa relation au futur. Il déshistorise non seulement le passé mais *défuturise* aussi le futur. Il le transpose dans le présent. Le futur motive les actions du présent. Les attitudes directrices du présent ne constituent pas seulement spontanément le futur, on travaille dans le présent sur l'état du futur existant à long terme en politique et en économie.⁸

Dans ce trait défuturisant, la frontière entre présent et futur disparaît de plus en plus. L'une des conséquences les plus pertinentes de ce changement est

⁶ Que cette différence passe par la philosophie de Marx, ne peut être un problème. Il déplace d'une part la fin mesurée à l'optimum civilisateur du capitalisme dans le futur lointain, alors que d'autre part il définit la Commune de Paris comme la forme politique de la libération du travail.

⁷ Une conséquence intéressante de cette nouvelle situation est le changement d'attitude des historiens eux-mêmes, ou, de celle des attentes face à leur activité. Des noms et oeuvres comme *Buckhardt*, *Ranke* ou *Bachofen* marquent ce tournant.

⁸ L'histoire infinie de la *planification* peut clarifier les dimensions de cette problématique.

l'investigation dans la signification grandissante de la force constructive historique de l'individu, dans l'importance de la liberté humaine, qui conduit aussi sociologiquement à la réévaluation de l'intelligence d'interprétation, auxquels protagonistes appartient parmi beaucoup d'autres Hermann Broch, aux côtés de Nietzsche.

■ Nous aimerions montrer, que la philosophie de l'histoire d'Hermann Broch, construite sur les valeurs (ou construite sur l'histoire de la philosophie des valeurs) procède de la même manière. Son Moyen-Age ou thèse de la décadence des valeurs ne représente aucun effort pour construire un processus historique tout entier et d'en arriver au présent au travers de tout ce processus afin de pouvoir développer seulement alors les problèmes spécifiques au présent. Son processus est aussi exactement dans ce sens déshistorisant, comme il apparut concrètement à l'exemple de Nietzsche.

■ Hermann Broch lui-même, comme depuis Nietzsche les intellectuels modernes est aussi un parfait produit de cette nouvelle attitude vis-à-vis du présent et ainsi de l'histoire et de l'histoire de la philosophie. En tant qu'auteur et penseur, il traite de cette problématique, d'une manière fondamentale sous deux aspects, sur deux périodes et dans deux catégories littéraires.

La première oeuvre est la *Trilogie des Somnambules*, dans l'analyse de laquelle nous devons affirmer avec quelque surprise, que Broch thématise totalement en elle les contextes psychologiques et existentiels de cette grande transformation entre la philosophie de l'histoire universelle omnipotente et le „modèle du présent”. Nous pourrions même encore risquer la thèse, selon laquelle cette grande transformation serait le *thème principal* réel de cette grande trilogie. Cela mérite un compliment pour la représentation spécifiquement artistique de Broch, la thématisation des conséquences existentielles du changement de modèle se produisant aussi et, tout d'abord, dans la représentation épique, bien que la même problématique soit aussi purement théoriquement concernée dans le même roman. Le modèle du présent se révèle en tant que nouvelle *condition humaine*.

■ Si on lit même avec l'impartialité requise la *Trilogie des Somnambules* sous cet aspect, on peut arriver à la conséquence, que la psyché humaine, l'existence humaine⁹ ne pourrait s'adapter elle-même à ce changement de modèle d'une manière critique (sinon tragique, comme le suggère Broch). Face à cette perspective, si nous lisons les trois volumes de la Trilogie, les idées de base des divers volumes (romantisme, anarchie, objectivité) se réfèrent nécessairement

⁹ Si la „psychologie” n'était pas aujourd'hui une science spécialisée exactement encadrée, nous devrions qualifier la question de Broch de „psychologique”, parce que ce n'est cependant pas le cas, nous préférons l'attribuer „existentielle”.

bon gré mal gré à cette transformation. Cette réflexion sur cette problématique de base porte déjà avec suspicion des résultats semblant unanimes.

La notion de Broch du *romantisme*¹⁰ peut être formulée dans la langue du changement de modèle, de telle sorte que le romantique poursuive toujours l'existence qui lui est imposée par l'ancienne philosophie de l'histoire universelle dans un présent qui, de son côté, ne connaît plus l'histoire et exerce¹¹ déjà son nouveau pouvoir de définition inconnu avant les romantiques. Une aliéation mutuelle apparaît, que Broch représente avec une étrange assurance, dans le premier volume de la Trilogie, par la méthode de *l'état crépusculaire* littéraire.¹²

Le romantique se sent parfaitement aliéné dans le monde dominé et dicté par le modèle du présent. Ce n'est cependant qu'un côté de la médaille. À la réalité historique et esthétique, il appartient aussi chez Broch, que le protagoniste vivant dans et du présent, donc le non-romantique, doit aussi devenir aliéné dans le contexte social donné. Pendant que son adéquation positive avec le temps est reflétée par l'aliéation insurmontable du romantique, il devient aussi aliéné de ce monde, qui aurait été originellement son propre monde. Même l'homme vivant totalement dans le présent est absorbé par l'aliéation de l'autre. Il entre même dans un espace social et existentiel vide. La grandeur littéraire de Broch peut apparaître une fois de plus dans un tout nouvel éclairage sous l'aspect du changement de modèle historique. Nous ne connaissons à vrai dire aucun autre écrivain classique éminent de l'Époque Moderne, ayant néanmoins représenté aussi clairement que Broch ce phénomène fondamental de la double, cependant aussi mutuelle aliéation.

Il n'est pas moins surprenant pour nous, que „*l'anarchie*” de Broch s'harmonise donc avec le grand changement de la constitution de l'histoire et de la société. Le phénomène spécifiquement Broch de l'anarchie décrit, si même ne *découvre* pas, la réaction aussi typiquement idéale, que le présent, déjà définitivement séparé de l'histoire aussi bien dans sa constitution que dans sa puissance d'effet, *ne* correspond pas aux besoins élémentaires de liberté et d'ordre. Les pulsions humaines primaires (Siegfried Kracauer) s'exacerbent contre le présent à puissance effective. Le présent représente invariablement son

¹⁰ Dans notre contexte, il est loin d'être une coïncidence, qu'également la notion de „romantisme” vienne de Nietzsche et englobe une importance propre, dont s'empare entièrement Broch. – Il est encore à noter ici, que l'argumentation complexe et polémique de Broch s'articule aussi dans son attitude très différenciée au positivisme, car „modèle de présent” et „positivisme” sont liés par des milliers de fils.

¹¹ D'une splendide manière, Broch en fait le leitmotiv de sa représentation avec laquelle totale incompréhension du jeune Pasenow il n'expérimente pas seulement le monde moderne, mais aussi tout un chacun s'y connaissant dans cette vie quotidienne moderne.

¹² Voir à ce sujet: Kiss, „*L'état crépusculaire dans un éclairage philosophique, psychologique et romantique-esthétique.*”

caractère spécifiquement „optimal” (pendant qu'ici, comme nous l'avons déjà remarqué, il ne s'agit pas d'un optimum dans les valeurs, mais d'un optimum dans les institutions et fonctions). Maintes fois convaincante est la vision inspirée de Broch, dans laquelle il laisse le protagoniste de l'anarchie, Esch, se confronter avec un „fonctionnaire” du syndicat (Geyring). Car, entre Esch et Geyring, une autre sorte d'aliénation¹³ mutuelle et double existe encore ici. L'optimal du présent vainquit la téléologie, le romantisme, mais aussi l'utopie de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle. L'anarchiste de Broch s'aliène du présent comme le romantique. Pendant que le cependant non-romantique (Berrand dans la Trilogie) voit encore au moins l'aliénation de l'autre dans son aliénation, le fonctionnaire se révèle être celui qui n'a plus aucune réflexion sur la problématique réelle. Il est tout simplement génial de voir avec quelle gaité assurée Geyring accompagne le calvaire de Esch, sans devenir en outre absolument conscient de sa propre aliénation.

Après le „romantisme” et „l'anarchie”, apparaît cependant aussi „l'objectivité” dans la Trilogie de Broch comme l'une des possibles interprétations de la *condition humaine* à l'époque du modèle du présent en tant qu'optimum fonctionnel et institutionnel. Sur la vague de l'optimum, apparaît une absence de valeurs fonctionnellement motivée, une consolidation ultime de l'optimum ainsi compris. C'est certainement une des seules interprétations possibles de cette condition. C'est certainement aussi ainsi, que Broch traite, non pas ici la transformation historique elle-même, mais celle du côté humain, plus exactement exprimé, son processus existentiel. Il nous semble cependant qu'il a été prouvé, que la vaste problématique de la transformation d'une philosophie de l'histoire universelle se trouve dans un modèle du présent de la philosophie de l'histoire, dans une large mesure, derrière l'horizon conceptuel de ce grand roman.¹⁴

L'autre grande oeuvre, dans laquelle Hermann Broch débat du changement de modèle dans la constitution de l'histoire est le soi-disant essai de *Hofmannsthal*.¹⁵ Dans le domaine spécifique de l'histoire intellectuelle de Berlin et Vienne, la grande transformation n'est pas directement thématisée, plutôt dans la perspective d'une analyse de questions culturello-philosophiques et sociologiques.

Cela conduit entre autres aussi au fait, que la transition devint visible, pas seulement par les perspectives existentielles des protagonistes typiquement

¹³ Voir à ce propos en détail: Kiss, *Vérité et Tragique de l'Anarchie*, 47–53.

¹⁴ Cela peut déjà être prouvé par les structures macroscopiques, pendant que tout protagoniste individuel de la grande Trilogie se révèle être une incarnation intensive des attitudes-clés possibles du modèle de présent.

¹⁵ Broch, „*Hofmannsthal et son Temps. Une étude*”; Broch, „*Ecrits en prose de Hugo von Hofmannsthal*”.

idéalement sélectionnés (comme ce fut le cas dans la *Trilogie*), mais aussi dans des généralisations théoriques (comme dans l'essai).

Les résultats de Broch s'harmonisent aussi, dans le contexte de cet oeuvre, avec les tendances générales du changement de modèle historique.

Dans la comparaison *sociologique*, Broch met en évidence, que dans l'art du troisième tiers du XIX^{ème} siècle, les grandes perspectives historiques, ainsi que l'interprétation dictée par elles (comme par exemple le tragique) sont remplacées par le succès social, exprimé un peu plus concrètement, par la promotion sociale ou par son absence. Entre autres, il s'ensuit une réévaluation de l'attitude de Broch, analysée de tant de façons, entre bourgeois et artiste.

Dans la *comparaison philosophique de valeur*, Hermann Broch se concentre, précisément dans notre plus large contexte mentionné ci-dessus, sur le fait qu'au cours de cette transformation l'esthétique, comprise au sens large, affaiblit aussi l'éthique ainsi comprise, l'écarte, sinon l'élimine au cours du développement artistique.

Ces deux diagnostics ne s'harmonisent pas seulement ensemble, ils montrent les mêmes points essentiels que ceux de la *Trilogie des somnambules*.

Aux yeux de Broch, la grande transformation conduisit à de nouveaux et énormes crises et conflits. Cependant, ceci est dans cette mesure supprimé *ab ovo* dans ce modèle. Le présent n'a plus l'omnipotence de la philosophie de l'histoire universelle. Le présent construit sur l'optimum relatif de structures et institutions n'est pas homogène. Il a sa propre dynamique et les individus devenus libres se mouvent maintenant dans ses espaces. Cela signifie, que la qualité historique du présent dépend, pour une grande partie, de la réalisation de la liberté humaine. Le diagnostic de Broch est essentiellement pessimiste. Le „romantisme“, „l'anarchie“ et „l'objectivité“ conduisent à des événements d'aliénation compliqués, au cours desquels les acteurs ne peuvent emplir les espaces vides des structures du présent par une activité libre et émancipatrice. L'optimal du présent n'apparaît pas dans l'existence des hommes. Les plus récentes circonstances ne l'aident pas non plus particulièrement. Il espère davantage dans le succès social constant que dans le bonheur authentique individuel. Au lieu de la réalisation du bonheur, il doit s'instrumentaliser lui-même esthétiquement, au sens le plus large du terme.

Dans cet essai, il ne s'agissait pas tant d'une reconstruction complète de l'interprétation spécifique de Broch de la grande transformation. Ce que nous voulions d'abord prouver ici, est la *correspondance de ce changement de modèle avec la réflexion de Broch sur l'histoire et le présent*. Broch partit déjà du modèle du présent, en pensa les conséquences et en vint ainsi à ses soudains nouveaux questionnements.

Bibliography

- Broch, Hermann. „Ecrits en prose de Hugo von Hofmannsthal.” Dans: Hermann Broch, *Ecrits sur la Littérature. 1ère critique*. Edition commentée, Vol. 9/1. 285–336. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1975.
- Broch, Hermann. „Hofmannsthal et son Temps. Une étude.” Dans: Hermann Broch, *Ecrits sur la Littérature. 1ère critique*. Edition commentée, Vol. 9/1. 111–284. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1975.
- Kiss, Endre. „L'état crépusculaire dans un éclairage philosophique, psychologique et romantique-esthétique.” Dans: *Antriaca* 55 (2003): 155–172.
- Kiss, Endre. „Vérité et Tragique de l'Anarchie.” Dans: *Hermann Broch ou la Peur de l'Anarchie*. Publié par Petrasch, Wilhelm–Pattillo-Hess, John, 47–53. Vienne: Verein Volksbildungshaus Wiener Urania, 1993.
- Kiss, Endre. *Philosophie et Littérature de l'Universalisme négatif. Monographie intellectuelle sur Hermann Broch*. Cuxhaven–Dartford: Junghans editeur, 2001.

Der Streit zwischen Harold Steinacker und Ákos Timon¹

In meiner Studie beschäftige ich mich mit dem Streit zwischen Ákos Timon und Harold Steinacker zur Zeit des Dualismus. Ich konzentriere mich auf die Personen und ihren Streit, dann versuche ich eine historiographische Auslegung zu geben.

Ákos Timon wurde zu Eger geboren.² Im Jahr 1876 wurde er ein Doktor der Rechte, dann studierte er in Berlin, Leipzig und Paris. Er unterrichtete vierunddreißig Jahre lang Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte an der Universität Budapest mit großem Erfolg: viele Studenten haben seine Vorlesungen besucht, und seine Ansichten gewannen einen weiten Kreis gewonnen.³ Timon forderte die Ansichten von Imre Hajnik heraus. Hajnik betonte die europäischen, wirtschaftlichen und sozialgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der ungarischen Verfassungsentwicklung. Er sympathisierte mit dem Ausgleich und mit Ferenc Deák, deshalb ist es nicht überraschend, dass die starken Könige (zum Beispiel Stephan der Heilige, Ludwig der Große) in seiner Verfassungsgeschichte spürbar im Mittelpunkt stehen. Der ungarische Rechtshistoriker bezeichnete die Zeit der Goldenen Bulle als Anarchie. Er hat viel über die Theorien der heiligen ungarischen Krone geschrieben und der Begriff „die Lehre von der heiligen Krone“ („szentkorona-tan“) war sein wissenschaftliches und ideologisches Konstrukt. Wenn eine Adelsfamilie ausstirbt, fällt der Adelsbesitz an die ungarische Krone zurück – Hajnik nennt dieses Phänomen Avizität oder die Lehre von der heiligen Krone. Laut Hajnik beruht diese (teils europäische/feudale, teils ungarische) Lehre auf dem Gleichgewicht zwischen dem König und den Ständen: die Krone symbolisierte die politische Einheit der ungarischen Nation vom vierzehnten Jahrhundert bis zur Abschaffung der Avizität (1848). Außer der Verfassungsgeschichte und der

¹ Der folgende Text ist eine erweiterte Version meiner Studie, die unter dem Titel „*Kleine Differenzen*“ zwischen Harold Steinacker und Ákos Timon über die ungarische Verfassungsgeschichte erscheinen wird.

² Über Timon: Vargyai, „*Adalékok*“; Várdy, „*Legal and Constitutional History*“; Kardos, *A szentkorona-tan története* (1987); Tóth, *Magyar közjogi hagyományok*, 63–74. Zur ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung des Dualismus: Erős, *Modern historiográfia*, 129–151.

³ Die Zahl der Studenten von 1850 bis 1936: Eckhart, *A jog- és államtudományi kar története*, 681–5.

Wirtschaftsgeschichte beschäftigte sich Hajnik in seinem Hauptwerk mit der Gerichtsverwaltung zur Zeit der Árpáden.⁴

József Illés, Sándor Domanovszky, Gyula Szekfű, Gyula Kováts und Tamás Vécsey betrachteten Hajnik als Bahnbrecher der modernen ungarischen Rechtsgeschichtsschreibung.⁵ Ákos Timon war anderer Meinung.

Nach dem Tod Hajniks (1902) argumentierte Timon für die Entfernung der Allgemeinen Rechtsgeschichte als selbständige Lehrkanzel. Timon gelang es (nach vielen Kontroversen), dieses Ziel zu erreichen. Als Rechtshistoriker gehörte er zur Schule der Nationalromantik. Diese Schule hat das Bild des sogenannten ungarischen nationalen Genius konstruiert. Im Narrativ Timons äußere sich der ungarische Genius im Blutsvertrag, im königlichen Rat, in der Goldenen Bulle, in den Institutionen der Ständetage und sein Höhepunkt sei die Lehre von der heiligen ungarischen Krone.⁶ Seine Interpretation über die Lehre von der heiligen Krone ist im modernen Sinn demokratisch, weil die Stände und der König die Nation im Einverständnis, harmonisch regieren, aber der Herrscher⁷ erhalte seine Macht durch Machtübertragung von der ungarischen Nation. Die heilige Krone sei ein abstrakter, organischer Begriff, die die Stände (die Gliedmaßen) und den König (den Kopf), zusammen die Nation (den Körper) repräsentiere. Nach Timon verfüge die heilige Krone über ein Mysterium und auch eine Persönlichkeit. Die Auffassung des Staates als einen lebendigen Organismus sei eine Errungenschaft des ungarischen Genius, deshalb sei die ungarische Verfassungsentwicklung eine Eigenartigkeit in Europa. Das feudale Europa im Mittelalter habe einen privatrechtlichen Typus und kenne die nationalen Verbände nicht. Durch die Lehre der heiligen Krone und den öffentlich-rechtlichen Geist des ungarischen Volkes unterscheide sich die Verfassungsentwicklung Ungarns vom privatrechtlichen Modell der germanischen, europäischen Länder des Mittelalters. Diese hungarozentrische Anschauung wurde im Hauptwerk Timons zusammengefasst. Das Buch hat sechs ungarische und sogar zwei deutsche Auflagen (1904, 1909) erlebt. Obwohl sich Timon auf das Mittelalter konzentrierte, enthielt das Buch aktualpolitische Bezüge. Mit der Konzeption der tausendjährigen, ungebrochenen Verfassungsentwicklung wollte Timon gegenüber der „großösterreichischen Schule“ beweisen, dass Ungarn von Österreich immer unabhängig war. Im

⁴ Hajnik, *Magyarország az Árpád-királyoktól* (1867); Hajnik, *Magyar alkotmány és jog* (1872). Über Hajnik: Vécsey, „Hajnik Imre emlékezete“; Eckhart, *A szentkorona-eszme története*, 316–333; Sarlós, „A szentkorona tan' kialakulásához“; Mezey, „Hajnik Imre.“

⁵ Illés, „Hajnik Imre“; Domanovszky, „Hajnik Imre emlékezete“; Szekfű, *A magyar állam életrajza*, 228.

⁶ Ich habe hier die zweite Auflage benutzt: Timon, *Magyar alkotmány- és jogtörténet*, (1903).

⁷ Es bezieht sich auch auf den Kaiser zur Zeit des Dualismus.

Gegensatz zu Imre Hajnik unterstrich Timon die Gültigkeit der Lehre von der heiligen Krone auch bezüglich der Zeit von 1848 bis zur Gegenwart. Diese neue Lehre von der heiligen Krone war zeitunabhängig und räumlich fast uneingeschränkt; bei Timon sind die gleichen Prinzipien (die Kontrolle der königlichen Macht, die demokratische Machtübertragung usw.) in jeder Epoche der ungarischen Verfassungsgeschichte bemerkbar.

Die heimische Rezeption des Buches war gemischt. Ungarische Historiker (namentlich Vilmos Fraknói, József Holub, Gyula Szekfű, Ferenc Eckhart, Károly Tagányi und Henrik Marczali) waren gegen die Schule der Nationalromantik und Timons Auffassung. Henrik Marczali hat in einem deutschsprachigen Buch über ungarisches Verfassungsrecht geschrieben, dass „die rechtsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der heiligen Krone eine Lebensgewalt“ sei.⁸ Nur Adel und Aristokratie⁹ waren Mitglieder des Körpers der heiligen Krone, deshalb sei die Lehre der heiligen Krone ein feudaler und kein moderner, demokratischer Begriff. Die Krone funktionierte als Symbol des Landes auch in anderen Königreichen des Mittelalters. Marczali zweifelt auch an der rechtlichen Gültigkeit der Lehre von der heiligen Krone:

*„Es gibt Staatsrechtslehrer welche diese Idee der heiligen Krone noch jetzt als zu Recht bestehend erklären. Ihrer Theorie nach hätte die Gesetzgebung von 1848 das gesamte Volk in die Schanzen der Verfassung aufgenommen und dadurch zu Mitgliedern der heiligen Krone erhoben. Diese Ansicht findet jedoch im Gesetze nicht die geringste Bestätigung.“*¹⁰

In seinen späteren Erinnerungen können wir Beiträge zur Entstehung des Buches lesen:

*„[...] ich glaube dass es mir gelungen hat, das große Mysterium, die heilige Krone zu entschlüsseln, und zwar eben aufgrund Verböczy. Ich habe mich nicht getraut, [deshalb] besuchte Graf Andrassy Gyula [1860–1929; Politiker, Rechtshistoriker] und las ihm das kurze Kapitel vor. Die Juristen an der Universität werden Sie dafür totschlagen, sagte er erstlich. [...] Das Werk erschien, und die Zahl meiner Gegner hat sich wieder vermehrt.“*¹¹

Vilmos Fraknói und József Holub erörterten die mythisierte, demokratische Rolle des Palatins in der ungarischen Rechtsgeschichte.¹²

⁸ Marczali, *Ungarisches Verfassungsrecht*, 28.

⁹ Aber nur diejenigen, die zugleich Grundbesitzer seien.

¹⁰ Marczali, *Ungarisches Verfassungsrecht*, 28.

¹¹ Marczali, *Emlékeim*, 202-203.

¹² Fraknói, „Az 1485-ik évi nádori czikkelyek“; Timon, *Magyar alkotmány- és jogtörténet*, 633; Fraknói, „Az 1485-ik évi nádori czikkelyek. Nyílt levél Timon Akoshoz“; Timon, „Az 1485-ik évi nádori czikkelyek. Válasz Fraknói Vilmos nyílt levelére“; Holub, „A nádor szerepe a koronázáson.“ Fraknói konnte Timon natürlich nicht überzeugen: laut Timon kann man die demokratische Rolle des

Gyula Szekfű¹³ hat die verfassungsgeschichtlichen Auseinandersetzungen aufmerksam verfolgt und war weder mit Timon noch mit Steinacker einverstanden. Er hat über Verwaltungs- und Sozialgeschichte des Mittelalters ein Buch geschrieben, in dem er die Ansichten Timons und Steinackers beurteilt und verurteilt.¹⁴ Laut Szekfű sei es Anachronismus, die sogenannte demokratischen Institutionen und die Lehre von der heiligen Krone in das 13. Jahrhundert (oder noch früher) zurück zu datieren. Er nennt aber Steinacker auch parteiisch weil er im Streit durch Timon die gesamte ungarische Rechtsgeschichtsschreibung kritisiert habe.¹⁵

Erwähnt werden muss auch der hervorragende und einflussreiche Wirtschafts- und Rechtshistoriker Károly Tagányi.¹⁶ Er konzentrierte sich auf verschiedene Fragen im Zusammenhang mit Gesellschaft, Rechtsgewohnheiten und wirtschaftliches Leben und galt als ein Vorbild für einige Mitglieder des Wiener Kreises der ungarischen Historiker (vor allem Gyula Szekfű und Ferenc Eckhart).¹⁷

Manche Juristen (Jenő Balogh, Gusztáv Schwarz)¹⁸ und der Kreis des Zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts (Pál Szende)¹⁹ haben ebenfalls das Lehrbuch von Timon angegriffen, aber bedeutende, bekannte Juristen und Politiker (Ernő Nagy, Albert Apponyi)²⁰ haben das Werk verteidigt und glorifiziert. Diese neue romantische/idealistische Lehre von der heiligen Krone wurde eine beliebte Theorie für Politiker, Rechtswissenschaftler und einige Historiker des Dualismus und der Zwischenkriegszeit.²¹

Palatins (die Beschränkung der königlichen Macht) zu dem öffentlich-rechtlichen Geist des Ungarntums zurückführen.

¹³ Bibliographie zu Szekfű: Gyurgyák, *Ezzé lett magyar hazátok*, 600–621. Zu der Beziehung zwischen Marczali und Szekfű: Dénes, „Mester és tanítvány.”

¹⁴ Szekfű, *Serviensek és familiárisok* (1912). Über die Entstehung des Werkes: Dénes, *A „realitás” illúziója*, 24–36; Glatz, *Történetíró és politika* 140–142.

¹⁵ Szekfű, *A magyar állam életrajza*, 229.

¹⁶ Bognár, „Tagányi Károly a Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle élén”. Tagányi war als Redakteur bei der ersten ungarischen Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeschichte (*Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle*) tätig und arbeitete als Archivar des ungarischen Staatsarchivs. Er hat mehrmals auf die analoge soziale Entwicklung der ungarischen, deutschen und slawischen Völker hingewiesen.

¹⁷ Zum Wiener Kreis der ungarischen Historiker: Fazekas, „Szekfű Gyula és a Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv és levéltársa”; Juzbašić–Ress (Hg.), *Lajos Thallóczy der Historiker und Politiker* (2010).

¹⁸ Balogh, „A jogtörténet tanítása hazánkban”; Schwarz, „Jog és közjog.” Über Gusztáv Schwarz: Hamza, „Szász-Schwarz Gusztáv.”

¹⁹ Szende, „Nemzeti jog és demokratikus fejlődés.” Zu dem Kreis des Huszadik Század: Pók (Hg.), *A Huszadik Század körének történeffelfogása* (1982).

²⁰ Apponyi, „Magyarország és Ausztria viszonyának jogi természete.”

²¹ Zu der Problematik der verschiedenen Theorien und Lehren der Heiligen Krone: Péter, „The Holy Crown of Hungary.”

Über die deutsche Auflage des Buches haben viele ausländische Juristen, Historiker und Rechtshistoriker reflektiert. Zu dieser Rezeption gehört vor allem ein böhmischer Werbőczyforscher (Karel Kadlec),²² ein deutscher Experte der mittelalterlichen Krönungen (Hans Schreuer)²³ und zwei Mitglieder der „großösterreichischen“ Schule (Harold Steinacker, Friedrich Tezner).²⁴ Schreuer und Kadlec haben darauf hingewiesen, dass die Lehre der heiligen Krone keine ungarische Eigenartigkeit, sondern eine mittelalterliche, europäische, ständische Verfassung war. Mit der Verfassung des abstrakten Staatskörpers konnten die Stände in den deutschen Territorialstaaten und auch in Ungarn die königliche Macht einschränken. Nach der Meinung Schreuers war die organische Verfassung des Staates eine kirchenrechtliche Theorie und wir können solche Ideen ebenso im heiligen römischen Reich finden. Die Mehrheit der ausländischen Rezensenten hat Timons Ansichten abgelehnt. Im Kontext dieser Rezeption können wir den Standpunkt von Harold Steinacker besser verstehen.

Der Vater von Harold Steinacker, Edmund Steinacker, Publizist und Politiker, wurde in Debrecen, Ungarn geboren.²⁵ Als Abgeordneter gehörte er dem ungarischen Landtag an. Er war ein leitender Verfechter der Interessen des Deutschtums in Ungarn und förderte die Dissimilation der Ungarndeutschen. Seine Karriere in Ungarn beendete er wegen politischer Angriffen. Nach seiner Übersiedlung nach Wien gehörte er (wie auch Harold Steinacker) zum Beraterkreis des Thronfolgers Franz Ferdinand und beteiligte sich an Überlegungen zu einer antidualistischen Reichsreform. Harold Steinacker habilitierte an der Universität Wien im Jahr 1905 und erhielt die Dozentur für Allgemeine Geschichte des Mittelalters.²⁶ Er widmete sich der politischen und Geistesgeschichte. In der Zeit des Dualismus diskutierte er nicht nur mit Timon, sondern auch mit dem Politiker Albert Apponyi über politische und historische Fragen.²⁷ Steinacker argumentierte für die Föderalisierung der Monarchie durch einen Bundesstaat – natürlich unter österreichischer/deutscher Herrschaft. Die Beziehungen zwischen Österreich und Ungarn fasste er als Realunion auf. Dagegen betonte Apponyi die staatliche Unabhängigkeit aufgrund der

²² Kadlec, „Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte von Ákos von Timon.“

²³ Schreuer, „Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte von Ákos von Timon.“

²⁴ Tezner, *Ausgleichsrecht und Ausgleichspolitik* (1907).

²⁵ Madaras, „Edmund Steinacker tevékenysége“; Tokody, „Edmund és Harold Steinacker a német Súdostförschungban“; Tokody, „A pángermanizmus és a dualista Magyarországg.“

²⁶ Über Harold Steinacker: Fellner, *Geschichtsschreibung und nationale Identität*, 163–166; Fellner–Corradini, *Österreichische Geschichtswissenschaft*, 92; Spreitzer, „Harold Steinacker“; Schader, *Harold Steinacker* (1997).

²⁷ Steinacker, „Zur Frage nach der rechtlichen Natur der Gesamtmonarchie“; Apponyi, „Die rechtliche Natur der Beziehungen“; Steinacker, „Der Begriff der Realunion“; Apponyi, *A magyar közzög osztrák világitásban* (1912).

organischen Theorie der heiligen Krone und des demokratischen Geistes des Ungarntums. Nach dem Ausbruch des ersten Weltkrieges setzte Apponyi den Streit fort: er schrieb Briefe an Steinacker.²⁸ Steinacker wollte Apponyi überzeugen, dass Ungarn²⁹ eine mechanische, undemokratische Verfassung habe, deshalb wäre eine Föderalisierung für beide Seiten vorteilhaft. Laut Steinacker wäre Österreich lange Zeit die einzige Großmacht im „mitteleuropäischen Raum“, deshalb sei es eine Aufgabe eines solchen Reiches die kleinen Völker zu verteidigen. Er hat 1914 folgendes an Apponyi geschrieben:

*„Ich halte es heute noch nicht für ausgeschlossen, daß sich unter dem Eindruck des Krieges auch in Ungarn, wenigstens bei den selbständig Denkenden, die tiefe Einsicht Rankes wieder Geltung verschafft, die in der langen Friedenszeit mit ihrer rein innerpolitischen Blickrichtung nur bei uns Historikern, den Theoretikern der Politik, unvergessen und ganz lebendig schien: ich meine seine Grundvorstellung von den 'Großen Mächten', denen heute mehr als je die politische allein gehört. Die kleinen und mittleren Völker und Staaten mögen in der Kulturgeschichte eine Rolle behaupten, politisch werden sie von den großen Machtsystemen aufgesogen werden. Selbst die völkerrechtlich neutralisierten scheinen dem nur durch besondere Gunst der geographischen Lage entgehen zu sollen.“*³⁰

Apponyi unterbrach die Korrespondenz wegen der „Kriegserklärung“ von Steinacker.³¹

Steinacker war ein Anhänger der großdeutschen („großösterreichischen“) und nach dem ersten Weltkrieg der alldutschen Geschichtsauffassung. Für ihn waren die Begriffe „Volk“ und „Rasse“ sehr wichtig, wichtiger als „Gesellschaft“ oder Sozialgeschichte.³² Er hat an den Südostforschungen aktiv teilgenommen. In der Zwischenkriegszeit geriet seine wissenschaftliche Tätigkeit in den Hintergrund. Im Jahr 1934 und dann 1938 trat er in die NSDAP ein. Er wurde gleichzeitig (1938) Rektor der Universität Innsbruck, und seine Antrittsvorlesung hielt er in SA-Uniform. Steinacker wurde nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg rehabilitiert, denn er wurde zum Ehrenmitglied der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften gewählt.³³

²⁸ Die ganze Korrespondenz wurde von Franz Huter veröffentlicht: Huter (Hg.), „*Harold Steinackers Briefwechsel mit Albert Graf Apponyi*“.

²⁹ Huter hat auch das Konzept eines Briefes von Steinacker (30. I. 1915) veröffentlicht. In diesem Text kann man vielmals „*magyarische Rasse*“ lesen (Ebd. 49-52.). Steinacker hat zuletzt eine andere Version ohne den Ausdruck „*Rasse*“ an Apponyi gesendet (9. II. 1915).

³⁰ Steinacker an Apponyi Ebd. 41.

³¹ Apponyi an Steinacker 23. II. 1915. Ebd. 66.

³² Auf dem Internationalen Historikerkongreß in Zürich (1938) argumentierte Steinacker für eine „rassisch“ determinierte Volksgeschichte. Spreitzer, „*Harold Steinacker*,” 198.

³³ Ebd. 223: „*Wissenschaftlich zog er sich mit anderen dem Nationalsozialismus nahe stehenden Historikern in die Südostforschung zurück und konnte 1964 kurz vor seinem Tod die volle Rehabilitierung als Wissenschaftler mit der Verleihung der Ehrenmitgliedschaft der ÖAW erleben [...]*“ Steinacker hoffte

Steinacker hat die Auseinandersetzungen mit einem umfangreichen Beitrag im Jahr 1907 ausgelöst. Der Titel dieses Beitrages lautete Über Stand und Aufgaben der ungarischen Verfassungsgeschichte und erschien in Mitteilungen des Instituts der Österreichischen Geschichtsforschung. Steinacker reflektierte nicht nur über das Buch von Timon, sondern kritisierte die Rechtsgeschichtsschreibung Ungarns: Unter diesem Aspekt ist der Beitrag Steinackers in der Rezeption beispiellos. Wir müssen die historiographischen Ansichten Steinackers kurz rekonstruieren, um seine Intention zu verstehen. Für den österreichischen Historiker gab es keinen Unterschied zwischen Imre Hajnik und Ákos Timon:

„Seit Hajnik ist der leitende Gesichtspunkt der magyarischen rechtsgeschichtlichen Forschung die Frage: worin unterscheidet sich die ungarische Verfassungsentwicklung von der westeuropäischen? oder richtiger: worin unterscheidet sie sich von jener zu ihrem Vorteil?“³⁴

Nach Steinacker war Timon ein Nachfolger Hajniks und sein Buch repräsentiere die gesamte ungarische Wissenschaft des Dualismus. Auf den nächsten Seiten arbeitete er eine Gegengenzählung über die ungarische Geschichte aus. Der österreichische Historiker kritisierte zuerst die Theorie der heiligen Krone: ich werde diesen Teil zitieren, denn Timon hat nur auf dieses Argument reagiert.

„Die Theorie von der H. Krone, die für die juristische Konstruktion des ungarischen Staatsrechtes nicht nur bis 1608, sondern bis 1848, ja bis heute als wichtige Grundlage gilt, ist die höchst subjektive Schöpfung des größten magyarischen Juristen: Werbőczys. Sie ist zugleich das Produkt eines ganz bestimmten Zeitraumes, der Jahre 1490 bis 1526 die einen Höhepunkt ständischer Macht bedeuten. Und selbst für diese Zeit ist sie weniger ein Ausdruck tatsächlicher Zustände, als ein ständischer Wunschzettel. Es scheint mir daher durchaus unhistorisch, dass die magyarischen Rechtshistoriker die staatsrechtliche Theorie des Tripartitums zum Angelpunkt ihrer Darstellung machen.“³⁵

Für Steinacker sind die Lehre und die Theorie der heiligen Krone Fiktionen, die keine historischen Grundlagen haben, deswegen beschäftigt er sich nicht mehr mit diesem Thema. Steinacker war der Meinung, dass die mittelalterliche Verfassung Ungarns dualistisch und unorganisch sei. Der Ständestaat im Mittelalter sei vielmehr eine Zweiheit: die Landstände, die als die Nation

sogar in 1962, dass die Historiker die „Erbwissenschaften“ wieder verwenden werden. Zur Ansichten Steinackers nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg: Schader, *Harold Steinacker*, 349-370. Zur „Entnazifizierung“ der österreichischen Geschichtsschreibung: Kropiunigg, *Eine österreichische Affäre* (2015).

³⁴ Steinacker, „Über Stand und Aufgaben,“ 277, 288.

³⁵ Ebd. 305-306. Betonung im Original.

aufträten, kämpfe gegen den König. Hingegen spiele die Stände und die Einschränkung der königlichen Macht in der Konzeption Timons eine positive Rolle. Bei Timon treten die Stände und Werbőczy als Verteidiger der demokratischen ungarischen Verfassung auf. Laut Steinacker war die ständische, dualistische Verfassung für Ungarn destruktiv, weil die Beschränkung der königlichen Macht und der ständische Egoismus zur Katastrophe von Mohács führte. Die ungarische Entwicklung unterschied sich von der des Westens, wäre dagegen mit der böhmischen und polnischen verwandt und überdies rückständig. Das ungarische Komitatsystem sei zum Beispiel eine Organisation mit über siebzig Köpfen, „eine unbesiegbare Hydra“.³⁶ Bei Steinacker können wir auch den Begriff der Rasse in der biologischen Bedeutung bemerken. Der mittelalterliche Christianisierungsprozess in Ungarn war sehr langsam aufgrund der Rasseneigenarten des ungarischen Volkes.

„Und wie elementar bricht im degenerierten Árpáden, Ladislaus dem Kumanier, der rassenmäßige Hang zum Zeltleben, zur nomadischen Ungebundenheit noch im 13. Jahrhundert atavistisch hervor?“³⁷

Timon hat nur kurz reagiert, obwohl er mehrmals eine gründliche Antwort versprochen hatte.³⁸ In den späteren Auflagen seines Buches hat er auf die ausländische Kritik in den Fußnoten geantwortet. Das Wichtigste für Timon war die Lehre von der heiligen Krone: er hat nur sie verteidigt.³⁹ Laut ihm kann man diese Lehre als vollständig vor und auch nach der Zeit Werbőczy's in der ungarischen Verfassungsgeschichte finden und sie ist weder eine Schöpfung Werbőczy's noch ein kirchenrechtliches Konstrukt. Die heilige Krone hat weder Mysterium noch Persönlichkeit in Deutschland, Böhmen und Polen, deshalb sei die Lehre der heiligen Krone eine ungarische Eigenartigkeit. Für Timon gab es keinen Unterschied zwischen Steinacker, Tezner, Schreuer oder Kadlec: er

³⁶ Ebd. 346.

³⁷ Ebd. 334. Fußnote 2. Meine Betonung.

³⁸ Timon, *Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte*, IV: „Diese These und überhaupt die von mir entwickelte ganze Theorie der Heiligen Krone stieß bei einigen Rezensenten meines Buches, besonders bei österreichischen Fachleuten und Nicht-Fachleuten auf den heftigsten Widerspruch. Ich hielt es nicht für angezeigt, auf die gegnerischen Argumentationen, sei es an dieser Stelle, sei es in den betreffenden Partien meiner Darstellung, des Näheren einzugehen. Es scheint mir zweckmäßiger, allen jeden kritischen Ausführungen, die wissenschaftlichen Wert besitzen und nicht bloss einer politischen Tendenz dienen, demnächst in einer besonderen Abhandlung entgegenzutreten.“

³⁹ Timon, „Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des öffentlich-rechtlichen Begriffs der Heiligen Krone,“ 318: „Die Behauptung, daß der öffentlich-rechtliche Begriff der Heiligen Krone und die auf diesem Begriffe aufgebaute Staatsverfassung schlechthin die 'Erfindung' Werbőczy's und das Produkt eines kurzen Zeitraumes (der Jahre 1490 bis 1526) sei, der den Höhepunkt ständischer Macht bedeutet, beruht demnach auf krasser Unkenntnis oder doch falscher Auslegung der Quellen.“ Ein deutscher Kritiker hat diese Studie von Timon als chauvinistische Phantasie beurteilt. Rietschel, „Festschrift,“ 342.

nannte sie Nichtfachleute. Timon versprach, in einer besonderen Studie dem Widerspruch entgegenzutreten. Er hat diese Abhandlung nie angefertigt.

Steinacker hat erst im Jahr 1914, in der Historischen Zeitschrift geantwortet, denn einerseits war er krank, andererseits wartete er auf die ausführliche Antwort Timons. Steinacker hat es Timon als Schuld angerechnet, dass er auf die Kritik Schreuers und Tezners nicht geantwortet hatte. In seiner kurzen Abhandlung wiederholt Steinacker seine Konzeption über die ungarische Verfassungsgeschichte, aber in der Schlussfolgerung geht er noch weiter.

„Die Kreuzung slawischen und finnisch-mongolisch-türkischen Blutes und Geistes, die Kreuzung orientalischer, byzantinischer, abendländischer Kultureinflüsse ist ein Vorgang, der sich bei allen osteuropäischen Völkern abspielt, wenn auch in verschiedener Weise.“ [...] „Bei aller nationalen Überhebung fehlt ihr [der magyarischen Forschung] der Sinn für die wahre Eigenart ihres Volkes, das nun einmal 'Kelet népe' (Volk des Ostens) ist? „⁴⁰

Ein Volk des Ostens bedeutete nach Steinacker ein für erfolgreiche Staatsgründung nicht fähiges Volk. Ein solches Volk brauche die Verteidigung der Großmächte (Österreich, später Deutschland). Das ist die Grundkonzeption für seine Ansichten bezüglich der Südostforschungen in der Zwischenkriegszeit.⁴¹ Es ist kein Wunder, dass Steinacker nicht den deutschen oder kirchenrechtlichen Einfluss auf die ungarische Verfassungsentwicklung hervorgehoben hat. Für ihn repräsentierten Timon und Apponyi die ungarischen Unabhängigkeitsaspirationen des Dualismus, die die kriegerischen Anstrengungen und die Stabilität der Monarchie riskieren.

Ich denke, dass in diesem Streit beide Seiten nationalistisch und gegeneinander voreingenommen waren. Imre Hajnik hat nie geschrieben, dass die ungarische Verfassungsentwicklung besser als die des Westens wäre. Die heimische Kritik des Buches von Timon war sehr gemischt. Auch die ausländische Rezeption war differenziert: zum Beispiel Schreuer und Kadlec hatten keine politische Intentionen, obwohl Steinacker seine Argumentation mit der Schreuers zu identifizieren versuchte.

Der Streit zwischen Steinacker und Timon ist bedeutungsvoll, weil er in einer umfassenden, internationalen Rezeption stattfand. An dieser Diskussion nahmen Politiker, Historiker und Juristen teil: diese Tatsache zeigt die Bedeutung der Streitfragen. Was bedeutet eine europäische Anschauung? Welche Rolle spielt die Sozialgeschichte in der Verfassungsgeschichte Ungarns? Wie können wir die Rolle der Stände interpretieren? Diese Streitfragen des Dualismus führen zur Sozialgeschichte. Diese Probleme waren auch in der ungarischen Geschicht-

⁴⁰ Steinacker, „Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte von Ákos von Timon,“ 403.

⁴¹ Steinacker, *Volk und Geschichte* (1943). Steinacker, *Austro-Hungarica* (1963).

schreibung der Zwischenkriegszeit signifikant, und Ferenc Eckhart (Wirtschafts- und Rechtshistoriker) arbeitete die Theorie von der heiligen Krone erneut aus. Ich denke, dass die ausländische und die heimische Rezeption Timons wichtige (aber natürlich nicht die einzige) Quelle für die Modernisierung der ungarischen Verfassungsgeschichte war, denn viele Historiker sind nach dem ersten Weltkrieg zur Rezeption des Buches von Timon nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg zurückgekehrt. Die Kritiker Timons (Szekfű, Schreuer, Kadlec und später am heftigsten Ferenc Eckhart) haben die Frage der Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Verfassungsentwicklung aufgeworfen. Sie haben auf die Notwendigkeit eines historischen Ausgangspunktes hingewiesen. Das heißt, man muss die Probleme der Verfassungsgeschichte und der Lehre von der heiligen Krone in einem historischen Kontext interpretieren statt absolut zu betrachten.⁴²

Bevor ich zum Schluss komme, möchte ich noch auf die Problematik der nationale Differenzen hinweisen. Steinacker stammte aus einer ungarndeutschen Familie und war für ihn wichtig, die Nationalitätenfrage der Monarchie irgendwie zu lösen. Die Lösung war die Föderalisierung, aber unter gesamtösterreichischer Herrschaft. Timon popularisierte die Lehre der heiligen Krone, aber die Krone symbolisierte die ungarische Staatsmacht. In diesem Fall kämpfte ein völkischer und rassistischer Standpunkt gegen eine chauvinistische, nationalromantische Anschauungsweise. Trotzdem kann ich nicht alle Meinungen auf nationale Gegensätze zurückführen. Die Geschichtsschreibung Ungarns hatte enge Beziehungen mit österreichischen Forschungen und Institutionen: es genügt, den Wiener Kreis ungarischer Historiker (Árpád Károlyi, Dávid Angyal, Lajos Thallóczy, Gyula Szekfű, Ferenc Eckhart usw.) zu erwähnen. Gegen/außer Timon und Steinacker entfaltete sich eine Generation der ungarischen Historiker, die in der Geschichtsschreibung einen wissenschaftlichen Fortschritt repräsentieren, deshalb halte ich eine historiographische Betrachtungsweise bei einer solchen Debatte für unverzichtbar.

Bibliography

- Apponyi, Albert. „Die rechtliche Natur der Beziehungen zwischen Österreich und Ungarn.“ In: *Österreichische Rundschau* 28 (1911): 165–174.
- Apponyi, Albert. „Magyarország és Ausztria viszonyának jogi természete [Die rechtliche Natur der Beziehungen zwischen Österreich und Ungarn].“ *Jogállam* 7 (1908): 561–588.
- Apponyi, Albert. *A magyar közjog osztrák világításban* [Das ungarische öffentliche Recht in österreichischer Beleuchtung]. Budapest: Franklin, 1912.

⁴² Eckhart, „*Jog- és alkotmánytörténel*“; Mályusz, „*Az Eckhart-vitá*“; Szekfű, *Allam és nemzet* (1942).

- Balogh, Jenő. „A jogtörténet tanítása hazánkban” [Der Unterricht der Rechtsgeschichte in unserer Heimat]. *Budapesti Szemle* (1905): 161-197.
- Bognár, Szabina. „Tagányi Károly a Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle élén (1894–1901).” [Károly Tagányi als Redakteur der Ungarischen Wirtschaftshistorischen Rundschau] *Ethnographia* 124 (2013): 273-296.
- Dénes, Iván Zoltán. „Mester és tanítvány: Marczali Henrik és Szekefű Gyula.” [Meister und Schüler: Henrik Marczali und Gyula Szekefű]. In: *A negyedik nemzedék, és ami utána következik. Szekefű Gyula és a magyar történetírás a 20. század első felében*. Hg. von Ujváry, Gábor, 195-212. Budapest: Ráció, 2011.
- Dénes, Iván Zoltán. *A „realitás” illúziója. A historikus Szekefű Gyula pályafordulója*. [Die Illusion der „Realität”. Wendepunkt in der Laufbahn des Historikers Gyula Szekefű]. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1976.
- Domanovszky, Sándor. „Kováts Gyula: Hajnik Imre emlékezete.” *Századok* 51 (1917): 75-77.
- Dževad Juzbašić–Ress Imre (Hg.). *Lajos Thallóczy der Historiker und Politiker*. Sarajevo-Budapest: MTA, 2010.
- Eckhart, Ferenc. „Jog- és alkotmánytörténet.” [Rechts- und Verfassungsgeschichte] In: *A magyar történetírás új útjai*, Hg. von Hóman, Bálint, 269-320. Budapest: Magyar Szemle Társaság, 1931.
- Eckhart, Ferenc. *A jog- és államtudományi kar története 1667–1935* [Die Geschichte der rechts- und staatswissenschaftlichen Fakultät, 1667–1935]. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetem, 1936.
- Eckhart, Ferenc. *A szentkorona-eszme története* [Die Geschichte der Theorie von der heiligen Krone]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1941.
- Erős, Vilmos. *Modern historiográfia. Az újkor történetírás egy története* [Moderne Historiographie. Eine Geschichte der Geschichtsschreibung in der Neuzeit]. Budapest: Ráció, 2015.
- Fazekas, István. „Szekefű Gyula és a Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv és levéltárosa az I. világháború előestéjén” [Gyula Szekefű und Archivar des Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs am Vorabend des Ersten Weltkrieges]. In: *A negyedik nemzedék, és ami utána következik. Szekefű Gyula és a magyar történetírás a 20. század első felében*. Hg. von Ujváry, Gábor, 58-75. Budapest: Ráció, 2011.
- Fellner, Fritz. *Geschichtsschreibung und nationale Identität. Probleme und Leistungen der österreichischen Geschichtswissenschaft*. Wien–Köln–Weimar: Böhlau, 2002.
- Fellner, Fritz–Corradini, Doris A.. *Österreichische Geschichtswissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert. Ein biographisches-bibliographisches Lexikon*. Wien–Köln–Weimar: Böhlau, 2006.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. „Az 1485-ik évi nádori cikkek.” Nyílt levél Timon Ákoshoz” [Die palatinische Klauseln von 1485. Ein offener Brief an Ákos Timon]. *Századok* 51 (1917): 529–537.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. „Az 1485-ik évi nádori cikkek.” [Die palatinische Klauseln von 1485]. *Századok* 33 (1899): 485–506.
- Glatz, Ferenc. *Történetíró és politika* [Der Historiker und die Politik]. Budapest, Akadémiai, 1980.
- Gyurgyák, János. *Ezzé lett magyar hazátok. A magyar nemzeteszmé és nacionalizmus története* [Das ist aus eurer ungarischen Heimat geworden. Geschichte der ungarischen Nationsidee und des Nationalismus]. Budapest: Osiris, 2007.
- Hajnik, Imre. *Magyar alkotmány és jog az Árpádok alatt* [Ungarische Verfassung und Recht zur Zeit der Árpáden]. Pest: Heckenast Gusztáv, 1872.
- Hajnik, Imre. *Magyarország az Árpád-királyoktól az ősiségnek megállapításáig és a hűbéri Európa* [Ungarn von der Árpáden bis zur Einführung der Avizität und das feudale Europa]. Pest: Heckenast Gusztáv, 1867.
- Holub, József. A nádor szerepe a koronázáson [Die Rolle des Palatins bei der Krönung]. *Századok* 51 (1917): 89-93.
- Huter, Franz (Hg.). „Harold Steinackers Briefwechsel mit Albert Graf Apponyi.” In: *Gedenkschrift für Harold Steinacker (1875–1965)*, Hg. von Mayer, Theodor, 27-66. München: R. Oldenbourg, 1966.
- Illés, József. „Hajnik Imre.” *Jogállam* 1 (1902): 637-639.

- Kadlec, Karel. „Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte von Ákos von Timon.” *Jahrbuch der Internationalen Vereinigung für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft und Volkswirtschaftslehre* 8 (1905): 426–434.
- Kardos, József. *A szentkorona-tan története, 1919–1944* [Geschichte der Lehre von der heiligen Krone 1919–1944]. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987.
- Kropiunigg, Rafael. *Eine österreichische Affäre. Der Fall Borodajkewycs*. Wien: Czernin, 2015.
- Madaras, Éva. „Edmund Steinacker tevékenysége a magyarországi németiség nemzeti öntudatának felébresztése érdekében a 19. század utolsó harmadában.” [Die Tätigkeit Edmund Steinackers zur Hebung des nationalen Selbstbewusstseins des ungarländischen Deutschtums im letzten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts]. *Acta Universitatis Debreceniensis* (1964): 111–142. Tokody, Gyula.
- „Edmund és Harold Steinacker a német Südostforschungban.” [Edmund und Harold Steinacker in der deutschen Südostforschung] *Századok* 131 (1997): 677–722.
- Mályusz, Elemér. „Az Eckhart-vita.” [Der Streit um Eckhart] *Századok* 65 (1931): 406–419.
- Marczali, Henrik. Emlékeim [Meine Erinnerungen]. Budapest: Múlt és Jövő Kiadó, 2000 [1929].
- Marczali, Henrik. *Ungarisches Verfassungsrecht*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911.
- Mezey Barna. „Hajnik Imre (1840–1902).” In: *Magyar jogtudósok*, Hg. von: Hamza, Gábor, 75–97. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 1999.
- Péter, László. „The Holy Crown of Hungary. The visible and invisible.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 81 (2003): 421–510.
- Pók Attila (Hg.). *A Huszadik Század körének történetfelfogása* [Die Geschichtsauffassung des Kreises Huszadik Század]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1982.
- Rietschel, Siegfried. „Festschrift, Heinrich Brunner zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Verehrern.” *Historische Zeitschrift* 106 (1912): 342–346.
- Sarlós, Márton. „A ‘szentkorona tan’ kialakulásához. A nemzeti hagyományok, Hajnik és az angol jog” [Zur Entstehung „der Lehre von der heiligen Krone”. Die nationale Traditionen, Hajnik und das englische Recht]. *Jogtudományi közlöny* 15 (1960): 596–601.
- Schader, Anna. *Harold Steinacker (1875–1965). Sein Weg in den Nationalsozialismus*. Dissertation Klagenfurt, 1997.
- Schreuer, Hans. „Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte von Ákos von Timon.” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung* 26 (1905): 326–340.
- Schwarz, Gusztáv. „Jog és közjog” [Recht und öffentliches Recht]. *Jogállam* 4 (1905): 20–29.
- Hamza, Gábor. Szász-Schwarz Gusztáv. In: *Magyar jogtudósok* 2. Bd., Hg. von: Ders., 71–82. Budapest: Professzorok Háza, 2001.
- Spreitzer, Renate. „Harold Steinacker (1875–1965).” In: *Österreichische Historiker*, Bd. 1., Hg. von: Karel Hruza, 191–223. Wien–Köln–Weimar: Böhlau, 2008.
- Steinacker, Harold. „Der Begriff der Realunion und die rechtliche Natur des Reichs.” *Österreichische Rundschau* 30 (1911): 1–18.
- Steinacker, Harold. „Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte von Ákos von Timon.” *Historische Zeitschrift* 113 (1914): 395–404; 700.
- Steinacker, Harold. „Über Stand und Aufgaben der Ungarischen Verfassungsgeschichte.” *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 28 (1907): 277–347.
- Steinacker, Harold. „Zur Frage nach der rechtlichen Natur der österreichisch-ungarischen Gesamtmonarchie.” *Österreichische Rundschau* 23 (1910): 525–538.
- Steinacker, Harold. *Austro-Hungarica. Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Geschichte Ungarns und der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie*. München: R. Oldenbourg, 1963.
- Steinacker, Harold. *Volk und Geschichte. Aufgewählte Reden und Aufsätze*, Brünn–München–Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1943.
- Szekfű, Gyula. *A magyar állam életrajza* [Der Staat Ungarn]. Budapest: Maecenas, 1988 [1918].
- Szekfű, Gyula. *Állam és nemzet* [Staat und Nation]. Budapest: Magyar Szemle Társaság, 1942.
- Szekfű, Gyula. *Szervientek és familiárisok* [Die Servienten und Familiaren im ungarischen Mittelalter]. Budapest: MTA, 1912.

- Szende, Pál. „Nemzeti jog és demokratikus fejlődés” [Das nationale Recht und die demokratische Entwicklung]. *Huszádik Század* 12 (1911): 264–290; 422–455.
- Tezner, Friedrich. *Ausgleichsrecht und Ausgleichspolitik*. Wien: Manz, 1907.
- Timon, Ákos. „Az 1485-ik évi nádori czikkelyek. Válasz Fraknoi Vilmos nyílt levelére” [Die palatinische Klauseln von 1485. Antwort auf den offenen Brief von Vilmos Fraknoi]. *Századok* 51 (1917): 537–544.
- Timon, Ákos. „Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des öffentlich-rechtlichen Begriffs der Heiligen Krone in der ungarischen Verfassung.” In: *Festschrift Heinrich Brunner zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht von Schülern und Verehrern*, 309–338. Weimar: H. Böhlau Nachfolger, 1910.
- Timon, Ákos. *Magyar alkotmány- és jogtörténet, különös tekintettel a nyugati államok jogfejlődésére* [Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte mit Bezug auf die Rechtsentwicklung der westlichen Staaten]. Budapest: Hornyánszky nyomda, 1903.
- Timon, Ákos. *Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte mit Bezug auf die Rechtsentwicklung der westlichen Staaten*. Berlin: Puttkammer & Mühlbrecht, 1909.
- Tokody, Gyula. „A pángermanizmus és a dualista Magyarország.” [Der Pangermanismus und das dualistische Ungarn]. *Történeti tanulmányok IX.* (2001): 45–61.
- Tóth, Zoltán József. *Magyar közjogi hagyományok és nemzeti öntudat a 19. század végétől napjainkig. Adalékok a Szent Korona-eszme történetéhez* [Ungarische öffentlich-rechtliche Traditionen und nationales Selbstbewusstsein vom Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zur Gegenwart. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Theorie der Heiligen Krone]. Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 2007.
- Várdy, Steven Bela. „Legal and Constitutional History and the ‘Doctrine of the Holy Crown’.” In *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, Hg. von: Ders, 175–183. New York and Guildford: East European Monographs, 1976.
- Vargyai, Gyula. „Adalékok a magyar nacionalista állam- és jogtörténetírás kritikájához” [Beiträge zur Kritik der ungarischen nationalistischen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichtsschreibung]. *Történelmi Szemle* 13 (1970): 451–479.
- Vécsey, Tamás. „Hajnik Imre emlékezete” [Erinnerung an Imre Hajnik]. *Századok* 37 (1903): 101–150.

The Romanian Historians and the Propaganda: Five Profiles (1914–1946)

Every state, every political regime, every period has its own forms and representations of propaganda. This paper will not discuss the general aspects of propaganda,¹ nor will it focus on the propaganda conducted in Romania² but will examine the involvement of the historians in propaganda activities. A premise of my research is that not only *the institutions*, but also the people, *the individuals* are important for the propaganda activities. In this case, as I will show in what follows, the historians played a very active role, not only as professional historians, but as politicians too.

For a long time, the association of personalities with propaganda had a negative connotation, and those figures were regarded with caution. While a historian from a neighbouring country who engages in historical propaganda and upholds the historical rights of his country over a province risks being labelled an irredentist and a revisionist, *our* own historian, who makes historical propaganda and supports the historical rights of *our* country over the same province will be deemed a patriot and an objective historian. The present paper will concentrate on *our* historians, on the Romanian historians involved in propaganda activities and publications and will try to examine their background, to understand this involvement through their origins, academic careers, political involvement, historical researches and publications.

For Romania, the years 1914–1946 were a period of major structural changes at the political, territorial, cultural and social levels. It started with World War I and the Paris Peace Conference (1919–1920), it crossed the interwar period and its international politics based on the System of Versailles. The 1930s witnessed the ascent of Germany, Italy and other states (the so-called *revisionist states*). World War II completely overturned the balance of powers and the end of the war brought about the Soviet occupation of Romania and the establishment of the Communist regime here. The last important moment for my analysis is the Paris Peace Conference of 1946.

¹ Domenach, *La propagande politique* (1959); Ellul, *Histoire de la propagande* (1967); O'Shaughnessy, *Politics and Propaganda* (2004).

² Dascălu, *Propaganda externă a României Mari* (1998); Anton, *Propagandă și război* (2007).

1. The institutions

Some historians were Ministers for the Minorities' Issues (Silviu Dragomir, 1937–1939) or Ministers of Propaganda (Constantin C. Giurescu, 1940), while other historians were active in governmental institutions that specialized in propaganda, like the Bureau of Peace (1942–1945), where Gheorghe I. Brătianu, Constantin C. Giurescu, Ioan Lupaş, Ştefan Manciualea, Ion Nistor, Zenovie Păclişanu, and Victor Papacostea were involved.

Propaganda is not always the product of a government; it is also the product of universities or cultural institutions. Ioan Lupaş and Alexandru Lapedatu founded the Institute of National History, as a member of the Ferdinand I University in Cluj and its publication, *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* [The Yearbook of the National History Institute]. Professor Silviu Dragomir was the head of the Centre for Studies and Research on Transylvania, an institution associated with the same University of Cluj (1942–1945). The same Centre published the *Revue de Transylvanie* (1934–1944) during its most active period. In Bucharest, Nicolae Iorga founded the Institute for the Study of World History (the World History Institute) in 1937, which was led, after his assassination, by Gheorghe I. Brătianu (1941–1947). The institute published the prestigious *Revista istorică* [The Historical Review] (1915–1946), its editor-in-chief being the same Nicolae Iorga, followed by Nicolae Bănescu (1941–1946). Nicolae Iorga also created the Institute for South-East European Studies, founded in Bucharest too, in 1914 and its periodical, *Revue Historique du Sud-Est Européen* (1924–1946; in 1963 the publication was resumed under the name *Revue des études sud-est européennes*). Another similar institution was the Institute for Balkan Studies and Research (1937–1947), founded in Bucharest by Victor Papacostea, a student of Nicolae Iorga's. There are many other examples of institutions, centres, institutes and reviews that were important for the propaganda activities in the above-mentioned period.³

These institutions coordinated the scientific research on specific topics, organized conferences and published reviews or other publications, even series which served for the purposes of the official propaganda.

2. The historians

During the period of interest here, a large number of Romanian historians served the needs of propaganda through their books, brochures, articles and

³ An overview in Mârza, *Romanian Historians and Propaganda*, 39–96.

papers: Nicolae Bănescu, Alexandru Boldur, Gheorghe I. Brătianu, Ștefan Ciobanu, Constantin Daicoviciu, Silviu Dragomir, Constantin C. Giurescu, Nicolae Iorga, Ioan Lupaș, Ștefan Manciuș, Ștefan Meteș, Ioan Moga, Ion Nistor, Emil Panaitescu, Zenovie Pâclișanu and Radu Vulpe. It should be mentioned that most of these publications were published as a result of historical researches and the use for the purposes of the propaganda was a secondary one.

But the above mentioned institutions published also collective volumes with an evident propaganda purpose, like the massive monographs entitled *La Transylvanie* (Bucharest, 1938, over 800 pages), published by the Institute of National History in Cluj, *Siebenbürgen* (Bucharest, 2 vols., 1943, cca. 800 pages), published by the Institute for Romanian History in Bucharest, *La Transylvanie* (Bucharest, 1938, over 800 pages), *La Transylvanie* (Paris, 1946, over 300 pages); these were collective monographs published by historians, linguists, historians of literature, art historians, sociologists, economists, geographers, lawyers and architects.

My recent researches focused on five Romanian historians representative for their careers, discourse and publications and also active in politics and propaganda: Gheorghe I. Brătianu (1898–1953), Silviu Dragomir (1888–1962), Ioan Lupaș (1880–1967), Ion Nistor (1876–1962) and Zenovie Pâclișanu (1886–1957). This selection was deliberate, and its main criterion was their *historiographical relevance*, since they are representative for the Romanian historiography of 1900–1940. Each case is unique, but at the same time, they all experienced relatively similar careers and destinies. In the next pages of this paper I will summarize the main conclusions of my research.⁴ I will observe their lives and careers, their publications too, focusing on those activities which I consider to be relevant for the purpose of my topic.

2.1 ORIGINS. CAREERS

The selected historians were originated in different parts of nowadays Romania. Some of them were born in Transylvania (Dragomir, Lupaș, Pâclișanu), Bukovina (Nistor) and the Old Kingdom (Brătianu). Their social origin was various, but included priests' families with a long political tradition (Dragomir) or of peasant origin (Pâclișanu). In the case of Gheorghe I. Brătianu,⁵ it was a famous family that marked the Romanian history and politics

⁴ For a more extensive treatment, see *Ibidem*, 97–122.

⁵ For general information, see Spinei (ed.), *Confluente istoriografice românești și europene*, especially 207–220, 241–354; Teodor, *Istorici români*, 24–67; Toderășcu (ed.), *Cuvinte*, I–LXVI; Brătianu, *Gheorghe I. Brătianu* (1997).

for 100 years – his father and grandfather were influential politicians and prime-ministers too. Gheorghe I. Brătianu was therefore a privileged historian, always *in medias res*. Another biographical observation is the positioning of the Transylvanian historians under the mark of confessionalism. Dragomir and Lupaş were Orthodox, Pâclişanu was a Greek Catholic; all of them let their faith interfere with their historical writings.

The historians from Transylvania and Bukovina were educated in the great Central European Universities (Budapest, Vienna, Chernivtsi), but also in Munich, Leipzig, Berlin. Brătianu studied in Iaşi and Paris and obtained the Doctorate in Philosophy at the University of Chernivtsi, and the Doctorate in Letters in Paris. Nistor defended his PhD at the University of Vienna, under the supervision of the Byzantinist and Balkanist Konstantin Jireček. All of them received a solid historical education and a deep understanding of the historical sources, and becoming acquainted with their contemporary historiographical trends. Some of them were from the beginning interested in the social and economic history (Dragomir, Brătianu, Nistor), in theoretical aspects (Lupaş), confessional history (the Transylvanian historians), in aspects regarding general history, Byzantine history, the history of the South-East Europe (Brătianu).

All of them taught at the main Romanian universities (Cluj, Bucharest, Chernivtsi, Iaşi). Dragomir and Lupaş were representative figures of the new (Romanian) University in Cluj (created in 1919),⁶ Nistor was politically involved in the transfer of the Chernivtsi University under Romanian administration (1918) and was its rector. He taught there after 1918, but also in the years 1912–1916. He also taught for two years at the Vienna University (1911–1912).⁷ Brătianu was a professor at the universities in Iaşi and Bucharest. They were also members of the Romanian Academy and they were active in organizing new academic institutions and research centres or periodicals. Ioan Lupaş was one of the founders of the Institute for National History and co-editor of the *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională din Cluj* [The Yearbook of the National History Institute in Cluj], and Silviu Dragomir was the creator of the Centre for Studies and Research on Transylvania and editor of the periodical *La Revue de Transylvanie* (founded 1934). Both institutions were subordinated to the University of Cluj.

After the assassination of Nicolae Iorga (1940), Gheorghe I. Brătianu took over the directorship of the World History Institute in Bucharest, which he renamed “Nicolae Iorga,” in memory of its founder.⁸ He was one of the leaders of the “new school” of historians in interwar Romania, a response to the

⁶ Şipoş, *Silviu Dragomir*, 42–49; Mârza, *Romanian Historians*, 105–106, 109.

⁷ I. Toderaşcu in Zub (ed.), *Ion Nistor*, 95–104; Grecu, “Nistor”, 26–27; Mârza, *Romanian Historians*, 114.

⁸ Ciobanu, Ana Maria, et al., *Institutul de Istorie “Nicolae Iorga,”* 105–163.

traditional way of researching and understanding history, especially a response to Nicolae Iorga. *Revista istorică română* [Romanian Historical Review] was the periodical of the “new school” published by the Institute of National History, functioning at the University of Bucharest and Brătianu was one of its editors.⁹ Ion Nistor also published in Chernivtsi the historical review *Codrii Cosminului* [Cosmin Forest].

2.2 HISTORIANS AS POLITICIANS

All the historians mentioned here were politically active, either as members of significant political parties,¹⁰ or as “technicians” in various governments, whose areas of expertise often included aspects related to the historical provinces, the religious confessions and the national minorities (Dragomir, Pâclișanu). Some of them benefited from the political experience of their families (Brătianu or Dragomir) or were politically active very early. As a student, Silviu Dragomir was politically active in Chernivtsi, and Ioan Lupaș in Budapest. Before 1918, Dragomir served in the ranks of the Romanian National Party in Transylvania, and Ioan Lupaș was a leading journalist convicted for a press offence (1908). In 1916–1917, he was sentenced to house arrest in Hungary. Both of the Transylvanian historians were organizers of the Assembly of Alba Iulia (1 December 1918), which decided the unification of Transylvania and the Banat with Romania. In the next period, they held executive functions in the Ruling Council (*Consiliul Dirigent*), the government body that managed the integration of Transylvania and the Banat in Romania. Zenovie Pâclișanu experienced a very similar political career too.

Ion Nistor had, perhaps, the most spectacular political career. To paraphrase one commentator, Ion Nistor did more than merely write history: he also made history.¹¹ He got engaged in politics at Chernivtsi before 1914, and in the year 1916, after the occupation of Chernivtsi by the Russian armies, he took refuge with his family in Romania, where he was among the most active campaigners for the union of Bukovina and Bessarabia with Romania. He was one of the main artisans of the process of unification and integration of the two provinces

⁹ “Cuvânt înainte” [Foreword] to *Revista Istorică Română*, I, 1, (1931): 3; Cernovodeanu, *Revista istorică română*, 12.

¹⁰ For an interesting perspective on the Romanian intelligentsia’s relations with politics, see Boia, *Capcanele istoriei* (2011).

¹¹ Greco, “Nistor,” 45.

in Romania; he was also associated with the process of Bukovina's "Romanianization".¹²

During the interwar period, Brătianu was one of the leading politicians in Romania. He was a main member of the National Liberal Party, which had been for 7-8 decades the traditional feud of the Brătianus, and from 1930 on, he led a dissident political group (the so-called Georgists).¹³ He closely watched not only the Romanian, but also the international political scene.¹⁴ In the 1930s, he observed and commented on the resumption of diplomatic ties between Romania and the USSR, drawing attention to the threats the USSR represented for Romania's international political stability.¹⁵ He kept a watchful eye on the relations between Romania and Germany, ever closer during the years that preceded the war. In 1939, he published a study in Germany, in which he placed Ion C. Brătianu and Bismarck face to face as a pretext for discussing the history of the Romanian-German diplomatic relations.¹⁶ During and after the war, he was one of the most alert observers and vehement defenders of the international system based on the Peace Treaties. This led him to run a series of university courses in the years 1943–1947, collected under the title *L'organisation de la paix dans l'histoire universelle*. His book manuscript remained unpublished until after 1989.¹⁷

Many of the historians were opened to share to the broad public their historical researches and ideas through magazines, conferences, even radio broadcasting. For example, Nicolae Iorga was known by the public also through his radio-conferences published under the title *Sfaturi pe întunec* [Advice at Dark] (Bucharest, 1936–1940). A similar case was those of Gheorghe I. Brătianu. He held public conferences and lectures dedicated to the Romanian historical unity and published in 1942 as a book: *Cuvinte către români* [Words Addressed to the Romanians]¹⁸.

To make Brătianu's profile as a historian complete, it should not be neglected that he effectively participated in the two world wars, in the military campaigns

¹² Doina Huzdup and M. Șt. Ceaușu in Zub (ed.), *Ion Nistor*, 12–19, 111–122, 123–130. Also see Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina*. (2001).

¹³ For Brătianu's political activity, see Răpeanu (Ed.), *Tradiția istorică despre întemeierea statelor românești*, XI–XXXI; Buzatu, Gheorghe in Spinei (ed.), *Confluente istoriografice românești și europene*, 461–500.

¹⁴ In 1941, Brătianu was one of the founders of the journal *Geopolitica și geoistoria. Revistă română pentru sud-estul european* [Geopolitics and Geohistory. The Romanian Journal for the European South-East], published in Bucharest until 1944.

¹⁵ Brătianu, *La Roumanie et l'U.R.S.S.* (1936).

¹⁶ Brătianu, „*Bismarck und Ion C. Brătianu*,” 5–28.

¹⁷ Brătianu, *L'organisation de la paix dans l'histoire universelle*. (1997).

¹⁸ Toderașcu (ed.), *Cuvinte*.

of the Romanian Army in Moldova (1917), Bukovina (1918, 1941) and the Crimea (1942). This experience led him to write several interesting memoirs: *File rupte din cartea războiului* [Pages Torn off the Book of the War], *Notes sur un voyage en Crimée*.¹⁹

Ion Nistor was also a member of the National Liberal Party. He occupied important government positions (Secretary of State, Minister), most often related to Bukovina or the national minorities. As regards Dragomir and Lupaş, they had rather similar political careers. They were involved in right-wing parties: the People's Party, National Peasants' Party, the National Agrarian Party, the National Christian Party, the latter one espousing far-right views. They were deputies in the Romanian Parliament, Secretaries of State and Ministers in various governments organized or supported by the above parties. Especially Dragomir was a supporter of King Charles II, remaining loyal to him even after the installation of the royal dictatorship and becoming one of the leaders of the National Renaissance Front, the unique party established by King Charles II.²⁰ The generation of the above-mentioned Romanian historians reached the peak of their academic and political careers between 1930 and 1940 and, as I will show in the next pages, they were all involved in the historiographical effort of supporting Romania's external policy during and around World War II.

After the rising of the Communist Regime in 1944–1945, they were all removed from political office, universities and the Academy, being persecuted for their political ideas, as main members of the Romanian political and cultural elite. Brătianu was imprisoned at Sighet Prison, where he died in unclear circumstances in 1953.²¹ Pâclişanu was a notorious member of the Greek-Catholic clerical hierarchy (he was Vicar General of the Romanian Church United with Rome), he was accused of espionage and treason and was arrested in 1948. He was released in 1952, imprisoned again in 1957, and he passed away in Jilava Prison that same year.²² Like Marc Bloch, whom he eulogized in 1946, Brătianu (and Pâclişanu too) died on duty, as “a scholar and a soldier.”²³

The new Communist regime enmeshed Silviu Dragomir in a criminal trial on economic charges, which was actually a dissimulated act of political persecution. He was imprisoned between 1949 and 1955.²⁴ Lupaş was arrested too and from 1950 to 1955, he was imprisoned in Sighet, having been convicted as a former

¹⁹ Brătianu, *File rupte din cartea războiului* (1935; 2006²); In *Revue Historique du Sud-Est Européen* XIX, 1 (1942): 176–182.

²⁰ Şipoş, *Silviu Dragomir*, 49–63.

²¹ Brătianu, *Gheorghe I. Brătianu* (1997).

²² I. Mârza in: Pâclişanu, *Relatio Rumenorum*, 16–20.

²³ In *Revue historique du Sud-Est européen* XXIII (1946): 5–20. See also Toderaşcu (ed.), *Cuvinte*, I–IX.

²⁴ Şipoş, *Silviu Dragomir*, 79–87.

Minister in the governments of the so-called “bourgeois-landlord” period. Nistor was arrested in 1950 and spent five years in the Sighet Prison, without having been convicted.

In my research, I do not focus on historians who had a similar fate; on the contrary, I have selected the most representative and important Romanian historians of the time. Their academic and public careers, their involvement in political life, the political persecutions to which they were subjected were not unique to these five historians, but representative of an entire generation of historians and intellectuals, who were active during the 1920s–1940s.²⁵

3. Areas of research

The historical concerns of the five historians were very varied in terms of the periods, regions or themes they studied and were closely linked to their professional formation, to the schools and universities in which they had learned, the cultural and political circles they frequented, their readings. For example, Brătianu’s scientific work cannot be understood without taking into account his proximity to Nicolae Iorga, his mentor, or his studies in Paris, under the supervision of the historians Ferdinand Lot and Charles Diehl. Similarly, Ion Nistor’s work was the fruit of his accumulations at the Austrian School of History and the School of Slavic, Balkan and South-East European Studies in Vienna, under the patronage of Konstantin Jireček, as well as of the political line he followed. Examples of this type can continue.

3.1 UNIVERSAL HISTORY

An important observation is that these historians were very well connected to the European historical movement and were familiar with the major historiographical trends and the great European historians of his time. The best example is provided by Gheorghe I. Brătianu; through him, Romanian historiography was in perfect sync with contemporary Western historiography, especially with the Annales School.²⁶ Paradoxically, his great monograph dedicated to the Black Sea, *Marea Neagră. De la origini până la cucerirea otomană* [The Black Sea. From Origins to the Ottoman Conquest], was written during the years of World War II, in parallel with Fernand Braudel’s monograph on the

²⁵ See Boia, *Capcanele istoriei* (2011).

²⁶ Teodor, *Istorici români*, 68–91; Crăciun, Maria Teodor in Teodor–Mârza (eds.), *Incursiuni*, 45–58.

Mediterranean Sea, published in 1949, which Brătianu's own monograph resembles in terms of its design and structure, without either of the authors being aware of the other's work.²⁷ Like other of Brătianu's major works, *The Black Sea* was to be published posthumously, by the Romanian exile in Munich.

Brătianu was the historian of the medieval South-Eastern Europe and of the Byzance par excellence. He explored its economic and trade history, the Venetian and Genoese trade in the Black Sea and at the Lower Danube too.²⁸

3.2 HISTORY OF TRANSYLVANIA

As I mentioned before, the Romanian historians were interested in the historical provinces they originated. In the specific atmosphere of the period around 1918–1920 or on the eve of the World War II, they understood to affirm through their publications as in the politics the fact that those provinces are Romanian provinces and that their historically belongs to Romania. Therefore they concentrated a lot of their scientifically energies in affirming it. For example, Silviu Dragomir's concerns revolved mainly around social, ethnical and confessional aspects of the history of the Romanians in Transylvania. He studied their social and institutional structures (nobility, institutions – knezates, voivodes) and continued the historiographical line of Ioan Bogdan, carrying out his research in parallel with his colleague Ioan Lupaş.²⁹

Ioan Lupaş³⁰ was actually the most important ideologue of the Romanian historical profile of Transylvania. His voice was the most authoritative voice in the Romanian historiography on Transylvania, and the influence of his ideas is still felt today. His historical conception started from the assumption of Transylvania's historical individuality, the Romanian people being an integral part thereof. According to Ioan Lupaş, Transylvania was a key province for the birth and affirmation of the Romanian national being (*Siebenbürgen – das Herz des rumänischen Lebensraumes*). Despite the natural barriers (the Carpathians, which had united rather than divided the Romanian people), Transylvania had stayed in permanent contact with the other Romanian provinces.³¹ Lupaş affirmed the

²⁷ The book is based on a series of university lectures dedicated to the Black Sea. Teodor, *Istorici români*, 81; Teodor, *Introducere în istoria istoriografiei*, 228–229; Spinei (ed.), *Marea Neagră*, 13–49.

²⁸ Teodor, *Istorici români*, 92–102.

²⁹ Mârza, *Romanian Historians*, 106.

³⁰ Comments on the historical researches of Ioan Lupaş: see Pascu–Teodor (eds.), *Scriseri alese*, 11–28; Edroiu–Mureşanu (eds.), *Scriseri alese*, XVII–XXXI.

³¹ Lupaş, “*Individualitatea istorică a Transilvaniei (1920)*,” 49–72; Idem, *Transilvania*, (1945), and its German, Italian and French editions. See also Mârza, “*Transylvania and Hungary or Transylvania in Hungary*,” 85–96.

ancientness and constancy of the Romanian population in Transylvania, and permanently contested their subjection to the Holy Crown of Saint Stephen (i.e. Hungary).³²

In terms of his historical outlook, Silviu Dragomir was very close to Lupaş. From the very beginning of his career, Dragomir studied the ecclesiastical ties of the Orthodox Romanians in Transylvania with Russia and Serbia, a subject on which he published two important contributions in 1912 and 1914³³. Thus, he published a very thoroughly documented monograph *Istoria desrobirei religioase a românilor din Ardeal în secolul XVIII* [The History of the Religious Emancipation of the Romanians in Transylvania in the 18th Century] (Sibiu, 1920–1930), a book written from a very Orthodox confessional perspective. One of the topics of confessional history that Silviu Dragomir approached from an overtly confessional angle, even after 1948, was the Union of the Romanian Church with Rome, especially given the fact that the Communist regime that banned the Greek-Catholic Church in 1948 approved and encouraged the point of view expressed by the historian.³⁴

Ioan Lupaş was also interested into the ecclesiastical history. His research topic were close to those of Silviu Dragomir, but he was interested not only in the life of the institution and of its bishops and metropolitans, about whom he published numerous studies and articles (Sava Brancovici, Gherasim Adamovici, Ioan Bob, Andrei Şaguna), but also in the religious life of ordinary believers. In 1918, he published an important synthesis *Istoria bisericească a românilor ardeleni* [The Ecclesiastical History of the Transylvanian Romanians].³⁵ Although he wrote this book from the position of an Orthodox believer, he was a moderate analyst compared to Silviu Dragomir. In his youth, he even published a paper, which has remained little known of, in which he disavowed the confessional bias in the Romanian historical writing in Transylvania, even though at times he also exhibited it.³⁶ He was also interested in the topic of the Union with Rome, a moment he referred to as the “ecclesiastical rift of the Transylvanian Romanians.”³⁷

³² Idem, “Mitul ‘Sacrei Coroane’ și problema transilvană,” 343–360. His main publications on the institution of the voivode: Idem, “Voevodatul Transilvaniei,” 83–114; Idem, “Realități istorice,” 1–85. Published as a leaflet: București, Imprimeria Națională, 1938.

³³ Dragomir, “Contribuții,” 1065–1247; Idem, *Relațiile* (1914). See Ghitta, “Silviu Dragomir,” 53–59.

³⁴ Dragomir, *Românii din Transilvania* (1963, 1990²). Miron, “Silviu Dragomir,” 599–604.

³⁵ Cf. Radosay (ed.), *Istoria bisericească a românilor ardeleni*, 20.

³⁶ Lupaş, *Șovinismul confesional* (1903).

³⁷ Idem, “Desbinarea bisericească,” 641–658; Miron, “Ioan Lupaş,” 101–109.

The third Transylvanian historian was Zenovie Pâclișanu³⁸ and he was also interested in ecclesiastical history, but from an opposite, again, confessional point of view. He was the historian by excellence of the Union with Rome, as well as of the Greek-Catholic Church in Transylvania. He had the merit of drafting the first synthesis on the history of the Greek-Catholic Church – *Istoria Bisericii Române Unite cu Roma* [The History of the Romanian Church United with Rome], which, although it was written more than half a century ago, has preserved, in a sense, its topicality.³⁹ He published numerous papers and studies on the history of the Romanian Church in general, focusing on Transylvania and the religious and on the cultural ties of the Romanians in Transylvania with the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. He researched both ecclesiastical institutions and the religious life of the Orthodox and Greek-Catholic believers. He was interested in aspects of social history – Romanian elites, especially the clergy, the relations between Church and Nation too. Many of his papers touched the question of the relation between Romanians in Transylvania and the medieval and modern Hungary, some of them showing the author as a very strong polemist.⁴⁰

3.3. HISTORY OF BUKOVINA

Ion Nistor was a native of Bukovina and this fact influenced his whole historiographical activity. His main research topics were connected to the history of Bukovina and Bessarabia too. He had a good knowledge of the Austrian, Hungarian, Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak and Western publications on the topics and he had a large perspective on regional history. Nistor published numerous studies, articles and books about the historical identity of Moldavia, the Moldavian–Polish and Moldavian (Romanian)–Ukrainian relations, aspects related to the ancientness of the Romanian population in Bukovina, the administration, education, culture and ecclesiastical history, the problem of the immigrations to Bukovina.⁴¹ His numerous researches and historical works

³⁸ For Zenovie Pâclișanu's historiographical activity, see I. Mârza in Pâclișanu, *Relatio Rumenorum*, 20–43.

³⁹ The work was written during the bleakest period in the author's life, when he hovered between arrests, detentions and brief spells of freedom. The book was published in exile, in West Germany, in the Greek-Catholic exile publication *Bunavestire* (1975–1978) (the first part); the second part also appeared in Germany (1991–1993), while the complete edition of the work was published by Galaxia Gutenberg Press in Târgu Lăpuș in 2006. Also see I. Mârza in Pâclișanu, *Relatio Rumenorum*, 37–38.

⁴⁰ Pâclișanu, *Propaganda catolică* (1920); Pâclișanu, “*Ungaria și acțiunea catolică*”.

⁴¹ See a general presentation of his publications in Grecu, “*Nistor*,” 24–46.

dedicated to the Romanian–Ukrainian relations and the Ukrainian issue bear most visibly the hallmark of Nistor, the politician. They were anchored in the everyday reality of Bukovina in around 1900–1910, which Ion Nistor kept in touch with throughout his life, including during his academic career in Vienna or at Chernivtsi, before and after 1918.

His first major research topic was the issue of Bukovina's northern frontier, about the area of interference between modern Moldavia and Ukraine, about which Nistor published *Die moldauische Ansprüche auf Pokutien* (Vienna, 1910), in the prestigious series *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*. In 1911 and 1912, Nistor published two other important works, with far-reaching echoes at the time, on Moldavia's trade policy during the Middle Ages.⁴²

The book *Românii și Rutenii în Bucovina. Studiu istoric și statistic* [The Romanians and the Ruthenians in Bukovina. A Historical and Statistical Study] had great political value, which is why it was translated into German for the Romanian Academy and printed in 1918. This study proved to be very valuable at the Paris Peace Conference and its documentary annexes helped to establish the Romanian–Polish border.⁴³ An important study was *Problema ucraineană în lumina istoriei* [The Ukrainian Question in the Light of History], a historical excursus about Ukraine and the Ukrainians, as well as about their historical links with Bukovina and the Romanian population there.⁴⁴ The historian carried his research well into his contemporary era, explaining the context of the failure to create an independent Ukrainian state and the incorporation of the Ukrainian-inhabited historical provinces into the Soviet Union. As I mentioned before, Nistor was also interested in Bessarabian history. In 1923, he published a consistent monograph *Istoria Basarabiei* [The History of Bessarabia].⁴⁵

Besides his scientific works, Nistor published an impressive number of popularization writings. Undeniably, these were historical researches, but their purpose was propagandistic. For example, during his stay in Kishinev, in early 1918, Nistor was involved in an intense cultural and propagandistic activity, advocating the Romanian cause: he was at the helm of a People's University, where he gave a lecture that was published shortly afterwards: *Drepturile noastre asupra Hotinului* [Our Rights over Hotin].⁴⁶

The connexion between history and politics was expressed by Nistor during his publications on the Romanian–Czechoslovak relations in the context of the

⁴² Nistor, *Die auswärtigen Handelsbeziehungen* (1911); Idem, *Handel und Wandel* (1912). See also Grecu, "Nistor," 24–26.

⁴³ Nistor, *Românii și Rutenii* (1915); Grecu, "Nistor," 29–30.

⁴⁴ Idem, *Problema ucraineană* (1934).

⁴⁵ Idem, *Istoria Basarabiei* (1923).

⁴⁶ Idem, *Drepturile noastre asupra Hotinului* (1918).

strong political ties between Romania and Czechoslovakia during the interwar period. Nistor published one of his first syntheses dedicated to the historical relations between the two countries: *Cehoslovacii și Români* [The Czechoslovakians and the Romanians] (Chernivtsi, 1930), and an article in homage to Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, the first President of Czechoslovakia. Both works were published from the twofold standpoint of the historian and of the politician.

Ioan Lupaș was a theorist of history, he helped chart out the periodization of Romanian history – *Epocele principale în istoria românilor* [The Main Epochs in the Romanians' History] (Cluj, 1928)⁴⁷ – and highlighted the importance of the geographical, cultural, religious, economic and ethnographic factors in national history. He was aware of *Valoarea educativă a istoriei naționale* [The Educational Value of National History] – the title of a public conference he gave in 1939.⁴⁸ He was the first historian from Cluj who showed a constant concern with the history of historiography.⁴⁹ He focused on the works of Nicolaus Olahus, Miron Costin, Dimitrie Cantemir, Petru Maior, A.D. Xenopol, and on Transylvanian historiography in general: *Cronicari și istorici români din Transilvania* [Romanian Chroniclers and Historians from Transylvania] (Craiova, 1933, second edition Craiova, 1941). He highlighted the role of historical figures: the Wallachian and Moldavian princes Basarab I, Stephen the Great, Michael the Brave, Matei Basarab, the Transylvanian voivodes Ladislaus Kán, Bartholomew Drágffy, John Hunyadi, Stephen Báthory, the Primate of Hungary Nicholas Olahus, the Transylvanian prince Gabriel Bethlen, Horea, the leader of the peasant's uprising in Transylvania in 1784–1785, Emperor Joseph II, Metropolitan Andrei Șaguna, Avram Iancu and King Charles I of Romania. All these historical figures were supporting the key theses of Romanian historiography.

Ioan Lupaș also published several school textbooks,⁵⁰ through which the historical discourse that he and the School of History in Cluj practised reached a very broad readership. This target was reached by other type of publications too. For example, the same historian published in 1937, at the request of King Charles II, the synthesis *Istoria Unirii românilor* [The History of the Romanians' Union],⁵¹ in which he summed up the arguments upheld in the Romanian historiography over the recent decades concerning the historical premises and

⁴⁷ Edroiu–Mureșanu (eds.), *Scrisori alese*, 25–27.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 31–38. Also see Lupaș, “*Sensul și scopul istoriei*” [The Aim and Purpose of History], in *Ibid.*, 54–62; first edition 1928.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 24–25.

⁵⁰ Lupaș, *Istoria românilor* (1921) (15 editions between 1921–1944); *Idem*, *Trecutul nostru românesc* (1934).

⁵¹ *Idem*, *Istoria Unirii românilor* (1937, 1938², 1993³).

consistency of the Romanian national unity thesis, the Romanian profile of the provinces annexed and integrated by Romania at the end of the World War I.

In the same atmosphere, Gheorghe I. Brătianu published a great monograph on the question of the origin and continuity of the Romanians, a topic frequently put into question by other (so-called revisionist) historiographies. *Une énigme et un miracle historique: le peuple roumain* (French edition: Bucharest, 1937, second edition, Bucharest, 1942; Romanian edition: Bucharest, 1940) was the result of an interesting and involuntary exercise in historiography. The book's starting point was Brătianu's polemic against the French historian Ferdinand Lot, who discussed the Romanians' ethnogenesis in his monograph *Les invasions barbares et le peuplement de l'Europe* (Paris, 1937), in a chapter whose title Brătianu's book took over.⁵²

4. Historical publications and propaganda

The last mentioned books of Lupaş and Brătianu were published in a new international context, a difficult time for Romania, when its frontiers, confirmed by the Paris Peace Conference, were called into question. This is one of the factors which should be taken into consideration in the analysis of the historical publications of the five historians (and their whole generation too). These publications have an evident militant character, and this conducted my research to the idea of propaganda.

This is not the place to discuss the relation between science and propaganda and, respectively, between scientific works and propaganda. It should be noted, however, that the publication of some papers (articles, scientific or popularization books) addressing certain sensitive issues for various historical periods and, especially, their publication in international languages is a clue that suggests their being enlisted for propaganda purposes. These publications supported the standpoints of the Romanian diplomacy and politics, articulated by historians, geographers, linguists, sociologists, and ethnographers. Among them, the voices of Gheorghe I. Brătianu, Ion Nistor, Zenovie Pâclişanu, Silviu Dragomir and Ioan Lupaş were among the most authoritative and representative.

At the beginning, it should mention the historical publications with a general character. Some publications made reference to entire Romania and presented it

⁵² The association between the Romanians' ethnogenesis and a historical enigma was first made by the Romanian historian Xenopol, *Les Roumains* (1885); Brătianu, *Une énigme* (1937), Romanian version: Bucharest, 1940. See the new edition, translated by Marina Rădulescu. Breşeanu (ed.), *Brătianu, Gheorghe I. Une énigme*, 6, 41. See also Ghitta in *Incursiuni în opera istorică*, 15–25.

from the perspective of its history, population, demography, economy and culture, or discussed particular aspects thereof. In this category, we could include – at random – the publications of Gheorghe I. Brătianu, i.e. *Origines et formation de l'unité roumaine* (Bucarest, 1943) or Silviu Dragomir, *La politique de la Roumanie a l'égard des minorités ethniques* (Bucarest, 1940).

4.1 HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS ABOUT TRANSYLVANIA

The most numerous publications were dedicated to particular historical provinces. Transylvania attracted the most substantial scientific and editorial effort of the Romanian historiography. It was the largest of the historical provinces, the most significant in terms of its demography, nationality, history, culture, economy and, not least, strategic position. Lastly, the province of Transylvania was overladen with historical significance and its reception at the level of the collective mind-set, the political class and historical writing was fraught with sentimental overtones. Since the early days of modern Romanian historical writing, Transylvania had been a symbol that was automatically associated with such concepts as the union, national unity, and the national state.

The first category of publication is the monographs, the big synthesis dedicated to the province. It was a collective effort of many authors (historians, geographers, ethnographers, linguists, sociologists, art historians, historians of the literature, specialists in demography and statistics, historians of the law, economists) who published representative books on Transylvania, expressing the official Romanian point of view. Many of those contributions were published not only in collective volumes, but as independent volumes too and they circulated in this form as well, being used as propaganda works. I will mention here the monograph published in French, *La Transylvanie* (Bucharest, 1938), coordinated by Ioan Lupaş. This work was published by the Institute for National History in Cluj under the patronage of the Romanian Academy. In 1943, a similar monograph, in two volumes, was published in German – *Siebenbürgen* by the Institute for the Romanians' History in Bucharest. The book was edited by Silviu Dragomir and its foreword was signed by Constantin C. Giurescu, director of the Institute. After the war, under the leadership of Silviu Dragomir, the Centre for Studies and Research on Transylvania in Cluj produced another work of synthesis entitled *La Transylvanie*, which was published in French and English (Paris, 1946), for the purposes of the Romanian diplomacy during the Peace Conference in Paris.

Another category of publications was represented by the articles and papers published by historians in periodicals, volumes or as brochures. Many of them

were initially published in Romanian, in periodicals or in book format, while later they were republished in foreign languages. For example, Ioan Lupaş published in 1943 two volumes of studies in German, elaborating on several of his previous conferences and articles. The two volumes, entitled *Zur Geschichte der Rumänen: Aufsätze und Vorträge* and *Beiträge zur Geschichte Siebenbürgens*, included a significant number of articles (21 and 33 respectively), many of them appearing, surprisingly, in both volumes (Sibiu, 1943). The selection of the papers published here is showing us that the author's intention was not necessarily to publish for the aims of propaganda, because he did not select his most representative papers from this point of view. He was particularly concerned to make available to the foreign (German-speaking) public many of his writings on the history of Transylvania; hence, Lupaş's propagandistic intentions should not be ruled out.

Another example shows us the publication policy adopted by Ioan Lupaş or by other historians. Lupaş published the article "Realităţi istorice în voevodatul Transilvaniei din sec. XII–XVI" [Historical Realities in the Voivodeship of Transylvania between the 12th and the 16th Centuries] in the *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Naţională* (vol. VII, 1936–1938); this article was later on translated into French and published, in 1938, in the volume *La Transylvanie* (Bucharest, 1938) and also as a separate volume (Bucharest, 1938).

One of the most important publications of Ioan Lupaş from propaganda perspective (but from historiographical perspective too) is *Transilvania "inima teritoriului etnic românesc"* [Transylvania – The "Heart of the Romanian Ethnic Territory"], which Ioan Lupaş only published in Romanian in Sibiu in 1945, after having printed it in German, French, and Italian (Bucharest, 1941–1942).

Silviu Dragomir published a similar work in Romanian: *Problema Transilvaniei* [The Transylvanian Issue], which was then translated into German: *Die siebenbürgische Frage* (both published in 1941). He also published two important papers dedicated to Transylvania and Banat: *La Transylvanie avant et après l'Arbitrage de Vienne* (Sibiu, 1943) and *Le Banat roumain: esquisse historique* (Sibiu, 1944).

Many publications insisted on the Romanian profile of the province of Transylvania, on the permanent presence of the Romanian during the Transylvania's history. They usually started with presentations of the natural landscape of Transylvania, with an emphasis on the province's close geographic connections to the regions outside the Carpathians (Wallachia and Moldavia). Transylvania was showed as the very heart of the Romanian lands, Transylvania and the other provinces inhabited by the Romanians were considered as symmetrically arranged and representing a unitary geographical space. Romania was seen as the result of an organic historical process, of a millennial history. The Carpathians were considered as a central axis around which the history of the

Romanian people had revolved the backbone of the Romanian national being. That these mountains had never been an obstacle in the way of communication among the Romanians from the historical provinces.⁵³

The underlying principle was the full unity of the Romanian territory and people. The geographical context was unitary, the history of the Romanians from all the three Romanian Countries (Transylvania, Wallachia, Moldavia) was unitary too, just like their economic life, customs and traditions, culture and, above all, their language and Orthodox faith were also unitary.⁵⁴ Any idea that strayed off this principle, for example, the thesis about the natural association and historical connection between Transylvania and Hungary that had been advanced in Hungarian historiography or the thesis of Transylvanism⁵⁵ were debunked and disavowed. The main institution associated by the Romanian historians with “their” own Transylvania was the institution of the voivode, and Ioan Lupaş was the most significant contributor in this regard.⁵⁶

Within its natural borders of 1918, Romania was seen as the result of an organic historical process, of a millennial history and not as the outcome of some fleeting desire for conquest on the part of a belligerent population.⁵⁷ It should not surprise us the emphasis placed on the history of Transylvania after 1918 in order to highlight the development of the province as an integral part of Romania. The argument was probably most strongly emphasized in the second volume of the vast monograph *Siebenbürgen* (Bucharest, 1943), which included studies on the development of literature and art, of education, the sciences, health, the economy, transportation, constructions and agriculture of this historical province.⁵⁸ Therefore, after two decades of successful participation of Transylvania into the Romanian society, culture and economy, the loss of North-Western Transylvania under the Vienna Dictate was perceived by the Romanian historians (by the Romanian society too) as un-natural from several perspectives, including from a geographical standpoint. More like that, this territorial seizure contravened *historical logic*.⁵⁹

⁵³ See Lupaş, *Transilvania* (1945) and its French, Italian and German versions. See also Someşan, Laurian in *La Transylvanie*, 1938, 7–36; Mehedinţi, *Le Pays et le peuple roumain*, 24–30. Comments in Mârza, “*Transylvania and Hungary*,” 93.

⁵⁴ Lupaş, 1. *Die Grundlagen der rumänischen Volkseinheit*, 1–32.

⁵⁵ Makkai, *Histoire de Transylvanie*, 9–11; Iancu, Victor in *Revue de Transylvanie*, X, 1–2, (1944): 44–70.

⁵⁶ Lupaş, “*Réalités historiques*”. Published as a leaflet: Bucarest, s.n., 1938. See also Mârza, “*Transylvania and Hungary*,” 89–95.

⁵⁷ Someşan in *La Transylvanie*, 1938, 7–36; Mehedinţi in *Siebenbürgen*, vol. 1, 3–18; Mehedinţi, *Le Pays et le peuple*, 24–30; Mihăilescu, Vintilă in Dragomir (ed.), *La Transylvanie*, 11–30.

⁵⁸ *Siebenbürgen*, vol. 2, 437–794; Dragomir, *Die siebenbürgische Frage*, 17–22; Idem, *La Transylvanie avant et après*, 30–35. See also Leon, *La Transylvanie* (1943).

⁵⁹ Dragomir, *La Transylvanie avant et après*, 50.

In their writings, all the authors from Transylvania (the Orthodox Ioan Lupaş and Silviu Dragomir, but also the Greek-Catholic Zenovie Pâclişanu) insisted on the situation of the ethnic and religious minorities in Romania, mainly focusing on those in Transylvania, since one of the major propaganda efforts the Romanian state made during the inter-war period and World War II was aimed at demonstrating the government's concern for the minorities and at underlining their social, economic and cultural progress after 1918, the year of their inclusion into Romania, in matters pertaining to their religious and intellectual life, to confessional education and the freedom of the press.⁶⁰ In 1940, Gheorghe I. Brătianu brought a new factor into discussion: the Romanian population across the Romanian borders and the imperative need that they should receive the same treatment as all the other minorities:

Rumänien fordert nur von allen Nachbarstaaten, die gleiche Mässigung zu zeigen und die gleichen Opfer darzubringen um des Friedens, der freien Entwicklung der Völker und des wirtschäftlichen Fortschrittes von Europa willen.⁶¹

The minorities theme was one of leitmotifs in the Romanian historical discourse, especially after 1940. The predilection for these topics was also the echo of a tense international atmosphere and a response to the Hungarian publications that complained about the highly underprivileged status of the minorities in Romania after 1918.⁶² For example, the ample monograph published in German in 1943 devoted great attention to the minorities in Transylvania, including studies on the Hungarians, the Saxons and the Szeklers, which tackled aspects of their history, culture and current situation in Transylvania after 1918.⁶³ Zenovie Pâclişanu noticed a big contradiction between the large freedom offered by the Romanian state to the minorities, and the Hungary's policy towards its nationalities. The central idea behind his works concerned the fact that the Hungarian government had constantly led a policy of Magyarization until 1918, aiming to supplant the country's ethnic mosaic with the monolithic nation-state and persecuting, to that end, Hungary's non-Hungarian nationalities.⁶⁴ Pâclişanu did not limit his interest to the Romanians in

⁶⁰ Idem, *La Transylvanie roumaine et ses minorités ethniques*, (1934); Idem, *La Transylvanie avant et après*, 35–41; Lupaş, *Ursprung und Entwicklung*, 22; Caliani, Aug. in *Siebenbürgen*, vol. 2, 611–634.

⁶¹ Brătianu, *Die rumänische Frage*, 9.

⁶² Szász, *The minorities* (1927).

⁶³ See the papers of Morariu, Tiberiu, Someşan, Laurian, Teodor, Avram P., Sassu, C. in: *Siebenbürgen*, vol. 1, 71–90, 111–126, 207–226, 349–380.

⁶⁴ Pâclişanu, "Der Kampf der Volksgruppen" 227–248; Lupaş, *Hungarian policy of magyarization* (1944).

Transylvania, but made equal reference to the situation of the Saxons, the Swabians, the Slovaks and the Ruthenians there and spoke on a policy of *Nichtberechtigung*, in contradiction to the principle of *Gleichberechtigung*.⁶⁵

4.2 HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS ABOUT MOLDAVIA AND DOBRUDJA

As regards the other Romanian historical provinces whose legitimate inclusion into Romania was called into question on the eve of the World War II, big political, diplomatic and propagandistic efforts were made around Bessarabia. The publications of the years 1938–1940–1944 merely continued a tradition of historiography that had begun in 1918–1919, when interest in this province registered a climax and when the Romanian historians published many works serving external propaganda purposes: Nicolae Iorga, Ștefan Ciobanu,⁶⁶ together with Ion Nistor and Gheorghe I. Brătianu. Again, the Romanian publications were only one part of the dispute; on the other side of the barricade, the Ukrainian and the Russian historians were as radical and convincing as the Romanian scholars. As shown above, historical discourse about Bukovina was, for various reasons, most often associated (especially in around and after the year 1940) with Bessarabia, probably because the two provinces were usually brought into discussion together in the diplomatic circles, even though they constituted distinct subchapters of the same Moldavian chapter in history.

One of the Romanian authors who constantly returned to the matter of Bessarabia and had the necessary training and competence to do so was Gheorghe I. Brătianu, the historian of the *Romanian unity*.⁶⁷ Having witnessed the great catastrophe of the summer of 1940, when, following the Soviet ultimatum, Romania evacuated Bessarabia (and Northern Bukovina and the Hertza region – as compensation required by the Soviets), Brătianu undertook the writing of a complex work that would represent Romania's point of view on the Bessarabian issue:

⁶⁵ Păclișanu, *Der Ausrottungskampf Ungarns*, 24, 56.

⁶⁶ Iorga, *La vérité sur le passé et le présent de la Bessarabie* (1922, 1940²); Ciobanu, *La continuité roumaine* (1920); Ciobanu, *La Bessarabie*. (1941).

⁶⁷ See other publications: Brătianu, *Roumanie et Hongrie* (1940); Idem, *Die rumänische Frage*; Idem, *Rumänische Einheit* (1944). See an analysis in P. Teodor in *Incursiuni în opera istorică*, 36–44.

Il nous faut informer sans tarder tous ceux auxquels incombe la lourde tâche de reconstruire l'Europe et le monde, de l'intérêt primordial et du droit indiscutable que représente pour la Roumanie la question de la Bessarabie.⁶⁸

The main thesis upheld the historical unity of Moldova's territory (including the northern part of Bukovina, the Hertza region and Bessarabia) and its quintessentially Romanian character.⁶⁹ Another fundamental idea was that after Bessarabia had been annexed to Russia in 1812, the latter had deployed there a systematic Russification program, which had nonetheless failed, as the Romanian character of the province had survived intact.

Both Brătianu and Nistor were more than mere historians: they were also politicians, and their political experience transpired from their historical publications. Gheorghe I. Brătianu constantly drew attention to the dangers that the USSR posed to Romania, going so far as to claim that the USSR was a threat not only to the frontiers of Romania, but to those of entire Europe.⁷⁰ Brătianu also had the occasion to witness the inability of Romania's traditional allies, England and France, to offer his country security guarantees, in 1940, for the territory of Bessarabia, in the event of a Soviet aggression.⁷¹ Nistor was less active in the forefront of Romanian politics, but he published more about Bessarabia and Bukovina. As I showed before, his first historical publications about the two provinces came out in the first two decades of the 20th century. From 1918 on and, especially, on the eve of the war and during the war, he published several writings with an obvious propagandistic intent, as well as many historical works in Romanian which may not have had a propagandistic agenda, but they pertained to a certain historiographical atmosphere.⁷²

A distinct theme of historical propaganda on Bessarabia was the motif of the Romanian population across the Dniester River. It is well known that during the Eastern Campaign (1941), the Romanian Army led by Marshal Ion Antonescu advanced beyond the Dniester, which had hitherto served as Romania's traditional natural eastern border, and continued its military operations across the river, in Transnistria. Leaving aside the enthusiasm accompanying the military offensive in the so-called *Holy War against Bolshevism*, in Romania the crossing of the Dniester was perceived as a turning point at the time (as it is also

⁶⁸ Brătianu, *La Bessarabie*, 7–8. See also Idem, *Die rumänische Frage*, 12.

⁶⁹ Idem, *La Moldavie et ses frontières historiques* (1940). Second edition: Bucarest, Les Editions Dacia, 1941.

⁷⁰ Idem, *Die rumänische Frage*, 12.

⁷¹ Idem, *La Bessarabie*, 211–216, 223–224.

⁷² Nistor, *Români și Rutenii*; Idem, *Drepturile noastre*; Idem, *Problema ucraineană*; Idem, *La Bessarabie et la Bucovine*, (1937); Idem, *Die Vereinigung der Bukowina mit Rumänien* (1940), and its English edition; Idem, *Die Herkunft* (1943).

considered nowadays). At that time, the Romanian historians brought the argument of the Romanian population living in large communities also across the Dniester. Among them was Gheorghe I. Brătianu, too, but he also expressed his scepticism about the occupation of Transnistria: “La Roumanie ne doit qu’au hasard de la guerre d’avoir occupé la ‘Transnistrie’ entre le Dniestr et le Boug.”⁷³ Romania included Transnistria among its concerns after its occupation in 1941. Several books and reviews dedicated to this area were published, including a study by Ion Nistor.⁷⁴

A territory that engendered the publication of a large number of historical propaganda works was Dobrudja, whose southern part (the so-called *Cadrilater*) had been obtained by Romania at the expense of Bulgaria under the 1913 Peace Treaty of Bucharest. As of that moment, the *Cadrilater* became a constant object of dispute between the two countries and, as in the case of Transnistria in 1941, the Romanian historians found historical arguments to justify the crucial importance why this small territory should belong to Romania. This became the subject of heated disputes in 1916–1918. Bulgaria occupied the *Cadrilater* after Romania’s entry into war, and Romania reoccupied the territory at the end of the war. Its possession was confirmed by the peace treaties and generated new historical writings on the part of the Romanian, Bulgarian or Western historians,⁷⁵ who presented the history of the province from ancient times until after the year 1878. Like in the case of Transylvania, the authors who published about Dobrudja stressed the rapid modernization of the province under the Romanian administration.

5. Conclusions

At the end of this analysis, several conclusions may be drawn. This paper has interrogated the connection between historians and propaganda, closely studying the cases of five Romanian historians who were representative for the historiography from first half of the 20th century: Gheorghe I. Brătianu, Silviu Dragomir, Ioan Lupaș, Zenovie Pâclișanu and Ion Nistor. I examined their educational and university trajectories, their academic and political careers, their historical concerns and publications. I discovered that the great themes of the Romanian historiography of the time, represented by the five historians (and by their colleagues from the same generation), corresponded to the agenda of the

⁷³ Brătianu, *La Bessarabie*, 210.

⁷⁴ Nistor, *Aspecte geopolitice și culturale* (1942).

⁷⁵ Stoica, *The Dobrogea* (1919); Tafrafi, *La Roumanie transdanubienne* (1918); Comnène, *La Dobrogea (Dobroudja)* (1918).

Romanian diplomats and politicians during the interwar period and, especially, during the first part of War World II. Its major themes were Romania's territorial integrity within the borders established by the Peace Treaties of 1919–1920 and the Romanian character of the provinces adjoined to the homeland in 1918 (Transylvania, Bessarabia, Bukovina and Dobrudja). Thus, through the academic positions they occupied in universities and research institutions, through the reviews they published and the numerous articles, studies, books and pamphlets they wrote over the years, these historians mobilized themselves and fought with their own weapons to fulfil the requirements of Romania's politics and diplomacy. Of course, their quality of politicians facilitated this relation.

Thus, the historians under consideration here wrote works of propaganda, contributed to the internal and, especially, to the external propaganda in favour of Romania and the great themes of its diplomacy. Despite the negative resonance of the term *propaganda*, we may notice – in this case – that these historians placed their works in the service of their country, like other historians from Romania or other countries also did. In this way, they were, to paraphrase Gheorghe I. Brătianu, who paid homage to Marc Bloch in 1946,⁷⁶ *scholars and soldiers*, but soldiers armed with the weapons of science.

Translation by Carmen Veronica Borbély

Bibliography

- Anton, Mioara. *Propagandă și război. Campania din Est 1941–1944* [Propaganda and War. The Eastern Campaign 1941–1944]. București: Ed. Tritonic, 2007.
- Boia, Lucian. *Capcanele istoriei. Elita intelectuală românească între 1930 și 1950* [The Traps of History. The Romanian Intellectual Elite between 1930 and 1950]. București: Humanitas, 2011.
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *Roumanie et Hongrie. Considérations démographiques et économiques*. Bucarest: Institutul de științe morale și politice, 1940.
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. "Bismarck und Ion C. Brătianu." In: *Vom Leben und Wirken der Rumänen. Rumänische Reihe* II. Heft 13–15. 5–28. Jena und Leipzig: 1939.
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *File rupte din cartea războiului*. București: Ed. "Cultura Națională", 1935, 2006².
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *L'organisation de la paix dans l'histoire universelle. Des origines à 1945*. Avec une préface de Rogister, John. Bucharest: Ed. Enciclopedică, 1997.
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *La Bessarabie: droits nationaux et historiques*. Bucarest, Institut d'Histoire Universelle "N. Iorga," 1943, pp. 7–8.
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *La Moldavie et ses frontières historiques*. Bucarest: Institut des sciences morales et politiques, 1940; Les Editions Dacia, 1941².
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *La Roumanie et l'U.R.S.S.* Bucharest: 1936.

⁷⁶ In *Revue historique du Sud-Est européen*, XXIII (1946): 5–20. See also Toderășcu (ed.), *Cuvinte*, I–IX.

- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *Rumänische Einheit*. Bukarest: Institut für Weltgeschichte N. Iorga, 1944.
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *Une énigme et un miracle historique: le peuple roumain*. Bucarest, Imprimerie Nationale, 1937.
- Brătianu, Gheorghe, I. *Die rumänische Frage: 1940*. Bukarest: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului. Imprimeria Națională, 1940.
- Brătianu, Maria G. *Gheorghe I. Brătianu: enigma morții sale* [Gheorghe I. Brătianu: the Enigma of His Death]. Translated into Romanian by Constantinescu, Antonia, with a study by Papacostea, Șerban. București: Fundația Academia Civică, 1997.
- Brezeanu, Stelian (ed.). Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *Une énigme et un miracle historique: le peuple roumain*. Édition soignée, préface, étude et notes par Stelian Brezeanu. Bucarest: Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1989.
- Cernovodeanu, Paul. *Revista istorică română. 1931–1947. Bibliografie critică* [The Romanian Historical Review. 1931–1947. A Critical Bibliography]. București: Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1977.
- Ciobanu, Ana Maria et al. *Institutul de Istorie "Nicolae Iorga," 1937–1948* [The "Nicolae Iorga" Historical Institute, 1937–1948]. București: Ed. Oscar Print, 2009.
- Ciobanu, Ștefan. *La Bessarabie. Sa population, son passé, sa culture*. Bucarest: Moniteur Officiel et Imprimeries de l'Etat. Imprimerie Nationale, 1941.
- Ciobanu, Ștefan. *La continuité roumaine dans la Bessarabie annexée en 1812 par la Russie*. Bucarest: Imprimerie Cultura Neamului Românesc, 1920.
- Dascălu, Nicolae. *Propaganda externă a României Mari (1918–1940)* [The Foreign Propaganda of Greater Romania (1918–1940)]. București: Ed. Alternative, 1998.
- Domenach, Jean-Marie. *La propagande politique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959.
- Dragomir, Silviu (ed.). *La Transylvanie*. Paris: Boivin and Co, 1946.
- Dragomir, Silviu. "Contribuții privitoare la relațiile bisericii românești cu Rusia în veacul XVII" [Contributions Regarding the Romanian Church's Relations with Russia in the 17th Century]. In: *Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice*, series II, Tome XXXIV, (1912): 1065–1247.
- Dragomir, Silviu. *Die siebenbürgische Frage*. Bukarest: 1941.
- Dragomir, Silviu. *La Transylvanie avant et après l'Arbitrage de Vienne*. Sibiu: Centrul de Studii și Cercetări Privitoare la Transilvania, 1943.
- Dragomir, Silviu. *La Transylvanie roumaine et ses minorités ethniques*. Bucarest: Imprimerie Nationale, 1934.
- Dragomir, Silviu. *Relațiile bisericești ale Românilor din Ardeal cu Rusia în veacul XVIII* [The Ecclesiastical Relations between the Romanians from Transylvania and Russia in the 18th Century]. Sibiu: Tipografia arhidiecezană, 1914.
- Dragomir, Silviu. *Românii din Transilvania și unirea cu Biserica Romei. Documente apocrife privitoare la începuturile unirii cu catolicismul roman (1697–1701)* [The Romanians in Transylvania and the Union with the Church of Rome. Apocryphal Documents Relating to the Beginnings of the Union with Roman Catholicism (1697–1701)]. Bucharest: Ed. Institutului Biblic și de Misiune Ortodoxă, 1963 (reedited 1990).
- Edroiu, Nicolae–Mureșanu, Camil (eds.). Lupaș, Ioan. *Serieri alese* [Selected Studies], vol. I. București: Ed. Academiei Române, 2006.
- Ellul, Jacques. *Histoire de la propagande*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967.
- Ghitta, Ovidiu. "Silviu Dragomir, historien des relations ecclésiastiques roumano-russes." In: *Transylvanian Review*, II, 2 (1993): 53–59.
- Greco, Vasile. "Ion I. Nistor ca istoric" [Ion I. Nistor as a Historian]. In: *Omagiul lui Ion I. Nistor. 1912–1937*, 22–48. Cernăuți: Tiparul Glasul Bucovinei, 1937.
- Hausleitner, Mariana. *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina. Die Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Grossrumäniens 1918–1944*. München: Oldenbourg, 2001.
- Iorga, Nicolae. *La vérité sur le passé et le présent de la Bessarabie*. Bucarest: Librairie P. Suru–Paris, Librairie H. Champion, 1922; 1940².

- La Transylvanie*. Bucarest: [s.n.], 1938.
- Leon, N.G. *La Transylvanie et la politique économique de la Roumanie*. Bucarest: 1943.
- Lupaș, Ioan. "Individualitatea istorică a Transilvaniei (1920)" [Transylvania's Historical Individuality (1920)]. In: Idem, *Studii, conferințe și comunicări istorice*, vol. I. 49–72. Bucharest: 1927.
- Lupaș, Ioan. "Mitul 'Sacrei Coroane' și problema transilvană" [The Myth of the 'Sacred Crown' and the Transylvanian Problem]. In: *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională*. Cluj, VIII (1939–1942): 343–360.
- Lupaș, Ioan. "Realități istorice în voevodatul Transilvaniei din sec. XII–XVI" [Historical Realities in the Voivodeship of Transylvania between the 12th and the 16th Centuries]. In: *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională*, Cluj, vol. VII (1936–1938): 1–85.
- Lupaș, Ioan. "Réalités historiques dans le voïvodat de Transylvanie du XII-e au XVI-e siècle." In: *La Transylvanie*, (1938): 165–260.
- Lupaș, Ioan. "Voevodatul Transilvaniei în sec. XII–XIII" [The Voivodeship of Transylvania during the 12th and 13th Centuries]. In: *Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice*, series III, tome XVIII, (1936): 83–114.
- Lupaș, Ioan. 1. *Die Grundlagen der rumänischen Volkseinheit*. 2. *Der geschichtliche Weg der Rumänen*. *Gastvorträge an der Universität Tübingen*. Hermannstadt: Krafft & Drotloff, Hauptverlag der Deutschen Volksgruppe in Rumänien, 1942.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Desbinarea bisericească a românilor ardeleni în lumina documentelor din întâia jumătate a veacului al XVIII-lea* [The Religious Dissensions of the Transylvanian Romanians in the Light of Documents from the First Half of the 18th Century]. In: *Biserica Ortodoxă Română, 1921–1922*, ser. 2, 40, no. 9 (495): 641–658.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Hungarian policy of magyarization*. Sibiu: Tip. Oct. L. Veștemean, 1944.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Istoria românilor. Manual aprobat de Ministerul instrucțiunii pentru școlile medii (civile) de băieți și fete clasa a IV-a de licen și pentru școlile profesionale din Transilvania* [A History of the Romanians. A Textbook Approved by the Ministry of Education for the (Civil) Middle Schools for Boys and Girls in the Fourth Grade of High School and for the Vocational Schools in Transylvania]. Cluj: Tip. Ardealul, 1921.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Istoria Unirii românilor* [The History of the Romanians' Union]. Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Regală "Principele Carol," 1937; 1938²; 1993³.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Șovinismul confesional în istoriografia românească ardeleană. Studiu critic* [Confessional Chauvinism in the Transylvanian Romanian Historiography. A Critical Study]. Sibiu: Tip. Arhidiecezană, 1903.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Transilvania "inima teritoriului etnic românesc"* [Transylvania "The Heart of the Romanian Ethnic Territory"]. Sibiu: s.n. 1945.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Trecutul nostru românesc. Scurt manual de istorie națională* [Our Romanian Past. A Short Textbook of National History]. Sibiu, Tip. Astra, 1934.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Ursprung und Entwicklung der bedeutendsten konfessionellen Minderheiten in Rumänien. Vortrag gehalten im Aulagebäude der Friedrich Wilhelms – Universität in Berlin am 11 Mai 1934*. Jena & Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Gronau, W. Agricola, 1936.
- Makkai, Ladislás. *Histoire de Transylvanie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1946.
- Mârza, Radu. "Transylvania and Hungary or Transylvania in Hungary as Viewed by the Romanian Historiography." In: *Slovensko a Chorvátsko. Historické paralely a vzťahy (do roku 1780)*. *Slovačka i Hrvatska. Povijesne paralele i veze (do godine 1780)* [Slovakia and Croatia. Historical Parallels and Connections]. Scientific committee: Homza, Martin–Lukačka, Ján–Budak, Neven–Kucharská, Veronika–Kuzmová, Stanislava–Mesiarkin, Adam (eds.), 85–96. Bratislava, Zagreb: 2013.
- Mârza, Radu. *Romanian Historians and Propaganda (1914–1946). The Case of Transylvania*. Translation from Romanian by Carmen-Veronica Borbély. Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press, 2014.
- Mehedinți, Simion. *Le Pays et le peuple roumain. Considérations de géographie physique et de géographie humaine*. Bucarest: 1937.

- Miron, Greta. "Ioan Lupaș – istoric al unirii religioase" [Ioan Lupaș – A Historian of the Religious Union]. In: *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai. Historia*, 36 (1991): 101–109.
- Miron, Greta. "Silviu Dragomir istoric al unirii religioase" [Silviu Dragomir, A Historian of the Religious Union]. In: *Revista Istorică*, Tome III, n. 5–6. (1992): 599–604.
- Nistor, Ion. *Aspecte geopolitice și culturale din Transnistria* [Geopolitical and Cultural Aspects of Transnistria]. București: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului, Imprimeria Națională, 1942.
- Nistor, Ion. *Die auswärtigen Handelsbeziehungen der Moldau im XIV., XV. und XVI. Jahrhundert*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1911;
- Nistor, Ion. *Die Herkunft der im rumänischen Bodenraum ansässigen Ukrainer*. Bukarest: Tip. Lupta, 1943.
- Nistor, Ion. *Die Vereinigung der Bukowina mit Rumänien*. Bukarest: Verlag "Bukowina" I. E. Toroușiu, 1940
- Nistor, Ion. *Drepturile noastre asupra Hotinului* [Our Rights over Hotin]. Chișinău: Tipografia Românească, 1918.
- Nistor, Ion. *Handel und Wandel in der Moldau bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Nach den Quellen dargestellt. Czernowitz: 1912.
- Nistor, Ion. *Istoria Basarabiei* [The History of Bessarabia]. Cernăuți: Institutul de Arte Grafice și Editură „Glasul Bucovinei”, 1923.
- Nistor, Ion. *La Bessarabie et la Bucovine*. Bucarest: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului, Imprimeria Națională, 1937.
- Nistor, Ion. *Problema ucrăineană în lumina istoriei* [The Ukrainian Question in the Light of History]. Cernăuți: Ed. Glasul Bucovinei, 1934.
- Nistor, Ion. *Românii și Rutenii în Bucovina. Studiu istoric și statistic* [The Romanians and the Ruthenians in Bukovina. A Historical and Statistical Study]. București: Librăriile Socec și Sfetea, Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Göbl, 1915.
- O'Shaughnessy, Nicholas Jackson. *Politics and Propaganda: Weapons of Mass Seduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Pâclișanu, Zenovie. "Ungaria și acțiunea catolică în Orient" [Hungary and the Catholic Action in the Orient]. In: *Revista istorică română*, XIV, n. 2. (1944): 180–197.
- Pâclișanu, Zenovie. *Der Ausrottungskampf Ungars gegen seine nationale Minderheiten*. Bukarest: Dacia-Bücher, 1941.
- Pâclișanu, Zenovie. *Propaganda catolică între românii din Ardeal și Ungaria înainte de 1500. Studiu istoric* [Catholic Propaganda among the Romanians from Transylvania and Hungary prior to 1500. A Historical Study]. Blaj: 1920.
- Pâclișanu, Zenovie. *Relatio Rumenorum e terris coronae Sancti Stephani ad Reformationem saec[ul]is et XVI et XVII = Legătura românilor de pe pământurile coroanei Sfântului Ștefan cu Reforma în secolele al XVI-lea și al XVII-lea, Viena, 1912*. Translated from Latin: Mărza, Andreea. Introductory study, edited, notes, summary and index by: Mărza, Andreea–Mărza, Iacob. Sibiu: Techno Media, 2010.
- Pascu, Ștefan–Teodor, Pompiliu (eds.). Lupaș, Ioan. *Scrieri alese* [Selected Studies], vol. 1. Cluj-Napoca: Ed. Dacia, 1977.
- Petrescu-Comnen, Nicolae. *La Dobrogea (Dobroudja). Essai historique, économique, ethnographique et politique*. Lausanne–Paris: Payot, 1918.
- Radosav, Doru (ed.). Lupaș, Ioan. *Istoria bisericească a românilor ardeleni* [The Ecclesiastical History of the Transylvanian Romanians]. Second edition, edited, notes and commentaries by Radosav, Doru. Cluj-Napoca: Ed. Dacia, 1995.
- Râpeanu, Valeriu (ed.). Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *Tradiția istorică despre întemeierea statelor românești* [The Historical Tradition Romanian Regarding the Founding of the Romanian States]. București: Ed. Eminescu, 1980.
- Siebenbürgen*, vol. 1. Bukarest: Institut für Rumänische Geschichte in Bukarest, 1943.
- Siebenbürgen*, vol. 2. Bukarest: Institut für Rumänische Geschichte in Bukarest, 1943.
- Șipoș, Sorin. *Silviu Dragomir – istoric* [Silviu Dragomir – The Historian]. Preface by Pop, Ioan-Aurel. Cluj-Napoca: Fundația Culturală Română, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2002.

- Spinei, Victor (ed.). Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *Marea Neagră. De la origini până la cucerirea otomană* [The Black Sea. From Origins to the Ottoman Conquest]. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 1999.
- Spinei, Victor (ed.). *Confluente istoriografice românești și europene: 90 de ani de la nașterea istoricului Gheorghe I. Brătianu* [Romanian and European Historiographical Confluences: the 90th Anniversary of the Birth of the Historian Gheorghe I. Brătianu]. Iași: Universitatea "Al. I. Cuza," 1988.
- Stoica, Vasile. *The Dobrogea*. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1919.
- Szász, Zsombor. *The minorities in Roumanian Transylvania*. London: The Richards Press, 1927.
- Tafrafi, Orest. *La Roumanie transdanubienne (la Dobroudja). Esquisse géographique, historique, ethnographique et économique*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1918.
- Teodor, Pompiliu. *Introducere în istoria istoriografiei din România* [An Introduction to the History of Historiography in Romania]. Cluj-Napoca: Ed. Accent, 2002.
- Teodor, Pompiliu. *Istorici români și probleme istorice* [Romanian Historians and Historical Problems]. Oradea: Fundația Culturală "Cele Trei Crișuri," 1993.
- Teodor, Pompiliu—Mărza, Radu (eds.). *Incursiuni în opera istorică a lui Gheorghe I. Brătianu* [Insights into the Historical Work of Gheorghe I. Brătianu]. Historical studies and interpretations. Cluj: Casa Cărții de Știință, 1999.
- Toderașcu, Ion (ed.). Brătianu, Gheorghe I. *Cuvinte către români. Zece conferințe și prelegeri* [Words Addressed to the Romanians. Ten Conferences and Lectures]. Edited, introductory study, notes and index by Toderașcu, Ion. Iași: Ed. Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza," 1996.
- Xenopol, A.D. *Les Roumains au moyen-âge: une énigme historique*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1885.
- Zub, Alexandru (ed.). *Ion Niștor. 1876–1962*. Chronological table, bibliography and index by Ceaușu, Mihai-Ștefan. Iași: Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza," 1993.

Between Scientific Rigor and Patriotic Duty. The Historical Discourse of the Romanian Scholars from Cluj during the Interwar Period

What I aim in this study is to capture the process whereby the representatives of the School of History from Cluj¹ shaped their outlook on the purpose of historical writing and on the manner in which history ought to be written. Being active within a new political context that also fostered the creation of institutional structures such as the National History Institute (1920), the Institute of Classical Studies and the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of Ferdinand I University, the historians from Cluj experienced a justified sense that this was a new beginning for historiography.

The personalities I have chosen to analyse, on account of the profound mark they left on the historiographical life of Cluj, are Al. Lapedatu (1876–1950), Ioan Lupaş (1880–1967) and Silviu Dragomir (1888–1961). These were three historians who had been educated in diverse academic settings: the first, a student of the Faculty of Letters at the University of Bucharest (1898), witnessed the rise of the critical school, whose representatives, D. Onciul, Ioan Bogdan and Nicolae Iorga, had recently entered the academic milieu of Bucharest. Ioan Lupaş came into contact with the Central European historiography while he was a student of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy at the University of Budapest

¹ The problem of the existence of various historical schools in the province, at Iaşi, Czernowitz and Craiova, as well as, implicitly, of a Cluj-based School of History has been discussed by Al. Zub, who contends that “there do not appear to have existed genuine schools that could easily be defined conceptually, methodologically, or stylistically.” And yet, the phrase is employed in historiography, without being clearly or explicitly defined, but rather suggested. When it is used, reference is made to an erudite spirit, to national militancy, to a predilection for the history of the province, Zub, *Istorie și istorici*, 163–164, 180, 184. What I have also had in mind is the fact that the historians who were active in Cluj, especially the three scholars to whom I refer in this study, set forth the directions of research on the history of Transylvania and proposed new university courses; they were prolific authors, who were influential in the public, political and historiographical space alike. The question that remains open, I think, is whether they were really *maitres d’école*, in other words, whether they were inventors of rules and disseminators of theories, whether they had disciples or merely directed consciences. I would be inclined to credit the latter possibility, given that many of their ideas and historical demonstrations are still sanctioned today by certain historians or theologians. For considerations on the founders of historical school, see Carbonell, *Histoire et Historiens*. 295–297.

(1900–1904), where he worked under the close supervision of Professor Henrik Marczali, the his BA thesis advisor.² His specialization in Berlin (1904–1905) enabled him to acquire closer knowledge of the German critical historiography, by attending the lectures delivered by Harnack, a historian of religion, Otto Hinze (who provided him with methodological suggestions as regards the national emancipation movement), Hans Delbrück and Friedrich Paulsen.³ Ever since the years of his secondary studies in Novi Sad, Silviu Dragomir had embarked on the study of the Slavic languages, which is why, after failed attempts to enrol in the Faculty of Theology from Karlowitz, he became a student of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Czernowitz (1905–1909). In parallel, he attended lectures in Slavic Philology at the Faculty of Philosophy,⁴ and in 1909–1910 he studied at the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Vienna. As professors, academicians⁵ and politicians,⁶ the three influenced Romanian scientific life in general and the historiography of the Cluj School in particular, through the lectures they delivered⁷ and the administrative activity

² He attended the lectures of Professors Finánczi and Fejérpataky, cf. Pascu–Teodor, “*Introducere*,” 10. On the Hungarian historiography, see Várdy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, 38–42.

³ Pascu–Teodor, “*Introducere*,” 12–13.

⁴ His professors from Czernowitz included Richard Wahle (History of Ancient Philosophy), Eugen Ehrlich (Roman Law) and Ferdinand Zieglauer von Blumenthal (History of Austria). In Vienna, he took introductory courses in philosophy with Wilhelm Jerusalem, Apology of the Current Age with Reinhold Georg, Art History with Wilhelm Suida, and History of the Peoples in the Balkans with Constantin Jireček, cf. Şipoş, *Silviu Dragomir istoric*, 31. For his studies and the university atmosphere in Czernowitz, see *Ibidem*, 28–35.

⁵ They were members of the Romanian Academy: Alexandru Lapedatu – a corresponding member in 1910 and a full member in 1918 (President of the Romanian Academy between 1935 and 1937); Silviu Dragomir – a corresponding member in 1916 and a full member in 1928, Opriş, “*Prefaţă*,” p. 17; Şipoş, *Silviu Dragomir*, 49.

⁶ Alexandru Lapedatu was Chairman of the Council of the Oppressed Nations of Austria–Hungary formed in Odessa in 1918, a member of the Romanian delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, a senator in the Romanian Parliament, in all the legislatures of the years 1919–1946 (except for the years 1920–1921), and a Minister of Religious Denominations and the Arts. Ioan Lupaş and Silviu Dragomir participated in the Great National Assembly of Alba Iulia on 1 December 1918. Silviu Dragomir was Secretary of State for the Minorities in the Octavian Goga Government (1937–1938), as well as Minister for the Minorities (1938–1940). For the political activity of Alexandru Lapedatu, see Opriş, “*Prefaţă*,” 15–177; for Ioan Lupaş, see Pascu–Teodor, “*Introducere*,” 15–16; for Silviu Dragomir, see Şipoş, *Silviu Dragomir*, 53–63.

⁷ Alexandru Lapedatu held the Chair in Ancient History of the Romanians; Ioan Lupaş taught Ancient History of the Romanians, Transylvania’s History during the Reformation Period, History of Transylvania under the Habsburgs, History of the Romanians from Michael the Brave to Constantin Brâncoveanu; Silviu Dragomir ran the Seminar on the History of the South Slavic Peoples, lectures on the History of the Slavic Peoples and a course on the 1848 Revolution, *Ibidem*, 43–46.

they engaged in as institute leaders and as Deans of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy.⁸

They formulated the major historical research projects launched in the aftermath of Transylvania's unification with Romania, placing, at the forefront of their concerns, the investigation of national history, or the integration of Transylvania's history within the general Romanian history. As such, they proposed studying the relationships between the three Romanian countries, highlighting the Romanians' contributions at the political level by studying the beginnings of state organization (Al. Lapedatu⁹) and the 1848 Revolution, the study of the Romanians' social organization, as well as the investigation of the Slavo-Romanian traces (S. Dragomir) and the social dynamics, or the peasant uprisings¹⁰. The historiography practised by the historians from Cluj stood out though two main features. First of all, it was an integrative historiography, which aimed to explore the common historical destiny of the three Romanian countries and, thus, to highlight the historical, cultural background of their political union. Hence, a second feature of this historiography, its legitimating character.¹¹ In terms of its goals and stance on the issues it examined, the Romanian historiography of the Cluj-based scholars was militant, adopting the line of inquiry that had been launched by the historians of the Enlightenment period, by the representatives of the Transylvanian School¹² and continued by the romantics. Following in the footsteps of Kogălniceanu, Al. Lapedatu considered that the Romanians' history, the national history had been hitherto deprived of systematic, in-depth research due to lack of resources and that it was high time it became the prime focus of historical inquiry.¹³ At this moment of historiographical optimism, impelled by the new political reality and considering the experiences of the past, Al. Lapedatu interrogated the relationship between

⁸ Ioan Lupaş was Director and Al. Lapedatu was Co-director of the Institute of National History; Lapedatu was also Dean (1921–1922) and Vice-Dean (1922–1923) of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy, and Silviu Dragomir also filled these offices (he was dean from 1925 to 1926 and vice-dean in 1926–1927). For Alexandru Lapedatu's administrative, management positions, see Opreş, "Prefaţă," 15.

⁹ For Alexandru Lapedatu's directions of study, see Teodor, *Incursiuni în istoriografia română*, 35–44; 45–57.

¹⁰ Idem, 80–127.

¹¹ Idem, 30.

¹² Zub, *Istorie și istorici*, 180.

¹³ In the opening lecture for his course on the national history, Al. Lapedatu distinguished between the time of yore and his own time, making reference to Mihail Kogălniceanu's lecture of 1843: "starting from the very first academic course on the Romanians' national history delivered by Mihail Kogălniceanu at the Mihăileană Academy in 1843, I proceeded to show the difficult circumstances for the national historiography back then, moving on to the new, all the more favourable conditions of Greater Romania," Lapedatu, *Amintiri*, 181.

the “science” of history and politics. He advocated respect for the historical destiny of the Hungarians, for their ethnic and cultural identity and, at the same time, for granting the Transylvanian Romanians’ history its rightful, legitimate place. His plea assumed a deliberate patriotic tone and revealed the frustrations he had accumulated, as he spoke of the “historical rehabilitation of the Romanian people in Transylvania and Hungary,” whose past had been, in his opinion, belittled or ignored by the Hungarian historians. On a note retributive-patriotic note, Romanian historians were called to repair a “great and blatant injustice.”¹⁴

The desideratum of promoting national history spurred reflections on previous Romanian historical writing and the history of historiography thus became a research field and an academic discipline taught by Alexandru Lapedatu and Ioan Lupaş. Their historiographical forays established the stage in the evolution of Romanian historical writing, the historiographical benchmarks and, obviously, the paths to be followed. The views they espoused were sensibly different. In his membership acceptance speech at the Academy in 1923, Al. Lapedatu was selective and restrictive, considering that the Romanian historiography in Transylvania had experienced a belated start, in as late as the eighteenth century, and that its beginnings were associated with the Greek-Catholic (Uniate) youth who had been educated in Rome. In his opinion, this historiography had to catch up with the other two – Hungarian and Saxon – historiographies in Transylvania, which were superior in terms of tradition; moreover, the history of the Transylvanian Romanians, which had traditionally been ignored both by the Hungarian and Saxon researchers and by those in Romania, had to come out of the isolation to which it had been relegated.¹⁵ Lapedatu eulogized, nonetheless, two personalities of great renown: Nicolae Iorga, an indefatigable traveller through pre-war Transylvania, who was a connoisseur of the Transylvanian Romanians in their homeland and had authored a synthesis of the history of the Romanians in Transylvania and Hungary, and Andrei Veress, remarkable in light of his work of editing documents that also made reference to the Romanians’ history.¹⁶ Alexandru Lapedatu proposed, in perspective, the alignment of the Transylvanian Romanian historiography with the historiography produced by the Hungarians,

¹⁴ “Noi împrejurări de dezvoltare a istoriografiei naţionale” in Mureşanu–Edroiu (ed.), *Alexandru Lapedatu*, 17.

¹⁵ Al. Zub wrote about a “complex” of Romanian history being ignored by foreigners in general, a complex afflicting Romanians from all the Romanian provinces ever since the early decades of the 19th century; hence, the effort to make known the history of the Romanians to foreigners. Zub, *Istorie şi istorică*, 117–125.

¹⁶ “Istoriografia română ardeleană în legătură cu desfăşurarea vieţii politice a neamului românesc de peste Carpaţi,” in *Alexandru Lapedatu*, 32–33.

the Germans and the Romanians from across the Carpathians; in his opinion, the study of the Transylvanian Romanians' history acquired significance only by comparison with the events that had taken place in Hungary and in the Romanian Countries, a comparison whose aim was to highlight the specific character of Romanian civilization.¹⁷ The desire of integrating the history of Transylvania into general Romanian history prevailed throughout the interwar period, not without reason, in fact, given that the historians from across the Carpathians had maintained their distance from the Transylvanian past (as attested, for example, by the meagre space dedicated to the history of Transylvania in syntheses of the Romanians' history).¹⁸ Regarding isolation or the fact that the other Transylvanian historiographies had disregarded certain key moments in the history of the Romanians, Lapedatu set out to start his first year as an academic in Cluj with a challenge, namely, bringing two historical figures to the students' attention, Stephen the Great and Michael Brave. He had wished, as he confessed, to begin his lectures "with our two great and glorious rulers, as a kind of protest against their having been ignored by the Hungarian and German historiography of Transylvania."¹⁹

While Lapedatu had the feeling that the Romanian historiography had to overcome a handicap, to make up for its tardy beginnings, Ioan Lupaş was more optimistic. In the analysis of the Romanian historiography in Transylvania²⁰ that he undertook in 1933, he set out to demonstrate that this historiography was as old and prestigious as the other historiographies in the province. What he included, as such, in the Transylvanian Romanian historiography were works written in Latin, Serbian and Romanian by chroniclers of Romanian descent or, he said, by Romanianized authors.²¹ He thus broadened the content of what was conceptually designated by the "Transylvanian Romanian historiography," or, to use another syntagm that belonged to him, the "Transylvanian School": chronologically, above all, as he went back to the fifteenth century in history, the century of the beginnings, in his opinion, but also thematically and authorially, as what Lupaş placed next to the history written by "the great," renowned

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, 34.

¹⁸ In volume II of C.C. Giurescu's *Istoria românilor*, dedicated to the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries, Moldova has, in terms of the number of pages allocated to it, a share of 48%, Wallachia, 41% and Transylvania a mere 11%. In his work *Din istoria României*, Dimitrie Onciul excluded Transylvania completely from his analysis, Boia, *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească*, 153.

¹⁹ Lapedatu, *Amintiri*, 181.

²⁰ Lupaş, "Dezvoltarea istoriografiei românești din Transilvania," 113–134.

²¹ He referred to a chronicle compiled in the second half of the fifteenth century, preserved, during the first half of the sixteenth century, by the members of the Drágfy family, who were, in his opinion, of Romanian origin. With reference to the sixteenth century, he claimed Nicolaus Olahus was of Romanian extraction, *Ibidem*, 114–115.

historians, fragments of unknown or forgotten chronicles, local accounts, compiled by priest-scholars who had evinced a passion for history.²² He thus integrated in the “Transylvanian School” authors who had been relinquished to oblivion or ignored by others but who, through their writings, had educated the larger public’s taste for history and had turned history into a means of self-knowledge and a weapon of political struggle. To demonstrate the potential of this historiography, as well as its diversity of forms of expression and composition, Lupaş also focused on histories written in verse or rhymed chronicles. Emphasizing the ancientness, diversity and capacity for self-renewal of the Transylvanian historiography, Lupaş made a gesture of cultural commendation towards the Transylvanian Romanians and a plea for an engaged and committed, albeit critical and balanced history, which should not slide “down the slope of hypertrophy and megalomania.”²³ He granted history the role of mobilizing the people and ensuring their self-confidence, as well as of consolidating their strengths. History, Lupaş wrote, “is called, now and in the future, to contribute, day by day, to strengthening these foundations (of national unity and liberty), making them strong and firm.” Moreover, “historians should stir sympathy, not contempt for our past,” and “national history” had a duty to spread “refreshing optimism” around.²⁴

An example of the national-integrative approach to certain historical subjects comes from the domain of confessional history, namely the union of the Romanians in Transylvania with the Church of Rome and the relations between the Greek Catholics and the Orthodox. The Union was considered an act devoid of spiritual significance, which had been accepted by the Romanian priests on economic grounds, based on false documents, and misunderstood by the laity, who had been deceived by the promise that nothing would be changed in their religion. Oppression, division and falsification were the key terms around which Orthodox discourse was built in the late nineteenth century and in the interwar period. It was in similar terms that Silviu Dragomir conducted his analysis of the relations between the Orthodox and the Uniates in the first half of the eighteenth century in his two volumes of *Istoria desrobirii religioase* [*The History of Religious Emancipation*], published within a decade of one another (1920, 1930)²⁵. The title indicates the central idea of Dragomir’s analysis – the liberation of the

²² For instance, he made reference to the chronicle of Archpriest Vasile from St. Nicholas’ Church in Şcheii Braşovului and to the parish priest Sava Popovici from Răşinari, who, at the end of the eighteenth century, had turned sermons into a means of disseminating historical identitarian matters among the parishioners: the unity and continuity of the Romanians in Dacia, *Ibidem*, 116–118.

²³ *Ibidem*, 131

²⁴ *Ibidem*, 131–132.

²⁵ Dragomir, *Istoria*, vol. I–II, (1920–1930).

Orthodox who had been confessionally oppressed by a foreign power. He emphasized the confessional turmoil and the pro-Orthodox movements, his ample documentary reconstitution being written in a tone that suggests his sympathy for Orthodoxy. Formulations like: “the religious heroism of the people”, “the terror regime”, “martyrs and heroines”, “defenders of the ancestral faith” add dramatic overtones to his discourse, often making recourse to black-or-white arguments, positively invoking the supporters of Orthodoxy, and casting the others – the Catholics and the Greek Catholics – into the opposite camp. The historian had acknowledged his subjective approach when he said that, at times, he had allowed himself to get “carried away by feelings,”²⁶ an understandable approach given his formative environment, as well as his commitment to the Church that had provided him with financial support during his study years.²⁷ The historian’s research on this subject, which he also continued during the post-war period, has a paradigmatic value for historians or for Orthodox theologians even today. It was also from a national-integrative and Orthodox perspective that Ioan Lupaş addressed this issue. In his course on the *History of the Transylvanian Romanians’ Church*, which he delivered in the early years of his career at the Orthodox Theological Institute in Sibiu, a course that he published in 1918, he referred to the union of a part of the Romanians with the “Western Church”, claiming that “from the Romanian point of view, this act of sad and painful memory must be given a name that expresses the unadulterated truth: the ecclesiastical division of the Transylvanian Romanians.”²⁸ Like his fellow university professor Dragomir, he also considered that the history of relations between the Uniates and the Orthodox during the first half of the eighteenth century, up until the reestablishment of the Orthodox Church (1761), had been one of ordeal and turmoil for the Orthodox soul, of a dramatic fight for defending the “ancient faith”. The confessional configuration of United Romania, in which Orthodoxy represented the dominant confession, encouraged the perception of the relations between the Greek Catholics and the Orthodox not in terms of constructive diversity, but in those of a solid, perennial unity, unaffected by any rupture, including by a confessional rift. Such approaches were consistent with the discourse on Romanianism adopted by the national right wing of the 1930s, for whose members the national spirit was largely identified with Orthodoxy.²⁹

²⁶ Şipoş, *Silviu Dragomir*, 220.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, 212.

²⁸ Lupaş, *Istoria bisericească a românilor ardeleni*, 108.

²⁹ Boia, *Istorie şi mit*, 168–170.

The patriotic, national ethos of romantic extraction that pervaded the researches of the historians from Cluj was reinforced by their interest in primary sources, which led to major documentary restitutions from archives located in the country or abroad. Given their interest in documents and text analysis, cultivated via their contact with the German or the Austrian historiography, the professors from Cluj rallied themselves to the current of historical criticism. In the aforementioned *Istoria desrobirii religioase*, Silviu Dragomir appended a substantial number of documents from the archives of Moscow, Karlowitz and Budapest. In fact, he was a historian who exploited various sources: in his research on the Middle Ages, for instance, he resorted to sources of an archaeological, linguistic (toponymical), architectural, or visual (mural) nature. Ioan Lupaş made a major contribution to the publication of *Documente istorice transilvane* [*Transylvanian Historical Documents*]³⁰ and Alexandru Lapedatu exploited manuscripts from the Romanian Academy Library, alongside archival funds and museum catalogs. By appealing to documents, the historians from Cluj aligned themselves with the historiography practised by their colleagues from Bucharest – by the so-called “critical triad.” Ioan Bogdan was a model cherished by Ioan Lupaş, especially as regards the publication of historical sources: in his opinion, the former had the merit of having removed Romanian historical science from its “romantic stage of infancy.”³¹ The issue of the historical sources led toward the problem of historical method and the historiographical horizon that the professors from Cluj had outlined, in their attempt to square the demands of critical documentary analysis with the national spirit of their interpretations.

Ioan Lupaş was more generous in comparison with his fellow historians, in his reflections on historical writing, due to the fact that he had taught courses on the history of historiography for many years. Through others, he defined himself, and his forays into Romanian and European historiography reveal his outlook on how history is written. His historiographical analyses disclose his constant concern with the historian’s subjectivity and the purpose of his research.

He addressed subjectivism in the writing of history in his opening lecture of 1 November 1923, entitled *The Meaning and Purpose of History*. Analysing the different trends and tendencies in the European historiography of the previous decades, he discussed the problem of historical knowledge and the historian’s approach to historical facts and lived life. He chose to present to his history students the defining figures of European historiography, innovative through their method and their vision of history, such as Ranke, or through the concepts

³⁰ Lupaş, *Documente istorice transilvane*, (1940); Lupaş, *Documente istorice privitoare la moşile brâncoveneşti din Transilvania și Oltenia 1654–1823*, (1933).

³¹ Lupaş, “Dezvoltarea istoriografiei românești,” 129–130.

they had created, such as Karl Lamprecht, with his *Kulturgeschichte*. Following the Ranke-Lamprecht dispute, he highlighted the creative dynamism of German historiography, centred on debate and dispute, drawing thus the attention of the students to a different kind of history than the narrative one. In this sense, he also insisted on the historical philosophy of Oswald Spengler, who denied the existence of laws in history, in opposition with the supporters of historiographical naturalism, upholding the value of the historian's intuition and the relativity of knowledge³². The individual or the collective subject of history, a rigorous or an intuitive historical method, spontaneity and subjectivism in approaching historical facts – here are the dilemmas whereby Lupaş wanted to make his students reflect on the writing of history. What solution did the professor propose? What was his position on approaches to history? He proved to be a supporter of the idea of history “as it happened”, to use Ranke's words, and of history as a “revival of integral life,” as Jules Michelet had envisaged it. The endeavour of Lupaş the historian was that of combining the interest in documents and historical accuracy, specific to what he called “scientific history”, with his personal, subjective outlook on historical facts because, he confessed, “we, ourselves, are history” and that is why we seek “the spiritual, vivid, personal and subjective contact” with it.³³ Presenting two methods: “explanatory-scientific” and “reconstructive-individualistic”, he distinguished between a perennial history of the Rankean type, based on rendering the “sheer truth” and transient, subjective history, in which the facts are distorted by the historian's thoughts and ideals. These methods were not exclusive, as the rendition of “sheer truth” could be supplemented by the historian's “penetrating insight.”³⁴ The text entitled “The Sense and the Purpose of History” betrays his attachment to the German School of History, but also his interest in subjective history, boosted by his own experience as a historian who was active on the political stage. He betrayed here his admiration for Ranke, outlined as the complete historian, through his creative power, the renown he had gained throughout the continent, not only through his studies on German history, but also through those dedicated to various European peoples (the French, the English, the Serbs), through his objective approach, revealed, among other things, by the manner in which he, a Protestant, wrote the history of the popes, through the clarity of his rhetoric and his talent as a writer. While he was a reader of Ranke (as evidenced by the quotations he reproduced), he did not ignore the subsequent German

³² For the reception of Oswald Spengler's work, *The Decline of the West*, in the Romanian historiography and, generally speaking, in the Romanian interwar culture, see Zub, *Istorie și istorici*, 243–245.

³³ Idem, “*Sensul și scopul istoriei*,” 61.

³⁴ *Ibidem*.

historiography. He made reference to Ranke's disciple, Heinrich von Sybel (whom he considered, "after Ranke, the greatest German historian")³⁵ and Treitschke, Ranke's successor at the Department of History at the Friedrich Wilhelm University in Berlin, as these were politically engaged historians, supporters of the idea of a unified and powerful German state,³⁶ an idea that must have influenced him in his approach to the relationship between politics and history. He was nonetheless also attached to the romanticism of Jules Michelet and the idealism of Thomas Carlyle,³⁷ and among his historical readings were the works of Hippolyte Taine³⁸ and Auguste Comte.³⁹ What would result from Lupaș's reflections on how history should be written? It should be written with the mind and the soul, I believe. This is the answer that emerges from reading Lupaș's historiographical essays, permeated by the desire to discover and tell the truth, in whose victory he believed ("*veritas vincit*") in a critical spirit, but also with respect for the educational-patriotic and mobilizing value of history⁴⁰. In fact, Lupaș the historian claimed thus that history cannot be divorced from life, from the one who re-creates it and gives it meaning.

To conclude, through their interest in political, narrative history, as well as through their chosen methodological frameworks, namely, German historicism and Romanian critical historiography, the three historians from Cluj seem to have ignored the changes in European historiography, which had developed an ever stronger interest in social structures, in processes of social change and in expanding the historical perspective from the sphere of politics into that of society at large.⁴¹ Their appetite for political history did not insulate them in the realm of Romanian historiography, but rather integrated and blended them therein.⁴² Although the interest of Romanian historiography in social history and

³⁵ Idem, "*Cultul eroilor și dreptatea istoriei*," 16.

³⁶ Iggers, *The German Conception of History*, 116–123.

³⁷ He was impressed with Carlyle's literary talent and the expressive edge of his comparisons, Lupaș, "*Cultul eroilor*," 16.

³⁸ He mentioned Taine in the same essay he wrote in his youth, "*Cultul eroilor*," concerning the role of outstanding individuals in history, *Ibidem*, p. 15.

³⁹ He cited Comte for his idea about the moralizing import of history: "History is like morals that instruct by way of exemplification," Lupaș, "*Vieața și activitatea lui Gheorghe Barițiu*," 3.

⁴⁰ See also Alexandru Zub's considerations in *În orizontul istoriei*, 37.

⁴¹ Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century*, 3–4.

⁴² There also existed a trend opposed to the dominant one led by Nicolae Iorga, illustrated by a new generation of historians, whose spokesman was C.C. Giurescu. Having launched *Revista istorică română* in 1931, C.C. Giurescu proposed that research should be focused on the economic, social and cultural problems. He thus distanced himself programmatically from the previous generation, which had limited itself, as he wrote, to the study of the national problem, Zub, *Istorie și istorici*, 173–174.

the “democratization” of history was never absent,⁴³ the concern with political history prevailed.⁴⁴ Thus, whereas at the beginning of the 20th century the Rankean paradigm had been increasingly criticized by historians from France, Belgium, the US and even Germany,⁴⁵ for Lupaș, as I have seen, Ranke remained the model par excellence. This attitude may have been contingent on the general state of Romanian society, on a more subdued economic and social dynamism than in Western Europe,⁴⁶ but it may also have been a reflection of the need felt by Romanian historians active in Cluj to recuperate a historiographical stage that had been insufficiently exploited in its own time, that of criticism. Convinced, in the early 1920s, that what opened before them was a vast historiographical site, the historians of the School from Cluj felt the need to place themselves in the service of the city, of the community, by combining scientific accuracy with patriotic devotion.

Translated into English by Carmen-Veronica Borbely

Bibliography

- Boia, Lucian. *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească*. București: Humanitas, 1997.
- Carbonell, Charles Olivier. *Histoire et Historiens. Une mutation idéologique des historiens français 1865–1885*. Toulouse: Privat, 1976.
- Dragomir, Silviu. *Istoria desrobirei religioase a românilor din Ardeal în secolul XVIII*. Vol. I–II. Sibiu, 1920–1930.
- Iggers, Georg. *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: from Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1997.
- Iggers, Georg. *The German Conception of History: the National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*. Middletown, Conn: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Documente istorice privitoare la moșiile brâncovenesti din Transilvania și Oltenia 1654–1823*. Cluj: Cartea Românească, 1933.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Documente istorice transilvane*. Cluj: Cartea Românească, 1940.

⁴³ Nicolae Iorga proposed an opening to non-official history, to history viewed from below or, in his own terms, to “the history of the country through the small ones,” *Ibidem*, 274–275.

⁴⁴ National history was, according to the historian Al. Zub, the leitmotif of Ioan Lupaș’s entire work, *Ibidem*, 97.

⁴⁵ Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century*, 5.

⁴⁶ According to Iggers, “democratization and the emergence of a mass society” led historians to take into account the role played by larger segments of the population and their living conditions, *Ibidem*.

- Lupaș, Ioan. *Istoria bisericească a românilor ardeleni* (Ed. Radosav, Doru). Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1995.
- Mureșanu, Camil-Edroiu, Nicolae (ed.). *Alexandru Lapedatu (1876-1950). Scrieri istorice*. București: Academiei Române, 2008.
- Opriș, Ioan. "Prefață." In: Lapedatu, Alexandru, *Amintiri*. Cluj-Napoca: Albastră, 1998.
- Pascu, Ștefan-Pompiliu, Teodor. "Introducere". In: Lupaș, Ioan, *Scrieri alese*. Vol. I. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1977.
- Șipoș, Sorin. *Silviu Dragomir istoric*. Cluj-Napoca: Fundația Culturală Română, 2002.
- Teodor, Pompiliu. *Incursiuni în istoriografia română a secolului XX*. Oradea: Fundația culturală "Cele Trei Crișuri," 1995.
- Várdy, Steven Béla. *Modern Hungarian Historiography*. Boulder: East European Quarterly, 1976.
- Zub, Alexandru. *În orizontul istoriei*. Iași: Institutul European, 1994.
- Zub, Alexandru. *Istorie și istorici în România interbelică*. Iași: Juminea, 1988.

Spiritual history/Geistesgeschichte-cultural history-intellectual history-postmodern.

The notion of spiritual history is without doubt one of the most discussed concepts of intellectual history in the 20th century. Within this framework, of course, there is no possibility to analyze the term entirely, but I would like to give a glimpse in what follows of what I consider to be its most relevant tenets.¹

It should be noted, however, that several ideas of this movement turned up even earlier; interpreters mention in this respect as forerunners the ideas of Herder, Voltaire, and Vico, as well as Humboldt, Hegel, Ranke, Nietzsche, and Jacob Burckhardt from the 19th century.²

Spiritual history, *Geistesgeschichte*, after all the above became dominant as an intellectual (partly political) stream at the turn of the 20th century and between the two World Wars, mainly in Eastern, Eastern-Central Europe (but not only there).³

Among the epistemological tenets of spiritual history, *Geistesgeschichte*, we can point out that it saw an essential difference between natural and social (called spiritual, cultural) sciences. There are naturally enormous differences between the concepts of Dilthey, the Neo-Kantians (Rickert, Windelband, Simmel, Cassirer), and the sociologist Max Weber, but basically all of them agreed that in opposition to natural sciences, which operate by laws, causal explanations (*Erklärung*), and by external relations of their objects, humanities regard as much more important the ideas, thoughts, motifs, and significance behind their objects (human actions), and therefore understanding (the exploring of the goals,

¹ About spiritual history/Geistesgeschichte cf. Kon, *Die Geschichtsphilosophie des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Srbik, *Geist und Geschichte vom deutschen Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart*. I–II; *The Philosophy of History in our Time*; *Theories of history*; Oexle, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus*; Iggers, *The German Conception of History*; Rösen, *Konfigurationen des Historismus*; *The Modern Historiography Reader*; Antoni, *From History to Sociology*.

² The above enumeration as forerunners of spiritual history/Geistesgeschichte seems to be quite contingent. This depends on theoretically (i. e. the selection as fore-runners) what kind of notion has been conceived about the movement. Those e. g. who regard political history/theory/philosophy (treated here in the followings) irrelevant from this point of view, will not include Ranke and his concepts about the “Primat der Außenpolitik”/primacy of foreign affairs and the questions of state/power into the idea of spiritual history.

³ Cf. recently *Key Concepts of Romanian History*.

Verstehen) is the most relevant for them.⁴ As mentioned earlier, there was a huge difference between Dilthey's idea of experience (*Erlebnis*),⁵ differentiating between idiographic and nomothetic sciences in the vein of Rickert and Windelband (and the so-called value relating method at its foundation), and between Max Weber's concept of ideal-types (which can be regarded as the most rational and closest to sociological methods). While all of them share the rejection of the application the method of natural sciences, which focus on the lawful, the repetitive, and the mass-like, and they regard as more important the inquiry about the significance, sense (*Sinn*), ends, and motifs of human actions.

We can regard the thesis about world views, *Weltanschauungslehre*, to be another important (rather ontological) tenet of spiritual history, *Geistesgeschichte* (cf. Ranke about the leading ideas of centuries, "Jede Epoche ist unmittelbar zu Gott."). According to this concept, every historical epoch has a leading idea (*Sinnzusammenhang*, see Ankersmit⁶), as e. g. Gothic, Renaissance, Baroque, Enlightenment, Romantic (cf. Eicken, Karl Joel⁷), which presents itself in different spheres of historical life, such as religion, economy, culture, technology, policy, form of government, etc. This concept played a definitive role in the creation of a synthetic approach in the historical works, which no more concentrated on outstanding personalities and events, on political history, it opened up a way towards a total approach to history. In this respect, art historians exerted a big impact; in Hungarian relation mainly the Austrian and German art-history schools come into consideration, such as M. Dvorak, Alois Riegl, Aby Warburg, E. Panofsky.⁸

To the concept of the world views, we can relate the idea of Max Weber, E. Troeltsch, Werner Sombart⁹ about the relationship between capitalism and puritan-Calvinist-protestant work ethic and religion (faith). According to this well-known and later heavily challenged thesis, the background of capitalism was forged by the Calvinist vocational work ethic, that (in opposition to Catholicism, but even to Luther) sees the only possibility of overcoming predestination in a certain asceticism, self-denial, devotion to a vocation, to steady work and action (which can be signs of grace and "chosenness").¹⁰

Spiritual history has a common feature (not shared by everyone) in terms of political philosophy as well. One of the outstanding representatives in this

⁴ Cf. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*. 282–302.

⁵ Cf. Orth, *Dilthey und die Philosophie der Gegenwart*.

⁶ Cf. "Franklin R. Ankersmit" 67–99.

⁷ Cf. Joel, *Wandlungen der Weltanschauung*.

⁸ Cf. e. g. Raulff, *Von der Privatbibliothek des Gelehrten zum Forschungsinstitut*.

⁹ Cf. Toeltsch, *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt*.

¹⁰ Against this conception cf. Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*.

respect is Friedrich Meinecke¹¹ (whose followers include the Italian F. Chabod, or E. Cantimori), who in many ways revived the idea of Ranke about the "Primat der Außenpolitik" (primacy of foreign policy). According to this theory, the international sphere is determined primarily by the struggle for power, for prevailing of state reason and interest (*Staatsraison*), and the big subject of Meinecke is: the opposition between power and ethics, *kratos* and *ethos*, between Potsdam and Weimar.¹² According to this conception, the main contradiction of the modern age (19th century) is the increasing opposition between power and ethics, which is not an exclusively German, but a general European phenomenon. In the interpretation of Meinecke, power in itself is not bad (strongly repudiating here Jacob Burckhardt), and (here the examples are Friedrich the Great, Bismarck, but even Hegel) in the final analysis, it is possible to exercise it in serving general ethical values and humanism (it hinges on the state-man).

The author of these lines assumes as a common feature of spiritual history, *Geistesgeschichte*, the concept of the so called "cultural circles," and a close relation with it, the critique of modern culture, and an interpretation of the cultural decline of the modern ages. These views are epitomized mainly in the works of A. Toynbee, O. Spengler, J. Ortega y Gasset, and others (L. Ziegler, J. Huizinga¹³). But many thinkers from the camp of the so called "Christian personalism" can also be evoked in this respect, such as N. Berdiajeff, J. Maritain, K. Jaspers, G. Marcel, or Denis de Rougemont.

In this respect the biggest impact was exerted by the book of O. Spengler, entitled *Der Untergang des Abendlandes (Decline of the West)*¹⁴ (the forerunners of which are Polybios, Machiavelli, Vico, Nietzsche, Burckhardt), which provides a universal, world-historical overview. In this work, history flows not in a linear, theological direction, but in so-called isolated, blind, monadic "cultural circles," without any connection to each other. Every organic circle, unity runs a specific trajectory that resembles an organism, having its childhood, adolescent and young age, its flourishing adult and peak period (in which most outstanding accomplishments are created), followed by an "inner desertification," by a withering old age, decline, and fall. The key notion here is the contradiction between culture and civilization, in which the main content of the process is a gradual rationalization, the coming into fore of the one-sided mechanical, technical-practical, utilitarian thinking and mentality. In this process (not

¹¹ About Meinecke recently cf. Paddock, 'Rethinking Friedrich Meinecke's historicism.'

¹² Cf. Meinecke, *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat*; Meinecke, *Die Idee der Staatsräson in der neueren Geschichte*.

¹³ About Huizinga cf. e. g. Strupp, 'Der lange Schatten Huizingas'.

¹⁴ Cf. Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*.

progress), this rationality is the final preparation for the crisis, decline, and destruction, with its epic-critical, superfluous optimism, with its faith in progress, ignorance of the tragic aspect of human being. We do not have enough space here for a deeper treatment of the differences between the different thinkers, enough is to say that (based on the opposition between challenge and response) the views of A. Toynbee sound more optimistic than that of Spengler.¹⁵ According to him, the fall of European civilization is not inevitable, as far as during the 20th century its traditional values can be saved by creating a world civilization. Similarly the concept of Ortega also has a more positive message than Spengler's work; Ortega sees the only chance for Europe in the opposition to the totalitarian systems based on mass-culture and mass-man – in the European Union, which can be accomplished by a new “intellectual,” historically trained nobility (elite), and which is the only chance to restrain the fatal clash between the brutal, ethnic, fundamentalist nationalisms of his age.¹⁶

The so-called “Christian personalism” (in its e version sensitive for history) is also based on crisis philosophy and on the critique of the modern age.¹⁷ According to this, the most threatening dark side of the modern, capitalistic era is the so called “depersonalification,” the coming to the fore of a new type of man, the “mass-man,” living purely for his self-indulging pleasures, regarding himself as a self-objective (*individu*).¹⁸

The basic notion of this movement is the person (*personne*), which epitomizes a certain harmony, mediation between the extreme poles that represent the “pagan” values, between the already mentioned *individu* and the communitarian totality. The most striking feature of the modern age is the dominant, even exclusively ruling position of these totalitarian entities (in the form of a party, class, nation, people, *Volk*), against which “Christian personalism” presents the *Agape*, the unconditional respect of the “other,” Christian human love.¹⁹ This has been epitomized, according to Maritain, in the ancient Christian ecclesiastical communities. Denis de Rougemont conceives from this principle a more or less original philosophy of history. Here ancient Greek pagan individualism is contradicted by the Roman (also pagan) state worship, and the syntheses of the two came about in the aforementioned old Christian communities, evoked by Maritain. European history after that (the pattern seems to be the *corso- ricorso* idea of Vico) runs the same trajectory (*corso*) again. The response to the well-known individualism of the Renaissance is the coming about of the new

¹⁵ Cf. about Toynbee still Huntington, *A civilizációk összeépása és a világrend átalakulása*.

¹⁶ About Ortega cf. Graham, *Theory of History in Ortega y Gasset*.

¹⁷ Cf. Rougemont, *Vingt-huit siècles d'Europe*.

¹⁸ Cf. Mounier, *Le Personalisme*.

¹⁹ Cf. Maritain, *Humanisme integral*.

collectivisms during the 18–19th centuries (race, class, people, etc.), which are the most significant precursors of the calamities of the 20th century, that threatened with the total dissolution of the European civilization. Against is – following Rougemont – the Europe of the regions and federalism constitute the alternative solution, which mediates between the two extreme poles, individual and community, and materializes the personalistic idea (in the form of the “Person”).

It should be added here, that the genre par excellence of spiritual history, *Geistesgeschichte* (which ran/stood in many respects against social history), was cultural history,²⁰ (and later intellectual history). It had such outstanding representatives in the period in question, as E. Kantorowitz, J. Huizinga, E. Friedell, M. Rostovzeff, H. Butterfield, G. Ferrero (beside the historians and thinkers already mentioned).²¹

Finally, we can pose the questions: How can we summarize all this? What is the personal opinion of the author about spiritual history/*Geistesgeschichte*, especially regarding cultural and intellectual history and postmodernism, as it is indicated in the title of this paper?

Firstly should be stated that – on the ground of the above – the statement that emerges in the Hungarian but in the general literature as well, according to which spiritual history can be equaled with/as political and event history /*histoire evenementielle* and being so essentially not passed the 19-th century historicism/or professionalism²² – can be claimed as an “idol”. Secondly that statement can be also qualified as another “idol”, according to which the notion of spiritual history/*Geistesgeschichte* not can be defined and never has been done so.²³

A textbook was published in Hungary about historical theory/philosophy of history a few years ago.²⁴ As I have indicated in some of my former publications it contains many texts from the authors discussed in this paper, but without any clear organization and interpretation. By the application of the notion spiritual history the common features of these authors could have been pointed out easily, not to mention the problems relating to them.

Thirdly, it is clear that we can reject as a false interpretation the claim that spiritual history is a mere German phenomenon, the product of the German “Geist” which is akin to foggy and suspect irrationalism²⁵. It is clear from the

²⁰ Cf. *Geschichte zwischen Kultur und Gesellschaft*.

²¹ Cf. Lem, *Johan Huizinga*. Later W. M. Johnston and C. Schorske continued the heritage of cultural history. Cf. e. g. Johnston, *Österreichische Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte*.

²² Cf. Iggers, *The German Conception of History*.

²³ Appears very often at the populists in Hungary. Cf. Borbándi, *Der ungarische Populismus*.

²⁴ Cf. *Történetelmélet*. I–II. About it still Erős, *Modern historiográfia*.

²⁵ Cf. Borbándi, *Der ungarische Populismus*.

examples I mentioned above, that we can find not only German but French, English, Italian, Spanish, and Russian authors as well among the representatives of spiritual history.²⁶

It could be reinforced by the fact that we can consider the direct continuation of spiritual history the American school of intellectual history (from A. Lovejoy, through Hans Baron, H. Holborn, Kristeller and F. Gilbert till D. LaCapra and Sidney Hook),²⁷ and the Cambridge school of the history of ideas (from Oakeshott and Collingwood through H. Butterfield till I. Berlin, Pocock or Judith Shklar),²⁸ especially after the Second World War.

Not to mention the German *Begriffsgeschichte* (from Gadamer and Jauss to R. Koselleck and J. Rüsen),²⁹ the *Italian school of intellectual history* (from the partly already mentioned F. Chabod, D. Cantimori, Omodeo till the great Ancient historians A. Momigliano, G. De Sanctis or F. Venturi).³⁰

But we can regard as a direct or semi-direct continuation of spiritual history/*Geistesgeschichte* the New Cultural History in the vein of Schorske, Johnston or Peter Burke as well.³¹

All to this we should add the cultural history vs. social history debate in Germany in the 1990s.³² On the basis of the schools and authors mentioned above it is clear that spiritual history is not exclusively a German affair.

We can also mention the “assimilationists-autonomists’ debate in the Anglo-Saxon world from the 1950s onward. In this debate the representatives of the “autonomist” position, namely W. Walsh and L. Mink, formulated very similar ideas to the views of the representatives of spiritual history (drawing here in many respects on Collingwood) regarding their conceptions about “colligation” or “synoptic judgment”.³³

Both of them (and e.g. P. Winch³⁴) advocate the much despised “essentialism”, in defence of the whole, the “sense” (*Der Sinn*), respectively the exploring/the query of it, in opposition to Popper’s “falsificaton” theory.³⁵

²⁶ Cf. Erős, *In the Lure of „Geistesgeschichte”*.

²⁷ Cf. Erős, *Az amerikai történetírás*.

²⁸ Cf. Erős, *Az angol történetírás a huszadik században*.

²⁹ Cf. Erős, *A második világháború utáni német történetírás*.

³⁰ Cf. Erős, *Modern historiográfia*.

³¹ Cf. Shorske, *Bécsi Századvég*.

³² Cf. Erős, *A második világháború utáni német történetírás*; Erős, *Modern historiográfia*.

³³ Cf. about them Breisach, *Historiográfia, Történetelmélet I–II*.

³⁴ Cf. Winch, *A társadalomtudomány eszméje és viszonya a filozófiához*.

³⁵ Another question is the possibility of spiritual history/“*Geistesgeschichte*” in Eastern/East_Central Europe, more exactly if the notion can be applied in this territory, indicating an intellectual period. In my opinion the answer is yes, in many respects, cf. the Romanian case with E. Cioran, M. Eliade or Noica (and probably many others), but the

As I mentioned earlier, we can also argue that spiritual history can be interpreted in many respects as one of the most important predecessor of micro-history regarding postmodernism which came to the fore from the 1970s onwards, after the so-called linguistic turn.³⁶ (This is the opinion of the already mentioned Dutch philosopher and theoretician of history, F. Ankersmit³⁷).

Concerning micro-history it is true that both micro-history and spiritual history had a predilection for cultural history, what is in striking contrast to both traditional political (event) history and to structural social history.³⁸

It is also true on the one hand that there are significant differences between the two kinds of above mentioned cultural histories as well. Spiritual history focuses on high elite culture (Renaissance, Baroque, Enlightenment, Romantique, etc.), what is in close relationship with its political-philosophical-intellectual message.

On the other hand, micro-history prefers history “from below” that is the study of everyday popular life and culture, which topics had been considered insignificant and “marginal” before. These topics, including the history of sexuality, time-experience, illnesses, death, feasts, etc. had not been canonized at all.³⁹

The same can be said about the relationship of spiritual history and postmodern. I do not want to deal with the problem here whether postmodern is the equivalent of micro-history, but in my opinion this is the case.⁴⁰ There are many parallels between the tenets of spiritual history and that of postmodern, from which we can come to the conclusion that postmodern is not that new. (It is not accidental that Toynbee is generally considered as one of the first representatives/forerunners of postmodernism.⁴¹)

Spiritual history, as well as postmodern emphasize the importance of inner/ethical/moral considerations in history, the descriptive/narrative character, and the denial of the scientific (social) character of it. Both of them stress the literary character of history writing, and they also doubt the ideas of development/progress and modernity, not to mention the idea of historical and historiographical relativism.⁴²

Austrian case can be also evoked with the partly already treated E. Friedell, Frobenius, the art-history school and perhaps with Srbik as well.

³⁶ Cf. Erős, *Történetfilozófiai iskolák a huszadik században*. The literature given there respectively.

³⁷ About Ankersmit latesty cf. e.g. Munslow, *A History of History*. Cf. still Domanska, *Encounters*.

³⁸ Cf. Strupp, *Johann Huizinga*.

³⁹ About microhistory cf. still István Szíjjártó's study in this volume.

⁴⁰ Many representatives of microhistory, e.g. Carlo Ginzburg, have the represent an opposite position. Cf. Ginzburg, *Nyomok, bizonyítékok, mikroörténelem*.

⁴¹ Cf. *Theories of history*.

⁴² Cf. Erős, *A szellemtörténet*.

It is also true on the other hand that there is a fundamental difference between spiritual history and postmodern. Due to this difference spiritual history is much closer to intellectual history than to micro-history. Both of them deny the identification of history and natural science (i. e. structures, laws, quantification), and both of them advocate historical relativism, or a reflected aptitude at least. But the representatives of spiritual history do not share the extreme relativism of postmodern. Not to mention the “endism” and “postism” of postmodern, the complete denying of any continuity between the past and the present, and the adherence of it to the high grade of historical realism.⁴³ (We can add the statement that there is a certain identity between subject and object in history, which is the epistemological precondition of being able to get to know the past.)

It is also not accidental that Ankersmit in the last few years or P. Ricoeur⁴⁴ keep on reclaiming a certain historical realism. On the basis of it we could be quite certain that Ortega, Croce, Troeltsch, Collingwood, Oakeshott, and even Th. Heussi were not the direct predecessors of postmodern “relativism” in the vein of Foucault or Hayden White⁴⁵.

All these statements are fostered by the phenomenon that although spiritual history nurtures heavy doubts towards the idea of linear progress or development of history, it basically believes in the possibility or even in the necessity of grand narratives in history (cf. the cyclical theories of Spengler and Toynbee⁴⁶). In contrast to this approach micro-history focuses on the insignificant, fragmented, marginal, particular, not similar and singular which is the complete denial of grand narratives. In this sense, micro-history falls into the category of postmodernism.⁴⁷

⁴³ Cf. Munslow, *A History of History*.

⁴⁴ Cf. about Ricoeur Erős, *A francia történetírás a huszadik században*. And Kelemen, *Az azonos, az önmaga és a más*.

⁴⁵ About them cf. *Történetelmélet I–II*. To Collingwood for me the best is Levine. *Re-enacting the Past*. Other work by Levine, in which he puts this approach into practice cf. Levine. *Between the ancients and the moderns*.

⁴⁶ Cf. *The Philosophy of History in our Time*.

⁴⁷ Cf. Szijártó, *A mikro-történelem*; Szijártó, *A történelem mikroszkópja*. From this follows that the author of present study hardly shares and has even severe doubts about the conception of István Szijártó M., according to which one of the main tenets and aims of micro-history is setting up and attempting to answer “big questions” in history. As far as postmodern is a kind of philosophical and conceptual background of micro-history this is a contradiction in adiecto. According to postmodern (e.g. to that of the early Ankersmit) history doesn’t bother with “big questions” any more, even denies/refutes “big” or “master” narratives and it declares the radical “other”-ness, “alien”-ness of the past, the definite discontinuity of past and present. That’s why it disintegrates history into many small stories and several different narratives. Already Gábor Gyáni calls the attention to this paradox and contradiction in his (anyway in many respects incorrect) review

Bibliography

- “Franklin R. Ankersmit”, In *Encounters* (Philosophy of History after Postmodernism), edited by Ewa Domanska. 67–99. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia. 1998.
- Alun, Munslow. *A History of History*. London and New York: Routledge. 2012.
- Carl, E. Shorske, *Bécsi Századvég*. Budapest: Helikon Kiadó, 1998.
- Carlo, Antoni. *From History to Sociology*. (The Transition in German Historical Thinking.) With a Foreword by Benedetto Croce. Detroit, Wayne State University Press. 1959.
- Carlo, Ginzburg. *Nyomok, bizonyítékok, mikro történelem*. Budapest: Kijarat Kiadó, 2010.
- Borbándi, Gyula. *Der ungarische Populismus*. Mainz: Hase-Koehler Verlag, 1976.
- Robin, George, Collingwood. *The Idea of History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Ernst, Breisach. *Historiográfia*. Osiris, Budapest. 2004.
- Erős, Vilmos. “A szellemtörténet”. *Valóság*, 2008/5: 20–35.
- Erős, Vilmos. *Az amerikai történetírás*. *Valóság*, 2010/2. 75–94.
- Erős, Vilmos: Az angol történetírás a huszadik században. *Aetas*, 27.évf. 2012/3. 139–154.
- Erős, Vilmos: A második világháború utáni német történetírás. *Valóság*, 2011/11. 20–33.
- Erős, Vilmos. *Történetfilozófiai iskolák a huszadik században*. In: *Történeti Tanulmányok*, XVI. Szerkesztette Velkey Ferenc. Debrecen 2008. 7–30.
- Erős, Vilmos. *A francia történetírás a huszadik században*. *Valóság*, 2012/8. Augusztus. 47–63.
- Erős, Vilmos, “In the Lure of „Geistesgeschichte””. (The Theme of Decline in the Hungarian Historiography and Historical Thinking Between the Two World Wars.) *European Review of History / Revue européenne d'histoire*, 2015/3. 1–22.
- Erős, Vilmos. *Modern historiográfia*. Az újkori történetírás egy története. Ráció, Budapest: 2015.
- Geschichte zwischen Kultur und Gesellschaft*. (Beiträge zur Theoriendebatte.) Herausgegeben von Thomas Mergel und Thomas Welskopp. München: Verlag C.H. Beck. 1997.
- John, T. Graham. *Theory of History in Ortega y Gasset*. (“The Dawn of Historical Reason”) Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press. 1997.
- Georg, G. Iggers. *The German Conception of History*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.
- Gyáni, Gábor: *Szjártó M. István: A történetész mikroszkópja*. A mikro történelem elmélete és gyakorlata. *Korall*. 16. évf. 60.sz. (2015) 151–162.
- Karl, Joel. *Wandlungen der Weltanschauung*. Tübingen, 1928.
- William, M. Johnston. *Österreichische Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte*. (Gesellschaft und Ideen im Donauraum 1848 bis 1938.) Wien–Köln–Graz: Herman Böhlau Nachf. 1974.
- Kelemen, János. Az azonos, az önmaga és a más: francia filozófia a XX. század második felében. *Helikon*, 2007. 53. 1–2. 5–58.
- Key Concepts of Romanian History*. Alternative Approaches to Socio-Political Languages Edited by Victor Neumann, Armin Heinen. Budapest–New York: Central European University Press, 2013.
- Ivan, Sergeievits, Kon. *Die Geschichtsphilosophie des 20. Jahrhunderts*. (Kritischer Abriss.) I–II. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964
- Anton, van Lem. *Johan Huizinga*. Leven en werk in beelden en documenten. Amsterdam, 1993.
- Joseph, M., Levine. *Re-enacting the Past*. (Essays on the Evolution of Modern English Historiography.) Ashgate Variorum, 2004.
- Joseph, M., Levine. *Between the ancients and the moderns*. (Baroque culture in Restoration England.) New Have, London: Yale University Press, 1999.

about Szjártó’s book and points out that Szjártó is missing to mention an example for such “big” questions. Cf. Gyáni, *Szjártó M. István: A történetész mikroszkópja*.

- Jacques, Maritain. *Humanisme integral*. In Ouvres completes, Paris, Éditions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse_Éditions Saint Paul, vol. VI.
- Friedrich, Meinecke. *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat*. Berlin–München: Oldenbourg, 1907.
- Friedrich, Meinecke. *Die Idee der Staatsräson in der neueren Geschichte*. München–Berlin: Oldenbourg, 1924.
- Emmanuel, Mounier. *Le Personalisme*. Paris: Presse Universitaire de France, 1949.
- Otto, Gerhard, Oexle. *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus*. Studien zu Problemgeschichten der Moderne. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht. 1996.
- José, Ortega, y Gasset. *History as a System and other Essays Toward a Philosophy of History*. Helene Weyl(Translator). New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1962.
- E.W., Orth (Hrsg.). *Dilthey und die Philosophie der Gegenwart*. Freiburg–München. 1985.
- Troy, R. E., Paddock, „Rethinking Friedrich Meinecke's historicism“. *Rethinking History: The Journal of Theory and Practice*. Volume 10., Issue 1. 2006: 95–108.
- Ulrich, Raulff. „Von der Privatbibliothek des Gelehrten zum Forschungsinstitut.(Aby Warburg, Ernst Cassirer und die neue Kulturwissenschaft).“ *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 23. (1997): 28–43.
- Denis, de Rougemont. *Vingt-huit siècles d'Europe*. In *Oeuvres complètes de Denis de Rougemont*. III. Écrits sur l'Europe. Paris, 1994. 485–780.
- Jörn Rüsén. *Konfigurationen des Historismus*.(Studien zur deutschen Wissenskultur.) Frakfurt am Main: Suhkamp, 1993.
- Heinrich, Ritter, von Srbik. *Geist und Geschichte vom deutschen Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart*. I–II. Salzburg–München: Müller, Bruckmann, 1950.
- Simon, Schama. *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987.
- Oswald, Spengler. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes: Umriss einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte, 1918–22* (2 vols.: Gestalt und Wirklichkeit; Welthistorische Perspektiven). München: C. H. Beckische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923.
- Winch, Peter: *A társadalomtudomány eszméje és viszonya a filozófiához*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1988.
- Christoph, Strupp. „Der lange Schatten Huizinga. (Neue Ansätze der Kulturgeschichtsschreibung in den Niederlanden)“ *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 23 (1997): 44–69.
- Christoph, Strupp. *Johann Huizinga*. (Geschichtswissenschaft als Kulturgeschichte.) Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, Göttingen. 2000.
- Szűjártó, M. István, *A mikrotörténelem*. In: Bevezetés a társadalomtörténetbe. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó. 2004. 494–513.
- Szűjártó, M. István. *A történelem mikroszkópja*. (A mikrotörténelem elmélete és gyakorlata.) Budapest: L'Harmattan. 2014.
- The Philosophy of History in our Time*. (An Anthology Selected, and with an Introduction and Commentary by Hans Meyerhoff). New York: Garden City, 1959.
- Theories of history*. Edited with Introductions and commentary by Patrick Gardiner. London: The Free Press, 1959.
- Történetelmélet I–II*. Edited by Gyurgyák János–Kisantal Tamás. Budapest: Osiris, 2006.
- Ernst, Troeltsch. *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt*. München und Berlin: R. Oldenbourg, 1911.

The historical teleology and worldview of Hungarian fascism in the 1930's-1940's

The Hungarian radical right is a historic animal. This statement represents the core of its very being, for it is through a particular understanding of history that the radical right in Hungary perceived the world. History animated the political activity of the Arrow Cross Party: the annual processions, press articles, parliamentary interventions and solemn speeches on special occasions. The biggest party rallies usually took place at anniversaries or commemorations of historical events important for the life of the nation and the community. The speeches of politicians and activists were rife with examples and references to the past; for every occasion or problem, there is certainly an homologue in the past. Therefore the past acts as a constant referential point. The Hungarian radical right needs to look back to the past in order to be able to look to the present or onward to the future. In this sense, one the arguments my paper seeks to make is that the radical right's ultimate goal is to cancel out history, by imposing its optimal *weltanschauung*. This view of the future is also deeply entangled with the past. A mythological past serves as its source. Therefore, an analysis of the historical perception is necessary that if we wish to do a cursory investigation into the ideology of the Hungarian radical right and explore its reasons for success.

But what does this perception entail? Firstly, it means that history serves as a grand ordinator of both identity and perception and interaction with the surrounding world. It is by making use of historical grand events, persons and motifs that the Hungarian radical right forms its core self. Secondly, it means that the radical right uses a certain code of political language to communicate. Many of the elements of the code are historical, as Pierre Nora called them, *lieux de memoire*, that a particular society shares among its members. The symbolic meaning of an image or a reference to a certain name within a political exposé evokes the desired response only when it is located in the correct socio-political context. As Clifford Geertz tells us in the introduction to his *Interpretation of cultures*, a certain gesture, symbol or concept may only be properly understood within the confines of a certain cultural setting. This is certainly true for political culture as well. These elements are therefore recognized as such by the

individuals making up society, but their interpretations may vary highly within the community itself.

The most useful way to conduct a systematic analysis of the anatomy of the Hungarian radical right's historical identity is to analyze its discourses pertaining to history.

I shall depart from one of the most important theoretical tenets of this thesis, the term of generic fascism put forward by such scholars as Roger Griffin and George L. Mosse. Fascism is identified by Roger Griffin as a sub-variant of ultranationalism, populist in style, and bent on regenerating state and society. The idea of palingenesis is tightly packed concept, encapsulating a historical narrative within it. It theorizes that history is made up a dialectical struggle between members of the nation and its enemies. The national body is under attack by a number of "enemies", which threaten its very existence. The response to this perceived crisis is to attempt a regeneration of the community in its entirety, which would ensure a re-vitalization and re-acquirement of all the positive qualities it possessed in the past, but in a new form. This creates a historical ellipsis, by which the linearity of history may be sidestepped, and society may enter into an a-historical time.

Fascism, Griffin and Mosse argue, was a by-product of a cultural malaise, pessimism and a perception of modernity as destroyer of mental superstructures, which it did not replace with anything concrete. This was evident in the works of such intellectuals as Friedrich Nietzsche, Arthur Schopenhauer, B.A. Morel and Max Nordau; certainly, when Nietzsche affirmed that God was dead, he was expressing an attitude shared by many of his contemporaries. The mass society that modernity produced also caused great fear in the establishment, expressed most poignantly in the works of Gustave Le Bon. The masses needed to be controlled, as their primary drive was anarchic and destructive.

The degeneration theories were later propounded by the effects of the Great War, and the chaos that followed it, which did much to confirm all the fears and suspicions of European society; this was echoed by the works of the likes of Oswald Spengler. Thusly, fascism was born out of a need to curtail and control modernity on the one hand, and revitalize the nation, on the other. Griffin calls this drive "Palingenetic", meaning it is centered on the myth of rebirth. This may be better understood by employing Arnold van Gennep's theory of the rights of passage¹ at the level of society. In it, a large section of society feels that the community is in a "liminal" phase, i.e. passing from one state of existence into another. This necessitates a revival of society in a revolutionary manner: fascist felt that the nation was under siege by foreign elements, outside influences and

¹ Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*, (2013).

modernity itself, which sought to pull the organic community apart with its centripetal force. Polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman referred to this as “liquid modernity”, a situation of increasing feelings of uncertainty and the privatization of ambivalence, in which the status of the individual and the community are uncertain, and can shift at any moment.² Fascism, as a political movement, stepped in to mediate this process and regenerate the nation, materially but most importantly, in a spiritual manner. The main tools of this regeneration were the myth of the nation and populism. Thusly, Griffin circumscribes fascism as a form of populist, Palingeneticultranationalism. The allegory of the nation, coagulated around a central creed, spiritually reinvented, and rising like a phoenix from the ashes is the core myth of fascist ideology, across borders. In my thesis, I have found the same basic idea in the discourses of Hungarian fascism, especially pertaining to its treatment of the concepts of nation, society, history and future.

In this article, I shall attempt to draw up a synthetic scheme of the worldview of the inter-war radical right through the description of its apprehension of the concept of history. This investigation may lead to the identification of the theoretical narrative of fascist political thinking, by inspecting the relationship between the salient conceptual elements. Secondly, a study of the interwar political scene in which the radical right wing was embedded may provide some explanation for the apparent success of their speech and popularity of their vision (upon certain sectors of society).

The beginnings of historical theory

The academic interpretation of history in interwar period was dominated largely by the school established by Szekfű Gyula. They belonged to the Geistesgeschichte School, which in Hungarian was translated as *szellemtörténet* (*history of the spirit*).³ German historians such as Wilhelm Dilthey and Friedrich Meinecke were the main influences for Szekfű's generation.⁴ The former provided the theory of history as a sum of the thoughts, feelings, sensations and experiences of humankind. The reactions to these personal experiences could be gleaned from their external manifestations (in politics, culture and so forth) by historians, and interpreted. The key of a proper interpretation was a psychological involvement of the historian with his subject-matter, which was

² Beilharz – Bauman, “*Liquid Modernity*”. 2001.

³ Deak, “*Historiography*” 1041

⁴ Epstein, *Gyula Szekfű*: 56–57.

possible because of the „lived-through” nature of history. History was not studied from the outside, but from within, since the historian was also “living history”. The thorough knowledge of the object of the study, as well as “the spirit of the age” assured proper historical interpretation.

The tenets of *szelemtörténet* prescribed a stadial model of history, governed by a linear pattern of development. Development, however, did not equal progress, and nowhere was this more apparent than in the *magnum opus* of the period, the five-volume *History of Hungary* of Szekfű, written together with historian Bálint Hóman (who served as Minister of Education for over a decade in the interwar period). The work further developed the ideas put forward by Szekfű in the previous decade, in his book *Three Generations*. It engendered the idea of decline and decay of the Hungarian state and community in the modern period. The factors of decay were identified as being the cosmopolitan, (pseudo)bourgeois and profiteering elements of society, which began manifesting themselves after the onset of the Reform Period (1825–1848). The social categories which participated the most in the process of slowly destroying the Hungarian state and culture were, according to the historian, the gentry and the Jews. Their liberal culture (political and otherwise) came into direct conflict with “traditional” Hungarian values, based on Christian fate and traditional political institutions.⁵ This tendency developed further, until 1918, when it came to its natural conclusion, almost dragging the entire community down into abyss.

Szekfű claimed that each era of history had a specific spirit governing it. The spirit of the 19th century had been one of decadence, while his era was one of restoration of the traditional value-system. The Bethlen regime was interpreted as a renovator of Hungarian spirit and culture. Hungarian culture was defined as superior to all others in the area, a worthy participant to European culture. The concept of culture, in Szekfű’s understanding, was quite narrow: it encapsulated high culture and art, statecraft and science. These were all inspirited by a strong sense of belonging to the national community and the Christian faith. Consequently, his history was a strongly elitist one, concentrating on the history of high culture, politics, the establishment, legislation and institutions (such as the Church). He also had a proclivity for integrating Hungarian culture into Germanic culture, to the distaste of the Hungarian right-wingers. Szekfű was, due to his philosophy, an apologist of the political regime he was part of. He was influenced by Meinecke’s historicist attitude of the individual being justified within history via his relationship to the general historical forces and trends.

The idea of the decay of the preceding period was therefore accredited by Szekfű, bolstered by his followers, and assumed by the authorities as an element

⁵ Epstein, *Gyula Szekfű*. 58.

of their legitimacy. The political regime presided by István Bethlen had a highly successful and influential cultural policy through the activities of Klebelsberg-Khunó, the Minister for Culture in the 1920's. Klebelsberg established the Geistesgeschichte historians, providing them with institutional support, and took from them the idea of Hungarian cultural supremacy.⁶

The fascist movement in Hungary also began to coagulate, ideologically, around a new idea of history. We may use the concept of history to illustrate the attempt at breaking away from conventional norms of fascist politicians, and as an attempt to define themselves. In order to legitimize themselves, they put forward a theory of historical evolution that, while dependent on many of the ideas of established historiography, subverted them. The dynamic of fascist historical theory is quite interesting: it proceeded from a single concept to an elaborate, stratified theory. The initial concept was what British historian Roger Griffin refers to as *liminoid*: a state of being in which one perceives himself, and society as being at the brink of great change. Early fascist activists shared this belief (sincerely or for self-legitimizing purposes), and announced the dawn of a new era. The present was established as decadent, and they projected an alternative vision of the future. The idea of the future came first, due to the contested nature of the present. They then worked backwards to construct a past in which there were only two possible outcomes: nullification or the confirmation of their vision of their prospects.

The first utterance of the novel idea of the dawning of a new age was made in the pages of the journal entitled *Pesti Ujság* (The Pest Daily). The newspaper belonged to journalist and politician Meskó Zoltán. This small-time political figure was a member of a populist faction of the governing smallholder party, was a deputy in the Lower House of the Hungarian Parliament and personally owned the journal. He became known as the founder of the first openly fascist political party with parliamentary representation (through his own mandate of deputy). Meskó, born in Baja in 1883 (of Slovak descent), graduated from the military academy in Vienna, and became a non-commissioned officer in 1910. Afterwards, he became involved in various welfare schemes for the peasantry, eventually becoming the general secretary for the Peasant's Insurance Union.⁷ After serving in the First World war on the Italian front, and being involved in the Szeged counterrevolution, he worked in a number of positions in the interim governments, on matters of agriculture and smallholders. He then became involved in the reorganization of the Smallholder Party in 1921, and its melding

⁶ Deak, "Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Hungary", 4.

⁷ Meskó Zoltán. In: *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*, Kenyeres Ágnes (Főszerkesztő), Arcanum Adatbázis Kft., 2001

into the Unitary Party. Shortly thereafter, he left the party because of its attitude toward land reform and the taxing of wealth by 80%.⁸ After 1927, he returned to the fold, holding a parliamentary mandate of the Unitary Party. Another important step he undertook was founding a popular newspaper entitled “PestiÚjság” (“The Pest Daily”), which was to become the main means of conveying his ideas, and the base for his political endeavors (the journal became one of the main publications of the Arrow Cross Party long after Meskó’s departure from politics). Within its pages, he constantly pushed for a program of reform for the peasantry, who he identified as Hungary’s main repository of moral and national values, as well as being the most disadvantaged social category.

Even before the official turn to fascism, Meskó’s daily published a high amount of articles describing the atrocious social state of the lower classes, especially the peasantry. He (and his journalists) also identified the huge disparities of living standards between the various social categories and between urban and rural settings. He attributed this state of affairs as a growing trend of decay within society, and identified the causes as being systemic. The liberal and most importantly, capitalist ordering of economy and social affairs were to blame. He understood capitalism solely through its exploitative dimension and its *laissez-faire* attitude which fostered disorder favorable for profiteers:

“...capitalism...maintains the state in order to assure itself unrestricted, free competition. For it, production is an end in itself, its goal is profitability, not the person, but the gain. While millions are starving, this capitalism burns crops, throws coffee and cotton into the sea. This capitalism carries within it the seed of its own demise...it strives for international dominance...while a few thousands of bankers earn billions, millions of poor men are being exploited...”⁹

The leitmotif of banks and cartels as instruments of national destruction became embedded in the political lexicon in the years of the crisis. The allegory, however, spawned another facet in early fascist writings: its monopoly on resources endangers the existence of the entire nation, and its leaders are cosmopolitan, often foreign elements. Therefore, the nation and the country faces a constant state of emergency, to which only stern measures suffice.

“...we cannot follow a policy of public interest, until the renewal of the spirit of the nation, the union of all honest working Hungarians does not sweep away those

⁸ *Magyar Országgyűlési Almanach*, (1935–1944.) 257–258.

⁹ *Pesti Újság*, nr. 10, march 6, (1932. 1.)

who are traitors of democracy..., profitors of work, who in everything see only their fate and their personal gain.¹⁰

The peasantry, the true core of Hungarianness, was understood as being besieged by these factors of decrepitude. Soon, the seeds of a teleologic narrative, posing peasant Hungarians against nefarious cosmopolitan agents, began to appear:

“...they await the dawning of a new age...of a new Hungarian daybreak!...even when everything around collapsed, and the country was getting ready to die, the heart of the countryside was strong...it gave a new life to Magyars. In the villages there are the true characters, brave, god-fearing, holy Hungarians. Our ancestors were not finicky, proud gentlemen. They were anonymous carriers of the Crown of Saint Stephen...and their spirit is conserved in the village...they await renewal.”¹¹

In this passage, we may observe the early appearance of the concept of the alternative, glorious future. Furthermore, we may glean an incipient structure, since the peasants secure victory for themselves in this possible bright future by relying on their ancestral heritage. Therefore, a rudimentary form of historical evolution was already sketched in these passages. It relied, as I have already mentioned above, on a dialectic structure, composed of the Hungarian masses and their antagonists. These antagonists, however, do not have a fixed quality, rather, they are composed of a changing number of characteristics. In the early years of Meskó's party (the party, together with its official journal, *The Voice of the Nation*, were founded in the June of 1932), modernity itself was the main foe to combat. This was probably due to the general cultural influence of anti-modernism, prevalent in the political culture of interwar Hungary. The enemy was understood as a materially exploitative, rationalist, individualist approach to modernity, that finds expression through the economic structure of capitalism and liberalism. The linkage was made early on between the immediate material aspects of modernity, and the spiritual ones, which were identified as being at the core of the problem.

“...the Titanic is the flagship of modern civilization...what is there to happen now? Modern science has no answers. Answer, rationalizing Pythia, coaxer of modern graphology!...What happened to modern man? Materialism has subjugated the world. It has erased the soul from existence....History was identified as the game between material and economic forces, and replaced providence with a coat. It is no longer man, the spirited animal who makes history, but the spiritless material...The soaring Ikarus has been chained to the ground. For the educated, positivist

¹⁰ *Pesti Újság*, nr.3., January 11, (1932) 1.

¹¹ *Pesti Újság*, nr. 37, September 21, 1-2.

philosophy has put a glass ceiling in the heavens, demarcation lines between it and earth. Man should stop his transcendental dreams, and think only of what he can grasp!...modern hell was built, with golden currency...a new tower of Babel had been erected...the golden calf declaims economic theory. The world economic crisis has been dubbed under different names by these money-grubbing haruspices. Our eyes are slowly being pried open. Now we see the cultural bacillus beyond the material cancer eating away at us...The world crisis is the crisis of the modern soul! It is the *deus ex machina*..."¹²

Modernity was portrayed as having run amok, a civilizational model in deep material, cultural and spiritual crisis. The root of the problem was identified as the replacement of core national and moral values with inhuman ones, that kept creativity and the desire to evolve from manifesting themselves. This self-destructive chain of events could even influence human nature itself, dehumanizing man, in a manner of speaking. Therefore, swift action was needed to rescue modernity from itself, in a sense. A fascist projection of the future as grounded in the past was pitted against this type of modernity, the details of which varied with each interpreter. The agents of change were identified as those members of society who exhibited a culturally pure Hungarianness, adhered to a traditional moral code, had the desire to act for the greater good, and were willing to rally around a providential leader-figure. Many of the elements of this model are in accordance with Szekfű's cultural criticism, and his opposition to the liberal interpretation of modernity. Still, the model was quite hazy, and failed to attract many followers. Its "value" was the position of a problem, and an original (at least novel in the Hungarian context) interpretation of the concepts of past, present, and future.

The first political thinker to attempt a connection between past, present and future and between the Hungarian and European historical contexts was Festetics Sándor. Count Sándor Festetics de Tolna was a wealthy aristocrat and political figure both before and after the First World War. Born in Dég in 1882, he followed a typical track for an aristocrat of the time, studying law and politics at the *École Politique* in France,¹³ and served as a diplomat in many countries. During the war he was a cavalry officer, and participated in the democratic Károlyi government as Minister of War, no doubt because of his close ties with the prime minister (he was Károlyi's brother-in-law). After his removal during the 1919 communist takeover, he didn't actively participate in politics until

¹² *Nemzet Szava*, nr. 76, November 3, (1932) 2–3.

¹³ It is known nowadays as the Paris Institute of Political Studies, and was founded by Albert Sorel, and Ernest Renan, as a liberal school of administration, in the wake of the German occupation and the Paris Commune.

1931¹⁴, when he was “offered” a mandate in Enying, an electoral circumscription which he owned. He ran under the banner of the Unitary Party, noting he could not stay away from politics in times of crisis. Shortly thereafter, in 1933, he left the party and founded his own fascist movement, often working closely with MeskőZoltán.

The sense of being an vanguard force on the cutting edge of historical renewal of society is expressed best in the series of articles published by count SándorFestetics in 1933, just prior to founding his own national-socialist party. Quoting an article entitled “The Sunset and Twilight of Democracy” by Mussolini, he affirmed the dawning of a new state of historical existence, the fascist one:

“...this dissolving civilization is the social and political system which began in Europe in 1789 (in Hungary in 1848) and lasted until today. This period created the liberal-parliamentary system which took over from feudalism. This system was dubbed the demo-liberal system by Mussolini, and it is this system's, this civilization's ruin we are witnessing today...”¹⁵

“...On the one hand, we are at the beginning of a new world order, the birth of a new civilization, that is taking Europe's states by storm...Concerning the “new civilization”, this new and powerful movement, which we have to contend with and with the spread of it, we cannot extricate ourselves from its path.”¹⁶

Festetics connected the appearance of fascism in Hungary to that of its inception in other states in Europe, most notably Germany and Italy. His “Mezőföld” journal published short biographies of Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini, and brief syntheses of their movements' histories and ideologies. Interestingly, he also incorporated into the family of “fascism” Marshall Pilsudski's Poland, and Kemal Ataturk's Turkey. This was probably due to a number of reasons. First, and foremost, it was done for added value of legitimacy: more states converting to the fascist creed meant that it was really a pan-European political revolution, not just an isolated local phenomenon. Secondly, there was probably a great deal of confusion to what the concept of fascism actually was, at this moment in Hungary. Fascist activists and politicians were still in the process of definition and concretion of the idea, adapting and crafting foreign ideologies to local necessities.

Political confusions aside, the idea of a pan-European political and civilizational shift, which Hungary could not escape, was projected by Festetics. He envisioned a Hungary reborn from the ashes, with a strong leader at its helm,

¹⁴ *Magyar Országgyűlési Almanach*, 1931–1936, 97–99.

¹⁵ *Mezőföld*, nr. 35, (August 27, 1933), 1.

¹⁶ *Mezőföld*, nr. 36, (September 3, 1933), 1.

who would put through a series of economic and social reforms. To bolster his argument, he was the first to begin to develop a stronger civilizational criticism toward the regime which he felt was on its way out. In the series of articles meant to publicize his fascist turn to the Hungarian public, he criticized the lack of adaption of the liberal-capitalist system to the needs of the present. Festetics was the first to chastise the legacy of liberalism, tying it to the French Revolution; since that event, the political ideology and the economic system it had put into place, have worked to dissolve national unity, bringing it to the state of necessity. Two tiers of history were set up: the recent past, and the bad state of present affairs. These were followed up by the fascist age. The basic tenets of Hungarian fascism's rendition of the concept of history were established. All that was left for further generations of fascists was to burrow further into history and develop the count's rough scheme.

This novel interpretation of history constituted the theoretical backbone for the legitimating of the existence of fascism on Hungarian soil, and justified adherence to it. It was interpreted as a historical necessity, a panacea to cure all ailments of modernity, whether be it spiritual or material. Its adopters were those who sought advancement beyond the current system of thought, while being reluctant of letting go of the core characteristics of their own social and national identities. The great ideological dynamism of fascist thought and the promise of regeneration, or the passing into a new historical stage, proved to be especially attractive to politically active, but jaded individuals. It contained all the critical points toward modernity espoused by them, and promised solutions at a point in time when cultural malaise was at a highpoint. This constituted the main lure of fascist ideology, and what caused many to take the "fascist turn". These early forbearers, while unsuccessful in their own endeavors, managed to introduce a whole new way of speaking and making mass politics in interwar Hungary, with unfortunate consequences.

Radical right histories

As stated above, historicity is a component of the nucleus of radical right wing ideology. The question then follows: what kind of history is this? Is there a certain dynamic, a certain logic to historical interpretation that differentiates the radical right from the rest of the political panorama? And if so, is this interpretation wholly original or does it share a number of common elements with other members of the political landscape? It is my argument that the answer to this last question is affirmative. The extreme right, while it shares a number of cultural symbols, among it, elements of historical identity, with the traditional

right, it appropriates them for its own use. The end result is a historical interpretation made in an original logic, which proves successful through its relation with the interpretation given by the conservative right.

Let me describe the main theoretical model for radical right wing history which I have constructed by comparing examples of theorizing from interwar and contemporary radical right wingers. This is an ideal-type construction, which is not always congruous with reality, or acts as a set of rules, to which all right wingers rigorously conform. It serves as a heuristic device, and shall be nuanced by the case-studies in will cite below. The model follows as such: fascist histories are not linear, but elliptical. They progress through a stadial model, with the important additions of points of rupture. These points of rupture are symbolic and serve as reinforcement of certain factors which influence historical development. The most important factor is *decay*. This factor is mainly destructive in nature, and follows a particular dynamic: it starts off slow and almost invisible in nature, gaining more clout and becoming manifest in the present. Its agents are diverse, but a high amount of congruence exists between the members of this group, as identified by radical right-wing opinions on the subject. It includes ethnic minorities, corruption, and selfish foreign interests, on the one hand, and on the other, weakness of self, and the loss of positive qualities by the members of the community on the other. At this point, it is important to precisely state the stages of history. First and foremost there is the initial stage. It is one of almost absolute positivity, a gilded time of positive qualities and strength overall: the high time of the national community as such. Of course, here the fascist view of history is often based on little fact, situating itself on the borderline of history and national mythology, but this is not important. What is significant, however, is to what degree the public shares such apprehensions about national history, which, in the Hungarian case, must have been significant, as fascism proved to be popular in the interwar period.

The second stage is characterized by the apparition of the factor of decay. In various episodic forms, this stage of history can stretch from the high middle ages until recent times. Its main characteristic is its dynamic, which is that of gradual decomposition of the framework of the national community. There are two agents of history locked in an ongoing (sometimes perhaps unconscious) conflict: illustrious members of the community (more often than not referred to as heroes), aided by the amorphous mass of the *people*, and various agents of decay. This decline is often synchronized with parallel developments in European and world history (for which the extreme right constructs similar stadial models). The decline of the set of moral and political value-set of the Western community is gradual, innocuous at first, but more and more apparent as we draw closer to the present situation.

The end of the period of gradual decay is marked by an important point of rupture, which acts as a symbol for all the negative effects cumulated in the period which just came to an end. In Hungarian history, this is the 1920 Peace Treaty of Trianon, and the subsequent parting up of territory and population. This event is treated as the blackest chapter of Hungarian history and identity, and the main determinant for political action in the present. It is used a summation for all the negative tendencies of the past and present. Often instrumentalized, it is used in order to identify present categories of enemies, which can be blamed both for Trianon and for their nocent influence in the present.

The present situation is one of liminality. Here I come back to concept invented by British historian Roger Griffin, the concept of the *liminoid* state of society. The liminoid is a mental state of society (or a portion of society), which believes itself to be before a great, transformative change. This change, in the Hungarian case is, however, characterized by a sort of crossroads situation, in which society itself (notwithstanding the impersonal mechanisms of historical progress) must make an active choice, and support it through political action. The choice must be made between a wholly positive (the golden age) and an utterly negative one (further decay and future destruction). The comparison between the rebirth of the national community in a glorious manner and the continuation of decay was sometimes implicit, other times explicit, but was always present, as a vital part of political agitation.

This brings me to our subjects of study. The investigation shall be realized by isolating relevant case-studies from the 1930–1940's; I have identified three main works, which may be utilized for this purpose: RáttkayRadichKálmán's *Modern Országépítés (Modern State Building)*, Literati Vágó Pál's *Gőzgép, Pénzuralom és nemzetiszocialista reneszánsz (Steampower, Rule of Money and National-Socialist Renaissance)* (also follow-up works such as *Munkaállam-The work state*) and Málnási Ödön's *A magyar nemzet őszinte története (The honest history of the Hungarian Nation)*. These works, alongside other publications and statements made by extremist thinkers such as Szálasi Ferenc and Matolcsy Mátyás, will be studied in order to reveal how they thought about the world around through history. We must see these and other such works (such as PóstaPéter's book, *Ellenfeleink*, which is a wholesale reproduction of Vágó's narrative), as attempts to historicize an inherently a-historical theory. The reason for the anti-historical political message being couched in a historicist cloak is the immense influence of Szekfű's work, and the general historicist nature of the régime's discourses in the interwar period. To refuse historicism would have invited political failure, as historicism pervaded political language in all of its crevases.

Sacred histories, dark presents, bright futures

The vision of the past, present and the future projected by the interwar movements all contain the same basic inferences about history, its agents and the mechanisms which push history forward. I shall start with a characterization of the historical genesis of the Hungarian people, which might differ in detail, but shares the same thematic among all those extreme right thinkers who have expressed a coherent opinion about them.

Time is broken up into three categories. The first is the immemorial past, in which myth and history fuse together to form an image which is mostly positive. The heroes of the past are all traceable back to the first heroes of the nation, the formers of the national community. The interwar radical right is anachronistic in its approach, equating ethnicity with nationality. Therefore, heroes such as the leader of Hungarian chieftains, the later king Arpad, and king St. Stephen, are hailed as the heroes of the greatest achievements in national history, through their creation of the Hungarian state and forging the national community. The most expressive work on the subject of Hungarian past is MálnásiÖdön's *Hones History of the Hungarian Nation*. Málnási was an unusual character: a former graduate of the Catholic seminary of Eger, he was also a veteran of the First World War, and later became a historian of Hungary and the Church. In the late 1920's, he joined the Hungarian Social Democratic Party, serving as an activist. His life and beliefs took another u-turn in 1937, sometime after he published his above-quoted book. The book display two important characteristics: ideological hollowness of its populism and a-historical argument couched in the form of a palatable history of Hungary. The pliable nature of its populist style is proven by the fact that while it was published by known left-leaning publisher Cserépfalvi, it became one of the basic tracts of Hungarian fascism.

Not long after its publication, he joined Szálasiferenc's Arrow Cross Party, becoming one of its main ideologues. Málnási draws up the following scheme on Hungarian history: Hungarians, at their origin, are formed by a synthesis of two races (the racial view was increasingly popular in the 1930's). The two races are: Ugric-Hungarians and Turanic-Hungarians. Ugric (sometimes he refers to them as Ugro-Baltic) Hungarians are mainly inquisitive, spiritual, hardworking, progressive and pragmatic; they have mostly positive qualities. Málnási also states that at ethnogenesis, they made up the overwhelming majority of the genetic pool. They were ruled by a thin layer of Turanic Hungarians, whose main characteristics were laziness, a love of grandiose speeches, the love of the law; they are born troublemakers and conservatives, who do not have the ability of forward thinking or composure. The history of Hungary may be characterized as a struggle between these two forces. The historian points toward the great

moments in Hungarian history as those when the leaders (king Mathias, prince Rakoczi Ferenc, Kossuth Lajos) were in tune with the needs of the lower strata of population, and did not need intermediaries. However unusual, Málnási's statements about the past have a number of common traits with the rest: they identify an alternative ethnogenetic process, apart from the official one of Finno-Ugric descent. This is a common theme within radical right wing discourses about the ethnic origins of the nation. Among the preferred proxies we may include a Hunnic theory (proved by the glorious deeds of Attila), a Sumerian-Scythic theory, and a Turanic theory. Often we may identify a mish-mash of the elements of the three. The past is characterized, as by Málnási, as a time of glorious deeds and of concord, of purity and warrior-like qualities, which made the nation great.

Matolcsy Mátyás is another author who has a comprehensive view of the past. A celebrated economist, he became an advocate of rationalized agriculture and peasant's rights in the early 1930's. After gaining a mandate to the lower house of the parliament, he began to champion fascism, and started his own Arrow Cross party in the late 1930's. He eventually joined Szálasi's movement as well. His vision of the past is derived from that of the famous interwar Hungarian historian and cultural figure, Szekfű Gyula, whom he often quotes. The same preference for grassroots versus high politics, as in Málnási, can be felt here, as Matolcsy puts forward his thesis of Hungarian history. It may be surmised as following: the peasants represent the core of the nation, and the synthesis of its political qualities (as in Málnási's racial vision of underlings and leaders). He quotes a number of cases in feudalism, as in 1437, when "the social forces" began to be at war with each other. One can surmise that the prior situation was one of concord. The result of the jaqueries of 1437 was the disastrous defeat in 1526 at Mohács at the hand of the Turks.

Other thinkers push the golden age toward the middle ages, ending in the late 18th century, with the French Revolution. It was this event, say both Ráttkay Radich Kálmán and Vágó Pál, that gave to the world a new concept: liberalism and capitalism. The ideological system of liberalism is the mental expression of the economic and social system of capitalism. They introduce a new world system, which did not share in the moral world of the ages which came before it. The fiziocratic liberalism of "laissez-faire" was criticized by both Ráttkay and Vágó (and also by Málnási and Matolcsy) as opening a sort of Pandora's Box.

The radical right's version of Hungarian history in its initial stages did not deviate greatly from that of the official historiography, which, in the interwar years, was dominated by the conservative right wing. The radical right shared many of the historical myths and logic of historical interpretation with

conservative historians. The regime also cultivated historical lieu de memoire, such as the cult of revolutionary and war heroes (1848 and World War I), and publicly commemorated significant events such as the christening of Saint Stephen or the Trianon peace treaty. This is the reason their views on the initial stages of history were tolerated. Many interwar extreme right thinkers used established historians as sources for their own works and transformed their interpretations by using the data they furnished (Szekfű even wrote the foreword to Matolcsy's first book). This was done in order to appear to be working within the same historicist canon, all the while subverting its logic from the inside.

Decay and rebirth

All the authors have identified the same problem areas. Among them, the first is an irresponsible political elite. The irresponsibility lies in the innate weakness of the leadership, which is isolated and not in tune with the needs of the greater majority of the population. A leader, or a leading class which is not privy to what the people desire is a a-national or anti-national one, since the radical right considers the lower classes as the most ideal preservers of the national qualities. This theoretical construction has lead the extreme right thinkers to identify the existence of a ruling class as such, to be an anti-national phenomenon. Direct methods of rule, which eliminate intermediaries between leader and people, are favored in radical right rhetoric. This is an ideal situation, and sometimes it is tamed by the introduction of a ruling political class (of extreme right politicians) which is governed by good intentions. The leader and the political class which aid him are governed by good intentions due to their devotement to the cause of the people and the knowledge about their true needs. These needs are guaranteed by the provenience of the leader and his aids: they are *of the people*. Both of them do not share any connections, or have clearly turned against the former ruling elite. This rendition clearly demonstrates the populist style of radical right wing politics.

Many homologues of such men are revealed by the radical right in their own version of the historical narrative. The loci in which they are usually to be found is extraordinary situations, times of need, historical or otherwise. For example, the revolutionary times of the Rakoczi rebellion or Kossuth's stance and attitude during the 1848 revolution. Let us begin our exploration by looking at extremist thinkers who concentrated on Hungarian history: Málnási Ödön and MatolcsyMátyás. They both have share similar views and analysis of the period of history when certain problems occurred, which affected the country's present situation. This is because both come from the populist tradition, and had a

populist past. Matolcsy's understanding of history is best expressed in his 1939 work, *My struggle for land*. The book collects various essays, interviews and parliamentary speeches made by the economist in the five years preceding the publication of the work. The selection is made by the author himself, so we may suppose that the work is programmatic for his political credo. In a speech made before the Lower House of parliament in 1936, he made a sharp criticism against the aristocracy:

"...In the two decades following the war, huge changes have occurred in the history of the European peoples...The attitude that nation can develop further only with the development of popular forces has found home in all European states, perhaps with the exception of Hungary...The opposite opinion, the one that sought to put down the popular forces, is what dug the grave of Hungary in 1918. However, Hungary, maimed, and deprived of its livelihood, still clings to this apprehension, which favors the landed aristocracy in front of the developing peasantry. A country can progress only by integrating the development of its social categories; a country which lets its social categories fight each other is doomed to stagnation, atrophy and destruction. This is the case for Hungary, and I believe I am right in this statement when I say that the Mohacs, so often quoted in our history is the result of the struggle against each other of the social classes, which hinder development.¹⁷"

Matolcsy goes on to explain that many other negative situations (as the defeat at Mohacs at the hand of the Turks) were the result of the same phenomena: the social classes working one against the other. The outcome was stagnation and decay of the country in the long run, and disastrous episodes as the defeat of the Hungarian independence struggles of the 18th and 19th centuries, and ultimately, the country's parting up at Trianon. Matolcsy speaks about "social integration", but what does he mean by it? We may answer this question if we take a closer look at the positive examples which he opposes to the scheme of decay:

"...We may therefore understand then, not two decades after the death of king Mathias, in 1514, why the first bloody rebellion broke out. We may understand the words of the peasant leader Dozsa György, when he spoke to his troops: »they have sucked our blood for ages and do not wish to fight against the Turks. Let us fight against these cold-blooded men!«...Later on, the troops of Rakoczi do not rebel against their leader, but curse their traitorous foreign lords and aristocrats. This is not a new historiography, but the truth. One can read it from Hungarian history...The kuruc call to arms was replaced by the sound of foreign rulers and German and Slavic immigrants...The great struggle carried out by the Hungarian peasantry, the Hungarian race, went on in 1848, but were clouded by the years after the revolution. In all other countries, the 1848 independence fights enlarged the rights of the peasantry, the maintainer of the race, broke up latifundia and brought the

¹⁷Matolcsy, *Harcom a földért*, 35.

development of a healthy, democratic bourgeoisie; not so in Hungary...the situation has changed little since 1848...¹⁸⁷

The leaders who favored the development of the lower classes are therefore judged to be positive and successful. The traitorous and rapacious aristocracy, along with foreign rulers represent the other part of this dichotomy. We may conclude that social coherence, in Matolcsy's understanding, is a term which means the endorsement of those he considers to be the best preservers of ethnic qualities, and represent the national community the most. They are identified as making up the majority, the have-nots, the disenfranchised.

Málnási has a similar understanding of the negative trends of the present, which he also traces back to deep rooted phenomena in Hungarian history. The aristocratic ruling class, which Málnási identifies as having a mixed racial origin (Turanic, Dinaric, Germanic), slowly fell victim to its own nature. It entered into a barter with foreign elements, mainly Jews, who brought with them money but also a new style of economy. This style was nascent capitalism, which both Málnási and Matolcsy identify as "having a Jewish spirit". The new economy transformed the feudal system into something even more evil, transforming serfs into slaves to capital and monetized income. As the 19th century came around, capitalism installed itself more and more as the dominant economic and social system, profiting from the technological developments of the time. Soon it found a political expression: liberalism. This ideology allowed Hungarians to become enslaved by the international system of lending and capitalized income, robbing the ruling classes of the little power and influence they had, and wresting true control of politics from their already feeble hands. The majority of the country became indebted to banks and to international interests, while a new social class, the industrial worker, became enslaved in the factory.

We may observe a transformation of certain concepts in this narrative account of Hungarian history. No longer were liberalism and capitalism treated as positive or even neutral terms. They took on, in the fascist interpretation, wholly negative connotations, as elements of a system which sought to denationalize Hungarians, and indeed, destroy the community. Certain opinions about the Hungarian ruling elite, which had been previously hailed as the re-founders of Hungarians statehood with their role in the 1867 compromise, had now been subverted. Politics, indeed, as the continuator and enabler of negative trends, were blamed for past and present disasters. The main trait of the ruling class was their obstinate backwardness, and their rapaciousness, on the other hand. But the present situation, in which the interests of the nation became

¹⁸ Matolcsy, *Harcom, a földért*, 36-37.

subservient to the needs of the few, was not solely the result of domestic factors. It was a structural problem, in the opinion of interwar radical right wing ideologues, linked to general European historical progress.

The linkage between domestic history and the international situation was rendered most clearly in the works of Literati VágóPál and RáttkayRadichKálmán. Both relatively unknown characters before 1933, they rose through the ranks to become important members in the Arrow Cross Party of SzálasiFerenc in its heyday. Ráttkay, a lawyer and a journalist, became an adherent of fascism in early 1933, with the publication of his book, *Modern State Building*. A short treatise about the advantages of the new autocratic styles of rule in Germany and Italy, it also contained a great deal of historical interpretation as the main ingredient in its argumentation. Its views may be surmised by a few short passages from the work:

“The closing liberalist-individualist era’s man was characterized by an individualist ethic, which read: I am responsible only to my own conscience because of my deeds. The ethics of man in the new era must state: I am responsible toward the community for my every action¹⁹”

“...The last century was that of steam power. Mankind adapted its institutions and ways of life to it. The economic, social and political system were adapted to it. Liberal-individualist spirited production, parliamentary representation of the people in the political system- were perhaps the appropriate forms in the age of steam power...The national society which adapts its economic and political system to better suit the age of electricity, radio and flight first is the one which shall be the most successful. Each age has its own political expression. We are on the threshold of a new era, so we must create new political and economic systems. The 18th century gave birth to liberalism, as an answer to the antiquated and backward ways of the middle ages. The 19th century produced socialism as an answer to the social disorder and disentanglement of liberalism. The 20th century brought corporatism as an answer to the Marxian socialism which sought one-sided class rule, the dictatorship of the proletariat. This great notion counter posed the idea of community, the theory of the communion of life within one society to the program of the sole rule of the proletariat...-over all of them an ethical State shall rule, which decides disputes in accordance to a higher social morality, with strict orders.²⁰”

The scheme envisioned by Ráttkay, as crude as it seems at a first glance, encapsulates and synthesizes very well the conception about the progress of history in the last two centuries, according to the radical right which he was a representative of. The individualist, self-oriented ways found expression through liberalism in the past centuries. They are rendered in a negative key, as systems of

¹⁹ Ráttkay. *Modern Országépítés*, 14.

²⁰ Ráttkay, *Modern Országépítés*, 18–22.

thought and existence. They are also antiquated, for European (perhaps even world) society is at the dawn of a new age. This age is heralded by developments in Germany and Italy, but also in other parts of the world: Ráttkay speculates that “winds of change are blowing even over America, once the safe haven of rampant capitalism and liberalist individualism”. The new age will be a positive one, since it will bring about social peace, justice and order. It will rejuvenate the national community, the interest of which it will put on a pedestal. This interpretation of history is a complete break with conservative right wing conjectures about the past and historical progress in general. While the conservative right followed a revisionist program in the interwar period, the radical right utilized history in order to make projections about the future. These projections did not involve a restoration of the past, but the creation of a new kind of future. While traditionalists sought a reinstatement, the radicals sought regeneration. In this manner, however vulgar, they were analytic, not merely commemorative. A clear, structural vision of the past was created, which increasingly featured a teleological approach toward where society was headed.

The story told by his party colleague, Literati VágóPál, appeared in the late 1930's and was a crystallized version of the *vulgata* laid out by Ráttkay. Vágó was a mechanical engineer, and administrator of various public industrial works, turned politician in the late 1930's. By no means a conventionally trained politician, or a political scientist, he nevertheless managed to provide a coherent synthesis of national socialist historical theory in his book, entitled “*Steam power, the rule of money and the national socialist renaissance*”, which appeared in 1940. Vágó worked with the same stadial model of history we saw with Ráttkay, but also Matolcsy and Málnási. The feudal period came first: it was considered to be a mixed baggage, with both good events (such as medieval rulers in tune with the people and a general high moral stance of society), but also the start of some negative trends. Among the latter he recounts the monetization of economy, and the onset of serfdom:

“The social system of the feudal age, marked by the institutions of slavery and serfdom, was solidified for millennia by the primitive manner of agricultural production. All ages prior to the introduction of mechanization suffered from constant deprivation of goods...The few luxuries enjoyed by the upper classes were supported by the efforts of the rest of 91% of society...However, this separated them very little from the rest, as they suffered along with them in case of strife...The motto of the age was:”Millions for one”. This was the first stage of the so-called Tragedy of Man.²¹”

²¹ Vágó, *Gőzgép*, 4–6.

The onset of mechanization, monetization and new political ideas are treated as a steady worsening of the progress of humanity. The twin demons of liberalism and capitalism are singled out again, also by Vágó, who criticizes them for their inhumanity and egoism.

“ Steam power broke the Solomonic statement: there is nothing new under the sun, because it created a new form of life for human society, never before paralleled in history, in which physical slavery was no more...but liberalism did not bring about general happiness to mankind. It did not do so, because the freedom it preached was the freedom to exploit. The social meaning of the technological idea. It did not bring about happiness, because the machine age delivered by liberalism was hijacked by all of the incarnations of egoism: the rule of the Almighty Money, who saw in the machine a means of profit, and forgot that the role of the machine is to lessen man’s physical toil...It expropriated the machine, which freed man from physical slavery, and built in its stead a new type of slavery, the slavery to profit.²²”

“...the destructive effect upon the national community of classical liberalism was soon felt even in its home, in happy England.²³”

We may observe several conceptual innovations in Vágó’s text. These are realized by coupling several established concepts in antithetic pairs. In this way, liberalism is paired with destruction of humanity, slavery and decay of the national community. Capitalism and money are synonyms of profiteering and egoism, and expropriation of the very thing that would have set man free. The two terms, liberalism and capitalism, have negative connotations, and are rendered as perverse, inasmuch as they preach freedom and practice the exact opposite. This reveals another implicit duality of honesty versus dishonesty. Rátkay states that this attitude of capitalist liberalism produced as one of its first byproducts, class warfare. This was also a negative effect, as the Marxian social democrats harnessing the power of the industrial workers were working against the national community, contributing to the antagonisms within it. The chain of profit and debt has enslaved smaller countries, as it did Hungary, leading to the disastrous socio-political situations it faced at present. Capitalism, Vágó established, had a “Jewish spirit”, and thus was alien to the interests of the nation:

“The main characteristic of the liberal economic system is the control of the rate of interest by a privileged group at the expense of the common good, with the aid of control over the emission of money. The obtaining of profit on money was an exclusively Jewish privilege in the Middle Ages, and the legacy of Jewish spirit

²² Vágó, *Gőzgép*, 9.

²³ Vágó, *Gőzgép*, 9.

inspired the liberal plutocracy...this is the reason for historical logic of the outbreak of hate sooner or later against the Jews in every part of the world.²⁴

Against this backdrop, Vágó projected a bright future, to be achieved by “Christian morals” in economic and socio-political planning. The fine points of this plan are less than clear, for the work aims to be an analytic critique of the current situation. It was later expressed in his book, *The work State*. The details are less than important for our demonstration however: suffice to say they are polar opposites to all the negative points the author identified in his book. The dynamic of decay, as opposed to rebirth, of a return to the golden age in history is apparent. It is a mainstay of all four works quoted, but fragments of it can be found in the majority of the public utterances of the radical right in the interwar period. A specific view of history formatted the world-view of interwar thinkers. It is the primary thesis of this essay that a similar understanding of history is also present among the contemporary Hungarian radicals.

BaráthTibor: the culmination of the fascist thesis of history

As we have seen above, the fascist theorem of historical evolution and its direct political meanings were quite well established by the late 1930's. They attracted and influenced a large amount of voters, who heard abbreviated versions of the theorems in the speeches and press of the fascist activists. All this popular support notwithstanding, the ivory tower of academy still stood untouched by fascist theorizing. This, however, was about to change, due to the scholarly and political activity of BaráthTibor, a young professor of history at the newly-(re)founded University of Kolozsvár.

Baráth, as I have mentioned, was a rather young academic, in his mid-30's, when he made the fascist turn. Before that, he had a promising career, which would have probably seen him integrated into the world of mainstream Hungarian academic historians. As a student, he specialized in history and geography, a detail which is important to mention, in light of his writings of the 1940's. An apprentice of DomanovszkySándor, he continued his studies with stints at the University of Vienna and in Paris, at the Sorbonne, after his graduation from the University of Budapest. He was appointed as a representative of Hungary in the International Commission of Historians, holding also the position of secretary to this prestigious organization.²⁵ The time spent in France was a serious influence on Baráth, for two main reasons: firstly,

²⁴ Vágó, *Gőzgép*, 33.

²⁵ Paksa, “*A történetírás mint propaganda*”, 1–2.

he developed a strong affinity for analytically-based writing of history. This was naturally coupled with a strong aversion toward the mainly narrative tradition of his native Hungary, and induced in Baráth's mind the notion of the backwardness of historical scholarship in Hungary. After 1933, he began to develop an interpretative framework of history based largely on the interplay between geography, space and politics. He underlined the historical role of Hungary, as one of the two (alongside Poland) leaders of Central Europe, and their strong connections with their respective geographical settings. Baráth continued to play the role of intermediary between Hungarian and French culture until 1940. In the fall of that year, due to the evolution of events on the international scale, he was called back to Hungary. Baráth was then appointed as a professor of contemporary Hungarian history at the University of Kolozsvár. This move was probably due to the need for qualified instructors at the reacquired institution, to the support of Domanovszky, and his lengthy experience abroad. The experience of the Transylvanian university proved to be transformative for the historian, as he came face to face with the realities of being in an inhospitable environment, full of hostile elements, in the reconquered Hungarian territory. He probably had first-hand experience of the practices and ideology of a competing fascist movement, the Iron Guard, which was much more successful than its Hungarian counterparts. In the context of a looming Hitlerite *Neurordnung Europas*, the Hungarian historian probably saw the development of a national socialist geo-political argument couched in historicism as a necessity for his country. A good amount of opportunism probably also contributed to his fascist turn, especially if we take into account the period when it happened.

The surprise move came a year later, when Baráth published a programmatic article entitled "The historiography of New Hungary". The piece was a sharp criticism against the antiquated methods of Hungarian academic historians, Baráth launching an attack against their narrow-sightedness and false interpretations. The article also served as a rough "arspoetica" of the young scholar, in which he made a theoretical and methodological outline of Hungarian history. It came as a shock to many, since Baráth, his earlier criticism notwithstanding, was an established academic. Moreover, the article was published in the columns of a fledgling Hungarian fascist scientific publication, the main editor of which was MatolcsyMátyás, the renowned economist turned Arrow Cross politician. It seemed that the fascist project was gaining a serious intellectual edge.

The article synthetically expressed Baráth's vision of history and his profession. It starts with a short criticism of the historiography of the era, which the historian saw as being inadequate. The linkage between history and politics

he made clear from the outset, stating that “worldview and the writing of history are strongly connected²⁶”. This phenomenon he not only saw as natural, shunning the false objectivism of the past generation of historians, but he underlined the political and social function of historiography. All interpretations of history were grounded in a certain political Weltanschauung, mirroring its broad ideological outlines, and supporting the needs of it with scientific work. Consequently, there were liberal, Marxist, and national-socialist interpretations of history. These, however, were not each valid renditions of historical evolution, according to Baráth, but were themselves tied to the epoch of their greatest apex. Therefore, since national socialism seemed to be dominant in the period when Baráth wrote his text, he naturally attributed pre-eminence to fascist historiography. He made his allegiance to this camp quite clear, and went about constructing the characteristics of the other side. There are certain connections, however, of his philosophy of the role of the historians, to those of SzekfűGyula, who also saw the need for historians to support dominant political regimes.

Baráth identified two main avenues of historical interpretation dominant before his time. Both of them belonged to the historical school of liberalism, expressing its major facets. The first belonged to the Hungarian Geistesgeschichte, with its main icon, SzekfűGyula. The author faulted the historian for over-emphasizing the weight of the *spirit*, i.e. according too much attention to the “psychic-intellectual” aspects of history, and neglecting other forces. He especially criticized Szekfű and the like for neglecting political history, to such extent that he concluded that Hungary had very little quality scholarship in this field. This was a result of passing over important factors which animated politics, the people (he decried the lack of social history), ethnic-racial characteristics, and geography. This is the reason, Baráth argues, that the Hungarian adepts of Geistesgeschichte had not managed to explain important questions in the recent history of their societies. The most important of these was the loss at Trianon. Furthermore, since they had a rigid concept of the nation, they placed a sign of equality between it and the state. This meant that in practice, the practitioners of Geistesgeschichte narrated the histories of ruling classes only, leaving out the masses, which in Baráth’s view, furnished the elites with victories. This narrow view mirrored the elitism and lack of compassion of political liberalism, and its lost connection to large sections of the community which it governed.

The second school was that of “positivist” historians. He criticized them the most, for Baráth stated that they had misinterpreted the basic core of positivism

²⁶ Baráth, “*Az Új Magyarország történetírása*”, 1, 7.

in its Comtean form (his years in France convinced him of this). They were not analysts of history, as Comte was when he put forward his bold thesis of stadial history. The Hungarian positivists received a stilted version of positivism, from German sources. These historians, which were no more than emulators of Leopold von Ranke, had a rigid methodology, but utterly lacked theoretical interpretation or analytic desire. In the end, they amounted to nothing more than antiquarians, gathering facts and data, without any connection to the society that supported them. According to Baráth, this was akin, on the political level, to the chaotic organization which liberalism brought about, lacking vision and drive. Both schools were extremely inflexible when it came to revision of their methods and theories, and exhibited a backward mentality, safeguarding their own positions within academia. This was an overt criticism against not only the academic, but the political establishment. Academia, as politics and society in general, was decrepit and decaying, and faced a great fork in the road: to adapt to the newest developments in scholarship, or persist in its provincialism, and be consumed.

Baráth wanted to combat these lacunae in Hungarian historical scholarship via the introduction of what he perceived were the newest methods and theories in European scholarship. He understood Hungarian historical research as closely connected and embedded in a larger European context. This gave historiography and research a dynamism of its own, further strengthening the need for change; in essence, he introduced the idea of linear development into the vision of historiography. As we have seen above, he also gave to the history of historical scholarship an individual dialectic. The historiography of "New Hungary" was to be a historiography that was up to date on the latest methods, themes and theory. The new themes he envisioned were the opening up of the field of study, via the inclusion of new objects of study: first and foremost, of the hitherto disenfranchised mass of the people. "The people" as Baráth understood them, were composed of the lower social strata, workers, but mainly the peasantry. The legacy of the populist authors of the 1930's had certainly left its mark on his work, for he too wanted to bring back the peasantry, as an object of scientific inquiry. The people had a unique set of characteristics, which Baráth gathered under the umbrella-term of race. The racial characteristics of peoples and nations play decisively into historical development, in Baráth's opinion. These concepts of the people and race he closely linked to another one: space and geography. The two were intertwined, and their combined characteristics assured historical development at the political and cultural level. This geographical determinism, reminiscent of Friedrich Ratzel (who probably served as a great influence for Baráth), stated that the potential of a certain nation was due to its biological traits, but only truly realized when placed in the correct geographical setting. The

ability of a certain nation to maximize its racial potential by situating itself in the correct spatial setting was the key to success throughout history. In his later book, *The Philosophy of State Building in the Carpathian Basin*, he put forward a new geopolitical view of history; Hungarians were the best-situated nation in Europe, due to the unique characteristics of the Carpathian Basin. The Basin was the quintessential model of ideal geographic setting. As the title announced it, the correct philosophy of state building within this spatial context would propel the Hungarian nation to the status of leaders of Eastern and Central Europe.

The role of history as expressed by Baráth, was to create efficient scientific argument, which would correctly bolster the political option of the historian (which was already given by his desire to adhere to an "up-to-date" ideology). Gone was the objectivism of positivist historians, or even the illusion of "living through" history: the discipline was an exercise in politics. Its social role was that of an inspirer, teacher, and source for the development of present day politics, and its future development governed by the necessities of the community.

Conclusions

As the study has shown above, the conceptual apparatus, the political language of the Hungarian radical right of yesterday is formatted by a certain understanding of the evolution of time. This is most apparent in the propensity for historically-inspired rhetoric. This is due to the core of their ideology, which is a specific historical understanding of the world and self. The success of such a style of rhetoric, of an understanding of key concepts, such as nation, society, justice, et cetera can only come about under a specific set of circumstances. These circumstances include a conceptual world dominated by the right wing, and an overt historicisation of public speech. This was the situation in the interwar period, when leading Hungarian right wing parties openly pandered to historical fetishism.

As I have stated above, the concept of history in interwar Hungarian fascist thought may be characterized accordingly: firstly, it was governed by an elliptical scheme of development. This framework may also be described as teleological, for it stops at the fascist age, the maximum of historical development. It also sought to make the ancient community, the starting off point of national history, anew, with the means of modernity. It did not reject technology, or other trappings of the modern age, just certain aspects of its spirit. The scheme traced historical development in both the national, and European contexts (for it tied the two rigorously together, rejecting parochialism), as a long series of episodes of decay. These were occasionally halted or interrupted by providential figures,

who through their genius, managed to momentarily affirm the people, and its true necessities. This all lead up to the present state of affairs, which was dire. The initial determinism of the fascist scheme also reveals another duality, when closely scrutinized. The present offered two choices, a sort of a metaphorical bifurcation of fates: continuation of decay, through inactivity, and eventual death of the community, or success and rebirth, brought on by swift action and sacrifice.

This specific construction of the concept of history by fascist thinkers in the third and fourth decade of twentieth-century Hungary lead to an original definition of fascist ideology, and helped the movements gain electoral support. It aided them in defining themselves vis-à-vis the political establishment, and the other elements within Hungarian political life, by furnishing innovative ideological elements, which were easily adoptable by the populace.

Bibliography

- Baráth, Tibor, "Az Új Magyarország történetírása", in *Új Európa* nr. 1, 1942.
- Beilharz, Peter and Bauman, Zygmunt, *Liquid Modernity*, Contemporary Sociology, vol. 30, New York: Polity Press, 2001, doi:10.2307/3089803.
- Deak, Istvan, "Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Hungary" *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (Oct., 1992),
- Gennep, Arnold van, *The Rites of Passage*, Routledge Library Editions: Anthropology and Ethnography, Taylor & Francis, 2013, <https://books.google.ro/books?id=QS7-AQAAQBAJ>.
- Epstein, Irene Raab, *Gyula Székely: a study in the political basis of Hungarian historiography*, Indiana University., 1974,
- Magyar Eletrajzi Lexikon, Kenyeres Ágnes (Fősz.)*, Arcanum Adatbázis Kft., 2001, www.mek.oszk.hu, 2010.04.05.
- Magyar Országgyűlési Almanach, 1931–1936,
- Magyar Országgyűlési Almanach, 1935–1944,
- Matolcsy, *Harcom a foldert*, 1939.
- Mezőföld*, nr. 35, August 27, 1933,
- Mezőföld*, nr. 36, September 3, 1933,
- Nemzet Szava*, nr. 76, November 3, 1932,
- Paksa, Rudolf, "A történetírás mint propaganda" in *Kommentár*, 2006, nr. 5,
- Pesti Újság*, nr. 10, march 6, 1932,
- Pesti Újság*, nr. 37, September 21,
- Pesti Újság*, nr.3., January 11, 1932,
- Rattkay R. Kalman, *Modern Országépítés*, 1933,
- Vagó Pál, *Gőzgép, pénzüralom es nemzetiszocialista reneszánsz*, 1940,

Zum Problem der Tatsache in der russischen, ostdeutschen und polnischen geschichtswissenschaftlichen Epistemologie (1960–1985)

Am Ende der 1950er, d.h. nach dem Tod Stalins kam es fast ohne jedes Vorzeichen und in relativ kurzer Zeit zu heftigen philosophischen und geschichtswissenschaftlichen Diskussionen, wobei meines Erachtens die Auseinandersetzungen mit der historischen Tatsache und mit deren Stellenwert zu den aufschlussreichsten Debatten zählt.

Im Mittelpunkt standen dabei die russischen/ sowjetischen Wissenschaftler Igor Semjonowitsch Kon, Aaron Jakowlewitsch Gurewitsch und später Anatoli Iljitsch Rakitow. Die russische/ sowjetische Wissenschaft zeigte traditionell großes Interesse für geisteswissenschaftliche und historiographische Fragen und am Anfang des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts entstanden wichtige und wertvolle Arbeiten zu diesen Themefeldern. Zu erwähnen ist in diesem Zusammenhang vor allem Lappo-Danilevskijs großangelegte Arbeit *Methodologie der Geschichte*, zwischen 1910 und 1913 in St. Petersburg erschien. Das Werk fokussiert die neukantianischen Gedanken der Entgegensetzung und metaphysische Trennung zwischen Natur- und Geisteswissenschaften sowie weitere Fragen der geschichtswissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung wie den Wundt'schen Psychologismus, die Deutung und Auswahl von Fakten, die Singularität historischer Ereignisse usw. Ein anderes wichtiges Buch stammt von Gustav Gustavovich Shpet, der einer der ersten bedeutenden Schüler von Edmund Husserl war. *Geschichte als Problem de Logik* erschien 1916 als in ganz Russland eine große Germanophobie herrschte. Diese Umstände zeugen deshalb davon, dass der Verfasser besonders mutig war und sich zur Wissenschaft verpflichtet fühlte. Shpet konzentrierte sich in seinen Ausführungen ausgehend von Christian Wolf, Georg Friedrich Meier, Johann Gustav Droysen, Immanuel Kant, Herder und die Neukantianer auf deutsche Geschichtsschreibung Die besten russischen/ sowjetischen Historiker und Geisteswissenschaftler kannten natürlich (?) die russische intellektuelle Tradition, obwohl sie sich nur vorsichtig auf sie bezogen, weil die Sowjetherrschaft diese Vorläufer als idealistische Wissenschaftler stigmatisierte.

In Bezug auf die Tatsachenproblematik bei Kon (*Geschichtsphilosophie des 20. Jahrhunderts*) ist festzuhalten, dass Kon es als seine Verpflichtung betrachtet, sich von den zwei extrem entgegengesetzten Gesichtspunkten der bürgerlichen Historiographie zu distanzieren: „Entsprechend dem einem von ist die Geschichte, reine Beschreibung' der Vergangenheit, und je weniger sie mit Gegenwart verknüpft ist, umso besser.“¹ Der echte Historiker sei am wenigsten der Geschichte unterworfen, behaupten die Befürworter dieses Standpunktes, denn jeder Versuch, die Geschichte ausgehend von der Gegenwart „...zu betrachten (...) bedeute unvermeidlich eine Modernisierung der Geschichte.“² Der Historiker müsse dementsprechend die Gegenwart hinter sich lassen, wenn er die historische Vergangenheit ernst verstehen will. Nach Kon könne man dieser Forderung nicht nachkommen, denn die Gegenwart

„(...) determiniert das geschichtliche Bewusstsein vor allem in der Hinsicht, dass sie dem Historiker gerade jene Fragen über die Vergangenheit stellt, die im gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt am wichtigsten sind.“³

Obwohl Kon die Einheit der Natur- und Geisteswissenschaften scheinbar anerkennt und ist dementsprechend dem wohl bekannten marxistischen und damals verbindlich geltenden Standpunkt verpflichtet, versucht er in seiner sorgfältigen Auslegung diese strenge Forderung Schritt für Schritt zu unterminieren. Wenn Historiker die Vergangenheit erforschen, können sie sich nicht vollkommen von den erforschten Ereignissen fernhalten, weil in die Reflexionen zwangsläufig auch jene Impulse einfließen, welche für ihre singuläre und unverwechselbare Position bezeichnend sind. Kon hält diesbezüglich fest:

„Der Historiker, der die Vergangenheit untersucht, befindet sich gleichzeitig selbst im unaufhörlichen Strom der Geschichte. Er beurteilt die Ereignisse der Vergangenheit im Lichte der Folgen, die diese zu der Zeit, da der Historiker lebt, erbracht haben.“⁴

Außerdem darf man die Gegenwartssituation nicht für endgültig halten, weil man sicherlich auch heute gar nicht voraussagen kann, dass die folgenden Generationen „(...) in der Vergangenheit ebenfalls etwas sehen werden, was wir noch nicht sehen.“⁵

Ausgehend von der Annahme, dass die Geschichtserkenntnis auf unterschiedliche Art und Weise perspektiviert wird, formuliert Kon drei Fragen:

¹ Kon, I. S: *Geschichtsphilosophie der 20. Jahrhunderts*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1966. II. 99.

² Ebd., 99.

³ Ebd., 101.

⁴ Ebd., 102.

⁵ Ebd., 102.

1. „Hat die Geschichtswissenschaft einen objektiven vom Bewusstsein des Historikers unabhängigen Forschungsgegenstand und ist sie auf die materialistische Widerspiegelungstheorie anwendbar? 2. Wie ist das Verhältnis von absoluter und relativer Wahrheit in der Geschichte beschaffen? 3. Kann die Geschichtswissenschaft, wenn sie parteilich ist, zugleich wahre Erkenntnisse vermitteln?“⁶

Im Folgenden möchte ich mich nur der ersten, beziehungsweise teilweise der zweiten Fragestellung widmen. Zunächst versuche ich als erster Schritt Kons Antworten auf diese Fragen zu rekapitulieren. Es ist meines Erachtens fruchtbar, Paul Ricoeurs und Paul Veynes Arbeiten, die ungefähr gleichzeitig mit Kons Arbeit erschienen sind, in die folgenden Überlegungen einzubeziehen. So folgt eine kurze Auseinandersetzung mit Aspekten, die mit Tatsachen- und Wahrheitsfragen in diesen Arbeiten verbunden sind. In der Arbeit *Geschichte und Wahrheit* (*Histoire et vérité*) wirft Ricœur die Frage nach dem subjektiven Charakter der geschichtlichen Wahrheit auf. Nach Ricœur sei es eine natürliche menschliche Aufforderung (Verpflichtung?), Historikern gegenüber die Wahrheit zu sagen. Sind aber Historiker überhaupt fähig, dieser Forderung nachzukommen? Ricoeurs Antwort lautet wie folgt: Es handele sich tatsächlich nicht um die Frage der Objektivität oder der Subjektivität, sondern man kann diesbezüglich nur die *gute* und die *schlechte* Subjektivität voneinander unterscheiden.⁷ Es handele sich dabei um eine eigenartige Subjektivität, indem, Historiker von ihren partikulären und eingeschränkten Subjektivität (französisch: *moi*) freikommen und einen Standpunkt der Menschheit (*l'homme*) beziehen können. Die Objektivität sei demnach nur als ein regulatives Ideal vorstellbar, aber sie bleibe faktisch immer unerfüllt. Was die Subjektivität der geschichtlichen Tatsache anbelangt, arbeitet Ricœur vier spezifische Merkmale heraus. Die erste Eigenschaft steht mit der *Beurteilung der Relevanz der Ereignisse* im Zusammenhang. Nur durch die Auswahl des Historikers und die von ihm hochgeschätzten Tatsachen kann die Geschichte aufrechterhalten bleiben, in diesem Sinne sei es möglich, dass aus den diskreten geschichtlichen Teilchen eine zusammenhängende Erzählung entsteht. Diese Auswahl bleibt aber immer subjektiv. Ricœur zitiert einen berühmten Satz von Raymond Aron: Die Theorie gehe demzufolge immer der Geschichte vorher. Eine weitere Problematik der historischen Erkenntnis ergibt sich aus der notwendigen Inkohärenz, die zwischen der alltäglichen Kausalitätsdeutung und der wissenschaftlichen Kausalitätsinterpretation besteht. Eine Besonderheit des historischen Wissens ist

⁶ Ebd., 102–103.

⁷ Ricœur, Paul: *Histoire et vérité*. Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1999. (Erste Auflage 1955.)

außerdem darauf zurückzuführen, dass die Benennung der in der Zeit verschwundenen Ereignisse immer schwieriger werde. Die Bedeutung der Wörter ändert sich ständig. Doch die scheinbar transhistorischen Begriffe wie Staat, Despotismus, Knechtschaft sind immer zweideutig und unsicher. Das Problem der Benennung lenkt die Aufmerksamkeit auf die Einbildungskraft (*l'imagination*), so Ricœur. Mit Hilfe der Einbildungskraft könne der Historiker zwischen Generationen eine Brücke bauen. (Hayden White und Franklin Ankersmit entwickeln diese Ansätze weiter). Die Einbildungskraft gebe Historikern die Möglichkeit zur Teilhabe am menschlichen Dasein. Die Geschichte sei eine der Modalitäten, mit denen Menschen ihre Zugehörigkeit zur Menschheit wiederholt zum Ausdruck bringen.⁸

Beinahe zum gleichen Zeitpunkt erschien neben dem Werk von Paul Ricœur eine weitere wichtige französische historiographische Arbeit, in der die Problematik der Tatsache eine überragende Bedeutung hat. Es handelt sich um das Buch von Paul Veyne, das unter dem Titel *Wie schreibt man die Geschichte?* (*Comment on écrit l'histoire.*) veröffentlicht wurde. „Es gibt keine atomistische Tatsache (*il n'y a pas de fait atomique*), schreibt Veyne.“⁹ Es sei unmöglich eine Totalität der Geschichte zu erfassen, weil alle Beschreibung gleichzeitig eine Selektion sei, behauptet Veyne. Man könne nie alle Ereignisse erzählen, deshalb sei es notwendig, aus der Vielfältigkeit zu wählen und zu selektieren. Es gebe immer verschiedene Wege zur Verallgemeinerung, obzwar nicht alle Wege gleichermaßen interessant seien, so Veyne. Der Historiker erzähle immer eine Geschichte, deren elementare Bestandteile (die Tatsachen) auch selbst Konstruktionen darstellen. Zusammenfassend kann man feststellen, dass sowohl Ricœur, als auch Veyne für eine hermeneutische Fundierung des geschichtlichen Wissens plädieren. Die intersubjektive Geltung des geschichtlichen Wissens hat darin zusammenzufassen, dass der Mensch gleichzeitig sowohl Subjekt als auch Gegenstand der Geschichte sein könne.

Wenn man sich noch einmal Kons Überlegungen widmet, ist es ersichtlich, dass der russische Philosoph, mindestens teilweise, auf ähnliche Weise argumentiert. Er will zwischen dem extremen Subjektivismus und dem Schein-Objektivismus einen Mittelweg finden. Gentiles Präsentismus veranschaulicht eine subjektiv-idealistischen Perspektive.

⁸ Ebd., 35. Es scheint interessant zu sein, dass zum Beispiel Jürgen Habermas anders denkt und argumentiert. Habermas spricht von der Lebenswelt, unter der er noch nicht historisch und empirisch identifizierbare 'Lebensformen' versteht. Die Lebenswelt hat solche 'invarianten' Symbolstrukturen, die mit Hilfe einer formalpragmatischen Analyse zugänglich gemacht werden kann. Vgl. Krüger, Hans-Peter: *Kritik der kommunikativen Vernunft*. Kommunikationsorientierte Wissenschaftsforschung im Streit mit Sohn-Rethel, Toulmin und Habermas. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1990. 377.

⁹ Veyne, Paul: *Comment on écrit l'histoire*. Édition du Séuil. Paris, 1971. 53–54.

„Die Hauptvoraussetzung der subjektivistischen Geschichtsphilosophie ist bewusste oder unbewusste Identifizierung des Geschichtsprozesses mit der Geschichtserkenntnis und Reduzierung des ersteren auf die letztere- so Kon. Diese These hat Gentile direkt formuliert. Von ihr geht der philosophische Irrationalismus aus, und darauf basiert die präsentistische Methodologie.“¹⁰

Die radikale „Perspektivität des Geschichtswissens“ wird in diesem Falle mit der Subjektivität des Historikers identifiziert und demzufolge wird das Problem der objektiven Wahrheit völlig aufgehoben. Eine solche Auffassung des Geschichtsprozesses weist Kon zurück. In Sowjetrußland ist eine ähnliche Tendenz in der Form des „Proletkults“ erschienen. Die Anhänger des Proletkults propagierten nämlich die vollständige Abkehr vom klassischen Erbe der Vergangenheit. Für sie wurde die Vergangenheit vollkommen getilgt, und die Gegenwart hatte einen absoluten Wert. Kon zieht daraus die Konsequenz: „Die darauf abzielenden Äußerungen haben unserer Literatur großen Schaden zugefügt.“¹¹

Natürlich muss man in diesem Kontext beachten, dass das historische Wissen nie auf der absolut ausführlichen Beschreibung der Wirklichkeit basieren kann. Die geschichtswissenschaftliche Wahrheitskonstruktion scheint fähig zu sein, eine annähernde Genauigkeit zu leisten. Aber es soll nicht unbedingt zu einem Relativismus der Skeptizismus führen. Wie Kon diesbezüglich hervorhebt:

„Die Tatsache, dass wir niemals alle Einzelheiten des Prozesses kennen werden, erschüttert durchaus nicht die Zuverlässigkeit der uns bekannten Fakten, wie wir auch in gewöhnlichen Leben nicht die Tatsache, dass N. N. Professor der Geschichte ist, nur deshalb in Zweifel würden, weil wir nicht alle seine Werke gelesen haben.“¹²

Zusammenfassend kann man festhalten, dass sich Kon in Hinblick auf die geschichtswissenschaftliche Erkenntnis nicht weit vom sogenannten „hermeneutischen Zirkel“ befindet. Das „historische Faktum“ erweist sich gewissermaßen nicht nur als Voraussetzung für die Forschung, sondern auch als ihr Resultat. Am Anfang hat der Historiker eine theoretische Annahme. Diese Annahme wird im Laufe der Forschung mit verschiedenen Ereignissen und Prozessen konfrontiert und aus diesen konstituieren sich die historischen Tatsachen. Anhand dieser Tatsachen versucht der Historiker wiederum seine Ausgangsthesen zu korrigieren.

¹⁰ Kon, Ebd., 104.

¹¹ Ebd., 105.

¹² Ebd., 109.

In der ehemaligen DDR führten die Philosophen und Geschichtswissenschaftler interessante Diskussionen über die historischen Tatsachen. Von diesen Arbeiten sollte man unbedingt Peter Bollhagens Buch erwähnen, das im Jahre 1966 mit dem Titel *Soziologie und Geschichte* erschienen ist.¹³ Meines Erachtens ist das größte Verdienst dieser Arbeit, dass der Verfasser – im Gegensatz zu den in den damaligen „normalen marxistischen Arbeiten“ erschienenen vereinfachten Perspektiven und Zugängen – eine sehr differenzierte Interpretation der historischen Tatsache ausarbeitet. Bollhagens Ausgangspunkt scheint jedoch auf den ersten Blick nicht besonders originär zu sein: „In der unmittelbaren Erfahrung ist eine einzelne Handlung, ein einzelnes Ereignis (und dessen Ergebnis) eine Tatsache.“¹⁴ Versuchen wir nun diesen Satz in David Humes Terminologie zu übertragen, um die Interpretationsmöglichkeiten dieser einfachen Aussage zu beleuchten. Nach dieser neuen Wortwahl würde die Primärtatsache der *Impression* (das heißt: dem unmittelbaren Eindruck) entsprechen. In diesem Fall müsste man zugleich jene unangenehme Wahrheit auch anerkennen, dass dieses nicht reflexive, nicht kommunikative, unmittelbare Tatsachenniveau in der Empfindungswelt des erfahrenden Subjekts verschlossen ist, und deshalb hat sie einen subjektiven und kontingenten Charakter. Wegen dieser Schwierigkeit ist es notwendig, diese einfache Auffassung zu vertiefen und die subjektiven Impressionen in die *Ideen* (das heißt: in die Welt der Kommunikation) weiterzuführen. Und auf diesem Punkt erscheint die Aufgabe der Wissenschaft und der Wissenschaftler. Bollhagen führt aus:

„(...) sobald wir in den Bereich des wissenschaftlichen Denkens, der wissenschaftlichen Forschung übergehen, können wir sehr schnell feststellen, dass diese Definition, welche die Tatsache als unmittelbare Erfahrung in den Blick nimmt, überhaupt nicht auf den Begriff der ‚wissenschaftlichen Tatsache‘ anwendbar ist. Eine wissenschaftliche Tatsache ist immer ein in sich gegliedertes kompliziertes Ganzes, das daher aus eigenen Elementen und Momenten besteht, aber auch Gemeinsamkeiten mit Tatsachen aufweist. Das gilt ebenso für die Art und Weise des Zusammenhangs der Gesamtheit der Momente, aus denen diese Tatsache steht. Diese Aussage gilt auch für Tatsachen der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, die mit Hilfe rein empirischer Methoden gewonnen werden. Empirisch-wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse und unmittelbare Wahrnehmung sind überhaupt nicht identisch.“¹⁵

¹³ Bollhagen, Peter: *Soziologie und Geschichte*. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften. Berlin, 1966.

¹⁴ Ebd., 88.

¹⁵ Ebd., 88.

Die wissenschaftliche Tatsache stellt nicht nur eine komplexe Reihe von Erscheinungen dar sondern auch die Beziehungen zwischen diesen Erscheinungen. Aus dieser Argumentation folgt, dass für Bollhagen die historische Tatsache letztendlich eine Konstruktion der wissenschaftlichen Abstraktion ist.

Die Schlüsselfragen der historischen Erkenntnis sind für Bollhagen die Probleme „selektiver Standpunkt“ und „Pluralität der Interpretationen“, die in der geschichtswissenschaftlichen Untersuchung vorhanden sind. In dieser Frage gerät er in Konflikt mit der berühmten „Historizismuskritik“ von Karl Popper. Man muss anerkennen, so Bollhagen, dass die Geschichtswissenschaft nie alle Tatsachen erforschen kann, schon deshalb, „(...) weil ihr nie alle Tatsachen zugänglich sind. Selbstverständlich muss sie unter den vorhandenen Tatsachen auswählen.“¹⁶ Bedeutet aber diese Feststellung, dass die Selektion der Willkür des Forschers preisgegeben werden soll? Es sieht so aus, als ob Poppers Gesichtspunkt diese Annahme unterstützen würde. Popper hält nämlich fest:

„(...) während die theoretischen Wissenschaften hauptsächlich an der Auffindung und Prüfung von universellen Gesetzen interessiert sind, nehmen die Geschichtswissenschaften alle Arten von universellen Gesetzen als bestätigt an und sind hauptsächlich am Auffinden und Überprüfen singulärer Sätze (statemens) interessiert.“¹⁷

Popper plädiert gegen die von ihm „Holismus“ und „Historizismus“ genannten Totalitätsauffassungen, die immer im Namen der absoluten Wahrheit auftreten. Anstelle dieses gefährlichen Absolutismus plädiert Popper für die Forderung des vorsätzlich selektiven Standpunktes, die er folgendermaßen charakterisiert:

„Derartige selektive Annäherungen (approaches) erfüllen beim Studium der Geschichte Funktionen, die in gewisser Weise denen von Theorien in der Wissenschaft analog sind. Es ist daher verständlich, dass sie oft als Theorien betrachtet worden sind.“¹⁸

Daraus folgt, so Popper, dass eine und dieselbe historische Erscheinung wahllos als Klassenkampf, Rassenkampf, Religionskampf usw. interpretiert werden könne. Leider, konstatiert Popper, können die „Historizisten“ nicht einsehen, „dass eine Pluralität der Interpretationen notwendig ist (...)“¹⁹

¹⁶ Ebd., 129.

¹⁷ Popper, Karl: *The Poverty of Historicism*. Boston, 1957. 144. Zitiert von Bollhagen. Ebd., 129.

¹⁸ Popper, Ebd., 141. Zitiert von Bollhagen, Ebd., 129.

¹⁹ Zitiert von Bollhagen, Ebd., 130.

Bollhagens Kritik richtet sich gegen Poppers Interpretationsrelativismus und ist mit einem hermeneutischen Zugang verwandt. Nach Bollhagen ist es eine „logische“ Notwendigkeit, alle Selektionsstandpunkte auf ein „Vorwissen“ zu stützen. Der Geschichtswissenschaftler kann immer nur auf der Grundlage eines übergreifenden historischen „Weltbildes“ von vielfältigen Selektionsmöglichkeiten wählen. „Der Begriff ‚selektiver Standpunkt‘ schließt nämlich ein, dass ein historisches Ganzes, d.h. die Einheit des historischen Prozesses anerkannt werden muss, sonst könnte man nichts ‚selektieren‘.“²⁰ Zweitens muss die Einheit des historischen Prozesses erkennbar sein, da in Ermangelung dieser Voraussetzung keine Aussage darüber möglich ist, ob es sich um ein selektives Verfahren geht oder nicht. „Drittens bedeutet das, dass der ‚selektive Standpunkt‘ nicht von der Erkenntnis des historischen Prozesses weg-, sondern vielmehr zu ihr hinführt.“²¹ Wie bereits dargestellt, bestreitet Bollhagen die Notwendigkeit der Selektion nicht. Die Entstehung (*Konstituierung?*) des historischen Wissens bedeutet immer eine Vorwärtsbewegung von dem Nichtwissen bis zum Wissen bzw. von dem begrenzten, relativen Wissen bis zur objektiven Wahrheit des historischen Prozesses. Dieser Prozess kann nur auf Grund eines vorhergegangenen Totalitätsbegriffs ablaufen, weil ohne einen solchen Begriff muss man zwangsläufig die Frage beantworten: Wie kann man eigentlich die Tatsache der Entwicklung feststellen? Die relativen Wahrheiten der „selektiven Standpunkte“ werden immer anhand eines Totalitätsbegriffes sichtbar, deshalb müssen sie einen Sekundärcharakter haben. Die Selektion ist immer eine Selektion im Verhältnis zu jemandem. Bollhagen argumentiert folgenderweise:

„Der selektive Standpunkt ist daher die Erkenntnis eines bestimmten Momentes oder eine Gruppe solcher Momente in der Totalität des historischen Prozesses, wobei diese Momente ihrerseits selbst wiederum eine Totalität von Erscheinungen, Eigenschaften, Struktureigentümlichkeiten, Beziehungen, usw. bilden. Hier gilt also die gleiche Beziehung, wie sie bei der Untersuchung des Verhältnisses der Totalität zu ihren Momenten für die allgemeine marxistische Soziologie festgestellt haben, selbstverständlich bei Berücksichtigung des Unterschiedes dieser beiden Totalitäten, d.h. bei Berücksichtigung der Tatsache, dass die von der Geschichtswissenschaft erforschte Totalität die an Formbestimmungen reichste und mannigfaltigste ist.“²²

Popper versucht um jeden Preis die Pluralität der Interpretationen zu retten. Aber in diesem Versuch erscheinen auch logische Widersprüche. Entweder bilden die historischen Prozesse eine Einheit, dann muss man die verschiedenen

²⁰ Ebd., 130.

²¹ Ebd., 130.

²² Ebd., 131.

Interpretationen in einer übergeordneten „Gesamtinterpretation“ (das heißt in der historischen Totalität) vereinen, oder ist man gezwungen, über verschiedene, voneinander unabhängig existierende „Teilgeschichten“ zu sprechen. Es wäre demzufolge unvorstellbar, sinnvolle Zusammenhänge zwischen diesen Teilgeschichten herzustellen. Wenn man versucht, diese Frage am Beispiel der Hussitenkriege darzustellen, kann man feststellen, dass in diesem militärischen Konflikt die historische Totalität, der Klassenkampf und der Religionskampf gleichermaßen erscheinen.

„Aber beide besitzen in der historischen Totalität ‚Hussitenkriege‘ eine *unterschiedliche* (??) Stellung, da sie *verschiedene* Momente dieser historischen Totalität sind. Das Problem ist also, welches Moment das grundlegende ist und welches ein abgeleitetes.“²³

Natürlich gibt es in der Geschichtswissenschaft verschiedene historische Interpretationsmöglichkeiten. Aber die Trennlinie findet sich ganz anderswo, als Popper denkt. Der fundamentale Unterschied zeigt sich zwischen der allgemeinen Soziologie und der konkreten Geschichtswissenschaft, sagt Bollhagen. Daraus folgt, dass es einen wesentlichen Unterschied zwischen soziologischen und historischen Tatsachen gibt. Die Soziologie widmet sich immer allgemeinen gesellschaftlichen Gesetzen und ordnet die singulären Ereignisse jeweils ihren selbstentworfenen allgemeinen Gesetzen zu. Für die Soziologie ist die Singularität an sich nicht von Belang. Im Gegensatz zur Soziologie ist die Geschichtswissenschaft eine *nichtsystematische Wissenschaft der Gesellschaft* und sie strukturiert ihre Gegenstände nicht nach systematischen Beziehungen der erforschten Erscheinungen

„(...) die bekanntlich im Gegensatz zum wirklichen historischen Ablauf stehen, sondern weil sie innerhalb zeitlicher (chronologischer) und räumlicher, also quantitativ bestimmbarer Grenzen den Ablauf der Ereignisse widerspiegelt. Daraus folgt nicht, dass die geschichtswissenschaftliche Erkenntnis im bloßen Empirismus, im bloßen Beschreiben der *unmittelbaren* Tatsachen steckenbleibt.“²⁴

Die Geschichtswissenschaft untersucht die vielfältigen partikulären Erscheinungsformen, wobei sie sich gleichermaßen historischen Zickzackbewegungen, „gewöhnlichen“ historischen Vorgängen wie auch historischen Zufällen usw. widmet.

²³ Ebd., 131. „In Wirklichkeit ist es daher mit der ‚Pluralität der Interpretationen‘ genauso wie mit der ‚Pluralität der Totalitäten‘: sie alle sind ihrerseits Momente einer höheren Einheit, der konkret-historischen Totalität des geschichtlichen Gesamtprozesses.“ 132.

²⁴ Ebd., 132–133.

Bollhagen stellt ausgehend von diesen Annahmen fest, dass sich der Begriff der historischen Tatsachen folgenderweise bestimmen lässt:

„Unter historischer Tatsache verstehen wir jedes historische Ereignis und sein Resultat. Dies ist der Ausgangsbegriff, gleichsam die primäre Bedeutung des Begriffs Tatsache. Sie verlangt eine nähere Bestimmung...“²⁵

Obzwar nach Primärbestimmung historische Tatsachen singuläre Phänomene sind, wäre es ein großer Fehler, diese Singularität zu übertreiben. Der Tod eines berühmten Menschen ist unmittelbar ein biologisches, natürliches Ereignis und man kann dieses Ereignis also als eine individuelle und unwiederholbare Tatsache betrachten. Es ist wohl bekannt, dass die Sterblichkeit allen Lebewesen, insbesondere den Menschen eigentümlich ist. Aber die Menschen leben und agieren immer in einem gesellschaftlichen Kontext und sind aufeinander angewiesen:

„Das Individuum als gesellschaftliche und damit ein historische Erscheinung lässt sich aber nur erklären, wenn sie seine gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse, also das, was es mit anderen gemeinsam hat, was ihnen allgemein ist, berücksichtigt werden. Darin widerspiegelt sich dass historische Tatsache kein Zustand, kein Ding usw. ist, sondern immer ein Ensemble gesellschaftlicher Verhältnisse, die sich in der betreffenden Tatsache zusammenfassen und überschneiden. Daraus folgt, dass die historische Tatsache nie im absoluten Sinne singulär ist.“²⁶

Die historische Tatsache als Gesamtheit von gesellschaftlichen Verhältnissen ist zugleich der Ausdruck der menschlichen Lebenspraxis, bemerkt Bollhagen. Das strenge Beharren auf Singularität kann als die Neugeburt des mittelalterlichen Nominalismus gedeutet werden. Die historischen Quellen anbelangt, sind nach Bollhagen, „(...) ein Abbild der unmittelbaren historischen Tatsachen bzw. sie sind selbst ‚geronnene‘ historische Tatsachen.“²⁷ Zusammenfassend kann man

²⁵ Ebd., 140.

²⁶ Ebd., 142. Nach Ernst Engelberg, der in einem seiner Bücher direkt Bollhagens Buch reflektiert, solle die historische Tatsache ein „monströses Phänomen“ sein, das gleichzeitig singuläre und allgemeine Elemente enthält. „Wir wissen, dass Gesetz wesentliche und notwendige Zusammenhänge zwischen den Erscheinungen seiner Wirkungssphäre aufdeckt. Insofern ist es tiefer als die lebendige Anschauung der Erscheinung. Auf der andern Seite ist die Erscheinung reicher als da Gesetz. Die Geschichtswissenschaft, deren Gegenstand besonders vielschichtig ist, hat die spezielle Aufgabe, die Widerspiegelung der gesellschaftlichen Totalität, Tiefe des Gesetzes und Reichtum der Erscheinungen organisch miteinander verbindend, anzustreben.“ Engelberg, Ernst: *Theorie, Empirie und Methode in der Geschichtswissenschaft*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1980. 28–29.

²⁷ Ebd., 145.

daher feststellen, dass man bei der Untersuchung von historischen Tatsachen grundsätzlich folgende drei Aspekte berücksichtigen soll:

„a) die Tatsachen, die sich im Verlauf der Geschichte tatsächlich ereignen; b) die Seiten dieser Tatsachen, die in den Quellen verschiedenen Typs enthalten sind bzw. widerspiegelt werden; c) diese Tatsachen können in der wissenschaftlichen Abstraktion sowohl einen empirischen als auch einen theoretischen Charakter annehmen.“²⁸

Aber es gibt einen anderen radikalen Standpunkt, der mit dem epistemischen Wert der historischen Tatsachen verbunden ist. Ausgehend davon, dass in der theoretischen Auseinandersetzung mit historischen Tatsachen abstrakt-allgemeine Momente immer im Vordergrund stehen, nehmen viele Theoretiker an, dass die singulären Ereignisse nur eine untergeordnete Rolle spielen und demzufolge sekundäre Funktionen haben. Diese Theoretiker meinen, dass die empirischen Abstraktionen immer nur die Oberfläche der historischen Erscheinungen zum Ausdruck bringen und sie „(...) nicht nur das Allgemeine, sondern damit zugleich auch das Wesen der historischen Erscheinungen [verdecken].“²⁹ Zum Beispiel stellt nach Leo Kofler die Quellenkritik, die in den Geschichtswissenschaften als eine verbindliche Norm gilt, *nur den kategorialen Schein*. Für Friedrich Hegel, Georg Lukacs und Leo Kofler sind die empirischen und singulären Ereignisse der Geschichte nur in Hinblick auf den „Endzweck“ sinnvoll. Gemeint ist damit, dass sie nur aus der Perspektive des „utopischen Kapitalismus“ (bei Hegel) oder des „Kommunismus“ (bei Lukács und Kofler) wertend betrachtet werden. Ereignisse, die zum Gelingen beitragen, werden dabei als wichtige und positive Tatsachen interpretiert. Gleichzeitig sind sie als unbedeutend und sekundär einzustufen, weil sie Hindernisse darstellen. Bollhagen stellt diesbezüglich mahrend fest: Eine derartige Instrumentalisierung sei gegenüber früheren Generation unwürdig. Diese Betrachtungsweise ist gewissermaßen eine Annäherung an den Historizismus. Diese Denktradition nimmt dabei an, dass sich „alle Zeitalter gleich weit vom Gott befinden.“

Die polnische Historikerin Celina Bobińska widmet dem Problemkomplex der geschichtlichen Tatsache in ihrem in deutscher Sprache 1967 erschienenen

²⁸ Ebd., 148. Was die Frage der Quellen betrifft, wird eine andere Typologisierungsmöglichkeit der Tatsachen von Bollhagen ausgearbeitet: a) die empirische vorwissenschaftliche (oder auch unwissenschaftliche) Abstraktionen; wissenschaftlich-empirische Abstraktionen; c) historisch-statistische Tatsachen usw.

²⁹ Ebd., 153.

Buch *Historiker und historische Wahrheit* ein ganzes Kapitel. Sie lehnt die konstruktionstheoretische Vorstellung von der historischen Tatsache zurück und besteht offensichtlich darauf, dass die historische Tatsache eine Widerspiegelung oder ein Abbild der objektiven Wahrheit sein solle. Auch Bobińska akzeptiert, dass Historiker die historischen Quellen zuerst von jeglichen ideologischen Konnotation befreien und sortieren bzw. kritisch überprüfen soll. Gleichzeitig vertritt sie auch die Meinung, dass der Historiker keine Tatsachen schafft, sondern sich nur ausgewählten Aspekten widmet. Bobińska formuliert folgenderweise:

„So ist der historische Tatsache für den Materialisten ebenso ein Teilchen des objektiven gesellschaftlichen Lebens wie jede andere gesellschaftliche Erscheinung“

und sie führt seine Argumentation wie folgt fort:

„Die Feststellung, dass 'die historische Tatsache eine wissenschaftliche Konstruktion ist', trifft dann zu, wenn diese Konstruktion als Widerspiegelung des komplexen wissenschaftlichen Verfahrens, als Charakteristik einer Gruppe der induktiver und deduktiver Forschungsmaßnahmen, in deren Folge die historische Tatsache entsteht, verstanden wird; diese Feststellung halten wir für falsch, wenn sie das Verhältnis zwischen den historischen Idee und der Geschichte selbst charakterisieren soll, wenn die Vielfalt der schöpferischen Gedankens die Vielfalt der Zusammenhänge und Strukturen usurpieren und ersetzen soll, die in der untersuchten realen Wirklichkeit vor sich gehen oder sich gingen.“³⁰

In einem Sammelband, der Mitte der 1980er Jahre in der DDR erschien, plädierte der Erkenntnistheoretiker Wolfgang Wächter dafür, dass die historische Tatsache keine einfache und isolierte Sinneserfahrung sei, sondern eher als eine wissenschaftliche Konstruktion darstellt.³¹ Nach Wächters Auffassung beging Celina Bobińska einen Fehler, weil sie den Begriff Ereignis mit dem Begriff Tatsache verwechselte. Zur historischen Tatsache kann der Historiker anhand von angemessenen wahren Aussagen gelangen. Wie Wächter diesbezüglich hervorhebt:

„Die Beschreibung Ereignisse und Vorgänge, die zur Aufstellung historischer Tatsache führt, ist dabei nur indirekt über die Interpretation historischen Quellen möglich.“³²

³⁰ Bobińska, Celina *Historiker und historische Wahrheit*. Zu erkenntnistheoretischen Problemen der Geschichtswissenschaft. Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1967. 7. und 30–31. Übersetzt von Hildegard Bamberger und Peter Bollhagen.

³¹ Wächter, Wolfgang: Zur Methodologie der historischen Erklärung. In: Küttler Wolfgang (Hg): *Gesellschaftstheorie und geschichtswissenschaftliche Erklärung*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1985. 151–236.

³² Ebd., 170.

Meines Erachtens knüpft sich Wächter damit an die Denktradition des ostdeutschen Philosophen Georg Klaus. In seiner Arbeit *Spezielle Erkenntnistheorie* versuchte Klaus nämlich Lenins berühmte Widerspiegelungstheorie zu revidieren. Nach Klaus stellt die Wahrheit keine Relation zwischen einem sprachlichen Satz und der objektiven Wirklichkeit dar:

... „auf die sich dieser Satz bezieht, sondern Wahrheit ist eine Beziehung zwischen einer Aussage und einem Sachverhalt, auf den sich diese Aussage bezieht.“³³

Historische Tatsachen werden durch wahre geschichtswissenschaftliche Aussagen hervorgebracht. Daraus folgt, so Wächter, dass der Begriff Tatsache im Kontext der historischen Ereignisse, Prozesse und Situationen ohne sinnvolle Alleinstellungsmerkmale keine Anwendung finden kann. Historische Ereignisse finden davon unabhängig statt, ob wir darüber nachdenken oder nicht. Der Begriff des historischen Ereignisses legt von vornherein Objektivität nahe. Ein historisches Ereignis, das nicht stattgefunden hat, ist ein Widerspruch in sich selbst.³⁴

Zum Schluss möchte ich noch kurz darauf eingehen, welche Impulse und Anregungen die geisteswissenschaftliche Forschung der ehemaligen Ostblockländern lieferte. Ich denke, dass über die vielen propagandistischen und vulgärmarxistischen Arbeiten hinaus nicht wenige wertvolle und aufschlussreiche Werke entstanden. Wenn man sich mit diesem Zeitalter eingehend auseinandersetzt, erfährt man immer wieder, dass auch damals intensive Diskussionen geführt wurden, die nicht weniger produktiv waren als jene, die für die abendländische Forschungslandschaft charakteristisch waren.

Bibliography

- Bobińska, Celina. *Historiker und historische Wahrheit*. Zu erkenntnistheoretischen Problemen der Geschichtswissenschaft. Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1967.
- Bollhagen, Peter. *Soziologie und Geschichte*. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften. Berlin, 1966.
- Engelberg, Ernst. *Theorie, Empirie und Methode in der Geschichtswissenschaft*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1980.

³³ Klaus, Georg: *Spezielle Erkenntnistheorie*. VEB. Berlin, 1965. 127. Früher schreibt Klaus: „Es ist ganz klar, dass unter diesem Aspekt Wahrheit oder Falschheit weder Sinnesempfindungen noch Vorstellen, noch den sprachlichen Sätzen zugeschrieben werden kann. Aussagen sind für sich genommen ja selbst die Invarianten einer Klasse von Aussagensätzen gleichen Sinnes“ Ebd. 126.

³⁴ Wächter, Ebd., 171.

- Klaus, Georg. *Spezielle Erkenntnistheorie*. VEB. Berlin, 1965.
- Kon, Igor. S. *Geschichtsphilosophie der 20. Jahrhunderts*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1966.
- Krüger, Hans-Peter. *Kritik der kommunikativen Vernunft*. Kommunikationsorientierte Wissenschaftsforschung im Streit mit Sohn-Rethel, Toulmin und Habermas. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1990.
- Popper, Karl. *The Poverty of Historicism*. Boston, 1957.
- Ricœur, Paul. *Histoire et vérité*. Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1999. (Erste Auflage 1955.)
- Veyne, Paul. *Comment on écrit l'histoire*. Édition du Seuil, Paris, 1971.
- Wächter, Wolfgang. Zur Methodologie der historischen Erklärung. In: Küttler Wolfgang (Hg): *Gesellschaftstheorie und geschichtswissenschaftliche Erklärung*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1985.

To the History of Quantitative and Social History in Hungary in the 1960–70s

International tendencies

After Zsigmond Pál Pach went back to Budapest from the II. International Economic History Congress (1963) he stated that the Hungarian historians, although very carefully, should apply methods of quantification in their historical writing in order to follow the international trends. Pach's opinion came relatively late, since at that time a small group of younger scholars had been using the methodology.¹ The conference and the observation of Pach were a piece of a much bigger image. According to contemporary Hungarian studies and new books about historiography, the quantitative methodology gained ground within the economic and social history during the 1960–1970s in the Western World (including Europe, North America and in this case also the Soviet Union).

The next enumeration starts with the countries which had less affection on the international historian community (as well as on the Hungarian school), and heads toward the most influential ones. The unit of measurement cannot be else than the number of the citations and their reputation according to contemporary documents and nowadays handbooks. First who are worth to mention: Czechoslovakia (Jaroslav Purs),² Denmark (Hans-Christian Johansen),³ Belgium (Herman Van der Wee),⁴ Bulgaria (Nikloai Todorov),⁵ Finland (Eeri Heikonen, Reino Hjerpe, Riitta Hjerpe)⁶ and East-Germany (Helga Nussbaum, Thomas Kuczynski). In the case of Hungary the latter is much more important, since the two countries had a DDR-Hungarian Historian Conference in 1977, where the main topics was the potency of the comparative and the quantitative methodology.⁷ In Sweden a database got established during the 1970s, which indicates that they used the quantitative methodology to a significant degree

¹ Pach, "II. Nemzetközi Gazdaságtörténelmi Kongresszus." 258.

² Berend, "Az V. Nemzetközi Gazdaságtörténelmi Kongresszus és tanulságai" 254.

³ Schneider and Woolf, *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, 1945 to the Present*. 312.

⁴ Berend, "Az V. Nemzetközi Gazdaságtörténelmi Kongresszus és tanulságai" 249–271.

⁵ Schneider and Woolf, *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, 1945 to the Present*. 365.

⁶ Ránki, "Finnország gazdasági fejlődésének néhány kérdése" 381–390.

⁷ Granasztói, "NDK-magyar történetész konferencia az összehasonlításról és a kvantitatív módszerek alkalmazásáról a történettudományban" 610–613.

before.⁸ Reports and reviews in Hungary frequently mentioned Soviet-Estonia⁹ to indicate that this country's historians were keen on to use the methodology of quantitative history (Ilo Sildmäe and L. Loone, Heldur Palli.¹⁰).

Beside Estonia on this level Polish historians were the other notable receptive community in the eastern bloc of Europe. In this respect the most decisive scholar was Antoni Maczak, who – according to the audience from Hungary¹¹ – together with his group in the 10th Polish Historian Conference (1979) challenged the opposition (the minority) who preferred the traditional way of the economic and social history. Also need to mention the work of the Polish-Hungarian Historian Committee, which – according to reports – concentrated on economic and social history.¹²

Among the most influential ones, I need to start with the cliometrics school (their “homeland” is the United States). The Hungarian attitude toward this school was quite divided, which was a mixed result of the methodology of the new and developing school and the geo-political situation. Here the role of a “corridor” was played by Scott M. Eddie who started his carrier at that time. His works were utilized in the most important work of László Katus. The respect was mutual because Eddie stated in an interview 2003 that although he also met with Iván Berend and György Ránki, he mostly appreciates the help of Katus.¹³ Later in the late 1970s and in the 1980s John Komlós also became an intermediary agent between the historian community of Hungary and the cliometrics.¹⁴

In the same way the Soviet Union also had remarkable imprint on the Hungarian economic and social historical writing. On the personal level the name of György Granasztói is worth to mention. He had good connections with the mathematician Valentin Aleksander Ustinov, who was the author of the book entitled *The Usage of the Electronic Computers in the Historical Science*. This was the first book in Hungary which dealt with such topic. The Historical Institution of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences translated and printed it in few copies,

⁸ Gyáni, “Egy új történelmi forrás: az adatbank” 96–97.

⁹ The Estonians were always mentioned separately from the other parts of Soviet Union in the Hungarian sources.

¹⁰ Deopik–Dobov–Kahk–Kovalcsenko–Palli–Usztyinov, “Hogyan nyerhetünk történelmi információt kvantitatív és gépi úton?” In: Glatz Ferenc (Ed.): *Történelemelméleti és módszertani tanulmányok*, 278. and Berend, “Az V. Nemzetközi Gazdaságtörténelmi Kongresszus és tanulságai” 249–271.

¹¹ Nagy–Unger, “A Lengyel Történelmi Társulat X. Kongresszusa”. 898–903. 902.

¹² Székely, “A kereskedelem és a kereskedelmi utak Közép-Kelet Európában a kései feudalizmus korában: a Lengyel–magyar Történelmi Vegyes Bizottság 1971. évi ülészárka” 797–814.

¹³ Kövér, “... gondoltam, ha olyan drámai története van Magyarországnak, jó, ha magyarul tanulok.: Beszélgetés Scott M. Eddie amerikai kliometrikus történészsel.” 187.

¹⁴ Benda, “...az emberek testén mintegy észlelni lehet a gazdasági folyamatok változását – Beszélgetés John Komlóssal” 257–264.

but it never got marketed. I also need to mention here the characteristics of Ustinov historical views. His idea was that as the science of computing is developing more and more, the human part in the study process is diminishing. The process will continue until all what one needs to do is analysing the data what he/she received from the machine.¹⁵ This point of view is a radical way of thinking about the methodology of quantitative history.¹⁶

In the case of French historical writing the most remarkable is Fernand Braudel, who – together with his wife – spent more than a week in 1962 in Budapest. Their guide was László Katus, who was talking about the event in his recent interview. Braudel went to Budapest in order to strengthen the scientific relations between the two historian communities. One of the results of the visit was the establishment of scholarship from Hungary for at least two decades. Among others Vera Zimányi, László Katus and László Makkai utilised this opportunity. Another important point here is that the Hungarian scholars had received western literature.¹⁷ Conferences were also organised between historians from Hungary and France. For instance in Budapest (1968) about the topic of the comparison of the trends of studying Western and the Eastern European economic and social development mostly with quantitative methodology.¹⁸

¹⁵ Usztyinov, "Elektronikus számológépek alkalmazása a történettudományban". 58.

¹⁶ Worth to mention that if we compare the scholars of the *Annales* (for example Pierre Chaunu or Marczewski) with the point of view Ustinov's, a far less radical statement can be seen. In the brief comparison of the cliometrics school and Ustinov can be seen that even if the first group received more serious critics, the latter was the one who wanted to transform the way of historical studies into mathematical one. Robert William Fogel and the circle of the cliometrics school had also strong intention to this kind of transformation, but their plan was to make the history more exact with the help of social sciences. The quantitative school of Marczewski and the *histoire sérielle* aimed for even less transformation. As Chaunu said their aim was to utilise these methods, but it was quite the opposite to what the cliometrics wanted which, according to Chaunu, used these methods for nothing else, but for its own sake. My opinion is that these schools and methods can't be divided from one another neither on theories, nor on empirical levels. Even if we could construct a framework, the fact that Fogel in 1984 said that projects with the methodology of cliometrics were in progress all over Europe, shows that even the different scholars did not sense this kind of differences. Chaunu, *Szeriális történelem. Mérleg és perspektívák*. In: Benda–Szekeres (eds.), *Az Annales a gazdaság, társadalom – és művelődéstörténet francia változata*. 251–276., Marczewski, *Kvantitatív történetírás*. In: Glatz (ed.), *Történetelméleti és módszertani tanulmányok*. 291–303. Fogel, "Tudományos és tradicionális történetírás" 7–39.

¹⁷ Bódy–Cieger, "Bódy Zsombor és Cieger András beszélgetése Katus Lászlóval" In: Katus, *Sokszólamú Történelem, válogatott tanulmányok és cikkek*. 452–458

¹⁸ On this conference Emanuel Le Roy Ladurie, Francois Furet and Denis Richlet also held lectures. From Hungary: Vera Zimányi, Erik Fügedi, László Katus, Dezső Dányi, Éva H. Veres, Iván Berend, György Ránki and Zsigmond Pál Pach took part. See more in Makkai–Zimányi–Katus, "Francia–magyar gazdaságtörténeti konferencia." 1088–1103.

The quantitative school of Hungary

In general, one of their aims was to bring the economic and social history closer to the social sciences. Here, as usually we can speak about the import of theories, mainly from the sociology and the economics in order to refresh the historical writing and thinking by new aspects, which may generate new results. Beside the above mentioned two social sciences the priority was the computer science, which was a brand new phenomenon in the period, at least in the eastern bloc of Europe. In this case the historians faced two major problems. The first was that in those times these devices were very expensive, which was the smaller problem, according to the sources and my assumptions. The fact that the technology was new was the profound obstacle of the adaptation. Without the knowledge about what is exactly going on inside a computer the scholar (who was by the way facing these phenomena at first hand) did not trust the new devices, rather stuck to the old school way of calculations (if he or she even dealt with that before). György Granasztói had written several studies on the question. He used soviet and western examples in order to call attention of the historians to the usefulness of the computers.¹⁹ Another remarkable but less known project was a program called SZOCPROG, written especially for scholars of the social sciences in the early 80's in order to facilitate the working process by the computer.²⁰

The computer sciences were key elements for processing the mass sources. The problem was not new, but the chance for the solution was unprecedented. The different sort of censuses, tax surveys and other sources were too thick for a historian or even for a team of historians to process. These sources were lying on the shelves of archives unexploited, which could show new images not only of the history of the country, but of smaller units – like a city or a manor. At least few of the abovementioned countries, on their path toward the modernisation of the historical writing, achieved a level where they had the financial and technical background as well as the adequate knowledge to create a database of historical data. Thus these databases can serve as units of measurement in this case. The question in Hungary had come up during the early 1970s; but it came to be almost a decade later. Géza Perjés wrote a report about the first large-scale initiation in the Hungarian historiography, which was processing the tax census of 1728. This project in its early stage was able to depict, among others, the

¹⁹ Granasztói–Zimányi, "Számok és számítógépek a történettudományban. Szovjet könyv magyarul az elektromos számítógépek felhasználásáról a történeti kutatásokban" 49–55.; Granasztói, "A történész és a mérés – egy modell korlátai" 314–329.; Granasztói, "A történész és a számítógép kapcsolatáról" 481–487.; Granasztói, "Mit ad a matematika a történészeknek?" Magyar Tudomány. 29–38.;

²⁰ Granasztói, "Történeti kutatómunka – gombnyomásra. Beszélgetés a SZOCPROG rendszerről" 79–84.

quantity of the bread cereal on the studied territories and to compare them to each other. It was concentrating on geographical conditions and the distribution of the different cereals of the studied territories.²¹

In order to process these sources another tool – beside the devices – was the quantification. In the old school perception the historian only uses basic statistics when he was forced by the sources or in order to make the understanding easier, but the principles of the new directions had merely nothing to do with the facilitation of the reading in this level. They wanted to see deeper into the tendencies and connections among certain dimensions of a historical event. For that they needed to utilize the more complicated statistics and calculations, but the problem was that after a certain level these formulas became more and more difficult to understand for somebody who came from the fields of humanities. Because of this the intention of these historians was to avoid these techniques and phrases in their works. Contrary to the mainstream the quantitative school tried to increase the reputation of calculations and to show in empirical and methodological way, what kind of advantages can others achieve if they learn the trick of the trade.

Vera Zimányi was among the early pioneers working with this methodology. In the late 1950s she started to work on the history of two manors which belonged to the Batthyány family in county Vas (today it is located in Western Hungary and Eastern Austria). The result was published in two books. The first one was issued in 1962 in Austria and titled *The Manor and its Peasantry in Güssing (Németújvár) in the 16–17. Centuries (Der Bauernstand der Herrschaft Güssing im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*²²) In the introduction part she declared that the book was derived from a methodological experience with the historical-statistics.²³ This book was the twin part of the second one which got published in Hungary five years later: *The Manor and its peasantry in Rohonc-Szalonaki in the 16–17. Centuries (A Rohock-Szalonaki uradalom és jobbágysága a XVI–XVII. században*²⁴). In my opinion in these books the author succeed with her idea, since both contains huge amount of statistical data. The main merit of the books is that she processes quantitative sources regarding the manor. The three out of four parts of the book involves tables which methodology can be called “erudite” during this period. Zimányi had finished her books at once, but while in Austria the publisher accepted it for publication, there were difficulties with the Hungarian one. First of all, the

²¹ Perjés, “Electronic Data Processing of an Assessment of Taxes Carried Out at the Beginning of the 18th Century” 1–92.

²² Zimányi, *Der Bauernstand der Herrschaft Güssing im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. 1962.

²³ Zimányi, *Der Bauernstand der Herrschaft Güssing im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. 1962. Second page of the introduction.

²⁴ Zimányi, *A Rohonc-Szalonaki Uradalom és Jobbágysága a XVI–XVII. században*. 1968.

Hungarian publisher wanted to issue the work but only with the condition of erasing most of the tables, which Zimányi did not accept.²⁵ Thus the work was forced to wait until the second half of the decade, when the author submitted it as a candidature thesis. The received critics were rather good, but one of the main weaknesses – according to the reviewers – was that the quantification was too much and the narration had lesser role in the book. Another important book of her is *Hungary in the European Economy between 1600–1650*,²⁶ issued in 1976. The book shows a personal development of the author. With the use of the calculated indexes she was able to show that during this period basically the same tendencies can be seen in Hungary just like in other territories of Europe. Her calculations were backed by the market economic theory which shown that the market was the main connection between different parts of Europe. In this point I need to stress out that Zimányi also wrote recensions and smaller articles with the aim of introducing the recent trends to historical thinking. For instance, she studied the cybernetics in order to understand how the historians could take advantage of its way of thinking.²⁷

Another significant scholar is Gyula Benda who had opportunity to spend time in France, and later he had a job in the Central Statistics Office.²⁸ His research field was the agrarian history but in our case the most important work of his is the study entitled *New Economic History*.²⁹ The place of its first appearance was one of the periodicals of the Central Statistics Office, which was less popular among historians. Still, this is the first longer study written on this question. In his work Benda first gave a description on the cliometrics. In his interpretation the school intention was, besides the Annales circle and the *histoire sérielle*, to equip the history with scientific methodology. Their aim was to change the method of explanation of the history with their deductive-hypothetical models. Their process of research is also different from the old school way of historians. The first step is that a scholar sets up a hypothesis. The second stage takes place when he searches empirical sources and then at the end

²⁵ Zimányi, "Válasz a kandidátusi disszertáció opponenseinek, felszólalóinak" 264.

²⁶ Zimányi, *Magyarország az európai gazdaságban 1600–1650*. 1976.

²⁷ Zimányi, "Kibernetika és történelem" 397–403.

²⁸ The institution was essential in the case of the quantitative school. *The director Dezső Dányi was also interested in quantification in the historical science*. Even not all the scholar belonged to Central Statistic Office they issued in this respect important books like, for example the *The Society and the Economics of Hungary between 1867 and 1967* (Magyarország társadalmi és gazdasági 1867 – 1967) which used only tables and graphs to tell the history of the period. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal: *Magyarország társadalmi és gazdasági 1867–1967*. 1967 Also they started periodicals like *Történeti Statisztikai Tanulmányok* and the *Számok és Történelem*.

²⁹ Originally: Benda, "New Economic History." In: Dányi (ed.): *Történeti Statisztikai Tanulmányok*. 1975. 261–276. Latter in bigger volume and easier availability: Benda, "New Economic History" In Benda (ed.), *Társadalomtörténeti tanulmányok*. 33–46.

of the research the historian accepts or rejects the results according to the used theories and datas.³⁰ After the methodological introduction Benda brought a few important examples what the cliometrics achieved and I think this study is still the best in Hungarian language if someone would like to read about them.

Maybe the centre figure is László Katus, who concentrated rather on the empirical usage of these methodologies. In an interview Katus said that in his early ages Fernand Braudel, Jean Marczewski, Pierre Channu, Simon Kuznets, W. W. Rostow influenced his historical point of view.³¹ Beside Katus personal connections (which I mentioned above) his works were also remarkable in the case of the quantitative history in Hungary. One of his earliest works was *To the East-European Industrialisation and the Self-Sustaining Capital Accumulation* (Kelet-Európai iparosodás és az „önálló tőkés fejlődés” kérdéséhez) issued in 1967.³² Where his aim was to introduce

“how complex wide ranged comparative studies, quantitative and structural analyses, clear and defined terms as well as the utilization of economics and sociological methodology are required from us to, in the case of such economic history questions, have comforting and solid conclusions based on assumptions.”³³

This work of Katus was only the first stage of his bigger work entitled *Economic Growth in Hungary during the Age of Dualism*, which was issued in 1970.³⁴ It was written in English, so the study in Hungary belongs rather to the less known works, although – according to György Kövér – it’s methodology was quite modern and among non-Hungarian scholars the study is regarded as a reference work even today.³⁵ The study was unique in its own kind, since before nobody combined the macroeconomics with historical sources in this high level. Katus was calculating GDP, which is the first initiation in this respect. He also divided the period between 1867 and 1914 into five subperiods where each represents a prospering, stagnant or recessive one according to the fluctuation of economics rates. By the help of these indexes and trends he was able to contextualise Hungary in the process of the industrialization. Another book where he contributed was the series *History of Hungary*. He wrote the economic history and demographical chapter in the volumes which include the periods of 1848–1890

³⁰ Benda, “New Economic History” In Benda (ed.), *Társadalomtörténeti tanulmányok*. 33–34, 43–44.

³¹ Katus, *Sokszólamú Történelem, válogatott tanulmányok és cikkek*, 454.

³² László Katus: “A Kelet-Európai iparosodás és az „önálló tőkés fejlődés” kérdéséhez” 1–45.

³³ Katus, *Sokszólamú Történelem, válogatott tanulmányok és cikkek*, 118.

³⁴ Katus, “Economic Growth in Hungary during the Age of Dualism (1867–1913)” In: Berend (ed.), *Social-economic researches on the history of East-Central Europe*. 35–127.

³⁵ Kövér, “Fordulat, forradalom után? A magyar gazdaságtörténet-írás a nemzetközi trendek tükrében.” 198.

and 1890–1914.³⁶ Here the tertiary sector got the leading position in the economics system so the monetary structure the accumulation of the capital and the different other conditions like supply and demand or presented international tendencies. This work applied the methods of the allied sciences and from a point of view still includes basic information (for instance grand price index, trends of the salary of workers or export-import baskets). But the merits of László Katus over the empirical ones are that he was able to raise the quantitative history up to the "macro" historical writing in Hungary. Moreover, he managed to issue a study dedicated to international audience in such a scientific environment which was mostly hostile toward these new methods.

György Granasztói was even more active in other aspects. He had the opportunity to work together with Ustinov in Moscow, and after Granasztói went back to Budapest he wrote several methodological studies on the question of the place of the computer science in the historical research. He was arguing that historians should utilize the new tool in order to facilitate the research in the social and economic history where the scholars meet with mass sources. However, Granasztói was aware of the limits of quantification.³⁷ He was close to the French way of quantification. In the late 1970s he worked together with Michel Demonet on the social history of Kosice in the *des Hautes Études en École Sciences Sociales*.³⁸ With the newly gained experiences his opinion about the quantification took different direction. The methods in this case were mechanical cartography and factor-analysis, which introduced a totally different viewpoint of the history of the town. However Granasztói was not satisfied with the results and turned against his previous standpoint. He declared that the quantification is often cumbersome and sometimes even unnecessary since the result can be predicted. Moreover, the methodology can be useless if the scholar made mistakes for instance during the preparation of the punch cards. In this work he turns more intensively against the cliometrics, which, according to him, ignores that the act of a person depends on and changing by one's social background. Thus they consider the behaviour of the person predestinated, which argument was basically the same as what György Ránki said one year earlier in 1977.

The school's most remarkable assembly took place in 1972 when few historians and even less computer experts arranged a conference supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The result of the conference can be described in two points. They were talking about their achievements and new

³⁶ Kovács–Katus (eds.): *Magyarország Története 6/2 1848–1890*. 913–1038. 1119–1154 and Hanák–Mucsi (ed.): *Magyarország Története 7/1 1890–1918*. 263–292.

³⁷ Granasztói, "Számítógépek és a történettudomány." 564–565. Granasztói, "A történetész és a számítógép kapcsolatáról." 481–482

³⁸ Granasztói: "A történetész és a mérés – egy modell korlátai." 314–316.

ideas,³⁹ but also worked out a programme, which had no strong aftermath. This fact shows that the group had the will for a more intensive continuation. According to Péter Hanák, who announced the program, they wanted to be a self-coordinating group which helps the development of cooperation. Last but not least they wanted to take advantage of the diversity of the group and arrange a self-teaching society.⁴⁰ I assume these are the germ of the Club Quantum where they were able to share information, knowledge and news among themselves. It was a home of interdisciplinarity and lasted at least until the middle of the 1980s.

Critical voices

Of course like everywhere in the Western World the quantification received critics. In Hungary György Ránki and Iván Berend were the most active in this case and they gave place to their concerns on the pages of journals. Thus they can be the representatives of the “contra” group, which was much thicker layer of the historian society in Hungary. Unfortunately, I have no place here to introduce the merits of the two scholars. Their methods in their early years were near to their mentor's eastern Marxist way, but later their approaches were closer to the British Marxist School, which can be seen in the changes in their studied topics and in the footnotes of their books. Worth to mention that the theories imported from social sciences and the calculations had less importance in their works than the narration (the traditional point of historians view). Among them Ránki concentrated much more on the quantification in the historical writing and thinking. His well-known work *Economics and History – the Answers of Economic History*⁴¹ (*Közgazdaság és történelem – a gazdaságtörténet válaszútjai*) analysed respectively the quantitative school, the *histoire sérielle* and the cliometrics. About the first two schools his opinion was that the quantification, cannot satisfy in any sense the demands of the Marxist economic history, because the history of the types of production includes political and military aspects, which cannot be fully quantified.⁴² His conclusion was that the method can be helpful, but only if the scholar who uses it is aware of it's dangers. The critical yet

³⁹ The assembly of the school received big publicity through the pages of the *Történelmi Szemle*. Tarján Rezső: “Számítógép és Történelem” 526–565.

⁴⁰ Péter Hanák: “Felszólalás, Számítógép és a történettudomány”. 563–564

⁴¹ First Ránki, “Az új gazdaságtörténet amerikai iskolája.” 164–172. Then latter: Ránki, *Közgazdaság és történelem – a gazdaságtörténet válaszútjai*. 1977b. 46–53. Or Ránki, “Közgazdaságtan és történelem – a gazdaságtörténet válaszútjai” In: *Mozgásterek, Kényszerpályák*. 1983.

⁴² Ránki, *Közgazdaság és történelem – a gazdaságtörténet válaszútjai* 52.

balanced analysis was followed by a chapter on the cliometrics. In the interpretation of Ránki, the school is based on the neo-classical economic theory and its concentrates on models and theories while aggressively expanding in the field of economic history.⁴³

The second point is rather political. He declared that the New Economic History is quite the opposite of the Marxist economic and social history, since while the latter studies the development of the humanity; the cliometrics only supports and makes excuses to the capitalism.⁴⁴ Moreover he attacked the following book of Gyula Benda from the same point of view.⁴⁵

Conclusions

On the previous few pages my intention was to give an insight into the quantitative historical writing in Hungary. This phenomena belong to the trends of the historiography of the Western-World (including Europe and North-America). The Hungarian is only a branch of a much bigger net.

Although the quantitative school was relatively productive, they wrote only a few long-lasting works. It is clear that the most eager champions of these initiations were Vera Zimányi, Gyula Benda, György Granasztói and László Katus. Their merits are unquestionable, even if nowadays only few of their works are in use. Besides them the scholars of the Central Statistics Office are noteworthy, for example Géza Perjés.

In the empirical level the work of László Katus is prior. He was able to raise the quantitative history up to the general historiography by his chapters of the synthesis of Hungarian history. Furthermore, he wrote a still-in-use study for non-Hungarian speaker audience in a rather hostile environment while in the general historiography the main motif was political.

György Granasztói wrote several methodological studies on the question of the relationship between history and computer science. His merit here is the interest that he showed in the promotion of the usage of the new technology and that he facilitated it. Although his attitude was waving toward the quantification during the late 1970s his works are the first initiations for the co-operation between these two sciences. Zimányi was much more empirical. Her work on the question of the place of the economic of Hungary in Europe showed the reader that through different corridors among the different courtiers there was stronger

⁴³ Ránki, *Közgazdaság és történelem – a gazdaságtörténet válaszútjai*. 55, 61.

⁴⁴ Ránki, *Közgazdaság és történelem – a gazdaságtörténet válaszútjai*. 66.

⁴⁵ Ránki, „Az új gazdaságtörténet amerikai iskolája”. 164–172.

connection than the widely accepted “Sonderweg”-theory (elkanyarodás-elmélet) assumed. She also wrote methodological works like the one about the cybernetics. Last but not least I need to underline the importance of Gyula Benda. His works were coloured by the historical statistics mainly about agricultural history, but his most important work is the one about the New Economic History, which is still the best introduction about the school in Hungarian language. Beside them there were a few scholars who experimented with the methodology.

During the late 1970s the attitude toward the quantification changes over the western-world. This difference can be seen in Hungary as well, since enthusiasm decreased among the historians. However the story of the Hungarian branch of the quantification is not reached its end here, it is continuing during the 1980s-1990s and further. My future intention is to introduce the following stages as well and to give a general picture at least in the case of the Hungarian scholars. My study was about the first and most intensive period, which will be followed by a modified one with "veteran" and new scholars and probably with new aims.

Bibliography

- Benda, Gyula. „...az emberek testén mintegy észlelni lehet a gazdasági folyamatok változását – Beszélgetés John Komlossal” In: *Aetas* 2006/2–3. 257–264.
- Benda, Gyula. ”New Economic History” In: Benda Gyula: *Társadalomtörténeti tanulmányok*. Osiris Kiadó, 2006. 33–46.
- Benda, Gyula. ”New Economic History”. In: Dányi, Dezső (ed), *Történeti Statisztikai Tanulmányok*. KSH, 1975. 261–276.:
- Berend, T. Iván. ”Az V. Nemzetközi Gazdaságtörténeti Kongresszus és tanulságai” *Századok* 1971/2, 249–271.
- Bódy, Zsombor, Cieger, András. ”Bódy Zsombor és Cieger András beszélgetése Katus Lászlóval” In: Katus László: *Sokszólamú Történelem, válogatott tanulmányok és cikkek*. Pécs, 2008.
- Chaunu, Pierre. ”Szeriális történelem. Mérés és perspektívák” In: Benda Gyula, Szekeres András (ed.). *Az Annales a gazdaság-, társadalom – és művelődéstörténet francia változata*. L'Harmattan, 2007. 251–276.
- Deopik, D. V., Dobov G. M., Kakh J. J., Kovalcsenko I. D., Palli H. E., Usztyinov, V. A. ”Hogyan nyerhetünk történeti információt kvantitatív és gépi úton?” In: Glatz, Ferenc (ed.). *Történelemelméleti és módszertani tanulmányok*. Gondolat Kiadó, 1977. 276–290. 278.
- Fogel, Robert William: ”Tudományos és tradicionális történetírás” *Világtörténet* 1986 / 3–4. 7–39.
- Granasztói, György, Zimányi, Vera. ”Számok és számítógépek a történettudományban. Szovjet könyv magyarul az elektromos számítógépek felhasználásáról a történeti kutatásokban” *Világtörténet* 1969 (19) 49–55.
- Granasztói, György. ”A történész és a mérés – egy modell korlátai” *Történelmi Szemle*, 1979/2. 314–329.

- Granasztói, György. "A történész és a számítógép kapcsolatáról" *Magyar Tudomány* 1971/7–8. 481–487.
- Granasztói, György. "Számítógépek és a történettudomány" *Történelmi Szemle* 1972 /3–4. 564–565.
- Granasztói, György. "Mit ad a matematika a történésznek?" *Magyar Tudomány* 1975/1. 29–38.
- Granasztói, György. "NDK-magyar történész konferencia az összehasonlításról és a kvantitatív módszerek alkalmazásáról a történettudományban" *Történelmi Szemle*. 1979/3–4. 610–613.
- Granasztói, György. "Történeti kutatómunka – gombnyomásra. Beszélgetés a SZOCPROG rendszerről" *Történelmi Szemle*, 1981/2. 79–84.
- Gyáni, Gábor. "Egy új történeti forrás: az adatbank" *Történelmi Szemle*, 1981/1. 94–99.
- Hanák, Péter and Mucsi, Ferenc (eds.). *Magyarország Története 7/1 1890–1918*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1983.
- Hanák, Péter. "Számítógép és a történettudomány" *Történelmi Szemle*, 1972/3–4. 563–564
- Katus, László. "A Kelet-Európai iparosodás és az „önálló tőkés fejlődés” kérdéséhez" *Történelmi Szemle*, 1967/1 1–45.
- Katus, László. "Economic Growth in Hungary during the Age of Dualism (1867–1913)" In: Berend, T. Iván (ed.). *Social-economic researches on the history of East-Central Europe*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970. 35–127.
- Kovács, Endre and Katus, László (eds.). *Magyarország Története 6/2 1848–1890*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1979.
- Kövér György, "... gondoltam, ha olyan drámai története van Magyarországnak, jó, ha magyarul tanulok: Beszélgetés Scott M. Eddie amerikai kliometrikus történésszel" *Aetas* 2004/1. 187–198. 187.
- Kövér, György. "Fordulat, forradalom után? A magyar gazdaságtörténet-írás a nemzetközi trendek tükrében" *Századok*, 2013/1. 189–203. 198.
- Központi Statisztikai Hivatal: *Magyarország társadalma és gazdasága 1867–1967*. 1967
- L. Nagy, Zsuzsa and Unger, Mátyas. "A Lengyel Történelmi Társulat X. Kongresszusa" *Századok* 1969/ 2–3. 898–903. 902.
- Makkai, László, Zimányi, Vera, Katus, László. "Francia –magyar gazdaságtörténeti konferencia" *Századok* 1968/ 5–6. 1088–1103.
- Marzewski, Jean. "Kvantitatív történetírás" In: Ferenc, Glatz (ed.). *Történetelméleti és módszertani tanulmányok*. Gondolat Kiadó, 1977. 291–303.
- Pach, Zsigmond Pál. "II. Nemzetközi Gazdaságtörténeti Kongresszus" In: *Századok* 1963/1. 258.
- Perjés, Géza. "Electronic Data Processing of an Assessment of Taxes Carried Out at the Beginning of the 18th Century" *Agrártörténeti Szemle*. 1981/ Suppl. 1–92.
- Ránki, György. "Az új gazdaságtörténet amerikai iskolája" *Magyar Tudomány*, 1977/3, 164–172.
- Ránki, György. "Finnország gazdasági fejlődésének néhány kérdése" *Századok*, 1977/2, 381–390.
- Ránki, György. *Közgazdaság és történelem – a gazdaságtörténet válaszútjai*. Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977b.
- Ránki, György. "Közgazdaságtan és történelem – a gazdaságtörténet válaszútjai" In: *Mozgásterek, Kényszerpályák*. Magvető Kiadó, 1983.
- Schneider, Axel and Woolf, Daniel: *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, 1945 to the Present*. Oxford University Press. 2011. 312.
- Székely, György. "A kereskedelem és a kereskedelmi utak Közép-Kelet Európában a kései feudalizmus korában: a Lengyel –magyar Történész Vegyes Bizottság 1971. évi ülészaka" *Századok* 1972/3 797–814.

Tarján, Rezső. "Számítógép és Történelem" *Történelmi Szemle*, 1979/2. 526–565.

Usztyinov, Valentin Alekszejevics: "Elektronikus számológépek alkalmazása a történettudományban" *Világtörténet*. 1964/1 23–58.

Zimányi, Vera. *A Robonc-Szálonaki Uradalom és Jobbágysága a XVI–XVII. században* Akadémiai Kiadó. 1968.

Zimányi, Vera. *Der Bauernstand der Herrschaft Güssing im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. Eisenstadt, 1962.

Zimányi, Vera. "Kibernetika és történelem" *Történelmi Szemle*, 1970/3. 397–403.

Zimányi, Vera. *Magyarország az európai gazdaságban 1600–1650*. Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976.

Zimányi, Vera. "Válasz a kandidátusi disszertáció opponenseinek, felszólalóinak" *Agrártörténeti Szemle*, 1967/1–2. 263–270.

The Comparison of current Slovak and Hungarian history textbooks for grammar schools

The quality of textbooks is often discussed, but the methods for objective finding are not sufficiently known and scientific studies comparing various textbooks on the market are not often published. Especially we are lacking comparing with other countries. The present study is trying to fill this gap using several methods of evaluation of textbooks. In our comparison we use qualitative and quantitative research. In our qualitative research we compare textbooks according their content using our historical and pedagogical knowledge and practical experience. The quantitative research approach in this study is represented by two complementary methods: measuring the didactic facilities of textbooks and didactic text difficulty. The research sample consists of four current textbooks for grammar schools showing the history of the 20th century: two Slovak¹ and two Hungarian.² Before starting the evaluation we made following hypotheses: The content and the form of the textbooks are suitable for students. They contain all the information in proper form and in sufficient extent. The difficulty of the text used is reasonable; they are not lacking the most important elements of didactic facilities.

¹ In Slovakia the textbook industry did not change a lot since 1989. There is still an unshakable position of state, which is responsible for writing, editing, publishing and distribution of textbooks to schools and students do not have to pay for them. That is the reason why there is always only one textbook available for each subject in each type of elementary and secondary school in each grade. For History at the Elementary and High School there is always a set of two books – one textbook separately on world History, one on national History.

² For our comparison we chose Hungary since we have shared a long common history, not only within one state, but also later as part of East bloc, what is obvious not only in curriculum itself, but also in the way how to teach it. The methods and approach, teaching plans and schedules have many common features. However, the situation in textbook industry is different, the market is free and students pay for their textbooks. Therefore there are more suitable textbooks to choose from. We decided to compare the latest textbook written according to current requirements for use of sources and development of intelligence of students: Száray–Kaposi, *Történelem IV. középiskolák, 12. Évfolyam. 2009.* and one older textbook translated also to Slovak for the Slovak minority education: Salamon, *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií. 1995.* We use the Slovak version.

I. The qualitative research of textbooks

We are interested in all aspects of form and content. We note structure and clarity of textbooks, graphics and navigation elements, as they contain all the necessary information for students, distinction between main and supplementary text, duplication of information, orientation difficulty in the textbook, use of maps and sources, and the occurrence of unknown words – technical terms, stylistic and grammatical errors. We evaluate the effectiveness of didactic material: the difficulty of chapters for lessons, visualisation, motivation in explanatory text, functions of tasks below, application of theoretical knowledge into practice, developing creativity through tasks, incentives to work independently, lack of structural features, support of self-study and a design of the chapter. In its content we focus on what kind of topics it includes, or if it contains a sufficient number of cartograms and illustration materials to support the visualisation. Among other things, we look at the language and style of the textbook. We expect that the target requirements of history knowledge and skills prescribed by both the Ministry of Education will be filled. These requirements prescribe developing students' knowledge and their understanding, application and synthesis, and that the students ought to be able to evaluate the historical events.

All textbooks divide curriculum into sections, sub-sections and chapters.³ Very difficult task is chronological arrangement of chapters. Every history book struggle with it, particularly when the chapters are larger. For this reason, we prefer large number of smaller chapters what makes it available to go through them during one lesson. The information about an interconnection of chapters such as *The Fascism in Germany* and *The Fascism in Italy* could be in the repetition part at the end of the section of the textbook and of course this section should not be missing in the textbook.

³ The Slovak textbook Kodajova–Tonková.; *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny. 2006.* more specifically divides out supplementary curriculum. Events related to Hungary and events in world history in Hungarian textbooks do not meet in one chapter, so although curriculum is not divided into two books, it is possible to exclude chapters on national history as chapters on the world history.

1. KODAJOVÁ, DANIELA – TONKOVÁ, MÁRIA: *DEJEPIS PRE 3. ROČNÍK GYMNÁZIÍ. SVETOVÉ DEJINY. (HISTORY FOR THE 3RD YEAR OF GRAMMAR SCHOOLS. WORLD HISTORY)*

187 pages, format A4, colour textbook. In the beginning of the book we find the introduction to the topic. The curriculum is divided to four sections: I. *World at the crossroad*, II. *From war to war*, III. *Second World War*, IV. *The World between East and West*. Important information and terms are bold. The authors in the introduction section called attention at difficulty of the historical evaluation of the 20th century and briefly summarized the most important historical events and their impact and also they explained the usefulness of study of history of the 20th century, which affect us today very much. A brief introduction to each chapter is very practical to highlight its main idea. It is followed by practical chronological overview in tables. Most of the images have not only aesthetic, but also informative value.⁴ In addition to images also different tables are connected to the text.⁵ Very few major events are bold, which makes orientation in the text not easy.

The number of sources in the chapters varies (0-11, 15, 17, 19). Sources are very useful and often connected with questions at the end of the chapter.⁶ Questions and tasks are unlike previously used Slovak textbooks even analytic. As in the recent Hungarian textbook they support student orientation in space and time and detect causes of events. Occasionally inappropriate sentences occur in the text.⁷ Sometimes the authors failed to create an appropriate description of the image.⁸ A rhetorical question very often appears in the title.⁹ In reading the text of the phenomenon of free time a student may get the impression that there were no societies before 20th century. On p. 64 there is the term “*successor states*”

⁴ Exclusive some, Kodajova–Tonková: *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 33: *Posledná strana Versaillskej mierovej zmluvy. (The Last page of the Treaty of Versailles)*.

⁵ Some, however, are not sufficiently precisely mentioned, Kodajova–Tonková: *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 44: “*Štáty sveta a ich priemyselná výroba v medzivojnovom období v percentách (Countries of the world and their manufacturing in the interwar period in percentage)*.” It would be more appropriate to write that it is their share of the world market.

⁶ It would be preferable to show *The October Manifesto* on p. 23 among the sources, not within the main text. It is the only such case of using sources.

⁷ “*The desire for a socially just world accompanied the mankind within living memory, but it became an instrument of political struggle only in modern history.*” Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny* 8.

⁸ “*Newspaper picture in newspaper from 1909 shows that the attacks against the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire lasted for years and were conducted systematically.*” A picture showing one actual attack cannot prove such thing. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 18.

⁹ However, sometimes it is not the most appropriate one: “*Stalinská bržovláda – logické smerovanie totalitného režimu alebo uchýlka? (Stalinist terror – logical tendency of totalitarian regime or a deviation?)*” Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny* 45.

without explaining they were the successor states of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.¹⁰ On p. 128 it would be preferable to formulate the second task: According to the data in the table on p. 122.... On p. 133 it would be more appropriate to write what kind of minister was Ernest Bevin. There were some grammatical mistakes in the text.¹¹ The textbook properly explain unfamiliar terms such as separation of church and state directly in the text.¹² Not all unfamiliar terms have been explained.¹³ Sometimes the authors in order to not overload the text with alot of data omitted essential information¹⁴ or they failed to explain historical events.¹⁵ In many places there are clear and visual explanations of various historical problems in the textbook.¹⁶ Likewise, in the supplementary curriculum it is recommended to link information from textbook

¹⁰ The authors obviously counted on the fact that in a parallel study of national history textbook it is enough to explain the term in other textbook.

¹¹ Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny* 102 incorrect hyphenation, p. 143 omission of a letter.

¹² Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 11–12.

¹³ It would be useful to add these terms into the historian dictionary: the secularization process (Ch. 1), the proletariat (Ch. 3), plebiscite, the mandate system (Ch. 4), nomenclature, unitary state, the Communist International, the totalitarian state (Ch. 5), economic depression, the pogrom, white terror, red terror (Ch. 6), rationalization of production, Dawes plan – divide one paragraph of the text (Ch. 7), invasion, Maginot Line (Ch. 12) affirmative action (Ch. 17)

¹⁴ E.g. p. 12: In the article about the modern Olympic Games the name of the founder, the date or place of origin is lacking, not to speak about the symbolic site of the first modern Olympic Games. On p. 15 there is an information about dominions of France and Great Britain without mentioning some of them. P. 77 The text mentions the stock market crash in New York on 29/10/1929, which was Tuesday; although in the text in brackets we can read Thursday. Black Thursday, 24/10/1929 was the day when there was a significant decline in stock prices, which in turn triggered the crisis black Thursday in Europe for the time difference perceived as Black Friday. But history knows also the Black Monday and Tuesday. Without any explanation it is therefore very confusing! On p. 119 we can find incorrect dating of the surrender of Japan. It would be appropriate to determine the precise dating on dropping bombs to be make more transparent link events. On p. 125 there is only a abbreviation SS without mentioning the whole name “Sicherheitsdienst” or Slovak translation. On p. 134 it would be preferable to specify Allied agreements among Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary. On p. 162 is not clear from the text how Gandhi strove to avoid fratricidal fight. On p. 176 the text about Brezhnev being appointed is without dating it. On p. 181 it would be appropriate to explain the ethical issues of cloning, problems of consumption of genetically modified foods and the dangers of economic and cultural globalization. The explanation of the causes economic growth of Japan after WWII on p.183 is missing, only its surrender it is mentioned and then jump to the 60s and 70s when Japan is mentioned as the third most powerful economic power of the world. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 12. 17. 77. 119. 125. 134. 162. 183.

¹⁵ The circumstances of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria (František Ferdinand D'Este) Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 15.

¹⁶ *Národné štáty v strednej a juhovýchodnej Európe – fikcia či realita* (*Nation states in Central and South Eastern Europe – fiction or reality*) explanation of creation of artificial national constructs. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 65.

with students' knowledge from other areas, e.g. historical films.¹⁷ It is very difficult to correctly distinguish between main and supplementary curriculum, but textbook has succeeded in this.¹⁸

Since the authors chose extensive chapters on one country or one block countries, some events are mentioned twice¹⁹ and explanation is given in the latter case.²⁰ It happened also that the thematic coherence rearranged the chronology of events.²¹ Similarly, some illustrations are sometimes inappropriately placed in the text.²² Some historical phenomena gained too much space e.g. Soviet Russia mentioned in the 3rd and 5th chapter.²³ Chapter 5 is too long compared to other chapters (it consists of 12 pages and most of chapters of 8p).²⁴

Some elements are not in a textbook for e.g. short introductions of different personalities, which are very strong element in e.g. Slovak History textbooks for vocational schools and would be an appropriate complement to the main curriculum also here.²⁵ In this textbook the personalities are presented only in

¹⁷ by adding paragraph *Heroes of the Royal Force*, in which the last sentence "We find among them the names of Slovak and Czech pilots and mechanics." may remind the famous film *Dark Blue World (Tmavomodrý svet)*. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 104.

¹⁸ We would only change small details: On p. 10 – 11 we would change the importance of texts of *Svet moderného človeka (The World of a modern man)* and *Moderný nacionalizmus a boj o školu (Modern nationalism and the struggle for school)*. Similarly, the text on p. 15 is important enough to be in the main text. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 10–11. 15.

¹⁹ On p. 30 the authors repeated the text of p. 19 on the last stage of the war. On p. 72 the information about the origin of the fascist movement is repeated. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 15. 30. 72.

²⁰ On p. 22 the explanation about Russia's participation in the Agreement. Similarly there is no explanation of Korean War on p. 157. It is mentioned only incidentally within the US foreign policy and undated. Similarly the Cuban Revolution is explained just in two sentences. The explanation of the divisions of Korea and Vietnam is missing, although we can read about the wars in these divided countries! There is another information about Vietnam Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 22, 157, 164.

²¹ Inside chapter: p. 24: First we learn about peace at Brest-Litovsk and then about the revolution of 1917. Inside the textbook: the text about the rise of production at Hitler time on p. 57 precedes the text about the global market crash on p. 68–69. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 57. 68–69.

²² We can see the picture of Lenin's mausoleum and only later read about his death. The image of p. 62 of the Locarno Conference would be more appropriate on p. 97, where we can read about it. The photo of Chinese blast furnaces on p. 172 refers to the text on p. 174. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 62. 97. 172. 174.

²³ The second part of the chapter covers too many historical events up to the year 1939, which is too far forward compared to the next chapter. E.g. it already mentions the Molotov – Ribbentrop Pact.

²⁴ Similarly it would be more appropriate to attach a part of Chapter 9 to Chapter 10 on lifestyle after WW1.

²⁵ E.g. on p. 49–52 Benito Mussolini. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 49–52.

the text,²⁶ or in the brief description of “snapshots”. The authors have tried to connect it with textbook on Slovak history.²⁷

The book is colorful and has a high-level graphics. There are a lot of illustrations – mainly photos and reproductions of works of art inside of it. This image material is almost at each page and the authors of the book have worked hard to switch the kind of illustrations within a book opening and vary. In the head of each side is a timeline, which divides the textbook into two imaginary blocks: 1914–1945 and 1945–1990 comparably represented in the textbook, (the period 1914–1945 in 76 pages and the period 1945–1990 in 88 pages). At the end of these units it is possible using well-arranged tables to repeat the most important events in international relations, in each country, in the economy and culture and science. Unlike other textbooks of History textbook has plenty of tables and a chronological overview is part of almost every chapter.

Cartograms in the textbook are rather rare. It is obvious that the authors expected students and teachers to work with the historical atlas for secondary school, as the maps in the textbook only complement this atlas. These atlases do not always contain everything necessary or for its comprehensiveness they may discourage student who is sometimes just e.g. looking for basic information such as demarcation of some country in some particular year. We would add into textbooks a map showing grouping of power states before the WWI, map of battlefields of WWI, map of the member states of the USSR, Hitler's armies approach to the West, map of battlefields WWII in Russia in p.115 (instead of the map of battlefields in the Pacific not mentioned in the text), and a map of the Middle East conflict to p.167. Map at p. 113 called *Places of German and other concentration and extermination camps* does not show labor camps in Slovakia.

2. BARTLOVÁ, ALENA – LETZ, RÓBERT: *DEJEPIS PRE 3. ROČNÍK GYMNÁZIÍ. NÁRODNÉ DEJINY. (HISTORY FOR THE 3RD YEAR OF GRAMMAR SCHOOLS. NATIONAL HISTORY)*

191 p, B4formate, colour textbook. In the beginning of the textbook we find an introduction to the topic. The content is divided to six sections: *I. Slovakia during the years of WWI, II. Slovakia in Czechoslovak Republic III., Slovak Republic,*

²⁶ Often they are mentioned in the text without further explanation that comes only later. E.g. p. 79 on Chiang Kai-shek. Kodajova–Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*.79.

²⁷ On p. 29 the 4th task asks the students to recall the text about the role of the Czech and Slovak legionaries in the Russian Civil War from the national history, but it is not possible to find this text in the textbook on national history. The fifth task at p. 49 is reformulated third task of national history textbook, Kodajova, – Tonková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*. 29. 49.

IV. *An attempt to build socialism and communism*, V. *From the ideal to agony*, VI. *The road to independence and to the common Europe*. Important information and terms in are bold.

According to the index (p. 190–191) the first two sections of the textbook are written by A. Bartlová and the rest by R. Letz, however the structure of the textbook is continuous. Subchapters distinguished from the main text recall distinguishing of supplemental curriculum. The title is often a metaphor, which is not very appropriate. Titles are often the in the form of a rhetorical question. A length of chapters is ranging 5–10 pages, except Chapter X. *Economical and domestic resistance*, which reaches up to 13 pages, because symbolically it concluded the events by the end of WWII and publishes excerpts from sources at longer ranges.

Some formulations were not completely accurate.²⁸ Sometimes authors in order to not overload the text by particulars omitted the essential information.²⁹ Not all unfamiliar terms have been explained.³⁰ Important information are often

²⁸ E.g. sentence on p. 37: “Two unsuccessful attempts of the former Emperor Charles to return, if not to imperial, namely of Vienna, then at least to the Hungarian throne testified that the initiative to restore the empire is welcome not only in Budapest but also outside Hungary.” The p. 78 sentence of losses of Slovak army in the war against Poland is not related to the rest of the text on the Little War between Slovakia and Hungary. On p. 93 there is an incorrect information on the number of Slovaks in Hungary in the source in the years 1938 to 1945 (750,000), therefore the source should preferably be omitted, or explained to the student so they would not accept the statement as true. On p. 122 there is an error in transcript of the source, as it is not easy to detect “direct speech” of Edvard Benes and his indirect speech, and therefore the source is incomprehensible. On p. 130, Vladimír Clementis is mentioned exclusive bourgeois nationalists as he would not be the one of them. The Activity of Charter 77 is not clear enough explained in the text on p.162. The Fate of Alexander Dubcek between 1968 and 1989 is not explained anywhere! Bartlová–Letz, *Dejepis pro 3. ročník gymnázií. Národní dějiny*. 37. 77. 78. 93. 122. 130. 162.

²⁹ On p. 11 we miss an interpretation of the Czech associations. On p. 42–3 we miss information on the outcome of national elections. On p. 105 is not explained the reason for the assassination of Reinhard Heydrich. On p. 119 it would be appropriate to reason execution of Jozef Tiso. On p. 122 it would be preferable to specify where Germans from Czechoslovakia were displaced. On p. 129 the information about the criminal of bishop Jan Vojtašák was dropped out. On p. 135 there is no explanation why Alexander Dubcek did not behave favorably to Gustav Husák. On p. 135 it would be appropriate to specify what was the highest position in the party. On p. 180 it is not explained what kind of language act was the mentioned Language Act. It would be appropriate to add that to the data in the sentence on p. 188: “Every third household has its own car, 61% of households have a washing machine and every tenth household has a computer. Mobile Phones owns 1.5 million citizens.” that there are based on the census of 2001. Bartlová–Letz, *Dejepis pro 3. ročník gymnázií. Národní dějiny*. 42–43. 105. 119. 122. 129. 135. 180. 188.

³⁰ It would be appropriate to add to the historian dictionary these terms: Congress (Ch. 3), Arbitration (Ch. 9), Slovenská pracujúca pospolitost’ (Slovak working congregation, Ch. 12), Bourgeois nationalism, separatism, resignation, reactionary, statehood, repression, rehabilitate, Congress of the Communist Party (Ch. 17), normalization (Ch. 19) information monopoly,

not highlighted (e.g. by different script). There were some grammatical errors in the textbook.³¹ Modern approach to the tasks sometimes makes them impossible to solve in practice.³² Some chapters could be complemented by other sources.

Colour graphics processing of textbook is the same as in the textbook on world history. In the head of each page is the timeline with following periods: 1914–1918, 1918–1938, 1938–1945, 1945–1968, 1968–1989 1989–2005, what is more logical than in the previously examined textbook. Summary tables are after each section and clarify the various events using separate parts: Politics, economy and culture. The last two parts are not represented in each table. As in the previous textbook, cartograms in this textbook are rather rare. In each chapter except Chapter 21 *Culture, science and sport* it is a chronological overview. There were some errors in the use of illustrative material.³³

3. SZÁRAY, MIKLÓS – KAPOSÍ, JÓZSEF: TÖRTÉNELEM IV.
KÖZEPISKOLÁK, 12. ÉVFOLYAM. (HISTORY FOR 4 GRADE OF
SECONDARY SCHOOL)

272 page,s A4 formate, color textbook. At the beginning is an index dividing it to 5 sections (each of appr. 50 pages): 1. *The First World War, rebellions and peace treaties*, 2. *Between the two world wars*. 3. *The Second World War*. 4. *Bipolar world*. 5.

dissident (Ch. 20), Competence Act (Ch. 23), the voucher method, privatization, obligations (Ch. 24). Some important terms are not in the main text, they are mentioned only in the description of images, for example the Candle Manifestation. Bartlová – Letz, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Národné dejiny*. 162–163.

³¹ Bartlová–Letz, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Národné dejiny*. 14.

³² E.g. when it requires linking the curriculum of various grades, which can also lead to such a task e.g.: “*Make a map of state bodies, which involved Slovakia. Help yourself with history books for grades 1 and 2 on p. 13*”. A third year student simply does not have these textbooks, nor the teacher cannot borrow them from the school textbooks store as they are used by students of another grades! Bartlová–Letz, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Národné dejiny*. 1–2. 13.

³³ Very interesting and refreshing is a connection of images forming mutual contrast, e.g. election posters of two completely different political parties on p. 118. There is a description to the picture on p. 48: “*An important condition of civilization and economic growth in Slovakia was electrification. Four joint-stock companies participated in its construction: Westslovakian, Southslovakian, Central Slovakian and Eastslovakian Power Station. Status of electrification of Slovakia in 1928.*” However in the picture next to the abbreviations of these companies there is one not mentioned: SESzS. On p. 67 we lack specifying the bridge in Bratislava shown in the picture. On p. 103 there is a photograph of Peter Prídavok, who is not mentioned in the text. The photo on p. 107 with a description *Rush at the airport Three oaks (Tri duby)* could be more accurately located. The picture on p. 117 with the description: “*The enthusiasm of youth was a frequent motif of promotional poster.*” shows a young family: father, mother and son! Not well distinguishable colors on the chart on p. 186 are apparently caused by misprints, in particular an indication of the SOP and the SDK is easy to confuse. Bartlová – Letz, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Národné dejiny*. 48. 64. 103. 107. 117. 118. 186.

Advantages and problems of the globalized world. After the index an introduction follows introducing the new perceiving of History subject, the school leaving exam in History and new concept of textbooks along with an instructional introduction to the textbook supported by summary table of symbols used in the book at the bottom of the book opening.

Unlike older types of textbooks in these books we can find a smaller number of chapters and the main text.³⁴ There is a number of questions and tasks designed for individual or group work, an oral presentation (presentation and discussion) and written presentation (essay or project). All these questions and tasks are not linked to the main text, but to the source materials. The main text is shorter since authors emphasise working with sources. They call attention to the frequent mistake in studying History in the fourth, i.e. senior year, when besides the year's curriculum students repeat all topics for school leaving exam and because of lack of time at the end of school year they often do not finish all the curriculum (the chapters about the last decades of the 20th century), or the curriculum is shortened only to the main text and supplementary source material is pushed aside as irrelevant.

The source material is distinguished by color-code as political, social, economic, church history and the history of ideas, but the color differences are very small, they blend with each other. The authors mentioned in the introduction that they tried to fill demand of suppression of dominance of political history in textbook compared to social, economic etc. history in order to make more understandable the other contexts of life in the described period. Yet still it dominates in the textbook. Another intention of the authors was to avoid too much factual information often causing reluctance of students to study. For this reason, sentences nominating the names of authors and scientists and works of art do not occur in this textbook. The fifth section of the book is devoted to various social issues and serves as repeating and comparing periods of the 20th century in terms of different problems. Such part of the book is beneficial for the repetition of the curriculum in the period before leaving examination.³⁵

³⁴ The authors of the book mentioned reduction of 20%. Száray–Kaposi. *Történelem IV. középszintű évfolyam*, 12. évfolyam. 4.

³⁵ For our comparison of textbooks it is interesting to note that a similar section only more oriented to the basics of political science it is possible to find in other Hungarian textbooks for secondary vocational schools, where it requires a combination of History and Civics in one subject in their curriculum of apprenticeships (blue-collar jobs – szakiskola). In the study of white-collar jobs students (szakközépszintű iskola) these two subjects are separated. Since authors Miklós Száray and József Kaposi wrote History textbook for vocational schools too, this second part of the textbook has similar topics, only adapted to abilities of students of mentioned schools.

Chapters are divided into two parts: on approx. 1,5 page we find the main text and the rest called ARCHÍVUM are the sources and tasks related to them. These are of different kinds: cartograms – mainly Hungarian and European maps, drawings of weapons, status of political parties, government division, samples of various government documents, reproductions of photographs, propaganda posters and artworks, transcripts of speeches and memories of statesmen, charts and tables. In the case of displays of contemporary press next to reproduction of the particular page in the original language we see an accompanying explanation. Textbook retains the same structure as the previous three textbooks from the same set of textbooks, each of which is for one year of study in high school. We analyzed the textbook for 4th grade.³⁶

An interesting fact is that the map of Austro – Hungarian monarchy is missing in the textbook, although until 1918 Hungary was part of it. It is always displayed separately as a completely separate part. Austria – Hungary can be found only in maps of Europe, for instance showing the distribution of political forces in 1914 on p. 8, and on p. 9 called *The fronts of WWI*. We miss this map especially in the chapters *The Peace Treaties* or *The Trianon Peace Treaty* to get more objectivity.

The cartogram titled *The emigration and deportation of Jews from the Hungarian territory* on p. 145 in the chapter *The German occupation, terror of Arrow Cross Party and military catastrophe* we find strange, because it shows Hungary in the condition before the WWI although at that time it was not the official Hungarian territory. Although the map distinguishes boundaries in 1914 and 1942, their colours disappear giving the impression only of a small territorial changes. For better understanding of deportations of Jews it would be more appropriate to show all the countries of Europe deporting Jews, showing the density of population and the number of deportees. Thus, the student is informed only about the situation of Jews in the former historical Hungary and does not recognize EU-wide ratios.

Number of sources in each chapter varies, usually approx. 14–17, they are also the chapters with 26 sources (*The company and the way of life in Hungary between the two world wars*), 24 (*Hungary in World War I and an explosion of revolution*), 23 (*The Rákóczi time*) or smaller number – 11 (*The Central Europe in the new world order, The Shake of the colonial world*). Tasks by each source can be divided according four recommended method of solutions: a. individual work, work in pairs or in groups analyzing a single source, b. independent or group work combining

³⁶ Unlike Slovak grammar schools History subject is to be found in all four years at high schools in Hungary. Students usually attend mandatory preparatory seminar for school leaving examination in fourth, sometimes also in third year. In recent years in Slovakia the number of lessons in individual grades changed and it happens that at one school in one grade they follow the old system and in other the new one.

knowledge from multiple sources, c. oral presentation – presentation and discussion and d. written presentation (essay, project and homework). It is accompanied by information, what competences students exercise: an use of sources and their understanding or use of terms or orientation in space and time or detecting causes of events. Most of them are from a. and b. categories. Written tasks are in minimal extent. Most competencies are understanding and ability to “read” sources and an understanding of the background of various events. The authors stressed that it is not necessary to deal with all the tasks, teachers should choose from them. Indeed there is not enough time because of their large number. Also in the high school is not possible to build teaching History at the study of sources, i.e. the most important is a teacher’s interpretation of the curriculum accompanied by some sources and thus can ensure better understanding and remembering of curriculum, especially when each source is accompanied by a task.

It is also important to help students to create their own opinion. The authors recommend practice of evaluation in the form of discussions on the phenomena and personalities. According to the authors it is practicing one very important competence for the life of: creation and defense of student’s own opinion as well as approach to the problem from several points of view. It is very well done by the task called *Points of view* in each chapter of textbook giving an probleme to start a discussion. E.g. in the chapter *The Treaties at the End of the War* on p. 22 there is such a probleme:

“During the centuries the Western powers saw the Austro–Hungarian Monarchy as one of the cornerstones of the European balance. In their military goals they did not count with its breakage. This opinion they changed only in the last third of the war. Their decision was affected by numerous factors: the revolution in Russia, military targets, national movements, faith in cooperation of new nations etc. Since then the permanent debate is: Was the breaking of empire a legitimate step or it was just a wrong answer of victorious powers at the current situation?”

Because each chapter contains appr. 5–6 pages (extremes 4–7), we miss the chapters’ titles in the heads of the pages. Instead of them there are only the titles of sections, which is some help, but a student has to scroll to the beginning of the chapter highlighted by just a little bit higher, thicker and different colored letters and therefore it causes a certain lack of transparency in the textbook. Especially when compared to the above-mentioned Slovak textbooks.

At the end of the textbook we can find very brief summarizing tables with colored marking of important events of the 20th century. In some cases essential

information is missing since the main text is so short³⁷ or in the explanations of some historical event we miss the pre-events which influenced them.³⁸ We find very interest the connection of revolution in Russia with the Berlin revolution in one chapter.³⁹

Chapters are well-arranged.⁴⁰ Division of chapters is very appropriate, also mentioning the European events prior to the events related to Hungary. The situation after World War II and especially the events of the Cold War and its termination is very well described. Chronologically, we do not find appropriate the sequence of chapters in section 4: because chapter about changes in Europe and the USSR is preceding chapters about the events in Hungary after the Second World War. (Ch. 32,33,34,35,36,37,38) which would be appropriate to transfer prior to Chapter 30 and 40. The chapter would also be preferable to be placed before it, possibly to move prior to chapter 27 *The Beginning of the Cold War*, as the Chapter 40 only summarizes information about the world after WWII. Other chapters in the fifth section relate to the whole 20th century and the Chapter 40 is again missing prior to the chapter *The Bipolar World*. The chapters in the fifth section we recommend to repeat and link to the present time of students and problems of our time.⁴¹ Very interesting is the chapter about the origine of the EU. Too bad that when rendering changes of the

³⁷ E.g. The Peace Conference in The Hague. In the chapter *The Treaties at the End of the War* it would be appropriate to add information about the Washington conference. The chapter *The Central Europe in the new world* is very engaging, but the situation of minorities is mentioned only in the successor states of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In fact, only the situation of Hungarian minority. Information about minorities in Hungary which would be interesting for comparison, is missing. It would be appropriate to add information on Paneuropa. We miss an entire chapter on the situation in the US after World War I, or about the world at that time. We would suggest at least a subchapter of information on the collaboration during the Second World War, about the Nuremberg and Tokyo Process. More details should be given to mention the situation of individual powers states before World War II.

³⁸ It would be appropriate to describe in more detail the international situation at the beginning of the 20th century or the situation before the revolution in Russia.

³⁹ Bartlová-Letz, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Národné dejiny*. 12.

⁴⁰ E.g. on p. 52–56 fascism is mentioned only in general terms at the beginning of the chapter, the information about Mussolini is short, but we can find more in the sources. However we miss the sources to other mentioned dictatorships: Portugal and Spain. Step by step authors help us imagine a world after World War I, i.e. also the colonies, China and Japan. The chapter *The Second Half of 1930 – Life Between the Two World Wars* does not indicate that this is already the eve of World War II. The 19th chapter *The Diplomatic and Coercive Tactics Before the Second World War* can be considered as an introduction to the WWII as which, however, mentions the imminent events before the war on Hungary. Chapters between them portraying life in Hungary between the wars would be at better place more forward to create a better image in the student's mind about the sequence of events. Bartlová-Letz, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Národné dejiny*. 52–56.

⁴¹ Particularly interesting is the last chapter *The Social Changes in the 20th Century in Hungary*, which is an ideal incentive for repeating national history. Unfortunately we cannot find a similar initiative for repeating global or at least European history in the textbook.

minority population in Hungary data about change in minority populations in neighboring countries are missing to create a complete picture.

The illustrative material is extremely rich because the Archivum parts of the textbook are color-processed and thus sources fulfill also an aesthetic – illustrative function. In this section we can find also cartograms. Timeline is missing. All illustrations are highly meaningful, since there is a task assigned to each of them.

4. SALAMON, KONRÁD: *DEJEPIS PRE IV. ROČNÍK GYMNÁZIÍ.* (HISTORY FOR 4TH GRADE OF HIGH SCHOOL)

301 pages, A4formate, black-white textbook. The textbook is divided into seven differently long sections: I. *Introduction to the History of the 20th century*, II. *The First World War and its Consequences (1914–1920)*, III. *Between the Two World Wars (1920–1939)*, IV. *During the Second World War (1939–1945)*, V. *Peace and the Cold War (1945–1962)*, VI. *Struggle for Peaceful Coexistence (1963–1988)*, VII. *The Victory of Democracy (1988–1990)*. In the introduction the author named the most important factors affecting the historical development in the 20th century. Unlike other history books curriculum of this textbook begins with a chapter on the Mexican Revolution, which the author sees as the prelude to the WWI. The textbook contains a large number of concise and clear chapters.

At the beginning we miss information on international relations in the early 20th century, about dividing to the blocks or the Peace Conference in The Hague, although further we can read about the attitude of Austria – Hungary and Germany to war. We miss information about a trench nature of the WWI. In the chapters of the revolution in Russia we cannot find information about Russia in the early 20th century, about the political parties or about the USSR.

Authors wrote the textbook from a very strong egocentric point of view, there are a lot of one-sided nationalist expressions at many places in the textbook.⁴² The chapters are short and clear. Unlike the Slovak textbooks the chronological sequence is more conserved. The chapter *The Problems of Europe in a New Form* is well- arranged, it talks about the discrepancies between the winners

⁴² One typical example is e.g. the chapter about the Trianon Peace Treaty, which is quite one-sided. We can find there such sentences as on p. 59: “*Neighbours of Hungary who have become its enemies did everything to present Hungary as a nest of bolshevism and nationalism, and thus they supported their territorial claims. ... At the same time Hungary, torn by internal contradictions, has been forced to pursue an active foreign policy.*” Special chapter (p. 50) is on “neighbouring countries and Hungarians under their rule.” Even in the period after WWII and later after the coup this question is again described in separate chapters. Salamon, Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií. 50. 59.

of the WWI, the complications regarding reparations and the Dawes Plan. The Slovak textbooks this information is scattered in several chapters. About the origine of fascism in Germany and Italy we can read in separate chapters. The chapter on the US after the war, or the chapter on the United Kingdom at the same time, in which is also the Irish question is mentioned are also very interesting. In the chapter about USSR we miss the information about the gulags.

In the chapter on Germany we again miss information about the Weimar Republic. This textbook also has a special chapter devoted to the situation of France after the war, but information about its foreign policy towards the Little Entente is missing. Unlike the Slovak textbooks rendering situation of home affairs is not absent. The chapter *The Uncertainty and Rebuilding* very well summarized the situation in the world in the 30s and combined history of individual countries. There is also a chapter about the arrival of the dictatorship and about the whole world, or the economy.

Information about non-European countries in this period are also present in the textbook. In the Slovak textbook on world history they are present in other chapters, too. Slovak textbook on world history better describes the WWII, in the Hungarian textbook the information is split in more chapters according individual countries. In the Slovak textbook we can find also information about collaborators or a chapter *The Price for War* about losses due to the war. In this textbook of K. Salamon unlike Slovak textbooks a detailed depiction of the situation in Europe, Asia and America after WWII is not neglected: Soviet-Chinese rupture, Vietnam, armaments, Berlin Question, the fourth Arab-Israeli War (but without mentioning the earlier ones) and the Helsinki conferences. It also mentions fighting of the US against the USSR in Africa and Asia and an exploration of the universe.

At the end of the textbook we can find chapters in non-chronological order: e.g. coup in Hungary was mentioned before perestroika in the USSR. The final chapter is not a summary of the subject matter of the whole year, but rather an outline development: overpopulation, pollution, migration to more developed countries and the division of the world into four zones: the first: the US, Canada and Latin America, the second: Europe, third: Japan and the Far East and fourth: Russia, India and China.

Illustration in the textbook are very suitable to the text, but unfortunately all of them there are just photographs. Beside main text we see some sources and shorter explanations. We miss questions or tasks and maps, but at the end of the textbook there is a chronological table, recommended literature and name register.

II. The Qualitative research

1. THE DIDACTIC EQUIPMENT OF THE TEXTBOOKS

The textbook is a structure made of structural components of different nature. They are bearers of partial functions, which together form the main function of textbook – to be a educational mean. Jan Průcha distinguishes 36 components (27 verbal and 9 visual) of textbook. This divides into three basic groups: the presentation of the curriculum, the apparatus leading learning the curriculum and the orientation system.⁴³

The verbal presentation of the curriculum is a main text, additional texts, additional explanatory texts, a summary of the curriculum, an introduction to the school subject, notes and footnotes, glossaries etc. The visual presentation of the curriculum can be in realistic (reproduction of paintings, photographs) or symbolic form (schematic drawings and sketches, graphs, maps, timelines). A visual presentation depends on main text, but it retroactively affects the content and structure of explanatory text and a verbal presentation of curriculum.

The apparatus leading learning the curriculum is decisively involved in the management function of textbook in teaching and learning process. It fulfills its function in cooperation with elements of presentation of the curriculum and orientation system. It includes introduction to the textbook (an introduction and instructional – methodological introduction to work with the textbook), introductions of each thematic units, tables, exercises, questions and tasks, instructions, guidance and links to other information sources.

The third essential component of textbooks is the orientation system facilitating students work with the textbook, providing quick orientation in each part of the textbook, textbooks and assisting in searching necessary knowledge. These components include: content of textbook (at the beginning of the book), dividing textbooks into sections, chapters and subchapters; graphic symbols identifying the rules, laws, questions, tasks and exercises, glossary, name index, bibliography and recommended literature.

For an evaluation of didactic equipment of textbook we need to find out whether and how these elements are included in the textbook. We proceed as follows: We check each components noting into the table (see Attachment 1).

⁴³ The presentation of the curriculum: 9 verbal + 5 visual =14, the apparatus leading learning the curriculum: 14verbal + 4visual =18, the orientation system: 4verbal. Verbal components together 27 (9 of the presentation of the curriculum+ 14 of the apparatus leading learning the curriculum + 4 of the orientation system). Visual components together 9 (5 of the presentation of the curriculum+ 4 of the apparatus leading learning the curriculum). See: Průcha, *Učebnice*, 141–143.

We are interested only in their occurrence, not in the frequency of their use. According to the data in the table we count coefficients of didactic equipment of textbook: the coefficient of the presentation of the curriculum, the coefficient of the apparatus leading learning the curriculum and the coefficient of the orientation system, the coefficient of verbal components, the coefficient of visual components and finally the coefficient of didactic equipment of textbook. We get a percentage of actually used elements from a set of possible components. (For instance: coefficient of the presentation of the curriculum in the Slovak textbook = $12 \cdot 12 / 14 = 85\%$.) Finally we compute the coefficient of didactic equipment of textbook by getting share of its possible components (36).⁴⁴

The higher the coefficient, the higher is its didactic equipment. On the basis of partial coefficients we find out which components we need to correct in the textbook. The values should exceed 50%. When finding the negative state by subsequent change in the textbook missing components should be included.

	Kodajová	Bartlová	Száray	Salamon
The total didactic equipment of textbook	47%	47%	53%	52%

Our results⁴⁵ show that the highest didactic equipment is in the latest Hungarian textbook of Száray M. and J. Kaposi with small difference of second textbook of Konrad Salamon. Slovak textbooks have achieved little worse results, because of lower coefficient of an orientation system. However, they are below the mentioned minimum of 50%. The achieved results suggest averageness of examined textbooks.

⁴⁴ Because of possible interpretation problems we are interested only in detecting presence of individual components in the textbook and not in their frequency. The optimal frequency of individual elements in the subject, grade and school level was not accurately defined. For this reason, it is impossible to examine this feature of textbooks only this single measurement. The absence of components may reduce the potential effectiveness of a didactic equipment of the textbook. It is potential because used equipment if textbook still does not ensure their real effectiveness, but their mere existence, however, significantly influences it – by increasing it. Cf. Šimeková, Hodnotenie rukopisu Stanko a kol.: Vlastiveda pre 3. ročník ZŠ. In: *Technológia vzdelávania* no. 2, 10. It would be ideal if there was a practically available formula which would even include the frequency of elements, similar to the formula at the level of the text.

⁴⁵ For details see Attachment 1.

2. THE DIFFICULTNESS OF DIDACTIC TEXT

One of the research methods very usable in History textbooks, in which the text is the most important part, is the method of determining the difficulty of the text (an accessibility, an intelligibility and a clarity of the curriculum). The difficulty of didactic text is a summary of such text attributes that exist objectively in any text, and in the learning process they influence the perception, understanding and processing of text information by learner entity.

The underlying assumption is that a certain level of difficulty of the text may be optimal for its perception, in contrast to the other levels the difficulty which may complicate the learning system or even because of overloaded information burden a short-term memory and attention.⁴⁶ Therefore this measuring is very important. Another problem to be found in the texts is overloading by scientific information so -called pseudoproficiency, i.e. inappropriate use of technical terms by students, which shows misunderstanding of the meaning of technical terms and contextual links.

This determination of text difficulty can be estimated, for example in the form of questionnaire for students or teachers. Very useful is a use of an assessment scale for individual components of the text: e.g. difficult terms, detailed analysis etc. Less subjective determination is to create tasks for students and based on their results to determine the difficulty of the text. These tasks can be targeted for example to select or organize information, complete missing words in the text etc.

Most objective finding is the formula of text parameters for qualitative expression of level of difficulty of the text, respectively especially for textbooks' texts, which we can determine after an operative measure and characterizing what causes this difficulty of the text. The most appropriate formula is the linguistically-qualitative method consisting in determining the difficulty of textbooks based on the presence and arrangement of any measurable units of the text: so-called Käte Nestler Textkomplizierheit's formula modified by J. Průcha.⁴⁷ This determining of difficulty is primarily intended for the detection of difficulty of explanatory texts of presentation of curriculum, but of course it can also be used for other types of texts. The calculation formulas of this method:

$$T = T(s) + T(p),$$

⁴⁶ Research has shown that the increased not corresponding level of difficulty of the curriculum always leads to a reduction of the level of learning outcomes. Čapek, *Didaktika dějepisu II.*, 172.

⁴⁷ For other methods see: Průcha, *Hodnocení obtížnosti učebnic*, 56–73.

Where $T(s)$ = syntactic difficulty and $T(p)$ = semantics difficulty, which we count:

$$T(s) = 0,1 \cdot V \cdot U,$$

where V = average length of sentence,

U = number of verbs

$$T(p) = 100 \cdot \frac{\Sigma P}{\Sigma N} \cdot \frac{\Sigma P_{(1)} + 3 \Sigma P_{(2)} + 2 \Sigma P_{(3)} + 2 \Sigma P_{(4)} + \Sigma P_{(5)}}{\Sigma N}$$

where P = difficulty of terms

P_1 = familiar terms

P_2 = technic terms

P_3 = factual terms

P_4 = numeral terms

P_5 = repeated terms

N = number of words

Σ = summa, total number of all entities

The weight of individual categories of terms varies according to the expected difficulty for the students, therefore the specialized terminology is the most important factor – three times more important and factual terms twice as the rest of words. The difficulty of the text can take values in the range of 1 (minimum level) to 100 (maximum level).

For example, in textbooks for primary schools the measured values range between 27–63, for vocational schools between 26–49. The largest value of T so far has been measured in the textbook of the Medical Biochemistry, where $T = 75.4$ points.⁴⁸ This method is based on the recognition that an objective difficulty of a text is caused by factors derived from two sources:

a. syntactic structure of the text, which serves as a kind of standard for the content of what we mean. These structures have a large variety of types with different complexity, which affects a perception and an understanding of the text. These characteristics can be expressed by two qualitative characteristics (U and V), which are incorporated in the formula.

b. semantic structure of the text. Semantic factor is of great importance and is therefore covered a total of five characteristics. The difficulty of the text is determined by what kind of concept, and in what proportions are represented in it. This is just an example of textbooks that didactically pass knowledge from different sciences, and therefore largely operate with special concepts and factual data. Usually this causes oversaturation by professional and other terms. It also depends on whether the terms in the text occurs only once or whether they are

⁴⁸ *Průcha, Učebnice*, 62.

repeated. Recurring terms have less impact on the overall level of semantic text than concepts appearing for the first time, resp. appearing in the text once.⁴⁹

In applying this method we use following hypothesis: The average difficulty of presenting of curriculum is directly proportional to the age of students. The pattern is clear: the higher the grade school, the higher the average level of difficulty of text in the textbook and increasing degree of difficulty of the text from lower to higher grades is uniform. These hypotheses, however, the practice does not confirm. Difficulty of texts is disproportionate to age of students and pupils and does not increase uniformly from lower grades, respectively from elementary school to secondary. There is a large differentiation in the difficulty of textbooks of same subject between the following grades, differentiation between primary school textbooks and textbooks for the first year of grammar school or vocational school. In most cases the problem is the semantic difficulty, respectively its sub-parameters. It turns out that the authors have sensitive approach to the formal aspect of the text but errors were made in the qualitative (semantic) page generated text for students and pupils. Large differences were also in the difficulty of the text of individual subjects that did not stem from the character of subject usually considered to be relatively easy, but from the number of professional texts, complicated sentence structures and very long of sentence units used in creating these books.

The measured values to 20 points represent the lowest level and 60 or more the highest level. They can be interpreted for different purposes of evaluation for detailed clarification of the textbook examined (while focusing on partial measurement), in particular to identify the reasons why is the examined text in textbook so difficult. It can be the syntactic difficulty or the semantic difficulty or a difficulty can appear in both areas. Most often it is an oversaturation by technical terms. This way we receive concrete recommendations for recasting the examined textbook e.g. to reduce number of technical terms etc. It is also possible to use the values for the comparison of textbooks of different subjects of the same year, the same curriculum in different grades, one subject in different types of schools, the same subject by different authors, the same subject at different times, the same subject in different countries.

	Kodajová	Bartlová	Száray	Salamon
Total difficulty of text in the textbook	33,7	35,5	37,16	35,34

⁴⁹ Průcha, Učebnice, 35.

In our comparison we found very similar total difficulty of text in examined textbooks. It was not a big surprise that the most demanding text contains the latest Hungarian textbook written by current requirements for the use of sources and the development of abilities of students. The easiest difficulty of text is to be found in the textbook by Kodajová, Daniela – Tonková, Mária: *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Svetové dejiny*.⁵⁰ The value of 35 based on our previous research⁵¹ could be perceived as suitable for secondary school students. The findings confirmed that language differences do not affect the measurement of difficulty of textbooks, on the contrary, this method is applicable regardless of the language.

Conclusion

Before the evaluation of the textbooks we set working hypotheses that were only partly confirmed. Our expectations about didactic equipment of textbooks were not met. Our results show that the examined textbooks use approx. only half of the possible didactic tools, Slovak textbooks, however, are even below this limit, which is also the minimum. Of course it is necessary to take into account that the formula for calculating the didactic equipment of the textbook excludes the possibility of recognizing a density measured elements, only searches for their presence in the textbook, and it is therefore not possible to examine this feature of textbooks only by this single measurement.

Nevertheless, our findings are significant. The biggest omissions were in the following areas: a summary of the curriculum and the associated various stimuli for repeating at the end of year, total student stimulation, application of knowledge into practice, means for self-reflection of students and different registers. Despite the large overall gaiety of color in the textbook authors did not fully use the possibility of the didactic function of the cover. In these areas it would be appropriate to make changes. Measuring didactic difficulty of the text showed ideal values for all examined textbooks. It would be appropriate to continue in this trend in the future.

Regarding our qualitative assessment in all the textbooks we found various inaccuracies and minor errors. What was interesting, however, they compensate

⁵⁰ The evaluation showed little difference between the Slovak textbooks written one way, but by different authors.

⁵¹ See: *Bobačiaková, Porovnanie učebníc dejepisu pre stredné odborné školy na Slovensku, Česku a Maďarsku na príklade témy Rozpad Rakúsko – Uhorska a vznik Česko–Slovenska. (The Comparison of History Textbooks for Vocational Schools in Slovakia, Czech Republic and Hungary at the Example of the Disruption of the Austria–Hungary and the Creation of Czech–Slovakia, 158.*

each other. Both Slovak textbooks do not contain all relevant information, they lack cartograms and particularly in comparison with the Hungarian textbook of J. Kaposi and M. Száray and requirements for the school leaving exam they do not develop enough all intelligence competencies of students. The textbook on world history contains number of inappropriate formulations. In this textbook, however, we can find a timeline.

Very interesting is the textbook of J. Kaposi. and M. Száray; innovative is its graphic aspect, the use of sources, illustrative material and tasks that really practice a variety of intelligence competencies. Its disadvantage as many teachers complain about is that the amount of supplemental material is several times larger than needed and main text is very short. For this reason, work with this textbook consists in good choice of sources and completing main text, which it is very difficult.

The graphic level of textbook of K. Salamon compared to other textbooks is very low, it is written in very nationalist way and we miss questions, tasks or cartograms. It is rather a collection of learning texts than a textbook. As a positive value we find name register and distribution of curriculum into smaller units, which allow more chronological sequence than other studied textbooks.

Used sources

- Bartlová, Alena. – Letz Róbert, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií. Národné dejiny*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo. 2005.
- Bohačiaková, Mariana. *Porovnanie učebníc dejepisu pre stredné odborné školy na Slovensku, Česku a Maďarsku na príklade témy Rozpad Rakúska – Uhorska a vznik Česko – Slovenska*. (Rigorózna práca). Univerzita Komenského, Pedagogická fakulta, Katedra histórie. 2011.
- Čapek, Vratislav. *Didaktika dejepisu II. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství*. 1988.
- Kodajová, Daniela. – Tonková, Mária. *Dejepis Svetové dejiny pre 3. ročník gymnázií*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo. 2006.
- Salamon, Konrad. *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyv Kiadó. 1995.
- Száray, Miklós. – Kaposi, József. *Történelem IV. középszintű, 12. évfolyam*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó. 2009.
- Průcha, Jan. *Učebnice: Teorie a analýzy edukačního média*. Brno: Paido. 1998
- Průcha, Jan. *Hodnocení obtížnosti učebnic*. Praha: Výzkumný ústav odborního školství. 1984.
- Šimeková, Jela. *Hodnotenie rukopisu Stanko a kol.: Vlastiveda pre 3. ročník ZŠ*. In *Technológia vzdelávania 2*, 1993.

Appendix

The attachment nr. 1: *The table of partial results of didactic equipment of the textbook*

	Chylova	Száray forrásközpontú történelem	Sipos	Balázs	Száray
1. The presentation of the curriculum	12	9	9	11	8
The coefficient of the presentation of the curriculum	85%	64%	64%	79%	57%
2. The apparatus leading learning the curriculum	6	7	3	2	8
The coefficient of the apparatus leading learning the curriculum	33%	39%	16%	11%	44%
3. The orientation systeme	2	3	2	2	2
The coefficient of the orientation systeme	50%	75%	50%	50%	50%
Verbal components	13	12	9	9	11
The coefficient of verbal components	48%	44%	30%	33%	40%
Visual components	7	7	5	6	7
The coefficient of visual components	78%	78%	56%	67%	78%
The structural components of the textbook	20	19	14	15	18
The total didactic equipment of the textbook	56%	53%	39%	42%	50%

The Attachment nr. 2: *The table of results of the difficulty of didactic text*

	Chýlová	Balázs	Sipos	Száray forrásközpontú	Száray
Number of words	1037	1062	1058	1065	1044
Number of sentences	70	73	75	57	70
Average length of sentence	14,81	14,55	14,11	18,68	14,91
Number of verbs	101	130	112	106	101
Average length of sentence unit	10,27	8,17	9,47	10,05	10,34
Syntactic difficulty	14,81	11,89	13,36	18,77	15,42
Number of terms	376	394	388	370	355
Familiar terms	170	142	197	217	189
Technic terms	73	84	88	71	95
Factual terms	53	68	42	44	28
Numeral terms	12	31	22	6	9
Repeated terms	68	69	39	32	34
Semantics difficulty	20,5	23,1	21,63	18,39	19,01
Total didactic difficulty of textbook	35,7	35	35	37,16	34,46

The capacities of microhistory

Looking at the contents of this conference volume, it seems to me that almost all the papers share the same outlook – all but this one. Every participant of the conference held in November 2014 was concerned with the writing of history as a social and cultural practice, the uses of history in past times. Every author of this volume looks back and devotes one's attention to ways historians wrote history in the past, but not usually in very remote times. This paper, however, focusses on the future: how history will be written – or at least, how it might be written in the years to come. Its approach is, therefore, not historiographical, but methodological. And, finally, it is taking a clear stand for microhistory, that contrasts with the the balanced and neutral stance of other papers to be presented here. This essay stands, therefore, out of the programme: not simply partisan and unbalanced but also exaggerated and therefore suspect.

Although all this might make this paper stand out here, in this volume, it is certainly still not completely out of place. Since the subject of the conference, the study of the ways historians wrote history in past, has always had a theoretical and methodological side, beyond the purely historiographical one. The questions concerning who wrote certain historical works, when and why, have always been accompanied by other questions concerning the general ways of how the relationship of the actual present and the past is seen, how knowledge can be generated about the past and what methods were considered legitimate in doing so. It might be also be argued that although that the study of the writing history is necessarily facing the past, we are talking and writing in the present, and no present action makes any sense if we have no intentions about the future. So, the outlook of this paper might not be fundamentally different from all the others – it just emphasizes something that might go unnoticed elsewhere. And finally, it is the conviction of historiography, a *sine qua non* of our profession, that historians are never neutral and impartial, for they have simply no chance to be like that – and therefore we ourselves, the historians of the other historians' work, we cannot be that, either. So, the confessed partial stance of this chapter for microhistory is just a frank statement of something that we all share. That makes it possible that a few relevant ideas may be touched upon by it, that concern the heart of the matter that was the subject of the conference held at the University of Debrecen in November 2014.

This paper intends to map the possibilities of microhistory in the writing of history. Having defined microhistory and placed it halfway between social and cultural history, a special attention will be given to the relationship between microhistory on the one hand and present fashionable currents of history on the other. Finally, four different forms, say four stages will be suggested in which the approach of microhistory can be efficiently used in producing historical knowledge.

Microhistory and experimental or global histories

In my understanding, microhistory, originally an Italian school of writing history (under the name of *microstoria*), originating in the 1970s and becoming world-wide known through the scholarship of Carlo Ginzburg and Giovanni Levi, finally getting fashionable also among English-speaking historians at the end of the 20th century, can be defined through three characteristics: first of all the intensive historical investigation of a relatively well defined smaller object (be it a single event, a local community or an individual), then, the conviction of the microhistorians that this investigation can lead them to finding answers to 'great historical questions', and, finally, that microhistory always regards those who lived in the past as actors, people who make decisions and thus form their lives in an active fashion.

As far as I can see, microhistory stands with one of its legs in the tradition of structure-oriented social history and with the other in the group of the approaches that can be classified as cultural history, that want to explore experiences of past actors as well as put a stress on their own interpretations of what happened to them.¹ This position of microhistory can be advantageous, since histories that concentrate exclusively on historical understanding (*Verstehen*), those who want to find only meaning, cannot get closer to the past than the authors of their sources.² It is, therefore, advisable to apply another approach as well, give the *a posteriori* explanations of the social history, using all the insights and methodological knowledge of the present-day social historian. (The best is to try to give several explanations at once to stress the arbitrary character of these.) I am convinced that one of the strongest arguments for microhistory is that it offers a possibility to blend the approaches of social and cultural histories. Its position between social and cultural history provides

¹ Ute, *Kompendium Kulturgeschichte*, 456.

² Ute, *Kompendium Kulturgeschichte*, 406–407.

microhistory with chances better than usual to arriving at valid new historical understandings.

I would like to argue that several works of the so called experimental history (transgressing the borderline of history and fiction) demonstrate the compatibility of the microhistorical approach and the experimentation with historical narratives, which is often labelled a post-modernist way of writing history.

John Demos e. g. built a fictitious monologue in his *The unredeemed captive*, while Simon Schama deliberately juxtaposed fictitious and real elements in the texts of his famous *Dead certainties*. Robin Bisha embarked on writing a pseudo-autobiography in an article, based on extensive research, and Russell McCormmach invented the figure of a German theoretical physicist merging real characters. Several attempts at merging history with literature are published in a volume edited by Alun Munslow and Robert A. Rosenstone. One of the books of the latter stands out because of the distinctly literary character of its narrative.³

The microhistorical approach seems to fit perfectly with these crossover attempts, and such attempts do not disqualify a narrative being history, if we agree with Reinhart Koselleck according to whom sources never lead the hand of the historian, rather tie it, sources must not be contradicted, they will never prescribe what the historian should actually write.⁴

It is more surprising, that microhistorical approach can similarly co-exist with global history, which seems to be *par excellence* macro-oriented. Not only Ginzburg tried to understand colonization through the life of one person, Jean-Pierre Purry, but others argue, too, that world history should be presented through the eyes of a single individual – e. g. Dale Tomich.⁵ Alexandra Parma Cook and Noble David Cook's microhistory of a sixteenth-century Spanish *conquistador* and his case of bigamy has trans-Atlantic connections at the core of the book.⁶ Randy J. Sparks's microhistory of two princes of a West-African kingdom (sold as slaves but redeemed from slavery) offers amazing insights into trans-Atlantic and cross-cultural connections in the 18th century.⁷

³ Demos, *The unredeemed captive* (1996). Schama, *Dead certainties* (1992); Bisha, "Reconstructing the voice of a noblewoman of the time of Peter the Great" In: Menshikova, *An experiment in (pseudo) autobiographical writing*, 51–63.; McCormmach, *Night Thoughts of a Classical Physicist* (1982).; Munslow–Rosenstone (eds.) *Experiments in Rethinking History* (2004).; Rosenstone: *Mirror in the Shrine: American Encounters with Meiji Japan* (1988).

⁴ Koselleck, *Futures Past*, 111.

⁵ Ginzburg, *Latitude, slaves and the bible*, 665–683.; Tomich, *The order of historical time*, XIII, 4, 1958. 2008.

⁶ Cook–Cook, *Good Faith and Truthful Ignorance* (1991).

⁷ Sparks, *The Two Princes of Calabar* (2004).

It seems that on the one hand microhistory can deepen historical understanding, while on the other it is compatible with the outlook of global history, since microhistory demands exploring all the implications of the case under the historian's microscope – including global ones, too.

The uses of microhistory

Having established that a microhistorical approach is compatible with some of the fashionable ways of writing history, the question arises: why would it be worthwhile to take the trouble and fumble with microhistory at all? My answer to this questions is based on the conviction that microhistory has as yet unexplored capacities for tomorrow's history.

To the founders of *microstoria*, the value of microhistory rested mainly in its subversive capacity. Even as late as in 2010, Carlo Ginzburg argued that the case may indicate the weak points of dominant epistemological paradigms.⁸ But if microhistory aspires to make general conclusions, to find answers to 'great historical questions' – which is clearly the case –, we cannot be satisfied with this. So let me suggest two more ways how microhistory can be used in the production of historical knowledge: as a junior partner and in a cooperation with macrohistory. Finally, it is also possible to combine the previously mentioned three fashions: subversion, junior partnership and cooperation.

To start with, I would like to evoke four books that share an important feature: all have a main argument, a backbone formed by macrohistorical considerations, often even underpinned by statistical evidence. But all of these also include dozens of most interesting short cases which bring their narratives quite close to those of microhistorical works (usually concentrating on one case, but exploring it in more detail and depth). In Joanne M. Ferraro's book about marital conflicts and separation in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Venice, in Gabriella Erdélyi's book about violent conflicts in late medieval Hungary that ended up in a Papal court of justice in Rome, in Adam Zamoyski's book about the retreat of Napoleon's *Grande Armée* from Moscow in 1812, and finally in Orlando Figes' book about the fate of Russian families under Stalin⁹ – in each of the ventures represented by these books microhistory is only a junior partner, nevertheless an important one. Here, microhistorical approach has a vital contribution in making a better history out of more traditional, fundamentally

⁸ Ginzburg, "Postface: Réflexions sur une hypothèse" in: *ibid.*: *Mythes emblèmes traces. Morphologie et histoire*. 361–362.

⁹ Ferraro, *Marriage Wars in Late Renaissance Venice* (2001).; Erdélyi, *Szökött szerzetesek*. (2011).; Zamoyski, *1812: Napoleon's Fatal March on Moscow* (2004).; Figes, *The Whisperers*. (2007).

macro-oriented historical works; the details of the several cases presented distinguish Ferraro's Erdélyi's, Zamoyski's and Figes's books from mainstream history. They convey lived experience to the readers, bring past people very close to them, and keep scholarly analysis on the level of the individuals, where history is lived. This can therefore be regarded as one of the possible uses of microhistory. It has been built upon partnership, rather than rivalry between macro- and microhistories. I would say that in these ventures microhistory occupies the position of a junior partner. Let us, then, make one more step into this direction: from partnership to cooperation.

An alternation of macro- and microhistory was suggested by Siegfried Kracauer as early as in 1969. He thinks that historians should concentrate on microhistory and occasionally give macrohistorical overviews.¹⁰ John Lewis Gaddis claims that great historians have long moved from micro- to macro-perspective and back.¹¹ But this cooperation might get a theoretically well-founded organized form. It is evident that if microhistory wants to find the answer to a great historical question in the deep-going analysis of a single case, it is of crucial importance how this case is selected – unless we think that 'the sea is present in every single drop of water' (which is the underlying assumption behind Erich Auerbach's fantastic *Mimesis*).¹²

Instead, I would like to argue that historians, at certain (but not an early) stage of their careers might feel that they can not only identify the problems that they have long faced in a single case, but also give the answers to these problems in applying a microhistorical approach and exploring the single case in depth. So, the first stage is acquiring a profound knowledge of the period, its source material and historiography, and the second phase is what the American pragmatist philosopher, Charles S. Peirce calls 'abduction'. (It was an American historian, Edward Muir who linked microhistory to 'abduction'.) According to Peirce, when we are looking for a theory, we take our starting point in facts. We do not make random guesses, but use our intuition. And what can happen, is what he calls 'abduction': a sudden regrouping of hitherto unconscious information into a new form. This is the only possible way to form new hypotheses.¹³ I think that microhistory is born by way of 'abduction', based on the self-similarity of history.¹⁴ The results of the microhistorical investigations, and this is stage number three, can finally change the outlook of macrohistory, might question

¹⁰ Kracauer, *History: The Last Things Before The Last*, 104–138.

¹¹ Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How historians map the past*, 81–84.

¹² Auerbach, *Mimesis*, 509.

¹³ Muir, *Introduction: "Observing trifles"* in: Muir–Ruggiero (eds.): *Microhistory and the Lost Peoples of Europe*, viii, xvi–ix; cf. Sebeok–Umiker-Sebeok, 'You know my method'. 1980.

¹⁴ For the argument about self-similarity see: Magnusson – Szijártó, *What is Microhistory?* 63–64.

old orthodoxies. Here we have reached the point so dear to Ginzburg or the generation of 1968 in general. There is a final step to be made: to combine all the so far mentioned uses of microhistory – subversion, junior partnership and cooperation with macrohistory – in a comprehensive approach.

It was almost fifteen years ago, when a friend and colleague of mine stood up at the end of a lecture of mine, giving an overview of microhistory, saying: 'All this is very well, but how to write the microhistory of Hungary?' And he repeated this three years ago at another conference. By now, I think I have an answer, at least in the form of a project of writing the microhistory of 18th-century Hungary that combines in its comprehensive approach the possible uses of microhistory.

The recipe goes like this: get prepared by studying your period for at least a quarter of century. Then mix macrohistorical arguments and microhistorical case studies so that the latter could add the historical actors' experiences and representations to the learned explanations of the social historian. Choose your microhistorical cases so that they could represent the main historical problems of the age, say one case for each chapter, and explore these so deep that you could suggest answers for the great historical questions of the age. And if you are lucky, you might end up with a dish that refutes earlier established historical knowledge and opens up new vistas for research.

Bibliography

- Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur*, 2nd edn. Francke Verlag: Bern, 1959. (1st edn 1946)
- Bisha, Robin. "Reconstructing the voice of a noblewoman of the time of Peter the Great" In: Daria Mikhailovna Menshikova, *An experiment in (pseudo) autobiographical writing, Rethinking History 2*, 1998.
- Cook, Alexandra Parma – Cook, Noble David. *Good Faith and Truthful Ignorance: A Case of Transatlantic Bigamy*. Duke University Press: Durham, NC–London, 1991.
- Demos, John. *The unredeemed captive. A family story of early America*. Macmillan Papermac: London, 1996. (1st edn 1994)
- Erdélyi, Gabriella. *Szökött szerzetesek. Erősök és fiatalok a késő középkorban [Monks on the Run. Violence and Young People in the Late Middle Ages]*. Libri: Budapest, 2011.
- Ferraro, M. Joanne. *Marriage Wars in Late Renaissance Venice*. Oxford University Press: Oxford–New York, 2001.
- Figes, Orlando. *The Whisperers. Private Life in Stalin's Russia*. Allen Lane: London, 2007.
- Gaddis, John Lewis *The Landscape of History: How historians map the past*. Oxford University Press: Oxford – New York, 2002.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. Postface: Réflexions sur une hypothèse, in: *ibid.*: *Mythes emblèmes traces. Morphologie et histoire*. Verdier: Paris, 2010.

- Ginzburg, Carlo. Latitude, slaves and the bible: An experiment in microhistory. *Critical Inquiry* 31, 2005.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Futures Past: On the semantics of historical time*. Columbia University Press: New York, 2004. (1st edn 1979)
- Kracauer, Siegfried. *History: The Last Things Before The Last*. Completed by Paul Oskar Kristeller. Oxford University Press: New York, 1969.
- Magnusson, Sigurður Gylfi – Szijártó M. István. *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice*. Routledge: London–New York, 2013.
- McCormach, Russell. *Night Thoughts of a Classical Physicist*. Harvard University Press: London–Cambridge, MA, 1982.
- Muir, Edward. „Introduction: Observing trifles.” In: Edward Muir – Guido Ruggiero (eds.): *Microhistory and the Lost Peoples of Europe*. The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore–London, 1991.
- Munslow, Alun – Rosenstone, A. Robert (eds.). *Experiments in Rethinking History*. Routledge: New York–London, 2004.
- Rosenstone, A. Robert. *Mirror in the Shrine: American Encounters with Meiji Japan*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA – London, 1988.
- Schama, Simon. *Dead certainties (Unwarranted speculations)*. Vintage Books: New York, 1992. (1st edn 1991)
- Sebeok, A. Thomas – Umiker-Sebeok, Jean. *You know my method?: A juxtaposition of Charles S. Peirce and Sherlock Holmes*. Gaslight Publications: Bloomington, IN, 1980.
- Sparks, J. Randy. *The Two Princes of Calabar: An eighteenth-century Atlantic odyssey*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA–London, 2004.
- Tomich, Dale. *The order of historical time: The Longue Durée and Micro-History*. Paper presented at “The Longue Durée and World-Systems Analysis. Colloquium to Commemorate the 50th Anniversary of Fernand Braudel, Histoire et sciences sociales: La longue durée. Annales E. S. C., XIII, 4, 1958. October 24–25, 2008. Fernand Braudel Center, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY 13902” Manuscript Online: HTTP: <http://www2.binghamton.edu/fbc/archive/tomich102508.pdf> (accessed 13. October 2012).
- Ute, Daniel. *Kompendium Kulturgeschichte: Theorien, Praxis, Schlüsselwörter*, 4th edn. Suhrkamp: Frankfurt am Main 2004.
- Zamoyski, Adam. *1812: Napoleon's Fatal March on Moscow*. HarperCollins: London, 2004.

Appendix¹

1. Literature about the medieval Hungarian historical writing and thinking in foreign languages

Előd Nemerikényi: Latin classics in medieval Hungary, eleventh century. Debrecen–Budapest, 2004.

Carlile Aylmer Macartney: Studies on the Earliest Hungarian Historical Sources 3 vols. Budapest, 1938–40.

Carlile Aylmer Macartney: The Medieval Hungarian Historians: A Critical and Analytical Guide. Cambridge, 1953.

Bálint Hóman: La première période de l'histoire hongroise. Revue des Études Hongroises et Finno-Ougriennes. 1925. 125–164.

Bálint Hóman: Les récentes études relatives à l'origine du peuple hongrois. Revue des Études Hongroises et Finno-Ougriennes. 1924. 156–171.

Kornél Szovák: L'histoire hongroise à l'époque árpádienne. Les Hongrois et l'Europe. 1999. 375–384.

László Veszprémy: Historical Past and Political Present in the Latin Chronicles of Hungary (12–13-th Centuries). In: The Medieval Chronicle. Ed.: Erik Kooper. Amsterdam 1990. 260–268. (Costerus New Series, 120.)

János Horváth: Die ungarischen Chronisten der Angiovinenzeit. Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 1971. 21. 321–377.

Adriano Papo: Umanisti e storiografi italiani alle corti d'Ungheria e di Transilvania. In: Hungarica Varietas. Mediatori culturali tra Italia e Ungheria. A cura di Adriano Papo e Gizella Németh. Edizione della Laguna, 2003.

Márk Aurél Érszegi: San Gerardo: mediatore attuale. In: Hungarica Varietas. Mediatori culturali tra Italia e Ungheria. A cura di Adriano Papo e Gizella Németh. Edizione della Laguna, 2003. 61–66.

Harold Steinacker: Zu den ungarischen Geschichtsquellen des Mittelalters. Südost-Forschungen Bd. 13 (1953) 265–270.

San Gerardo fra Venezia e Ungheria [Szent Gellért, Velence és Magyarország]. A cura di M. A. Érszegi, Venezia 2002.

Elvira Patakí: Splendor doctorum. La mémoire de Saint Jerome dans la littérature hongroise du Moyen Age. In: Schola Europaea. Les valeurs de l'Europe-L'Europe des valeurs. [Európa értékei – az értékek Európája. A Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe, 2007. november 22–23. c. konferencia előadásai.] Eds.:

¹ The content of the present bibliography is certainly far from complete (The Editors).

László Havas – László Takács – Imre Tegye. Budapest–Debrecen. 2009. 91–114.

Sándor Domanovszky: Die Interpolationen der Wiener Ungarischen Bilderchronik. Ungarische Rundschau, 1912. I. 771–799.

Ryszard Grzesik: Kronika wegierska-polska. Warszawa, 2003.

Marian Plezia: Ungarische Beziehungen der ältesten polnischen Chronisten. Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. 1959. 7. 285–295.

Gyula Kristó: Über die Hunnentradition der Ungarn. In: Varia Eurasistica. Festschrift für Professor András Róna-Tas. Szeged, 1991, 117–125.

László Veszprémi: La tradizione unno-ungariara nella Cronaca Universale di Fra Paolino da Venezia. In: Spiritualità e lettere nella cultura italiana e ungherese del basso medioevo. A cura di Sante Graciotti – Cesare Vasoli. Firenze, 1995. 355–375.

Master Roger's Epistle to the sorrowful lament upon the destruction of the Kingdom of Hungary by Tatars. (Translated and annotated by János M. Bak and Martyn Rady.) Central European University Press Budapest–New York, 2010.

László Havas: La conception de l'histoire chez le poète hongrois Janus Pannonius. Acta Conventus Neo-Latin Budapestiensis. ACMRS, Arizona. 2010. 281–289.

Antal Csiba: Petri Ransani Epitome rerum Hungaricarum. Hajdúböszörmény, 1932.

Die Denkwürdigkeiten der Helene Kottanerin (1439–1440.) Hrsg Karl Mollay. Wien, 1971. (Wiener Neudrucke. 2.)

Simonis de Kéza: Gesta Hungarorum. Simon of Kéza: The Deeds of the Hungarians. (Edited and translated by László Veszprémi and Frank Schaer. With a study by Jenő Szűcs.). CEU Press, Budapest, New York, 1999.

Die Gesta Hungarorum des anonymen Notars. Die älteste Darstellung der ungarischen Geschichte. Hrsg. Gabriel Silagi, Mitarb. László Veszprémi. Sigmaringen, 1991. (Ungarns Geschichtsschreiber. 4.)

Kornél Szovák: Wer war der anonyme Notar? (Zur Bestimmung des Verfassers der Gesta Ungarorum). Ungarn–Jahrbuch. 1994. 19. 1–16.

György Györffy: Formation d'états au IX-e siècle suivant les "Gesta Hungarorum" du Notaire Anonyme. Nouvelles études historiques, Budapest, 1965. 1. 27–54.

Anonymus, notary of King Béla: The deeds of the Hungarians. (Edited, translated and annotated by Martin Rad and László Veszprémi.) CEU Press, Budapest, New York, 2010.

Alexandru Madgearu: The Romanians in the Anonymus Gesta Hungarorum. Truth and fiction. Romanian Cultural Institute. Cluj-Napoca, 2005.

János Horváth: Meister P. und sein Werk. Die türkssprachlichen Kenntnisse des Meisters P. A. A. A. S. H. XVIII. 1970. 371–412.

Konrad Schünemann: Die „Römer“ des anonymen Notars. Ungarische Jahrbücher, VI. 1926. 448–457.

Konrad Josef Heilig: Wer war der anonyme Notar? Ein Beitrag zur ungarischen Diplomatie und Historiographie. A Bécsi Magyar Történeti Intézet Évkönyve, 1932. 2. 1–61.

Gernot Nussbaeher: Wer war der Verfasser der Wandchronik? Eine wissenschaftliche Diskussion von zwei Jahrhunderten wieder aktuell. Karpatenrundschau, 8. Jg. 16. Januar, 1976.

Sándor Domanovszky: Die Chronik Simonis von Kéza. Ungarische Rundschau, (1912). 137–154.

Sándor Domanovszky: Die Interpolationen der Ungarischen Bilderchronik. Ungarische Rundschau, (1912). 771–799.

Sándor Domanovszky: Simonis de Kéza Gesta Hungarorum. In: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. Ed. Emericus Szentpétery. I. Budapest, (1937). 129–194.

Sándor Domanovszky: *Cronici Hungarici composito saeculi XIV*. *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. Ed. Emericus Szentpétery. I. Budapest, (1937). 217–505.

Sándor Domanovszky: *Chronicon Poseniense*. In: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. Ed. Emericus Szentpétery. II. Budapest, (1937). 7–51.

Sándor Domanovszky: *Chronicon Monacense*. In: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. Ed. Emericus Szentpétery. II. Budapest, (1937). 53–86.

Sándor Domanovszky: *Chronicon rhythmicum Henrici de Mügeln*. In: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. Ed. Emericus Szentpétery. II. Budapest, (1937). 225–277.

2. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking during the 16th–18th centuries in foreign languages

Endre Veress: *Catalogo ungherese dei manoscritti bolognesi del Marsigli*. Ateneo Letterario, Budapest. 1907.

L. Frati: *Catalogo dei manoscritti di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili*. Olschki, Firenze, 1928.

Luigi Ferdinando Marsili: *Memorie e introduzione all'istoria della ribellione d'Ungheria*. Ms. Marsili. n. 28.

C. Tagliaviani: *Luigi Ferdinando Marsili e la scrittura „runica“ dei siculi di Transilvania*. Bologna, 1930.

Luigi Ferdinando Marsili: *Autobiografia*, a cura di E. Lovarini. Bologna, 1930.

R. Gherardi: *Potere e costituzione a Vienna fra Sei e Settecento. Il „buon ordine“ di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili*. Bologna, 1980.

Gyula Herczeg: L'Autobiografia di Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli e l'Ungheria. In: AA. V.V. , Venezia, Italia, Ungheria fra Arcadia e Illuminismo. A cura di Béla Köpeczi e Péter Sárközy. Budapest, 1982. 65–85.

Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli: Relazioni di confini della Croazia e della Transilvania a sua Maesta Cesarea (1699–1701). A cura di R. Gherardi. Modena, 1986. 2. vol.

Zsuzsanna Rozsnyói: La storia ungherese vista da Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli. In: „Anecdota”, no. 2. 1999. 75–93.

Zsuzsanna Rozsnyói: Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli e gli ungheresi. Alcune considerazioni sul Marsigli storico. In: *Hungarica Varietas*. Mediatori culturali tra Italia e Ungheria. A cura di Adriano Papo e Gizella Németh. Edizione della Laguna, 2003. 133–140.

Tünde Cserepes: Measuring identity (Károlyi Sándor önéletírásáról). *European Review of History*, 2012. Vol. 19. 729–748.

Gyurkovits Georg: Biographie des Huszaren-Obristen Johann Lipszky von Szedlicsna aus dessen eigenhaendigen Notaten gezogen. *Oesterreichische Blaetter für Literatur, Kunst, Geschichte, Geographie, Statistik und Naturkunde*, 4. 1947. 1121–1123., 1125–1127., 1137.1139., 1141–1142., 1145–1146.

George Kiss: Lipszky's Map and the First General Land Survey of Hungary (1786–1806.) *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters*. Vol. 23. 1942. 449–455.

László Szörényi: Le fonti antiche dei trattati filosofici di Galeotto, In: Galeotto Marzio e l'umanesimo italiano ed europeo, Atti del LII convegno di studio Narni 8–11 novembre 1975, Narni, Centro Studi Storici, 153–163.

Ioachim Craciun: Cronocarul Szamosközy si insemnarile lui privatoare la romani 1566–1608. Cluj, 1928

Attila's Image in the Poetry and Historiography of the Central European Baroque, In: Attila, The Man and his Image, szerk. Franz H. Bäuml–Marianna Birnbaum, Budapest, Corvina, Published under the auspices of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, 99–105. 1993.

Imre Wellmann: Mátyás Bél, a Polygraph in Hungary in the 18th century. *Hungarian Studies*. 1985. 2. 191–204.

Imre Wellmann: Mathias Bél, organisateur de la recherche scientifique. In: Jacques Le Goff – Béla Köpeczi (ed.): *Intellectuels français, intellectuels hongrois: XIII^e–XX^e siècles*. Budapest: Akadémiai – Paris: CNRS, 1985, 153–158.

László Szörényi: Venere e la vergine – ciclo poetico in latino di Ferenc Lénárd Szegedi su santa Margherita d'Ungheria. In: *Schola Europaea*. Les valeurs de l'Europe-L'Europe des valeurs. (Európa értékei – az értékek Európája. A Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe, 2007. november 22–23. c. konferencia előadásai.) Eds.: László Havas–László Takács–Imre Tegye. Budapest–Debrecen, 2009. 281–313.

Jacques Bongars (ed.): *Rerum hungaricarum scriptores varii, historici, geographici*. Francofurti: apud heredes Andreae Wecheli, Claudium Marnium et Joan. Anbrium, 1600.

György Fejér: *Memoria St. Katonae*. Buda. 1835.

Orsolya Báthory: György Pray's unpublished manuscript: *Epitome rerum sub Josepho II., Leopoldo II. et Francisco I. regibus Hungariae gestarum*. In: *Schola Europaea. Les valeurs de l'Europe-L'Europe des valeurs. (Európa értékei – az értékek Európája. A Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe, 2007. november 22–23. c. konferencia előadásai)*. Eds.: László Havas–László Takács–Imre Tegye. Budapest–Debrecen, 2009. 407–417.

Andrea Seidler: *Die Affaere Sulzer-Pray. Eine gelehrte Querele aus dem spaeten 18. Jahrhundert*. In: Wynfried Kliegleder – Andrea Seidler, Jozef Tancer (Hg.): *Deutsche Sprache und Kultur im Raum Pest, Ofen und Budapest*. Bremen, Lumiere, 2011. Band. 63.

Callimaco Esperiente e la corte di re Mattia, In: *Callimaco Esperiente poeta e politico del '400, Convegno internazionale di Studi, San Gimignano, 18–20 ottobre 1985*, Szerk.: Gian Carlo Garfagnini, Firenze, Leo S. Olschki Editore, Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Atti di convegni XVI, 105–118.

Andrea Seidler: *Briefdokumente jenseits der Privatheit. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Karl Gottlieb Windisch und Daniel Cornides (1781–1787)*. In: *Wiener Elektronische Beitrage des Instituts für Finno-Ugristik*. Oktober 2001.

Andrea Seidler: *Briefwechsel des Karl Gottlieb Windisch*. Hg. eingeleitet Andrea Seidler. Budapest, 2008.

János Schwandtner: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum veteres ac genuini*. Tyrnaviae (Nagyszombat): Typis Collegii Academici Societatis Jesu. 1765.

Karl Heinz Jügelt: *Die Rezensionen der ungarischen ind Ungarn betreffenden Schriften in der Allgemeinen Literaturzeitung 1785–1803*. Rostock, 1975.

Éva H. Balázs: *Agust Ludwig Schlözer und seine ungarischen Anhänger*. In: Friedrich Engel-Janosi – Grete Klingenstein – Heinrich Lutz (Hrsg.): *Formen der europäischen Aufklärung*. Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1976. 251–269.

La parentela linguistica, storiografica ed epica nella letteratura del Settecento in Ungheria. In: *Una pastorale della comunicazione, Italia, Ungheria, America e Cina: l'azione dei Gesuiti dalla fondazione allo scioglimento dell'Ordine*, a cura di Diego Poli, Atti del Convegno di Studi, Roma – Macerata, 26–29 ottobre 1996, Il Calamo, Roma, 257–272.

La storiografia umanistica latina ungherese e la sua trasformazione volgare: Antonio Bonfini e Gaspare Heltai, *Studi Umanistici Picensi*, XXII, Istituto Internazionale di Studi Picensi, Sassoferrato, 121–128. 2002

Károly Vekov: *Istoriografia Maghiara din Transylvania in secolul al XVI-lea*. Editura Studium. Cluj Napoca, 2004.

Gábor Almási: The uses of humanism. Johannes Sambucus, Andreas Dudith and the Republic of Letters in East Central Europe. Leiden, 2009.

István Bitskey: Katholische Reform und Gegenreformation in Ungarn. (Ein Bericht über neuere Forschungen.). In: István Bitskey: Lebensgemeinschaft und nationale Identität. Wien, 2007. 187–206.

Georgius Széklenár: Vetustissimus Magnae Moraviae situs et primus in eam Hungarorum ingressus et incursus. Pozsony, 1784.

Georgius Széklenár: Hipercriticon examinis vetustissimi Magnae Moraviae situs. Pozsony, 1788.

Stephanus Katona: Examen vetustissimi Magnae Moraviae cum vindiciis Anonymi Bele notarii. Pest–Buda–Kassa 1786.

Stephanus Katona: Vetus Moraviae rursus ad suos limites reducta. Buda 1789.

3. Literature about the Transylvanian Saxon historical writing and thinking in foreign languages

Haner, G. Jeremia: Das königliche Siebenbürgen entworfen und mit nöthigen Anmerkungen versehen von G. J. H. Erlangen: Wolfgang Walther 1763.

Haner, G. Jeremia: Scriptorum rerum Hungaricarum et Transilvanicarum. Viennae: Trattarn 1777.

Haner, G. Jeremia: De scriptoribus rerum Hungaricarum et Transsylvanicarum saeculi XVII. scriptisque eorundem. (Opus posthumum.) Hermannstadt: Martin Hochmeister 1798.

Karl Fabritius: Die Schaeßburger Chronisten des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts. In: Fontes Rerum Austriacarum. Oesterreichische Geschichtsquellen, I. Abt. Scriptorum, Bd. IV. Wien, 1856.

Johan Karl Schuller: Georg Reicherstorffer und seine Zeit, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte von Siebenbürgen in den Jahren 1527–1537. Archiv für Kunde oesterreichischer Geschichte 1859. 223–291.

Heinrich Konrad Föringer: Nachtrag zu dem Aufsätze J. K. Schuller's Georg Reicherstorffer und seine Zeit. Archiv für Kunde oesterreichischer Geschichte 1859. 409–411.

Siebenbürgische Chronik des Schaeßburger Stadtschreibers Georg Kraus 1608–1665, hg. vom Ausschusse des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde, II. Teil, Wien, 1864.

Joseph Trusch: Schriftsteller-Lexikon oder biographisch-literarische Denkblätter der Siebenbürger Deutschen. Kronstadt, 1871. III. 86–102.

Albert Michael: Die „Ruinae Pannonicae“ des Christian Schesaeus. Schaeßburg, 1872.

Michael Albert: Die „Ruinae Pannonicae“ des Christian Schesaeus. In: Program des evangelischen Gymnasiums in Schaeßburg. 1872/73. Sibiu, 1873. 58.

Egon Hajek: Die Hecatombae Sententiarum Ovidianarum des Valentin Franck von Franckenstein. Hermannstadt–Sibiu 1923.

Karl Kurt Klein: Zur Basler sachsenlandkarte des Johannes Honterus vom Jahre 1532. (Faksimile der Landkarte Chorographia Transylvaniae Sybenbürgen, Basileae 1532.) München: Hans Menschendorfer 1960.

Karl Kurt Klein: Münster-Honter-Reichenstorffer. Südostdeutsche Semesterblätter. 15. 1965. 25–42.

Viktor Möckesch: Martin Schmeizel als Kartograph in der Offizin Joh. Bapt. Homann in Nürnberg. In: Siebenbürgische Hauskalender. Jahrbuch 1966.

Bernhard Capesius: Der Hermannstaedter Humanist Georg Reichenstorffer. Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde. 10. 1967. 35–62.

Togan Grigore: Zur Frage nach der Herkunft und Sprache des Rumaenen bei Laurentius Toppeltinus. In: Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde, 2/1968.

Karl Kurt Klein: Leibniz, Brukenthal und die saechsische Wörterbucharbeit. In: Saxonica Septemcastrensis. Forschungen, Reden und Aufsätze aus vier Jahrhunderten zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen. Marburg, 1971.

Bernhard Capesius: Drei Humanisten über die Walachei, die Moldau und Siebenbürgen. Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde 17. 1974. 53–60.

Ute Monika Schwob: Siebenbürgische Humanisten am Ofener Jagellonienhof. Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde, III. F. 12. 1975. 81–90.

Mathias, Miles: Siebenbürgischer Würg-Engel oder Chronicalischer Anhang des 15 Seculi nach Christi Geburth aller theils Ungaern und sonst Siebenbürgen angraenzenden Laendern für gelauffener Geschichten (Unveraenderter Nachdruck der Ausgabe Hermannstadt 1670). Köln Wien, Böhlau Verlag, 1984. (Schriften zur Landeskunde Siebenbürgens. Bd. 8.)

Stefan Sienerth: Ein großer Humanist. UNESCO-Gedenktag: 400 Jahre seit dem Tode des Christian Schesaeus. Die Woche, XVIII. Nr. 919. 26. Juli, 1985.

Joachim Wittstock: Zeitgeschichte und Poesie in einem. Vor 400 Jahren starb Christian Schesaeus. Das Werk des Mediascher Humanisten und seine Interpreten. Neuer Weg. XXXVII. Nr. 11249, 27. Juli, 1985.

Gernot Nussbaecher: Meschener Wein-wie von Kreta. Christian Schesaeus über die Umgebung von Mediasch. Die Woche, XVIII. Nr. 937, 29. November, 1985.

Joachim Wittstock: Die Geschichte der Anna Kendl (Eine Dichtung des Siebenbürger Humanisten Christian Schesaeus, 1535–1585.) Neue Literatur, XXXVI. Nr. 9, September, 1985. 17–24.

Gernot Nussbaecher: Christian Schesaeus und Schaeßburg. Neuer Weg, XXXVII., Nr. 11215, 18. Juni, 1985.

Gernot Nussbaecher: „dessen Ruhm keine Zeit kann zerstört noch mindern“. Das Honterusbild bei Christian Schesaeus. Karpatenrundschau XVIII (XIX), Nr. 30. (1785), 26. Juli 1985.

Gernot Nussbaecher: Christian Schesaeus und Temeswar. Über die Eroberung der Festung durch die Türken. Neue Banater Zeitung, XXIX, Nr. 7013. 7022. 2 und 12. Juli, 1985.

Gernot Nussbaecher: Christian Schesaeus und Kronstadt. Abschrift einer verschollenen Elegie des Humanisten gefunden. Neuer Weg, XXXVII, Nr. 11267, 17. August 1985.

Gernot Nussbaecher: Christian Schesaeus als Dichter der Reformation in Siebenbürgen. Kirchliche Blätter, XIV (LII), Nr. 1. Januar, 1986.

Adolf Arbuster: Die Rumaenen in der siebenbürgischen Chronistik des 17. Jahrhunderts. Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde, 9 (1986) Heft 2.

Gernot Nussbaecher: „mir teurer als selbst mein Leben“. Poetische Liebesbriefe von Christian Schesaeus. Karpatenrundschau, XIX (XXX), Nr. 32 (1839), 8. August, 1986.

Joachim Wittstock: Christian Schesaeus Transylvanus. Fahrten in die Lebensgeschichte eines Wenig gelosenen Dichters. Neue Literatur, XXXVII, Nr. 3, März, 1986. 7–38.

Joachim Wittstock: Der Mediascher humanistische Dichter Christian Schesaeus über seine Vaterstadt. 137–139.

Thomas Naegler: Christian Schesaeus. Taten und Gestalten. 114–116. 1992.

Paul Binder: Der Humanist Christian Schesaeus und Klausenburg. In: Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde. Bd. 36 (1993). Nr. 2. 40–49.

Joachim Wittstock: Literarische Aspekte in historischen und volkskundlichen Schriften des 17. Jahrhunderts. Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde, 1987. 29, Heft 1.

Katalin Blaskó: Narrativ saechsisch-siebenbürgische Geschichtsschreibung in der josephinischen Zeit. Martin Schechs Beitrag im Ungrischen Magazin. In: Krieglleder, Wynfried–Andrea Seidler–Tancer, Jozef (Hrsg.): Deutsche Sprache und Kultur in Siebenbürgen. Edition Lumiere, Bremen, 2009. 213–222.

Zsombor Tóth: From the Cradle to the Grave. Representation of Confessional Identity in Mihály Cserei's Writings (1667–1747). (A Case Study in Historical Anthropology.) Colloquia. Vol. XV. 2008. 44–71.

Edit Szegedi: Tradition as a Constitutive Element of the Transylvanian Saxon Identity in the 16-th-17th Centuries. 5–30.

Friedrich Teutsch: Unsere Geschichtsschreibung in den letzten zwanzig Jahren (1869–1889). Archiv für siebenbürgische Landeskunde, XXII. 1890. 619–867.

Friedrich Teutsch: Georg Daniel Teutsch. Geschichte seines Lebens. Hermannstadt. 1909.

Ludwig von Thallóczy: Johann Christian von Engel und seine Korrespondenz 1770–1814. Verlag Duncker und Humblot, München Leipzig 1915.

Friedrich Teutsch: Bischof Friedrich Müller 1828–1915. Ein Lebens- und Zeitbild. In: Archiv für siebenbürgische Landeskunde, XL, 1918. 191–300.

Richard Csaki: Vorbericht zu einer Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in Siebenbürgen. Hermannstadt, 1920.

Gragger, Robert (Hrsg.): Bibliographia Hungariae. 1. Historica. Verzeichniss der 1861–1920 erschienen, Ungarn betreffenden Schriften in nichtungarischer Sprache. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1923.

Karl Kurt Klein: Adolf Menschendorffers Drama Michael Weiß, Stadtrichter von Kronstadt. Literaturgeschichtliche Studie. Hermannstadt: Ostdeutsche Druckerei und Verlag, 1924.

A. Schullerus: Unsere geistige Entwicklung in den Jahren 1850–1880. In: Bilder aus der Kunstgeschichte. II. 1928

Karl Kurt Klein: Die siebenbürgisch-sächsische Literatur in den Jahren 1898 bis 1918. Ebenda.

Richard Huß: Geistesgeschichtlicher Überblick über das Schriftum der siebenbürger Deutschen. Debrecen, 1929.

Karl Kurt Klein: Deutsches Schriftum in Siebenbürgen. In: Karl Bell: Siebenbürgen. Dresden: 1930.

Friedrich Müller: Wandlung der geschichtlichen Hauptaufgaben unseres Volkes im Laufe seiner Entwicklung und seine Anpassung daran. in. SVS, LV, 1932.

Friedrich Müller: Dr. Friedrich Teutsch. Denkrede. In: Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Neue Folge, Bd. 47. Hermannstadt 1933. 150.

Orendi-Hommenau, Viktor: Madjarisches, Allzumadjarisches. Ein Kleiner Beitrag zur Minderheitenfrage in Ungarn. Bukarest: Selbstverlag 1940.

Karl Kurt Klein: Deutscher Transylvanismus. Klausenburg/Kolozsvár: Lyceum-Druckerei 1943.

Jules Szeksfű: L' historiographie des Saxons de Transylvanie. In: État et nation. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France–Budapest. Éditée par L'Institut Paul Teleki. 1945. 225–342.

Karl Kurt Klein: Die Goten-Geten-Daken-Sachsengleichung in der Sprachentwicklung der Deutschen Siebenbürgen. In: Transylvanica. Gesammelte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze zur Sprach- und Siedlungsforschung der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen. München, 1963.

Andreas Möckel: Nachwort. In: Friedrich Teutsch: Kleine Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen, 1965.

Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. (Unter Mitarbeit von Andreas Möckel, Harald Zimmermann, Hans Beyer, Hans

Mommsen, Erwin Vierhaus und Ernst Wagner.) Herausgegeben von Paul Philippi. Böhlau Verlag, Köln Graz. 1967.

Andreas Möckel: Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewußtsein bei den Siebenbürger Sachsen. Karl Kurt Klein zum 70. Geburtstag. 6. Mai, 1967. 1–23.

Harald Zimmermann: Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. [Vortrag anlaßlich der 2. Hauptversammlung des Arbeitskreises für siebenbürgische Landeskunde in Ansbach am 5. Januar 1964]. 24–55.

Hans Beyer: Geschichtsbewußtsein und Nationalprogramm der Siebenbürger Sachsen. 56–115.

Capesius, Bernhardt: Der „Siebenbürgische Würg-Engel“. Siebenbürgisch-deutsche Geschichtsschreibung vor hundert Jahren. Neuer Weg. Bukarest. Jg 22 (1970), Nr. 6640. 5–6.

Karl Kurt Klein: Sachsengeschichte, und Sachsen Bischof Friedrich Teutsch. In: Saxonica Septemcastrensis. Forschungen, Reden und Aufsätze aus vier Jahrzehnte zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen. Marburg, 1971. 3–12. 337–352.

Carl Göllner: Das historische Werk Friedrich Teutschs. In: Heidelberger Jahrbücher, XVI, 1972.

Carl Göllner – Heinz Stanescu (Hrsg.): Schriftum der Siebenbürger Sachsen und Banater Schwaben. Bukarest, Kriterion, 1974.

Carl Göllner: Carl Fabrizious. Leben und Wirken. In: Forschungen, XVIII. Nr. 1. 1975.

Adolf Arbuster: Vorarbeiten zu einer Geschichte der siebenbürgisch-sachsischen Historiographie. In: Südostdeutsches Archiv, XIX/XX. (1976/1977)

Ludwig Binder: Georg Daniel Teutsch und Friedrich Teutsch als Historiker. In: Forschungen, XXI. nr 2. 1978. 57–80.

E. Eisenburger: Herodot der Siebenbürger Sachsen. In: Sie erkannten die Zeichen der Zeit. Cluj-Napoca, 1979. 159–171.

Adolf Arbuster: Einführung. In: Mathias Miles, Siebenbürgisches Würg-Engel. (Ndr.) Köln, Wien, 1984.

Stefan Sienerth: Geschichte der siebenbürgische-deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. Cluj-Napoca 1984. 149–154. 232–233.

Adolf Arbuster: Einführung. In: Mathias Miles, Siebenbürgisches Würg-Engel. Ndr. Köln–Wien 1984.

Adolf Arbuster: Vorarbeiten zu einer Geschichte der siebenbürgisch-sachsischen Historiographie. In: Südostdeutsches Archiv, XIX/XX. (1976/1977)

István Bitskey: Historie und Politik. In: Ders.: Lebensgemeinschaft und Nationale Identität. (Beiträge zur frühneuzeitlichen Kulturgeschichte Ungarns im mitteleuropäischen Kontext.) Wien 2007. 33–52.

Briefe an Georg Daniel Teutsch. Hrsg. Monica Vlaicu. Köln–Wien–Weimar 1994.

Carl Göllner: Carl Fabrizious. (Leben und Wirken.) In: Forschungen, XVIII. Nr. 1. (1975)

Carl Göllner: Die Siebenbürger Sachsen in den Jahren 1848–1918. Köln–Wien 1988.

Eisenburger, Eduard: Herodot der Siebenbürger Sachsen. In: Sie erkannten die Zeichen der Zeit. Cluj-Napoca 1979. 159–171.

Erich Wenneker: Teutsch, Friedrich. In: Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon. Band 11. Herzberg 1996. 728–733.

Gernot Nussbaecher: Aus Urkunden und Chroniken. (Beiträge zur siebenbürgischen Heimatkunde.) III. Band. Bukarest 1990.

Karl Kurt Klein, Leben-Werk-Wirkung. Hrsg. Peter Motzan. München 2001.

Konrad Gustav Gündisch: Die historischen und landeskundlichen Forschungen der Siemenbürger Sachsen in der Zwischenkriegszeit. In: Siebenbürgen zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen. Hrsg. Walter Müller. Köln–Weimar–Wien 1994. 339–351.

Konrad Gustav Gündisch: Friedrich Müller-Langenthal. In Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon. Band VI. Herzberg 1993. 239–242.

Konrad Gustav Gündisch: Müller, Friedrich. In Neue Deutsche Biographie 18. 1997. 383–384.

József László Kovács: Die Oedenburger Chronik. WAB Band 105. Eisenstadt 2001.

Miklós Lackó: Die Zeitschrift „Erdélyi Helikon“ und die ungarisch-sächsischen Beziehungen In: Siebenbürgen zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen. Hrsg. Walter Müller. Köln–Weimar–Wien 1994. 219–234.

Ludwig Binder: Georg Daniel Teutsch und Friedrich Teutsch als Historiker. In: Forschungen, XXI. nr 2. (1978) 57–80.

Ludwig Binder: Tendenzen und Aufgaben der Siebenbürgischen Kirchengeschichtsschreibung. In: Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde 15. (1992) Heft 2.

Schriftum der Siebenbürger Sachsen und Banter Schwaben. Hrsg. Carl Göllner – Heinz Stanescu. Bukarest 1974.

Stefan Sienerth: Geschichte der siebenbürgische-deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. Cluj-Napoca 1984. 149–154. 232–233.

István Szabadi: Descriptio Transylvaniae und Descriptio Moldaviae von einem humanistischen Verfasser. Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis 28. 1992. 123–131.

Edit Szegedi: Geschichtsbewusstsein und Gruppenidentität. (Die Historiographie der Siebenbürger Sachsen zwischen Barock und Aufklärung.) Köln–Weimar–Wien 2002.

4. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking in the 19th century and during the dualism in foreign languages

Monika Baár: Historians and Nationalism. (East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century.) Oxford–New York. 2010.

Louis J. Lekai: Historiography in Hungary, 1790–1848. Journal of Central European Affairs. 14. (1954) 3–18.

Ágnes R. Várkonyi: The Impact of Scientific Thinking on Hungarian Historiography about the Middle of the 19th Century. Acta Historica, 14 (1968). 1–20.

József Antall: The emergence of the system of modern higher education in Hungary. (A modern felsőoktatási rendszer kialakulása Magyarországon.). Orvostörténeti Közlemények 51–53. (1969). 61–74.

Elek Bolgár: Entwicklung und Literatur der Soziologie in Ungarn. Monatsschrift für Soziologie 5. (1909). 324–334.

Vilmos Erős: Die ungarische Geschichtsschreibung zur Zeit des Dualismus (1867–1918). In: Transylvanian Review, Kolozsvár/Cluj. Vol. XXI (Supplement), No. 4. (2012). 301–316.

Vilmos Erős: Die ungarische Geschichtsschreibung zur Zeit des Dualismus (1867–1918). In: kakanien revisited. 2012. <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/-fallstudie/VEeros1/main>. Accessed 02. 04. 2016.

Tibor Baráth: L'histoire en Hongrie. (1867–1935.) Extrait de la Revue historique. L. CLXXVII. Paris, 1936.

Steven Bela Vardy: The Hungarian Economic History School: Its Birth and Development. In: Ders. Clio's Art in Hungary. 55–74.

Steven Bela Vardy: The Birth of the Hungarian Kulturgeschichte School. In: Ibid. 35–53.

Steven Bela Vardy: Antal Hodinka: A Pioneer of Slavic Historical Studies in Hungary. In: Ibid. 121–127.

Steven Bela Vardy: The Ottoman Empire in European Historiography: A Reevaluation by Sándor Takáts. In: *Ibid.* 129–145.

Arpad von Klimo. Nation, Konfession, Geschichte: Zur nationalen Geschichtskultur Ungarns im europäischen Kontext (1860–1948). Munich, 2003.

Balla György Kisari: Manó Kogutowicz. (The great hungarian cartographer). Budapest 1997.

Tibor Frank: Egy emigráns alakváltásai. (Zerffi Gusztáv pályaképe 1820–1892.). Budapest. 1985.

Tibor Frank: Gustavus George Zerffi, ‘Scientific Historian’. *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae Sectio Historica* XX (1980). 119–155.

Tibor Frank: G. G. Zerffi – rekishi gakusha to shite. *REKISHI-ZHINRUI* 8 (1980). 31–83.

Tibor Frank. Hungarian Art-Historian in Victorian Britain: Gustavus George Zerffi. *Acta Historiae Artium* XXIII. 1–2. (1977). 121–134.

Tibor Frank: Aru bomeisha no henshin. (Zerufi Gusutaavu Den.) Tokyo 1994.

Ein Diener seiner Herren: Werdegang des österreichischen Geheimagenten Gustav Zerffi (1820–1892). Mádl Péter (transl.), Draskóczy Piroska (transl.), Frank Tibor (transl.) (eds.). Köln–Weimar–Wien 2002.

Henri Marczali: Hongrie. In: *Histoire et historiens depuis cinquante ans. (Méthodes, organisation et résultats du travail historique de 1876 á 1926.)*. Paris 1927. 209–218.

Gyula Szeksfű: Il centenario della nascita di Guglielmo Fraknói. Corvina 1943. 425–434.

Leo Santifaller: Briefe von Wilhelm Fraknói und Theodor Sickel aus den Jahren 1877 bis 1906. *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 6–7. (1962/63). 193–351.

Lajos Pásztor: L’Istituto Storico Ungherese a Roma e il vescovo Vilmos Fraknói. *Archivio della Societa Romana di Storia Patria*, 1977. 143–166.

Ágnes Hetényi: Il Palazzo Falconieri di Roma. *Ibid.* 127–142.

Lajos Pásztor: Le origini dell’Accademia d’Ungheria a Roma. In: *Un istituto scientifico a Roma: l’Accademia d’Ungheria (1895–1950) a cura di Péter Sárközy e Rita Tolomeo*. Roma, 1995.

László Bóka: Un Hongrois „bon Européen”: Ladislas Szalay. *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie*. 28/4. (1935). 183–189.

Miksa Falk: Ladislaus von Szalay’s Leben und Wirken. *Österreichische Revue* 1865. Band II. 1–87.; Wien 1863.

Alexander Flegler: Erinnerungen an Ladislaus Szalay und seine Geschichte des ungarischen Reiches. Leipzig 1866.

Eugen Fraternik: Was ist die Wahrheit? (Eine Erwiderung auf das Szalaysche Paphlet, betitelt: zur kroatischen Frage.) Agram 1861.

László Tóth: Antal Hodinka der Historiker der ungarisch-slawischen Beziehungen. Pester Lloyd, Morgenblatt. 1944. 03. 05.

István Udvari: Antal Hodinka. (Forscher der ruthenischen Geschichte, 1848–1946.) *Studia Slavica Savariensia*. I. 2. (1992) 66–78.

Alder–R. Dalby: The Dervish of Windsor Castle. (The Life of Arminus Vámbery) London 1979.

Birgit Bock-Luna: Reiseleben–Lebensreise: der ungarische Orientalist Hermann Vambery (1832–1913) über Zentralasien, Interethnische Beziehungen und Kulturwandel. Münster 2003.

Peter Haber: Sprache, Rasse, Nation. (Der ungarische Turkologe Ármin Vámbery.) In: Peter Haber – Erik Petry – Daniel Wildmann: Jüdische Identität und Nation (Fallbeispiele aus Mitteleuropa, Jüdische Moderne). Köln–Weimar–Wien 2006. 19–49.

Christoph Baumer: Southern Silk Road: In the Footsteps of Sir Aurel Stein and Sven Hedin. Bangkok 2000.

Shareen Brysac: „Sir Aurel Stein’s Fourth ‘American’ Expedition.” <https://www.britishmuseum.org/pdf/Stein%20Brysac.pdf> Accessed 02. 04. 2016.

Leo Deuel: Testaments of Time; the Search for Lost Manuscripts and Records. New York 1965.

John Falconer et al.: Catalogue of the Collections of Sir Aurel Stein in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Budapest–British Museum 2002.

John Falconer et al.: Supplement to the Catalogue of the Collections of Sir Aurel Stein in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Budapest 2007.

Valerie Hansen: „The Silk Road; A New History”. Oxford 2012.

Peter Hopkirk: Foreign Devils On The Silk Road. Massachusetts 1984.

Jeannette Mirsky: Sir Aurel Stein. (Archaeological Explorer). Chicago 1977.

Joyce Morgan – Conrad Walters: Journeys on the Silk Road. (A desert explorer, secret library, and the unearthing of the world’s oldest printed book) Picador Australia 2011.

S. N. Pandita: Aurel Stein in Kashmir. (Sanskrit of Mohand Marg). Om Publications 2004.

Annabel Walker: Aurel Stein. (Pioneer of the Silk Road.) Washington 1999.

Handbook to the Stein Collections in the UK. Ed. Helen Wang. British Museum Occasional Paper 129. 1999.

Sir Aurel Stein in The Times. Ed. Helen Wang. London 2002.

Sir Aurel Stein. Ed. Helen Wang. British Museum Occasional Paper 142. 2004.

Sir Aurel Stein, Colleagues and Collections. Ed. Helen Wang. British Museum Research Publication 184. 2012.

Susan Whitfield: Aurel Stein On The Silk Road. Chicago 2004.

Ludwig Bittner: Árpád Károlyi als Archivar. Beilage der Zeitschrift des königlich-ungarischen Staatsarchivs. Levéltári Közlemények, vol. XI. (1933).

István Fazekas: Árpád Károlyi (1853–1940). (Der Lebenslauf eines ungarischen Archivars in k.u.k. Diensten. In: Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs.) Beruf (ung): Archivar. Festschrift für Lorenz Mikoletzky. Teil I. Wien 2011. 63–81.

Ferenc Eckhart: Julius Szekfű, A száműzött Rákóczi (Der verbannte Rákóczi). Sonderabdruck aus den „Mitteilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforschung“, XXXVI. Band, 2. Heft.

Irene Raab Epstein: Gyula Szekfű. (A Study in the Political Basis of Hungarian Historiography.) New York 1987.

Vilmos Erős: Ethique et raison d'état. (Gyula Szekfű et Jacques Maritain.) In: Schola Europaea. Les valeurs de l'Europe-L'Europe des valeurs. (Európa értékei – az értékek Európája. A Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe, 2007. november 22–23. c. konferencia előadásai.) Eds.: László Havas–László Takács–Imre Tegvey. Budapest–Debrecen 2009. 333–339.

Snouck Hurgonje: Ignaz Goldziher. De Gids, IV. (1921) 489–499.

V.V. Bartold: I. Goldziher 1850–1921. (Nekrolog.) Izvestia Rossiyskoy Akademii Nauk (1922) 147–168.

Richard Gottheil: Ignaz Goldziher. Journal of American Oriental Studies, XII. (1922) 189–193.

Bernard Heller: Bibliographie des oeuvres de Ignaz Goldziher. Paris 1927.

Richard Hartmann: Ignaz Goldziher. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganlandischen Gesellschaft 76, (1922) Neue Folge I. 285–290.

Abraham Schalom Yabuda: Die Bedeutung der Goldziherischen Bibliothek für die zukünftige hebraeische Universitaet. Der Jude 8. (1924). 575–592.

Johann Füick: Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts. Leipzig 1955.

Ignace Goldziher memorial vol. 1. P. Eds. Samuel Löwinger – Joseph Somogyi. Budapest 1948.

Ignace Goldziher memorial vol. 2. P. Eds. Samuel Löwinger – Joseph Somogyi. Jerusalem 1958.

C. H. Becker: Ignaz Goldziher. Der Islam 12 (1922). New publication: Islamstudien II, 1967, 499–513.

Julius Németh: Goldzihers Jugend. Acta Orientalia Hungarica I. (1950). 7–24.

Joseph de Somogyi: A collection of literary remains of I. Goldziher. Journal of Royal Asiatic Studies, (1935). 149–154.

Joseph de Somogyi: My Reminiscence of I. Goldziher. *The Muslim World*, 51. (1961) 5–17.

J. J. Waardenburg: L'islam dans le miroir de l'Occident. (I. Goldziher, C. Snouck-Hurgronje, C. H. Becker, D. B. Mac-Donald, L. Massignon). Paris-la Haye 1963.

Peter Haber: Une assimilation fragile. (Ignac Goldziher et l'histoire judeo-hongroise.) In: Ignac Goldziher. *Un autre orientalisme?* Paris 2011.

Willem Otterspeer: Goldziher Ct Leyde.

Gazsi Denes: Les relations de Goldziher avec les orientalistes hongrois (Armin Vambery, Vilmos Bacher, Sandor Kegl et Aurel Stein). In: *Ibid.*

Dominique Bourel: De Berlin Ct Budapest: Carl Heinrich Becker et Ignac Goldziher. In: *Ibid.*

Sabine Mangold: Ignac Goldziher et Ernest Renan. (Vision du monde et innovation scientifique). In: *Ibid.*

Suzanne Marchand: Ignac Goldziher et l'orientalisme au XIXe siecle en Europe centrale 89. In: *Ibid.*

Celine Trautmann-Waller: Histoire culturelle, religions et modernite, ou y a-t-il une „methode” Goldziher? In: *Ibid.*

Ludmila Hanisch: «Islamisme et Parsisme” apres Goldziher. Contributions des iranaisants allemands. In: *Ibid.*

Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen: Le culte des saints musulmans ala lumiere d'Ignac Goldziher. In: *Ibid.*

Alain Messaoudi: Ignac Goldziher en France. (Echanges savants et reception de l'oeuvre (1876–1920)). In: *Ibid.*

Francois Angelier – Louis Massignon: Ignac Goldziher. (Influence intellectuelle et legs spirituel. Correspondance inedite (1909–1921)). In: *Ibid.*

Youssef Djedj: Max Weber et Ignac Goldziher (la „non-rencontre”). In: *Ibid.*

Nora Lafsi: Goldziher vu d'Al-Azhar. ('Abd Al-Jam Shalabf et la critique de l'orientalisme europeen.) In: *Ibid.*

Richard Gottheil: Ignaz Goldziher. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 42. (1922) 189–193.

Richard Hartmann: Ignaz Goldziher. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgen Landischen Gesellschaft* 76. (1922) 285–290.

Louis Massignon, Ignace Goldziher (1850–1921). (Notes sur sa vie, ses oeuvres et sa methode) In: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*. LXXXVI. (1922) 61–72. Repris et modifie sous le titre „In memoriam Ignace Goldziher (1850–1921)”, In: Bernard Heller: *Bibliographie des oeuvres de Ignace Goldziher*, Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927, V–XVII; Et in: Ignaz Goldziher, *Le Dogme et l'islam. Histoire du developpement dogmatique et juridique*

de la religion musulmane, tr. Felix Alin (Pmis: Geuthner,1920), 2e ed. augmentee, Paris 2005. IX–XIX.

Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje: Ignaz Goldziher. De Gids 4. (1921) 489–499; repris in: C. Snouck Hurgronje, *Verspreide Geschriften VI*. Leyde 1927. 453–464.

Joseph Somogyi: Ignaz Goldziher (1850–1921). *Muslim World*. 41. 3. (1951). 199–208.

Joseph Somogyi: My Reminiscences of Ignace Goldziher. *Muslim World* 51. 1. (1961) 5–17.

Articles, chapitres d'ouvrages et ouvrages scientifiques. (Goldziher Memorial Conference). Eds. Eva Apor – Istvan Ormos. Budapest 2005. http://real-eod.mtak.hu/78/1/KTOS_12.pdf Accessed: 2016-09-11

Dévényi Kinga: Information Exchange Before the Internet. (On law aqṣama `alā llāh la-abarrahu in Goldziher's Correspondence.) In: *Ibid.* 21–35.

Hidvégi Máté: Immanuel Löw's Reflections on „The Essence and Evolution of Judaism” in his Letters to Ignaz Goldziher in 1888. In: *Ibid.* 75–81.

Prods Oktor Skerrevé: Goldziher and Iranian Elements in Islam. In: *Ibid.* 245–250.

Lawrence Conrad: The Near East Study Tour Diary of Ignaz Goldziher. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1990) 1. 105–126.

Lawrence Conrad: The Dervish's Disciple. (On the Personality and Intellectual Milieu of the Young Ignaz Goldziher) *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1990) 2. 225–266.

Lawrence Conrad: The Pilgrim from Pest. (Goldziher's Study Trip to the Near East (1873–74)) In: Ed. Richard Netton: *Golden Roads, Migration, Pilgrimage and Travel in the Mediaeval and Modern Islam*. Richmond 1993. 110–159.

Lawrence Conrad: Goldziher on Ernest Renan. (From Orientalist Philology to the Study of Islam). In: Ed. M. Kramer: *The Jewish Discovery of Islam*. (Studies in Honor of Bernard Lewis) Tel Aviv 1999. 137–180.

Lawrence Conrad: A new volume of Hungarian Essays by Ignaz Goldziher. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 17. 4. (2007). 363–379.

Hamid Dabashi: Ignaz Goldziher and the Question Concerning Orientalism. In: Ders.: *Post-Orientalism. (Knowledge and Power in Time of Terror)*. New Brunswick (New Jersey) 2009. 17–122.

Mattias Dahlen: Ignaz Goldziher and Sweden. In: Ed. Carl Henrik Carlsson, *Forskamndtverket Judarna i Sverige – en minoritets historia*. Uppsala 2011.

John M. Efron: From Mitteleuropa to the Middle East. (Orientalism through a Jewish Lens). *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 94. 3. (2004). 490–520.

Johann Fück: Goldziher. In: Ders. Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts, Leipzig 1955. 226–231.

Peter Haber: Zwischen jüdischer Tradition und Wissenschaft. (Der ungarische Orientalist Ignac Goldziher (1850–1921)) Köln–Weimar–Wien 2006.

Peter Haber: Vernetzt und doch allein. (Der ungarische Orientalist Ignac Goldziher (1850–1921)). In: Eds. Helga Mitterbauer – Johannes Feichtinger: Moderne Kulturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch 1 (2006) Vernetzungen. 71–80.

György Lederer: Goldziher's „Baha', correspondence". The Arabist. Budapest Studies in Arabic 1. (1988). 103–119.

Suzanne Marchand: Ignaz Goldziher. (Man between Two Laws) In: de la meme, German Orientalism in the Age of Empire. (Religion, Race and Scholarship) Washington–Cambridge 2009. 323–332.

Gyula Németh: Goldziher's Jugend. In: Acta Orientalia Acaemiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 1. (1950) 7–25.

Friedrich Niewöhner: Der Gefangene von Budapest. (Ignaz Goldziher (1850–1921) zwischen Tora und Koran) In: Eds. Dirk Hartwig et al: 'Im vollen Licht der Geschichte'. (Die Wissenschaft des Judentums und die Anftaenge der kritischen Koranforschung). Würzburg 2008. 133–137.

Maurice Olender: Semites comme Aryens (Ignaz Goldziher). In: du meme: Les langues du Paradis. (Aryens et semites: un couple providentiel). Paris 1989. 211–242.

Raphael Patai: Ignaz Goldziher and His Oriental Diary. (A Translation and Psychological Portrait) Detroit 1987.

Holger Preinler: Ignaz Goldziher in Leipzig. (Ein ungarischer Jude studiert Orientalistik). In: Ed. Dan Diner: Exil und Erkenntnis. Leipziger Beitrage zur jüdischen Geschichte und Kultur. 3 (2005). Munich 293–315.

Robert Simon: Ignac Goldziher. (His Life and Scholarship as Reflected in his Works and Correspondence) Budapest–Leyde 1986.

Selected correspondence of I. Goldziher and T. Nöldeke. In: Ibid. 163–419.

Georg Stauth: Frühe Ansätze zu einer Soziologie des Islams bei Ignaz Goldziher und Max Weber. Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie 15. 2. (1990) 38–51; repris in: Georg Stauth, Kultur und moderne Gesellschaft. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie des Islams. Bielefeld 2000. 217–238.

Celine Trautmann-Waller, Du „caractere des peuples semitiques »a une« science de la mythologie hebrai"que" (Ernest Renan, Heymann Steinthal, Ignac Goldziher). Tensions franco-allemandes et evolutions methodologiques. In: Eds. P. Rabault – C. Trautmann-Waller: Itinéraires orientalistes entre France et Allemagne Revue Germanique Internationale 7. Paris 2008. 169–184.

Ignác Goldziher, Tagebuch. Éd. Alexander Scheiber. Leyde 1978.

„Machen Sie doch unseren Islam nicht gar zu schlecht.“ (Der Briefwechsel der Islamwissenschaftler Ignaz Goldziher und Martin Hamann, 1894–1914.) Éd. Ludmilla Hanisch. Wiesbaden 2000.

Scholarship and Friendship in Early Islamwissenschaft. (The Letters of C. Snouck Hurgonje to I. Goldziher. From the Oriental Collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.) Ed. Pieter S. van Koningsveld. Leyde 1985.

Alexander Scheiber: Max Nordau's Letters to Ignace Goldziher. Jewish Social Studies 18. (1956) 199–207.

Ignác Goldziher: Sur l'islam. Origines de la theologie musulmane, avec une Présentation de Rémi Brague, Paris 2003.

Alexandre Domanovsky: L'organisation des historiens en Hongrie. Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences vol. II. pt. 2. No. 2. 204.

Pasquale Fornaro: L'immagine dell'Italia nell'opera di un garibaldino ungherese: Gusztáv Frigyesy. In: Hungarica Varietas. Mediatori culturali tra Italia e Ungheria. A cura di Adriano Papo e Gizella Németh. Edizione della Laguna, 2003. 67–78.

Dževad Juzbašić, Imre Rész (Hg.): Lajos Thallóczy, (der Historiker und Politiker.) Sarajevo–Budapest, 2010. In this band:

Ferenc Glatz: Lajos Thallóczy – Historiker der Habsburgermonarchie

Dubravko Lovrenović: Ungarisch-bosnische Beziehungen und die Religionsgeschichte des mittelalterlichen Bosniens im Werk Lajos Thallóczys

Horst Haselsteiner: Analecta zu Leben und Werk Ludwig von Thallóczys

Imre Rész: Lajos Thallóczys Begegnungen mit der Geschichte von Bosnien und Herzegowina

Salmedin Mesibović: Thallóczy und die Untersuchung der Bezeichnung „Bosna“

Emir O. Filipović: Lajos Thallóczy und die bosnische Heraldik

Edin Radušić: Ein Beitrag zur Einschätzung der Bedeutung Lajos Thallóczys für die bosnisch-herzegowinische Geschichte der österreichisch-ungarischen Zeit.

Éva Somogyi: Die staatsrechtlichen Ansichten von Lajos Thallóczy.

Andreas Gottsmann: Ludwig von Thallóczy und die österreichisch-ungarischen Interessen im Adriaraum.

Krisztián Csaplár-Degovics: Ludwig von Thallóczy und die Albanologie: Skizzen eines Experiments zur Nationsbildung

Zijad Šebić: Lajos Thallóczy über die Ereignisse in Bosnien-Herzegowina nach dem Attentat von Sarajevo am 28. Juni 1914.

Dániel Szabó: Lajos Thallóczy als Zivillandeskommissär im besetzten Serbien.

János György Szilágyi: 'Unsere pelasgischen Urahnen'. Das 'nationale' und das 'universale' in der klassischen Archäologie Ungarns. In: National Heritage – National Canon. Ed. by Mihály Szegedy-Maszák. Budapest, 2001.

5. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking during the interwar period in foreign languages

Furio Jesi–Karl Kerényi: Demone e mito. (Carteggio 1964–1968.) Macerata, 1999.

Hermann Hesse–Karl Kerényi: Briefwechsel aus der Nahe. (Hrsg. und kommentiert von Magda Kerényi.) Frankfurt am Main, 1972.

Thomas Köves Zulauf: K. Kerényi (1897–1973). In: Eikasmos. Quaderni di Filologia Classica, 4 (1993). Festschrift für Ernst Vogt. 243.

Furio Jesi: Kerényi, Károly. In: Enciclopedia Garzanti di Filosofia. Milano, 1981.

A. Breilich: Appunti su una metodologia. Studii e materiali, 27 (1956), 1–30.

A. Breilich: Scienza e verità una vita. In: Storia delle religioni, perché. Napoli 1979.

Nicola Cusumanno: Károly Kerényi e l'Italia. Il veltro, 37. no. 1–2 (1993). 161–170.

Magda Kerényi: Commemorazio di Carlo Kerényi 1897–1973. Archivio di filosofia. 44 Roma, (1974) 13–14.

Vincenzo Tusa: Pellegrini a Selinunte. La gazetta italo-ungherese 4. (1989) 33–37.

Vincenzo Tusa: Karl Kerényi e Selinunte. Sicilia Archeologica, 29 (1996), 57–58.

Volker Losemann: 'Die Krise der Alten Welt' und der Gegenwart. Franz Altheim und Karl Kerényi im Dialog. In: P. Kneissl – V. Losemann (Hrsg.): Imperium Romanum. Studien zu Geschichte und Rezeption (Festschrift Karl Christ) Stuttgart (1998), 492–518.

Riccardo Dottori: Karl Kerényi ai Convegni internazionali di Enrico Castelli (1955–1971). Mythos, Rivista di storia delle Religioni, no. 7. Palermo (1995.) 33–57.

Nicola Cusumanno: Mnemosyne-Lesmosyne. Memoria e oblio, mito e storie. Mythos, Rivista di storia delle Religioni, no. 7. Palermo (1995.) 17–31.

D. Pieraccioni: Mario Untersteiner e Carlo Kerényi: (Due spiriti europei in un epistolario). In: Nuova Antologia, 2162. sz. (1987), 293–328.

A. Magris: Carlo Kerényi e la ricerca fenomenologica della religione. Milano, 1975.

K. Kerényi: Scritti italiani. Napoli, 1993.

Károly Kerényi: Ricordi e testimonianze. *Mythos*, Rivista di storia delle Religioni, no. 7. Palermo (1995.) 99–103.

Karl Kerényi: La filologia latina nell'Ungheria del dopoguerra. in: Gli sudi romani nel mondo. Roma, Istituto di Studi Romani, 1936.

Karl Kerényi: Tage und Wandernbücher 1953–1960. München–Wien, 1969.

Irene Raab Epstein: Gyula Szekfű. (A Study in the Political Basis of Hungarian Historiography). New York, 1987.

Vilmos Erős: Ethique et raison d'état. (Gyula Szekfű et Jacques Maritain.) In: *Schola Europaea. Les valeurs de l'Europe-L'Europe des valeurs. (Európa értékei – az értékek Európája. A Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe, 2007. november 22–23. c. konferencia előadásai.)* Eds.: László Havas–László Takács–Imre Tegye. Budapest–Debrecen. (2009.) 333–339.

László Orosz: Die Verbindungen der deutschen Südostforschung zur ungarischen Wissenschaft zwischen 1935 und 1944. (Ein Problemaufriss anhand des Briefwechsels zwischen Fritz Valjavec und Elemér Mályusz.) In: Fata Márta (Hsg.): *Das Ungarnbild der deutschen Historiographie*. Franz Steiner Verlag. 2004.

Vilmos Erős: Die Rolle von Elemér Mályusz in der ungarischen Sigismund-Forschung. In: (Hg.) Tilmann Schmidt und Péter Gunst: *Das Zeitalter König Sigmunds*. 39–43. Debrecen. 2000.

Vardy, Steven Bela: Elemér Mályusz and the Hungarian Ethnohistory School. In Ders.: *Clio's Art in Hungary and Hungarian America*. New York. 221–247.

Vilmos Erős: Mályusz 's "Ethnohistory". *Budapest Review of Books*, (1995/4). 179–186.

Thomas L. Szendrey: The Ideological and Methodical Foundations of Hungarian Historiography 1750–1970. PhD. Diss. New York. 1972.

Steven Bela Vardy: *Modern Hungarian historiography*. East European Quarterly, Boulder. Columbia University Press, New York and Guildford, Surrey 1976.

Tibor Frank: Luring the English-Speaking World: Hungarian History Diverted. *Slavonic and East European Review*. Vol. 69. No. 1. (1991.) 60–80.

Domokos Kosáry: Sur quelques problemes d'histoire comparée. *Revue d'Histoire Comparée*, (1943/1–2.) 3–32.

Domokos Kosáry: The Idea of a Comparative History of East Central Europe: (the Story of a Venture.) In Dennis Deletard, Harry Hanák (eds.): *Historians as Nation Builders*. London. (1988). 124–138.

Tibor Baráth: L'histoire en Hongrie. (1867–1935.) Extrait de la Revue historique. L. CLXXVII, 1936. Paris, 1936.

Árpád von Klimó. Transnationale Perspektiven in der ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung des 20. Jahrhunderts: Vom 'Hóman-Szekfu' bis 'Ránki-Berend', in: Duchhardt, Heinz (Hg.), "Nationale Geschichtskulturen in Europa", 2006.

Árpád von Klimó: Zeitgeschichte als Revolutionsgeschichte. ('Gegenwartsgeschichte' in der ungarischen Historiographie des 20. Jahrhunderts,) in: Nützenadel, Alexander; Schieder, Wolfgang (Hg.), Zeitgeschichte als Problem. Nationale Traditionen und Perspektiven der Forschung in Europa. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2004 (Geschichte und Gesellschaft, SH 20), 283–306.

Árpád von Klimó: Volksgeschichte in Ungarn. (Chancen, Schwierigkeiten, Folgen eines 'deutschen Projektes), in: Middell, Matthias (Hg.): Volksgeschichte im Vergleich. Akademische Verlagsanstalt: Leipzig. (Im Druck).

Árpád von Klimó: Nation, Konfession, Geschichte: (Zur nationalen Geschichtskultur Ungarns im europäischem Kontext 1860–1948). Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2003.

Árpád von Klimó: Die gespaltene Vergangenheit. (Die großen christlichen Kirchen im Kampf um die Nationalgeschichte Ungarns 1920–48), in: Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft 47/10 (1999), 874–891.

Emil Niederbauer: Beitrage zur Bibliographie. (Der Geschichte der slawischen Völker in der ungarischen bürgerlichen Geschichtsschreibung). SSI 1960. 6.tom. 3–4. fasc. 457–473.

Vilmos Erős: István Szabó und die Probleme von 1848/1849. in: (The first Millenium of Hungary in Europe). Debrecen, 2002. 480–490.

Gábor Ujváry: La storia dell'"Istituto Ungherese a Roma dal 1912 al 1945. Idem. 19–44.

Steven Bela Vardy: Antal Hodinka: A Pioneer of Slavic Historical Studies in Hungary. In. Ders.: Clio's Art... 121–127.

László Tóth: Antal Hodinka der Historiker der ungarisch-slawischen Beziehungen., Morgenblatt. 1944.

Udvari István: Antal Hodinka-Forscher der ruthenischen Geschichte. 1848–1946. Studia Slavica Savariena. 1. évf. 2. sz. (1992.) 66–78.

Jenő Berlász: Der Werdegang der ungarischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte. Sonderdruck aus der Zeitschrift „Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte.“ 1944. 155–184.

Domokos Kosáry: Neue Wege der ungarischen Geschichtsforschung. Hochschule und Ausland. (1934). Heft 5. 33–36.

Domokos Kosáry: L'équipe de la Revue d'Histoire Comparée. In: Rencontres intellectuelles franco-hongroises. Regards croisés sur l'histoire et la littérature. Red. Péter Sahin-Tóth. Budapest, 2001. (Workshop 10.) 276–279.

Domokos Kosáry: Apologie pour l'histoire. In: Rencontres intellectuelles franco-hongroises. Regards croisés sur l'histoire et la littérature. Red. Péter Sahin-Tóth. Budapest, 2001. (Workshop 10.) 339–343.

6. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking after 1945 in foreign languages

András Gerő: A Prisoner of Ideas: István Bibó on Hungarian History in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century. Budapest. 2001–2002. 89–112.

Central European University, History Department Yearbook 2007. Vol. XIV: *Borbála Zsuzsanna Török*: Elites all Over the Place. An Interview with Viktor Karády. Vol. XVIII. 2011. *Judit Pál*: *Vera Bácskai*, 'Grande Dame' of Central European Urban History. 175–185.

„Wouldn't be Better for Me to Enroll in the Mathematics Department?“. – Interview with the Historian *Vera Bácskai*. Convened by Judit Pál. Idem. 186–195.

András Kubinyi: Zsigmond Jakó, the Scholar of History. Idem. 317–344.

„...my career has been a great adventure...“ (Interview with Zsigmond Jakó. Initiated by Mária Lupescu Makó.) Idem. 345–358.

Idem. In honorem Zsigmond Jakó.

Ioan Dragan: A Report on the Archives of Oradea in 1949. 2006. Vol. XII. No. 1–2. 305–315. (On Zsigmond Jakó). 2005. Vol. XII. No. 1–2.

Carmen Florea: On the Enduring Fascination of the Central European Middle Ages. A Profile of Gábor Klaniczay. Idem.

A Discussion with Gábor Klaniczay. Initiated by *Maria Craciun* and *Carmen Florea*. (2009.) Vol. XVI.

Gabriella Erdélyi: The Hungarian Miss Marple and the Adventures of Early Modern History. (A profile of Katalin Péter).

„I am walking in history...as I do in everyday life.“ An Interview with Katalin Péter convened by *Gabriella Erdélyi*. Idem.

Benedicty Róbert: Die literarische Taetigkeit von Gyula Moravcsik. AA, 1962. 10. tom. 1–3. fasc. 295–313.

László Csorba: Storia dell'Accademia d'Ungheria a Roma dopo il 1945. In: Cento Anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Roma (1895–1995). 45–68.

László Csorba: La storia dell'Istituto Pontificio Ecclesiastico Ungherese a Roma dal 1945 fino ad oggi. Idem. 76–94.

„Dem Sonnenschein, dem Regen, mit gleichem Mut entgegen“. Marlene Farkas im Gespräch mit Thomas von Bogyay, Ungarn-Jahrbuch 17 München (1989.)

Zsolt K. Lengyel: Thomas von Bogyays Hungarologie im Exil 1945–1994: (Reichweite und Wirkungen. Eine Fallstudie über die grenzüberschreitende Wirkungsvermittlung zwischen Deutschland und Ungarn. Wissenschaftsbeziehungen und ihre Beitrag zur Modernisierung. Das deutsch-ungarische Beispiel.) Hg.: Holger Fischer–Mirja Juelich. Oldenburg, München, 2005. 483–565.

Zsolt K. Lengyel: Umwege eines Gelehrtenlebens. (Aus der Biographie Thomas von Bogyays 1909–1994). Ungarn-Jahrbuch 27. (2004) 81–111.

Jenő Fitz: András Alföldi: (1895–1981. Alba Regie.) Annales Musei Stephani regis 19, (1981.) 284.

Cahn, Herbert A.: Andreas Alföldi in memoriam. Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau. 60, (1981.) 99–104.

Alföldi, Maria R.: Andreas Alföldi (1895–1981.) Historische Zeitschrift 233, (1981.) 781–786.

Wolf Harry-Gilliam, J.F.–Kolb, Frank, P.–Bastien, Pierre–Alföldy, Géza–Alföldy–Rosenbaum–Elizabeth: Andrew Alföldi 1895–1981. New Jersey. 1982.

Orationes et studia a discipulis admiratoribusque Andreae Alföldi dicata atque lecta in colloquio habito ann. MCMXCVI exacto saeculo ab ortu professoris doctissimi nec non revolutis XV annis ab eiusdem morte. Acta Classica Universitatis Debreceniensis Tom. XXXIII. 1997. Debrecen, 1998.

Von Entstehung Roms bis zur Auflösung des Römerreiches. (Konferenz zum Gedenken des hundersten Geburtstages von Andreas Alföldi 1895–1981.) Dissertationes Pannonicae III. 5. Budapest, 1999.

Géza Alföldy: Ein Unger in der Emigration: (Andreas Alföldi 1947–1981). In: László Borhi (Hg.): Von Entstehung Roms bis zur Auflösung des Römerreiches. Konferenz zum Gedenken des hundersten Geburtstages von Andreas Alföldi (1895–1981.) Dissertationes Pannonicae III. 5. Budapest, 1999.14.

Karl Christ: Neue Profile der Alten Geschichte. Darmstadt. 1990.

G. Franciosi: Andreas Alföldi e il problema delle tribù gentilizie, in Ricerche sull'organizzazione gentilizia romana. 1995.

Thomas von Bogyay: Ungarns Heilige Krone. Ein kritischer Forschungsbericht. Ungarn-Jahrbuch 9. (1978) 207–235.

Thomas von Bogyay: Über die Forschungsgeschichte der heiligen Krone=Insignia regni Hungariae, (I. Studien zur Machtsymbolik des mittelalterlichen Ungarns.) Budapest. (1983.) 65–89.

Thomas von Bogyay: Dem Gedenken an Josef Deér (1905–1972). Ungarn-Jahrbuch 4 (1972). 236–239.

Magda von Bárány-Oberschall: Die ungarische St. Stefanskrone im Lichte der neuesten Forschungen. Südostforschungen 16. Halbband (1957/1.) 24–53.

Árpád von Klimó: Kampf um die nationale Geschichte. (Die Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Kirchen und kommunistischen Parteien in Ungarn und der SBZ 1945–48), in: Kommunikation und Revolution. Hrsg. v. Kurt Imhof, Seismo: Zürich 1998, 359–389.

Árpád von Klimó: 1848/49 in der politischen Kultur Ungarns, In: 1848 im europäischen Kontext. Hg.: Helgard Fröhlich; Margarete Grandner und Michael Weinzierl, Wien: Turia und Kant (1999) 204–222.

Árpád von Klimó: Multiculturalism and the Problems of History Writing in Central Europe: (Hungary, Italy, Germany, in: Local Identity, Multiculturalism, Cultural Power: An Asian Perspective. Busan Asian Games International Conference.) Hg. v. Hoon-Sang Lee.; Busan (200), 167–176.

Árpád von Klimó: Détruire la source symbolique du pouvoir: (La stalinisation de la culture historique des élites hongroises) in: Nicolas Bauquet, François Bocholier (dir.), Le communisme et les élites en Europe centrale, Paris 2006.

Árpád von Klimó: „Habsburger“ und „Preußen“. (Historische Feindbilder und ihre Wandlungen in Ungarn und der DDR im Vergleich) in: Silke Satjukow/Rainer Gries (Hg.): Unsere Feinde. Konstruktionen des ‘Anderen’ im Sozialismus. Leipziger Universitätsverlag: Leipzig 2004.

Árpád von Klimó–Jürgen Danyel: Die ungarische Nachkriegsgeschichtsschreibung. (Neuere Trends und Tendenzen) in: Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft 47/10 (1999), 869–873.

Árpád von Klimó: La stalinizzazione della Storia. (I tentativi di creare una storia ungherese nazionale 1948–56), in: Le Carte e la Storia V/2 (1999), 24–35.

Árpád von Klimó: Nationale Geschichtskulte als Teile einer Geschichtskultur: Ungarn im europäischen Kontext, in: Comparativ 10/2 (2000), 36–60.

Árpád von Klimó: Zeitgeschichte als Revolutionsgeschichte. (‘Gegenwartsgeschichte’ in der ungarischen Historiographie des 20. Jahrhunderts) in: Nützenadel, Alexander; Schieder, Wolfgang (Hg.), Zeitgeschichte als Problem. Nationale Traditionen und Perspektiven der Forschung in Europa. Göttingen (2004) 283–306.

Steven Borsody: Modern Hungarian Historiography. Journal of Modern History, 26 (1952) 398–405.

Zoltan Horvath: Hungary: recovering from the past. In: The New History. (Trends in Historical Research and Writing Since World War II.) Eds. Walter Laqueur–George L. Mosse. Harper Torch books. New York and Evanston. (1967) 221–235.

Éva H. Haraszti: Compte rendu du Congrès des historiens. AH 1954. 2. tom. 3. fasc. 265–300.

Erzsébet Andics: Développement et problèmes principaux de la science historique hongroise au cours des dix dernières années. AH 1955. 4. tom. 1–3. fasc. 1–44.

István Hahn – János Harmatta: Le développement de l'historiographie Hongroise au cours des cinq dernières années. Études historiques 1. 11–148.

Zsidmond Pál Pach: Problemü razvitija vengerszkoj markszisztzskoj isztiricseszkoj nauki. AH 1966. 12. tom. 1–2.sz. 113–191.

Péter Gunst: Die Agrargeschichtsschreibung in Ungarn 1945–1965. At. Sz. (1965.) 7.évf. Supplementum. 1–44.

Péter Hanák: Probleme der Betriebsforschung. AH (1968.) 14.tom. 3–4.sz. 339–366.

András Kubinyi: L' historiographie hongroise moderne des villes. AH (1961.) 8. tom. 1–2.no. 175–189.

La situation et les taches de la recherche dans l'histoire des villes. (Débat á la Commission des Sciences Historiques de l'Académie des Sciences de Hongrie.) AH. (1967.) 13. tom. 1–2.no. 241–248.

András Kubinyi–Lajos Nagy–Károly Vörös: Zur Erforschung der Geschichte von Budapest. AH, (1967.) 13. tom. 1–2. nr. 171–198.

József Molnár: Einige theoretische und methodologische Fragen der Dorfgeschichtsforschung. AUSB Sectio historica 9. (1967.) 273–280.

Miklós Mann: Un débat sur les problèmes de l'histoire culturelle. AH (1967.) 13. tom. 1–2.nr. 248–251.

Emil Niederhauser: Geschichtswissenschaftliche Arbeiten in Ungarn über die Beziehungen zu den slawischen Völkern zwischen 1945–1955. SSI (1956.) 2. tom. 1–4. fasc. 437–441.

Institution des science historique en Hongrie. AH, (1958.) 5. tom. 1–2. nr. 175–187.

Vom Mars bis in den Fünften Bezirk. (Béla Illés und die Abenteuer des Rittmeisters Alexej Gussew im ungarischen Stalinismus 1945–61), in: Silke Satjukow, Rainer Gries: Sozialistische Helden. Die kulturgeschichtliche Anatomie von Propagandafiguren. Berlin (2002.) 220–234.

Nachum Gross: The Triumph of Quantitative Economic History in Budapest. Journal of European Economic History: 1. (1972/1.) 155–161.

Ágnes Pogány: Business History in Ungarn. In: Business History. Wissenschaftliche Entwicklungstrends und Studien aus Zentraleuropa. Hg. Alice Teichova, Herbert Matis, Andreas Resch. Mainz, Wien, (1999.) 77–87.

Gerhard Seewann: Geschichtswissenschaft und Politik in Ungarn 1950–1980. Die Historiographie zu Mittelalter und Neuzeit. Südostforschungen 41 (1982), 261–323.

Holger Fischer: Politik und Geschichtswissenschaft in Ungarn: (Die ungarische Geschichte von 1918 bis zur Gegenwart in der Historiographie seit 1956). München, 1982.

Holger Fischer: Neuere Entwicklungen in der ungarischen Sozialgeschichtsforschung. In: Archiv für Sozialgeschichte 34 (1994), 131–156.

Gyula Benda: L'historiographie hongroise des années 80. In: Antoine Mares (ed.): Histoire et pouvoir en Europe médiane. Paris (1996.) 117–126.

Gyula Benda: L'historiographie hongroise apres 1989. Idem. 229–237.

Historians and the History of Transylvania. Ed. László Péter. East European Monographs, Boulder. New York. 1992.

Steinacker, Harold: Nachwort. In: Austro–Hungarica. Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Geschichte Ungarns und der österreichisch–ungarischen Monarchie. München, (1963.) 61–74.

Steinacker, Harold: Die Nationalitätenfrage des alten Ungarn in marxistisch-leninistischer Beleuchtung. Idem. 326–362.

Stelian Brezeanu: La continuité daco-roumaine. (Science et politique.) Editura Stiintifica si Enciclopedica, Bucarest, 1984.

Alessandro Rosselli: Due ricezzioni del '56 ungherese in Italia: Ungheria 1945–1957 (1957) e Ungheria 1956: necessità di un bilancio (1986). in: Hungarica Varietas. Mediatori culturali tra Italia e Ungheria. A cura di Adriano Papo e Gizella Németh. Edizione della Laguna, (2003.) 115–124

Miklós Mann: Le Congrès du Centenaire de la Société Hongroise d'Histoire. (Du 22 au 26 aout 1967.) AH, (1968.) 14. tom. 3–4.nr. 385–400.

Les recherches en cours á l'institut d'histoire universelle et d'histoire Amerique latine á Szeged. AH. (1968.) 14. tom. 3–4.nr. 367–372.

Lajos Ráczás: Recherches d'histoire poursuivies á l'Institut des Sciences de Transdanubie. AH, (1961.) 8. tom. 3–4.nr. 405–414.

„Le développement du capitalisme dans les anciens pays de la Monarchie Austro–Hongroise.“ Conférence des historiens á Budapest. AH, (1959.) 6. tom. 3–4.nr. 425–431.

László Katus: Rapport sur les travaux de la Bibliographie hongroise d'histoire. AH, (1960.) 7. tom. 1–2.nr. 183–189.

Győző Ember: Les archives et l'historiographie en Hongrie. AH, (1955.) 4. tom. 1–3.fasc. 319–343.

Antal Széző: Recherches historiques dans les Archives hongroises. AH, (1964.) 10. tom. 3–4. nr. 393–402.

András Mócsy: Die wissenschaftliche Taetigkeit des Lehrstuhls für Archeologie an der Lóránd Eötvös Universitaet. AUSB Sectio historica 8. (1966.) 251–257.

Mihály Malán: Ergebnisse der ethnisch-anthropologischen Forschungen des Ungarntums. AnK (1961.) 5. köt. 1–4.sz. 107–116.

Hommages des orientalistes hongroises á M. Louis Szigeti. (Avec bibliographie des oeuvres de Ligeti.) AO (1962.) 15. tom. 1–3. fasc. 5–13.

Gyula Moravcsik: Dix années de la philologie classique hongroise. AA (1955.) 3. tom. 3. fasc. 191–209.

Béla Gunda: Slawische ethnographische Forschungen in Ungarn zwischen 1945–1955. SSI (1956.) 1. tom. 4. fasc. 467–470.

Tibor Klaniczay: Les sciences littéraires hongroises apres la liberation. A. Litt. (1965.) 7. tom. 3–4. fasc. 395–414.

Béla Köpeczi: Vingt années de philologie moderne en Hongrie. A. Litt. (1965.) 7. tom. 3–4. fasc. 415–430.

Miklós Kázmér: Treize ans de recherches toponymiques hongroises (1945–1957.) AL 1958. 7. t. 3–4. fasc. 379–411.

7. Literature about the Hungarian historical writing and thinking after 1990 in foreign languages

Attila Pók: Einige Gedanken zur Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung in Ungarn 1990–2000. (In: *Klio Ohne Fesseln?*) (Historiographie im östlichen Europa nach dem Zusammenbruch des Kommunismus) Hg.: Alojz Ivanisevic, Andreas Kappeler, Walter Lukan und Arnold Suppan. Peter Lang Europaeischer Verlag der Wissenschaften. Wien, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, (2002.) 315–325.

Béla Rásky: (Allzu) persönliche Anmerkungen zur ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung nach 1989. Idem. 327–334.

István Deák: Hungary. *American Historical Review* 97 (1992), 1041–1063.

Balázs Trencsényi–Péter Apor: Fine-Tuning the Polyphonic Past: Hungarian Historical Writing in the 1990s. In: *Narratives Unbound*. (Historical Studies in Post-Communist Eastern Europe). Eds: Sorin Antohi–Balázs Trencsényi–Péter Apor. Press. Budapest New York, (2007.) 1–99.

Bálint Varga–Kuna–Stefano Bottoni: Hungary. In: *Atlas of European Historiography*. (The Making of a Profession.) Eds.: Ilaria Porciani – Lutz Raphael. New York. (2010). 153–156.

András Mink: The Revisions of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. In: Michael Kopeček (ed.): *Past in the Making. Historical Revisionism in Central Europe after 1989*. (2008.) 169–178.

Ferenc Laczó: The Many Moralists and the Few Communists. (Approaching Morality and Politics in Post-Communists Hungary). Idem. 145–167.

Mihály Szegedy-Maszáék. Collegium Budapest, 2001. 219–226.

About the authors

László L. Lajtai

Received his PhD degree from the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (history and civilisations) as well as from the Eötvös Loránd University (European historiography and social sciences) in 2011. Researcher at the MTA TKI – Atelier, Department for European Historiography and Social Sciences of the Eötvös Loránd University (2007–2010). Publishing Director at the Ráció Press (2012–) Fellow researcher at the Institute of Romanistics, Romanian Philology Department (2012–2014). Publications: „Magyar nemzet vagyok”. Az első magyar nyelvű és hazai tárgyú történelemtankönyvek nemzetdiskurzusa. Budapest, Argumentum Kiadó–Bibó István Szellemi Műhely, 2013. Lajtai L. László: *Entre préhistoire et avenir. Le discours national des premiers manuels scolaire d'histoire hongroise 1777–1848*. Saarbrücken, Éditions universitaires européennes, 2012. Email: laszlo.lajtai@gmail.com

Jo Tollebeek

Obtained PhD in history (1989). Between 1992 and 1996 he has worked at the University of Groningen. Later became an appointed professor at the University of Leuven (full professor since 2003), where he co-ordinated the research group „Cultural History since 1750” until 2011. He was visiting professor at the University of Pennsylvania, titular of the Francqui Chair at the University of Antwerp and fellow at the National library of the Netherlands and the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences. He is a member of the Royal Historical Commission, the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts, the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Academia Europaea. He served on several expert panels of the Research Foundation–Flanders (FWO) and is a member of the Scientific Committee for the Humanities of Science Europe. Since the 1st of August 2015 he is dean of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Leuven. Email: jo.tollebeek@arts.kuleuven.be

Endre Kiss

D.Sc., Dr., ph.d. dr. habil. Born 1947 Debrecen, Hungary. Professor at the Department of Philosophy History in University of Eötvös in Budapest as well as at the Department of Kulture and Education History at the Jewish University in Budapest (OR-ZSE). Humboldt Fellowship, 1999 founder of the postmodern centrum Budapest/Székesfehérvár. Publications: u.a.: *Der Tod der k.u.k. Weltordnung in Wien*, Wien/Köln/Graz 1986; *Hermann Broch elmélete a polibisztorikus regényről* [Hermann Brochs Theorie über den polyhistorischen Roman], Budapest 1981; *Against New Metaphysics*, Cuxhaven/Dartford 1996, *Zur Rekonstruktion der präsentistischen Rationalität Mittel-Europas*, Cuxhaven/Dartford 1998, *Monetarista globalizáció és posztoszocialista rendszerváltás* [Monetaristische Globalisation und postsozialistischer Systemwechsel], Budapest 2002; *Friedrich Nietzsche evilági filozófiája* [Friedrich Nietzsches diesseitige Philosophie], Budapest 2005; *Marx lábnyomai* [Die Fussstapfen von Karl Marx]. Budapest, 2013.
Email: andkiss@hu.inter.net

László Dávid Törő

Since 2014 he has been a PhD-Student in history at the University of Debrecen. His main research field is historiography and he is working on his doctoral thesis about the historical writing of Ferenc Eckhart. Earlier he dealt with the impact of Michel Foucault on Hungarian historiography and earned the third place at the XXXI. OTDK (National Scientific Students' Associations Conference). During his MA-studies he turned to the debates between Harold Steinacker and Ákos Timon about Hungarian constitutional history. His study about the topic got published In: *Valóság*, 2015/1. 30–41. pp.
Email: tlaszlod@gmail.com

Radu Mârza

Graduated from the „Babeş-Bolyai” University in Cluj, Faculty of History and Philosophy (BA, MA, PhD) and the „Jan Amos Komensky” University in Bratislava (PhD). Associate Professor of the „Babeş-Bolyai” University in Cluj, Faculty of History and Philosoph, Department of Medieval, Early Modern and History of Arts. He is teaching courses and seminars about the history of the Byzantine Empire, Romanian medieval history, Cultural history of travelling and tourism, Slavs and slavonism in the medieval and early modern Romanian history. Publications: *The History of Romanian Slavic Studies. From the Beginnings until the First World War*. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Academiei Române, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2008, *Romanian Historians and*

Propaganda (1914–1946). The Case of Transylvania. Translation from Romanian by Carmen-Veronica Borbély. Bratislava, 2014.

Email: rmarza@yahoo.com

Greta-Monica Miron

Graduated from „Babes-Bolyai” University in Cluj. University professor in the Faculty of History and Philosophy, Medieval History and Historiography. Her field of research is the history of Romanian historiography and the United Church of Transylvania in the 18th century. Her publications include: Greta-Monica Miron: *Biserica greco-catolică din comitatul Cluj în secolul al XVIII-lea*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2007. Greta-Monica Miron: „...poruncește, scoale-te, du-te, propoveduește...”. *Biserica greco-catolică din Transilvania. Cler și enoriași (1697–1782)*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2004.

Email: gretamiron2003@yahoo.com

Vilmos Erős:

Associate Professor at the University of Debrecen (Historical Institute), where he teaches Hungarian and European historiography, Theory of History and History of Political Ideas. Now he is working on a summary about the Hungarian historical writing (in English). Vilmos Erős: *Modern historiográfia. Az újkori történetírás egy története*. Budapest, 2015. Vilmos Erős: In *The Lure of Geistesgeschichte: The Theme of Decline in Hungarian Historiography and Historical Thinking in The First Half of The Twentieth Century*. In: *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*. vol. 22. (2015) 411–432.

Email: cros.vilmos@gmail.com

Áron Szele

PhD candidate at the Central European University. His previous training is in the field of comparative social history of Eastern and Central Europe. After receiving his B.A. from the Faculty of History of the University of Bucharest, he gained an M.A. in comparative Hungarian–Romanian history from the Department of History of the CEU. He is currently working on a doctoral thesis concerning the right-wing populist movements of contemporary Hungary. His main themes of interest and expertise include entangled histories and relationships of Hungary and its neighbors, populist and right-wing radical movements, and minority issues in East-Central Europe.

Email: aronszele@gmail.com

András Lajos Kiss

Born in 1954 Kisújszállás. Graduated from Russian language and history in Nyiregyháza. (1987) and philosophy in Budapest (1995). Habilitated in Debrecen (2005). Between 1984 and 2016 Docent and College Professor at the Collage of Nyiregyháza (from 2016 University). Fields of research: French, Russian and German Philosophy and Historical Epistemology. Publications: *Az eltűnt lelkiismeret nyomában*. Budapest, Liget Műhely Kiadó, 2001. *Teóriák hálójában*. L'Harmattan Kiadó, Budapest, 2005. *Haladásparadoxonok*. Liget Műhely Kiadó, Budapest, 2009. *Értelmiség az ezredfordulón*. Liget Műhely Kiadó, Budapest, 2014. *Politika és diskurzus*. L'Harmattan Kiadó, Budapest, 2015.

Email: kisslaj@nyf.hu

Róbert Káli

Accomplished his graduate studies at the Historical Institute in the University of Debrecen, where he is recently doing his PhD studies as well. He is working on doctoral thesis about the „history of cliometrics”. Received „A” research grant at the Library of John F. Kennedy Center for North American Studies in 2015 where he was working on a study about the „Time on the Cross” debate. He also attempts to utilise the methodology of quantitative history in the local history and develops a height database of prisoners in the 1930's Debrecen. Káli Róbert: *Egy birtokjogi per és Balmazújváros társadalma a 18–19. században*. Új Nézőpont I. évf. (2015) 3–4. sz. 23.–50.

Email: kali_robi@hotmail.com

Martina Pillingová

Received PhD from Trnava University, Faculty of Arts, Department of History. Pillingová, Martina: *Svätoplukovská legenda medzi humanizmom a osvietenstvom v českej a moravskej historiografii*. In: HOMZA, Martin et al.: *Svätopluk v európskom písomníctve. Štúdie z dejín svätoplukovskej legendy*. Bratislava: PostScriptum, 2014, s. 283–331. Pillingová, Martina: *Pozoruhodnosti barokových frontispisov niektorých českých a moravských historikov*. In: HOMZA, Martin et al.: *Svätopluk v európskom písomníctve. Štúdie z dejín svätoplukovskej legendy*. Bratislava: PostScriptum, 2014, s. 332–336. Pillingová, Martina: *Svätoplukovská tradícia u Slovákov v druhej polovici 18. storočia*. In: HOMZA, Martin et al.: *Svätopluk v európskom písomníctve. Štúdie z dejín svätoplukovskej legendy*. Bratislava: PostScriptum, 2014, s. 371–406.

Email: m.pillingova@gmail.com

István M. Szijártó

Associate Professor at the Department of Economic and Social History of Loránd Eötvös University, Budapest. His main fields of interest are the social history of politics in Hungary in the 18th century, and theoretical problems of microhistory. He is coordinating the activities of the 'Microhistory Network' since 2007. Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon–István M. Szijártó: *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice*. Routledge, 2013; Szijártó M. István: *A történész mikroszkópja. A mikrotörténelem elmélete és gyakorlata*. L'Harmattan, 2014.

Email: szijarto@elte.hu

