

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav světových dějin

Seminář nejnovějších dějin

Zora Gonczarow

**Tragedie a obět:
Maďarská a slovenská historiografie 15
let po změně**

**The Tragedy and the Sacrifice:
Hungarian and Slovak Historiography
15 Years after the Change**

Disertační práce

vedoucí práce – Prof. PhDr. Vladimír Nálevka, CSc.

2009

Prohlašuji, že jsem disertační práci vykonal samostatně s využitím uvedených pramenů a literatury.

Content

- I. Introduction
- II. Methodology
- III. Slovak Historiography
- IV. Hungarian Historiography
- V. Case Comparison
- VI. Conclusion
- VII. Bibliography
- VIII. Abstract

I. INTRODUCTION

"Sub-sumption of cultural identity under national identity is not an innocent move!"¹ Neither is it innocent to subsume history to national discourse. There has been and ever will be a gap between history as it happened and history as it is written. The second can in fact never fully re-capture the first because the first can never be re-done.² The body of historical work is also referred to as historiography. But historiography is also semiotics of specific studies, or a discipline or sub-discipline in itself of the processes by which knowledge of the past, recent or distant, is obtained and transmitted. As the tools of historical investigation have changed over time and space, the term itself bears multiple meanings and is not readily associated with a single all-encompassing definition. Apart from Marc Bloch one can mention also E. H. Carr's, *What is History?* (1961) and Hayden White's *Metahistory* (1974) as the pillars of the literature related to this topic.

The body of historical work is a reflection on past as because it aims to explain it de facto interprets. The history of countries, continents or cultures aims to explain a broad area, which usually involves several hundreds years and also a huge territory. For this reason historiography tends to lead the author to generalisations. Even if working in a group, the authors on different periods still have to consult and need to present their final text as a consistent piece of work, hence they generalise. They want to present a picture of a country, a geographical area or a social group the way it could be understood by that actors of the history as well as by those that are simply interested. As the "actors of history" are often understood not only those, they took part in particular historical events, but also their successors. They understand the history of their grandfathers to be their own and need to build a picture of it.

¹ Nederveen Pieterse, Jan, *Development Theory*. (London: Sage, 2001) pp. 63

² Bloch, Marc, *The Historian's Craft*. (New York: Vintage Book, 1953)

Professional historical writing in one way respond to the picture society has about its own history. From this point of view, historiography reflects the contemporary state of mind of the society. On the other hand historical writing influences this picture. Authors explicitly or implicitly aspire to change the way their readers understand history. Though history can as a discipline be understood as independent from social, political, culture or religious influence, the author never is. And for "national history" this rule applies twice. The national history as a discourse aims to explain history from the point of view of a national revival. In the process of national revival, every nation for centuries fought for its independent identity, for its territory and for its own state. By national discourse it is understood as a significant defect of history, that very often there were many potential nations on the same territory having now "a right" to claim it. Often the "own" geographical territory was not even there in the history and very often there was also a lack of a nation, where this was supposed to be.

But all these defects can be "set right". Usually by historical writing. The authors willingly contribute to the picture of "our national history". Some of them are convinced nationalists, some of them victims of public demands. Sometimes the contribution to the national history happens as a historian's reaction to a view presented by colleagues, that the historian regards as ridiculous. Then some most modest historians give up their precious time to satisfy a public demand on "our history", or just simply to discharge their feeling of personal responsibility towards this public discipline. "If I don't write on this topic who else will?"

The moral and intellectual meaning of a historical book in Central and Eastern European countries still carries slightly greater importance than it does in Western Europe. The social context of the book is sometimes more important than the historical text itself. The publication of a book on Second World War in the late 1990's can often represent a power struggle among recent political leaders. Also, the

particular interpretation of certain key historical events is given greater importance than the facts themselves. This situation is not new for the Central European region; it has not changed for 60 years. Polish film director Krzysztof Kieslowski in the last biographical documentary before his death ("I am so-so") says: ' There was a certain danger in openly telling things during the period of Communism. Now you can say whatever you want, but it means nothing.' From his point of view, the circumstances have changed radically. But there are still residues from that period, particularly visible in relations between intellectual disciplines and social life. Intellectuals as those who feel and carry responsibility for society and act accordingly to it, are deeply engaged in social life and their work is closely watched.

History is written by winners - in case of national history, by one nation-state. During the last two centuries most of the European nations were able to establish their own states, because "the spirit of the time" was favourable. Together with the national state, national history flourished, but it had and still has many specifics. National history excludes the bigger historical picture, because it builds on one specific nation. As any neighbouring national history also builds on one specific nation (a different one), the two (or more) of them can never come to a compromise. All of them see historical events from the point of view of their own , particular myth of nation-building. All the events which have occurred are judged by their perceived contribution or non-contribution to their own, particular national revival. Whereas, the end of the First World War is a long-awaited event "setting many nations free" for those that were indeed set free, for others who were set free but lost territory, believed to be one of the key attributes of a nation, the interpretation of the peace is a little bit more difficult.

The national history is always utilitarian and therefore instrumentalistic. It follows an idea and creates the interpretation favorable to it. It also has less obvious devices of national interpretation. It is selective. It creates an obligatory *corpus of*

*national history*³, which dictates how and by which events the national history will or should be described. It creates a set of events deemed to exemplify that particular nation-building. All these events have to be mentioned by any historian of the period. Any historian who does not mention it is either an inferior foreigner or an inferior neighboring national historian. In both cases the authors lose their legitimacy for interpreting that particular history to its own actors or their successors. National history appears to be in the strict possession of a nation.

National discourse in history is an exclusivist one. It not only excludes the bigger picture and is selective in its interpretation. It also excludes minorities. The winning ethnic group is always the only one and the others, unless joining in, have no place in that history. In Central and Eastern Europe this is the fate of Roma people or those of Jewish origin. Whereas, in some of the national histories, they are simply ignored, in others they are either transformed into an indistinguishable part of the nation or presented as inner enemies. A specific role in historical interpretations is played by those nations that are the constituting nation of a neighboring state. They can hardly be expelled from history, but their role is almost without exception negative. The neighboring nations, if mentioned, are pictured as an opposing power and, not infrequently, again as an enemy.

National identity would be nothing without cultural struggle. National identity, like any identity, is a process and therefore often a struggle. The cultural struggle is usually conducted in specific areas, which is what makes one different from another; among them are language, religion, historical or territorial identity. Cultural struggle is the reason why people fight for their interpretation of history. "Their history" constitutes an integral part of their cultural identity. There are two approaches to the culture: one is deductive, the other inductive. The deductive model is the national one. It says, the national culture is derived from macrosocial powers. This approach

³ This term is a key one for our thesis and it is introduced and explored in the methodological section.

understands culture as a product almost in its materialistic form. The national culture is then music, visual art or other typical products of a nation. It is also the language. National history is a cultural heritage. The national culture is one of the key topics of any national ideology. It is something worth fighting for. "The politics of nation building involves the marginalization of aliens, suppression of minorities and indigenous peoples - a process sometimes captured under the heading of internal colonialism."⁴

The inductive model of culture is sometimes called local cultural discourse. It was mainly influenced by cultural anthropology and concerns the manifestation of culture in terms of culture as behavior understanding and everyday life.

Not only national history, but also national identity is an exclusive one. Everyone in Europe either adopts single national identity or experiences a certain pressure to choose between the given options. It is possible to adopt two or more national identities, but it is rare and it may cause problems. There are national identities that have nothing common and are simultaneously adoptable without causing difficulties. There are also national identities that are in permanent conflict and to claim both of them can only create personal risks. It is extremely difficult to be Hungarian and Slovak at the same time. One can do this in Prague, though one may seem strange, but one can hardly defend this position in southern Slovakia. If the parents are from both nations, sooner or later one is expected to choose, or to become a suspicious intruder in both social environments. If however one decide on retaining both or even more identities, besides gains from belonging to this or that national or ethnic group, one is lucky to find a single other person claiming the same combination. One's choice is simply a personal one, it does not make him/her a part of any group.

⁴ Nederveen Pieterse, Jan, *Development Theory*. (London: Sage, 2001) pp. 63

To avoid the trouble with European identity in Europe, one can vote for a European identity or to stick to a non-European one. Being born in the UK to parents from the Ivory Coast, one is British and has probably never been to the Ivory Coast. First default option is to be British. Hardly any other European country is likely have such an open option. But this openness is strongly influenced by the history of the country and also by the way how the country dealt with its history. Because of its imperial past Great Britain understands and accepts its people being not of the same colour and culture. The state identity (citizenship) is distinguished from the cultural identity. Thanks to this concept Britain reached successfully the modern age and today offers an identity not burdened with the past or a nation.

For this opened approach to state identity achievable by anyone, Britain is getting its strength from the past. It is, however, an exception. The other European countries also carry the consequences of their past. But they make them weak. They carry on mixing the state and the nation (national culture). The choice of proclaimed identity one makes has different consequences in different European countries. It brings us back to the importance of history and how it is understood in particular countries. It brings us back to the importance of a national discourse in history.

But does British identity move you? Does it make you fight? Hungarian identity on most occasions certainly does. So what is the relationship between the national identity and the psychological dispositions of the modern man? Is the national identity so strong and emotional, that it can not be simply exchanged for another one? And what is the reason that the phenomenon that arose two hundred years ago has been causing such a mess in Europe ever since? Because it is difficult to believe that any national identity is passed by blood, the only two strong connections to emotions would be through imprinting at an early age and the psychological need of a member of a social group to identify himself or herself with a group as large as a nation. The nation is a group or a concept of a group most of whose members have no

chance to meet personally; they do not always share the same space, though they may share a common interest of a well-being of their nation.

The sense of the national identity is one of the common results of modern socialization - the process of learning one's culture and how to live within it. Even more important is the fact that there is a place in people's minds for a national identity. In another words, the modern man is ready for identification with such a big group. The sense of identification with a group has already grown so far, most people in Europe can feel themselves to be a part of a severalmillionheaded nation. But how is it possible? People have to learn affection towards "their nation" during their lifetime, especially during their youth. That acquired early, affection lasts strongly and for longer because it is written deeply in minds. In this sense nationalism is passed on with one's "mother's milk". The identification with a nation requires emotional engagement: otherwise there would be no reason to become angry when someone claims one's nation behaved as mass murderers some five hundred years ago. Also, if one is to become fond of someone else, one has to learn him. The same is with the nation. There would not be any affection for a nation, if there was no information about it or if it had no specific character. This may be exactly what is missing from British identity. But it is not our task to deal with the British, but with the Central Europeans.

Central Europe exists not as a political unity, but as a cultural one in both senses of the word. "Central Europe is a culture or faith. Her boarder is imaginary and it is to be defined in every historical epoch again and again" said Milan Kundera - Czech writer, philosopher and emigrant - in 1984 beginning an intellectual discussion on Central Europe. Central Europe is the region lying between the variously and vaguely defined areas of Eastern and Western Europe. In addition, Northern, Southern and Southeastern Europe may variously delimit or overlap into Central Europe. The term and widespread interest in the region itself came back into fashion after the end

of the Cold War but its history was rather more interesting. The very first concept from the beginning of 19th Century mixed science, politics and economy and was strictly connected with intensively growing German economy and its aspirations to dominate a part of European continent called *Mitteleuropa*. The interwar period brought new geopolitical system and economic and political problems, and the concept of Central Europe took a different character. The centre of interest was moved to its eastern part – the countries that have reappeared on the map of Europe: Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. However, neither a concept of Little Entente, nor the concept of Międzymorze could unite the otherwise in different direction looking countries. The opportunity came only after 1948 and especially during the years of strengthening of the dissident movement. On the other hand outside the region the idea was also developed. The topic became popular in Western Europe and the United States, much of the research being carried out by immigrants from Central Europe among them Oskar Halecki.⁵

Central Europe is not only linked by similarities across countries in the cultural life of literature, theatre or music, but it also has very similar ways of understanding everyday life and of living it (the other sense of the word "culture"). All Central Europeans, Hungarians or Slovaks have very similar habitus, in other words a set of acquired patterns of thought, behavior, and taste. The concept of habitus has been used as early as Aristotle but in contemporary usage was introduced by Marcel Mauss and later re-elaborated by Pierre Bourdieu. These patterns, or "dispositions", are the result of internalization of culture or objective social structures through the experience of an individual or a group.

Central European mentalities are compatible within the broad perspective of Europe, though they are not identical. Even if fighting with language difficulties, a Pole will better understand the meaning of a sentence of a Hungarian, than a Spaniard.

⁵ Halecki, Oscar, *The limits and divisions of European history*. (London and New York, 1950)

This commonly is a result of shared experience. Bourdieu extended the scope of the term habitus to include a person's beliefs and dispositions. Habitus then can be defined as a system of durable and transposable "dispositions" as lasting, acquired schemes of perception, thought and action.⁶ The habitus, or the final achievements of the socialization, depends on the society the individual is brought up in and on his or her family and other social factors.

In order to strengthen their identity, societies build on homogeneity, on common aims, values and also on common history. Therefore the way they understand and interpret history is the key to their understanding of contemporary life. For groups or societies as entities it is not historical events that count, but interpretations of the events themselves.

Any Central European culture or Central European identity is hard to be discerned when the national discourse is on. National discourse is an obstacle for finding another, more suitable identity for any European person, because it forces one either to accept or to refuse fully one or another national identity without being given another option almost as if no other cultural identity is possible except the national one.

The effect of nationalism on historiography is very similar. When it comes to concepts of history for larger modern European territory, a historian is left with a nationally limited discourse, whatever his or her personal belief may be. A modern history, particularly when it deals with politics, is still very much dependent on the state and its concept. Historical writing may in practice fight for its independence from political systems, but it can only hardly claim its independence from the "concept" of the contemporary state. As modern historians, we can write about past events that do not have a lot in common with the contemporary state, or that do not go beyond the limits of a relatively narrow frame but to complete a history of this or that

⁶ Bourdieu, Pierre, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. (Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 1977)

country, territory or group, we have to work with concepts. And it seems that those concepts in Europe today are only the national ones. The problem for Central Europe is the lack of concept of history and therefore also for identity.

The concept of "European history" is already in the process of forming and will probably be confirmed in the future. But should we not be alarmed by the fact that a concept (or discourse) of European history is introduced by a political one? As if the only option for the historical concepts was to be derived from the political one. This is particularly obvious in "big historical stories" and it is so always in "national histories". In the case of national history, the reason for its undimmed popularity could be the national state. National states, as established during the 19th and 20th centuries exist until today not only within the same borders and under the same names, but also often with the same national ideology.

George Schöpflin⁷ is wrong claiming that neither a nation nor a state is eternal and therefore there is no point in sanctifying either of them. The problem is that the state is eternal. At least some form of it. A state is a cultural practice of society living and functioning together and in that sense it hardly can be missed. In Europe we can hardly expect any changes to the current situation. States may change their forms, may change their territory or regimes, but always will be here as an essential organization of society in a developed region. Here our problem begins to become more complicated, because the reason of an instrumental element in Central European historical writing has two sources: nation and state.

By exploring contemporary Central European historiography I intend in a modest way to contribute to the discussion on culture and national identity, and to the discussion on Central Europe. I analyse the contemporary historical writing with a case-comparison on inter-war history in two countries: Hungary and Slovakia. The

⁷ George Schöpflin is a member of the European parliament for Fidesz (Hungarian Civic Union), Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) and European Democrats in the Parliament, and was Jean Monnet professor of politics at University College London.

state of art section aims to get a closer look at the Hungarian and Slovak historiography how it developed 15 years after the change, i.e. after gaining the full freedom of expression. The comparative analysis is used to discover the writing strategies. I have neither the tools nor the capacity to compare Central European historiography with any other European one, but at least I can identify the pictures two studied nations built about themselves. This could be the first step for future research. Neither do I intend to research into national identity, because that is not any more a task for a historian either. To study the causes of strength and influence of national identity is not in my remit; instead I study causes of strength and influence of national historiography in Central Europe. I study uses of national historiography in their relation to purposes and functions. In its limited way the work consists of analysis, how "nation building" works in Central European historiography; what are its tools and strategies.

Let us have a look at our operational methods. In the chapter on methodology we explain our methods. We explain characteristics we use to classify categories of national historical writing and we also explain the purpose and function of the method of comparative.

II. METHODOLOGY

Initially I give an account on Hungarian and Slovak historiography fifteen years after 1989, a year of a big change in society and consequently in academic world. This account I believe to be essential to understand what happened with professional history after this change. The history as science and also historiography change in terms of institutions and personnel, but it also changed methodologically and in terms of topics and approaches. However, my main aim is to compare two post-1989 historiographies related to the inter-war period.

I analyse the contemporary historical writing on the topic of inter-war history in two countries: Hungary and Slovakia. I use analysis to compare them and to extract the similarities and discrepancies in contemporary historical writing in Central Europe. Two modern nations in Central Europe have more common than only the fact that they do not have access to the Sea. Hungarians and Slovaks have already long time been taught that they are part of this or that national culture. They are close neighbours and have hundreds of years of joint history but with different results. Both of them feels extreme distinction between their national identities, each of them is emotionally attached to it and is also convinced that the history of their country is exclusive and unique.

Hungary and Slovakia are chosen as examples of Central Europe because each of them is in a different historical situation from the other and therefore, their historical writing can represent Central European historiography by reflecting its diversity. Slovakia has much shorter state tradition (1939-1945 and later since 1993) and the Slovak nation is one of the youngest nation in Europe. Hungary has an "advantage" in both; it has a long state history as well as long developed national tradition. But it is frustrated with it.

I analyse the interpretations of the interwar period, because it is an essential phase for Central European nation building. The nation and its idea is very much dependent on the nation state and vice versa. Therefore the history of the period, when the contemporary national states were built with their recent borders, has essential meaning for interpreting of national revival. I try to prove that the contemporary national historiographies in Central Europe are not only sub-summoned to national discourse but also are only games of interpretation; they all have one aim: to support the idea of a nation and its state. Where the history is shared on a long term basis and countries have mixed ethnic, cultural and geographical backgrounds, it is the task of a national historian to make them sound distinctive.

As defined earlier, history in terms of past and historiography (historical writing) are divided by one strict border; history is the actual body of actions and events as they happened and historiography is a reflection and interpretation of them. But historiography is not only the "theory of the past". By interpreting the past, historiography happens to become an action in itself. Independently from its intentions, willingly or not willingly, historiography reflects and also influences the present. This becomes history tomorrow. Historiography, in this sense, is not only the past, but also a historical practice "of the present".

Historiography as a practice has consequences in history in terms of the past. Publishing a book with extreme ideas may cause turbulence in academia, evoke a strong response from public or even land the author in court. Writing history and more general "thinking history" is not only a historical, but also a cultural practice. In the same way that we learn to say hello to greet someone, we also learn to think about history. We learn to expect to have some history as individuals and also to have history as a group. Writing history is a natural result of this need. Historiography as a cultural practice has cultural consequences. History helps people to understand their everyday life.

We have an excellent example of massive involvement in national historiographical tradition in Slovak historiography. Many individual authors are already contributing to the theory of hybridity and many other post-national topics, but recently they joined to publish another book on national history. It happened as a response to militant nationalistic historical writing, but it produced only another book on national history⁸. Liberal and open-minded historian, Ľubomír Lipták, in his chapter in the book reveals the weaknesses of the "national story". However, three years later having become the consultant for an ambitious exhibition to celebrate 10 years of Slovak independence, he fails to ensure any mention of the Romany people for the whole period of 20th century. This could be put down to his age and health and also to the arrogance of the exhibitions' organisers publicly claiming his input. Whichever the case, the exhibition did not mention Romany people and it has misled the audience in many other ways.

According to Institute of Public Affairs in Bratislava established by Gregory Mesežnikov, about 7% of the population in Slovakia in 2002 was Romany and their presence in the territory has been significant for a couple of centuries. The message of the above mentioned exhibition is clear: The Romany still do not fit into the official Slovak national history. The problem of national history as a discourse is not only in the active mis-interpretation (or distortion) of the facts by default, misleading and influencing (choice of maps and pictures), but also in "forgetting" of certain groups involved, marginalization of neighbours, minorities and of all those who do not fit in "our story".

My aim is entirely to deal with interpretations, not with any "historical truth", although I am convinced there is a difference between truth and lie in terms of conscious misleading and misinterpreting of facts, not only the difference between

⁸ Mannova, Elena (ed.): *A Concise History of Slovakia*. (Bratislava: SAV, 2000)

interpretations in historical writing. The historical truth are facts, actions, events how they happened. That is called the past. The opposite to this truth is not a lie, but an untruth - a statement about facts, how they did not happen. Lie is an intentional misleading and misinterpreting in order to achieve something. It is instrumental, it has a purpose and it has its place within concept of morality. The past, the historical events, how they happened, have as such no moral position at a present.

Any reflection of past is already interpretation and therefore has a place within the idealistic (or materialistic) and moral concepts of the interpreter. Any reflection is therefore also relative. However, I do not intend to deal with intentions of the authors and therefore not with lie and truth. I intend to research the methods of the authors, how they approach the past and what are the outcomes. In my study I analyse two historiographies and how they relate to each other; not how they relate to the actual past, which they describe.

As historians or their clients, readers, we only access interpretation - the history can not be undone or done once again for that matter. To repeat the history would be the full truth. But we, as clients of professional historians, we also need the interpretations.

I often use word "nation" in my text. It has to be clear that I do not intend to imply, that the "nation" per se exists; it is a historical construct. The nation as a category exists in people's minds and is massively believed in. The "nation" made a successful career as a concept and therefore also as a motive for action. But this "other life of a nation" does not make it less powerful, rather on the contrary . Believing in the existence of a nation can motivate heroic actions at one place, as it can cause terrific slaughter at another. In this sense nation exist as a significant factor in social behavior - that is, in culture. Using the word "nation" as a concept allows me to write about "national history" and also about the attitude of the "members of the nation " towards the idea of it. In terms of culture the “nation” exists.

I have already given a definition of a nation as a group, whose members one may has no chance to meet all personally and they are not always share the same space. But they share a common interest in the well-being of their nation. Nation for me is a working term that describes beliefs of social groups, rather than the groups themselves. When we speak about Slovaks, we do so not because we necessarily believe they exist in terms of physical or other genetic similarities, but because they feel like Slovaks themselves. This subjective impression gives them strength to act differently from for example Hungarians, but it does not make them different. A child of Slovak parents given to adoption to Hungary will without knowledge about his or her origin grow up to be a Hungarian. His or her physical or psychological dispositions will not change, he or she will be easy going or a trouble-maker, open-minded or a racist independently from one of those countries, but the national identity in this case will be Hungarian instead of Slovak. This issue would get more complicated with two different races, but for our purpose this example fits just as well. I intend to search what effect the concept of the nation has in the theory and the practice of historical writing.

The nation exists as a cultural practice. If the nations are not distinct from each other either physically or psychologically, they all have the same chance to make the best of their history in terms of its interpretation. It can be only their temporary, however massively accepted conviction about their national identity, which creates the differences between them and consequently also differences between their national stories. In another words Hungarians are not jingoistic by birth, but because of massive acceptance of jingoism in behavior. If a person believing the "nation" being more than a cultural practice says, "Hungarians are jingoists", the statement can be regarded as a falsely telescoping with terms describing cultural causes. Respecting the author's view the statement would be a contradiction, because it would mix terms of natural origin with cultural origin. If one accepting "nation" as a culture says

“Czechs have modest national pride”, using both terms as culture terms, it does not cause him any philosophical complication.

I study Central European Historiography, because I expect Central European culture to be different from that of Western or Eastern Europe. I do not expect Central Europe to express or reflect political unity, but to represent cultural unity in both senses of the word: culture as a product of artistic or intellectual work and culture as a way of understanding everyday life and acting in it. One of the hypotheses of my study is that there are significant similarities among Central European historical writings that can be explained with reference to similar historical or other conditions. I am convinced Central Europe exists on the same level of cultural practice as nation.

The aim of my research is a critical analysis of the contemporary historiography in the Central European region and more broadly my research touches issues concerning Central Europe, historiography and the concept of the nation in general.

My main questions are: What are the main tendencies of the contemporary historiographies in Central Europe? Central Europe countries are for this purpose represented by Hungary and Slovakia. How does national discourse work in practice? Are the Hungarian and Slovak historiographies mutually influenced and connected enough, that we can speak about “Central European historiography” or “culture” respectively?

I assume that the contemporary historiography in both countries is based on national discourse. If this is a truth, there must be significant characteristics of it. For nation being a groups in terms of behavior the same applies as for any other group. A social group can be defined as two or more humans that interact with one another, accept expectations and obligations as members of the group, and share a common identity. Characteristics shared by members of a group may include interests, values, ethnic or social background, and kinship ties. Such a group is typically identified by

who "we" are, what is our main characteristic and our past, who is our enemy, what is our territory and similar. The same applies for the nation. These points of identification are likely to be found in historical writing. In our case those will be signs of national group characteristics. I have developed two hypotheses which will be tested on selected historiography representing Hungarian and Slovak and thus also Central European historiography.

Hypothesis nr. 1: If characteristics of group identification (in these terms national group) are present in Central European historical writing, then the historiography is subordinated to national discourse.

I will analyse representative historiography which aims to give a picture of the history of the two mentioned states. As there are no specific methods dealing with this topic I developed a method of my own. I am convinced there is in any historiography with national discourse a *corpus* of national history. The national corpus is a body of facts consisting of certain historical events and their interpretation and that exists as an independent and closed system or structure. National corpus means that there are some historical facts, there must be present in any national historical synthesis. On this collection of facts the story is based and the set is usually interpreted some special way. Although, the authors may have a different point of view on the corpus and also the individual events, the corpus has to be always presented as a set. I am looking for this corpus in various books which have different viewpoints and try to prove its existence. I am also looking for a high point (similar to Leitmotif) of any historical period, which somehow characterizes the national story. It is usually, but not necessarily, a moment of pride which for our purposes I call "*event symbolical*". Such a typical event puts the period in history in a specific light. I would expect to find such an event in any period and thus expect to find in the period analysed. There also has to be a national enemy, whose function is to strengthen the sense of who we, members of the group, are. Usually the national group enemy is another nation, which

often prevents nation number one from its self-realization. In case I find no proof of a national discourse, the contemporary Central European historiography uses either other discourse or is in state of total chaos or independence from a bigger concept.

Hypothesis nr. 2: If there are similarities in writing strategy in both studied countries representing Central European region and these similarities can not be explained by national discourse there must be another common characteristic behind, possibly the Central European one.

This possible similarity if found, could hardly be based on any common history of the last 50 years. Both countries though, behind the Iron Curtain, had very different experience of socialism and particularly for the historiography the last fifty and especially the last twenty years were far different. This situation is closely inspected in the section on Hungarian and Slovak historiography after 1989. Another example why eventual similarity in both historiographies could hardly be a result of similarities in history is the fact that both countries have experienced completely different development of a nationhood and statehood, so neither of these facts can be a reason for any similarities found.

In general my methodological approach is based on sociological methods. I use "content analysis" for dealing with texts and I compare the results of the analyses for both mentioned historiographies. I have chosen several professional historical books from both countries and also have chosen a specific period on which the analysis to conduct. The analysis is practiced on historical books, on syntheses (longer texts exceeding the inter-war period) or monographies focusing on the inter-war period. Reason to prefer synthesis is efficiently catching the general idea and also extracting the main features of the period. By doing so we are supposed to get a more-dimensional picture of contemporary Central European Historiography. The critical analysis is to be exercised on popular though professional historical writing and therefore I do not use textbooks for this purpose. The books were chosen with

prioritising large syntheses over monographies under the condition that the book devotes at least 30 pages to the inter-war period. 30 pages allows the authors to go deeply in the subject, on the other hand, the synthesis presses the historian to name things briefly and clearly. Within syntheses we prioritise those, which include longer period or include "History of Hungary", of Slovakia as whole. In case there was more than 10 bigger syntheses published within the last 16 years, my strategy was to cover the whole recent period (since 1989) and not to include one author twice. Eventually, the choice of books turned out to be less complicated due to fewer publications fitting our conditions. I have not included any author twice (even if the author contributed to a synthesis and then wrote a book of his own. This left me with a rather short list of authors covering in both cases large spectrum in terms of approach.

I have chosen books from each country published between 1990 and 2005. The reason for this choice was the freedom of speech and publishing, which can be dated in Slovakia and Hungary since 1990. Since that time, there is not anything what could not be published if the author finds a publisher or publish his or her work on his/her own. This was not an obvious state of matters in 1989 and before. Then, among the consequences for publishing outside the ideological mainstream were to be found on a scale from prison to forced emigration. The loss of any chances in a professional carrier was the least possible complication. 1989 meant a big change in Central European social sciences. Whether the chance was really lived up to is another question.

Although it takes at least one-two years to write and publish a historical book, we consider a subject of our research books published in early time after the break out of the freedom. Historians and authors, that have been always involved in historical writing, though sometimes excluded from official groups of historians, have had their work often ready for publishing. They wrote for themselves or even sometimes for

publishing, which had not after all happened. Their work in this situation could lack influence of other than their ideas, and we can consider it to be free from the pressure of the regime (if not free from ideology). If such a work was by the author considered ready for publishing it could have been published almost immediately after 1989. That is why in my analysis I would consider in principle book published as early as in 1990.

I choose from all the books published after 1989 independently from the year of their origin. Some of them might have waited for the publishing for years, others might have been re-published. My main reason to include these too was their current social relevance reflected by their author, publisher and eventually their readers.

The reason why to focus on the interwar period in terms of my analysis was its revival after 1989. This subject is touched upon in the section on Hungarian and Slovak historiographies after 1989. Both historiographies devote extremely large number of books precisely to this period. And this turn came only in 1989. Period after 1918 is essential not only for nation building, but also for historiography. Historical writing was flourishing and become more accessible and more popular with the state nations. It has adopted almost exclusively the national discourse. Apart from brief description of process of building each of the chosen historiographies we would like to point out several long term characteristics each of them offer to the youngest historians as a legacy. Our aim is to test and possibly prove that the main discourse has not changed since 1918 and therefore every Central European historian must on his or her first steps in the discipline either accommodate it or stand to it.

When regarding to the inter-war period I do include the Second World War. The main reason is that in my theory one of the countries has its peak moment, its symbolical event in this period. The Second World War has meant extremely new and important experience for at least one of the countries. Slovakia for the first time achieved its own state

At the beginning I give a general report on the state of art after 1989 in both countries. As explained earlier in the Central Europe a big political and therefore historical role belongs to historiography. Since 1990 politics, history and historiography met in the story of HSDS, book of Milan Ďurica and the general public in Slovakia or in the story of FIDESZ and House of Terror in Hungary or also elsewhere. Only after making the reader more familiar with the potential conflicts between history and its interpretation, I come to the parallel analysis of the Hungarian and Slovak books.

Initially, I describe all of the analysed books and their stories. Important is the author and his or her reaction to the 1989 and possibly 1993 in Slovak case. Each of the books hides its own history, why and when it was published, whether it existed earlier and many consequences of publishing.

Then I closely analyse the national corpus of the two countries. The analysis happens side by side as the inter-war period unfolds. The inter-war period shows different characteristics shown by different authors, but all of them are explained on several facts and events, they can not be left out. This summary of facts and events we call "national corpus". National corpus of each of the three countries consists of 50-60 events or facts which have a special position in national history and are repeatedly reinterpreted in each book. These events have a special role to explain specifics of each national state. They explain on which idea the state was build, what was its tradition, its relations to other countries, its pride and aspirations. The national corpus in sketch describes the whole interwar period and at the same time gives the national history its meaning.

How the national corpus works can be illustrated on the following example: Mária Ormos writes about French Frank forge scandal (she does not mention a word more on the subject) and takes the 'obvious' parts of the national corpus for granted and understood: "The forge scandal in 1996 was closed by a trial which disclosed the

circumstances and brought partial execution, but during which every speech was cleverly cut at the point when the upper classes – the Army leadership, the government - would have been mentioned. By the way the scandal was much more than an entertaining intermezzo how it is regarded by most people. From the foreign policy point of view it was in fact incredibly harmful and its affect in Western Europe lasted for almost two years.” (*"A hamisítási botrány 1926-ban perrel zárult le, amely feltárta az események és a végrehajtók egy részét, de amelynek során minden szílat gondosan elváltak azokon a pontokon, ahol már felsőbb körök - vezérkar, kormány - felelőssége kerülhetett volna szóba. A botrány egyébként sokkal több volt szórakoztató intermezzónál, aminek többnyire tekintik." Külpolitikailag ugyanis rendkívül káros volt, es hatása Nyugat-Europában közel két évig tartott. "*)⁹ Who knows what is she talking about? Only Hungarians brought up on national history (which till late 90's certainly was the case of elementary and high schools) and perhaps several non-Hungarians likely to be Hungarian historians.

In the following section on terminology I focus on how the historiographies describe the shared international events and what terminology they use. Often the discrepancies are rather big. For example Hungarian historiography often uses special terms for former Hungarian territories, and that happen even after the former loss. An example is a term "Upper land" (*"Felvidek"*)¹⁰ for Slovakia used in 1919, when formally the country was a part of Czechoslovakia. Though the used terminology has not to be an exclamation of a claim it is historically out of place and in the same connotation would never be used in Slovak historiography. Also "Upper Hungary"¹¹ is perfectly understandable for a Hungarian reader, however, would never be used in Slovak historiography for the same period; for an educated reader it might be

⁹ Ormos, Mária, *Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945* (Debrecen: 1998) pp.119

¹⁰ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 30

¹¹ Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) pp. 113

understood though. 6 December 1918 “On the basis of Hungarian-Slovak agreement in the Upper Country is the demarcation border declared more or less on the ethnical basis.” (*A magyar-szlovák megállapodással a Felvidéken nagyjából az etnikai határok mentén jelölnek ki demarkációs vonalat.*)¹²

Another area of interest is the identification of the enemy. All groups identities need except for their history and common believes also their enemy. It has to be clearly marked who are "we" and who are the "others"; The special others which are marked "enemies" have a special role to tight the group together. The following example is from one of the most discussed Slovak books of the 1990's. Milan Ďurica there presents history in a chronological list of events. Without any need to name the enemy himself, Ďurica uses words of one Andrej Hlinka: “27th September * Andrej Hlinka in his public speech said: ’Not the Czechs are our biggest enemies. Our biggest enemies are Slovak Czechoslovakians whom we have to conquer in the political field by voting ballots, in the economic field by professional organisations and in the cultural field by magazines of all sorts.’ (,27. september * Andrej Hlinka vo verejnom prejave povedal: ,Nie Česi sú našimi najväčšími nepriateľmi. Našimi najväčšími nepriateľmi sú slovenskí čechslováci, ktorých musíme poraziť na politickom poli hlasovacími lístkami, na hospodárskom poli odbornými organizáciami a na kultúrnom poli časopismi všetkého druhu.“)¹³

Within the area of twenty one inter-war and almost six war years we are looking for one main event, which became a main topic of historiography and since then marks the whole period. We expect this symbolic event and its interpretation essentially influence the interpretation of the inter-war period. The most important historical topic of the inter-war period is usually the one, to which the largest amount of books and other publications is devoted. The amount of bibliography devoted to

¹² Ormos, Mária, *Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945* (Debrecen: 1998) pp.288

¹³ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dějiny Slovenska a Slovakov* (Bratislava: 1996) pp. 121

one period can also help us to locate the event (or the fact). Though, one of significant specific can be reflected; in Hungarian as well as in Slovak historiography the identified event itself is rarely popular for monographies. When it is the authors are usually from extreme right wing. As an example we take so called Slovak National Uprising. Authors of Slovakia history devote a huge part of their publications to the inter-war period and to the Uprising, but as a topic of monographies it has not been very popular.

The formal characteristics of the books, the size of the books and space devoted to the inter-war period is also in our interest. I include page counting with prefaces and summaries (if any) and also pictures and maps if included in the text; their content is usually extremely interesting. Their presence in the book is not without meaning. By the comparison among all the books, I can get closer to the authors approach and possibly intentions.

Finally, I include Hungarian and Slovak texts from the selected historiography alongside the English translation. This way the affect of the original text can be understood in full.

III. SLOVAK HISTORIOGRAPHY

III. 1. In Search of National History

Invariably, each political nation needs its own history. History-writing takes place in a particular space and time. The subject of this paper on Slovak historiography is precisely a political nation's effort to construct its own history in Central Europe from approximately the middle of the 19th century. This effort is obviously a national interpretation, placing a single ethnic group in the center of historiographical interest with the aim of proving its historical-political claim to statehood, whether it is already a reality or not. If a specific historical state territory exists and can be introduced into this historiographic conception, the political history of this state is studied from the point of view of the emancipation and state formation of the selected nation. However, the question is more complicated in our case, the case of Slovakia.

In the period when national consciousness began to appear and spread, the Slovak ethnic group was part of the old Hungarian state formation. Therefore, it is not possible to speak of any original Slovak state area. While before 1918, there was some interest in finding points of contact between Slovak and Czech history, the mainstream of the intelligentsia of the time refused to understand Slovak history as part of Hungarian history, Czech history, or Czechoslovak history¹⁴.

The year 1918 brought a fundamental change. If a common state existed and a common Czechoslovak nation was acknowledged, then a distinctively Czechoslovak history had to be found. Such a history was a pre-condition for the legitimacy of the newly formed state. The idea of a common Czechoslovak history had resounded in

¹⁴ For more details see: Rychlík, Jan: České, slovenské a československé dějiny – vztahy a souvislosti, (Czech, Slovak and Czechoslovak History – Relations and Connections.). In: Československo 1918-1938, HÚ AV ČR, Praha 1999, p. 163-164

Masaryk's thought even earlier, and the Czechoslovak state was successfully founded thanks to him.

However, the understanding of the origin of the Czechoslovak state was different in its two parts (if we leave aside the problem of the Sub-Carpathian Ruthenians). While the Czechs understood Czechoslovakia as the renewal of national independence denied since 1620, what the Slovaks sought in Czechoslovakia was independent state-forming denied to them by Hungary.

From the Czech point of view, Slovakia widened the original Czech state space and so also its history. From the Slovak point of view, the impression arose that the Czechs believed that up to 1918 the Slovaks had been part of Hungary, but now they had to integrate into the history of the Czech lands. This Czech interpretation was grounded partly in a lack of interest in and partly in ignorance of the Slovak environment. In the cultural-political atmosphere of the Kingdom of Hungary Slovaks had developed a different heritage. The wish to overcome this distinctiveness was the motivation for efforts to think in terms of the "Slovak branch of the Czechoslovak nation". Furthermore, this difference was interpreted in a simplified way, as a kind of backwardness: the Slovak nation was at a different economic, administrative, and educational level, which had to be improved by Czech contributions.

At first Czech historians taught at the university in Bratislava founded in 1921, but, as in other areas, this transitional period assisted the birth of a domestic Slovak-language historical science, which went its own way, independently of Czech or Hungarian historiography. Some diligently endeavoured to combine Czech and Slovak histories (Václav Novotný, Václav Chaloupecký, Albert Pražák,¹⁵ and the

¹⁵ Novotný, Václav: *Z dějin československých* (From Czechoslovak History.), Brno 1921
Pražák, Albert: *Češi a Slováci. Literárně dějepisné poznámky k československému poměru* (The Czechs and Slovaks. Literary Historiographic Comments on the Czechoslovak Relationship.), Praha 1929
Pražák Albert: *Československý národ* (The Czechoslovak Nation.), Bratislava 1925

Slovak politician Ivan Dérer¹⁶), but their efforts were conceptually and ideologically conditioned and did not prove to be viable. Slovak history soon freed itself from the framework of Czechoslovak history.

On the political level, autonomous Slovak history threw itself into the autonomist efforts of Hlinka's Slovak People's Party.¹⁷ The conception created by its court historian František Hrušovský¹⁸ persisted into the post-war period and became the basis for the Ľudák version of Slovak history after 1989.¹⁹ In 1942, the Academy of Sciences was founded, and Slovak historiography emerged as a central interest of the Slovak state. However, its officially supported output was more propaganda than scientific history. In the short time between the end of the war and the "February Victory" of 1948, František Bokeš published his *History of Slovakia*.²⁰ However, immediately after the Communist coup the hard line of a united and controlled historiography returned. In the 1960s, the tendency to revise the Czecho-Slovak relationship in the framework of the Republic was again strong in Slovakia.²¹

Discussions appeared on the pages of the *Historický časopis (Historical Periodical)*, and the professor from the Department of Czechoslovak History Miloš Gosiorovský, from 1951 a leading Party personality in the historical sciences at Comenius University, worked a justification for the need to federalize the Republic.²² In the foreword to the new edition of Lipták's *Slovakia in the 20th Century up to the Sixties*,

¹⁶ Dérer, Ivan: *Československá otázka (The Czechoslovak Question)*, Praha 1935

¹⁷ Hlinková Slovenská ľudová strana - HSLS was the main representatives of the autonomist efforts on the Slovak political scene of the inter-war period.

¹⁸ Hrušovský, František: *Slovenské dejiny (Slovak History)*, T.S.Martin 1939

The fact that the book was published in Martin is no accident. From the origin of Matica Slovenská in 1863, Turčiansky Svätý Martin was regarded as a sort of centre of the Slovak national emancipation efforts. *Pohľad na slovenskú politickú minulosť (A View of the Slovak Political Past)* by Ferdinand Ďurčiansky, Bratislava 1943, is a further work from the time of the Slovak state.

¹⁹ For further information on Ľudák historiography see: Rychlík, Jan: *První československá republika v slovenské ľudácké a neoľudácké historiografii, (The First Czechoslovak Republic in Slovak Ľudák and neo-Ľudák Historiography)*. In: *Reflexe dějin první Československé republiky v české a slovenské historiografii*, HÚ AV ČR, Praha 1998

²⁰ Bokeš, František: *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov od najstarších čias až po prítomnosť, (The History of Slovakia and the Slovaks from the Earliest Times to the Present.)* Bratislava 1946

²¹ A new constitution, adopted in 1960, cast doubt on the existence of separate Slovak institutions.

²² Sent to the Party in 1963, fully published in *Historický časopis*, roč. XVI., č. 3, 1968, p. 355-406. Existence of the material acknowledged and well known to all students of history in Slovakia.

Ivan Kamenec wrote: “Perhaps the most important and most effective role was played by historiography (together with other social science disciplines) in establishing the new constitutional solution of the Slovak question in the Czechoslovak Republic. Here, historians had the greatest opportunity for ‘social application‘ and intervention in public affairs“.²³ It is also clear from Kamenec’s comment that a very different accent on individual historical moments and the role of historiography in them is still present in Czech and Slovak theoretical-methodological literature.²⁴

The idea of a united Czechoslovak nation was quietly abandoned after the Second World War, but different perceptions of individual historical moments continued. Hussitism continued to be one of the main controversial themes. Whereas in the Czech lands it was a source of national pride, in Slovakia it was marginal. The Battle of White Mountain of 1620 was another controversial historical moment. For the Czech lands it meant national or state more than religious humiliation, but its anti-Catholic aspect made it less acceptable in Slovakia. It is also clear from this what disagreements needed to be dealt with. It was necessary to confront the concept of an independent Slovak history, emerging in the 1930s, with the Czech concept, which had been developing for a century. From the beginning of the Czechoslovak republic, Slovak and Czech historiography were unequal in their development.

The national conception of Slovak history was definitively constituted during the first two post-war decades. It is characteristic that this happened not only in confrontation with Czech but also with Hungarian historiography. In the light of recent developments, this is obvious, but it was clearly underestimated in post-war “Czechoslovak historiography”. An integrated concept of Slovak history, evidently marked by Marxist historiography, was presented in *The History of Slovakia* volumes

²³ Lipták Lubomír: Slovensko v 20. storočí, Kalligram, Bratislava 1998, p.366

²⁴ For more details see Lubomír Lipták and Jan Rychlík in: Československo 1918-1938, HÚ AV ČR, Praha 1999

I and II from 1961 and 1968, the encyclopedic *Slovakia I – History from 1971* and the *History of Slovakia* volumes I-IV from 1985-1990.

The problems of Slovak historiography up to 1989 had a technical and ideological character. The technical difficulties included the inaccessibility of some domestic sources, especially pertaining to 20th-century history. At the same time, contact with Western historiography was almost impossible and access to foreign sources was limited. Especially in the period of Normalization (the 1970s and 1980s), the travel to Western Europe was possible only for some selected and ideologically reliable persons, and they contributed very little to world historiography. Such historical production had its ideological rules. There was a state plan for scientific research, and only themes approved by the Communist Party could be researched. Until the end, Czechoslovakia made strict demands concerning the content of historical works, covering ideological terminology, themes, and the conclusions of research. Historians learnt to write between the lines, as it were, and their students learnt to read between these lines.

In this respect, there was a great difference between the situation in Czechoslovakia and that in Poland or Hungary. In Poland contact with the so-called ‘Western science‘ was never broken, and if Czech or Slovak researchers wanted to learn about new trends in the social sciences, they often turned to Polish translations. In 1980s Hungary, the regime relaxed so much that, for example, sociologists could openly publish literature about the possibilities of the further social and political development of the country. Nothing like this existed in Czechoslovakia. An individual could find his own way to avoid open conflict with the regime and partially devote herself to her own interests, but an atmosphere of uncertainty and distrust prevailed.

Historical literature could only arise with difficulty in such a cramped environment. In the two decades before the fall of the regime, Czech and Slovak

historiography was closed into itself. It was appropriate to devote attention to world history only to the end of the 19th century, as otherwise the author could only repeat the officially declared clichés. As a result of the deficient knowledge of languages on the part of Czech and Slovak historians and the above-mentioned technical difficulties, medieval history compared badly with the world historiography of the time. The physically closed character of Czechoslovakia also contributed to the concentration on itself, although the region always exhibited such tendencies. National history was the main focus, and in some areas it did achieve some depth. However, in methodology, historiography remained significantly behind Western Europe. Virtually only political history was written, and methodology was not reflected on at all. All this had the result that the “political history of the state of the Czechs and Slovaks” still prevails in the output of Czech and Slovak historiography.

III. 2. Changes after 1989: Institutions, Research Venues, Publications

Alžbeta Sedliaková²⁵ regularly compiles a bibliographic review of Slovak historiographic writings, and many publications and articles have appeared on the state of Slovak historiography after 1989.²⁶ Dušan Kováč has written: “If we speak of

²⁵ Sedliaková, Alžbeta (ed.): *Historiografia na Slovensku 1990-1994, Výberová bibliografia*, Bratislava 1995, Sedliaková, Alžbeta (ed.): *Slovenská historiografia 1995-1999. Výberová bibliografia*, Bratislava 2000, Sedliaková, Alžbeta (ed.): *Slovenská historiografia 2000. Výberová bibliografia*, In: *Historický časopis* 50, 2002, c. 4, p. 699-754, Sedliaková, Alžbeta (ed.): *Slovenská historiografia 2001. Výberová bibliografia*, In: *Historický časopis* 51, 2003, c. 4, p.750-801

²⁶ The whole number of *Bohemia* 42, 2001 and *Historický časopis* 52, 2, 2004 are dedicated to Slovak historiography. Except that: Mannova, Elena – Daniel, David P. (ed.): *A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia*. In: *Studia historica Slovaca* 20, 1995, Winkler, Martina: *Alte Bilder und Neue Perspektiven: Aktuelle Arbeiten zur slowakischen Geschichte*. In: *Bohemia* 42, 2001, p. 391-404, Petruš, Pavol: *Die slowakische Historiographie in den Jahren 1990-1994*. In: *Bohemia* 37, 1996, p. 153-168, Kováč, Dušan: *Die slowakische Historiographie na 1989. Aktiva, Probleme, Perspektiven*. In: *Bohemia* 37, 1996, p. 169-174, Kováč, Dušan: *Paradoxa und Dilemmata der postkommunistischen Geschichtsschreibung*. In: *Osterreichische Osthefte* 44, H. 1/2, p. 15-41, Kowalska, Eva: *Neue Wege zur Bewältigung der Geschichte der Slowakei in den 1990er Jahren*. In: *Osterreichische Osthefte* 44, 2002, H. 1/2, p. 287-297, Hrabovec, Emilia: *Zehn Jahre nach der Wende. Slowakische Historiographie: Ein schwieriger Weg zur Selbstverantwortung*. In: *Osterreichische Osthefte* 44, 2002, H. 1/2, Kováč, Dušan: *Probleme der sozialhistorischen Forschung zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in der slowakischen Historiographie*. In: *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 34, 1994, p. 111-130, Kováč, Dušan: *Die Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung und die Sozialgeschichte in der slowakischen Historiographie seit 1945*. In: *Mitteilungsblatt des Instituts für soziale Bewegung* 23, 2000, p.100-110, Krajcovičová, Natália: *Slovenská historiografia o dejinách medzivojnovej ČSR*. In: *Reflexe dějin první Československé*

the origin of Slovak professional historiography, we must also realize that this origin actually occurred in three stages. The first milestone came in 1919 with the foundation of Comenius University in Bratislava. The second beginning was in 1953 with the establishment of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which included the Institute of History. Unfortunately, this new beginning was marked “from the beginning” by the time – the Bolshevik regime and its ideology. For this very reason, Slovak historiography had its third beginning in 1989.”²⁷ I do not entirely agree with this general periodization of professional historiography in Slovakia, but, penned by a leading Slovak historian with an important position in the Slovak Academy of Sciences, it confirms that professional historiography in Slovakia developed first after 1918 and its development was closely connected with institutional development.

Before 1989, historical work was concentrated in a few institutions. The two most important were the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Comenius University. The low number of institutions enabled the regime to easily control historical work and gave future historians little chance to develop even minimally independent views. Those historians who could not be employed in these institutions after 1968 but remained in the profession most frequently worked in regional archives or libraries and were entirely prevented from publishing. One of these persons was Lubomír Lipták, who was rehabilitated only after 1989. He was an excellent Slovak historian, and the fact that for many years he could not normally contribute to the stream of European historiography is a great loss for all. The situation changed after the so-called ‘Velvet Revolution‘.

republiky v české a slovenské historiografii. Ed. HU AV CR, Josef Harna, Praha 1998, p. 63-72, Rychlík, Jan: První Československá republika v slovenské ľud'acké a neolud'acké historiografii. In: Reflexe dějin první Československé republiky v české a slovenské historiografii. Ed. HU AV CR, Josef Harna, Praha 1998, p.73-87, Lipták, Lubomír: Slovenská historiografia o medzivojnovom Československu. In: Valenta, Jaroslav – Voráček, Emil – Harna, Josef (ed.): Československo 1918-1938. Osudy demokracie ve střední Evropě, Praha 1999, p. 48-52, Stolárik, Mark M.: The Painful Birth of Slovak Historiography in the 20th century. In: Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung 20,2001, p.161-187

²⁷ Kováč, Dušan: O slovenskej historiografii v Collegium Carolinum, HČ, roč. 52, č.2, 2004, p. 233

After 1989, the number of institutions concerned with history increased, mainly with the establishment of departments at newly founded universities. Currently, universities with departments concerned with history or with the teaching of history in secondary schools are the following: The Faculty of Philosophy of Comenius University in the Bratislava, the Faculty of Education of Comenius University in Bratislava, the Faculty of Theology of Comenius University in Bratislava, the Faculty of Humanities of the College of Education in Nitra (since 1995 the University of Constantine the Philosopher), the Faculty of Humanities and Faculty of Education of Trnava University, the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Cyril and Methodius at Trnava, the Faculty of Humanities and Faculty of Education of Matej Bél University in Banská Bystrica, the Faculty of Philosophy and Faculty of Education of Prešov University, the Faculty of Law of P.L. Šafárik in Košice, and the Catholic University in Ružomberok.

Apart from the history departments and institutes in universities, Slovakia has the following centers of historical research at present: the Institute of History,²⁸ the Institute of Archaeology,²⁹ the Institute of Political Science,³⁰ the Institute of the State and Law³¹ of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Military History, the Institute for Research into the History of Slovak Exiles and Institute of Slovak History of Matica Slovenská,³² the Slovak National Museum, its individual parts and other museums,³³ the Slovak National Archives, district, town and other archives,³⁴ and some other institutions.³⁵ Two other high-level institutes – the Institute of Social

²⁸ <http://history.sav.sk/>

²⁹ <http://www.archeol.sav.sk/>

³⁰ <http://www.upv.sav.sk/>

³¹ <http://usap.savba.sk/>

³² <http://www.matica.sk/>

³³ <http://www.snm.sk/>, <http://www.muzeum.sk/>

³⁴ Kollárová, Z. – Hams, J.: Sprievodca po slovenských archívoch, Prešov, Universum 1999

³⁵ the best guide for Slovak historical institutes is Mannová Elena – Daniel, David Paul (ed.): A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia, Bratislava 1995

Sciences³⁶ in Košice and the Institute of Ethnology³⁷ in Bratislava – cooperate with the Institute of History in the framework of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. The Institute of Social Sciences in Košice devotes its attention specifically to researching identities and worldviews associated with questions of national history and relationships to minorities. This is the institution in which inter-disciplinarity was first successfully applied in the Slovak social sciences. The Institute also has its own Internet periodical.³⁸ The Institute of Ethnology is oriented towards social and cultural anthropology. Among other questions, it devotes attention to collective identities.

The Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences has operated a web site devoted to history since the 1990s. The page provides information about activity in the academic community, including the review *História, Historický časopis* (*Historical Periodical*) and the Slovak Historical Society. It features reviews of publications and many interesting links to other organizations.³⁹

The historical community in Slovakia is organised into the Slovak National Committee of Historians. Formerly it was part of the Committee of Czech and Slovak Historians, but since 1993 it has been an independent member of the Comité International des Sciences Historiques (CISH) and the Slovak Historical Society at the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which organises regular conferences for its members. The seventh conference of the Slovak Historical Society (SHS)⁴⁰ was held between 24 and 26 April 2001 at Smolenice. Three such conferences have been held since 1989 (1991, 1996, 2001).⁴¹ They were devoted mainly to the relationship of the historical sciences to politics. At the Smolenice conference Dušan Kováč spoke of the great

³⁶ <http://www.saske.sk/SVU/>

³⁷ <http://www.uet.sav.sk/>

³⁸ <http://www.saske.sk/cas/>

³⁹ <http://www.dejiny.sk/>

⁴⁰ <http://www.dejiny.sk/shs/>

⁴¹ *Historický časopis*, 39, 1991, č.4-5, *Historický časopis*, 45, 1997, č.1, *Historický časopis*, 50, 2002, č.1

inadequacies in the methodology of the historical sciences in Slovakia. These inadequacies are connected with the unpreparedness for confrontation with nationalism and the neo-Ludák ideology and hindered contact with fellow historians abroad.⁴²

Apart from state institutions, non-state institutions also developed; however, their existence was complicated by formal difficulties in the 1990s. Back then, the state attempted to intervene with their activities, and now they have financial problems. However, Slovakia is situated in a region in which investment in the non-state sector, institutions concerned with the social sciences, can be expected. The Academia Istropolitana was established in Bratislava in 1990, but in 1996 it was reorganised for political reasons as the Academia Istropolitana Nova.⁴³

In 1997, the Forum Institute, a social science institute for the Hungarian minority in Slovakia, was established in Šamorín, a few kilometres from the capital city. There are also more or less formal groups such as the Society for the History and Culture of Central and Eastern Europe⁴⁴ headed by Tatiana Ivantyšynová, the new interdisciplinary Centre of Excellence – a project of the Institute of Ethnology and the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava.⁴⁵ Cooperation with foreign colleagues exerts an important influence. It includes bilateral historical commissions (Slovak – Czech,⁴⁶ - Hungarian, - German, - Polish, - Austrian, - Romanian and others), and participation in joint projects, activities,⁴⁷ and programs⁴⁸.

⁴² Kováč, Dušan: Slovenská historiografia desať rokov po. Zámery a ich realizácia. In: Historický časopis, 50, 2002, č.1

⁴³ <http://www.ainova.sk/>

⁴⁴ <http://www.dejiny.sk/Spolky/Komisie/SDK/sdk.htm>

⁴⁵ <http://www.history.sav.sk/centrum.htm>

⁴⁶ <http://www.dejiny.sk/Spolky/Komisie/Cskom/>

⁴⁷ Bohumila Ferencuhová and other colleagues cooperate with École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales v Paříži, with CeFReS – Centre Francais de Recherches an Sciences Sociales in Prague and also with Central European Centre at the University of Nancy.

Published on the basis of the cooperation: Francais, Tcheques et Slovaques pendant la Premiere Guerre mondiale. In: Guerres mondiales et conflicts contemporains 169, 1993, Janvier, Ferencuhova, Bohumila (ed.): La France et l'Europe centrale. Les relations entre la France et l'Europe centrale en 1867-1914. Impacts et imagines reciproques, Bratislava 1995, Ferencuhova, Bohumila (ed.): Milan Rastislav Stefanik. Astronome, soldat, grande figure franco-slovaque et europeenne, Bratislava 1999, Česko-

World historical congresses are also a great impulse for Slovak historiography. Slovakia prepared a volume of papers for the one held in Oslo in 2000.⁴⁹ A conference on the theme of Slovak historiography lasting several days was held in Munich in October 2001, at the invitation of the Collegia Carolina. It was probably the first such foreign event concerned exclusively with Slovakia. The papers presented in Munich appeared with various changes in the periodical *Bohemia* and in the Slovak *Historický časopis*.⁵⁰

Currently Slovakia has two popular historical magazines. The older of the two, which seemed promising to the historical community, is the *Historická revue*.⁵¹ However, in the course of its development, its reputation declined because of a frequent lack of expertise on certain topics. Expertise and quality of information were sacrificed in the interest of popularization. It was originally published by the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport of the Slovak Republic, starting in 1990. Today it is published by a private publisher with the support of the Ministry of Education. As a result, the magazine *História*⁵² was established in 2000. The Society Pro Historia publishes it “with the authorization of the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences”.

The specialist historical periodicals include *Historický časopis (Historical Periodical)*,⁵³ published regularly by the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, the annual publications of the Institute of History with the titles

slovensko-francouzská kolokvia z moderních dejín. In: Moderní dějiny. Sborník k dějinám 19. a 20. století 8, 2000, p. 197-264, Čičaj, Viliam- Pickl, Othmar (ed.): Städtisches Alltagsleben in Mitteleuropa vom Mittelalter bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhundertp. Bratislava 1998, Csáky, Mórítz – Mannová, Elena (ed.): Kolektivne identity v strednej Európe v období moderny. Bratislava 1999, Stekl, Hannes – Mannová, Elena (ed.): Heroen, Mythen, Identitäten. Die Slowakei und Osterreich im Vergleich, Wien 2003

⁴⁸ Cooperation in the project European Doctorate in Social History and Mediterranean, granted by EU (Maria Curie Fellowships)

⁴⁹ Kováč, Dušan (ed.): Slovak contributions to the 19-th international Congress of Historical Sciences, Bratislava 2000

⁵⁰ *Bohemia* 42, 2001, *Historický časopis*, 52, 2004, c. 2

⁵¹ viz Marsina, Richard: O istých črtách terajšieho stavu slovenskej historiografie, *HČ*, roč. 45, č.1, 1997 p.8

⁵² <http://www.historiarevue.sk/>

⁵³ <http://www.dejiny.sk/histcas.htm>

Historické štúdie, *Studia historica slovacae*,⁵⁴ and *Z dejín vied a techniky na Slovensku* (*From the History of Science and Technology in Slovakia*), as well as the further publication *Slovanské štúdie* (*Slavonic Studies*). *Studia historica nitriensia*, an annual established in 1993, is published in Nitra. It is published regularly, and its high quality is acknowledged by the leading personalities in Slovak historiography.⁵⁵ Apart from *Studia historica nitriensia*, the following publications are also expert and specialist periodicals: *Slavica slovacae*, *Historica Carpatica* (Košice), *Historický sborník* (*Historical Miscellany*, Martin), *Human Affairs* (Bratislava, Slovak Academy of Sciences), *Sborník Filozofickej a Pedagogickej fakulty Univerzity Komenského* (*Miscellany of the Faculties of Philosophy and Education of Comenius University*), *Zborník Muzeálnej slovenskej spoločnosti* (*Miscellany of the Slovak Museum Society*, Martin), *Zborník Slovenského národného múzea – História* (*Miscellany of the Slovak National Museum – History*, Bratislava, *Acta historica Neosoliensia Banská Bystrica*), *Acta Nitriensia* (Nitra), *Acta Universitatis Matthiae Belii* (Banská Bystrica), *Asian and African Studies*, *Bibliografický sborník* (*Bibliographic Miscellany*, Martin), *Bibliografické štúdie* (Martin) and *Genealogicko-heraldický hlas* (*The Genealogical-Heraldic Voice*, Martin). Various other institutions, especially museums and schools, also have their own periodicals.

Lubomír Lipták has stated that there are too many volumes of papers in Slovakia.⁵⁶ The problem, above all, is that volumes of papers are united in theme, but rarely reflect different methodological approaches. The level of individual contributions are often varied and the aim is merely achieving publication. A great many collections of papers have appeared in Slovakia since 1989, but not all of them give a very convincing impression. Most of them are publications of conference contributions.

⁵⁴ *Studia Historica Slovaca* is the only historical periodical published regularly in English .

⁵⁵ See Roman Holec's texts in *Historický časopis* since 90's

⁵⁶ Lipták, Ľubomír: Slovo k slovenskej historiografii, *Historický časopis* 52,2,2004, p. 375

The titles of the published collections of papers give a clear idea of the orientation of the academic historical conferences held in Slovakia during the 1990s.⁵⁷ They reacted to social demand and devoted themselves mainly to Czech – Slovak relations, to Slovakia in the Second World War, and later to the place of Slovakia in the wider Central European region. In 1990, the Slovak Academy of Sciences began to organise conferences on individual periods of Slovak history⁵⁸ and sent Slovak historians to conferences in the Czech Republic.⁵⁹ The trend towards cooperation with Czech colleagues still continues, although it is weakening. Cooperation with Austrian colleagues is increasing. Contact with Hungarians is unavoidable, but still strongly polarized.

Several volumes of documents from the area of international relations have been published in Slovakia since 1989. The first contained documents concerning Slovak emigration up to the end of the Second World War,⁶⁰ the second included

⁵⁷ Sympóziium Slovensko v pol. systéme Česko-slovenska v letech 1918-1938, 1991 Slovakia
 Medzinárodné sympóziium o mestách v Podunajskom priestore 1991, Slovakia
 Cyrilo-metodské dedičstvo a počiatky kultury na Slovensku 1991
 Seminár o národe a národnost'achach, 1991, Smolenice
 Milan Hodža, štátnik a politik, Bratislava 1992 (conference 1992, Bratislava)
 Sympóziium o stave a perspektívach spracovania náboženských a cirkevných dejín na Slovensku, Tr. Teplice, 1993
 Vojenskopolitické a geopolitické súvislosti vývoja Slovenska v rokoch 1918-1945, Trenčín 1992
 SNP v pamäti národov (k ved konferenci v Blave 1994). Múzeum SNP, Banská Bystrica 1995
 Literatura a Slovenské národné povstanie, Banská bystrica 1995
 Slovensko v habsburskej monarchii 1526-1918, Bratislava, Katedra slovenskych dejín, FiF UK, 2000
 Národná rada v kontexte slovenských dejín, 150. Výročie vzniku prvej slovenskej národnej rady
 Stredoevrópske národy na križovatke novodobých dejín 1848-1918, Ed. Švorc, P.-Harbulová, L.,
 Prešov-Bratislava-Wien, Univerzum 1999 sborník FF PU v Prešove
 Prvé povojnové voľby v strednej a juhovýchodnej Európe, Bratislava, Veda SAV 1998
 Česi na Slovensku. Sbornik z konferencie Česi na Slovensku, Martin, Slovenské národné muzeum 2000
 (Dokumentacne centrum Českej kultury na Slovensku v etnografickom muzeu v Martine)
 Rozpravy k slovenským dejinám, Bratislava, SA Press 2001, ed. V. Čičaj
 Slovensko a druhá svetová vojna, Bratislava, Vojenský historický ústav 2000

⁵⁸ Bystrický, Valerián (ed.): Slovensko v rokoch druhej svetovej vojny. Bratislava 1991, Bystrický, Valerián (ed.): Slovensko v politickom systéme Československa. Bratislava 1992, Bystrický, Valerián – Fano, Štefan (edp.): Slovensko na konci druhej svetovej vojny (stav východiská, perspektívy). Bratislava 1994, Pešek, Jan (ed.): V tieni totality. Politické perzekúcie na Slovensku v rokoch 1948-1953. Bratislava 1996

⁵⁹ Conference on Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk and Central Europe 1991, conference on history Czech-Slovak-French relations, 1989 in Prague, 1990 in Paris, conference on social and national development in 1780-1918 Opava, colokvium on čechoslovakismus 1991, Praha, conference on Czechs and Slovaks in Central Europe. 1993 Brno, Cestami česko-slovenskej vzájemnosti, Liberec, Masarykova akademie 1993 (conference 1991-1992)

⁶⁰ Slovenské vyst'ahovalectvo. Dokumenty. 5. Pramene k dejinám slovenského vyst'ahovalectva do Francúzska a Belgicka v rokoch 1920-1945. [Zost.]: Baláž, Claude. Martin, MS 1990

documentation of the contacts between the Slovak Republic and the Vatican⁶¹ and the third consisted of documents on the relationship of France to Slovakia and Czechoslovakia.⁶²

From Slovak history, documents were published from the period before the arrival of the Slavs⁶³ and from the Slovak national revival,⁶⁴ as well as two series of documents in the national confrontation spirit, as their titles already indicate.⁶⁵ For Czech-Slovak history,⁶⁶ Slovakia has drawn on Czech publications⁶⁷ to produce several collections of documents for use as university textbooks. Documents about the

⁶¹ Vatikán a Slovenská republika (1939-1945). Dokumenty. [Zost.]: Kamenec, Ivan - Prečan, Vilém - Škorvánek, Stanislav. Br., Historický ústav SAV a Ústav soudobých dějin ČAV v Slovac Academic Press 1992

⁶² Petruf, Pavol : Politické vzťahy medzi Francúzskom a Československom a Francúzskom a Slovenskom (1939-1948). Výber z dokumentov. [Prel. z franc.]: Petruf, Pavol. [Prel. z angl.]: Styan, Clifford. Martin, Matica slovenská v spolupráci so Slovenským historickým ústavom Matice slovenskej v Bratislave 2003

⁶³ Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov. [Zv. 1. Územie Slovenska pred príchodom Slovanov.] [Red.]: Valachovič, Pavol. [Hlavný red.]: Marsina, Richard. [Predhovor]: Ferko, Milan. [Úvod k 1. zv.]: Valachovič, Pavol. [Preklady]: Škoviera, Daniel. [Autori]: Marsina, Richard - Valachovič, Pavol - Kolníková, Eva. Br., [Národné literárne centrum] 1998, Slovensko očami cudzincov. Vzácné správy o histórii nášho územia od 6. do 10. storočia, tak ako sa javia v písomnostiach prevažne cudzieho pôvodu. Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov. Zv. 2. [Ved. red.]: Marsina, Richard. [Aut. kol.]: Marsina, Richard - Steinhübel, Ján - Lukačka, Ján - Pauliny, Ján. [Ed.]: Dvořák, Pavel. Br., Literárne a informačné centrum vo vyd. Rak Budmerice 1999

⁶⁴ Bratislava a počiatky slovenského národného obrodzenia. Dokumenty. [Zost.]: Hučko, Ján. [Nap.]: Hučko, Ján - Kohútová, Mária - Kowalská, Eva - Lehotská, Darina - Michalová, Miroslava - Mikleš, Ján - Novacká, Mária - Sopko, Július - Sopusková, Alžbeta - Škoviera, Daniel - Špiesz, Anton - Tibenský, Ján - Urbancová, Viera - Vyvíjalová, Mária. Br., Obzor pre Archív hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy 1992

⁶⁵ Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti. Zv. 1. [Dokumenty sprac.]: Čaplovič, Dušan - Beňko, Ján - Marsina, Richard - Segeš, Vladimír - Hučko, Ján - Podrimavský, Milan - Pekník, Miroslav - Hronský, Marián. [Vedeckí red.]: Beňko, Ján - Hronský, Marián - Marsina, Richard - Pekník, Miroslav. Br., Národné literárne centrum - Dom slovenskej literatúry 1998

Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti. Zv. 2. [Dokumenty sprac.]: Hronský, Marián - Deák, Ladislav - Korček, Ján - Barnovský, Michal - Štefanský, Michal. [Vedeckí red.]: Beňko, Ján - Hronský, Marián - Marsina, Richard - Pekník, Miroslav. Br., Národné literárne centrum - Dom slovenskej literatúry 1998

Viedenská arbitráž 2. november 1938. Dokumenty. Zv. 1. (20. september - 2. november 1938.) [Zost.]: Deák, Ladislav. [Preklady z franc.]: Kolník, Ján. [Preklady z nem.]: Ivaničková, Edita. [Preklady z maď.]: Deák, Ladislav. Martin - Br., Matica slovenská [v spolupráci so Slovenským historickým ústavom Matice slovenskej a Archívom Ministerstva zahraničných vecí SR] 2002, Viedenská arbitráž 2. november 1938. Dokumenty. Zv. 2. Okupácia (2. november 1938 - 14. marec 1939). [Zost.]: Deák, Ladislav. [Preklady z maď.]: Deák, Ladislav. [Preklady z angl.]: Deák, Dušan. Martin - Br., Matica slovenská [v spolupráci so Slovenským historickým ústavom Matice slovenskej a Archívom Ministerstva zahraničných vecí SR] 2003

⁶⁶ Paralel use of the term „Slovak“ and „Czecho-Slovak“ history has its purpose. It is influenced by the orientation and the aim of the historiography to 1918-1993.

⁶⁷ For example: K Ústavnému vývoji v českých zemích a na Slovensku v letech 1938-1948. Studie. První poválečná vláda. Komentované dokumenty. Praha, Ústav pro soudobé dějiny ve spolupráci se Státním ústředním archivem 1992. 165 p. Reg. menný. Rép. angl. Ed. Sešity Ústavu pro soudobé dějiny ČSAV. Svazek 5. 1993

events of 1989 or the following years have been published recently.⁶⁸ Important documents have also been published in the biographical field. Documents on the relationship of R.W. Seton-Watson to the Czechs and Slovaks⁶⁹ as well as the speeches and texts of Alexander Dubček⁷⁰ and Jozef Tiso⁷¹ have been appeared. Two series of documents with different methodological underpinnings have come out on the history of the Jews in Slovakia. One was published by the Museum of Jewish Culture,⁷² while the other began to be published in cooperation with the Milan Šimečka Foundation and the Jewish Religious Community.⁷³ In recent years, documents on the position of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia⁷⁴ and the legal position of minorities in general⁷⁵ have been published.

⁶⁸ Verejnosť proti násiliu 1989-1991. Svedectvá a dokumenty. [Red. upravila]: Antalová, Ingrid. [Kalendárium a súbor dokumentov zost.]: Mistríková, Mária. Br., Nadácia Milana Šimečku 1998
November 1989 a Slovensko. Chronológia a dokumenty (1985-1990). [Ed.]: Žatkuliak, Jozef.
[Koeditori]: Žatkuliak, Jozef - Hlavová, Viera - Sedliaková, Alžbeta - Štefanský, Michal. Br., Nadácia Milana Šimečku - Historický ústav SAV 1999
Petruf, Pavol : Slovensko v rokoch 1989-1998. Dokumenty. 2. vyd. Prešov, Metodické centrum Prešov 2000

Dokumenty doby 1990-2000. [Zost.]: Šimulčík, Ján. Prešov, Vyd. Michala Vaška 2002

⁶⁹ R.W.Seton-Watson and His Relations with the Czechs and Slovaks. R.W.Seton-Watson a jeho vzťahy k Čechům a Slovákům. R.W.Seton-Watson a jeho vzťahy k Čechom a Slovákom. Documents. Dokumenty. 1906-1951. Zv. 1. [Editori]: Rychlík, Jan - Marzik, Thomas D. - Bielik, Miroslav. [Preklady]: Habánková, Eva - Mason, Valerie - Rychlík, Jan - William, Robert - Marzik, Thomas D. Praha, Ústav T.G.Masaryka - MS 1995

⁷⁰ Alexander Dubček Od totality k demokracii. Prejavy, články a rozhovory. Výber 1963 - 1992. [Zost.]: Žatkuliak, Jozef - Laluha, Ivan. [Publikáciu sprac.]: Laluha, Ivan - Sedliaková, Alžbeta - Sikora, Stanislav - Uher, Ján - Vondrová, Jitka - Žakuliak, Jozef. Br., Veda vydavateľstvo SAV 2002

⁷¹ Jozef Tiso. Prejavy a články. Zv. 1. (1913-1938). [Ed.]: Fabricius, Miroslav - Suško, Ladislav. [Spoluzostavovatelia]: Hradská, Katarína - Magdolenová, Anna. Br., Academic Electronic Press - Historický ústav SAV 2002

⁷² Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1939-1945). Dokumenty. Časť 1.-2. [Zost.]: Hubenák, Ladislav. Br., SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry 1994, Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1943-1945). Dokumenty. Časť 3. [Zost.]: Hubenák, Ladislav. Br., SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry 1995, Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1938-1945). Dokumenty. Časť 4. [Zost.]: Hubenák, Ladislav. Br., SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry 1999, Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1938-1945). Dokumenty. Časť 5. [Zost.]: Hubenák, Ladislav. Br., SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry 2000

⁷³ Holokaust na Slovensku. Obdobie autonómie (6.10.1938-14.3.1939). Dokumenty. [Zv. 1.] [Ed.]: Nižňanský, Eduard. Br., Nadácia Milana Šimečku - Židovská náboženská obec 2001

⁷⁴ Obžalovaný prehovorí. Dokumenty z dejín Maďarov v Československu. [Zodpovedný]: Szigety, László. [Z maď. prel.]: Kráľová, Katarína - Piovarcsyová, Eva - Lesná, Marta. [Dosl. nap.]: Fazekas, József - Szarka, László. [Pozn. nap.]: Mayer, Judit. Br., Kalligram 1994

⁷⁵ Dokumenty. Zborník medzinárodných dohôd, vyhlásení a zákonov Slovenskej republiky o právach národnostných menšín. Zv. 1.-2. Br., Danubiaprint 1995

Independent encyclopedias devoted to Slovakia⁷⁶ began to be published in large numbers in Slovakia after 1993. They played a popularizing role in relation to Slovak history. Encyclopedias of Slovak history in English and German were published in 2000.⁷⁷ Several encyclopedias of Slovak historical and present-day personalities have also appeared.⁷⁸

A historical dictionary of the Slovak language⁷⁹ and a Slovak biographical dictionary have been published.⁸⁰ A dispute about the writing of personal names revolved around the latter.

In related sciences, ethnography has been the most successful in producing encyclopedic works in Slovakia, with the publication of *The Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia*, the *Bibliographic Dictionary*, and the *Encyclopedia of Folk Culture*.⁸¹ New volumes on the history of fine art⁸² and the history of theatre⁸³ have also appeared.

⁷⁶ Malá slovenská encyklopédia. Encyclopaedia Beliana. [Aut.]: Kol. pracovníkov Encyklopedického ústavu SAV. Br., Encyklopedický ústav SAV - Goldpress Publishers 1993
Kronika 20. storočia. [Konceptia a zost. nem. orig.]: Bodo, Harenberg. [Aut. nem. orig.]: Warner, Karl Friedrich - Stuckmann, Elmar - Rippeľová-Manssonová, Irmtraud - Gödeke, Peter - Vogt, Martin - Hoppe, Josef - Rohe, Karl - Gehlhoffová, Beatrix. [Konceptia slov. vyd.]: Biermann, Karol. [Slov. vyd. zost.]: Ivaničková, Edita. [Úv. štúdiu nap.]: Lipták, Lubomír. [Z nem. orig. prel. dopln. a uprav.]: Deák, Ladislav - Fano, Štefan - Hlavová, Viera - Institoris, Alexander - Ivaničková, Edita - Korček, Ján - Michálek, Slavomír - Múcska, Vincent - Písch, Mikuláš - Roháčová, Irena - Samson, Ivo - Sikora, Stanislav - Štefanský, Michal - Šuchová, Xénia - Tonková, Mária - Zelenák, Peter - Zelenáková, Želmíra - Žatkuliak, Jozef. Br., Fortuna Print 2000

Slovakia and the Slovaks. A Concise Encyclopedia. [Zost.]: Strhan, Milan - Daniel, David Paul. Br., Encyclopedical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences - Goldpress Publishers 1994
Kronika Slovenska. Zv. 1. Od najstarších čias do konca 19. storočia. Br., Fortuna Print & Adox [1998].
Kronika Slovenska. Zv. 2. Slovensko v dvadsiatom storočí. Br., Fortuna Print 1999

⁷⁷ Slovak History Chronology and Lexicon. [Nap.]: Škvarna, Dušan a kol. Br., Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo 2002, Lexikon der slowakischen Geschichte. [Nap.]: Škvarna, Dušan a kol. Br., Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo 2002

⁷⁸ Nižňanský, E. a kol.: Kto bol kto za 1. ČSR, Bratislava 1993 (obsahuje i slovník historických pojmov)
Kto je kto na Slovensku 1991? [Zost.]: Adamec, Vladimír - Dinka, Jozef - Dziuban, Boris - Marčoková, Ivana - Pechová, Mariana - Žiláková, Milota. Br., Konzorcium Encyklopédia 1991
Priekopníci vedy a techniky na Slovensku 3. (1. 2. Díl v letech 1986 a 1988), Bratislava, AEP 1999
chronol. Rázení za leta 1918-1945

⁷⁹ Historický slovník slovenského jazyka I.-II. (Majtán, Milan). Bratislava, Veda 1991-1992

⁸⁰ Slovenský biografický slovník, Martin, Matica slovenská od r. 1988 (I,II) 1989 (III) 1990 (IV) 1992 (V), 1994 (VI) zde se jasně (v 80. letech) projevil boj za jazykovou úpravu jmen

⁸¹ Bibliografický slovník etnografie a folklóristiky za roky 1986-1990, Bratislava, Ústav etnologie SAV, 1994 (pokračuje v řadě od roku 1960)
Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska. Zv. 1.-2. [Ved. red.]: Botík, Ján - Slavkovský, Peter. Br., Veda 1995

Etnografický atlas Slovenska. Mapové zobrazenie vybraných javov ľudovej kultúry. [Ved. red.]: Kovačevičová, Soňa. Br., Veda - Slovenská kartografia 1990, německy 1991, angl. 1994

⁸² Rusinová, Z. a kol.: Dejiny slovenského výtvarného umenia 20. Storočia, Bratislava, Slovenská národná galéria 2000

The bibliography of Slovak history is published by the Slovak Academy of Sciences, namely by Alžbeta Sedláková, once every five years.⁸⁴ This author also publishes reviews of historiography each year in *Historický časopis*. A new chapter in Slovak historiography opened with the year 1989. The turning point was clearly the fall of the regime, which had severely limited historical work both thematically and ideologically. Its lack of openness also brought a significant methodological limitation.

Above all the need to re-evaluate Slovak history grew after November 1989. Ivan Kamenec thinks, and I agree, that there were actually two great re-evaluations: in 1989 and in 1993.⁸⁵ The year 1993 was an important turning point for Slovak historiography, since it began to devote its attention almost exclusively to Slovak history with all the difficulties the new situation brought. However the influence of 1993 in Slovak historical writing can be seen with one or two years delay. Ľud'ák historical publications began to appear in large numbers, the political situation sharpened, and Slovak historians had to react quickly to this shift to the right. In the second half of the 1990s, Slovak historiography increased by 67% compared to the first half of the decade, while historiography devoted to political history increased by 144% and publications devoted to the theme of the nation grew by 168%!

There was no historian in Slovak historiography who publicly opposed critical reflection after 1989. However, various groups found different starting-points for this re-evaluation, and the results did not come immediately. It was not possible to put a

It is the sixth part of the project Dejiny slovenskeho vytvarneho umeni.

⁸³ Mistrnik, M. a kol.: Slovenské divadlo ve 20. Storoči, Bratislava, Veda 1999

⁸⁴ Historiografia na Slovensku 1990-1994. Výberová bibliografia. [Zost.]: Sedliaková, Alžbeta. [Na databázovom spracovaní spolupracovala]: Mikuličová, Ivana. [Úvod nap.]: Kováč, Dušan. Br., Historický ústav SAV 1995

Slovenská historiografia 1995-1999. Výberová bibliografia. [Slovak Historiography 1995-1999. Selected Bibliography.] [Zost.]: Sedliaková, Alžbeta. [Na databázovom spracovaní spolupracovala]: Mikuličová, Ivana. [Excerpcia českej literatúry a spolupráca pri excerptcii zahraničnej literatúry]: Horčáková, Václava a kol. [Spolupráca pri sprac. maď. lit.]: Zsideková, Veronika. [Preklady do angl.]: Szeghyová, Blanka. Br., Veda vyd. Slovenskej akadémie vied - Historický ústav SAV 2000

⁸⁵ Kamenec, Ivan: Stereotypy v slovenských dejinách a v slovenskej historiografii, OS, 1998/3

new general work on the market in the first five years. Partial studies and older works, which could not be published in the pre-November period, appeared.

Most historians halt the reinterpretation of history at 1948. As Pavol Petruf states, an integrated picture of events after the Second World War has still not appeared.⁸⁶ Such a situation is natural, however, since the period of Socialism personally concerns the majority of historians, and it is not easy to come to a position on it. The years after February 1948 are their own history. The time since that period is too short for the social experience of the Communist era to be comprehensively and disinterestedly understood. We still encounter in Slovak public life and politics people who actively participated in maintaining the regime. People who were seriously and often irreversibly harmed by the old regime are still alive. However, precisely because of them, professional historians have an obligation to devote great attention to events of the recent past. Slovak historiography is only slowly taking this step.

Public intellectuals have taken the lead in the popularization of history. While Slovak historiography endeavoured to produce high quality works, public intellectuals indiscriminately produced a large number of simplified and misleading explanations, claims, and visions. The cause of this development is both the excessively slow reaction of Slovak historians to the demands of society and the rapidly swelling wave of nationalism, which hindered the adoption of reasonable positions based on facts. A greater penetration of non-professionals into historical literature was also connected with the boom of works by public intellectuals, which often attempted to take the place of works by experts. Anybody can participate in the production of works on history if a publisher accepts it. The two main universities and the Academy of Sciences are gradually losing their monopoly on the “production of young

⁸⁶ Petruf, Pavol: Die slowakische Historiographie in den Jahren 1990-1994, Bohemia, Band 37, Heft 1, 1996 (Oldenbourg Verlag, München), p.154

researchers”. It is also typical of Slovak social life that many scientific researchers, especially from the social sciences, express their views on current problems on the pages of selected newspapers and magazines. Thus, the expert public is not isolated but rather is an integral part of Slovak society. It works on the popularization of its own work.

Apart from the need to rapidly satisfy the public, there was also a need to revise the literature used in teaching history. Almost immediately, in 1990, textbooks were published for the last years of elementary school and for secondary schools.⁸⁷ Further textbooks for elementary schools followed, in spite of political delays.⁸⁸ Thanks to political interventions in the historical sciences, there were still no new history textbooks in grammar schools (*gymnasia*) even ten years after the change of regime, in spite of all the publishing activity. As a result, students supplemented their reading with such publications as *The History of Slovakia* and *The Slovaks on the Road to Self-Awareness* by Anton Špiesz and *The History of Slovakia and the Slovaks* by Milan Ďurica.⁸⁹ The first of these books repeats old clichés about the thousand-year road of the Slovak nation to independence, and the second is the work of an exiled historian, who does not hide his sympathy for the Slovak wartime regime. The work of Milan Ďurica was approved and financed by the minister of education of the time.

The return of the post-war exiles was a great wound for Slovak historiography. As Dušan Kováč writes: “After November 1989, some historians returned from exile who had preserved their clearly ideological conception of Slovak history through all the years. They were joined by some of their blood brothers in Slovakia, and all found

⁸⁷ Texts for 7th and 8th class of secondary school written by Eva Kowalská, Dušan Kováč and Ľubomír Lipták and *Kapitoly z dejín pre stredné školy 1914-1948* written by Dušan Kováč and Ľubomír Lipták

⁸⁸ Textbooks published in the publishinghouse Orbis Pictus Istropolitana or for example *Slovenské dejiny* by M. Ferko, Richard Marsina, Viliam Čičaj, Dušan Kováč a Ľubomír Lipták (Martin, Matica slovenská, 1992)

⁸⁹ Špiesz, Anton: *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovakov na ceste k sebevedomeniu*, Bratislava 1992, Ďurica, Milan Stanislav: *Dějiny Slovenska a Slovakov*, Košice 1995

shelter in Matica Slovenská”.⁹⁰ For the most part, the exiles had solidly rightist views connected with the Ľud’ák tradition. They were mostly former active members of that tradition, and they outlined a nationalist programme. Ľud’ák historiography had a clear idea of how to interpret the history of Slovakia in the 20th century. This idea had already been established for a long time.⁹¹

A large number of biographies and memoirs⁹² expressing Ľud’ák views were published after 1989. They included works originally published abroad, often long before, and works produced in Slovakia, either from unpublished sources or written after 1989.⁹³ The memoirs are clearly concerned with the period of the independent Slovak state, while the biographical literature is exclusively devoted to the three leading personalities: Jozef Tiso,⁹⁴ Andrej Hlinka,⁹⁵ and Alexander Mach.⁹⁶

Ľud’ák historiography interprets Slovak history from a strongly nationalist point of view. The group, leading representatives of which are František Vnuk and Milan Ďurica, found continuers such as Robert Letz and Ján Bobák. An extensive

⁹⁰ Kováč, Dušan: Slovenská historiografia desať rokov po. Zámery a ich realizácia, HČ, roč.50, č. 1, 2002, p.6

⁹¹ Ďurčanský, Ferdinand: Biela kniha – Právo Slovákov na samostatnosť vo svetle dokumentov 1989 (Buenos Aires, 1954)

Vnuk, František: Neuveriteľné sprisahanie, Bratislava 1993 (Middletown, USA 1964)

Dies Alter – Nešťastný deň 29. august 1944 (sborník), ERPO, Bratislava 1994

Dies Alter – Nešťastný deň 29. august 1944 (sborník), LÚČ, Bratislava 1994

Krvácajúca hranica, ed. Jozef Kirschbaum, Matica slovenská 1994 (1940)

⁹² Čarnogurský, Pavol: 14. marec 1939, Bratislava 1992

Čarnogurský, Pavol: 6. október 1938, SAV, Bratislava 1993

Sidor, Karol: Takto vznikol Slovenský štát, Bratislava 1992

Svedectvo jednej generácie, ed. Imrich Kružliak, Ján Okál’...Slovensko (Cambridge, Ontario 1990)

Okál’, Ján: Výpredaj ľudskosti....Slovensko (Cambridge, Ontario 1989)

Medrický, Gejza: Minister spomína, Bratislava 1993

Körper-Zrínsky, Karol: Môj život, Bratislava 1993

⁹³ see Jablonický, Jozef: Spomienky a životopisy ľud’áckych predstaviteľov publikované po roku 1989, HČ, roč. 43, č.2, 1995, Sidor, K.: Takto vznikol Slovenský štát, Bratislava 1991, poprvé 1971 Vnuk vydal v USA

⁹⁴ Májek, Stanislav: Dr. Jozef Tiso. Sborník z vedeckého seminára 22. september 2001, Bratislava 2002

Rašla, Anton- Žabkay, Ernest: Proces s dr. Jozefom Tisom, Bratislava 1990

Ďurica, Milan: Jozef Tiso slovenský kňaz a štátnik, 1887-1939.....(Abano Treme 1989)

Čulen, Konštantín: Po Svätoplukovi druhá naša hlava, Partizánske 1992

Murín, Karol: Spomienky a svedectvo, Hamilton, Ontario 1987

Slovenský rodofub Dr. Jozef Tiso (1887-1947), Trenčín 1992

Pokus o politický a osobný profil Jozefa Tisu, ed. V. Bystrický, Bratislava 1992

Prezident Jozef Tiso očami obhájcu Dr. Martina Greču, Partizánska 1993

⁹⁵ Bartlová Alena: Andrej Hlinka, Bratislava 1991, Bielik, František – Borovský, Štefan (ed.): Andrej Hlinka a jeho miesto v slovenských dejinách. Bratislava 1991

⁹⁶ Vnuk, František: Mat’ svoj štát znamená život. Politická biografía Alexandra Macha, Bratislava 1991 (Cleveland 1987)

controversy arose around M. Ďurica's *The History of Slovakia and the Slovaks*⁹⁷ in September 1996. In the following school year, it was required to use this book as a reference text for the teaching of history in all elementary schools. It was also distributed to the schools. The Institute of History of the Academy officially rejected the book in March 1997.⁹⁸ The controversy was brought into the arena of domestic and, later, international politics. In July 1997, the Minister of Education had to withdraw the formerly approved book. Thus, the nationalist textbook was not officially used in the Slovak Republic.

The Ľud'ák branch of Slovak historiography has ambitious explanatory goals regarding Slovak history. It is concerned with demonstrating that the Slovak nation originated more than a millenium ago and that its efforts to form a Slovak state go back just as far. Such a conception obviously has resonance in present-day Slovak politics and to a large extent arises from political demands. Part of the Slovak political spectrum has a great interest in the nationalist interpretation of Slovak history. As a result, a sharp political dispute arose in the ranks of professional historians.

It is necessary to remark that Ľud'ák historiography is definitely in minority and isolated in the historical community. However, in spite of all its isolation in the academic world, this nationalist interpretation of Slovak history admittedly has resonance in society and has found support especially among people who remember the period. It is also supported by the Communist heritage, since all evaluations of the wartime regime as "totalitarian" or "fascist" are condemned as the result of Marxism or Czechoslovakism.

We do not claim that the Ľud'ák literature is the only kind produced about Slovakia in exile circles. Such a claim would be an over-simplification. However, the writings of Slovaks living abroad have characteristics in common with the work of a

⁹⁷ M. S. Ďurica: *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov*. Košice 1995, 2. vydání Bratislava 1996

⁹⁸ *Stanovisko ku knihe M. S. Ďuricu: Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov*. Bratislava 1997

large proportion of Central European exiles from different countries. Until Concise History of Slovakia edited by Elena Mannová appeared in 2000, Slovak history has been represented in the English-speaking world by the publications of Stanislav J. Kirschbaum and Peter Toma.⁹⁹ The former does not deny his engagement in emigrant societies,¹⁰⁰ while the latter, trying to avoid ideologization, leaves out any unifying idea of Slovak history and restricts himself to relating facts. The first attitude is typical of Slovak exiles in general, not only of professional historians. Although they do not approach the nationalism of Milan Ďurica,¹⁰¹ they strongly express attitudes from patriotism to messianism, they are methodologically and thematically backward, and they show clear political and national bias.¹⁰²

Among emigrants and the descendents of emigrants concerned with the social sciences, one often finds the phenomenon of „paying the debt“. In such cases, the author feels a need to devote attention to his native country or the native country of his parents and in some way compensate for his absence. For the first generation of emigrants, “nationality” is often the only thing they have to put on the market.

It has been mentioned that the extreme rightist interpretation of history is isolated in the academic environment, although it has resonance in society, especially among the older generation. The reason for this “success” of the Ľud’ák ideology was and is inadequate historical reflection. Slovakia has not reflected on its own history from the period 1938-1945 the way in which post-war West Germany or Austria have since the 1980s. In the post-war history of Czechoslovakia political factors permanently prevented such a reflection, and by now it has been successfully avoided for another 15 years. Despite all of this, reflection on wartime history must eventually take place.

⁹⁹ Kirschbaum, Stanislav: A History of Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival. New York 1995, Toma, Peter – Kováč, Dušan: Slovakia. From Samo to Dzurinda. Stanford 2001

¹⁰⁰ In this case it is the Slovak World Congress

¹⁰¹ Ďurica, Milan: Dejiny Slovenska a Slovakov, Bratislava 1996

¹⁰² Compare : Winkler, Martina: Pohľad z blízka i zďaľky: Výskum Slovenska v Severnej Amerike a stredo-europejske diskusie, Historický časopis 52, 2, 2004, p. 247-260

The first two conferences of the Slovak Historical Society were devoted to the relationship between the historical sciences and politics. The question of whether historiography receives its tasks from outside or finds them for itself was asked, but there was not sufficient reflection on the political failure of the historians in 1989 and their academic failure to confront the nationalist ideologies in the 1990s.

The interpretation of Slovak history is strongly tied to politics, whether as a storehouse of arguments or as an active component in the shaping of public opinion. In some stages after 1989, non-professional historians such as the Ľudáks and some media representatives took over the production of history. At some moments, the political leaders themselves attempted to define it. In the political context of nationalism, a dispute arose over the Institute of History itself. There was a proposal to subordinate this part of the Slovak Academy of Sciences to Matica Slovenská. The rivalry between the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and the newly established Institute of Slovak History of Matica Slovenská was quite open. There could be no doubt about the consequences of such a step, and the fact that the dispute also appeared on the pages of such a periodical as *Bohemia*¹⁰³ testifies to the seriousness of the situation. It is shocking that in 1996 the democratically elected government of Slovakia virtually attempted to liquidate the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

Another politically motivated dispute, which is still continuing in Slovak historiography, revolves around the writing of personal names. It started in the 1980s and is still alive today.¹⁰⁴ The debate originally started out from the conviction that names of foreign origin can be appropriately translated into Slovak, especially when there is a “historical justification” for this. However, the weakness of the whole

¹⁰³ *Bohemia*, roč 1996

¹⁰⁴ Horváth, Pavel : Neuvážený návrh na zrušenie slovenskej transkripcie starých rodových mien a priezvisk. [Ill-judged proposal for the abolishment of Slovak transcription of old family names.] *HČ* 47, 1999, č. 2, p. 306-315

project is precisely the obscurity of the bases for the justification of rewriting names in particular instances. It is difficult to definitively determine the nationality and, therefore, the appropriate writing in the case of the majority of aristocratic families that lived in Slovakia for centuries. The families themselves wrote their names differently in different centuries, and the way of writing itself expressed their political and other aspirations. What some of their forefathers worked to achieve is now denied and revised by professional historians.

The whole dispute is based on a disagreement between historians who project the possible contemporary aspirations of the Slovak nation into the writing of history, and those who want to avoid this distortion. The revised forms of personal names are still used in the Slovak biographical dictionary, in which the family name “Nyáry” becomes “Ňáριοvci”, and “Csáky” becomes Čákiovci”.¹⁰⁵ However, some authors return to the original spelling. The examples include *The Concise History of Slovakia*, in which authors like Elena Mannová and Eva Kowalská show the results of dual writing in a quite practical manner. The dispute about the writing of personal names in expert works influences all editorial work in the academic historical profession.¹⁰⁶ However, since the history of the territory of the present-day Slovak state is the history of several overlapping ethnic groups (not just Hungarians and Slovaks) a definitive solution is not possible either for one historical epoch or for a specific geographical area. The writing of personal names is a matter of consensus, but in the end each author has to come to an individual decision about it. Nevertheless, there is much controversy in Slovak historiography in this area.

¹⁰⁵ Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do roku 1990). Zv. 3. K-L. Martin, MS 1989. 448 p. Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do roku 1990). Zv. 4. M-Q. Martin, MS 1990. 568 p. Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do roku 1990). Zv. 5. R-Š. Martin, MS 1992. 560 p. Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do roku 1990). Zv. 6. T-Ž. Martin, MS 1994. 659 p. Reg. menný.

Slovenský biografický slovník. Zv. 7. A-Ž. (Dodatky.) Martin, Biografický ústav MS 1995. 270 s

¹⁰⁶ Krátke dejiny Slovenska. [Zost.]: Mannová, Elena. [Autori]: Brezováková, Blanka - Daniel, David Paul - Dvořáková, Daniela - Holec, Roman - Kowalská, Eva - Lengyelová, Tünde - Lipták, Lubomír - Lukačka, Ján - Mannová, Elena - Mrva, Ivan - Steinhübel, Ján. [Epilóg]: Avenarius, Alexander. Br., Academic Electronic Press - [Historický ústav SAV] 2003.

The use of the expression “Slovakia” has created a problem similar to that of writing personal names. It is not an ideal term for periods before 1918, and there are conventions by which the term “Slovakia” is replaced by longer and more awkward phrases such as “the territory of present-day Slovakia”. Many non-Slovak authors reject this phrase. The rejection of the expression “Slovakia“ before 1918, however, is as an approach very similar to the insistence on rewriting Hungarian personal names in Slovak.

Many authors concerned with the history of Slovakia distinguish two currents in recent Slovak historiography: national or conservative and “cosmopolitan” or liberal. Representatives of the first support the idea of the organic development of the nation, Christian values, and the history of the Slovaks seen as a thousand-year road to state independence. Representatives of the second see the nation as a modern phenomenon. In practice, however, the difference is mainly in the extent to which thinking in national terms and national criteria characterizes each, since both these conceptual camps belong to the category of national historiography, which regards one nation with its cultural and political aspirations as the subject of historiography. Some individual authors are attempting to break away from this historiographic tradition, which has been in place in Slovakia for more than a century. However, as elsewhere in Europe, there are only isolated instances of such works, and they still lack a broader conception.

These problems of Slovak historiography derive from various forms of nationalism, a persistent issue in Slovakia. Since nationalism is an expression of the political aspirations of the nation, it closely connects Slovak historiography with politics.

In his article on recent Slovak historiography, Juraj Podoba¹⁰⁷ unambiguously draws attention to the heritage of Communism in the academic world. There is a lack of critical thinking and critical discussion. Critically thinking and acting academics are ostracized and marginalized. Let us add that the terms “critical thinking“ and “criticism“ in general are connected with the expression “constructive criticism”, misused under the old regime. The absence of a critical approach was and is connected with the absence of tolerance of different views and that of a plurality of scientific starting points, approaches, and methodologies. The loss of contact with Western European science is still being remedied. This breach with the rest of scholarly Europe was greater in the case of Czechoslovakia than in those of the neighbouring socialist countries. The political and social sciences were significantly limited in Slovakia in the recent past.

After 1989, the Slovak historical science profession faced the task of critical reflection on the preceding period and of becoming a full member of the world historical science community. We think that neither of these tasks has been completed up to now—which corresponds to the situation in other post-communist countries. Slovak historiography is still struggling with the heritage of the ideological and paternalist state.

Roman Holec has commented on this: “We have no Martin Nodl,¹⁰⁸ who would regularly exasperate us with his diction. I even have the feeling that we have no dissatisfied young historians, who could present the accounts and give our circles a good airing.”¹⁰⁹ Holec asks obliquely about where the young historians are who could call the previous generations to account. He gives the answer himself: “The lack of methodological grounding and complete absence of theoretical categories in our

¹⁰⁷ Podoba, Juraj: Národná identita a “Erinnerungspolitik” v slovenskej historiografii: niekoľko kritických postrehov od “susedov”, *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004, p. 263

¹⁰⁸ See Czech historiography after 1989

¹⁰⁹ Holec, Roman: Historik a peniaze (alebo podiel peniazí na poľudštení historika), *HČ*, roč. 50, č.1, 2002, p.27

works does not trouble above all those who do not feel the need to or do not have the opportunity to confront work from foreign countries, where extraordinary importance is given to theoretical questions both at universities and in scientific education. It is the basis for the concept of the historical school, which is (*in Slovakia*) absurdly supplied by the number of doctoral students.” This reflects the policy of the universities towards young researchers. There are others at the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences—concerned mainly with technical problems and with their older colleagues.

III. 3. Themes and Approaches

New themes appeared and new areas of research were opened in the 1990s. They include Church history, Jewish history, the history of everyday life, and the history of women. Slovak research is beginning to concentrate more on the questions of identity, collective memory, historical stereotypes, and myths; it uses new methodologies and is comparable to work in other countries in the Central European context. However, there has been no change of paradigm.¹¹⁰ Political history remains in the first place, and all synthesizing works are the results of the victory of national historiography. Positivism still prevails in methodology.

Dušan Kováč has been critical of national historiography: “Slovak history has long been perceived and taught in Slovakia as a more or less closed system, and the national or ethnic development of the Slovaks has been emphasized. This closed character was broken to some extent, but only in one direction – towards Czech history... In any case, it is proven that the closed conception of Slovak history, according to which this history has meaning only in itself and for itself, is unsustainable... Just as a nation as existing only for itself cannot have meaning,

¹¹⁰ Mannová, Elena: *Clio na slovenský spôsob*. In: *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004, p.243

national history cannot have meaning without confrontation with a wider space, and for Slovakia this space is not only Central Europe.”¹¹¹

We think that precisely the reverse is true. National histories make sense only and exclusively for themselves. The moment they are confronted with other national histories, their self-centeredness is easily seen. The only route is to abandon national history. However, the specific directions Slovak historiography should take are still not clear.

Roman Holec thinks that the methods of the historical sciences in Slovakia are a form of the “positivism of the 19th century denuded of any sign of theoretical considerations, not to speak of any new methods.”¹¹² Both the quoted authors come from the heart of the Slovak academic community.

The *Selected Bibliography of Slovak History* by Alžbeta Sedliaková includes almost four thousand (3,938) separate publications and articles, devoted to Slovakia, Slovak history, or written by Slovak authors, in the period 1990-1999. Interestingly, there has been an increasing number of publications: while between 1990 and 1994, Alžbeta Sedliaková recorded almost 1,500 publications, in the following period almost 2,500. 78%, about 3000 works from the whole output is devoted to Slovak history and only 7% to world history.¹¹³ At the same time, there has been a decline in the proportion of works devoted to world history, from 7.9% in between 1990 and 1994 to 6.7% in between 1995 and 1999. Most of the works on general history are devoted to Russia, including the Soviet Union and the Commonwealth of Independent States, or to Hungary, including the historic Kingdom of Hungary.

In historiography, Slovak history means the history of the 19th and 20th centuries, as 57% of Slovak history is devoted to this very period. It is even more

¹¹¹ Kováč, Dušan: Slovenská historiografia desať rokov po. Zámery a ich realizácia, HČ, roč.50, č. 1, 2002, p.8

¹¹² Holec, Roman: Historik a peniaze (alebo podiel peniazí na poľudštení historika), HČ, roč. 50, č.1, 2002, p.26

¹¹³ Porovnej: Ivantyšinová, Tatiana: O probleme kontinuity a diskontinuity historiografie všeobecných dejín na Slovensku. In: Historický časopis, 50, 2002, c.1, p. 102-106

interesting that a whole quarter of Slovak history is related to the period 1918-1945 (between 1990 and 1994 it is 24.5%; between 1995 and 1999 26%!). Economic history with 9% and local or regional history with 13% kept their position. 6% of works were devoted to national questions in the nineties, but only 5% to Church questions and less than 2% to Jewish questions. Only a few works were devoted to Romany history.

The thematic composition of the output is clearly one-sided. Almost 30% of the publications on Slovak history are devoted to political history, and we find a large increase in political history in the second half of the nineties compared to the first half. While in the first half it made up 22%, in the second half as much as 34%. Cultural history including science, culture and art was 22% in the nineties, with the largest part devoted to the Slovak language and Slavonic studies.

The history of the territory of present-day Slovakia up to the 9th century is called the “Pre-Hungarian period” in English. In Slovak, the expressions “Pre-Slavonic period” and “Slavonic period” are used for the same period. This part of Europe had its Celtic period, Roman and Germanic period, the Migration, the coming of the first Slavs, and the Great Moravian Empire. Therefore, the study of this period is very divided and based mainly on archaeological research. Two ambitious publications of sources on the “Pre-Hungarian” period¹¹⁴ and works on the earliest history of some areas and localities¹¹⁵ have been published since 1989. Gabriel Fusek devoted attention to the Slavonic period, Ján Steinhübel wrote about Great Moravia

¹¹⁴ Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov. [Zv. 1. Územie Slovenska pred príchodom Slovanov.] [Red.]: Valachovič, Pavol. [Hlavný red.]: Marsina, Richard. [Predhovor]: Ferko, Milan. [Úvod k 1. zv.]: Valachovič, Pavol. [Preklady]: Škoviera, Daniel. [Autori]: Marsina, Richard - Valachovič, Pavol - Kolníková, Eva. Br., [Národné literárne centrum] 1998, Slovensko očami cudzincov. Vzácné správy o histórii nášho územia od 6. do 10. storočia, tak ako sa javia v písomnostiach prevažne cudzieho pôvodu. Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov. Zv. 2. [Ved. red.]: Marsina, Richard. [Aut. kol.]: Marsina, Richard - Steinhübel, Ján - Lukačka, Ján - Pauliny, Ján. [Ed.]: Dvořák, Pavel. Br., Literárne a informačné centrum vo vyd. Rak Budmerice 1999

¹¹⁵ Nitra. Príspevky k najstarším dejinám mesta. Nitra, Archeologický ústav SAV 1993
K problematike osídlenia stredodunajskej oblasti vo včasnom stredoveku. [Zost.]: Čilinská, Zlatica. Nitra, Archeologický ústav SAV 1991, Plachá, Veronika - Hlavicová, Jana - Keller, Igor : Slovanský Devín. Br., Obzor pre Mestské múzeum v Bratislave 1990

and the first kings of Hungary, and Vincent Sedlák considered the ethnogenesis of the Slovaks.

Until recently, the most important historian who devoted attention to early history was Alexander Avenarius. His area of interest extended from the Byzantium to Church history up to the 12th century. His contributions to the methodology of historiography and the alternative histories of Slovakia were equally great.

In the period up to the 9th century, we find one theme that became central in the 1990s. It is Great Moravia, its significance, and its relationship to present-day Slovakia. Does Great Moravia belong to Slovak national history and is Slovakia the “heir” of Great Moravia? These are the questions Slovak historiography intends to answer. Two large collection of texts on Great Moravia and the history of the territory of present-day Slovakia from the 6th to the 10th centuries were published in the 1990s.¹¹⁶

Subsequently the territory of present-day Slovakia was conquered by the Hungarians or Magyars and came under the scepter of the kings of Hungary. The history of Slovakia was essentially the history of a region in the Kingdom of Hungary. Slovak historians either devote their attention to Hungarian politics, as in three publications on the Árpád dynasty, the Anjevin kings,¹¹⁷ and the reign of Sigismund of Luxembourg¹¹⁸ by groups of authors, as well as in the works of Blanka Brezováková and Július Bartl, or to regional history. An example of the latter is the work of Ferdinand Uličný, who emphasizes the development of the towns. From this

¹¹⁶ Svätopluk 894 - 1994. Nitra, Archeologický ústav SAV 1997
Slovaks in the Central Danubian Region in the 6th to 11th Century. [Ed.]: Kučera, Matúš. Br., SNM 2000

¹¹⁷ Pod vládou anjouovských kráľov. Slovensko po vymretí Arpádovcov a nástupe Anjouovcov na uhorský trón, Karola Róberta, Ľudovíta Veľkého a jeho dcéry Márie. [Ved. red.]: Sedlák, Vincent. [Autori]: Brezováková, Blanka - Lukačka, Ján - Sedlák, Vincent - Sopko, Július. Br., Literárne informačné centrum 2002

V kráľovstve svätého Štefana. Vznik uhorského štátu a čas arpádovských kráľov. [Výber, preklad a komentáre]: Marsina, Richard. [Ed.]: Dvořák, Pavel. Br., Literárne a informačné centrum 2003

¹¹⁸ Prvý cisár na uhorskom tróne. Slovensko v čase polstoročnej vlády uhorského, českého, lombardského a nemeckého kráľa a rímskeho cisára Žigmunda Luxemburského, syna Karola IV. [Ved. red.]: Bartl, Július. [Ed.]: Dvořák, Pavel. [Vedúci aut. kol.]: Bartl, Július. [Autori]: Dvořáková, Daniela - Lukačka, Ján - Lukačka, Tomáš - Sopko, Július. Br., Literárne informačné centrum [2001].

point of view, the territory of Slovakia was a developed part of the Kingdom of Hungary. Apart from monographs on small Slovak towns, two extensive collections of texts on the histories of Bratislava and Košice were published.¹¹⁹

The settlement of the territory of southern Slovakia before the 13th century has been a topic of discussion. Was this territory settled before the coming of the Magyars? If so, by whom? Which ethnic group lived in the southern half of Slovakia up to the end of the 12th century? In more recent works, authors like Branislav Varsik have attempted to give a definitive answer to this question, with the help of the analysis of regional names.

A shortage of publication of sources from Slovakia is typical of the work of the medievalists. The territory of Slovakia as one of the regions of the Kingdom of Hungary has its place in Hungarian publications such as Hungarian chronicles, but there has been inadequate publication of local sources in present-day Slovakia. The *Gesta Hungarorum* was edited by Vincent Múcska.¹²⁰ In the second half of the 1990s, Richard Marsina and Július Sopko published a collection of medieval legends and chronicles with the aim of approaching the image of Slovakia through the eyes of contemporaries. Both authors devote attention to cultural history. Apart from the medieval history of Slovakia from Great Moravia to the High Middle Ages, Richard Marsina also devotes attention to methodology and the history of historiography. Ján Lukačka, Július Bartl, František Oslanský and others devote attention to medieval social history.

After 1526, the Kingdom of Hungary became part of the Habsburg Empire, but half its territory, including Buda, came under Turkish rule. With this change, the

¹¹⁹ Halaga, Ondrej R. : Počiatky Košíc a zrod metropoly. Košice, Východoslov. vyd. 1993
Städte im Donauraum. Sammelband der Beiträge aus dem Symposium in Smolenice 30. 9. - 3. 10.
1991. Bratislava - Pressburg 1291-1991. [Hrsg]: Marsina, Richard. Br., Slovenská historická
spoločnosť - Historický ústav SAV - Miestny úrad Bratislava-Staré mesto 1993

¹²⁰ Kronika anonymného notára kráľa Bela. *Gesta Hungarorum*. [The Chronicle of Anonymous Notary of the King Bela.] [Prel., pozn. a reg. nap., úv. štúdiu nap.]: Múcska, Vincent. [Ed.]: Dvořák, Pavel. Budmerice, Vyd. Rak v spolupráci s nadáciou Osudy predkov 2000

territory of Slovakia became vitally important. The state administration and the Church authorities were transferred to the territory of Slovakia, and the Hungarian crown was kept in the Church of St. Martin in Pressburg (Bratislava).

Slovakia bordered on the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish expansion directly affected it. Among recent historians, Vojtech Kopčan devoted attention to Turkish studies. The Reformation penetrated into Slovakia from the 16th century and encountered the strong re-Catholicization policy of the Habsburg monarchy. David P. Daniel works on the history of the Reformation in Slovakia.

The work of Ján Tibenský concentrates mainly on the first half of the 18th century, while Eva Kowalská, Viliam Čičaj, Pavel Horváth, and Maria Kohútová are concerned with the Enlightenment and the influence of the French Revolution on Slovakia at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries. They devote attention to both political and cultural history. Eva Kowalská deals with education and the rise of the national movement. Viliam Čičaj concentrates on publishing. Pavel Horváth and Mária Kohútová are concerned with the personalities of certain periods as well as with social history. Works on economic history are few and far between. A few articles have been written on the history of the Jews in Slovakia in the medieval and modern periods.¹²¹ Vladimír Gecelovský and Pavol Šalamon devote attention to the history of the Romany.

Medieval and modern history provide sufficient biographical materials. Two publications on the lives of saints¹²² and a large publication on scientific life in Bratislava¹²³ have appeared. Publication on the history of music in Slovakia is also

¹²¹ Tandlich, Tomáš : Židia v stredovekom Uhorsku. HR 12, 2001, č. 8, p. 6-7, Marsina, Richard : Das Judentum in der Slowakei im Mittelalter. In: Juden im Grenzraum. Symposium im Rahmen der "Schlaininger Gespräche" vom 19.-23. September 1990 auf Burg Schlaining. Eisenstadt, Burgenländischen Landesmuseum Eisenstadt 1993, p. 23-35, Horváth, Pavel : Typy židovských osád. Párovce, Židovská Veča, Šarišské Lúky, Huncovce. HR 6, 1995, č. 8, p. 8-9

¹²² Rusina, Ivan - Zervan, Marián : Životopisy svätcov. (Ikonografia.) Br., Pallas 1994
Rusina, Ivan: Svätci v strednej Európe/ Heilige in Zentraleuroppe. Bratislava. Slovenská národná galéria, 1993

¹²³ Kapitoly z vedeckého života v Bratislave. Br., Veda 1991

continuing.¹²⁴ The 19th century is the period of the National Revival. With this, the development of the Slovak nation comes into the centre of attention. Milan Podrimavský focuses on the period from 1848 to 1918. From the 19th century, cultural history is subordinate to the unifying idea of political emancipation—thus, it is really political history.

The greatest part of Slovak historiography is devoted to political history. The most recent volume of the six-volume academic synthesis *The History of Slovakia III*, covering the period from 1848 to the end of the 19th century, was published in 1992.¹²⁵ The work is sponsored by the Slovak Academy of Sciences. However, most importantly, new versions of the history of Slovakia from the beginning to recent times have appeared. These include the works of the Ľud'ák exiles and other nationally oriented publications. Other members of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, including Dušan Kováč and Ľubomír Lipták, have also produced histories. The works of Ľubomír Lipták and Pavol Petruf also appeared in foreign languages with foreign support, which is a great achievement. We may say that almost every member of the Slovak historical community felt challenged, often in reaction to the rightist interpretation, to express her view on the “meaning of Slovak history”.

From world history, works on well-known names appeared, with only a few covering a longer period or being a result of long-term research. Slavomír Michálek and Pavol Petruf produced significant works; Pavol Petruf contributed to the history of historiography and published editions of sources. So-called “world” or “general” history is usually limited to international relations with Slovakia. One of the latest

¹²⁴ Múdra, Darina: *Dejiny hudobnej kultúry na Slovensku II. Klasicizmus*. Bratislava 1993

¹²⁵ *Dejiny Slovenska III. Od roku 1948 do konca 19. storočia*, Bratislava Veda 1992

important works is *Views to the East* by Dagmar Čierna-Lantayová.¹²⁶ A series of publications on military history appeared in the 1990s.¹²⁷

The growth of thematic literature on the years after the Second World War has been a significant feature of Slovak historiography from the second half of the nineties. It concerns world and, again, mostly Slovak history.¹²⁸

It is interesting that to this day no historian has produced a thorough analysis of the independent Slovak state during the Second World War. There are some researchers who devote their attention to this very period—other than the Ľud'ák authors, especially Valerián Bystrický. Some issues about the Holocaust have been discussed in the course of the last 14 years, and some very important documents on that topic were published. However, the Slovak state has still not been successfully and consistently situated in the history of Slovakia.

Biographical literature has undergone the same rapid progress as literature on Slovak history. In particular, biographies of Slovak personalities from the interwar period have appeared,¹²⁹ and usually with interpretations from different points of view. Apart from the leading figures of the Slovak state already mentioned, the main

¹²⁶ Čierna-Lantayová, Dagmar : Pohľady na východ. (Postoje k Rusku v slovenskej politike 1934-1944.) Br., Veda vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied 2002

¹²⁷ Dangl, Vojtech - Kopčan, Vojtech : Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 2. 1526-1711. Br., Ministerstvo obrany SR vo Vojenskej informačnej a tlačovej agentúre 1995

Dangl, Vojtech - Segeš, Vladimír : Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 3. 1711-1914. [Br.], [Ministerstvo obrany SR] [1996.]

Hronský, Marián - Krivá, Anna - Čaplovič, Miloslav : Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 4. 1914-1939. [Br.], [Ministerstvo obrany SR] [1996].

Klein, Bohuš - Ruttkay, Alexander - Marsina, Richard : Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 1. Stručný náčrt do roku 1526. Br., Ministerstvo obrany Slovenskej republiky 1994

¹²⁸ Jablonický J.: Podoby násilia (Statna bezpecnost 1945-51), Bratislava, Kalligram 2000, Spetko, J.: Lisky kontra jeze. Slovenska politicka emigracia 1948-1989, Bratislava, Kalligram 2002, Marušiak, Juraj: Slovenská literatúra v druhej polovici pädesiatych rokov, Brno 2001, Pešek, Jan: Slovensko v rokoch 1953-1957. Kapitoly z politického vývoja. Brno 2001, Barnovský, Michal: Prvá vlna destalinizácie a Slovensko (1953-1957). Brno 2002, Londák, M.- Sikora, S. – Londáková, E.: Predjarie. Bratislava 2002

¹²⁹ Muži deklarácie. [Aut.]: Kováč, Dušan a kol. Martin, Osveta 1991

Švorc, Peter : Rozbýjali monarchiu. (Populárny slovník osobností česko-slovenského odboja 1914-1918.) Košice, Východoslov. vydav. 1992 Veda vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied 2003

Kto bol kto za I. ČSR. [Nap.]: Nižňanský, Eduard - Suško, Ladislav - Slnková, Veronika - Marci, Ludovít. Br., Q111 1993

Michálek, Slavomír - Krajčovičová, Natália a kol. : Do pamäti národa. Osobnosti slovenských dejín prvej polovice 20. storočia.

heroes of these biographies are Milan Rastislav Štefánik, Milan Hodža as well as Alexander Dubček¹³⁰.

Generational biographical works and biographies related to other historical branches have also appeared.¹³¹ Roman Holec has written a series of unusual biographies that overlap with economic history, attempting to put historical personalities into a comprehensive social and cultural environment.¹³²

Recent Slovak economic history employs new methodology. (The main representative of this trend is Roman Holec.) However, the majority of publications from this area are still produced in the spirit of neo-positivism with archival research forming the basis for detailed work with firm regional or period definition, but often without wider anchoring. A close connection of the economic history of the medieval and modern periods with the history of aristocratic families in Slovakia is characteristic.

A group of authors, which includes Marián Tkáč, Rudolf Návrát and Ján Valach, has developed an unusual approach to economic history. They researched the lives of Slovak personalities who engaged in finance and banking, although they are primarily known from other areas. Among them are doctors of medicine, politicians,

¹³⁰ Štvrtecký, Štefan: *Náš Milan Rastislav Štefánik*, Bratislava, Smena 1990
Juríček, J.: *M.R.Štefánik*, Bratislava, Mladé letá 1990 (vyšlo dvakrát 1968-69)
Zuberec, V.: *Milan Rastislav Štefánik – léta hvězdná a válečná*, Slovo k historii, 23, Melantrich, Praha 1990 (studie)

Vároš, M.: *Posledný let generála Štefánika*, Bratislava, Obzor 1991

Marsina, R.: *Štúdie k slovenskému diplomatáru II.*, Bratislava, Veda 1989

Kollár, K.: *Milan Hodža, moderný teoretik, pragmatický politik*, Bratislava, Infopress 1994 (socg. a filosof autorem, úsek do 1918, soc.-fsof. názory, netradiční biografie)

Mathé, Svätoslav: *Milan Hodža. Štátnik a politik*, Bratislava 1992

Cambel, S.: *Štátnik a národohospodár Milan Hodža 1878-1944*, Bratislava, Veda 2001

Laluka, I.: *Alexander Dubček. Politik a jeho doba*, Bratislava, Nova Praca 2000

Kováč, Dušan a kol.: *Muži dklarácie*. Martin 1991, 2. vydání Bratislava 1991

¹³¹ Mlynárik, Ján: *Pražané na Slovensku ve 20. století*. Praha 2000, Mlynárik, Ján: *Českí profesori na Slovensku*. Praha 1994

Pichler, Tibor: *Národovci a občania. O slovenskom politickom myslení v 19. storočí*. Bratislava 1998

Bakoš, V.: *Kapitoly z dejín slovenskeho myslenia*, Bratislava 1995

Bakoš, Vladimír: *Question of the nation in Slovak though. Several chapters on the national thought in modern Slovakia*. Veda.Bratislava 1999

¹³² Holec, Roman: *Poslední Habsburgovci a Slovensko*. Bratislava 2001

Holec, Roman: "Neresti" slovenských narodovcov z pred sto rokov. In: *Historické štúdie* 42, 2002, p. 173-187

Holec, R.: *Zabudnuté osudy. (10 zivotnych príbehov novodobych slovenskych dejin)*, Martin 2001

teachers and such figures from Slovak history as Ľudovít Štúr, Pavol Orszagh Hviezdoslav, and Andrej Hlinka.¹³³ There are also works devoted to farming. These are not histories of great events; however, they do contribute to historical knowledge, in an area where it is not possible to use only written sources.

After 1989, it was possible to reopen the theme of Church history in Slovakia. Unlike in the Czech Republic, the Church is still an important factor in Slovak social life today, and interest in its history has grown rapidly.¹³⁴ Apart from regional histories, the majority of works are devoted to the position of the Church before 1989 and so to the “history of oppression”. The time for reflection on the Church as an active power has still not come.

The Evangelical College in Prešov has done important work in the field of Church history. Their publications appear in *Acta Collegii Evangelici Presoviensis*, a series under the management of the Bishop’s Office in Prešov. They publish material on Church activities, volumes of collected historical works and editions of sources. Ján Šimulčík deserves special mention as a person who has devoted his attention to the history of the Catholic Church in the second half of the 20th century.

III. 4. The Plurality of Voices: Historical Regions and Nationalities

Regional history was more or less on the margins in Slovak historiography during the 20th century. It received less publicity, procured insufficient resources for its development, and was generally regarded as a supplement to “greater history”.

¹³³ Tkáč, M. – Navrátnik, R. – Valach, J.: *Mali sme lekárov?*, Bratislava, Prúdy 1996

Tkáč, M. – Navrátnik, R.: *Synovia a otcovia*, Bratislava, Offprint J. Holík 2000

¹³⁴ Mikloško, F.: *Nebudete ich moc rozvrátiť?*, Bratislava 1991, *osudy kat. cirkve na Slov. 1943-1989*
Hlinka, A.: *Sila slabých a slabosť silných. Cirkve na Slovensku v rokoch 1945-1989*, Trnava, Spolok sv. Vojtecha, 1990

Pesek, J. – Barnovský, M.: *Pod kuratelou noci. Cirkvi na Slovensku v rokoch 1953-1970*, Bratislava, Veda 1999

Pesek, J. – Barnovský, M.: *Statná moc a cirkvi na Slovensku 1948-1953*, Bratislava, Veda 1997

Lexikon katolíckych knazských osobností Slovenska, Bratislava, Luc 2000

Pavel Švorc thinks¹³⁵ that this was a reaction to the handicap of the Slovak nation, the territory of which was placed in a regional position for a long time. Švorc suggests, this situation has not changed since Hungarian Empire. In our view, precisely the reverse is true. Slovak historiography was not suppressed, and it had the task of constructing a Slovak national history comparable to the national histories of other European countries. It was under pressure from the European trend of the time in historiography and from social demands in Slovakia. Since every national history is ideological and ideology needs to be built from above, Slovak historiography first devoted itself to creating a corpus of national history. It did not devote attention to regional history because it did not have sufficient capacity and not because it would sadly recall the regional position of Slovakia in larger state units.

The attention of historians has now returned to regional and local history. The reason is that regional history and local history are relatively unexplored territory, which is becoming more and more popular and receives regional financial support. The fact that it is possible to write and publish just about anything as long as somebody will pay for it plays an important role-and there is no shortage of regional patriots in Slovakia.

Slovakia has three large regions, West Slovakia, Central Slovakia, and East Slovakia. In practice, usually only two regions, Central-Western Slovakia and East Slovakia, are distinguished. Apart from this, Slovakia is divided into historical administrative units, especially former counties, which gained specific characters thanks to their geographical and historical features. Slovakia did not develop as a united constitutional and administrative unit until 1918, and, therefore, its individual regions have different historical heritages.

¹³⁵ Švorc, Peter: Slovenská historiografia a regionálne dejiny 19. a 20. storočia, In: Historický časopis, 52, č.2, 2004, str 295-308

Of more than 3000 publications on Slovak history in the 1990s, 13.2% were devoted to regional history. Larger proportions appeared strictly on political history and the history of culture, science, and art.

The specificity of individual regions manifests itself in their economic development, their religious and ethnic development, and generally in their “contribution” to the history of Slovakia. Certain stereotypes arose from the examination of some of them.¹³⁶ There are regions which are difficult to fit into Slovak national history because of their mixed populations,¹³⁷ but they have important positions in some of the histories of minorities in Slovakia. Regional history finds support among the various minorities.

The supporters of regional history also include universities, especially the more recent ones established to accommodate historical differences among regions. The Church also plays a similar role. It strongly supports regional research and production of knowledge in connection with its regional institutions. The theme of support for regional history, which is also ideologically conditioned, takes us back to Church history and the history of national or ethno-religious minorities, which strongly overlap with regional history in Slovakia.

Although the volume of regional history has been increasing in Slovakia since the nineties, such history often takes the form of local history in the sense of the history of towns or villages rather than the history of territorial units. This is a result of the above-mentioned renaissance of regional patriotism. Methodologically, Ján Tibenský's *A Homage to the Village of Budmerice* has been a great step forward in regional history.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ Šariš - Stereotype of the economical underdevelopment and therefore hardly possible to explain any “contribution” to Slovak history. All the Eastern-Slovakian region waits for its rehabilitation, because until now it was not for its economical delay and rich ethnical composition compatible with the great Slovak myth.

¹³⁷ Spiš as a German region, Komárno, South Slovakia and partly Eastern Slovakia as a Hungarian region.

¹³⁸ Tibenský, Ján: *Poctivá obec budmerická*, Budmerice 1996

Slovak history is marked by religious division, multi-culturalism and multi-ethnicity. Of the three, the strongest characteristic is multi-ethnicity. For this reason, rather than for giving priority to the national point of view, we place special emphasis on the history of the non-Slovak population. The history of the non-Slovak minorities constitutes a special chapter in the history of Slovakia. The topic cannot be treated by regional history in the cases of the Hungarians, the Germans, and the Rusyns or Ukrainians. Church history cannot provide a framework for writing the history of the Jews, nor, to some extent, that of the Ukrainians and Rusyns. However histories of all the named ethnic groups in Slovakia often overlap the regional and the Church history, the role of the minorities in the history of Slovakia was and still is much more comprehensive.

Before 1989, only the Hungarians and the Ukrainians were recognized as ethnic minorities in Slovakia. Some works were devoted to them, but they are ideologically half-hearted. The Romany and the Rusyns did not exist in historiography, and very little space was devoted to the Germans and the Jews.

Each of these ethnic groups has a different place in the history of Slovakia, assigned by history, changes of position in 1918 or 1945, and other factors. Up to 1918, assuming the history of Slovakia is not defined as the history of one ethnic group, historiography can start from some more or less uncontroversial facts. The administration of the territory of Slovakia was Hungarian, some areas such as Spiš and Šariš were German, with the Germans excelling in mining and commerce as well as penetrating into the administration. The Jews were more or less persecuted and devoted themselves to commerce. The Rusyns or Ukrainians and the Romany were practically ignored when the situation did not demand otherwise and did not draw attention to themselves. By comparison, the Slovak population experienced a process

Tibenský, Ján: Poctivá obec budmerická. Starodávna história. Každodenný život slovenskej dediny od najstarších čias do začiatku 18. storočia. Budmerice, 1998

of national emancipation from the end of the 18th century, but in reality it remained in a subordinate position.

From the beginning of the 19th century, the membership of individual ethnic groups and emerging nations began to play an important role in society. The 20th century brought an absolute change in the social positions of all the ethnic groups and a change in the way they reflected on their positions.

The Hungarians lost their privileged status and began to be perceived as aliens in the new nation state. The Jews were almost liquidated in Slovakia during the Second World War, and contemporary historiography is attempting to atone for this crime. The Germans in Slovakia were identified with those responsible for the war and were readily forgotten after it. The situation of the Rusyns or Ukrainians and the Romany could only improve in the 20th century. The Rusyn-Ukrainians had already attracted attention in the First Czechoslovak Republic with an attempt at autonomy. They began to reappear in the historiography of the 1980s. The Romany started to secure interest to historiography only in the 1990s, and their historical self-reflection has not yet been born. In contrast with all these other groups, the Slovaks achieved their own nation state in the 20th century, and their own national historiography dates back to even earlier.

Each of these ethnic groups has its own specificity and their only unifying element is their common history in the territory of present-day Slovakia. However, the histories of these ethnic groups cross the borders of Slovakia. The histories of the Jews and the Holocaust, the Hungarians, and the Romany all take place in Central European or European contexts.

The history of the Jewish community is a good example of the complicated situation of Slovak historiography. Working on the Holocaust, Slovak historiography goes beyond both Central European and European histories. At the same time, the history of the Jewish community is a perfect example of regional and local history as

well as of “affliction by history”. Little is known about the fate of the Jews in southern Slovakia and around Košice, since these territories were under Hungarian rule during the Second World War. This still makes the work of Slovak historiographers more difficult.

The history of the Germans in Slovakia has significantly developed since the 1990s.¹³⁹ The Museum of the Culture of the Carpathian Germans¹⁴⁰ was established in 1997 as an independent part of the Slovak National Museum. It produces the series *Acta Carpatho-Germanica* as well as other publications. In 2000-2002, the Institute of Social Sciences in Košice, under the leadership of Soňa Gabzdilová, researched the German minority in Slovakia after 1918. The focus of this research was on changes in the historical memory of Germans.

Up to 1918, the territory of present-day Slovakia was administered in Hungarian, and since then Slovak historiography has continually had to reckon with the Hungarian language and heritage. Before 1989, the Hungarians or Magyars were one of the two officially recognized nationalities in Slovakia, but not much was published about them. Since 1989, interest in the nationality theme has increased¹⁴¹ and has found its sources of finance.

The Institute of Social Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, under the leadership of Štefan Šutaj in Košice, concentrates on questions of identity, especially

¹³⁹ Kováč, Dušan: *Nemecko a nemecká menšina na Slovensku (1871-1945)*, Bratislava 1991, Gabzdilová, Soňa - Olejník, Milan : *Odsun nemeckej menšiny zo Spiša v rokoch 1945-1948*. In: *Spiš v kontinuite času*. Prešov-Bratislava-Wien, FF v Prešove UPJŠ v Košiciach - Österreichisches Ost- und Südosteuropa Institut Wien 1995, p. 214-221 (výzkumný projekt) a výsledky výzkumu *Postavenie nemeckej minority v regióne Spiša v rokoch 1918-1948 a zmeny jeho etnickej identity (1997-1997)* pod vedením Soňi Gabzdilové (Spoločenskovedný ústav v Košicích) a Petera Švorca (Katedra slovenských dejín a archívnictva Filozofickej fakulty Prešovskej univerzity), Gabzdilová, Soňa : *Nemecká menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1947-1950*. In: *Etnické minority na Slovensku. História, súčasnosť, súvislosti*. Košice, Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV 1997, p. 114-123

¹⁴⁰ http://www.muzeum.sk/muzeum/default.php?co=mkkn_snm

¹⁴¹ Chmel, Rudolf: *Moje maďarská otázka*. Bratislava 1996, Kusý, Miroslav: *Čo s našimi Maďarmi?* Bratislava 1998

of the Rusyn-Ukrainian and the Hungarian minorities.¹⁴² Since the end of the 1990s, the German minority in Spiš, the Rusyn-Ukrainians, and the Romany are also included in the themes researched. The Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences has organised and participated in several projects and conferences on Slovak – Hungarian relations, and volumes of papers from these have been published.

Among historians from Slovakia who have devoted attention to the Hungarian minority are Katalin Vadkerty and Daniela Čierna-Lantayová. A historian from abroad who addresses the theme of Hungarians as a minority in Slovakia is László Szarka. In most texts, it is possible to identify allegiance to one side or the other on the majority – minority issue; some take an openly confrontational approach.

Slovakia typically has some historians whose mother tongue is Hungarian; often, this motivates them to work on topics closely connected with the national question. In a period when state-national history still prevails, it is impossible to be a Hungarian and a Slovak historian at the same time. Nevertheless, these historians are an integral part of the Slovak historical community. The Hungarian minority historians publish in both languages, and they connect with Hungarian historiography. Their interpretations of history do not resound in the Slovak environment and often is in temptation to become more controversial than the state-Hungarian one. In such a situation, the question remains whether Slovak and (Slovak-) Hungarian historiography can be brought closer on connected themes.

The Hungarian minority is building its own smaller institutions, some of them of an academic nature. The most prestigious Hungarian academic institution in Slovakia is the Institute Forum,¹⁴³ which holds historical conferences, produces publications, and concentrates part of the Hungarian intellectual community in

¹⁴² Šutaj, Štefan: Maďarská menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1945-1948. Východiská a prax politiky k maďarskej menšine na Slovensku, Bratislava 1993, Šutaj, Štefan: Reslovakizácia. Zmena národnosti časti obyvateľstva Slovenska po 2. svetovej vojne, Košice 1991
Gabzdilová, Soňa : Školy s maďarským vyučovacím jazykom na Slovensku po druhej svetovej vojne. Košice, Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV 1991

¹⁴³ <http://www.foruminst.sk/>

Slovakia. The Forum was founded in 1996 at Dunajská Streda. In 2002 it moved to Šamorín, near Bratislava. In this period, it divided into three institutions: the Forum Institute for Research on Minorities, the Forum Information Centre, and the Forum Centre for Regional Development. The Bibliotheca Hungarica of Hungarian-language Czecho-Slovak literature, assembled on civil initiatives since 1990, became part of this institution in 1997.¹⁴⁴ A large proportion of the published works concentrate on the ethnography of Hungarian settlement in the territory of present-day Slovakia and the social history of ethnically mixed territories. This was necessitated by the shortage of such works in the preceding period and made possible by the fact that ethnography and ethnology are definitely less involved in Slovak political discussions in a confrontational way. This is something the Forum does not want and cannot choose. Komárno is becoming another important center for the Hungarian intelligentsia in Slovakia. This is partly given by tradition and partly by the new situation, in which Komárno has become the location for university teaching in the Hungarian language. An increasing number of smaller historical writings in Hungarian is also published here.

In addition to those mentioned, books are brought out in Slovak and Hungarian by various Slovak publishers; it is also possible to find bilingual publications. The publishing house Kalligram releases a large number of translations from Hungarian and basic, now already classical literature on the nationality questions in the Central European region during the course of the 20th century. The Czech humanist can also draw on these.

Much space has been devoted to the history and position of the Jews in the territory of Slovakia during the post-revolutionary years. One reason is that the Jewish community flourished after 1989 compared to the preceding period. The theme of the

¹⁴⁴ Végh, L. (ed.): *A Bibliotheca Hungarica (cseh)-szlovákiai magyar könyvgyűjtemények bibliográfiája (1918-2000)* 1-2, Dunaszerdahely, Lilium Aurum 2000

history of the Jews was again opened to the public, and the wartime Slovak state was at least partly dealt with in connection with this topic. The authors who have done most work in this area are Eduard Nižňanský and Katarína Hradská among historians and Peter Salner in ethnology and cultural anthropology, all from the Slovak Academy of Sciences. Peter Salner is also the head of the Jewish community. Their works are significant resources to those with an interest in Jewish themes; but we find texts by many other authors as well.¹⁴⁵ A whole series is devoted to regional and local histories of Jewish communities throughout Slovakia.

A new institution addressing Jewish history has been founded. The Institute of Jewish Studies at Comenius University in Bratislava, established in the nineties, has no parallel, for example, in the Czech Republic. Some experts on Jewish studies from the Czech Republic participated in its establishment. The Institute has already published several volumes of papers, which are interesting for their wide methodological range, covering history, culturology, philosophy, and ethnology.¹⁴⁶ The Milan Šimečka Foundation¹⁴⁷ now includes a Holocaust documentation center and a section of the Slovak National Museum; the Museum of Jewish Culture publishes the series *Judaica Slovaca* and the annual *Acta Judaica Slovaca*.

The fates of the Jewish communities in Slovakia (mostly histories of oppression) are a focus of attention.. The first wave of literature on this theme concerned the “history of persecution”, examined from the perspectives of the majority and the minority communities. The Second World War and the Holocaust were the main themes in this period. After 1989 some fundamental works that had been written but could not be published earlier appeared. They included above all the

¹⁴⁵ Bratislava – P. Salner, I. Kamenec, P. Larišová, Topoľčanki – R.Y.Büchler, A. Jamrichová-James, Nitra – L. Könyözszyová, Piešťany – K. Psicová, Prešov – P. Kónya, D. Landa, Trnava – V. Slnková, Trenčín – M. Vrzgulová, Šala . R. Kuklovský

¹⁴⁶ *Židia v interakcii* (ed. Egon Gál), Bratislava 1997, *Židia v interakciiII*. (ed. Egon Gál). Bratislava 1999, *Židia dnes*. (ed. Egon Gál). Bratislava 2003

¹⁴⁷ <http://www.nadaciamilanasecku.sk/>

book by Ivan Kamenec.¹⁴⁸ Collections of documents also came out. Eduard Nižňanský and Katarína Hradská have done important work in this area.¹⁴⁹ Besides older memoirs, new ones were also put out after 1989.

Since the end of the 1990s publications opening a new approach to the history of the Jews in Slovakia have begun to appear. These address the social composition of the Slovak community and the place of the Jews in it. New methodological approaches are also developing in this field.

In the nineties, the book by Peter Salner *They Survived the Holocaust* was published as a result of a project.¹⁵⁰ Using the method of oral history, it preserves the stories of 150 victims of the Holocaust. In 2000, Peter Salner published the book *Jews between Tradition and Assimilation*,¹⁵¹ in which he attempts to capture the changes experienced by the Jewish community in the course of the 19th and the 20th centuries. The book is concerned with questions of identity, assimilation and the relationship between the minority and majority populations. An ethnologist, Eva Krekovičová is also concerned with the Jews in Slovakia. She has devoted her attention to the image of the Jew in Slovak folklore.

The development of the Romany theme in Slovakia is remarkable. According to official figures, the percentage of the Romany in the population of Slovakia is relatively small, however, on the basis of demographic estimates and sociological research, the minority has about 320,000 members among more than five million of

¹⁴⁸ Kamenec, Ivan: *Postopách tragédie*, Bratislava 1991, Lipscher, L.: *Židia v slovenskom štáte 1939-1945*, Print-servis 1992

¹⁴⁹ *Vatikán a Slovenská republika (1939-1945). Dokumenty.* (ed. I. Kamenec, V. Prečan, S. Škorvánek). Bratislava 1992

Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1938-1945). Dokumenty. 5 zväzkov (ed. L. Hubenák), Bratislava, vydalo Slovenské židovské muzeum

Holocaust na Slovensku. Dokumenty. Vyšly zatím 4 svazky: Obdobie autonómie 6.10.1938-14.3.1939 (ed. E. Nižňanský), Bratislava 2001, *Prezident, vláda, Snem Slovenskej republiky a Štátna rada o židovskej otázke 1939-1945* (ed. E. Nižňanský – I. Kamenec), Bratislava 2003, *Listy Gizely Fleischmannovej (1942-1944) /K. Hradská*, Bratislava 2003, *Dokumenty nemeckej proveniencie (1939-1945)*. (ed. E. Nižňanský), Bratislava 2003

¹⁵⁰ Salner, Peter: *Prežili holokaust*. Bratislava 1997

¹⁵¹ Salner, Peter: *Zidia medzi tradíciou a asimiláciou*, Bratislava, Ustav etnologie SAV, Židovska naboženska obec Bratislava, Institut judaismu UK, Zing Print 2000

Slovak citizens.¹⁵² Therefore, the history of the Romany, if only the history of their relations with official culture and administration, is an important issue for Slovakia. Some works on this theme have appeared. These works are monographs, however. This minority still does not appear in syntheses. An exhibition with the title “Historical Milestones for Slovakia in the 20th Century“ opened in Bratislava Castle in January 2003. Although it gave details of the military history and the revolutionary and ethnic map of Slovakia up to the beginning of the century, it included not one word about the Romany Holocaust. *The Concise History of Slovakia*¹⁵³ is an exception among the synthetic works in which the Romany are still not included.

Arne Mann devotes especially much attention to the Romany problem in Slovakia. It is clear that all work on this theme deals with relations between the state and the Romany or society and the Romany. The Romany still do not have their own history. Apart from historians, the Institute for Public Questions of Grigorij Mesežnikov¹⁵⁴ (Michal Vašečka is the director of its programme on nationality questions) and the Milan Šimečka Foundation¹⁵⁵ devote special attention to the Romany. However, these institutions are concerned with sociological study or work for the integration of the Romany. The number of historians addressing the theme is still insufficient. Thus, Slovakia has to draw on Czech writing on the Romany.

In 2001-2003, two research projects were carried out by the Institute of Social Sciences in Košice under the leadership of Anna Jurová, on the “Development and Position of the Romany in Slovakia since the Enlightenment Reforms“ and “The Romany in Slovakia after 1945“. Research on the Romany is done in the framework of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

¹⁵² Slovensko 2003. Súhrnná správa o stave spoločnosti, IVO, Bratislava 2003

¹⁵³ A Concise History of Slovakia. [Ed.]: Mannová, Elena. [Zo slov. prel.]: Styan, Martin C. - Daniel, David Paul. Br., Historický ústav SAV 2000

¹⁵⁴ <http://www.ivo.sk/>

¹⁵⁵ <http://www.nadaciamilanasidecku.sk/>

Literature on the Rusyns or Ukrainians greatly increased in Slovakia in the 1990s. Apart from articles, whole monographs appeared on the fate of this group as well as on the history of Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia (Podkarpatská Rus).¹⁵⁶

The methodology of engaged historiography is illustrated by the Rusyn example. In the case of the history of individual nationalities in Slovakia, there is always a researcher or a group to devote attention to the problem with full enthusiasm. This is the case with the circle of Paul Robert Magocsi, which produces the great number of works on the Rusyns. The Department of History of the Faculty of Humanities and Natural Sciences of Prešov University (Peter Švorc) is also interested in the Rusyns. The Institute of Social Sciences in Košice has researched the Rusyn-Ukrainians in Slovakia and the Slovaks in Ukraine under the leadership of Marián Gajdoš.

The history of the Czechs in Slovakia is not long, as they arrived after 1918. In the context of the ideology of the one Czechoslovak nation, the attention of historians was not directed towards them. Even after the rejection of the Czechoslovak nation ideal, the theme of Czechs in Slovakia was unwelcome. It was established as a legitimate topic only after 1993, when the Czechs definitively became foreigners in the Slovak state.

Part of the work on the Czechs in Slovakia is devoted to the period of the First Republic. The Slovak National Museum has published an extensive collection of texts on the Czechs,¹⁵⁷ and six parts of *A Small History of Czecho-Slovak Relations* have appeared.¹⁵⁸ The latter uses the method of oral history to map the common Czech and Slovak history from 1918 to the present. Dušan Kováč has published a monograph on

¹⁵⁶ Kónya, Peter : *Stručné dejiny Podkarpatskej Rusi. Zv. 1. (Od praveku do roku 1918.)* Prešov, Metodické centrum 1996

Švorc, Peter : *Stručné dejiny Podkarpatskej Rusi. Zv. 2. (1918-1946)* Prešov, Metodické centrum 1996

¹⁵⁷ Česi na Slovensku. Zelinová, Hana [ed.]. Martin, Slovenské národné múzeum 2000

¹⁵⁸ *Malé dejiny česko-slovenských vzťahov. Zv. 1-5. Prvá Československá republika.* [Zost.]: Radičová, Iveta a kol. Br., Nadácia Milana Šimečku 1994-1995, *Malé dejiny česko-slovenských vzťahov. Zv. 6.* [Zost.]: Kamenec, Ivan - Fialová, Zuzana. Br., Nadácia Milana Šimečku 1996

the same theme, and the Czecho-Slovak Historical Annual 2000 provides a series of texts on mutual relations.¹⁵⁹

Slovakia provides interesting material for any research on the ethnic group or the nation, and the terms ‘multi-ethnicity’ and ‘multi-culturalism’ have appeared in the works of some authors.²²¹ However, the belief that the individual nationalities in Slovakia could smoothly coexist may appear idealistic. Therefore, the idea of “hybridity”, introduced to Slovakia by Elena Mannová, is significant.

Where should the history of the individual nationalities in the territory of Slovakia be placed in the discipline? It is difficult to subsume it under regional history, since it goes beyond the range of that. However, the history of the nationalities in Slovakia is can not be understood separately from its wide historical consequences. The history of the Hungarians in Slovakia is a category that makes sense only after 1918, since before that we can only speak of the history of the Slovaks in the Kingdom of Hungary. Therefore, when addressing these issues, a broader view needs to be taken of Slovak history.

Some of the researchers open to new themes in Slovakia began to devote their attention to the problems of identity and historical memory. They apply theories of ethnicity, nationalism, and

strategies of remembering to the case of Slovakia.¹⁶⁰ Štefan Šutaj and Viera Bačová of the Institute of Social Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Košice play an important role in this work. Among the ethnologists, it is possible to distinguish between those who persist with traditional ethnography and those who, making use of the political change, have devoted their attention to social and cultural anthropology and opened the question of ethnicity and collective identities from this

¹⁵⁹ Česko-slovenská historická ročenka 2000, Texts: J. Rychlík, V. Goněc, Z. Beneš etc.

¹⁶⁰ Salner, Peter: Taka bola Bratislava. Bratislavcania Bratislavcanom o Bratislave. Bratislava 1991
Salner, Peter – Luther, Daniel: (ed.): Etnicita a mesto. Etnicita a ko faktor polarizacie mestskeho spolocensta v 20. storoci. Bratislava 2001

point of view.¹⁶¹ The Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava, headed by Gabriela Kiliánová, is the center for this work.¹⁶² Folklore studies is another strong inspiration for research on identities, stereotypes, and myths. This is the starting-point of Eva Krekovičová's work as well.

Generally, the theme of national identity and the politics of memory (*Erinnerungspolitik*) stirs all divisions of the Slovak historical community. It attracts the attention of the historians who build Slovak national ideology and, therefore, identity with their work. The range of authors who work in this area is broad: those associated with Matica Slovenská, the above-mentioned exiled historians and non-professional historians (mentioned here because of their influence and activity with regard to the Slovak public), as well as historians with traditional approaches and the historians concerned with social history and associated with the Slovak Academy of Sciences, such as Elena Mannová (collective identities), Eva Kowalská, Peter Macho, Dušan Škvarna (national identities), Ľubomír Lipták (historical memory and its manipulation), and Roman Holec.

III. 5. Historiographical Research

Social history, similarly to other areas of history, is marked by the period of Communism. In connection with this heritage and with the change in the political situation in 1993, it is necessary to deal with much ideological sedimentation.

Traditional Slovak historiography explains the history of Slovakia on the basis of the development of one of its ethnic groups and concentrates mainly on political history.

¹⁶¹ Csaky, Moritz – Mannová, Elena (ed.): *Collective Identities in Central Europe in Modern Times*. Bratislava 1999, Bačová, Viera (ed.): *Historická pamäť a identita*, Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, Košice 1996

Bačová, Viera- Kusá, Z. (eds.): *Identity v meniacej sa spoločnosti*, Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, Košice 1997

¹⁶² Kiliánová, Gabriela (ed.): *Identita etnických spoločenstiev. Výsledky etnologických výskumov*. Etnologické štúdie 5, Ústav etnológie SAV, Bratislava 1998

Kiliánová, Gabriela – Rečianská, Eva (eds.): *Identities of Ethnic Group and Communities. The Results of Slovak Ethnological Research*. Etnologické štúdie 7, Institute of Ethnology of SAV, Bratislava 2000

When attention was devoted to social history, the work produced had to exhibit marked Marxist influences. Slovak historiography differed in this respect from Polish and Hungarian, where social history already reacted to world research from the beginning of the 1970s.¹⁶³

Due to these tendencies, Slovak historiography was constrained by some stereotypes. In the center of Slovak history is the Slovak population, the exemplar of which is the simple Slovak, the peasant or the herdsman. The nobleman, that is, the lord, plays a negative role, to which his frequently different ethnic origin contributes. The urban middle class is an anti-hero, since Marxist ideology understood it that way.

A new approach to economic and demographic development and to social structure in the synthesis of Slovak history emerged only at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s.¹⁶⁴ The transition from political history to socio-cultural and socio-historical research is identifiable in regional history, but these cannot replace social history.

Social history suffers, above all, from inadequate methodology. Only a few historians consider methodological questions.¹⁶⁵ Apart from his work on modernization, Ľubomír Lipták also dealt with the history of elites, identities, memories and stereotypes. Roman Holec has progressed from the study of economic history to research on social groups in the population, life style, and the environment. His findings were made into a monograph about the events at Černová.

In research on everyday life, Slovak historiography devoted its attention to earlier periods. Concerning the 20th century, there is research partially originating in ethnology. In particular, Elena Mannová has published important findings on civil

¹⁶³ Compare: Dudeková, Gabriela: Sociálne dejiny 19. a 20. storočia na Slovensku – bilancia a nové impulzy. *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004, p. 331-351

¹⁶⁴ *Dejiny Slovenska II. (1526-1848)*. Bratislava 1987, *Dejiny Slovenska III. (od roku 1848 až do konca 19. storočia)*. Bratislava 1992

¹⁶⁵ Ľubomír Lipták, Eva Kowalská, Elena Mannová a Roman Holec, srovnej: Mannová, Elena (ed.): *Concise History of Slovakia*. Bratislava 2000, Mannová, Elena (ed.): *Krátké dejiny Slovenska*. Bratislava 2003

society and developed a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic approach in cooperation with ethnology.

In recent years, the most interesting research on everyday life with an urban orientation has focused on the urban middle class in the 20th century (in the work of Elena Mannová), Bratislava (in the work of Peter Salner), and everyday urban life from the Middle Ages to the 19th century (in the work of Viliam Čičaj). Cooperation with foreign historians has been an important trend in the area of social and cultural history.¹⁶⁶ There is a series of articles by Slovak historians in the Hungarian periodical *Korall*.¹⁶⁷ However, social history is still not institutionally established in Slovakia.¹⁶⁸

Studies devoted to the family, sport, medicine have appeared, and a whole series on migration, which is again connected with the history of individual ethnic groups in Slovakia, has been published.

In the area of intellectual history, Vladimír Bakoš¹⁶⁹ produced *Chapters from the History of Slovak Thought*, part of which has also been published in English. Tibor Pichler wrote a book devoted to the 19th century, and Ján Mlynárik has put out a work on Czech professors and their pupils.

A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia by Elena Mannová and David P. Daniel is a good introduction to the history of Slovak historiography.¹⁷⁰ Some extensive collections of texts on the same theme have appeared as well. Ľubomír Lipták, Richard Marsina, Elena Mannová, Ivan Kamenec, Eduard Nižňanský, Alexander

¹⁶⁶ Mannová, Elena (ed.): *Bürgertum und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in der Slowakei 1900-1989*, Bratislava 1997, Csáky, Moritz – Mannová, Elena (ed.): *Kolektívne identity v strednej Európe v období moderny*. Bratislava 1999. Stekl, Hannes – Mannová, Elena (ed.): *Heroen, Mythen, Identitäten. Die Slowakei und Österreich im Vergleich*, Wien 2003

¹⁶⁷ <http://www.korall.szoc.elte.hu/>

¹⁶⁸ Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV in Košice exists and Slovak Historical Society has its section for economic and social history. The first named works on identities and attitudes, the second one works on economic history. There is no periodics devoted to social history.

¹⁶⁹ Bakoš, V.: *Kapitoly z dejín slovenskeho myslenia*, Bratislava 1995

Bakoš, Vladimír: *Question of the nation in Slovak thought. Several chapters on the national thought in modern Slovakia*. Veda. Bratislava 1999

¹⁷⁰ Mannová Elena – Daniel, David Paul (ed.): *A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia*, Bratislava 1995

Avenarius, and others have addressed the methodology of historiography. However, the theory of historiography is usually closely connected with the problems of Slovak history. Purely methodological works are rare. When not concerned with reflection on the development after 1989, the history of historiography is usually interested in the inter-war period and the period of Marxism.

The Slovak historical community is relatively small, with only several hundred members.¹⁷¹ Therefore, contact with foreign, including Czech, historiography concerned with Slovakia is very important, and individual foreign publications have great influence.¹⁷² It is necessary to mention the work of two non-Slovak authors in regard to this: Elizabeth Bakke's, on Czechoslovakism and the Slovak autonomist reaction, and Ismo Nurmi's, according to which Slovak national consciousness dates back to 1918. Both authors came to similar conclusions, and it is no accident that their criticism of traditional Slovak historiography comes from countries which solved the problem of national identity only in the 20th century. Articles and whole books devoted to foreign historiography about Slovakia have appeared since the nineties.¹⁷³ Slovak historians are working on joint projects with historians from abroad who are interested in Slovak history: Peter Haslinger and Emilia Hrabovec in Austria, and

¹⁷¹Recently the Slovak historical society has about 400 members. The number is slightly sinking. <http://www.dejiny.sk/shs/> In the Slovak bibliography for the first half of 90's there is about 1000 names and for the second half of 90's there is about 2000 names. Among them there are also non-Slovak authors and author from related disciplines.

¹⁷² The most recent publications on Slovak history with the greatest impact are:
Nurmi, Ismo: Slovakia. A playground for nationalism and national identity. Manifestations of the national identity of Slovaks 1918-1920. Helsinki 1999
Bakke, Elizabeth: Doomed or failure? The Czechoslovak nation project and the Slovak autonomist reaction 1918-1938. Oslo 1998

Cornelius, Deborah S.: In search of the nation. The new generation of Hungarian youth in Czechoslovakia 1925-1934. Boulder 1998 (East European Monographs)

Rudinski, Norma L.: Incipient feminists. Women writers in the Slovak national revival. Columbus 1991 (Slovak language and literature)

¹⁷³ Jelinek, Yeshayahu Andrej : Historiografia o Slovensku v Izraeli. Historiography on Slovakia in Israel. HČ 40, 1992, č. 6, p. 707-713

Jakešová, Elena : Kanadská historiografia, etnické skupiny a Slováci. HŠt 34, 1993, p. 136-140
Czech and Slovak History. An American Bibliography. [Compiled by]: Kovtun, George J.

[Introduction by]: Winters, Stanley B. Washington, Library of Congress 1996

Šutaj, Štefan - Vovkanyč, Ivan : Súčasná ruská historiografia o československých dejinách v rokoch 1945-1948. SlŠt 1997 [vyd. 1999], č. 1, p. 11-26

Srovnej : Winkler, Martina: Pohľad z blízka i zďiaľky: Vyskum Slovenska v Severnej Amerike a stredo-európskej diskusie, istickej časopis 52, 2, 2004, p. 247-260

especially László Szarka in Hungary. Such projects yield publications in English or German.

No historians in the Czech Republic write much about Slovak history. However, Slovak historiography draws on the Czech historiographic production and on the Czech archival sources. This tapping of Czech resources concerns the literature on the history of Czechoslovakia, publications of sources on the history of the common state, and not least of all translations of methodological or other historiographical literature. Some Slovak historical writings are published in the Czech Republic in mixed Czech – Slovak collections of papers. For some themes there are basic works in both languages that are impossible to ignore. If we compare the cooperation of Slovak historiography with the Czechs and with other neighbours, we can clearly state that Slovak-Czech cooperation is remarkably productive. Joint conferences are held, collections of papers are put out, and two new syntheses of Slovak – Czech relations¹⁷⁴ and a collection of papers on the history of historiography have been published. Slovak bookshops offer a large amount of literature in the Czech language. But this Czecho – Slovak contact is unfortunately asymmetrical. Slovak production is of interest only to those Czechs who devote their attention to the history of the Czechoslovak state. In other themes, this interest depends on personal contacts between individual researchers in areas such as cultural history or methodology.

In the Czech lands, only a small group of people are concerned with Slovak rather than with Czechoslovak history; but it is a good sign that there are young researchers among them. Jan Rychlík became the pioneer of Slovak history in the Czech lands after 1989, and his work has had great success in Slovakia. Czech – Slovak cooperation has its difficulties, but for the obvious reasons that Czechs and

¹⁷⁴ Rychlík, Jan : Češi a Slováci v 20. století. [Diel 1.] Česko-slovenské vzťahy 1914-1945. Br. - P., [Academic Electronic Press v Bratislave a Ústav T.G. Masaryka v Prahe] 1997. 360
Rychlík, Jan : Češi a Slováci v 20. století. [Diel 2.] Česko-slovenské vzťahy 1945-1992. [Br. - P.], [Academic Electronic Press v Bratislave a Ústav T.G. Masaryka v Prahe] 1998

Slovaks spent three-quarters of a century in a common state and that they are linguistically and culturally close, it will continue.

The majority of international conferences in Slovakia are attended mainly by historians from the Czech Republic, Austria, Hungary, Poland, and Ukraine. With its penetration into the history of Hungary, Poland, and Ukraine, Slovak historiography is significantly different from its Czech counterpart. Czech, Austrian, Hungarian, Polish and Ukrainian historiography is regularly reviewed. Although each of them attracts the attention of only a few Slovak authors who speak the languages, they do continuously inform the whole Slovak historical community. The Slovak historians permanently monitor neighboring historiographies and have lively contacts with the authors, whether for their own reasons, or because of the needs of historical-geographical relations. This does not mean that they cannot have nationalistic attitudes, but such contacts will always be a great challenge and incitement for them.

Slovak historiography slightly resembles its Polish counterpart in its outreach, but substantially differs from Czech historiography, which has a closed character. If Czech historiography regards anybody as a partner, it is German historiography, and then only in strictly political contexts. It cannot be denied that Hungarian historiography reaches beyond the territory of the nation state, but this outreach is very much ideologically conditioned, with the Hungarian minorities in the neighboring states as its main subject.

What has been said about outreach and openness towards other national historiographies can be demonstrated at the levels of interest, of people, and of institutions. The level of traditional interests is determined by history and geography-or, shortly, by history. For many years, Slovakia was in common state formations with all its present neighbours: for 1000 years with the Hungarians, for a little shorter period with the Trans-Carpathian region, for almost 400 years with Austria, about 100 years with Galicia and three-quarters of a century with the Czechs. Slovakia is a small

state in the heart of Europe, not only surrounded by its neighbours, but related to them through its citizens and historians. Thus, the historical-geographical level merges with the personal level. For every period, Slovakia has a historian who will be interested in the history of the Rusyns or Ukrainians, the history of the Slovak Germans, Austrian history or the history of Orava and Spiš, where the histories of the Slovak and Polish ethnic groups overlap. There are always historians who will devote attention to the history of the Kingdom of Hungary, the Hungarian Republic, or the ethnic Hungarians in the territory of Slovakia. The shoulders of these historians bear the weight of building the interstitial contacts, which can create traditions, and there is much opportunity for this in Slovakia.

The main object of Slovak historiography, “Slovak history”, is a problematic concept because of its vagueness: language groups, state territories or units, and national cultures overlap. The reaction is to build syntheses on the basis of a territorial or ethnic approach. Slovak history is the history of the territory of present-day Slovakia or the history of the Slovaks. The former, purely geographical approach appears not to be ideologically objectionable, but it offers a very vague picture about Slovak history. The purely ethnic approach, categorizing according to ethnic origin, makes Slovak history the history of the Slovak ethnic group. The present synthesis of Slovak history is built on a combination of both approaches.

The alternative to this approach is, for example, *The Concise History of Slovakia*,¹⁷⁵ the authors of which start from an understanding of the national phenomenon as a construction, which cannot be applied to earlier history. Slovak society is defined as multi-ethnic or socially and culturally fragmented.

In practice, Slovak authors solve two problems: the problem of an inadequate state tradition and the ethnic problem or national discontinuity. Although this position

¹⁷⁵ Mannová, Elena (ed.): *Concise History of Slovakia*. Bratislava 2000, Mannová, Elena (ed.): *Krátkě dejiny Slovenska*. Bratislava 2003

may appear disadvantageous, it is actually an advantage, since every thinking Slovak historian needs to build a new conception of history. Where the experimentally thinking Czech, Hungarian, or Polish historian still gets stuck in the snares of national history, the Slovak historian, so to speak, has nowhere to get stuck. The concept of society as open to other societies, the history of which is studied by historians, could be for Slovakia, the way out of the ghetto of nation-state history. The conception of regions and the conception of trans-territoriality are relevant here. Peter Haslinger proposes research on loyalty, research on hybridness, and research into cultural transfer and networks.

III. 6. Conclusion

What makes Slovak historiography interesting is not the quantity of its production, since like the historiography of many smaller states, it cannot compete with its neighbours in quantity. Its quality is dependent on a few significant personalities and their teams. However, what is specific is the route which Slovak historiography had to travel in the last 90 years and the situation it is in now. We can conclude here in several following points.

Throughout the period of existence of the Czechoslovak state we can speak of the existence of “Slovak historiography”, although the inter-war period was its cradle. Professional Slovak historiography was born only after 1918 in the new Czechoslovak state. It gained institutional anchoring at that time and could educate the first generation of professional Slovak historians. From the beginning it was clear that the history of the Czech lands and Slovakia, like the political aspirations of the two nations, have less in common, than was at the given moment necessary to achieve ideological merging. The two nations identified themselves differently, although convinced Czechoslovaks existed, and so they created different national histories.

In syntheses on the history of Slovakia, starting from the sixties to eighties, a conception of “Slovak history” gradually became defined as the history of Slovakia and the Slovaks on the basis of a territorial-ethnic approach.

The year 1993 was an important milestone in Slovak historiography. After the origin of the independent Slovak state and in the political conditions of the time, a situation desired by the nationalists, who used history as one of the instruments in their argumentation. Therefore, the Slovak historical community turned to the theme of national history to provide an alternative to extremism and to keep pace with the interests of its readers. This turn appeared in the historiography of the second half of the nineties.

After the opening of Slovak historiography after the long period of normalization, the return of the Slovak exiles was the catalyst of nationalism. However, apart from straight-forward nationalism, we find many shadows of exaggerated emphasis on the national theme in Slovak historiography. Apart from the nationalist parties and exiles, some of the intellectuals and historians also participated and are participating in the revitalization of national emotions and increased nationalism as an ideology in political and everyday practice. They still see their role as the interpretation of national history and strengthening of national identity. A certain frustration with the inadequate emphasis on the Slovak national theme in the preceding years may play a role in this, as well as the heritage of the authoritarian state – conformism and the allegiance of historians to the political establishment.

The interpretation of Slovak history is strongly connected with politics, whether as a storehouse of arguments or as an active component in the creation of public opinion. This can be documented by an example of the dispute over Milan Stanislav Ďurica’s book which has been by the Ministry recommended for use in schools and the decision was strongly opposed by the Slovak Academy of Sciences. At that time

Vladimir Mečiar was the Prime Minister and the Academy was represented by Dušan Kováč.

The extreme rightist interpretation of history is isolated in the academic environment, but it has resonance in society, especially among the older generation. The reason for this “success” of the Ľud’ák ideology was and is the inadequacy of historical reflection. The years from 1938 to 1945 have not been subject to Slovak historical self-reflection in a comparable to post-war West Germany or in Austria since the 1980s. There was no chance for this in the post-war history of Czechoslovakia for political reasons, and now it has already been successfully avoided for another 15 years. However, sooner or later self-reflection on wartime history will be very necessary.

A large part of the Slovak historical community shows passivity and behaviour from the periods of direction of its activity by an ideological, paternalist state. Historiography in Slovakia is faced with practical problems such as the functioning of institutions, legislation, and the possibility of finding non-state resources to support research, which limit it. The dominance of political history, thematic and chronological fragmentation, and so a predominance of interpretation over deeper analysis, leading to manipulation of history, is characteristic of recent Slovak historiography.

Slovak historiography is now at a turning point. In the course of the next few years, the generations, which spent the greater part of their lives in the socialist normalization of Czechoslovakia, will finally leave, and space will open for today’s young doctors and doctoral students. They will have the opportunity, on their study visits, to deal with their own nationalism and learn about new methodological currents in the subject. Some of them will use these opportunities, for others it will be “only once”. The greatest problem of these young researchers, who have the ambition to place Slovak historiography in the European mainstream, is to gain a place for their

future academic work. Their colleagues from the natural sciences are leaving Slovakia for foreign countries. The question is, where will the social scientists apply themselves?

The opportunities in Slovak historiography are great. Slovakia benefits from contact with Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Poland and Trans-Carpathian Ukraine. It also “benefits” from contact with the Hungarian minority in Slovakia. It lives in a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural world. This is its great opportunity.

IV. HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

IV. 1. Overlapping the Border

Borders have been an important issue in the Hungarian national history ever since it began. It was important to acknowledge (or not), explain and define the border with Turks, the border with Austria as well as it was later important to do the same with the border of Slovakia or Romania in later centuries. In this sense the border is literary the physical or rather geographical border of the Hungarian State in whichever shape it appeared in history. But there are also significant borders of Hungarian history in terms of historical landmarks. In the period after 1945 the most important was 1956. In the text below we will touch both subjects – borders geographical as well as historical landmarks. In exploration of the pre-1989 era of the Hungarian historiography we owe a lot to an in-depth work of Balázs Trenczényi and Péter Apor in *Narratives Unbound* published in 2007 in Budapest by CEU Press.

Throughout the modern history of Hungary, the production of historical knowledge has been closely related to the contemporary constellation of political power.¹⁷⁶ Apparently, both variants of the communist regime – before and after 1956 - intended to institutionalize historical production to the extent that it would generate interpretations appropriate for the purposes of power. This situation was not characteristic for the socialist period only; the relation of the interpretation of national history and the political power was known and misused in Hungary as well as elsewhere in Europe before.

¹⁷⁶ There is not much written on the history of modern Hungarian historiography. Probably the best overview is by Vardy, Steven Bela - *Modern Hungarian Historiography* (New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1976). Emma Lederer's *A magyar polgári történetírás rövid története* (Bp. 1969) is dated, Péter Gunst's more recent *A magyar történetírás története* (Debrecen, Csokonai K., 1995) is very sketchy. For recent works on particular issues, connected to the topic of the present essay, see Erős, Vilmos - *A Szekfü-Mályusz vita* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 2000)

For a recent polemic overview, see Gyáni, Gábor, "Történetírásunk az évezred fordulóján," *Századvég, Új folyam*, 18 (2000) 117-40. Social and economic historians seem to be more self-reflective to their own practice. See Gyáni's *Történetészdiskurzusok* (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2002) with the above mentioned article pp. 35-55. and Kövér, György, 'A magyar gazdaságtörténetírás régi útjai' and 'Elmélet és módszer a legújabb gazdaságtörténetírásban' in his *A felhalmozás ive* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2002), pp. 360-74.

However only after 1945 or rather 1948 the situation in Hungary reached the point when one Party was able to start to gain control of all historical production.

The re-arrangement of the structure of historical education and scholarship began in the autumn of 1948 right after the foundation of the new party monolith: the Hungarian Workers' Party. Between 1945 and 1948, the intermezzo of political pluralism witnessed an impressive variety of historical approaches from *Geistesgeschichte* through positivist social history to the not yet totally homogenized Marxist narrative. Beginning in 1948, however, the communist leadership set to control and centralize the field of science. The purpose of the new power-center was to form a system of dependence based on well organised lines of clientele and patronage. Its first measure was the re-arrangement of the national-level management of science. The old Academy of Sciences, which was an autonomous institution, could not be simply appropriated for party purposes, since formally Hungary was still governed by a coalition of parties. Therefore, the communist leadership decided to found a new organ, the Hungarian Council of Science, designed to conduct all aspects of scholarship in the country.

The Council practically acted like a formal ministry of science. It was, however, under direct communist control: an organ of the party executing administrative issues. Starting with Spring 1949, the Council of Science began to re-organise the overall structure of the historical discipline. The overruling of the free academic institutions happened through changes in personnel of these institutions, control over the students and new generation of the academics and control over the actual public production. First of all, many formerly established professors lost their positions or were forced to retire. The leadership of the Historical Society was replaced in March 1949. The new president, Erzsébet Andics, who in addition took over the edition of the traditionally most prestigious scholarly journal, *Századok* (Centuries), was one of the main Stalinist hard-liners, who dominated the discipline until 1956. The membership of the Society was selected to form a communist majority. Although non-Marxist historians of the older

generations were also included, they were outnumbered by many young, sometimes rather talented, Marxist scholars. The crucial leading positions, nevertheless, were occupied by ideologically oriented party bureaucrats.

From 1949 onwards, higher education became part of the centralized planning. All aspects of university and college life came to be directed by the ministry of education, existing under various names. The competent party centers determined the goals and financial means for these institutions. In 1950, special Departments of Marxism-Leninism were formed at all universities, and 175 new textbooks were published, which were partly translations of Soviet works. Higher education was extensively formalized: standard requirements were set up, which had to be respected in all institutions and by all professors.¹⁷⁷

Although after 1956 the institutional system did not change significantly, several crucial figures of the Stalinist regime were removed and new ones, closer to the new leadership, were appointed. For instance, Erik Molnár, the director of the Institute for Party History, who had a crucial role in the construction of historical interpretations concerning modern Hungary in the 1950s, was criticized and subsequently replaced. Apart from that, the faculty of certain universities were changed due to their involvement in the revolution, temporarily marginalizing a number of eminent scholars who could come back to the forefront of academic life from the mid-sixties onwards.¹⁷⁸ These changes notwithstanding, the institutional frames of scientific production remained the same throughout the whole period until the late 1970s and early 1980s. Apart from the universities, the major research centers were the newly-founded (1948) Historical

¹⁷⁷ Huszár, Tibor, *A hatalom rejtett dimenziói* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1995), esp. pp. 38-44., 50-6., 85-93., 294-5. Romsics, Ignác, *Hungary in the 20th Century* (Budapest: Corvina - Osiris, 1999), p. 360., Glatz, Ferenc, 'Hajnal István történetírása' in Hajnal, István, *Technika, művelődés* (Budapest: História - MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1993), p. XVIII. On the Academy of Science see also Pótó, János, 'Harmadik nekifutásra', *Történelmi Szemle* 36 (Spring – Summer, 1994), pp. 79-110. and Péteri, György, 'Születésnap ajándék Sztálinnak', *Századvég* 1 (1989), pp. 18-35. On the replacement of scientific elite Bíró, Judit – Székelyi, Mária, 'A tudomány újjáépítése, 1945-1950', *Szociológia Szemle* (Autumn – Winter, 1996), pp. 81-104. The details of the following book are also useful, although it was written from a late socialist perspective. Ladányi, Andor, *Felsőoktatási politika 1949-1958* (Budapest: Kossuth, 1986), pp. 18-163.

¹⁷⁸ Ladányi, *Felsőoktatási politika*, pp. 164-217.

Institute and the Institute for Party History. The most renowned journal was *Századok*, accompanied by *Történelmi Szemle* (Historical Review). Historical studies were also published in forums like *Társadalmi Szemle* (Review of Society), the theoretical journal of the party, *Párttörténeti Közlemények* (Publications on Party History) and *Valóság* (Reality).

The late-seventies and early eighties were marked by two academic projects that were meant to give new direction to Hungarian historiography. Ideologically the most important one was the project of publishing the history of Transylvania. Writing the history of Transylvania was considered to be out of the scope of Hungarian historiography in the 1950-60s, when the regime was trying hard not to hurt the sensitivities of the fellow-communist countries in the neighborhood. It became possible to publish such a book only when it became obvious that the Ceaușescu-regime launched an increasingly aggressive propaganda campaign abroad suggesting that Hungarians were actually ungrateful newcomers in the flourishing land of the autochthonous Daco-Romanian population. The booklets were published in western European Languages and were increasingly aggressive in their terminology. Back in the mid-seventies, György Ránki, the vice-director of the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences, was already airing that the Institute would like to produce a synthetic work on Transylvania in the period of its next five-year work plan. The preparations of the book were quite protracted and the three-volume work was published only in 1985.¹⁷⁹ It was a blend of some classic topics of inter-war Hungarian historiography particularly in the area of ethnogenesis of different groups in Danubian basin, some Marxist meta-historical models, and most importantly, a positivist cult of factuality. Positivism was still the only allowed methodological approach of the era. The editor-in-chief was Béla Köpeczi, a

¹⁷⁹ Köpeczi, Béla, ed., *Erdély története* [The History of Transylvania], (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986)

renowned researcher of XVIII-th century Transylvanian politics and literature, and – more conspicuously - also minister of culture at the time.¹⁸⁰

The thematic chapters of these syntheses were usually written by the leading specialist of the given topic, no matter what the provenience or ideological direction of the person was. By all means the approach was loudly Marxist and that united all contributed sections. In the 1980s, the institutional framework of research (most importantly the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, directed by the social historian Zsigmond Pál Pach) was bringing together, in a syncretic co-existence, rather different people. Thus, within the framework of Hungarian historiography, doctrinaire Marxists, liberal Marxists, semi-dissenters, and anti-ideological neo-positivists were all present, and with varying degree of institutional support they could all publish their works regularly in the seventies and eighties. More closely the issue is explored in the work of Balázs Trenczényi and Péter Apor mentioned above.¹⁸¹

The second project of a similar structure was the edition of a ten- volume History of Hungary. In terms of structure this was a typical approach to history in most of the communist/Eastern Block countries. The aim was to bring together the elite of the profession in writing synthetic thematic essays on various aspects of a given period.¹⁸² Eventually the product varied in style and quality of different chapters but was certainly unified by first plan Marxist approach. They all started from the socio-economic

¹⁸⁰ For the conflict between Hungarian and Romanian historians on the occasion of the appearance of the book, see Vincze Gábor, „Magyarellenes hecckampány Romániában,” in: *Beszélő*, 1999/ 7-8., 146-148.o. Some of the key texts were collected in the volume, edited by László Péter: *Historians and the History of Transylvania* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1992).

¹⁸¹ To name but a few prominent names from these academics at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences – sometimes overlapping - generations: the economic historians György Ránki, Iván T. Berend or Zsigmond Pál Pach; the historian of Eastern Europe Emil Niederhauser; the early modernist social historian Ferenc Szakály; the cultural historian Domokos Kosáry; the political and cultural historian of the 17-18th century Kálmán Benda; the cultural historian Péter Hanák, the political historian and historian of historiography Ágnes R. Várkonyi; the diplomatic historian István Diószegi; the historian of Protestantism Katalin Péter; the specialist of national liberalism György Szabad; the intellectual historian Miklós Lackó; the medievalist and historian of national identity Jenő Szűcs; the historian of the Enlightenment Éva H. Balázs; or the veteran medievalist Elemér Mályusz.

¹⁸² Pach, (ed.), *Magyarország története tíz kötetben.* (Budapest, 1979)

determinants and then proceed to the political and cultural phenomena. Generally they were all rooted in positivism, remained rather restrained in view of the potential alternative methodological perspectives and some of them included also a second plan reading for advanced students. Though the aim of the volumes was to give "thick" descriptions of the given periods, based on the most up-to-date (national) research available, excluding, as much as possible, direct references to ideological narratives, it also gave hints of other possible interpretations except for the first plan Marxist ones. This was a very popular though never publicly acknowledged strategy how to write and read between lines. It never reached complex level of meta-narratives, neither it aimed to do so, but it was a useful method how to pass some ideas through the thin filter of the Marxist censorship.

Nevertheless, the scope of acceptable themes was also slowly but steadily expanding throughout the seventies and eighties, making contested figures to become the object of biographical or monographic interest, such as the early years of István Bethlen, by Ignác Romsics,¹⁸³ or the radical democratic politics of Oszkár Jászi, by Péter Hanák¹⁸⁴ or György Litván.¹⁸⁵ Also some authors from 30's and 40's experienced revival The critical reception of Gyula Szekfű started already in the late-seventies,¹⁸⁶ works of István Hajnal also appeared but only in late eighties.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸³ Romsics Ignác: Bethlen István. Politikai életrajz. Budapest, 1991.

¹⁸⁴ Hanák Péter: *Jászi Oszkár dunai patriotizmusa*. (Budapest: Magvető, 1985).

¹⁸⁵ See Litván, György and Szücs László, *A szociológia első magyar műhelye* vols. I-II. (Bp. 1973), a collection of texts, which was seminal in the recovery of the heritage of Jászi and the civic radicals around the journal, *Huszedik Század*. See also György Litván, *Magyar gondolat, szabad gondolat* [Hungarian Thought, Free Thought] (Budapest, 1978).

¹⁸⁶ Glatz, Ferenc, "Szaktudományos kérdésfeltevések és történetpolitikai koncepció. A fiatal Szekfű Gyula bécsi éveinek történetéből," in: *Történelmi Szemle*, 1974. 3.; "Történetíró, jelenkor, interpretáció. Történetpolitikai koncepció és "történetfilozófiai" irányzat Szekfű Gyula, Der Staat Ungarn c. művében," in: *Századok*, 1976./2. Dénes Iván Zoltán, *A „realitás” illúziója. A historikus Szekfű Gyula pályafordulója*. (Budapest, 1976).

¹⁸⁷ Hajnal István: *Az újkor története*. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988). (Reprint of the first edition from 1936). The articles of László Lakatos had a seminal role in Hajnal's re-integration to the historiographical pantheon. See his "Az elfelejtett Hajnal István. Az íráskultúra és a kapitalizmus szelleme: Hajnal István 1933/34-es tanulmányai", *Medvetánc* 1982/2-3.sz, 'Egy szociológus történész: Hajnal István' in: *Tanulmányok a magyar szociológia történetéből.*, (Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, 1988), and his *Az élet és a formák. Hajnal István történelemszociológiája*. (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1996), which is based on his doctoral dissertation of 1988.

Unlike in Slovakia (or rather Czechoslovakia), Hungary was opening its themes and intellectually opening its borders to the West. The process was slow and from the Western point of view would, perhaps, seem insignificant. In comparison with the situation of the Slovak historiography though, the academia was experiencing some fresh air. The late-1980s also produced an authoritative synthesis, exactly along the lines of this project of "Europeanisation". It was originally intended as a four-volume venture, but only three were published (authored by Pál Engel, Ferenc Szakály, and Domokos Kosáry). It is probably not by chance that it was exactly the ideologically most contestable period (from 1867 until present, undertaken by Ferenc Glatz) that never appeared.

In their work Balázs Trenczényi and Péter Apor remind of the two key topics or debates of Hungarian historiography before 1945. Those were the "meaning of national history" and the Compromise of 1867. They ask why the post-Communist historiography failed to re-institutionalize them.¹⁸⁸ I am convinced that both these topics fulfilled a role of being a corner-stone of different historical opinions and this role simply fell on another topic after 1989. This topic is the inter-war period and my task is now to prove that and explain why this period and this regime bear such an important meaning for the Central-European post-Communist historiography.

In certain terms Hungarian historiography in 20th century also suffered a problem similar to the one Slovak historiography had. It had to identify what was the subject of the so called national history itself. In the Hungarian case the question was how far in geographical as well as other sense can one go to write about Hungarian historiography.

¹⁸⁸ Trenczényi Balázs, Apor Péter: *Fine-Tuning the Polyphonic Past: Hungarian Historical Writing in the 1990's in: Narratives Unbound* (Budapest: CEU Press 2007)

IV. 2. Changes after 1989: Institutions, Research Venues, Activities

The relatively smooth political transition of 1989, and also to the - in regional comparison rather unusual level of – cultural tolerance in the eighties cause that the situation of Hungarian historiography of the nineties was very much derived from the eighties. Both in themes and personnel, one could witness a strong continuity. This situation, however, was not unusual in the region. The possible difference between Hungary and Slovakia one could see in the tolerance and the lack of it, respectively, in the eighties. No clear cut was necessary in Hungary to divide the two eras. In Hungary some authors remained very socialist in their views but it was and still is in a way acceptable unlike it was in Slovakia in early 90's. However, the personnel remained often the same in both countries. Only, in the later case the academics rushed to assure the public they are and always were against communism and they suffered under the regime. In Hungary many academics retained openly their socialist views as the distinction between the 80's and the 90's in terms of ideas was less strict. In Slovakia the same academics spoke loudly of their different views, were however changing little in their work and often even less in their professional behaviour.

The rather peaceful and smooth transition in Hungary did not mean, however, that the life of the historical profession in the 1990s was utterly peaceful, or without remarkable events. In fact, the growth of political, methodological and institutional pluralism opened up new venues, and the considerable compactness of the “guild” has been challenged from different angles.

The principal drive of institutional reformation after 1989 was the elementary demand for both collective and individual scholarly autonomy.¹⁸⁹ Universities began to establish their independence both in terms of education and research. Similar to the other

¹⁸⁹ For a representative survey on the situation of Hungarian historiography after 1989, see „AETAS-körkérdés a magyar történetírás szerkezetéről és intézményrendszeréről” (AETAS survey on the structure and institutions of Hungarian historiography). *Aetas* (1993) 4, pp. 165-212. (the list of participants included Bácskai Vera, Engel Pál, Erdmann Gyula, Faragó Tamás, Gerő András, Gyáni Gábor, Gyimesi Sándor, Hiller István, Jakó Zsigmond, Kövér György, Kristó Gyula, Kubinyi András, Makk Ferenc, Pach Zsigmond Pál, Niederhauser Emil, Várdy Béla).

Eastern-European cases, the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences, which was the center of research before 1989, became less visible after the transition, while the universities gained weight, at least in symbolic terms. This was partly due to the shift in financing, but also to the introduction of Ph.D. programs, which were relegated to the universities. Universities were hit but the financial restriction hard too; that forced them to reduce numbers of staff. This rationalization often entailed that they got rid of the oldest teachers (who were sent to pension), and the youngest, who did not have an established position. This led to the strengthening of the positions of the middle-generation (around 40-45 at the time of the transition), who got hold of the departments, but also meant an almost complete blocking of new places for basically an entire decade. Similarly, in other post-socialist countries the young researchers were in bad luck. Many of them opted for work in abroad and many of them were forced to leave the profession.

The same way the free academic work in the area of history was restricted after 1948 it was restored after 1989 but in opposite sequence. The research became less centralised, universities gained more weight in comparison to other institutions, number of students increased and their work and study programmes started to vary depending on their background institution. A clear sign of the new era was the measure of the first freely elected government that in 1993 renewed the right of universities for awarding scientific degrees. This step had symbolic and practical significance at the same time. The first doctoral programs in history were introduced in the academic year of 1995-96. At present, Ph.D. studies are conducted within 'doctoral schools,' organised according to thematic or chronological principles.

Regarding the concentration of young researchers and leading scholars within these doctoral schools, they have the potential of growing into catalysts of considerable professional achievement. However, the universities are often criticized for not integrating doctoral students sufficiently into collaborative research. According to these critiques, doctoral schools in many cases do not provide more than „atomised” tutor–

student relationships and it is dubious whether they are to emerge as genuine scientific workshops in the future. The putative characteristics of doctoral studies are considered to be prescriptive for all spheres of historical profession in Hungary. Albeit undergraduate education has been diversified, several different approaches, methodologies and ideas can be learned through seminars, however, professors rarely manage to form permanent research workshops around themselves. Although history students are interested in various other social sciences like sociology, cultural anthropology, economics, philosophy or legal studies, undergraduate education is organised according to rigid disciplinary lines. Professors are collected within departments that reflect historical periodization and divided into 'Hungarian' and 'Universal History' sections.

Similar characteristics can be detected in the case of research institutes. The par excellence institution for historical scholarship is the Historical Institute. Apart from that, professionals of the discipline are involved in the work of the recently founded László Teleki Institute and the Minority Studies Institute, both of which concentrate on minority issues, preferably, but not exclusively, Hungarians outside of the country. After several decades of one-on-one ties among Hungarian scientists active in Hungary, in the neighbouring countries, and overseas resp., a major step towards strengthening those ties was taken in 1990 with the introduction of external memberships of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS), a recognition for distinguished scholars of non-Hungarian citizenship who considered themselves fully or partly Hungarian. To handle issues related to Hungarian science abroad, the 'Hungarian Science Abroad' Presidential Committee was set up in 1996. The Academy of Sciences even distributes grants to Hungarian researchers abroad. The Homeland Research Programme was launched in 2000 to support the research work of Hungarian scientists living in the neighbouring countries. The grants are available on a competitive basis and are to be used in the home country of the applicants. The Homeland Research Programme is administered by the Institute for the Study of Ethnic-National Minorities of HAS.

Regarding, however, the limited number of historians in the two above mentioned organizations (even though the directors of the institutions are historians themselves), they are not able to launch broad-scale research projects where the discipline could play a decisive role. In their initiatives, mostly dominated by political sociology or anthropology, history often fulfils a complementary function.

While the Historical Institute published its research priorities and projects in 1991,¹⁹⁰ it is still difficult to reveal a well-grounded strategy in its collective work. Most often, collaborative publications are not preceded by team work, they are resulting rather from the joint efforts of individual historians with similar interests to publish their findings.¹⁹¹ A significant number of historians work for other public institutions, like archives or museums. However, due to their fragmentation and over-burdening, these scholars are not able to engage themselves in the time-consuming collective research, although several of them made significant contribution to the discipline.

While a series of new higher education institutions were founded after 1989, in history the traditional ones (Budapest, Debrecen, Pécs, Szeged) managed to retain their symbolic and infrastructural advantage. The only exception is probably Miskolc, where the pre-existing technical university was extended to include a Faculty of Arts as well, and where the new recruitment at the History Department created some job opportunities for the generation of the „thirty-agers”, who remained rather marginal in other universities. The two new denominational universities also made some efforts to lay the foundations of prestigious History Departments, trying to attract more established professors from the state universities.

¹⁹⁰ *Történelmi Szemle* 33 (Spring – Summer, 1991)

¹⁹¹ The *Atelier – French-Hungarian Centre for Social Sciences* has launched a comprehensive research on the state of social sciences in Hungary jointly with *Social Scientific Research of National Priority* (OKTK). The results have been published in <http://www.atelier-centre.hu> and in working paper format. On the institutional system see András Szekeres's report: *A társadalomtudományi kutatás intézményi feltételei Magyarországon 1990-2001 között*. On the institutional model, see Buskó, Tibor László, *Az intézeti modell múltja és jövője*.

In the Central-European region not entirely typical plurality of Church based universities is a strong characteristic of Hungary. Where in Czech Republic these never play a significant role in historical research, in Slovakia their influence is limited and are all Catholic. In Hungary the situation is more diverse. The Pázmány Péter Catholic University succeeded in building its own framework. In certain sub-fields – with the remarkable exception of post-1945 history, marked by the presence of right-wing party ideologues – it became commensurable with the state universities (also, there is a historical research going on in other departments, which managed to fill in the existing holes of the pre-existing educational system, like in the case of Slovak studies). The lack of interest of this university to collaborate with other academic institutions is, however, worrying particularly if that is probably a result of the conservative and rather right-wing ideology. The Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church, while initiating interesting projects in certain sub-fields, connected to the history of Protestantism, underwent a series of political storms (between the liberal conservatives and the extreme-right) and its development was seriously hindered. The school educated numerous future social workers rather than historians.

As for the periodicals, there are numerous professional journals, including the oldest one Századok, and the other traditional forum, Történelmi Szemle. The latter has been renewed recently and became a broad forum of new publications in various fields, involving the most important representatives of the middle-generation. The third significant periodical is Aetas, edited in Szeged. This journal emerged as a principal forum for theoretical and methodological reflections. Notwithstanding this, none of the journals possess easily recognizable distinctive features. All of them publish studies from more or less the same circle of authors, although Aetas also made important efforts to involve the younger generation.

Regarding methodological or theoretical orientation, all of them are fairly colourful, without a strong unifying paradigm. The recently founded Korall¹⁹² is an exception in this respect, as it is exclusively dedicated to social history, attempting to establish an organ of the practitioners of this branch of research. An periodical of more specialized nature, Fons was founded in 1994, creating a forum for archivists and historians interested in archival research. Historical studies are also published in the periodical Múltunk, the heir to the former journal of party history. It seeks to become the principal academic periodical for twentieth century political history. Furthermore, history is a significant topic in other, not strictly disciplinary journals, as well. For instance, the basically sociology-oriented periodical Replika, the general intellectual forum 2000, BUKSZ¹⁹³ (Budapest Review of Books), or the social sciences-oriented Világosság and Valóság are all open to historical publications. The generally and broadly conceived intellectual public, including history teachers, however, reads mainly the popular journals História, edited by the Institute for History, and Rubicon, an independent periodical. The two popularizing magazines continue to have a certain impact, often finding a niche of targeting the most controversial issues of the public historical consciousness with sometimes even best-selling thematic issues (this was the case of the Rubicon-issue on the life of János Kádár, which was even reprinted due to the unprecedented interest).

The book-market has been also profoundly changed since 1989: numerous publishing houses of the socialist period have perished, whereas many new ones have undertaken the task of producing history books. What makes the situation in Hungary distinctive from many other post-socialist countries in the region is again a strong political drive of these publishing houses. Their political orientation is publicly acknowledged and the scale is considerably large. The Institute for History also launched a monograph series, based mainly upon its own achievements. The most important new

¹⁹² <http://buksz.c3.hu/>

¹⁹³ <http://www.korall.org/>

company of the past decade that published a significant number of volumes connected to history was the Osiris (which emerged as the largest new editing house, launching its own series, among others, on historical methodology, translating an impressive number of current Western works, and also editing various textbook-series).

The structure of funding has been obviously transformed, as well. While previously the sole financial source was the state, after 1989, with the appearance of local and foreign non-governmental organizations and foundations, as well as the establishing of new international institutional networks, the system was considerably diversified. While the main source is still the state, the distribution is fairly de-centralized: several public foundations control the flow of funding, most importantly the National Public Foundation for Social Sciences (OTKA).¹⁹⁴ Apart from that, several private organizations have been supporting research in the humanities in Hungary, chiefly the Open Society Institute (OSI).¹⁹⁵ Although the Sasakawa Foundation¹⁹⁶ does not have overall projects like OSI, it also has a Fellowship program promoting research.¹⁹⁷

Specific note belongs to one foreign institution which made a difference for Social and Human Sciences research in Hungary after 1989. Hungarian émigré George Soros funded not only the above mentioned Open Society Institute (OSI) but most importantly funded an independent international university now based in Hungary. Central European University was founded in 1991 with the explicit aim of helping the process of transition from dictatorship to democracy in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and Central Asia. It was committed to bringing together students from these 30 countries and from Western democracies promoting the values of the Open Society. Now the University cast its web wider. CEU continues to attract students from Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia but almost 50% of the applicants come from other parts of the world,

¹⁹⁴ <http://www.otka.hu/>

¹⁹⁵ <http://www.soros.org/>

¹⁹⁶ <http://www.gbsf.org.uk/>

¹⁹⁷ See the Atelier report by Éva Kámán and Gyöngyi Heltai, *A társadalomtudományi alap kutatások finanszírozási rendszere, 1990-2001.*

also from the whole of the developing world, as well as from North America and Western Europe, Turkey and Southeast Asia. The original idea was to base the University in Prague but for the political unwillingness of the Czech government this did not happen. This gave an excellent opportunity to Hungarian students and in the early years a greater part of students were Hungarians.

Hungarian national bibliography is published regularly by Szechenyi Library and can be found online on www.oszk.hu under Országos Nemzeti Bibliografija. The national bibliography includes History specifically, though Historical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences publishes as an ongoing long-term project a multi-volume Hungarian analytical historical bibliography edited by Domokos Kosáry.

IV. 3. Themes and Approaches

The development in medieval studies after 1989 began as a turn towards social history. Apart from that the discipline had to struggle with difficult past or rather suppressed past. This sub-discipline was regarded as bourgeois and nationalistic and therefore medieval studies went through a considerable decline in the 1950-60s. Thus, the resurrection of an independent and powerful medieval studies signaled a return to pre-communist Hungarian historiographical traditions. The sub-discipline had where to look for its roots; investigation of social problems in the Middle Ages was one of the leading fields of the scholarship before the communist takeover.

It is, hence, not astonishing that as the social historians of more modern periods evoked István Hajnal, the key figure of the rapprochement between sociology and history in Hungary, medievalists turned towards the figures of Elemér Mályusz and Sándor Domanovszky, thereby constructing a twofold discontinuity: on the one hand, between the 1980s and 1990s, on the other, between the years before and after 1945.¹⁹⁸ In this

¹⁹⁸ Their works had already been re-printed in the 1970s. Mályusz, Elemér, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1971) Domanovszky, Sándor, *Gazdaság és*

way, scholars reconstructed the communist argument on discontinuity itself and sought to cover the otherwise fascinating continuity between late-Marxist thought and the birth of the post-Marxist conceptions.

As mentioned explained above the discipline made a turn back and republished some of the classical authors. Discontinuity conceals itself precisely in the depth of this continuity: the apparently identical descriptive language has very different political implications in different discursive contexts. In this regard, the reception of Jenő Szűcs's posthumously published book on late-thirteenth century Hungarian history is extremely instructive. Szűcs's monograph, published posthumously in 1993, was highly acclaimed as the example of high quality history entirely free of Marxist ideological ballasts.¹⁹⁹ Albeit it is true that the historian omitted the concept of class struggle as the driving force of his narrative, he still attributed extraordinary role to certain components of the classical Marxist historical conception. He started his carrier in 50's and although he distanced himself from the Communist Party later his approach remained influenced by Marxist conception. It is worth to say that it was Marxism in much clearer form from the eventual concept-less strifes of 70's. Szűcs also considers the 'state' as the principal subject of history: in his account, the reconstruction and dissolution of central political institutions, which are usually identified with 'statehood,' are crucial tools of analysis. Thereby the fight for the dominance over state organs becomes a crucial motive of history. Szűcs reiterated several crucial concepts of Marxian historical thought of his time. In many ways, this tradition survived in the medievalist school of Szeged University, characterized by historians like Gyula Kristó and Ferenc Makk. They concentrate mostly on problems of the 'organization of the state' through the translation of charters and the description of

társadalom a középkorban (Budapest: Gondolat, 1979) Mályusz's studies began to be re-published recently. *Népiségtörténet* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1994) *Magyarország története a felvilágosodás korában* (Budapest: Osiris, 2002) *A középkori Magyarország település- és nemzetiségpolitikája* (Budapest: Lucidus, 2002)

¹⁹⁹ Szűcs, Jenő, *Az utolsó Árpádok* (Budapest: História – MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1993).

events in terms of state existence, focusing on high politics, diplomacy and central royal governance.²⁰⁰

After 1989, social history of the Middle Ages took up the research of nobility instead of peasantry as its main thematic orientation.²⁰¹ In the 1980s historians formulated a descriptive language that made it possible for the new generations of historians to follow different paths without any radical change. The new works also aim to create a closer look at the society, describing more specific cases, regions or a county rather than taking as a subject a whole class .

In the 1990s, two dominant tendencies emerged. One of them, the representative figure of which was the late Pál Engel, aimed at a careful reconstruction of the noble class in its entirety. Here the limited area of research has a methodological reason: one can only learn about the reality of social network through minute investigation. Engel, in his path-breaking study on the nobility of Ung county, therefore, began with a detailed reconstruction of families and lineage. The author looks for the origins of nobility and distinguishes various paths like immigration, church and secular property or the rise of former royal middlemen into the noble class through the 13th century.²⁰² Engel also aimed at a profound re-construction of the structure of the political elite of the Hungarian Kingdom in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Although he called his research

²⁰⁰ See, for example, Kristó, Gyula, *Magyarország története 895-1301* (Budapest: Osiris, 1998) *Honfoglalás és társadalom* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996) *A korai magyar államról* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996) *Írások Szent Istvánról és koráról* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2000) Kristó, Gyula – Makk, Ferenc, eds. - *Árpád előtt és után*. (Szeged: Somogyi Könyvtár, 1996) Makk, Ferenc, *Magyar külpolitika* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely) *A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1998) Reviews in *Századok* 131 (September 1997), pp. 1192-5. and 133 (September 1999), pp. 1107-10. *Európa és Magyarország Szent István korában*, eds.: Kristó, Gyula – Makk, Ferenc (Szeged: Csongrád Megye Önkormányzata, 2000).

²⁰¹ For example see the work of Attila Zsoldos, *A szent király szabadjai* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1999).

²⁰² Engel, Pál, *A nemesi társadalom a középkori Ung megyében* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1998) See also his textbook: *Magyarország története, 1301-1457* (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1992) and his English language synthesis: *The Realm of St. Stephen* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2001)

political history, he broadened his focus to include the mobility of office-holders that marked a general social historical interest.²⁰³

The representative of the second approach was Erik Fügedi who had even stronger micro-historical focus. Erik Fügedi sought to reconstruct the structure of the nobility. However, instead of concentrating on a territorial unit, Fügedi chose to investigate the putative basic element of the noble class, the clan. The author hoped to accomplish this task by paying careful attention to one sole clan, the Elefánthy. Fügedi began with the analysis of family relations in a strict sense, that is concentrating on the father and mother. Then he mapped out the history of the clan's property as the basis of its autonomous noble status. One of the crucial means of handling with land was the wide range of marriage strategies, which at the same time provided the primary access to social networking.²⁰⁴ Likewise, historical research of urbanism shifts its focus from the site of production towards the loci of autonomy, self-governance and common liberties.²⁰⁵

Several years later, time came to pick the fruits of new methodological approaches. The next generation of medieval historians formulated radically different views on history by capitalizing on the wide methodological opportunities of contemporary "Western" historiography. In these terms, Gábor Klaniczay's volume of studies, published in 1990, is a veritable milestone. Klaniczay's book has a well-defined thematic focus: popular culture. Klaniczay's book, however, fosters different ambitions than the description of one distinct part of the social structure. While the author defines the mechanisms of exclusion and those alternative systems of values that perished during the process of civilization, he formulates a concept of history that is based upon the collective usage, construction and appropriation of symbolic value-systems. Thereby, Klaniczay refuses to

²⁰³ Engel, Pál, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1451*. Vols. 1-2. (Budapest: História - MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996) Review in *Századok* 131 (July 1997), pp. 965-9.

²⁰⁴ Fügedi, Erik, *Az Elefánthyak* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) (first edition 1992) English translation: *The Elefánthy: The Hungarian Nobleman and His Kindred* (Budapest, 1998)

²⁰⁵ See, for instance, Ladányi, Erzsébet, *Az önkormányzat intézményei és elméleti alapvetése az európai és hazai városfejlődés korai szakaszában* (Budapest: Márton Áron, 1996). Review in *Századok* 133 (January 1999), pp. 206-7.

define a certain segment of the social structure through its cultural attributes, mentality or values. Beliefs are not considered as signs that reflect one's place in the system, rather as a thick texture that makes the traces of the past comprehensible.²⁰⁶ As a result of these new methodologies and approaches several other significant mediaval books were published, most of them born on interdisciplinary grounds between the borders of history and ethnography.²⁰⁷

Where is medieval history the turn towards social history did not bear much political relation to the present and was rather a methodological transformation process; it has to be said for the history dealing with 19th Century onwards the broad political scale of opinions influencing historiography starts to be clearly visible. Even though it was impossible to disentangle modern Hungarian national identity from the Reform Age and the 1848 Revolution, the communist regime's symbolic relationship to 1848-49 was not completely devoid of ambivalence. This attitude goes back to the very first years of the establishment of Stalinism in Hungary, when basically two alternative strategies were employed simultaneously. On the one hand, the regime, in a bombastic campaign orchestrated by József Révai, the principal cultural ideologue of the time, tried to coin a symbolic continuity, hailing some of the 1848 revolutionary leaders as quasi-communists, identifying the projected communist society with the fulfillment of the centuries-long freedom fights, and describing the communists as the inheritors of the collective charisma of the national Pantheon. On the other hand, some of the official historians of the regime, such as Erzsébet Andics or Erik Molnár, set to re-evaluate the traditional historical canon in the spirit of class-fights and, as a result, proposed a narrative which would have purged

²⁰⁶ Klaniczay, Gábor, *A civilizáció peremén* (Budapest: Magvető, 1990) His works in English: *The Uses of Supernatural Power* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990), and in German: *Heilige, Hexen, Vampire* (Berlin: Klaus Wagenbach, 1991).

²⁰⁷ *Ősök, táltosok, szentek*, eds.: Pócs, Éva - Voigt, Vilmos (Budapest: MTA Néprajzi Kutatóintézete, 1998) Magyar, Zoltán, *Szent László a magyar néphagyományban* (Budapest: Osiris, 1998) Tüskés, Gábor - Knapp, Éva, 'A katakombaszentek tisztelete', *Századok* 128 (January 1994), pp. 3- Petekí, Áron, 'Advenae et peregrini', *Századok* 128 (March 1994), pp. 352- It is remarkable that Klaniczay argued that the Hungarian historical anthropology could be born from the co-operation of ethnography and history. His recent book is also devoted to the cult of saints: *Az uralkodók szentsége a középkorban* (Budapest: Balassi, 2000), English edition: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses* (Cambridge - New York, 2002).

Hungarian historiography of its "nationalist" overtones and, in some ways, returning to the turn-of-the-century socialist scholar Ervin Szabó – seeking to destroy the national-liberal canon. A very similar strategy was employed when interpreting national upraising in all then-Socialist countries. Any liberal tones had to be destroyed and the upraising would be interpreted as ever-lasting fight of masses for freedom of which Communists were the eventual winners who as liberators of masses were placed high on the list of national heroes.

Although one cannot talk of a direct conflict, it is obvious that the historiographical "school" that emerged in the late-seventies and eighties around György Szabad posed a challenge to this narrative. In some ways, they were continuing the discursive tradition of the Protestant-Independentist historiographical narrative (an important mediating link here was the Transylvanian-born Zsolt Trócsányi), but they were also engaging in a project of reconsidering the Reform Age and the 1848 Revolution from a perspective of the merging "bourgeois political culture", by involving new sources and also combining social, political and intellectual history in a way that went well beyond any Marxist model of historiography, thus effectively rehabilitating political history. Scholars in this way challenging the narrative of 50's and 60's were András Gergely, Gábor Erdődy, László Csorba, András Gerő, Zoltán Iván Dénes, Gábor Pajkossy and János Veliky and, to a certain extent, an older historian, János Varga too. By the early nineties, they came to dominate both institutionally and thematically the field of research on the "long" nineteenth century. Some of them became diplomats and social servants or pursued political career. Due to their work the picture of Kossuth, his time and the whole Reform Age was reshaped. The perspective of these scholars of "Szabad-school" was determining the representative series edited to commemorate the 150-th anniversary of

the revolution, called "Hungarian Liberals", which gave a selection of texts from each classic author, accompanied by a scholarly introduction.²⁰⁸

Erdődy, who also served as ambassador to Germany between 1992 and 1996, authored an important small monograph on German liberalism and another on the history of Hungarian political thought in 1848,²⁰⁹ whereas Csorba published an important biography of István Széchenyi and studied many the Hungarian revolutionary emigration and the legal historical aspects of nineteenth-century Hungarian politics.²¹⁰ At the same time, the intellectual historian Zoltán Iván Dénes, who before 1989 worked both on Reform Age and the oeuvre of Gyula Szekfű, turned to the problems of collective identity and the dilemmas inherent in the interwar debates about Hungarianness. He has written and edited a series of books focusing on the political philosophy and the intellectual heritage of István Bibó, whom he considers as a theoretical starting-point for a new synthesis of the values of political liberalism and communitarian solidarity.

István Bibó was a Hungarian politician and political theorist. During the Hungarian Revolution he acted as the Minister of State for the Hungarian National Government. When the Soviets invaded to crush the rebellious government, he was the last Minister left at his post in the Hungarian Parliament building in Budapest. Rather than evacuate, he stayed in the building and wrote his famous proclamation, "For Freedom and Truth", as he awaited arrest. But after 1989 rather his earlier works were re-published and his liberal legacy is strong among the young Hungarian academia and among Central-European academia as well for that matter.

Finally, the political historian András Gerő, whose main field of interest was the Hungarian parliamentarism in the Dualist period, also assumed a more actualized

²⁰⁸ *Magyar szabadelvűek*, 12 volumes, appeared in 1998 at the Új Mandátum editing house, the editor-in-chief of the series was András Gerő.

²⁰⁹ Erdődy, Gábor - *Kényszerpályán. A magyar politikai gondolkodás 1849-ben.* (Budapest: Argumentum, 1998).

²¹⁰ Csorba, László - *A vallásalap „jogi természete”. Az egyházi vagyon problémája a polgári átalakulás korában Magyarországon 1782-1918.* (ELTE BTK Művelődéstörténeti Tanszék, Budapest, 1999). László Csorba and Ferenc Velkey *Reform és forradalom 1790 – 1849* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1998).

historiographical perspective. While continuing to publish on Hungarian politics between 1867 and 1918, he also dealt with the history of everyday life during communism, urban culture, and the chances of liberal politics after 1989.²¹¹ In view of the nineteenth-century, a unique methodological direction was represented by the late Mihály Lackó, unfortunately, before he was able to finish his theoretically most promising and ambitious project on the historico-psychological analysis of István Széchenyi, died.²¹²

The 19th Century history saw in the 90's a new generation to emerge; among the scholars were Ágnes Deák²¹³ or Gábor Gángó²¹⁴. Deák wrote a definitive volume on the nationality politics in the 1850-60s in Hungary, while Gángó conducted research on Eötvös. Although working on different material, the military historian Róbert Hermann also produced some interesting works.²¹⁵ Already now it is clear that the interpretation of the history of Hungary from the Reform Age up to the Ausgleich of this generation will be rather different than their predecessors.

The same way the inter-war period became the most popular part of the national historiography in Slovakia, also Hungarian Horthy period underwent a huge revival. What used to be regarded as bourgeois and nationalistic past became now a very attractive and often praised period. The period became the most contested particularly due to the needs of symbolic legitimisation and also due to natural link between the inter-war Hungary and the Hungary after 1989. In my view the intermezzo of more than 40 years between 1948 and 1989 was an unnatural "cu-de-sac" forced by mighty Communist ideology and the Interwar-period would have been as it will be and is a natural focus of

²¹¹ András Gerő, *The Hungarian Parliament: A Mirage of Power*. Atlantic Studies on Society in Change, no. 92. (Highland Lakes: Atlantic Research and Publications, Inc., 1997); *Modern Hungarian society in the making: The unfinished experience*. (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995).

²¹² Lackó, Mihály, *Széchenyi és Kossuth vitája* (Budapest: Magvető, 1977); *Halál Párizsban* (Budapest: Magvető: 1986); *Széchenyi elájul* (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2001).

²¹³ Deák, Ágnes. „'Nemzeti egyenjogúsító'” kormányzati nemzetiségpolitika Magyarországon 1849-1860 (Governmental policy in Hungary aiming at „national emancipation,” 1849-1860). Budapest: Osiris, 2000.

²¹⁴ Gángó

²¹⁵ For his implicit self-positioning, see Hermann, Róbert. „Az 1848-49-es forradalom és szabadságharc a magyar történetírásban,” (The 1848-49 Revolution and War of Independence in Hungarian historiography), *Aetas* (1999) 1-2, pp. 62-85.

legitimation and therefore the narrative as far as the country will draw the same borders. Another reason for the overweighting of the inter-war period was simply a revival of nationalism. It is possible to play a national note on 19th Century and particularly on 1848, but it is hardly possible to identify with the state as it was then. The state which is the reference point for democratic Hungary is the inter-war kingdom.

Before 1989 topics like revolution of 1918, the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire, and the underlying question of nationalities in the last decades of the Monarchy were treated in many monographs by József Galántai or Péter Sipos. In a broader sense, the Octobrist tradition was gradually becoming part of the tolerated field of research, first through the figure of Mihály Károlyi or the social-democrat Vilmos Böhm. Finally, even civic radicalism was reintegrated, though in the case of Oszkár Jászi obviously avoiding his anti-communist works of 30's and 40's. The case of Oszkár Jászi, Hungarian social scientist and politician, is a good example of a figure whose work have benefited from the change of 1989. He was a member of Karolyi government and later emigrated from the country. He was a representative of democratic and socialist values and in his works criticised the state of society in inter-war Hungary of which he blamed liberalism.

The political history between the two world wars became the object of creative research already in late 80's, and most importantly Miklós Lackó, Gyula Juhász, and Mária Ormos contributed to a more nuanced, though politically unconflicting narrative about the Horthy-regime.

In the late eighties, with the opening up of the public sphere to alternative sets of collective memory, the first half of the twentieth century became the object of various attempts of re-thematisation of the traumas. More and more oeuvres were recovered in their entirety, like those of Szekfű or Jászi, and also new journals and new media started to contribute to the reshaping of historical consciousness. Thus, magazines like *Medvetánc* (originally the theoretical journal of the Communist Youth Organisation of the Faculty of Arts, gradually turning into one of the most important forums of exchange

of ideas on the suppressed past and the strategies of transition), or Századvég (initiated by a group of students, some of whom later became founders of FIDESZ; at this point championing an unusually broad spectrum of reference-figures traditionally divided into populists and urbanites, ranging from Jászi to Dezső Szabó).²¹⁶ Documentary films, which had a high social prestige already in the seventies, also contributed to this historical reconsideration, and formed an alternative public sphere, where those things that could not be yet stated in an academic institution were formulated as subjective personal recollections. Thus, a whole range of projects were started, laying the foundations for archives of oral history, as well as triggering further historical research on the most precarious moments of Hungarian history.²¹⁷

Not surprisingly, the relatively depoliticized nature of historiography of the twentieth century was challenged in the 1990s, one can speak of the emergence of a post-nationalist official narrative, rediscovering, reconstructing and extolling the symbolic heritages of István Tisza, István Bethlen, Kunó Klebelsberg and Gyula Szekfű. The nationalist narrative is shared by many otherwise different historians Ferenc Glatz, Ignác Romsics, László Kósa (another historian rather concentrating on social history) or László Tökéczki. Significantly, this narrative is not only and not so much a challenge to the communist canon, but also to the (semi-)„dissenter” one of the 1980s, elaborated, with different overtones, by Péter Hanák, György Litván, and, most importantly, Miklós Szabó, who all extolled the Hungarian „octobrist” and civic radical tradition to counter both the traditional nationalist canon and the communist narrative.²¹⁸

²¹⁶ Incidentally, these two journals were at the root of the two most important post-1989 academic editing houses of the country, *Századvég* being the forefather of *Osiris*, while the editor of *Medvetánc* came to launch *Atlantisz*.

²¹⁷ Pál Schiffer's classic *A Dunánál* (At the Danube) from 1987, the numerous films by János and József Gulyás, and the famous TV series by Gábor Hanák and Péter Bokor, entitled "Századunk" (Our century).

²¹⁸ After 1990, Miklós Szabó was member of parliament for the Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ) until his death. For his post-1989 publicistic works, written polemically against the re-emerging nationalist historical discourse, see his *Múmiák öröksége* (The legacy of mummies). (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1995).

In the last decade, there was a considerable number of popular historiographical works published bringing back figures Count Kunó Klebelsberg, the most important cultural politician of the twenties, Pál Teleki, eminent geographer, prime minister in 1939-41, and symbolic figure of the ethno-political reformism of the inter-war period, István Tisza, prime minister in the 1910s whose economic liberalism was coupled with an intolerant stance both to the nationalities and the left-wing political opposition, or Gusztáv Gratz, legitimist politician, who was one of the main figures of the conservative-liberal opposition to the Horthy-regime.

In terms of more synthetic narratives of the last decade, probably the most influential works concerning the period were written by two political historians, Mária Ormos and Ignác Romsics. Ormos, professor at the University of Pécs, who has been a respected scholar of fascism from the seventies onwards, kept publishing her bestseller-biographies on dictators.²¹⁹ The real tour de force was, however, her monograph on Miklós Kozma, a close collaborator of Horthy, who was responsible for the propaganda and public image of the regime, and who, in the second part of the thirties, was making some steps to involve the young generation of reformists, preparing a kind of "cultural and political opening" in face of the Nazi danger.²²⁰

Possibly, Ignác Romsics was the historian whose perspective was the most influential on the reconsideration of the inter-war period. As mentioned before, his first important monograph was on the early career of István Bethlen. In the nineties, he published a series of monographs and edited volumes. After 2000 he published history of Hungary in 20th Century and edited a volume of document to the period. His analyses were integrated into a broader framework, which were comprised of the contemporary

²¹⁹ Mária Ormos, *Hitler* (Budapest: T-Twins, 1994)

²²⁰ Mária Ormos - *Egy magyar médiavezér: Kozma Miklós*, vols. I-II. (Budapest: PolgART, 2001).

theoretical references of nationalism studies. This way he contributed to relativization of traditional claims of Hungarian exceptionalism.²²¹ and the tendency to self-victimisation.

In many ways complementing these efforts, the diplomatic historian András Bán D. has been publishing a series of important documents concerning the broader context and limitations of Hungary's foreign policy of the period.²²² Another important contribution to the understanding of Hungarian politics is the painstaking research by József Vonyó into the political structure of the Hungarian extreme right-wing mass-movements of the thirties.²²³ While political history was at the focus of interests, intellectual history, which would require even more interpretative distance, was rather marginalized in the discussions on the inter-war period. Probably the most important exception is the veteran Miklós Lackó²²⁴, whose significant pre-1989 oeuvre was supplemented with a series of publications witnessing his hermeneutic skills. He turned back to the liberal-conservative humanism of some cultural figures of the thirties, such as the Geistesgeschichte-oriented philosopher Lajos Prohászka, the art historian Lajos Fülep, or the classical philologist Károly Kerényi, who were deeply concerned with the crisis of European culture, but instead of turning to a totalitarian solution that promised collective regeneration, they asserted the values of the classical European heritage. Apart from Lackó, Ambrus Miskolczy²²⁵ made an important contribution to this shift of perspective, concentrating on

²²¹ Romsics, Ignác, ed. *Integrációs törekvések Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19-20. században* (Ambitions of integration in Central and Eastern Europe in the 19-20 th centuries). (Budapest: TLA, 1997). Romsics, Ignác, ed. *Magyarország és a nagyhatalmak a XX. században* (Hungary and the great powers in the XXth century). (Budapest: TLA, 1997). Romsics, Ignác - *Helyünk és sorsunk a Duna-medencében* (Our place and destiny in the Danubian basin). (Budapest: Osiris, 1996). Romsics, Ignác. *Nemzet, nemzetiség és állam Kelet-Közép- és Délkelet-Európában a 19. és 20. században* (Nation, nationality and the state in East-Central and Southeast Europe in the 19-20th centuries). (Budapest: Napvilág, 1998). Romsics, Ignác - *Trianon és a magyar politikai gondolkodás, 1920-1953* (Trianon and the Hungarian political thought, 1920-1953). (Budapest: Osiris, 1998).

²²² Bán D., András - *Pax Britannica: Wartime Foreign Office documents regarding plans for a postbellum East Central Europe*. (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, New York: Columbia Univ. Pr. 1997).

²²³ Vonyó, József - *Gömbös Gyula és a jobboldali radikalizmus* (Pécs: Pro Pannonia, 2001).

²²⁴ Lackó, Miklós. *Szechenyi es Kossuth vitaja* (The debate of Szechenyi and Kossuth) (Budapest: Megveto, 1977)

²²⁵ Miskolczy Ambrus . *Eszmék és téveszmék. Kritikai esszék a román múlt és jelen vitás kérdéseit tárgyaló könyvekről* (Budapest, 1994), 97. Miskolczy, Ambrus . *Lélek és titok. A "mioritikus tér" mítosza, avagy Lucian Blaga eszmevilágáról* (Budapest: Közép-Európa Intézet - Kortárs Kiadó, 1994),

the intertwining aesthetic and (meta-)political agendas of interwar conservative-liberalism, searching for a way out from the pressure of left-, and right-wing totalitarianisms. First attempts to re-interpret the inter-war history were however made already in 1989 and soon after. All of these bore a strong neo-conservativist air with them.²²⁶

As mentioned earlier this particular historical period and its interpretations were underpinned by political ambitions of one of the Hungarian after-1989 parties. This gave the historiography and extra role as a bearer of the message of the “new right”. It was a time for revival of national pride where event such as Trianon were “tragic events, which were always coming from "outside”.”²²⁷

While the chief ideologist of the FIDESZ-government in the historical field, Mária Schmidt, was rather dealing with the post-1945 period (though her original field of research was the Holocaust),²²⁸ some of the other intellectuals, like László Tőkéczki, were also experimenting with a neo-nationalist narrative in view of the first half of the century, usually promoting the figure of István Tisza as a model of bringing together economic modernism and political nationalism.

The links between history and politics deserve more remarks. Mária Schmidt, the Director of the House of Terror, is one of the great examples how a historian takes a chance to become a public figure. The House of Terror details in length Hungary’s painful modern history of social control through haunting, interactive exhibits. The museum’s basement showcases the restored prison cells and torture rooms that once held countless prisoners. The House of Terror is however famous in Hungary for another

Miskolczi, Ambrus . *Szellem és nemzet. Babits Mihály, Eckhardt Sándor, Szekfü Gyula és Zolnai Béla világról* (Budapest, Napvilág, 2001)

²²⁶ One of the characteristic figures was Ernő Raffay, secretary of state in the first government, and also author of strongly nationalist narratives, mainly about Transylvania. Raffay, Ernő. *A vajdaságtól a birodalomig: Az újkori Románia története* (From the principalities to the empire: The history of modern Romania). (Szeged: JATE, 1989); *Magyar tragédia: Trianon 75 éve* (The Hungarian tragedy: 75 years of Trianon). (Budapest: Püski, 1995).

²²⁷ Trenczényi Balázs, Apor Péter: *Fine-Tuning the Polyphonic Past: Hungarian Historical Writing in the 1990's* in: *Narratives Unbound* (Budapest: CEU Press 2007) p

²²⁸ Schmidt, Mária - *Diktatúrák ördögsekerén. Válogatott tanulmányok*. (Budapest: Magvető, 1998).

reason. Its establishment became a very controversial and political as well as politicised event. Schmidt is politically engaged as an ally of former Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, who can be credited in part with the establishment of the museum and helping Schmidt to become the director. Schmidt therefore can be mentioned as one of the historians for some reason either marginalised or who already lost impact as proper scholars but, capitalizing on her prestige, decided to have a second try as an ideologist.

Remaining usually detached from actual politics, those practitioners of cultural history who were dealing with the inter-war period, were usually going in a moderately conservative direction. The historian and ethnographer László Kósa is the most important figure of this trend.²²⁹ Another social historians dealing with the period were Vera Bácskai or Gábor Gyáni²³⁰.

The Communist period brought even more discontinuity in terms of interpretation than the inter-war period. At first sight it seems obvious. What was previously produced by the party about its own history was criticised and revised. After the first period of enthusiasm, it began to be admitted, however, that communist historiography had been based upon "false principles" rather than on forged facts. The most important dogma of the regime was encapsulated in the statement that the uprising in October 1956 had been a 'counter-revolution.' Democratic political identity after 1989 in Hungary was, to a large extent, grounded on the memory of the anti-Stalinist revolution, therefore the professional research of its history was ranked among the most urgent scientific duties. The government established a new research institute at the Academy of Sciences that was devoted to work exclusively on the details of the 1956 events. The Institute for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution (hereafter 1956 Institute) considers itself primarily the successor of the Imre Nagy Institute of Sociology and Politics, which

²²⁹ For a representative volume, see László Kósa (ed.) - *Magyar művelődéstörténet* (Budapest: Osiris, 1998).

²³⁰ Gyáni, Gábor, 'Mai várostörténet-írásunk: teljesítmény és irányzatok', *Századvég* 4 (Spring 1997), Gyáni, Gábor and György Kövér *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a reformkortól a második világháborúig* (Social History of Hungary, 1830-1945), (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)

operated in Brussels between 1959 and 1963, and of other western emigrant organizations and writers that maintained the inheritance of the Hungarian Revolution for more than three decades. The preparatory committee and temporary international board of trustees of the 1956 Institute were formed on June 17, 1989, the day after the reburial of Imre Nagy and his fellow martyrs. On March 1, 1990, the 1956 Institute and its foundation were legally registered. On March 16, on the initiative of Domokos Kosáry, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences formed the Academic Documentation and Research Group for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. In 1995, the government of the Hungarian Republic granted the 1956 Institute, until then a social organization, the official status of a public foundation.

The institute quickly published a general textbook, a bibliography and began to issue a yearbook series.²³¹ The researchers affiliated with the Institute produced a series of synthetic works, both in Hungarian and also in English. The study of 1956 takes place outside the walls of the Institute as well, mainly at university departments. A characteristic line of the reappraisal of recent history is the sequence of biographical monographs. The seminal book of János M. Rainer, currently director of the 1956 Institute, on Imre Nagy, Prime Minister of 1956, opened up this direction. It was soon followed by the academic reintegration of other contested figures into the canon of modern Hungarian historical heroes. Biographies of the young communist heretic Géza Losonczy and of Zoltán Tildy, the former President of the Republic (1945-1948), were soon to follow.²³² However, the area of research was not seen similarly by all historians

²³¹ Litván, György, ed. - *The Hungarian Revolution of 1956: Reform, Revolt and Repression 1953-1963*, (London – New York: Longman, 1996). On 1956 see also Gyurkó, László, *1956* (Budapest: Szabad Tér, 1996) Békés, Csaba, *Az 1956-os magyar forradalom a világpolitikában* (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1996) Ripp, Zoltán, *Őrvenhat októbere és a hatalom* (Budapest: Napvilág, 1997)

²³² Rainer, M. János, *Nagy Imre. Politikai életrajz 1896-1953*, Vol. 1 (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1996) *1953-1958*, Vol. 2 (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1999) Kövér, György, *Losonczy Géza 1917-1957* (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1998) Haas, György, *Diktatúrák árnyékában* (Budapest: Magyar Napló, 2000) Horváth, Miklós, *Maléter Pál* (Budapest: Osiris - Századvég - 1956-os Intézet, 1995) A recent debated work is Révész, Sándor, *Aczél és korunk* (Budapest: Sik, 1997)

and became heavily contested territory.²³³ Whereas the re-appraisal of 1956 was a prior task of historiography, the research on the organs of repression also became important. The mysterious and mythical organizations came to the light as object of rigorous scientific investigation and were used as keys to understand, although from very different perspectives, the communist system in general.²³⁴ One important work on opposition was published since.²³⁵

First book on modern Hungary after 1989 was published by scholars from Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest and a circle of scholars in the Institute for Political History (former Institute for Party History).²³⁶ More successful was Mária Palasik with the story of a birth of one-party system.²³⁷ The one-party seems inevitable to some scholars²³⁸, others put the emphasis on Soviet influence.²³⁹ Contrary to the first approach, these historians see 1945 as marked by the beginning of 'Sovietization' that created a dictatorship alien to Central-European and Hungarian historical traditions. Using this narrative, albeit in a nuanced way, Ignác Romsics authored the work that is the most influential and of the highest standard.²⁴⁰ The extremist version of this explanation,

²³³ As a controversial volume see Kahler, Frigyes - M. Kiss, Sándor, *Kinek a forradalma?* (Budapest: Püski - Kortárs, 1997)

²³⁴ Kenedi, János, *Kis Állambiztonsági Olvasókönyv* (Budapest: Magvető, 1996) Kiszely, Gábor, *ÁVH* (Budapest: Korona, 2000)

²³⁵ Csizmadia, Ervin, *A magyar demokratikus ellenzék 1968-1988* Vols. 1-3. (Budapest: T-Twins, 1995)

²³⁶ See e. g.: *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) Izsák, Lajos, *Polgári pártok és programjaik Magyarországon 1944-1956* (Pécs: Baranya Megyei Könyvtár, 1994) *Rendszerváltástól rendszerváltásig* (Budapest: Kulturtrade, 1998) *Fordulat a világban és Magyarországon, 1947-1949*, eds.: Feitl, István - Izsák, Lajos - Székely, Gábor (Budapest: Napvilág, 2000) Borhi, László, *A vasfüggöny mögött* (Budapest, 2000) *Megalkuvás és erőszak* (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetem - MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1997) Föglein, Gizella, *Államforma és államfői jogkör Magyarországon 1944-1949* (Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 1993) Fülöp, Mihály, *A befejezetlen béke* (Budapest: Héttorony, 1994) Földes, György, *Az eladósodás politikatörténete 1957-1986* (Budapest: Maecanas, 1995). Their main forum is the journal *Múltunk*.

²³⁷ Palasik, Mária, *A jogállamiság megteremtésének kísérlete és kudarca Magyarországon 1944-1949* (Budapest: Napvilág, 2000)

²³⁸ Iván T. Berend's recent works mark this approach: *Central and Eastern Europe 1944-1993* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) Hungarian translation is: *Terelőúton* (Budapest: Vince, 1999)

²³⁹ See e. g. Szerencsés, Károly, *Magyarország története a II. világháború után, 1945-1975* (Budapest: Ikva, 1991) „Az ítélet: halál” (Budapest: Kairosz, 2002) Földesi, Margit, *A Szövetséges Ellenőrző Bizottság Magyarországon 1945-1947* (Budapest: IKVA, 1995) Kahler, Frigyes, *Joghalál Magyarországon, 1945-1989* (Budapest: Zrinyi, 1993).

²⁴⁰ Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 2000), English edition: *Hungary in the 20th Century* (Budapest: Corvina - Osiris, 1999).

however, tends to depict the communist system as a conspiracy of the Red Army and the Soviet security services. Valuch, Tibor, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében* (Budapest: Osiris, 2001).

Tibor Valuch²⁴¹ analyses the structure of the Hungarian society in the second half of the twentieth century. Others chose to elaborate accounts on urban society and industrialization, or peasant communities and state repression.²⁴² A sub-topic of the analysis of social changes is the investigation of demographic tendencies and migration.²⁴³ The number of attempts to understand the system in terms of ideology or intellectual history is relatively trifling and these authors concentrate mainly on the party elite, a choice inherent to their approach.²⁴⁴

Promising initiatives to formulate an alternative language come from border territories of historiography like historical anthropology, or border areas of different disciplines like that of sociology, or history of political science, namely it was Tibor Huszár²⁴⁵ Apart from Huszár, this field includes attempts to comprehend the dictatorship, culture or mentality. However, only a few of them manage to avoid drawing a sharp borderline, often with apologetic intention, between state and society.²⁴⁶ Successful

²⁴¹ Valuch, Tibor, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében* (Budapest: Osiris, 2001).

²⁴² Belényi, Gyula, *Az alföldi városok és a településpolitika (1945-1963)* (Szeged: k. n., 1996) Review in *Századok* 131 (March 1997), pp. 549-51. *A sztálini iparosítás emberi ára 1948-1956* (Szeged: JATE, 1993). Erdmann, Gyula, *Begyűjtés, beszolgáltatás Magyarországon, 1945-1956* (Békéscsaba: Tevan, 1992), Review in *Aetas* (Vol. 1-2. 1995), pp. 280-4. Csanádi, Márta, *Honnan tovább?* (Budapest: T-Twins - MTA Közgazdaságtudományi Intézet, 1995) Vida, István, *Az állami-politikai vezető réteg összetétele az 1980-as évek elején* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1992) A comprehensive overview on research concerning contemporary history is in *Hatalom és társadalom... and Politika, gazdaság és társadalom a XX. századi magyar történelemben*, eds.: Püski, Levente - Timár, Lajos - Valuch, Tibor, Vols. 1-2. (Debrecen: KLTE Történelmi Intézet Új- és Legújabbkori Magyar Történelem Tanszéke, 1999)

²⁴³ Stark, Tamás, *Magyarország második világháborús embervesztesége* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1989) Tóth, Ágnes, *Telepítések Magyarországon 1945-1948 között* (Kecskemét, 1993), Review in *Aetas* (Vol. 1-2. 1995), pp. 277-9. Vadkerty, Katalin, *A belső telepítések és a lakosságcsere* (Pozsony - Bratislava: Kalligram, 1999)

²⁴⁴ Kalmár, Melinda, *Ennivaló és hozomány* (Budapest: Magvető, 1998), Review in *Századok* 134 (September 2000), pp. 1301-3. Standeisky, Éva, *Az írók és a hatalom* (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1998) Rainer, M. János, *Az író helye* (Budapest: Magvető, 1990)

²⁴⁵ *Restauráció vagy kiigazítás?*, eds.: Huszár, Tibor – Szabó, János (Budapest: Zrinyi, 1999) *A politikai gépezet 1951 tavaszán Magyarországon* (Budapest: Corvina, 1998) *A hatalom rejtett dimenziói...*

²⁴⁶ Pótó, János, *Emlékművek, politika, közgondolkodás* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1989) Gyarmati, György, *Március hatalma – a hatalom márciusa* (Budapest: Paginarium, 1998) Gerő,

exceptions in this sense, and potential inspirations for further research, are the works of István Rév²⁴⁷ or Tibor Dessewffy.²⁴⁸

IV. 4. Neighbours In and Out: Jewish History and History of Historical Hungarian Territories

The historical research on anti-Semitism became one of the most contested and vivid fields of social research in Hungary after 1989. After the collapse of communism, it seemed to be possible again to negotiate the issue openly. The excitement of this topic was naturally increased by the long years of silence. At the same time this is one of the characteristics of Hungary in the central-European region – it is publicly confronting and dealing with its anti-Semitic issues.

This was fostered by many factors, like the post-1989 rediscovery and re-creation of Jewish identities, the emergence of ethnic nationalism, the attempts to "regenerate" national identity after the alleged denationalization of the socialist period, and the open appearance of right-wing radicalism. However, these factors again can not exclusively explain the problem. In comparison the Czech Republic experienced all the above mentioned factors, re-creation of the Jewish identity was strong so was the new right-wing radicalism. However, the end result was strong animosity and never solved issue with Roma minority. I would rather like to point out that both these minority groups play in both countries similar role and that is something which can be compared.

András, *Az államosított forradalom* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998) *Replika* 23-24 (December 1996), pp. 71-80., 141-158.

²⁴⁷ István Rév –"In Mendacio Veritas". in: *Representations* vol. 35., Summer, 1991 pp. 1-20., Hungarian translation: 'In Mendacio Veritas' in *2000/5* (September 1994), pp. 51-61. and "Parallel Autopsies," in: *Representations* 49, Winter 1995, pp. 15-39; 'Az atomizáció előnyei' in *Replika* 23-24 (December 1996), pp. 141-158.

²⁴⁸ Dessewffy, Tibor, *Iskola a hegyoldalon* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1993). One should note here also the distinguished sociologist Elemér Hankiss's *Kelet-európai alternatívák* (Budapest: Közgazdasági- és Jogi Kiadó, 1989). English edition is *East European Alternatives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) The Hungarian "internationalist" sociologist, Arpad Szokolczai who taught at the European University Institute, Florence and the University of Cork, as well produced several promising historico-sociological works. See, for instance, his co-operative book with Agnes Horvath: *The Dissolution of Communist Power: The Case of Hungary* (London: Routledge, 1992)

To answer the question why this or that particular group happened to play the role of an enemy is not easy. It is not necessarily the size of the group which is by the root of the situation. In Slovakia Roma people reach the highest level in the region in terms of proportion of the population. Yet, the “public problem” with Roma people is discussed in Czech Republic. Also, the long and significant history of the minority in the country is not necessary the reason for becoming a public enemy. In Poland the existence of Jewish minority has been traditionally strong, so was in Hungary. Yet, only one country had in 90’s anti-Semitic signs all over the bus stops.

The increasing historical interest was accompanied by the intense research within the fields of social psychology and the sociology of collective mentalities. Historical scholarship turned to the issue again from the late-1980s onwards.²⁴⁹ At the time, however, the debates were conducted on an abstract level, within the general framework of the belated Hungarian modernization.

The historiography of the 1990s was conditioned by the practical and coercing need to explore the causes of anti-Semitic aggression. The variety of research agendas catalyzed very diverse scholarly approaches. Thus, the research on the Hungarian Holocaust was enlivened. Studies on various details, like the fate of the Budapest ghetto, or the deportation of countryside Jews, as well as the role of Hungarian authorities in the extermination were published.²⁵⁰ As a result of these particular investigations, a series of comprehensive monographs were accomplished.²⁵¹ These studies identify the social

²⁴⁹ The breakthrough was Hanák, Péter, ed., - *Zsidókérdés, asszimiláció, antiszemitizmus* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1984).

²⁵⁰ Szita, Szabolcs, *A zsidók üldöztetése Budapesten, 1944-45* (Budapest: Magyar Auschwitz Alapítvány – Holocaust Dokumentációs Központ, 1994) Molnár, Judit, *Zsidósors 1944-ben az V. (szegedi) csendőrkörletben* (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1995) To a certain extent Tamas Stark’s demographic study can be mentioned here: *Zsidóság a vészorszakban és a felszabadulás után 1939-1955* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1995)

²⁵¹ Prepek, Anikó, *A zsidóság Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19-20. században* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1997). Ránki, Vera, *Magyarok-zsidók-nacionalizmus* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1999). Ungvári, Tamás, *Ahasvérus és Shylock* (Budapest, 1999); *The 'Jewish Question' in Europe: The Case of Hungary* (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 2000); Karsai, László, *Holokausz* (Budapest: Pannonica, 2001).

segregation and exclusion of Jews with hostile political rhetoric or legal regulation, thereby focus mostly on the political sphere of prejudice and aversion.²⁵²

It is, thus, hardly accidental that the two mostly debated books concerning the issue of anti-Semitism deal with the causes of popular anti-Jewish emotions. Both the work of János Pelle, who devoted his study to the pogroms that followed World War II, and that of Tamás Kende, who developed his argument on earlier – 18th and 19th century – cases, aimed at the comprehension of peasant violence towards the Jews.²⁵³ Pelle describes the genesis of popular anti-Semitism through a peculiar psycho-analytic reasoning²⁵⁴ and Tamás Kende's intention is to look for the roots of anti-Semitic aggression in different social and cultural elements.²⁵⁵

Of course, historical research was not only accentuating the conflictual sides of the Hungarian-Jewish coexistence. Géza Komoróczy, who otherwise is the major Hungarian scholar of ancient Near East, edited, together with Anikó Prepuk, a multi-volume project, provocatively entitled "Jewish Budapest" – subverting the traditional anti-Semitic labeling of Budapest as being "contaminated" by the Jews. The book offered a kind of lieux de mémoire for the cultural flourishing that marked the Jewish embourgeoisment process in the Hungarian capital, especially at the turn of the century. Komoróczy was also the author of the only "meta-historical" narrative – focusing on collective identity, entitled "Self-enclosing into the national tradition" (*Bezárkózás a nemzeti*

²⁵² Mária M. Kovács's works represent a unique voice in this body of research. She tried to connect a thorough archival research into the institutional policies of certain layers of the Hungarian society with a broader theoretical interest in the nature of nation-building and the social context of ethno-political claims. See her *The Politics of the Legal Profession in Interwar Hungary* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987); and *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), which is a reconstruction of the attitudes and policies concerning the Jews on the part of the advocates' and physicians' chambers. The Hungarian version was published as *Liberalizmus, radikalizmus, antiszemitizmus* (Budapest: Helikon, 2001).

²⁵³ Apart from the books see also the socio-political history analyses of Standeisky, Éva, 'Antiszemita megmozdulások Magyarországon a koalíciós idoszakban', *Századok* 126 (March 1992), pp. 284-308. Vörös, Éva, 'Kunmadaras', *Múlt és Jövő* 5 (April 1994), pp. 69-80.

²⁵⁴ Pelle, János, *Az utolsó vérvádak* (Budapest: Pelikán, 1995). The romantic image of popular classes can be found in the classic works of Natalie Zemon Davis and Robert Darnton as well.

²⁵⁵ Kende, Tamás, *Vérvád* (Budapest: Osiris, 1995) 'The Language of Blood Libels in Central and East European History' in *Pride and Prejudice*, ed.: Kontler, László (Budapest: History Department of the Central European University, 1994), pp. 91-104.

hagyományba).²⁵⁶ An important turn of argument on Jewish history was initiated by the Paris and Budapest-based historical sociologist, Victor Karády's book, *Zsidóság, polgárosodás, asszimiláció*.²⁵⁷ The book initiated a debate whether the Jewish community was really more successful in engaging with market economy and capitalist business practices due to its original material and mental capital. The problem was rather that of the methodology. While Karády was registering the assimilation and cultural integration of the urban Jewry at the turn of the century and suggested that the overall modernity-deficit of the society was mainly responsible for the increasing frustration and eventual conflict of this new middle class and the traditional elite-groups, his main opponent Gábor Gyáni's narrative was less determined by the subsequent tragedy and put the emphasis on the concept of 'civilization' as a possible core of identity for the entire modern Hungarian society.²⁵⁸

After 1989 the research of the neighbors' history was expected to bring new results, though the everlasting conflict different national narratives could hardly be helped. Between 1945 and 1948, research in a Central European context had a short but unprecedented flourishing. Some of the leading scholars were actually coming from the Hungarian minority of the successor-states, others were close to the populist tradition that had an open sympathy to the Eastern-European peasant nations, while others were raised in the spirit of Szekfű's historical perspective. The generation of Domokos Kosáry, Zoltán I. Tóth,²⁵⁹ László Makkai, or László Hadrovics, to mention but a few, wrote a series of important works in this short period, and, even though the loci of their co-operation were

²⁵⁶ *Bezárkózás a nemzeti hagyományba* (Budapest: Századvég, 1990)

²⁵⁷ *Zsidóság, polgárosodás, asszimiláció* (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1997). The debate is in *Budapesti Könyvszemle* 9 (Autumn 1997) and 10 (Spring 1998). Karády published extensively in Western languages. E. g. : Victor Karády and Yehuda Don eds., *A Social and Economic History of Central European Jewry*, (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1990).

²⁵⁸ it is important to mention here the work of János Gyurgyák, *A zsidókérdés Magyarországon* (Jewish Question in Hungary) (Budapest: Osiris, 2001). And the reviews by Emil Niederhauser, *Magyar Tudomány* 2001/12, Mihály Vajda and Miklós Lackó in *Élet és irodalom*, XLV./ 22., 2001. July 1, and a series of articles in the journal *2000* between November 2001 and January 2002.

²⁵⁹ The least known of this group, Zoltán I. Tóth was an eminent scholar of Romanian national ideology, who was accidentally shot dead during a demonstration during the 1956 Revolution. His most important work was re-edited recently: *Az erdélyi román nacionalizmus első évszázada* (The first century of Romanian nationalism in Transylvania). (Csíkszereda: Pro-Print, 2000).

ultimately destroyed. One of such places was Teleki Institute which has been restored later as Teleki László Alapítvány. The Institute of Political Sciences was founded in 1926 by Count Teleki - university professor and Prime Minister of Hungary on two occasions - within the Hungarian Statistical Association, a scientific society. Its task was the recording of the state of affairs in the neighbour countries surrounding Hungary. After Teleki's death the Institute of Political Sciences became a member of the Count Paul Teleki Research Institute, a group of institutes organised by the Minister of Education. The work of the institute was stopped by the Communist intervention and only restored after 1989. Today the research institute studies the place and role of Hungary in a broader international context and within the region, analyses the global and Central European social, political, economical and cultural trends and processes. Operated by the Teleki László Foundation, there are two research units within the Institute: the Centre of Foreign Policy Studies and the Centre of Central European Studies.

The group of researchers concentrating on Central Europe under the Communism and after comprised such scholars as Emil Palotás, Emil Niederhauser, or Endre Kovács. Niederhauser produced in mid 90's a comparative work on Eastern European historiography.²⁶⁰ Also Niederhauser's review articles published in *Századok* were following closely the academic developments in the neighboring country and were markedly devoid of any nationalistic bias.

Compared to the Eastern European average, there is a relatively sizeable translation literature from the historiographical output of the neighbors. Some of the key works by e.g. Dušan Kováč, L'ubomír Lipták, or Lucian Boia are also available in Hungarian, though it is to be added that these editions were often produced by Hungarian editing houses from Slovakia or Romania.²⁶¹

²⁶⁰ Niederhauser, Emil. *A történetírás története Kelet-Európában* (The history of historiography in Eastern Europe). (Budapest: História- MTA TTI, 1995).

²⁶¹ Lucian Boia, *Történelem és mítosz a román köztudatban* (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1999); L'ubomír Lipták, - *Száz évnél hosszabb évszázad: a történelemről és a történetírásról* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2000); Dušan Kováč - *Szlovákia története* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2001). In addition, various

In the nineties, Romania and Slovakia emerged as the regionally most important objects of research activities, a fact obviously converging with the presence and considerable size of Hungarian minorities in the two countries. In both cases, one has to mention two extremely active personalities, who were busy teaching, organizing conferences, editing and publishing, thus considerably contributing to the overall academic culture of the country, emancipating their fields from the primary political connotations and also from the exclusive concentration on the situation of the Hungarian minorities in the respective countries.

In the Slovak case it is László Szarka, who is also heading the Institute of Minority Studies of the Academy of Science, and the Slovak Studies Department at the Pázmány Péter Catholic University. He initiated a series of projects and also published an important book on the Slovak question in late-nineteenth century, which gave a very balanced narrative of the assimilatory politics of the Hungarian state and the corresponding hardening of the Slovak elite's position in view of a possible cooperation.²⁶² In the field of Romanian studies, Ambrus Miskolczi was a similarly active figure, publishing a series of important works on Romanian historiography, ethnography and political culture.²⁶³ From the younger generation, one has to mention the Transylvanian-born diplomatic historian Béla Borsi-Kálmán, who published a series of important books on the diplomatic interaction of the Hungarian and Romanian

publications focused on the fundamental texts of the Romanian intellectual tradition. See, for example, the series

edited by Ambrus Miskolczi, and also Pászka, Imre, ed. - *Román eszmetörténet, 1866-1945. Önismeret és modernizáció a román gondolkodásban* (Budapest: Aetas -Századvég, 1994); Lajos Kántor, ed. - *Szegényeknek palota: XX. századi román esszék* (Palace for the poor: Romanian essays from the 20th century) (Budapest: Balassi, 1998); Iordachi, Constantin, and Balázs Trencsényi, „A román történetírás kihívásai,,, (Challenges of Romanian historiography). *Replika* (November 2000) 40-41, pp. 165-264.

²⁶² *Szlovák nemzeti fejlődés - Magyar nemzetiségi politika 1867-1918* (Slovak National Development - Hungary's Ethnic Minorities Policy 1867-1918) (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1995).

²⁶³ Trócsányi, Zsolt and Ambrus Miskolczi. *A fanariótáktól a Hohenzollernekig. Társadalmi hanyatlás és nemzeti felemelkedés a román történelemben.* (From the Phanariotes to the Hohenzollerns. Social decline and national development in Romanian history). (Budapest: ELTE BTK, 1992.) *Tündérgert: Az erdélyi fejedelmi kor magyar és román szemmel. Két tanulmány: Gheorghe I. Brătianu, Makkai László* (The Fairy Garden: The age of Transylvanian princes from Hungarian and Romanian points of view. Two studies: Gheorghe I. Brătianu and László Makkai). Selected and foreword by Ambrus Miskolczi. Budapest: ELTE BTK Román Filológiai Tanszék, 1994. See also Zoltán Szász's *A románok története* (The history of the Romanians). (Budapest: Bereményi, 1993).

revolutionary emigrés throughout the 1840-60s, attempting to interpret the ups and downs of their negotiations in view of the evolution of Romanian national ideology.²⁶⁴ While functioning mainly in terms of a minority-policy think-tank, the Teleki László Institute also had an impact on the re-thematization of Hungary's geopolitical position and the history of Hungarian minorities in the neighboring countries. Last, but not least, it has to be mentioned that literary studies also contributed to the growing cultural awareness to the culture of Hungary's neighbors. An important author of this disciplinary borderland is Endre Bojtár, whose main field of interest is Baltic Studies, but he also made contributions to the intellectual history of Central Europe on the whole.²⁶⁵

Up to 1918, the history of Upper-Hungary or Transylvania is not thematized as a separate branch of research in Hungarian historiography, although in certain cases we can find region-specific topics and monographs. In turn, the history of Transylvania is often dealt with separately, by local historians, who are also present on the Hungarian „academic market”. They also have their own Transylvanian-Hungarian institutional framework, having even different research "schools", while this is far from being the case in Slovakia, where the Hungarian minority had a more limited output of academic culture. This is probably due to a combination of reasons: on the one hand, the number of the Transylvanian Hungarian minority is substantially larger, on the other hand, there has

²⁶⁴ Borsi-Kálmán, Béla. *A békétlenség stádiumai: Fejezetek a román-magyar kapcsolatok történetéből* (The stages of restlessness: Chapters from the history of Romanian-Hungarian relations). Budapest: Osiris, 1999); *Kihívás és eretnokség: Adalékok a román-magyar viszony történetéhez* (Challenge and heresy: Contributions to the history of Romanian-Hungarian relations). Sepsiszentgyörgy: H-Press, 1996. *Kockázatos viszonyok: Írások a román irodalom, művelődéstörténet és nemzeti önszemlélet tárgyköréből* (Hazardous relations: Writings on Romanian literature, cultural history and national self-perception). Pécs: Jelenkor, 1997; Translated into French as *Liaisons risquées: Hongrois et Roumains aux XIXe et XXe siècles. Consciences nationales, interférences et relations délicates*. Pécs: Jelenkor, 1999); *Illúziókergetés vagy ismétléskényszer? Román-magyar nemzetpolitikai elgondolások és megegyezési kísérletek a XIX. században* (Chasing illusions or complexes of repetition? Romanian-Hungarian national ideas and attempts at reconciliation in the 19th century). (Bukarest, Budapest: Kriterion, Balassi, 1995); *Nemzetfogalom és nemzetstratégiák: A Kossuth- emigráció és a román nemzeti törekvések kapcsolatának történetéhez* (The concept of the nation and national strategies: On the history of the relations of the Kossuth emigration and the Romanian national aspirations). (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1993). Translated into English as *Hungarian exiles and the Romanian national movement, 1849-1867*. (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 1991).

²⁶⁵ Bojtár, Endre. *Kelet-Európa vagy Közép-Európa?* (Eastern Europe or Central Europe?) (Budapest: Századvég, 1993).

been a continuously existing framework of elite reproduction, despite the growing restrictions in the seventies and eighties.

Among historians from Slovakia who have devoted attention to the Hungarian history are Katalin Vadkerty and Daniela Čierna-Lantayová. Works of László Szarka are translated to Slovak. Slovakia typically has some historians whose mother tongue is Hungarian; often, this motivates them to work on topics closely connected with the national question. In a period when state-national history still prevails, it is impossible to be a Hungarian and a Slovak historian at the same time. Nevertheless, these historians are an integral part of the Slovak historical community. The Hungarian minority historians publish in both languages, and they connect with Hungarian historiography. Their situation is complicated by relative physical closeness of both countries and by relatively small size of the Slovak-Hungarian academic community. Either they simply cross the bridge and become Hungarian historians as the above mentioned László Szarka did, or they work on local level. The most prestigious Hungarian academic institution in Slovakia is the Institute Forum,²⁶⁶ which holds historical conferences, produces publications, and concentrates part of the Hungarian intellectual community in Slovakia. The Forum was founded in 1996 at Dunajská Streda. In 2002 it moved to Šamorín, near Bratislava. In this period, it divided into three institutions: the Forum Institute for Research on Minorities, the Forum Information Centre, and the Forum Centre for Regional Development. The *Bibliotheca Hungarica* of Hungarian-language Czecho-Slovak literature, assembled on civil initiatives since 1990, became part of this institution in 1997.²⁶⁷ A large proportion of the published works concentrate on the ethnography of Hungarian settlement in the territory of present-day Slovakia and the social history of ethnically mixed territories. Komárno is becoming another important center for the Hungarian intelligentsia in

²⁶⁶ <http://www.foruminst.sk/>

²⁶⁷ Végh, L. (ed.): *A Bibliotheca Hungarica (cseh)-szlovákiai magyar könyvgyűjtemények bibliográfiája (1918-2000)* 1-2, Dunaszerdahely, Lilium Aurum 2000

Slovakia. This is partly given by tradition and partly by the new situation, in which Komárno has become the location for university teaching in the Hungarian language. As explained above this academic work is not particularly contributing to the state of art as perceived in Hungary.

Contrary to the historiography in Hungary, the nineties meant a chance of radical transformation for Hungarian historians from Romania. The disappearance of oppression did not mean however the momentum of immediate expansion, or even radical transformation, due to the lack of the middle-generation. Thus, the restoration of Hungarian academic institutions in Transylvania usually meant the re-emergence of persons and institutional settings of the 1950-60s, the last period when there was a relatively strong independent Hungarian research infrastructure.

The key figures of Hungarian historiography in Romania are veterans of the profession like the cultural historians Samu Benkő,²⁶⁸ István Imreh, Zsigmond Jakó,²⁶⁹ and Ákos Egyed,²⁷⁰ or the social historians Elek Csetri, or Lajos Demény, most of whom publish in both Romanian and Hungarian and had an important role of mediating between the two historiographies. While retaining a high level of professional ethos, this generation represents the historiographical convictions and methodological canons of the 1960s, mostly concentrating on social and socio-cultural history. At the same time, the enormous pressure on the part of the Transylvanian Hungarian community, eager to reshape its collective identity after 1989, was pushing these scholars to publish on virtually everything, seeking to re-establish a kind of local canon and institutionalize a public memory of the Transylvanian Hungarians, often with a special eye on the history

²⁶⁸ Benkő, Samu. *Újrakezdések: Tanulmányok, előadások, beszélgetések, búcsúztatások, 1980-1995* (New beginnings: Essays, lectures, conversations, and farewell speeches, 1980-1995). (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémia, 1996).

²⁶⁹ Jakó, Zsigmond. *Társadalom, egyház, művelődés: Tanulmányok Erdély történelméhez* (Society, church and culture: Studies on the history of Transylvania). (Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközössége, 1997).

²⁷⁰ Egyed Ákos. *Erdély, 1848-1849* (Transylvania, 1848-1849). 2 Vols., (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémia, 1998-1999). Egyed, Ákos. *A korszerűsödő és hagyományörző Erdély* (The modernizing and traditionalist Transylvania). 2 Vols. (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémiai, 1997).

of Szeklers.²⁷¹ While generally they are grossly under-represented, there has been nevertheless some place opening up for a younger generation as well in the nineties. Judit Pál (Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj)²⁷² is working on the nineteenth century, and especially urban history in Transylvania, Kinga Tüdös²⁷³ (N. Iorga Historical Institute, Bucharest), is combining ethnography and history, while Edit Szegedi is working on the history of Transylvanian Saxons.

In general, different sets of narratives are often produced depending on the audience and therefore also on the language of the publication: one, focusing on rather non-ideological history, for the Romanian academic audience interested in their topic, one for the Hungarian professional and semi-professional audience; concentrating on broader questions of Transylvanian history; and the third one for the local Transylvanian Hungarian public, which is searching for a viable narrative of identity. These narratives are not overlapping, but also not explicitly controversial.

IV. 5. Historiographical Research

At first sight, the most progressed area of research after 1989 is social history. It seemed that ‘social history’ possessed the potential of finally posing those relevant questions that the previous politically oriented scholarship was unable to formulate. Already in the 1990 issues of historical journals, social history represented around 30% of the publications, in spite of the still prevailing dominance of political history, which made up around one half of the articles. Two people to inspire the research were already mentioned György Ránki and Péter Hanák.

²⁷¹ The most important source-edition is Demény, Lajos, ed. - *Székely Oklevéltár – Új sorozat* (Szekler Archives – New Series). Vol. IV. *Székely népességösszeírások 1545-1627* (Szekler census, 1545-1627). Vol. V. *Székely népességösszeírások 1635* (Szekler census, 1635). Vol. VI. *Székely népességösszeírások 1635-1653* (Szekler census, 1635-1653). (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1998-2000).

²⁷² Pál, Judit - *Procesul de urbanizare din scaunele secuiești în secolul al XIX-lea* (The urbanization process in the Szekler districts in the 19th century) (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1999).

²⁷³ Tüdös, S. Kinga - *Erdélyi védőrendszerek a XV-XVIII. században: Háromszéki templomvárak* (Transylvanian defense systems in the 15-18th centuries: Fortified churches in the Háromszék region). (Budapest: Püski, 1995).

After the opening of the space of debates in 1989, issues in social history provided an easily accessible way to the empirical and scientific critique of the previously held scholarly views. This research culminated in the first social historical textbook in Hungary co-authored by leading scholars in the field Gábor Gyáni and György Kövér, published in 1998.²⁷⁴ The work covers the formation of modern Hungarian society approximately between 1830 and 1945. Gyáni's contribution to social history is much deeper though.²⁷⁵

A third focal figure of the sub-discipline is the grand old lady, Vera Bácskai, who influenced, mainly by her urban historical studies, numerous students through her professorship in the doctoral school of the Department of Economic and Social History, Budapest.²⁷⁶ The main schools of social history are traditionally in Budapest, at ELTE (Department of Economic and Social History, Department of Historical Sociology), and at the University of Debrecen, marked by scholars like Zsuzsa L. Nagy, who covered broad aspects of modern Hungarian history, from the intellectual history of liberal parties to path-breaking studies on the petit-bourgeoisie; István Rácz, who contributed to the understanding of early-modern agricultural structures; and Lajos Tímár, who is a distinguished expert in urban social history. Apart from the previous two centers, a strong social history school is developing at the University of Miskolc, where young researchers gathered around József Ö. Kovács.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁴ Gyáni, Gábor and György Kövér *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a reformkortól a második világháborúig* (Social History of Hungary, 1830-1945), (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)

²⁷⁵ The author's main publications in the decade include *Hétköznapi Budapest* (Budapest: Városháza, 1995), *Az utca és a szalon* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998) Mária Ormos re-assessed the Horthy-period from a different - rather political historical - perspective: 'Jelző és történelem', *Történelmi Szemle* (Summer 1997), pp. 179-190. György Kövér gathered his publications from the last decade in his *A felhalmozás ive* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2002)

²⁷⁶ See the collective volume dedicated to Vera Bácskai: Bódy, Zsombor - Mátay, Mónika - Tóth, Árpád, eds. - *A mesterség iskolája* (Budapest: Osiris, 2000) and her *Városok és városi társadalom Magyarországon a XIX. század elején* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1988) *Család, háztartás, társadalom a 19. század elején* (Budapest: Történelmi Statisztikai Füzetek, 1992)

²⁷⁷ To name but a few works: Benda, Gyula, 'A tárgyak termelése és fogyasztása a jobbágyfelszabadítást megelőző évszázadban', *Néprajzi Értesítő* 76 (1994), pp. 284-96. Rácz, István, *Parasztok, hajdúk, civisek* (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2000) Hajdú, Tibor, *Tisztikar és középosztály, 1850-1914* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1999) L. Nagy, Zsuzsa, *A haszonból élő kispolgár* (Debrecen: Debrecen University Press, 1997) Csiki, Tamás, *Az északkelet, kelet-magyarországi városi zsidóság gazdaság- és társadalomtörténete* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999)

Social history became a popular and proper critical weapon, since it was able to separate - and occasionally also isolate – the 'social' and 'society' from 'political power' and particularly the 'state'. Notwithstanding the intellectual history of the counter-position of state and society, it had a specific Hungarian – or broadly speaking East-Central European – scientific context. Social history in general found an obvious source of scholarly inspiration in sociology. Social historians tend to borrow research methods and techniques of representation from sociological approaches. In comparison to Slovakia respectively Czechoslovakia at that time, Hungary had much easier access to Western science namely the sociology. Out of centra-European countries it certainly was Poland which was influenced by western sociology most. For lack of other resources Slovak and Czech sociologists, historians and other academics tend to bring translated books from Poland and read them in Polish.

Tibor Valuch's published social history textbook, which deals with the second half of the 20th century. Valuch's comprehensive volume concerns the structures of settlement, demography, stratification, habits and mentality. He also edited a collective volume in social history of modern Hungary, *Power and Society in 20th Century Hungarian History*.²⁷⁸

Program of "socio-cultural history" was realized in the most influential way by the late Károly Vörös, who was a distinguished social and urban historian at the Institute for History.²⁷⁹ The research of urban life and urbanism was institutionalised as a sub-discipline of social history, which is, however, not a unique Hungarian phenomenon. It

Mazsu, János, *The Social History of the Hungarian Intelligentsia in the 'Long Nineteenth Century' 1825-1914* (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 1996); Timár, Lajos, *Vidéki városiak* (Budapest: Magvető, 1993); Ö. Kovács, József, *Zsidók a Duna-Tisza közén* (Kecskemét: Kecskeméti Lapok – Kecskemét Monográfia Szerkesztősége, 1996).

²⁷⁸ Valuch, Tibor, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében* (Budapest: Osiris, 2001) *Hatalom és társadalom a XX. századi magyar történelemben*, ed.: Valuch (Budapest: Osiris,)

²⁷⁹ Vörös, Károly, *Hétköznapok a polgári Magyarországon* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1997).

was, again, Gábor Gyáni and Vera Bácskai who contributed to this sub-discipline.²⁸⁰ An interesting work on women history was produced by Andrea Pető who focused on women in politics after 1945.²⁸¹ In spite of the fact that the culturally interpreted concept of gender could inspire further research and innovative representations, in reality there is no corpus of gender history in Hungary. Although women studies grow in popularity especially among students, this interest does not develop into genuine gender oriented scholarship. Scholarly interest in women produced rather traditional social history of women than new analyses of the past through the category of gender.²⁸² It is frequently stated that there are no integrated research projects, the discipline is under-institutionalized and it is also under-represented in education and professional reception.²⁸³

In the last decades, one can list a series of important historical and literary oeuvres which were containing some aspects of intellectual history,²⁸⁴ and in the nineties many works were published, especially in the domain of literary studies, which sought to analyse certain historical problems from the perspective of intellectual history writ large (history of topoi, imagology, history of rhetoric, or the history of cultural transfer).²⁸⁵

²⁸⁰ Gyáni, Gábor, 'Mai várostörténet-írásunk: teljesítmény és irányzatok', *Századvég* 4 (Spring 1997), pp. 55-67. Szakály, Ferenc, *Mezőváros és reformáció* (Budapest: Balassi, 1995) Bácskai, Vera, *Gyula gazdasága és társadalmá a XV-XVI. században* (Gyula: Békés Megyei Levéltár, 1991) Most recently, see her *Városok Magyarországon az iparosodás előtt* (Budapest: Osiris, 2002).

²⁸¹ Pető, Andrea, *Nőhistóriák* (Budapest: Seneca, 1998) See in greater detail Péter Apor's review in *BUKSZ* 12 (Spring 2000), pp. 80-4. Pető, Andrea, 'Átvonuló hadsereg, maradandó trauma', *Történelmi Szemle* (Spring - Summer, 1999), pp. 85-109.

²⁸² Szende, Katalin, 'A női munka a középkori gazdaságban', *Aetas* (Vol. 1-2. 1995), pp. 179-94. 'Craftmen's Widows in Late Medieval Sopron', *Women in Towns*, eds.: M. Hietala - L. Nilsson (Helsinki - Stockholm, 1999), pp. 13-24. Péter, Katalin, 'Női családfők Sárospatakon a 16. és 17. században', *Századok* 123 (September - November, 1989), pp. 563-606. Gyáni, Gábor, 'Patterns of Women's Work in Hungary 1900-1930', *European Review of History* 5 (Spring 1998), pp. 25-37. *Férfiuralom*, ed.: Hadas, Miklós (Budapest: Replika, 1994) Lafferton, Emese, 'Hysteria and Deviance in Fin-de-siècle Hungary', *Replika* (1998), pp. 75-99. Vári, Sándor, 'Női hisztéria Budapesten az 1880-as években', *BUKSZ* (Summer 1999), pp. 174-84.

²⁸³ See e. g.: Benda, 'A társadalomtörténetírás...', Kövér, György, 'Milyenek vagyunk?', *Századvég* 4 (Spring 1997), pp. 43-54.

²⁸⁴ One can mention here the names of Imre Bán, Kálmán Benda, Tibor Klaniczay, Márton Tarnóc, László Makkai, Béla Köpeczi, Ágnes R. Várkonyi, Katalin Péter, Ferenc Bíró, István Fenyő, Domokos Kosáry.

²⁸⁵ Such works from the nineties are Öze Sándor – „Bűneiért bünteti Isten a magyar népet”. *Egy bibliai párhuzam vizsgálata a XVI. századi nyomtatott egyházi irodalom alapján* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 1991), Heltai János – *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok* (Budapest: Balassi, 1994); Hargittay Emil – „A fejedelmi tükör műfaja a 17. századi

English materials of the XVII-XIX-th centuries), and whose exceptional irony and erudition meant an inspiration for many generations dealing with the history of political ideas.

The offer of conceptual history is to turn to the vocabularies of the political interaction rather than to the authors of texts as the starting-point of analysis. A pioneering project of establishing a Hungarian Begriffsgeschichte was formulated by the philosopher György Bence and social historian Károly Halmos, who were keeping the program of analyzing political vocabularies alive throughout the nineties, although not producing any definitive collective result yet.²⁸⁶ In the intellectual history the German input was not so popular among historians, but was rather strong in political science. The situation is different in the case of the French methodological input. French history-writing have had a stronger lobby within the ranks of Hungarian historiography.

Interestingly, similar pro-French and slightly anti-German approach one can account for in everyday life and in education. Hungary in comparison with Slovakia and the Czech Republic in particular has much larger proportion of young scholars studying French. French is popular also in Poland though where it would be caused by strong historical links. Several generations of Poles have emigrated to French and the connection between the two countries has always been strong and alive. The inter-war Czechoslovakia made a similar attempt to connect politically and culturally strongly with France but with disastrous results. Thus, in the Czech Republic or Slovakia the French is not particularly popular choice of language.

All in all, the strongest paradigm in intellectual history to date remains a mixture of literary history and history of ideas, along the lines of the late Tibor Klaniczay, a crucial

Magyarországon és Erdélyben,": Imre Mihály – „Magyarország panasza”: a *Querela Hungariae* toposz a XVI-XVII. század irodalmában (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1995), Kecskeméti Gábor – *Prédikáció, retorika, irodalomtörténet. A magyar nyelvű halotti beszéd a 17. században* (Budapest: Universitas, 1998).

²⁸⁶ For the program of the research project, and a personal recollection concerning the impact of the philosopher György Márkus, who was the first one in Hungary to use Peter Laslett's path-breaking edition of Locke in the 1960s, see György Bence– „Márkus és a kulcsszavak,” in: *Lehetséges-e egyáltalán? Márkus Györgynek – tanítványai* (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1993). pp. 81-98.

figure of Hungarian literary studies from the 1950s onwards. This direction also relies on the works of such literary historians as, Lajos Csetri,²⁸⁷ Ferenc Bíró,²⁸⁸ or István Fenyő²⁸⁹ who have been analyzing themes pertaining to the problematic of the history of ideas with painstaking philological care and with broad intellectual horizons.

In the nineties new methodological innovations were applied by Sándor Bene²⁹⁰, József Takáts,²⁹¹ and Gábor Gángó²⁹² Parallel to these attempts, there is an emerging dialogue between the various scholars and schools, who are dealing with the history of literature, political thought and mentalities, and parallel to literary and political intellectual history, there is an increasing interest on the part of political scientists to apply the – mainly German – approach of discourse analysis on Hungarian material.²⁹³

Art history became another field of the most recent interest. The exhibition at the National Gallery, entitled History-Image, made an extremely interesting attempt to document the reflection of Hungarian history in various artistic genres from the Middle Ages until the twentieth century, presenting both the high cultural canon and also objects pertaining more to the popular culture, seeking to decipher the different narratives of temporality encapsulated in the visual material.²⁹⁴ This attempt, of course, was not without predecessors in art history proper, as, for example, the works of Géza Galavics concerning baroque art were going to the same direction, seeking to map "visual

²⁸⁷ Csetri, Lajos - *"Nem sokaság, hanem lélek". Berzsenyi-tanulmányok* (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1986); *Egység vagy különbözőség?* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1990).

²⁸⁸ His latest synthesis is Bíró, Ferenc - *A felvilágosodás korának magyar irodalma* (Budapest: Balassi, 1994).

²⁸⁹ Fenyő, István - *Valóságbrázolás és eszményítés. Irodalomkritikai gondolkodásunk fejlődése, 1830-1842* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1990).

²⁹⁰ Sándor Bene, *Theatrum Politicum* (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1999).

²⁹¹ Takáts József – „Politikai beszédmodok a magyar 19. század elején (A keret),” in: *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*, 1998/5-6, p. 668-686.

²⁹² Gángó Gábor - *Eötvös József az emigrációban* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1999).

²⁹³ See Márton Szabó, *Diszkurzív térben: Tanulmányok a politika nyelvéről és a politikai tudásról* (Budapest: Scientia Humana, 1998), and Márton Szabó, ed., *Szövegvalóság: Írások a szimbolikus és diszkurzív politikáról* (Budapest: Scientia Humana, 1997); Szabó Márton, Kiss Balázs, Boda Zsolt ed., - *Szövegváltozatok a politikára: Nyelv, szimbólum, retorika, diskurzus* (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó-Universitas, 2000).

²⁹⁴ *History-Image: Selected Examples of the Interplay between Past and Art in Hungary*, exhibition arranged by Katalin Sinkó and Árpád Mikó (2000). The catalogue was edited also by Árpád Mikó and Katalin Sinkó, (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, 2000).

discourses."²⁹⁵ The exhibition, however, was applying this discursive analytical perspective on the *longue durée* of Hungarian art history, and even though the theoretical principles were not overemphasized, it turned out to be one of the most important, though somewhat exotic, attempts to apply (post-)modern methodologies of analyzing historical narrativity on the Hungarian material.

The decade after 1990 was marked by various attempts of reconsidering culture and society, and of experimenting with new methodologies. Ferenc Szakály's last work on the relationship of urbanisation and Protestantism in the 16-17th centuries was one of the most important attempts in the spirit of fusing social and cultural history.²⁹⁶ One of the most spectacular shifts along these lines was that of Ágnes R. Várkonyi, who previously was working on 17th-century cultural and political history, and also on the history of nineteenth-century historiography. She launched an ambitious project of "ecological historical anthropology", concentrating on the history of the non-human environment in the early-modern period.²⁹⁷ Another research project, which can also be referred back to the post-Annales methodological innovation, although it had its own "local" roots as well in the prestigious early-modern philology practiced at Szeged university, was the project headed by István Monok on early-modern Hungarian book collections, with the ambition of mapping not only the stocks of the provincial and noblemen libraries, but also opening up the research towards the history of mentalities of reading.²⁹⁸

In many ways, György István Tóth also turned to re-evaluate a type of documents, which has been traditionally used more for its factological value, to shed light on the broader socio-cultural conditions of early-modern Hungary from the perspective of the

²⁹⁵ Galavics, Géza - *Kössünk kardot az pogány ellen. Török háborúk és képzőművészet.* (Budapest: 1986).

²⁹⁶ Ferenc Szakály, *Mezőváros es reformáció* (Budapest: Balassi, 1995)

²⁹⁷ *Európa híres kertje: történelmi ökológia tanulmányok Magyarországról* (Budapest: Orpheusz, 1993). She also kept on publishing on political history, see for example her *A tűzvész tanúi* (Budapest: Liget Műhely Alapítvány, 1995).

²⁹⁸ Monok, István, Noémi Németh, and Sándor Tonk, eds. *Erdélyi könyvesházak. 2. Kolozsvár, Marosvásárhely, Nagyenyed, Szászváros, Székelyudvarhely* (Transylvanian libraries. 2. Kolozsvár, Marosvásárhely, Nagyenyed, Szászváros, Székelyudvarhely). (Szeged: Scriptorum, 1991).

history of mentalities.²⁹⁹ He published a series of articles analyzing reports of various representatives of the Catholic church. The history of mentalities was also represented in the post-1989 works of Vera Zimányi,³⁰⁰ and Katalin Péter, who, in her studies on the history of childhood in early modern Hungary, also made a visible move towards historical anthropology.³⁰¹

A separate and highly prestigious branch of early-modernist historical research is Ottoman studies. From the 1970s onwards, a number of researchers – most importantly Pál Fodor, Géza Dávid and Klára Hegyi - have been preoccupied with reconsidering the social and cultural situation of Hungary under the Turkish rule.³⁰² Another of these scholars was Gábor Ágoston now working at the University of Georgetown. There were attempts to abandon the self-centric Hungarian historical perspective from the "other side" as well, namely by historians who were dealing with the Habsburg context of Hungarian history like the military historian Géza Pálffy.³⁰³ The late-XVIII-the century was represented János Poór³⁰⁴ and György Kókay.³⁰⁵

In fact, literary studies produced a number of contributions in view of the seventeenth century as well, namely from Gábor Kecskeméti,³⁰⁶ Ferenc Zemplényi³⁰⁷

²⁹⁹ Jobbágyok hajduk deákok Budapest, Akadémiai, 1991. 189 pp., Három ország-egy haza. Budapest. Adams, 1992. *Relationes missionariorum de Hungaria et Transilvania (1627-1707)*. Roma-Budapest. 1994. *Mivelhogy magad írást nem tudsz. Az írás térhódítása a művelődésben a koraiújkori Magyarországon*. Budapest. 1996., *Literacy and Written Record in Early Modern Central Europe*. CEU Press Budapest 2000.

³⁰⁰ Zimányi Vera, ed., *Óra szablya, nyoszolya. Életmód és anyagi kultúra Magyarországon a 17-18. században*. (Budapest: 1994)

³⁰¹ *Papok és nemesek. Magyar művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok a reformációval kezdődő másfél évszázadból*. (Budapest: Ráday Gyűjtemény, 1995); *Gyermek a kora újkori Magyarországon : "adott Isten hozzánk való szeretetéből... egy kis fraucimmerecskét nekünk"* (Budapest: MTA-Történettudományi Intézet, Bp., 1996); *Beloved Children. History of Aristocratic Childhood in Hungary in the Early Modern Age* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001).

³⁰² Géza Dávid and Pál Fodor (eds.), *Ottomans, Hungarians, and Habsburgs in Central Europe. The Military Confines in the Era of Ottoman Conquest*. The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage, Politics, Society and Economy. Vol. 20. (Leiden: Brill Academic Publisher, 2000). Fodor, Pál - *A szultán és az aranyalma. Tanulmányok az oszmán-török történelemről*, (Budapest: 2001)

³⁰³ Pálffy, Géza - *A tizenhatodik század története*. (Budapest: Pannonica, 2000). The series is called "Magyar Századok" (Hungarian centuries), and was edited by the Pannonica editing house, between 1999 and 2000. See also his *A császárváros védelmében. A győri főkapitányság története, 1526-1598*, (Győr: Győr-Moson-Sopron Megye Győri Levéltára, 1999).

³⁰⁴ Recently, he edited the volume on József Hajnóczy in the series *Magyar szabadelvűek* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998).

³⁰⁵ Kókay, György - *Kereszténység, felvilágosodás, nemzeti kultúra* (Budapest: Universitas, 2000).

³⁰⁶ Kecskeméti, Gábor - *Prédikáció, retorika, irodalomtörténet* (Budapest: Universitas, 1998).

Emil Hargittay, Sándor Bene, and Pál Ács.³⁰⁸ A new generation of scholars, mostly working in the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences, turned to early-modern Hungarian literature from a perspective that opened itself up to intellectual history and historical anthropology, starting to produce much more "contextualist" works on early-modern topics than the previous generations, thus creating a possibility of future dialogue between historians turning to the history of mentalities and of reading, and literary historians, turning to political discourses.

IV. 6. Conclusion

In Hungary a strong communist heritage can be experienced. The academia in 80's found themselves relatively free and open which on the other hand might have caused unclear transition in early 90's. Some authors claim that Hungary has the strongest unbroken Communist heritage in academia among the Central European countries. In this case, obviously, the level is difficult to measure. Also, it has to be said that some authors remained very socialist in their views which is in a way acceptable in Hungary.

Though there is a level of internationalism in the Hungarian historiography and the historiography has a long history is still focuses on the history of one nation. Hungary had a long history of historical writing lined with great historians writing in languages as Latin, German or eventually Hungarian. Latin was the official language of two of the Parliament Houses till 1848. In these terms Hungarian historiography has always been international because it aimed to write a history of great territory inhabited by Hungarians in terms of political nation rather than "nation" in national sense. This approach proved to be difficult not only during socialism, but long after. Domestically this may not cause conflict, but internationally the Hungarian academia is still facing awkward reaction from

³⁰⁷ Zemplényi, Ferenc - *Az európai udvari kultúra és a magyar irodalom* (Budapest: Universitas, 1998).

³⁰⁸ *Az idő ósága" – Történetiség és történetiszemlélet a régi magyar irodalomban* („Antiquity of Time" – Collected Renaissance studies), (Budapest, Osiris Kiadó, 2002)

neighbouring “national academia”. Hungarian historiography has to face challenges from the site of its neighbours, but it is not at all inconceivable that Hungarian academic culture, getting ever closer to the European (and, for that matter, extra-European) structures, institutions and intellectual movements will be able to reformulate itself in a way that valorizes multiplicity not only in terms of the usual post-Herderian (or post-modern) legitimation, according to which every national culture adds something to the wholeness of human culture, but in the other direction as well, realizing that a culture gets richer and more interesting, and opens more windows to the external world, by the multiplicity of the pasts, sub-cultures and alternative intellectual canons it manages to incorporate.

There is a strong link between the historiography and the politics in Hungary. Spectrum of the political approach of the Hungarian historians is wide and visible. It is no secret where each of the leading academics is coming from and none of them has a problem to speak his/her mind openly. Another direction of bringing ideology back to historiography became popular mainly due to the politicization of intellectual production throughout the decade. The cleavages between the various intellectual and meta-political sub-cultures that existed throughout the 1970-80s served as convenient structuring lines for the emerging multi-party system. Thus, some of the crucial points of – especially twentieth-century – Hungarian history were turned into symbolic identity-markers for one group or another. Furthermore –with rather divergent intentions, means and efficiency – all post-1990 governments made some efforts to devise an "official" discourse, prioritizing a certain combination of research institutions, historical figures, lieux de memoire, and cultural-historical references.

At the same time, while some of the historians emerged as leading politicians in the new set-up, the mainstream of the craft kept to its own standards of avoiding direct involvement with either "too theoretical" interpretative schemes, or "too actualized" political narratives. Relying on more "ideological" narratives thus remained the strategy

of the off-mainstream: providing "weapons" for those who were not yet accommodated, who were for some reason previously marginal, or who already lost their impact as proper scholars but, capitalizing on their prestige, decided to have a second try as ideological gurus.

Hungarian historiography nurtures a specific relationship with Hungarians abroad. The relationship is affecting researchers as well as general public. All the professional are treated on the first place as fellow Hungarians and only then as professionals in the field. The relationship is a strong point as well as a weak point of the Hungarian academia. On one hand it allows for broad international contacts, on the other hand it is the one nation contact which certainly overshadows the internationalism. Occasionally, this support may seem a little bit patronising and it traditionally includes support to historical Hungarian territories in Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia and elsewhere.

Public confrontation of anti-Semitic issues is one of the characteristics of Hungary in the Central European region. The historical research on anti-Semitism became one of the most contested and vivid fields of social research in Hungary after 1989. After the collapse of communism, it seemed to be possible again to negotiate the issue openly. The excitement of this topic was naturally increased by the long years of silence. At the same time, the phenomenon ceased to remain a topic purely intellectual discussion, often implying direct political considerations. This was fostered by many factors, like the post-1989 rediscovery and re-creation of Jewish identities, the emergence of ethnic nationalism, the attempts to "regenerate" national identity after the alleged denationalization of the socialist period, and the open appearance of right-wing radicalism. However, these factors again can not exclusively explain the problem. In comparison the Czech Republic experienced all the above mentioned factors, re-creation of the Jewish identity was strong so was the new right-wing radicalism. However, the end result was strong animosity and never solved issue with Roma minority. I would rather

like to point out that both these minority groups play in both countries similar role and that is something which can be compared.

Historiographical positivism was not really shaken by the arrival of new methodologies. Due to the relatively high level of de-ideologization of Hungarian historiography at the turn of the decade, the nineties were marked by various attempts to bring back a more 'coherent' image of history that was gradually dissolved by the positivist consensus of professional historiography in the previous two decades. One such attempt was connected to the adaptation of various Western methodological schools, which promised a more sophisticated relationship between the historian and his source-material, thus seeking to problematize the naïve-factological methodology. Along these lines, various schools and ideological directions emerging in the last two-three decades in Western Europe and the United States were offered to the broader public: post-structuralism, microhistory, oral history, historical anthropology, contextualist intellectual history, gender history, etc. As in all other Eastern European countries, this process of adaptation was happening with an accelerated speed, often concentrating merely on the very act of reception of the Western achievements, without making it possible for the representatives of these canons to engage themselves in a more detailed negotiation among their respective discourses.

Not so surprisingly, those methodological offers, which questioned the hitherto unambiguous relationship between “the past” and its representation were unable to challenge the firm objectivistic conviction of the “guild”. This was due partly to their relatively belated reception. Those theoretical considerations that eventually influenced a ‘critical turn’ of the discipline in the West were arriving in Hungary only in the nineties, that is, together with their critical context. Historians were either absolutely disinterested in or ignorant of the post-modernist challenge or classified it as an erroneous attempt to blur the border between historical truths and historical myths. Albeit some of these scholars were aware of the theoretical complexity of the constructivist critique and even

tended to accept that the past could not be known in its entirety, they regularly insisted on that history-writing was eventually based on objective factual documentation, approximating, if only tangentially, the “totality of knowledge.” Consequently, they also proved to be completely resistant to any subjectivist construction.

The Hungarian historiography is still looking for its identity in terms of ideological, geographical or historical borders. It is not particularly clear to this art where it begins and where it ends. But the Hungarian historiography is not in its search on its own.

V. CASE COMPARISON

For the analysis and comparison I have chosen five books from Hungarian Historiography and six from Slovak historiography. The books fitted the criteria explained in my methodology. Though, there would have been about two or three more of similar type of works my aim was to cover the broad spectrum of authors including the re-published or emigrant historians. As the range of approaches was very broad in both cases any eventual similarities will be confirming my theory of a unified broadly accepted national strategy.

*Magyarország története (History of Hungary) 1918-1990*³⁰⁹ was published in 1995 by Korona publishing house and its main purpose was to provide an university textbook. However, the book was published in a popular form and was also publicly accessible in main bookstores. The author of the interwar period section is Jenő Gergely an ELTE university professor. *Magyarország története a XX. században (History of Hungary in the 20. Century)*³¹⁰ by Ignác Romsics was published in 1999 and ambitiously was accompanied by a collection of documents relevant for the 20. century Hungary providing this way an "indispensable" guide for the nation. *A History of Hungary*³¹¹ published by Palgrave MacMillan in 2001 was originally published in English by Atlantisz Könyvkiadó in Budapest 1999. The book was written by László Kontler former emigrant to U.S. who after 1989 returned to Hungary. Mária Ormos' *Magyarország a két világháború korában, 1914-1945*,³¹² was published in Debrecen in 1998 and the author is one of the leading historians dealing with the period. Another emigrant, Miklós Molnár published *A Concise*

³⁰⁹ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995)

³¹⁰ Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999)

³¹¹ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001)

³¹² Ormos, Mária, *Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945* (Debrecen: 1998)

*History of Hungary*³¹³ by Cambridge University Press in 2001. The book was originally translated from French as the author worked between 1969 and 1985 on the University of Lausanne. He has been an external member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences since 1995.

Generally, Hungarian historical books have authors from all scale of political orientation. The books provide for the interwar period a large amount of information on the neighbouring state. Mainly that is because of the ever lasting interest in the former Hungarian countries and in the Hungarian population living outside the recent borders. Another reason could be certain identification with the Monarchy. Until today Hungarians call sometimes their Austrian neighbours "our cousins".

Books including the interwar period into a general Hungarian history of 20. Century, devote much more attention to the years 1918-1945 (28 years) than to the later period 1945-1990 or 1998 (36 or 44 years). *Magyarország Története 1918-1990* for example writes the history of the first 28 years on 167 pages and the history of the following 46 years on 154 pages. The tendency, however, is ceasing with the distance parting the book from 1989.

Slovak books used for our analysis and comparison are Dušan Kováč's synthesis³¹⁴ printed in Prague in Czech in 1998. It was one from very popular series *Dejiny statu* published by Lidove Noviny. Two controversial right wing authors are also included in our selection. One of them is Milan Stanislav Ďurica³¹⁵, whose book cause a great discussion and conflict after being recommended as a teachers' handout. The story is explored more in the section on Slovak Historiography after 1989. Another book taking rather an extreme turn judging already by its title is

³¹³ Molnár, Miklós, *A Concise History of Hungary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

³¹⁴ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998)

³¹⁵ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996)

History of Slovakia on the Road to Self-Consciousness by Anton Špiez.³¹⁶ Anton Špiez is a historian who was not able to publish in the second half of 1980's but returned to the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences after 1989. Milan Stanislav Ďurica is a person who returned to Slovakia from abroad working partially at the University of Padova and Catholic Faculty of the Komensky University in Bratislava. Yet there is another emigrant whose work reflects and creates the opinion on Slovak history. Stanislav J. Kirchbaum is a Professor of Political Science at the York University of Toronto and his book is characteristically called '*History of Slovakia. The struggle for Survival*'.³¹⁷ For my analysis I use another two synthesis' which comprise of texts of several authors. The inter-war period is however always entrusted to the same person: Dušan Lipták. His contribution to *A Concise History of Slovakia* edited by Elena Mannova³¹⁸ is a great achievement and being published in English reaches wide audience.

Two other "Histories of Slovakia" have taken Lipták as an author for the period 1918-45 or even after 1945. There would seem little point to comparing those, however the difference between the text in the Concise History of Slovakia and in the two other books is there. Particularly important seems to be his original text in *Slovenské dejiny* from 1990.³¹⁹ It was published right after the political change and apparently was well prepared. The author published the same text with changes in later works including *Dejiny Slovenska* published by Academic Electronic Press in 2000 and also with even bigger changes in *A Concise History of Slovakia* also from 2000. The texts of Ľubomír Lipták³²⁰ create a great exception in their erudition, methodology and narrative in general. Interestingly his interpretation of the inter-war Slovak history was able rather smoothly incorporate the 'Czech' part in. At least the

³¹⁶ Špiez, Anton: *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992)

³¹⁷ Kirschbaum, Stanislav J., *Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival* (New York: St Martin's Griffin, 1995)

³¹⁸ Mannova, Elena (ed.), *A Concise History of Slovakia* (Bratislava: SAV, 2000)

³¹⁹ Čičaj, Viliam/Kováč, Dušan/Lipták, Ľubomír/Marsina, Richard: *Slovenské dejiny*. (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1990)

³²⁰ Often published in other European languages as English or French

text in the Concise history was a successful prove of it. Ľubomír Lipták successful wrote neither a history of Slovakia, nor of Czechoslovakia, but a history of Slovakia in Czechoslovakian Republic. This all without any apparent need to express particular opposition or aversion towards the lats mentioned country. Of course even in his texts one can make very entertaining finds. One of them is so called Tuk's affair mentioned in 1990 but left ot of the 2000 text. By all menats Ľubomír Lipták found some points of contact or some common ground for both historiographies after 1989 and in this way almost formulated a ‚Czecho-Slovakian corpus‘. This real possibility might have been easily overlooked then (wthn the mentioned book it comprises of only about 40 pages), but I would like to draw attention to it.

V. 1. National Corpus

National corpus of each of the three countries consists of 50-60 events or facts which have a special position in national history and are repeatedly reinterpreted in each book. These events have a special role to explain specifics of each national state. They explain on which idea the state was build, what was its tradition, its relations to other countries, its pride and aspirations. The national corpus in sketch describes the whole interwar period and at the same time gives the national history its meaning.

The way how the corpus works can be explained on the following example. The following is the way how the Trianon was explained by Ľubomír Lipták and Dušan Kováč respectively. Both text eventually sum up the same fact in a very similar way – as if both wanted to tick off this item on their list. More then about the originality or possibly plagiarism it says something about the need to mention a set of events and facts which is in a way obligatory fo the period. Ľubomír Lipták's text follows: „The big event was clear definition of Slovak borders, actually first time in history. The border with Austria on the West was defined by the Saint-Germain

Treaty 10th Septemebr 1919; on the North Poland did not recognize old borders with Austro-Hungary and compeled concessions of several villages in the area of Orava and Spiš. On the East Slovakia adjoined Carpathian Ruthenia which also became a part of Czechoslovakia. There was no historicalprecedens for the south border with Hungary therefore the Czechoslovakian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference had to fight hard for it. The treaty with Hungary signed on 4th June 1920 at the Trianon Castle by Paris a borderline was eventually agreed which is a combination of the ethnical, strategical and economical elements.” (*„Veľkou udalosťou bolo jasné vytýčenie hraníc Slovenska, vlastne prvýkrát v dejinách. Hranicu s Rakúskom na západe určila zmluva v Saint-Germaine 10.9.1919;na severe Polsko neuznávalo staré hranice s Rakúskom-Uherskom a vynútilo si územné ústupky niekoľkých obcí na Orave a Spiši. Na východe susedilo Slovensko s Podkarpatskou Rusou, ktorá sa stala tiež súčasťou republiky. Pre hranicu na juhu s Maďarskom nebol žiaden historický precedens, preto československá delegácia na mierovej konferenci v Paríži musela o ňu tvrdo bojovať. V mierovej zmluve s Maďarskom, podpísanej 4. júna 1920 na zámku Trianon pri Paríži, bola napokon schválená hranica, ktorá je kombináciou prvkov etnických, strategických i hospodárskych.“*)³²¹

Worth noticing is who defined the elements taken into account. Obviously, those who won the war. Foolowing text is by Dušan Kováč: “Part of the founding of the Czecho-Slovakian state was also defining of the borders.This way in fact Slovakia was for the first time constituted not only as a traditional notion which defined the country inhabited by Slovaks, but also as an administrative territory circled by specific borders. Historical was only the border on the North with Poland. That was in principle accepted, Polnad however compeled incorporation of some vilages in Orava and Spiš which originally belonged to Hungary. The border with Carpathian Ruthenia

³²¹ Čičaj, Viliam/Kováč, Dušan/Lipták, Lubomír/Marsina, Richard: *Slovenské dejiny*. (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1990) pp.222

on the East and with Moravia on the West was only an internal border with the Czecho-Slovakian state. The sort border sequence with Austria was with no trouble defined by the Saint Germain Treaty. More complicated was the south border with Hungary which was long discussed. The main problem was that because of long term migration of population within the historical Hungary the ethnical border did not exist and due to strong centralisation neither other border existed. Trianon Treaty from 4th June 1920 has taken into account ethnical, strategical and economical aspects and constructed a border which in fact is valid until today.“ (*„Súčasťou konštituovania sa česko-slovenského štátu bolo aj vytýčenie hraníc. Tak vlasne poprvýkrát v dejinách vzniklo Slovensko nielen jako tradičný pojem, ktorý znamenal krajinu obývanú Slovákmi, ale aj jako administratívne územie ohraničené konkrétnymi hranicami. Historická bola iba hranica na severe s Poľskom. Tá sa v zásade akceptovala, Poľsko si však vynútilo pripojenie niekoľkých obcí na Orave a Spiši, ktoré patrili pôvodne do Uhorska. Hranica s Podkarpatskou Rusou na východe a s Moravou na západe bola iba vnútornou hranicou v rámci česko-slovenského štátu. Krátky hraničný úsek s Rakúskom určila bez problémov saint-germainská zmluva. Zložitejšia bola južná hranica s Maďarskom, o ktorej sa dlho rokovalo. Hlavným problémom bolo, že vzhľadom na dlhodobú migráciu obyvateľstva v Uhorsku neexistovala etnická hranica a v dôsledku silnej centralizácie tu nebola ani nijaká iná hranica. Trianonská mierová zmluva zo 4. júna 1920 zohľadnila etnické, strategické i ekonomické aspekty a vytvorila hranicu, ktorá v zásade platí do súčasnosti.“*)³²²

Let's not forget the above mentioned authors are still probably the best authors for the period. Similar example is the following description of the industry in Slovakia after 1918: In Slovakia within the first decade of the republic tens of big factories disappeared... some of the industrial areas especially in the mountains literally changed into the „hunger valleys“ (*„V prvom desaťročí republiky zanikli na*

³²² Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.184-185

*Slovensku desiatky veľkých tovární ... Niektoré rušné priemyselné oblasti najmä v hornatých krajoch sa zmenili doslova na ,doliny hladu‘. “)*³²³ Kováč on page 194 follows a very similar scheme when referring to the inter-war Slovak industry and related issues. In all Slovak historical books this issue simply has to be talked through with a certain stress on the Slovak hardship.

The interwar national corpus starts before 1918 and relates to the situation of the country before the war. For Hungarian historiography the important is, in particular, the form of state before 1918, loyalty to that state, independence of the nation etc. In the Slovak case the stress is on national awaking and action taken by the constituted emigration in order to declare the nation existence and its aspiration to have a state of its own. Later the interpretation of specific events relates to the form of the state which was established in or after 1918. This story explains how the state was build. In Hungarian case the story starts with democratic revolution and ends by a kingdom being a subject to Trianon Treaty. In the Slovak case the corpus rather focuses on which terms the Slovaks joined Czechoslovakia which in fact also is an answer on ‘What state and why?’. On the third place is a story of aspirations. Hungarian historiography refers to the state borders and relations to the neighbours, then the corpus aims to explain home affairs including relations to other nationalities or minorities and finally the story goes on to actual aspirations in terms of territory. In the case of Slovakia this part of the corpus is more straightforward and focuses on ambitions to gain independence. On the fourth place the corpus' events relate to the beginning and position in war and to the end of war. Especially the corpus again aims to give a picture of the state at the very end of it and make him an acceptable member of the European family of nations. That, of course, in both cases is a hard task. Hungary points out the German occupation where the Slovakia points at the uprising.

³²³ Čičaj, Viliam/Kováč, Dušan/Lipták, Lubomír/Marsina, Richard: *Slovenské dejiny*. (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1990) pp. 231

Though the explanations of each symbolical event may differ according to the political orientation of the author, each event has to appear in the story and thus inevitably build the national corpus.

V. 1. a) Till 1918 – Tradition and Awakening

For Hungary the history before 1918 is rather a story of a successful kingdom gaining its position within the monarchy and reflecting and rather smoothly excepting the challenge of national awaking. Hungary gradually introduced Hungarian as an official language in both Chambers of the Parliament - at the end of 18. Century and in 1848. The original and international Latin was replaced by a national language. Later in 1867 the Hungarian Kingdom gained equal position within the Monarchy and Habsburg imperium started to be known as Austro-Hungary. The Hungarian part had nothing to complain about and crowned Habsburgs as Hungarian Kings. In 1918 the Hungarian Kingdom was loyal to its ruling dynasty.

The important events from the national corpus are the coronation and *enthronement of the Charles Habsburg as Charles IV. Hungarian in 1916* and on *16th October 1918 his note about the proposed federalism for the Austrian part of the monarchy*. The following day the former Hungarian Prime Minister *Istvan Tisza acknowledged that the Monarchy lost the war*. His famous words were 'I agree with what Count Karolyi said yesterday. We have lost this war.'³²⁴ and form a steady part of the national corpus.

In *October 1918 the King names a noble man from his family, Archduke Joseph, a "nador" ie his representative*. This role is known in Hungarian history and Archduke Joseph has his statue and even a street bearing his name in the centre of Budapest until today. Laszlo Kontler even suggests a year later Archduke Joseph considered himself a Regent: "... they (Allies) refused to recognise Friedrich

³²⁴ See Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) and others

government, because it was appointed by Archduke Joseph, nominated by Charles IV. to represent him a year before and now considering himself a Regent, which raised fears of Habsburg restoration."³²⁵

Archduke Joseph represents the king and names on *31st October 1918*, after two day civil uprising called *Aster Revolution*, *Mihaly Karolyi the Prime Minister*. This event leads to another which already tells us more about the form of the state in the interwar Hungary. On *13th November* the King declare the so called "*Eckartsau note*" which might be understood as an abdication. Some of the authors simplify this event and call it directly an abdication.³²⁶

What is an interesting moment some of the Hungarian authors stress the army situation to the extend that they incorporate every single step of it into the corpus providing its exact date and other details. Maria Ormos in her chronology placed at the end of the book mentions 7 November the date of "fegyverszunet", 13th November Belgrade Convention, 15th November Romanian troops cross of the demarcation agreed line and 8th November Czech army cross the Hungarian border.

Hungary proclaimed Republic on 16th November. Ferenc Poloskei writes: "Karolyi (Prime Minister) ...after a long and wearing mental torment has also chosen the republic form of the state." ("*Károlyi ... hosszú és kínos lelki gyötrődés után, de vállalta a köztársasági államformát is.*")³²⁷ The same author also writes: "...the revolutionary powers have forced Karolyi to the decision." ("*...a forradalmi jellegű mozgalmak Károlyit döntésre kényszerítették.*")³²⁸ On *11 January 1919 Mihaly Karolyi became a temporary president of the republic*. Very apparent in the above interpretation is the lack of willingness to establish a republic and also the role of the revolutionary anonymous mass which are keen to try the new form of the state.

³²⁵ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001pp 340

³²⁶ Ormos, Mária, *Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945* (Debrecen: 1998) pp.286

³²⁷ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.16

³²⁸ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.16

This interpretation is extremely interesting mainly because it is used by an author (and signed by a group of authors) rather influenced and interested in political left. The book consists of many data on benefits of social democracy, does include history of Hungarian and also of the international working class. However, when it comes to the Hungarian history in 1918, every author rushes to confirm the loyalty to the Monarchy and the innocence and perhaps the naivety of the Prime Minister when the country slowly slipped to the revolutionary Communism. "The allegation that Karolyi has given the power to the Communists appeared in the Horthy period ..."
*("Az az állítás és szemlélet, miszerint Károlyi átadta a hatalmat a kommunistáknak, a Horthy-korszakban terjedt el ...")*³²⁹

Certain nostalgia after the Monarchy can be found in many places in the Hungarian historiography. Period until 1914 is often regarded to as "The Happy Years of Peace" ("boldog békeidők", together with the quotes this became a title of one chapter in Magyarország Története a XX. században,)³³⁰. Its place in the nostalgic memories has also the last Hungarian King and his son. When mentioning Charles IV. in the Austrian part of the Monarchy, the person which comes up into our mind is eleventh king of Bohemia from the House of Luxembourg, and Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV. died in 1378. For Hungarian historians Charles IV. is only the one crowned in 1916. Also, when referring to the dethronisation of Charles Habsburg in 1921, three years after loosing the crowns, some authors up to the end mention all his most important titles: "The Hungarian government passed king Charles into the hands of the Entente and the English cruiser Glowworm took him with the Portuguese government consent to the Madeira island where the monarch, Austro-Hungarian Emperor and the King of Hungary on 1st April 1922 died." (*"A magyar kormány Károly királyt a szövetségesek kezébe adta, egy angol cirkáló, a Glowworm pedig a*

³²⁹ Magyarország története 1918-1990, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.22

³³⁰ Romsics, Ignác, Magyarország története a XX. században (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) pp. 11

*portugál kormánnyal kötött megállapodás értelmében Madeira szigetére szállította, ahol az uralkodó, Ausztria-Magyarország császára és Magyarország királya 1922. április 1-én meghalt.”)*³³¹

Otto Habsburg, son of the last Hungarian king, is a popular figure in Hungary until today. He has his place especially on the St Stephen's day celebrations in the St. Stephan's Cathedral in the centre of the city. Otto Habsburg made his way back to the Hungarian memory since 1989. But similarly he made his way back to Austria in late 1960's . At the beginning of 1960's Habsburg crisis divides the Austrian public opinion into two parts. Later in 1970's, when he celebrates his silver wedding in Mariazell the event becomes hugely popular by general public. Perhaps, the reason is that his return has lost its sting by then.

Slovak situation before the war is regarded to as the one of hope and hard work on the nation awakening. Part of the corpus of that time is so called *Slovak League* a group of representatives of the Slovak nation, *Memorandum* from September 1914 and also *Cleveland Agreement*. “The *Cleveland Agreement* was accepted also by the Slovaks in Russia on the meeting in Kiiiv on 19th October (1915 – note of the author) eventhough Milan Rastislav Štefánik at the end of August was convincing them about the ‘political unity Czecho-Slovakian nation’. For the independence of the Slovakia spoke repeatedly also Slovaks in Moskow and St. Petersburg. („*Clevelandskú dohodu prijali aj Slováci v Rusku na zhromaždení v Kyjeve 19.októbra (1915 – author’s note) napriek tomu, že Milan Rastislav Štefánik koncom augusta ich presvedčal „o politickej nerozdielnosti česko-slovenského národa“*. Za samostatnosť Slovenska sa opätovnie vyslovili aj Slováci v Moskve a Pertohrade.”)³³² This article seems to suggest the Cleveland Agreement was intended for the independence of the nation as opose to the joint state with Czechs. Basically,

³³¹ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 98

³³² Ďurica, Milan Stanislav: *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov*. (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp. 113

all these formal document in one way or another proclaimed Slovak independence as a nation and also the nation's right to choose its own path in the future. I assume it is a choice of the author how to interpret and some right wing authors repeatedly choose to document the nations independence.

It is interesting to compare the above article with writing of Dušan Kováč: “Štefánik however, by his enourmous effort and tenaciousness managed to overcome the disagreement between the countrymen and convince them to support *Czecho-Slovakian National Assembly in Paris*. (1916 – note of the author) 29th August 1916 the countrymen by the *Kiiv Agreement* this act definitely completed. („Štefánikovi sa však enormným úsilím podarilo a húževnatosťou podarilo prekonať rozpory medzi krajamni a získať ich pre podporu Česko-slovenskej národnej rady v Paríži. (1916 – author's note) 29. augusta 1916 tzv. Kyjevskou dohodou krajanía v Rusku tento akt završili.“)³³³

The following events usually play a role of the documents proving independent politics of the Slovak political representation before establishing of the state. In the *spring 1918* Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk traveled to the United States to secure public support of the Czech and Slovak representations to create a joint state. Representatives of Slovenska Liga, České Národní Sdružení and Svaz Českých Katolíků eventually agreed a joint proclamation known as *Pittsburg Agreement*.

Another important event in the interwar Slovak history is *St Martin's Declaration*. St Martin (Turčanský Svätý Martin) was traditionally linked with Slovak national awakening. The Slovak National Party met here already in *May 1918* to discuss the future of the country and the nation. From this meeting the most quoted *speech* is the following by *Andrej Hlinka*: It is necessary for us to say clearly whetehr we will go further with Hungarian or with Czechs. Let's not avoid this question, let's say clearly we are for the Czechoslovak orientation. The thousand year marriage with

³³³ Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.167

Hungarians collapsed. We have to part.“ (*„Nutno nám určite vysloviť, či pôjdeme naďalej s Maďarmi alebo s Čechmi. Neobchádzajme otázku, povedzme otvorene, že sme pre orientáciu československú. Tisícročné manželstvo s Maďarmi sa nevydarilo. Musíme sa rozísť.“*)³³⁴ Particularly the last two sentences are a traditional part of the Slovak national corpus for that period.

On 30th October 1918 the “representatives of the Slovak nation”³³⁵ gathered in St Martine called together by Slovak National Party. The main aim was to fund a *Slovak National Assembly* who would formally represent the national and its political aspirations. Often in the historiography it is recalled that a similar secret assembly was funded earlier that year (12th September 1918) in Budapest from the initiative of Matúš Ďula. According to Špiez the Assembly meeting in October is characterized as following: Slovak National Party members were in considerable majority. It was confidential and had character of conspiracy.” (*„Výraznú početnú prevahu v nej mali členovia Slovenskej národnej strany. Mala dôverný a konšpiratívny charakter.“*)³³⁶ The Assembly was successfully established and a *Declaration* was agreed and announced. In the late hours of that day Milan Hodža brought a news that the state of Czech and Slovaks was already declared. Again, a narrower group of the Assembly gathered which amended the Declaration accordingly: On the basis of this principle we express our consent with this newly established international situation which was declared on 18th October 1918 by president Wilson and which was accepted on 27th October 1918 by the Austro-Hungarian minister of foreign affairs.” (*„Na základe tejto zásady prejavujeme svoj súhlas s tým novo utvoreným medzinárodným položením, ktoré dňa 18. októbra 1918 formuloval prezident Wilson a ktoré dňa 27. októbra 1918*

³³⁴ Quoted by most authors if not in full, compare Kováč, Dušan: *Dějiny Slovenska*, LN, Praha 1998, str. 174

³³⁵ An expression used by most authors if not in full, compare Kováč, Dušan: *Dějiny Slovenska*, LN, Praha 1998, str. 176

³³⁶ Špiez, Anton: *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp.138

uznal rakúsko-uhorský minister zahraničia.“) ³³⁷ Slovak representatives declared their consent with the common state. The Declaration of St Martin and The Pittsburg Agreement became the key mottos in the interwar agitating for so called “Slovak question” and their symbolic value can be felt until today.

Apart from the relationship with Czech the historiography also mentions an explains relationship of the Slovak nation with Hungary, namely the *speech of Ferdiš Jurig in the Hungarian Parliament*, and the relationship with Russia, namely *professor Ján Kvačala at the university in Jurijev* (Tartu, Estonia). Generally, all texts regarding the period up till 1918 aims to document other options at the time of establishing of the state than joining the state with Czechs. In comparison with the Czech historiography the last two are facts probably never mentioned in the Czech historiography dealing with that period.

Finally, the war itself was reflected as a time of suffering and the experience was most regretted. Interestingly, many books mention a similar war-reminder: a poem by Pavol Országh-Hviezdoslav called *Blody Sonnets* (Krvavé sonety). ³³⁸

V. 1. b) The New State and Its Form

The *Hungarian Communist Republic (21 March 1919-1 August 1919)* is not praised by any leading Hungarian author. On *20 March 1919* The Great Entente has forwarded to Hungary a so called “*Vix note*” demanding withdrawal from territories which according to Paris Conference belong to new neighboring states. This worked as a catalyst: the democracy was discredited for not being able to save the country and the Communists took over. The Entente is to blame: “...they forced the government which proclaimed Soviet Republic and refused the Vix note into negotiations.” (“...a *Szovjet-Ország szövetséget hirdető s a Vix-jegyzeket elutasító tanácskormányal*

³³⁷ Compare for example Kováč, Dušan and other authors

³³⁸ Compare Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.162

*alkudozásokba kényszerültek.")*³³⁹

"Wilsonism being compromised, proletarian internationalism seemed to be an antidote of national disaster, and Karolyi appealed to the Social Democrats to lend greater weight to the decision by assuming sole government responsibility."³⁴⁰ Maria Ormos sums up: "Founding of the new, independent, Hungarian state was not successful; in circumstances between partially Peoples Republic and partially Soviet Republic almost the whole Hungarian left wing disintegrated." (*"Az új, független magyar államot nem sikerült megalapozni, ám részben a 'népköztársaság', részben a 'tanácsköztársaság' körülményei között felmorzsolódott szinte az egész magyar baloldal."*)³⁴¹

The same way Hungary went through certain difficulties when identifying the state form in 1918-19 repeated a year later. Events around 1919-1920 declare authors' position towards the interwar regime and how it became reality. Certain historians have little difficulties with accepting the new regime - a kingdom without a king - others see the lost opportunity to establish a truth democracy. In late *summer 1919* The Great Entente sent British Minister for Foreign Affairs Sir George Clerk to Hungary and its neighbours to help to settle the matters in the Danube basin." *The Clerk mission* having been sent to Hungary meant certain compromise in The Entente Hungarian politics. ... gave up the former aim the plan to establish in civic democratic system in Hungary. " (*A Clerk-misszió Magyarországra küldése tehát az antant-hatalmak magyarországi politikájának bizonyos kompromisszumát jelentette. ... feladta korábbi célkitűzését, a polgári demokratikus berendezésű Magyarország létrehozásának tervét."*)³⁴²

³³⁹ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 24

³⁴⁰ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp 334

³⁴¹ Ormos, Mária, *Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945* (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 64-65

³⁴² *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.38

The kingdom was established thanks to the Entente indulgence and interest in stability and was established by "contra-revolution" i.e. not by the people, by the inhabitants: "... the Hungarian contra-revolutionary powers together proclaimed a kingdom." ("*... a magyarországi ellenforradalmi erők egységesen a királyság proklamálását követelték...*")³⁴³ The *contra-revolution* started as an *Anti-Bolshevik Committee established on 12 April 1919* in Vienna by Istvan Bethlen and in Arad respectively Szeged the *opposition government led by Gyula Karolyi since 5 May 1919*. Two days after the resignation of the Communist Government on 1 August 1919 *Romanian army occupies Budapest (3 August-16 November 1919)*. The Entente initiate negotiations and as a result *Miklos Horthy*, the head of the *contra-revolutionary army enters the capital city on 16 November 1919*.

An important part of the narrative about this particular period is so called '*White terror*' carried out by either the government succeeding the Communists or by the army, Miklos Horthy or all of them. "Thirdly (after the government and the Romanians - remark of the author), there was the National Army of Horthy, who transferred his now independent headquarters to Transdanubia and refused to surrender to the government. Without any title, the army controlled and gave orders to the local authorities, and its most notorious detachments were the instruments of naked terror. In three months, they may have killed as many as two thousands actual or suspected former Soviet members, Red Army soldiers, and sometimes individuals who were in no way associated with the proletarian dictatorship, but were Jews. Besides the executions and lynching, about seventy thousand people were imprisoned or sent to internment camps during the same period."³⁴⁴

Eventually *Horthy is elected a regent on 1 March 1920*. However controversial this regime is for most of the authors it has to be dealt with: "Born out of

³⁴³ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.42

³⁴⁴ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 340

unbridled terror, the Horthy regime owed its very existence perhaps less to international support than to international contingencies, and in spite of its roots in the extreme right it bore the imprint of the priorities of the western peacemakers that assisted at its inception even in the 30's when the changing international atmosphere made it lean ever more heavily back towards those roots. The emblematic figure of the period embodied these contradictions appropriately enough." ³⁴⁵

Laszlo Kontler carries on about Horthy: "The emblematic figure of the period embodied these contradictions appropriately enough. ...he temporarily took the helm of the radical anti-parliamentarian aspirations of the Christian (that is, non-Jewish) middle-class ...These engagements and inclinations made him a suitable partner of Hitler in the 30's, although, throughout, he was also a hesitant one. For his cast of mind was fundamentally conservative and traditionalist."³⁴⁶ The return to the Monarchy is confirmed and the regent is elected; the question of the king figure still remains open.

In 1921 Charles Habsburg makes two attempts for restoration of his dynasty and enters the country on 26 March and on 20 October. Both attempts are unsuccessful and are followed by the detronisation of the dynasty in Hungary in November. "The royal coups were the last, rather pathetic tremors of the earthquake that shook Hungary in the aftermath of the First World War, and their outcome helped the consolidation of Hungary's international position and domestic consolidation along the lines envisaged by Bethlen." and "The new Prime Minister (Bethlen) stood his first major test in October 1921, when the ex-monarch attempted a second coup. This time Charles did not intend to bargain with Horthy." ³⁴⁷

Kontler sums up: "...the flaws and shortcomings of the peace treaty system dictated by the Allies confirmed, and lent credibility to, the inherent nationalism and

³⁴⁵ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 345

³⁴⁶ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 345

³⁴⁷ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 348-349

revisionism of the conservative regime that became consolidated thereafter."³⁴⁸

Kontler also blames Allies and the Trianon Peace not only for discrediting of democracy but also for nationalism and revisionism. The later two however made a great revival three quarter of a century later when it is difficult to tract the causes to event as distant as the First World War.

The same time is reflected in Slovakia as a period of joining the Czechoslovakia but question remains on which terms. Twice the situation in the region was challenged by a *military confrontation between Hungary and the states of Czechs and Slovaks*. First it was at the end of 1918 when the Hungarian administrative and executive powers were still present at the Slovak territory. St Martin was occupied by Hungary and the chairman of the Slovak National Assembly Matúš Dula was taken into custody. At the end of the year the capital was freed and together with the army *government of Vavro Šrobár* has taken its place. In spring 1919 Communist took power in Hungary and started an offensive; within several weeks the Hungarian forces occupied almost one third of Slovak territory. *In June 1919 in Prešov Slovak Republic of Councils (Soviet Republic)* was proclaimed. The expansion of the Hungarian armed forces was stopped only by the Entente. "When the Czecho-Slovak army launched a counter attack it started to push Hungarians home." (*„Keď nastúpila česko-slovenská armáda do protiofenzívy, začala Maďarov tlačiť domov.“*)³⁴⁹ Lt-Col Vyx demanded that the Hungarian army leaves Slovakia. This is the so called "*Vyx note*", in fact an ultimatum which is admitted by Slovak historians³⁵⁰. It is an essential part on the Hungarian national corpus, well know in Slovak historiography and going almost unmentioned in Czech historiography. This case is similar to the later case of lord Rothermerer in 1928, also almost un-noticed by

³⁴⁸ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp.325

³⁴⁹ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp.143

³⁵⁰ Compare with Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998)

Czech historiography. It is apparent that for Slovak history as well as historiography the situation in the neighbouring Hungary required and still requires most attention. In Košice V. Dvortsák proclaimed Slovak People's Republic (*Slovenska lidova republika*) in December 1918; also a fact almost unmentioned by Czech historiography perhaps, because it harms picture of Czecho-Slovakian unity at that time.

Another matter dealt with in the Slovak historiography for the period are the national proportions within the country. The main aim is to establish how many Slovaks were there in early 1920's. This can always be only an estimate as not the Slovak nationality was an option on the list, but Czechoslovakian nationality only. Important are some of the numbers which are supposed to show a *new national ratio*. Often for the above reason the actual numbers are avoided.³⁵¹ A. Špiez in 1930 claims 70,4% Slovaks³⁵² being in the country but he admits that the Czechs are not included in the statistics.

Historically, for the first time *the borders of Slovakia* were defined. "Trianon Treaty from 4th June 1920 has taken into account ethnical, strategical and economical aspects and constructed a border which in fact is valid until today." („*Trianonská mierová zmluva zo 4. júna 1920 zohľadnila etnické, strategické i ekonomické aspekty a vytvorila hranicu, ktorá fakticky platí súčasnosti.*")³⁵³ This formulation often repeated in the historiography is particularly interesting if compared with the Hungarian notes. Hungarian historiography claim exactly the opposite and complains that the ethnical , strategical and economical aspects were not taken into account. The difference of the two approaches is here the most remarkable.

³⁵¹ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) etc.

³⁵² Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp.142

³⁵³ Kováč, Dušan *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 185

In May 1919 Milan Rastislav Štefánik died in an airplane crash and a legend about his mysterious death and possible assassination spread immediately. It is very likely it was an intended shot down because Štefánik due to his approach to Masaryk and Beneš in the last phase of the resistance in particular with regards to the question of position of Slovakia as well as to his own position in the new state became a non-convenient partner with whom they did not know what to do.“ (*„Je veľmi pravdepodobné, že išlo o úmyselné zostrelenie letadla, lebo Štefánik svojimi postojmi vôči Masarykovi a Benešovi v poslednej fázi odboja najmä v otázke postavenia Slovenska, ale aj v otázke osobnej pozície v novom štáte sa stal nepohodlným partnerom, s ktorým si nevedeli rady.“*)³⁵⁴

“*Maďaróni*” (plural) are very specific phenomenon in Slovak historiography and a word itself is not recognized by other than Slovak Word processor. The word describes those Slovaks who in some way served or worked for Hungarians. In another words “Slovaks in Hungarian service”. The most famous names in Slovak historiography are Viktor Dvortsák and František Jehlicska. The names not only are not known in Czech historiography, they are not known in Hungarian either. Both men are simply in another service now. Their names serve as symbols of failed national loyalty. The later - František Jehlicska – even helped Andrej Hlinka to travel to Paris Peace Conference with a faked Polish passport. Though Hlinka undoubtedly contributed to the Slovak nation in his political career are also negative moments. For example he got with a Polish passport to the Paris Peace Conference to fight there for the rights of the Slovaks. But the diplomatic stand was for a simple village vicar too slippery. Though some participants listened to him politely, he was fully sized by Beneš and for Hlinka this resulted in several month prison. Neither in choosing people for the trip was he fortunate. F. Jedlička turned out to be an agent of Hungarian irendent who never returned back home. Not very fortunate was he regarding Vojtech

³⁵⁴ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp. 110

Tuka who was sentenced to 15 years for high treason. Hlinka stand fully by him, visited him in the prison and called him a Slovak martyr. In 1950's Hungarian institutions allowed our historians into their archives where they found documents confirming that Tuka worked as a Hungarian agent.“ (*„I keď sa Hlinka nepochybne zaslúžil o slovenský národ, trba vedieť, že v jeho politickej kariére sú aj negatívne momenty. Napríklad roku 1919 sa dostal s poľským pasom na parížsku mierovú konferenciu, aby tam bojoval za práva Slovákov. Ale diplomatická pôda bola pre jednoduchého vidieckeho farára príliš klzká. Hoci ho niektorí účastníci zdvorilo vypočuli, plne sa na nej presadil Beneš a pre Hlinku z toho vyplynulo viacmesačné väzenie. Ani při výbere osôb na túto cestu nemal Hlinka šťastie. Z F. Jedličku sa vyklul agent maďarskej iredenty, ktorý sa domov už nevrátil. Nie príliš šťastný výber mal aj čo sa týka dr. Vojtecha Tuku, ktorého odsúdili za vlastizradu na 15 rokov väzenia. Hlinka sa za neho úplne postavil, navštívil ho aj vo väzení a označoval ho za slovenského martýra. V päťdesiatych rokoch však maďarské inštitúcie pustili do archívov našich historikov, kde našli dokumenty, že Tuka pracoval jako agent v prospech Maďarov.“*)³⁵⁵

An extra chapter in any Slovak synthesis is always dedicated to the Constitution from 1920 which is viewed as the main clashing point. In this constitution the idea of a united Czechoslovakian nation was fixed (though introduced much earlier) which implied that no autonomy and no federation was in plans. Charters with headings „Ústava z roku 1920 – Problém spoločného štátu“³⁵⁶ tell the story for themselves. Kováč's synthesis tells the story of „centraly and unitarily organised state“ (*„centralisticky a unitaristicky organizovaný štát“*).

An extremely important phenomenon in Slovak historiography is *Slovak People's Party (Slovenská ľudová strana)* and since 1925 Hlinka's Slovak People's

³⁵⁵ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp.146

³⁵⁶ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.187

Party (HSLS). „The People’s Party was not by its leadership linked as much to the new political representation as other groups of the Slovak urban population and inteligensia were; that is why it soon realised the need of specific administration of the country so different from Czech countries as the Slovakia was.“ (*„Ľudová strana nebola svojím vedením natoľko zviazaná s novou politickou reprezentáciou jako iné skupiny slovenského meštiactva a inteligencie, preto si skôr uvedomila potrebu osobitnej správy územia od Čiech tak odlišného, jako je Slovensko.“*)³⁵⁷ The party in 1925 achieved 34% and took over social-democracy. In the following years the party became the most powerful party in the country. Usually it is mentioned in the first place in a chapter about Slovak political parties or Slovak political life.

Similar attention is dedicated also to the main three leading personalities of the party *A. Hlinkov, V. Tuka and J. Tisovi*. Usually a short portrait of all three is drawn and that is even in the case it is going to be a negative one. In the case of Tuka it is accepted even by the right wing historiography that he was not exactly an example of a national hero: „Not very fortunate was he (Hlinka – note of the author) regarding Vojtech Tuka who was sentenced to 15 years for high treason. Hlinka stand fully by him, visited him in the prison and called him a Slovak martyr. In 1950’s Hungarian institutions allowed our historians into their archives where they found documents confirming that Tuka worked as a Hungarian agent.“ (*„Nie príliš šťastný výber mal (Hlinka – pozn. Autora) aj čo sa týka dr. Vojtecha Tuku, ktorého odsúdili za vlastizradu na 15 rokov väzenia. Hlinka sa za neho úplne postavil, navštívil ho aj vo väzení a označoval ho za slovenského martýra. V päťdesiatych rokoch však maďarské inštitúcie pustili do archívov našich historikov, kde našli dokumenty, že Tuka pracoval jako agent v prospech Maďarov.“*)³⁵⁸ Tuka became „...editor-in-chief of the centre of the daily paper Slovak and he was appointed to prepare a proposal of

³⁵⁷ *Slovensko I – Dejiny* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1971) pp. 656

³⁵⁸ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp.146

the autonomy. In 1922 he founded within the People's Party so called Rodobrana, a group of uniformed, mainly young fanatical nationalists, potential bearers of ideological and physical aggression and terror. “ („... šéfredaktorom ústredného orgánu denníka Slováč a bol poverený vypracovaním návrhu autonómie. Roku 1922 založil v rámci ľudovej strany tzv. Rodobranu, skupinu uniformovaných, zväčša mladých fanatických nacionalistov, potencionálnych nositeľov ideovej a fyzickej agresivity a teroru. “)³⁵⁹

Slovak People's Party prepared a *proposal for Slovakia autonomy* to the National Council already in 1922. “Immediately after 1918 in Czech countries and Slovakia a stereotype of the end of the 300-year long respectively 1000-year long Czech respectively Slovak suppression was born. Since then in Slovakia the stereotype of 1000-year long humiliation has successfully grown – at least by another 75 years.” („*Hned v roku 1918 sa v Čechách i na Slovensku zrodil stereotyp o skončení 300-ročného, resp. 1000-ročného útlaku českého, resp. slovenského národa. Odvtedy na Slovensku stereotyp o 1000-ročnej porobe utešene narástol – prinajmenším o ďalších 75 rokov.* “)³⁶⁰

V. 1. c) State aspirations and relations

The same way many changing points of the war are by some authors included into the national corpus some of the border or territory situations become a part of the corpus too. *1-2 December 1918* Romanian National Assembly declare ... (in Engl) *Transylvania (Erdély) and Partium integrated into the Romanian Kingdom. 6 December 1918* “on the basis of Hungarian-Slovak agreement in the Upper Country is the demarcation border declared more or less on the ethnical basis.” (*A magyar-szlovák megállapodással a Felvidéken nagyjából az etnikai határok mentén jelölnek ki*

³⁵⁹ *Dejiny Slovenska V* (Bratislava: Veda, 1985) pp. 93

³⁶⁰ Kamenec, Ivan, *Stereotypy vnímania česko-slovenských vzťahov v realite a v historiografii*, in: *Československo 1918-1938* (Praha: HÚ AV ČR, 1999)

demarkációs vonalat.)³⁶¹ This is not accepted by the Czechoslovakian Minister of Foreign Affairs and further actions are taken on 23 December.³⁶² After the Vix note and the *foundation of the Communist Republic in March 1919 Romania starts its offensive on 16th April and on 27th April Czechoslovakia crosses the demarcation line.* “9th May 1919 started the soviet government’s so called Eastern Attack which re-captured the Eastern part of the Upper Country and 10th June reached Polish border. 16th June in Eperjes (Presov (Sk) – author’s note) Slovak Soviet Republic was proclaimed.” (*“9th May 1919 megindul a tanácskormány ún. északi hadjárata, amely a Felvidék keleti felének visszafoglalásával jár, s június 10-én eléri a lengyel határt. Június 16-án Eperjesen kikiáltják a szlovák Tanácsköztársaságot.”*)³⁶³

The Hungarian offensive is eventually weakened and the Communist Government resign. Two days on 3rd August 1919 Romanian troops occupy Budapest only to leave on 16th November 1919 after Miklos Horthy's return to the city is approved by the Entente. The country returns to its original state form and Miklos Horthy is elected a Regent. Subsequently Trianon Treaty is signed on 4 June 1920 and at the end of the year adopted by the Parliament. Most of the Hungarian authors believe in the power of numbers and sums up the *Trianon Treaty* rather shortly: "The peace treaty, signed.... by two representatives of the Hungarian government who did not want to take part in public life in the future (what a remark! – author’s note), deprived Hungary of two-thirds of its former territory (without Croatia) and nearly sixty per cent of its population, including thirty per cent of ethnic Hungarians. Besides its new neighbours (Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom - later Yugoslavia - and Austria) even Italy (Fiume) and Poland obtained some of its former territory, now reduced from 282,000 to 93,000 square kilometres, with only

³⁶¹ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp.288

³⁶² Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp.288

³⁶³ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp.288

7,6 million of the former 18,2 million inhabitants."³⁶⁴ The power of the Trianon Treaty is enormous; the issue is not only the peace itself but all its consequences and its power which it still has over the generations. We believe the Trianon Treaty is a central point of the interwar Hungarian historiography and we will dedicate a special chapter to the issue.

On 14 August 1920 Czechoslovakia signs a treaty with the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians. Two following treaties between the Kingdom and Romania and Romania and Czechoslovakia establish the so called *Small Entente*. "From the point of view of the Italian Central-European influence and the Hungarian revision plans the task of the greatest importance was to divert Austria from its French-Czechoslovakian orientation. ... However, the planned military putsch eventually became unnecessary, the Austrian home politics anyway in spring 1929 turned right." (*"A közép-európai olasz befolyás és a magyar revíziós tervek szempontjából egyaránt elsőrendű fontosságú feladat volt Ausztria eltérítése a francia-csehszlovák orientációtól. ... A tervezett katonai puccs azonban végül is szükségtelenné vált, az osztrák belpolitika ugyanis 1929 őszére jobbra tolódott."*)³⁶⁵

On 21st March 1921 Charles Habsburg attempted a return to Hungary but was not successful; better prepared and also ready to use an army force he made his second attempt on 20th October 1921. Both returns had broad international consequences. "The new Prime Minister (Bethlen) stood his first major test in October 1921, when the ex-monarch attempted a second coup. This incident once again gave occasion for Hungary's new neighbours to clamour for tough measures,..."³⁶⁶ "The Hungarian government passed king Charles into the hands of the Entente and the English cruiser Glowworm took him with the Portuguese government consent to

³⁶⁴ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 342

³⁶⁵ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 60

³⁶⁶ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 348

the Madeira island where the monarch, Austro-Hungarian Emperor and the King of Hungary on 1st April 1922 died.” (*"A magyar kormány Károly királyt a szövetségesek kezébe adta, egy angol cirkáló, a Glowworm pedig a portugál kormánnyal kötött megállapodás értelmében Madeira szigetére szállította, ahol az uralkodó, Ausztria-Magyarország császára és Magyarország királya 1922. április 1-én meghalt."*)³⁶⁷ The little closing note speaks for itself. Maria Ormos is carried away by nostalgia and calls Charles Habsburg yet again Hungarian King.

Istvan Bethlen established his *first government* on 14th April 1921 and eventually kept his post for another ten years (until 1931). “Bethlen did not question the past of the ‘Contrarevolution’; as a state he stressed task the nation building and the economic growth.” (*"Bethlen nem kérdekedett 'ellenforradalmár' múltjával, ő a nemzetépítést, a gazdasági fölemelkedést hangsúlyozta állami feladatként."*)³⁶⁸ To achieve his goals Bethlen had to achieve a stabilized political environment. He achieved that in two steps. First, on 22 December 1921 was signed so called *Bethlen-Payer Pact* between the government and Social Democracy. “This so much discussed document limited the party action freedom but it had also an advantage that the social democrats freed from the ghetto into which they got due to their role with the Soviet Republic, due to White Terror brutality and finally due to the neglect of the elections.” (*"E sokat vitatott okmány kétségtelenül korlátozta a párt cselekvési szabadságát, de megvolt az előnye, hogy a szociáldemokratákat kiszabadította a gettóból, amibe pártjuk a Tanácsköztársaságban vállalt szerepe, a fehérterror brutalitásai és végül a választások negligálás miatt belekerült."*)³⁶⁹ The next step to a stabilized political environment was a strong leading party. On 2nd February 1922 governmental *United Party* was established. Until the WWII it has changed its name several times, but always remained the governmental party and kept its majority in the

³⁶⁷ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 98

³⁶⁸ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 92

³⁶⁹ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 100

Parliament.

"The two-third Parliament majority did place a significant power into the hands of Bethlen and his successors. However, against all that we can not speak about a party or a Prime Minister dictatorship." (*A kétharmados parlamenti többség igen jelentős hatalmat adott Bethlen és utódjai kezébe. Párt- vagy kormányelnöki diktatúráról azonban ennek ellenére sem beszélhetünk.*)³⁷⁰ A careful equilibrium was established. "...the old conservative-liberal landowning and capitalist elite gradually returned to the political scene and overshadowed the extreme right until the 30's, when the influence of the victors of the First World War in the Danubian Basin also shifted into the hands of Nazi Germany and fascist Italy."³⁷¹

Also Horthy has its ways how to attract and award steady social group of the new regime supporters. He focused mainly on conservative middle class. "... Horthy established the 'Order of Heroes', that is, those who had proved their commitment to Christian and national values (and their loyalty to the Regent) by distinguishing themselves in the fight against revolution."³⁷²

As a part of promoting national values Hungary slipped down the way of discrimination and also of antisemitism. Hungarian historiography usually forgets to mention any minorities on its territory before 1940 (II. Vienna arbitration) but does not forget to mention Jewish bills. Hungary was the first country in the interwar Europe to introduce in 1920 *numerus clausus* restricting number of Jewish population in certain occupations and in university education. Laszlo Kontler comments the *numerus clausus*: "But even in 1920, besides pressure and administrative action against the right wing radical organisations, measures to placate the anti-Semitic Christian middle class (as well as the 'people of the puszta') were needed to create

³⁷⁰ Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) pp. 226

³⁷¹ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 345

³⁷² Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 347

stability."³⁷³ The numerus clausus was modified in 1928 and three Jewish bills followed in 1938, 1939 and 1941. Overall anti-semitism is often explained in many different ways: "The politikai palette only just fulfilled in 1918 and immediately also emptied. At the same time the idea of democracy and republic was shaken. Because these ideas were represented (also) by a lot of Jewish intelligencia, there were exceptionally many Jews– this is by the way a superstition - among the leading persons of the soviet power, in Hungarian history for the first time anti-Semitism spread among the wide population." (*"Alighogy feltöltődött a politikai paletta 1918-ban, azonnal ki is ürült. Ezzel együtt megrendült a demokrácia és a köztársaság gondolata is. Mivel ezeket az ideákat sok zsidó értelmiségi (is) képviselte, a tanácsuralom vezető személyiségei között pedig különösen sok volt - az egyébként hitehagyott - zsidó, a magyar történelemben első ízben izzott fel széles körökben az antiszemitizmus."*)³⁷⁴

Where the Jewish bills were expected to keep an order and ensure stability; several affairs in the interwar Hungary had very much an opposite affect. In May 1926 French Frank forge scandal broke out. "In December 1925, a Hungarian diplomatic courier was arrested as he tried to exchange a false one thousand franc note at The Hague. ... the idea ... came from right-wing army officers... The opposition hoped in vain that the international consternation caused by the forged francs affair would sweep the Bethlen government away: ..." ³⁷⁵ Yet again for illustration how 'obvious' certain parts of the national corpus are this is what Maria Ormos writes about French Frank forge scandal (she does not mention even a word more on the topic). "The forge scandal in 1996 was closed by a trial which disclosed the circumstances and brought partial execution, but during which every speech was cleverly cut at the point when the upper classes – the Army leadership, the

³⁷³ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 348

³⁷⁴ Ormos, Mária, *Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945* (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 65

³⁷⁵ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 354

government - would have been mentioned. By the way the scandal was much more than an entertaining intermezzo how it is regarded by most people. From the foreign policy point of view it was in fact incredibly harmful and its affect in Western Europe lasted for almost two years.” (*"A hamisítási botrány 1926-ban perrel zárult le, amely feltárta az események és a végrehajtók egy részét, de amelynek során minden szílat gondosan elváltak azokon a pontokon, ahol már felsőbb körök - vezérkar, kormány - felelőssége kerülhetett volna szóba. A botrány egyébként sokkal több volt szórakoztató intermezzónál, aminek többnyire tekintik."*)³⁷⁶

Another destabilizing event was a *13th September 1931 Szilvester Matuszka's bombing of a Biatorbagyi bridge* under an international train from Vienna. 22 died and Hungary introduced martial law which lasted for another year. 1931 was also a year when Bethen eventually lost the elections and after ten years in the Prime Minister position was replaced. Hungary was affected by international crisis and a new era of fulfilling the country territorial ambitions started.

In the second half of 1920's Hungary already moved into a category of politically acceptable states and started to voice its aspirations. In 1926 League of Nations stopped its financial and a year later its army supervision over the country. “In relation to the idea of the ‘nation’ in practice there was not a legal party at work which would not accept it. However, there was no country in Europe either which would not be conquered by nationalism at the time.” (*"Ami a 'nemzeti' eszmét illeti, gyakorlatilag nem működött az országban legális párt, amely ne vallotta volna. Amint egyébként Európa-szerte sem akadt ország, ahol a nacionalizmus ne hódított volna ebben az időben."*)³⁷⁷ Maria Ormos obviously acknowledges the strong national viewpoint of that time, but an attempt to make it make it sound less exceptional in Hungary by pointing at other European states seems to be a little bit out of place. In

³⁷⁶ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 119

³⁷⁷ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 118

Hungary as well as any other country who lost the war the nationalism was obviously much stronger due to territorial and other punishment suffered by the Peace Treaty. "The most noisy from this point of view were those who believed and spread 'No, no, never' and 'Everything back' slogans, their circles however did not cross over from the extreme right wing groups." (*"A leghangosabbnak e tekintetben a 'Nem, nem, soha' és a 'Mindent vissza' szlogeneknek a megfogalmazói és terjesztői voltak, ezek köre azonban nem lépte túl a szélsőséges jobboldaliak csoportjait."*)³⁷⁸ Yet again this is an attempt to make Hungarian jingoism and interwar nationalism less extensive (nationwide acceptable) and less final.

In summer 1927 lord Rothermere published in *Daily Mail* an article to support Hungarian Peace Treaty revision. Following the new publicity the Hungarian Prime Minister *Istvan Bethlen* officially declares the aim of the government's foreign policy - the revision. "During 1927 and 1928, instead of 'self-denial' required by the circumstances, Bethlem emphasised the need for new borders with increasing frequency."³⁷⁹

Hungarian right wing became more and more powerful "... the period saw the establishment of ...the *Party of national Will* by *Ferenc Szalasi*, a cashier officer, in 1935."³⁸⁰ Actually Szalasi established several parties and it was rather his figure and ideas and movements which attracts attention that the parties which so often changed their names themselves. For non-Hungarian historiography this is an important figure representing extreme right; for the Hungarian historiography referring to 30's it is one of if not many then several. Other parties turning to the strong led right were Count Fidel Palffy's United Natinal Socialist Party or earlier Gombos' Party of Racial Defence. *Gombos* also re-organised the governemnt party

³⁷⁸ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 118

³⁷⁹ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 356

³⁸⁰ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 356

and re-named it as the *Party of National Unity*. This was followed again with a move to establishing a totalitarian mass party.

In order to achieve its ambitions the country needed strong international links and made those with countries with similar intentions. On 5th April 1927 Hungary-Italy Friendship Agreement was signed. “During this (agreement meeting – author’s note) Mussolini and Bethlen agreed that the after-war status quo can not be kept on the long run and they thought that international situation will perhaps around 1935 become to change.” (*“Ennek során Mussolini és Bethlen egyetértett abban, hogy a háború utáni status quo hosszabb távon fenntarthatatlan, és úgy vélekedtek, hogy a nemzetközi élet 1935 táján lendül majd mozgásba.”*)³⁸¹. The period of early 1930's is often referred to as 'temptation' or 'dangerous temptation'. (*“kísérletek” or “veszélyes kísérletek”*)³⁸². On 21st February 1934 Hungary and Germany sign an economic agreement. Not a full month later on 17th March 1934 Hungary-Italy-Germany agreement was signed in Rome. Perhaps, already then the future of Hungary was sealed. “There is no doubt that in autumn 1932 Gombos counted on Hitler coming into power and from that he expected the international situation to get hot and open a chance for revision.” (*“Nem kétséges, hogy 1932 őszén Gombos számított Hitler hatalomra kerülésére, és ettől a nemzetközi élet felforrósodását és a revízió lehetőségének megnyílását várta.”*)³⁸³

As a part of its international ambitions Hungary got to the point of solving the head of the state question. Horthy seemed to be well established in his chair, however the time needed a leader with more and stronger competencies and also his role was only temporary (however long it already lasted). In 1933, 1937 - two bills about extension of the regent's competencies and about the election of the regent. “A discussion developed around the heir bill because on more sides it was feared that it

³⁸¹ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 124

³⁸² Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 147

³⁸³ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 152

will serve the purpose of establishing Horthy's dynasty .. Whatever was the truth in the issue, the gossip damaged the case and the face of Istvan Horthy, and it caused a lot of difficulties for passing the bill in question." (*"A vita az utódajánlási jog körül alakult ki, mivel több oldalon is tartottak tőle, hogy ez gyakorlatilag a Horthy-dinasztia megalapozását szolgálja, ... Bármi volt is e téren a valóság, e híresztelések rontották Horthy István arcát és esélyét, és nehézségeket jelentettek a szóban levő törvénytervezet elfogadtatása körül is."*)³⁸⁴ However, on 19 February 1942 Regent's son Istvan Horthy was elected a successor. Six months later died on the Eastern Front.

Slovakia did not have an easy road in 20's and 30's either. At least that is how the period is presented. It was a journey to autonomy and final, though controversial, independence. For the future the biggest demonstration backing the independence was to become the celebration of the *anniversary of the foundation of Pribina's Church in Nitra in 1933*.

In January 1927 the Hlinka's Slovak People's Party (HSLS) joined the government. It was the second post-elections government and the party became a member on the basis of the 1925 elections. The party actually received the largest proportion of ballots, though not a majority. Apart from them into the political life stepped also the Communist Party. Czechoslovakia was the only Central-European country where the Communist Party could formally exist. The results of the elections boosted the confidence of HSLS and at the same time the so called „Slovak question“ became a public topic. The process was similar to the raising of the Hungarian territorial claims and discussions about them in 1928. The HSLS sharpened its rhetorics.

From this atmosphere came one of the biggest affairs of the interwar Slovakia – *Tuka's Affair in 1928*. Let's not forget that Slovakia was an ingral part of a Czechoslovakian state and whatever the feelings for the state were, the centre of the

³⁸⁴ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 174

power was to be found in Prague and that is where any quest for Slovak autonomy was strongly disregarded. Vojtech Tuka, the main editor of the party's magazine *Slovák*. In the December issue he published an article *Vacuum Iuris* where he evoked a spirit of St Martin's Declaration. In the Declaration there was a secret attachment he claimed. The attachment guaranteed to Slovakia the right after ten years of the common state with Czech to re-consider whether the Slovaks will stay in the state or whether they will create a state of their own. Tuka now reminded the nation that the ten years is over and Slovakia formally ceased to be a part of Czechoslovakia.

Yet again Slovak students know everything on the topic, yet their Czech colleagues have hardly ever heard about it. Exceptionally we mention here two examples how the affair is described by two major syntheses in 1970's and 1980's. "At the same time also the Hungarofil wing of the party became active represented mainly by dr. Vojtech Tuka who used his education (under Hungary he was an international law university professor), his political experience and support of the Hungarina revisionist circles and by fight against Prague he attempted to subordinate the People's Party to Budapest." (*„Súčasne sa aktivizovalo aj maďarofilské krídlo vo vedení strany, reprezentované predovšetkým dr. Vojtechom Tukom, ktorí využil svoje vzdelanie (za Uhorska bol univerzitným profesorom medzinárodného práva), politickú skúsenosť i podporu maďarských revizionistických kruhov, a bojom proti Prahe sa snažil ľudovú stranu podrobiť Budapešti.“*)³⁸⁵ Here follows the description of the affair. „When it was in the Tuka's trial discovered that indeed he was in the service of the Hungarian irredentism and the jury sentenced him to 15 years, HSLŠ was forced to recall its two ministers Labay and Tiso from the government. “ (*„Keď sa v procese s Tukom ukázalo, že naozaj bol v službách maďarskej iredenty, a súd ho odsúdil na 15*

³⁸⁵ *Slovensko I – Dejiny* (Bratislava : Obzor, 1971) pp. 673

*rokov väzenia, bola HSLŠ nútená odvolať svojich dvoch ministrov Labaja a Tisu z vlády.“)*³⁸⁶

Was the Slovak historiography aiming to blame Hungarians for such major disloyalty? After 1989 the mainstream historian Dušan Kováč already presents the affair in much calmer manner. „In October 1928 the ľud'áks (slightly pejorative however common name for the members of the People's Party- author's note) used the Tuka's affair for leaving the government. 1st January 1928 Vojtech Tuka published in the daily paper *Slovák* an article ‚In the Tenth Year of Martin's Declaration‘. In the article he referred to a non-existing secret clause in the Martin's Declaration according to which the Slovaks agreed the accession to Czechoslovakia for the “trial period” of ten years. According to Tuka the by 30st October 1928 Slovakia ceases to be a part of Czechslovakia unless its representatives decide otherwise. On the basis of this article Tuka's trial started in which he was accused of high treason and espionage for Hungarians and on 5th October he was sentenced to 15 years in prison. 8th October ministers of HSLŠ Tiso and Labaj left the government.“

*(„Na vystúpenie z vlády využili ľud'áci Tukovu aféru v októbri 1928. 1.januára 1928 uverejnil Vojtech Tuka v denníku Slovák článok V desiatom roku Martinskej deklarácie. V článku sa odvolával na neexistujúcu tajnú klauzulu k Martinskej deklarácii, podľa ktorej Slováci súhlasili s pripojením k Československu iba na „skúšobnú lehotu“ desiatich rokov. Podľa Tuku 30.októbra 1928 prestáva byť Slovensko súčasťou Československa, ak jeho predstavitela nerozhodnú inak. Na základe tohoto článku sa začal s Tukom súdny proces, v ktorom bol obvinený z vlastizrady a špionáže v prospech Maďarska a 5. októbra ho odsúdili na 15 rokov väzenia. 8.októbra odstúpili ministri HSLŠ Tiso a Labaj z vlády.“)*³⁸⁷ The secret attachment is no longer that one which „existence was nobody able to prove“ („ktorej

³⁸⁶ *Slovensko I – Dejiny* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1971) pp.674

³⁸⁷ Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998)

existenciu nevedel nikto nezvratne dokázat“)³⁸⁸, but simply does not exist. However, regardless what the current interpretation is the Tuka's affair a strong part of the national corpus.

Though for example *Krajinské zriadenie 1928* is a long not discussed subject (rarely mentioned in syntheses) an important part of the Slovak national corpus is the issue of the national economy and culture. This obviously is a part of any interwar national synthesis, but in Slovakia the facts have their special role. The facts always have to determine the relationship between the Czech and the Slovak part of the common state or rather the Czech influence in Slovakia. „... for Slovakia had less economical development than the Czech Lands. Moreover, as a result of the economic liberalism at the time, the Slovak economic activity and the prospects for development were not only limited, but in many cases curtailed. In the republic's first decade and a half, 260 enterprises in various industrial branches in Slovakia were shut down as a result of the competitive pressure from Czech industries; ...“³⁸⁹

Interestingly, The Concise History emphasised a different result of the joint economy: „The foundations of the armaments complex, which formed the backbone of Slovak industry until 1989, were laid precisely in these years.“³⁹⁰

In 1930 HSEŠ prepared already the second proposal of the country's autonomy and in the following years things started to happen. *Munich Agreement* which in 1938 cut off large amount of territory from the Czech part of the republic did not touch Slovakia specifically, but the important threat laid in the recommendation of the Agreement to solve similarly the situation between Slovakia and Hungary. This event, though mentioned in Slovak historiography, remains in the shadow of another for Slovakia more important agreement – *Vienna Arbitrary*. The Arbitrary from 2nd

³⁸⁸ Slovensko I – Dejiny, Obzor, Bratislava 1971, str. 673

³⁸⁹ Kirschbaum, Stanislav J., *Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival* (New York: St Martin's Griffin, 1995) pp 173

³⁹⁰ Mannova, Elena (ed.), *A Concise History of Slovakia*. (Bratislava: SAV, 2000) pp 254

November is from the outset interpreted as a result of the Munich Agreement and as it significantly reduces the Slovak territory in favour of Hungary the event gets most attention.

1938 was important also for resolving one long discussed matter. In October Slovakia finally achieved the longed for *authonomy*. This was negotiated by the Hlinka's Party and based on the support of Slovakian parties declared in Žilina Agreement. The country finally had its own authonomy government headed by Jozef Tiso. But it was not only Slovakia which benefited from the changes, authonomy received also Carpathian Ruthenia. „However, the Munich Agreement brought home one unpleasant truth: The government was unable to protect the integrity of the state. As a result, the governmnet parties lost credibility, leaving the political arena in Slovakia open for the Slovak People's Party. The party quickly recognized the obverse of Benes's maxim about the importance of Slovakia for the defence of the state: If the state could not defend itself, then it could also not defend Slovakia. This would have to be done by Slovaks, and for this they needed their own government.“³⁹¹

Very interesting parts of the Slovak national discourse are events like *tragedy in Šurany*. In the late 1938 police forces opened fire against civilians and a young girl was killed. The event bears significant resemblance with another tragedy in 1907 when in a similar situation another young person got killed by Hungarian police. These events usually remind the reader that an unjust force was used by the „occupying forces“ against civilians. In both cases the emphasis is on the external occupying or foreign forces.

In November 1938 HSLS-Party of National Unity was funded by incorporating all other Slovak parties into the HSLS. Other Slovak parties ceased to exist; the only exceptions were German and Hungarian national parties also known as

³⁹¹ Kirschbaum, Stanislav J., *Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival* (New York: St Martin's Griffin, 1995) pp 180

minority parties. The German one was led by Franz Karamasin and the Hungarian one by János Esterházy. Both the minority leaders have their place in the Slovak historiography. Interestingly enough, the later is better known among Slovak Hungarians and Slovak historians than it is known among Hungarian public. „The representative of the Hungarian minority was János Eszterházi ascending from a well know aristocratic family. As a leader of the Hungarian minority and a member of the Slovak Parliament he criticized situation in Slovakia, did not vote for the Jewish Codex and here and there dropped aristocratic-haughty remarks about the topic.“

(„*Reprezentantom maďarskej menšiny bol János Eszterházi, pochádzajúci so známej aristokratickej rodiny. Jako vôdca maďarskej menšiny a poslanec slovenského snemu kritizoval pomery na Slovensku, nehlasoval za židovský kódex a sem-tam utrúsil na jeho adresu zlomyslné aristokraticko-povýšenecké poznámky.*“)³⁹² If the reader was unfamiliar with the European history, one would think that the naughty man disregarded a fine example of Slovak law – the Jewish Codex. Špiez’s writing seems to have rather two edges, though this might be not be his intention. Also, notice a Slovak transcription of Esterhazy’s name – the transcription of the names of Hungarian aristocracy in Slovak history has been a big issue since it appeared. The issue has a lot of to do with symbolical humiliation as the „y“ at the end of the name is a sign for aristocratic origin. In Slovak recently and selectively applied transcription the „y“ is simply substituted by „i“. Similar example was in this chapter already encountered with the name of Labay (Labaj in the latest Slovak transcription), one of HSLS’s ministers in the Slovak government till 1928.

Hitler incorporated Slovakia in his plans to occupy Czech countries. In February 1939 he invited Tuka to Berlin acknowledging in him a political personality most inclined to proclaim an independent Slovak state. The leadership of the Hlinka’s

³⁹² Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp. 156

Party including Jozef Tiso and Karol Sidor was not yet decided. Later, Homola's coup was attempted and the Prague government sent army to Slovakia announcing military dictatorship for the time being. "This military intervention known in the literature as Homola's coup was with high probability arranged by Hitler and it served his ends." (*„Tento vojenský zásah, známy v literatúre jako Homolov puč, s veľkou pravdepodobnosťou zrežiroval Hitler a slúžil jeho zámerom.“*)³⁹³ To solve the situation Hitler invited Tiso to Berlin and manipulated him into a proclamation of the *Slovakian independence on 15th March 1939*. Yet again, it is the independence which gets the limelight and not the fact of destroying the republic. In some literature the fact is viewed critically, in some rather enthusiastically, but by all means it attracts the attention and takes it from the actual break-up and end of the interwar republic. So little is the identification of the Slovakian historiography with the Czechoslovakian state.

Historically the blame for the raise of the pro-fascist Slovak state took „bourgeois Czechoslovak leading elite” which led the country to Munich. This approach was meant to solve the problem the communist historiography was facing: one could have not praise the circumstances though the independence was rather welcome. Until today the Slovak historiography faces the same issue and somehow always ends up in schizophrenia. On one hand the regime was doomed from the beginning, on the other it was the first Slovak state and as such it is a strong hold of Slovak national identity. At the beginnings of the Slovak independence was a non-democratic power, but it was a Slovak power after all. "...the new state became for Slovaks a homeland to which they related positively and more and more deeply." (*„...nový štát sa stal pre Slovakov vlasťou, ku ktorej mali pozitívny vzťah, ktorý sa stále prehľboval.“*)³⁹⁴ " For Slovaks the joining of the Czecho-Slovakia bear important

³⁹³ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.215

³⁹⁴ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992)

meaning and brought general progress.. The conditions which the Czechs brought with them were popular and democratic and in comparison to feudalism ruling in historical Hungary they meant a big step forward.“ (*„Pre Slovakov malo pripojenie k Česko-Slovensku ohromný význam a všestranný pokrok. Pomery, ktoré so sebou priniesli Česi, boli ľudové a demokratické a oproti feudálnym, ktoré vládly v Uhorsku, znamenali veľký krok vpred.“*)³⁹⁵ They (Slovaks) expressed they will to live with Czechs in the Czecho-Slovakian state, they mobilised in the army, saw in Hitler an evil who leads Germany and the World into destruction, they could appreciate democracy and stay by its side. However, a large proportion of Slovaks, and I guess already most of them, did not like Beneš' intrigues, another withdrawn promise and the concept of the state Beneš represented.“ (*„Ved' prejavili (Slováci) vôľu žiť v česko-slovenskom štáte s Čechmi, nastúpili do zmobilizovanej armády, videli v Hitlerovi zloducha, ktorí vedie Nemecko aj svet do záhuby, vedeli oceniť demokraciu a stáli na jej strane. Ale značnej časti Slovakov, a, hádam, už aj väčšine, nevyhovovali Benešove intrigy, Ďalší nedosržený sľub a koncepcia štátu, akú Beneš reprezentoval.“*)³⁹⁶ The overall mood is the one of sadness that the Slovak willingness and potential loyalty was not recognized or even was betrayed. But the same betrayal is often felt from the site of Slovakian Hungarians who often show loyalty which did not pay back. Apparently for a national state and his historiography the best gift would be assimilation, otherwise the story does not work.

After the fall of the Czechoslovakian republic and the raise of the Slovak state it was Hungary which came to join the feast. The conflict is referred to in Slovak Historiography as “*Small War*” (*„Malá vojna“*) and Hungary then occupied Carpathian Ruthenia and part of the eastern Slovakia.

pp.140

³⁹⁵ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992)

pp.140

³⁹⁶ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992)

pp.149

Becoming a German ally Slovakia had later to join the War. Unlike Czechoslovakia which never entered the War, Slovakia entered as an independent country and had to bear the consequences. It is emphasised that the public never identified with the war, but which public does? But mainly the historiography aims to lessen the importance of the actual fact. “Overall the number of Slovaks fighting on the side of anti-Hitler coalition was higher than number of the mobilised Slovaks who fought on the German side.” (*„Celkovo počet Slovákov, ktorí bojovali na strane protihitlerovskej koalície, bol vyšší ako počet mobilizovaných slovenských vojakov, ktorí bojovali na strane Nemecka.“*)³⁹⁷ Slovaks joined the war since its first days at both sides of the front ...Slovaks fought among South-Yugoslavian guerrillas, in guerrilla troops in Ukraine and also Belorussia, in North Italy, in the French resistance...In the last phase of the war more Slovaks fought with weapons on the side of the anti-fascist coalition than on the German side which was the one of the Slovak Republic allies.” (*„Slováci sa zúčastňovali vojny od jej prvých dní z oboch strán frontu....Slováci bojovali v radoch juhoslovanských partizánov, v partizánskych jednotkách na Ukrajine i v Bielorusku, v severnom Taliansku, vo francúzskom hnutí odporu... V záverečnej etape vojny bojovalo viac Slovákov so zbraňou v ruke na strane antifacistickej koalície, ako na strane Nemecka, ktorého bola Slovenská republika spojencom.“*)³⁹⁸

Most recently the problematic issue of one's identity is openly discussed and often it is believed that the Slovak political elite with little exceptions had to stay in place as there was no alternative. The independence still somehow overweighs the elite's political tendencies. In the extreme interpretation, however, this approach is dangerous and strongly reminds of any dictatorship or revolutionary ideology. The following quotation is from an article reacting on the Ďurica's book: “Against the

³⁹⁷ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 232

³⁹⁸ Čičaj, Viliam/Kováč, Dušan/Lipták, Lubomír/Marsina, Richard: *Slovenské dejiny*. (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1990) pp. 245

Germany and the Nazism it was necessary to raise or somehow to get to the Allies' side. Hungarians were able to do it, Romanians were able to do it, also other European nations compromised by co-operation with Nazist Germany were able to do it. Slovaks, in addition to that, were able to destroy their own state." („*Proti Nemecku a nacizmu bolo trba povstať alebo prejsť neako na stranu spojencov. Vedeli to urobiť Maďari, vedeli to urobiť Rumuni, vedeli to aj iné národy Európy zkompromitované spoluprácou s nacistickým Nemeckom. Slováci však navyše dokázali zlikvidovať svoj štát.*“)“³⁹⁹ The issue certainly still raises emotions.

V. 1. d) The War and Its Outcome

2 November 1938 I. Vienna Arbitrary was negotiated and announced by Italy and Germany. Hungarian Prime minister Bela Imredy was hoping to set the bill with Czechoslovakia. “The handover of Kassa, Munkacs and Ungvar (Kosice, Mukachevo and Uzgorod – author’s note) to Hungary happened thanks to Italy stepping ahead, but which facing disagreeing Ribbentropp could not have been extended to Pozsony and Nitra (Bratislava and Nitra – author’s note). (*“Az olasz föllépésnek volt köszönhető Kassa, Munkács és Ungvár átadása Magyarországnak, amit azonban az ellenálló Ribbentroppal szemben Pozsonyra és Nyitrára már nem lehetett kiterjeszteni.”*)⁴⁰⁰ Half a year later Germany occupied the rest of Czechoslovakia, respectively its Czech part, and helped to set the Slovak Republic. Hungary took the opportunity and on 15 March 1939 occupied Carpathian region. This way then, the yet again for Hungarians unexpected solution of the Carpathian question in March 1939 could not have been attributed to Imredy, - politically he was dead then.” (*“Így azután Kárpatalja kérdésének 1939. márciusi, a magyarok számára*

³⁹⁹ Comments by Bartl, Július to Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov by Milana Stanislava Ďuricy, HČ 45, č. 1, 1997, pp.121

⁴⁰⁰ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 196

megint csak váratlan elrendeződése Imredy számára nem kamatozhatott, - addigra ő már politikailag meghalt.")⁴⁰¹

30 August 1940 II. Vienna Arbitrary achieved for Hungary a similar revision in Transylvania as the I. Vienna Arbitrary achieved in the north. *20 November 1940 Hungary joined the German-Italy-Japan power agreement. 3 April 1941 Prime Minister Pal Teleki commits suicide* which precedes the *Hungarian participation in the German attack against Yugoslavia on 11th April 1941.* "The Hungarian leaders faced a vicious dilemma. They either accept, at the cost of breaking a three months old treaty and incurring the wrath of the western powers, the return of the nearly half a million Hungarians in those provinces, which they and the public opinion held rightful and right extremists vigorously demanded; or they defied their larger ally, retaining the sympathy of the Allies, but risking military occupation by Germany. Teleki collapsed under the weight of the moral and political responsibility."⁴⁰² "In his political testament reminded Horthy about the consequences (of the attack on Yugoslavia –author's note). Personal Teleki's tragedy however could not prevent the nation's new tragedy." (*"Politikai végrendeletében figyelmeztette Horthyt a következőkre. Teleki emberi tragediája azonban nem tudta megakadályozni a nemzet újabb tragediáját."*)⁴⁰³ As a new tragedy is understood the starting point in the new war.

26 June 1941 Kassa, Raho and Munkacs (Kosice a Mukacevo in Slovak) are bombed by unknown planes. On the same day *Hungary joints Germany in the attack against The Soviet Union.* 5 June 1942 the USA declared war on Hungary. "... from September 1943 on, plans for 'operation *Margarethe*', that is, the millitary occupation of Hungary were worked out in Berlin."⁴⁰⁴ *19 March 1944 Hungary is occupied by*

⁴⁰¹ Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 200

⁴⁰² Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp.377

⁴⁰³ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 134

⁴⁰⁴ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 383

Germany. 15 May 1944 starts deportation of the Hungarian Jews into concentration camps. "... Horthy stopped the deportations in early July, which, for the time being, saved the lives of the 200,000 Jews in Budapest."⁴⁰⁵

15-16 October 1944 putsch of German oriented Hungarian radicals which followed the regent's declaration about truce. "Blackmailed by the kidnapping of his son, Horthy withdrew his proclamation on the following day, appointed Szalasi as premier, and resigned from the regentship. He was taken into 'protective custody' in Germany, and Szalasi occupied the position of head of state as 'Leader of the Nation'."⁴⁰⁶

26th December 1944 - 13th February 1945 Fight for Budapest According to some authors in 1945 Budapest was "liberated"⁴⁰⁷. This probably relates rather to "liberation from Germans" than "liberation by Soviet army". The stress is on the fact Budapest was since 19 March 1944 occupied by German army and home radicals. "The senseless persistence of the Arrowcross and the Germans resulted in a siege of over one and a half months, with heavy bombardment and bitter warfare, a 'second Stalingrad', as recalled in several German war memoires."⁴⁰⁸

Slovakia rather by accidentally became Hungary's ally though both countries have endless dispute and occasional armed conflicts over territories. In the Slovak narrative an important role plays *home resistance*. The resistance was shared by the Communist party and the civil parties. "Organised resistance against the regime installed by Hlinka's Slovak People's Party was started almost since the beginning of the existence of the Slovak Republic, by the Communists ... organised resistance launched also groups created from former politicians whose parties were under the pressure united with Hlinka's People's Party. This grouping was called the

⁴⁰⁵ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 384

⁴⁰⁶ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 385

⁴⁰⁷ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 337

⁴⁰⁸ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 386

‘Civil block’.” („*Aktivni organizovany odboj proti rezimu nastolenemu Hlinkovou slovenskou ludovou stranou zahajili skoro od sameho zacatku existence Slovenske republiky komuniste. ... Organizovany odboj zahajily i skupiny slozene z byvalych politiku, jejichz strany byly pod natlakem slouceny s Hlinkovouslovenskou ludovou stranou. Tomuto seskupeni se rikalo „obcansky blok“.*“)⁴⁰⁹ Description of the home resistance is usually very detailed and includes names of many political figures involved. The closer the described period is to the origin of the book the more affected are the event’s surviving participants and the more names the book includes.

Much more complicated is description of the *resistance in abroad*. That is usually strongly influenced by a fundamental disagreement between Edvard Beneš and *Milan Hodža with Štefan Osuský* as representatives of Slovakia. The problem was the same: shall the Slovakia have its autonomy and to which extend it should be independent. “The two most important Czechoslovakian politicians in the foreign resistance were Slovaks Milan Hodža and Štefan Osuský. Both declared their consent with the project of Czechoslovakian Republic. But between Beneš on one side and Hodža and Osuský on the other significant disagreements appeared. The main topic of the disagreement was the Slovak question. According to Beneš the Czechoslovakia should have been restored in its pre-Munich form i.e. as a united state. Hodža and Osuský advocated bigger autonomy for Slovakia. In a Memorandum which they both elaborated in conjunction with Slovak Communist living in emigration a reform of the internal organisation of Czecho-Slovakia was advocated which would in fact allow for a federation. This model of an internal state organisation however, Beneš prepared to accept. Serious disagreements and even a breach arose.” („*Dvaja najvýznamnejší československí politici v zahraničnom odboji boli Slováci Milan Hodža a Štefan Osuský. Obaja sa prihlásili k projektu obnovy Československej republiky. Medzi Benešom na jednej a Hodžom a Osuským na druhej strane však došlo k vážnym*

⁴⁰⁹ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 231

*neshodám. Hlavným predmetom sporu bolo riešenie slovenskej otázky. Podľa Benešovej koncepcie malo byť Československo obnovené v predmníchovskej podobe, tj. jako unitárny štát. Hodža a Osuský presadzovali väčšiu samosprávu Slovenska. V memorande , ktoré obaja vypracovali v spolupráci so slovenským komunistou žijúcim v emigrácii Vladimírom Clementisom, sa požadovala také reforma vnútorného usporiadania Česko-Slovenska, ktorá by bola prakticky federáciou. Na takýto model štátoprávneho usporiadania však Beneš nechcel pristúpiť. Došlo k vážnym sporom i k roztržke.“*⁴¹⁰ Hodža funded in Paris Slovak National Assembly, but also accepted a post in the Beneš' government in abroad. After a final conflict with Beneš, Hodža emigrated to the U.S. where he two years later died.

The embarrassing part of the history of Slovakia during the Second World War is the approach to *Jewish people* and to *Romani*. Romani were apart from being an object to genocide also under a threat being interned in special Romani camps on Slovak territory. The conditions were similar to the German camps and at the end of the war many of the prisoners were shot. Jewish people were at the beginning restricted in their civil freedoms and eventually deported to so called “Eastern working camps”. Neither the camps were in Eastern Slovakia, nor were there working camps. Most of the Slovak Jews died in the camps; but the most embarrassing fact was that for the deportation the Slovak government paid a fixed sum per head to the Germans. The historiography either includes or avoids this fact depending on the view of the author on the Slovak regime. But the need to explain this particular chapter of the history is so great that for example Kováč mentions one of three main reasons for initiation of the home resistance “brutal anti-Jewish measures” („*brutálne protižidovské opatrenia*“)⁴¹¹.

⁴¹⁰ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 232

⁴¹¹ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 233

The integral part of the interwar history is also the Slovak National Uprising but we dedicate a special chapter to this event.

The national corpus in case of Hungarian as well as Slovak historiography has an aim to show a history of an independent and proud nation which has worked hard to achieve its own state. The corpus is dedicated to the national story picturing the past and the tradition to build on, explaining the form of the state as it is (including the borders), describing the ambitions of the state and finally explaining the situation during and after the war to ease the way of the country to the European family. The aim is then not only to build the story in isolation, but fit it into the European context. Though both historiographies come from entirely different directions, what unites them is the aim and the means or more precisely the strategy to achieve the aim.

V. 2. Terminology

This chapter concentrates on how the historiographies describe the shared international events and what terminology they use. Often the discrepancies are rather big. There are events which have their almost “brand” and when using their name for international public do not need any further explanation. In Central Europe this is for example the case of the “Anschluss”. One does not have to be a historian to know when and what was the “Anschluss” about. Other examples are the events thoroughly known to the national general public, that is to all of those who went through the same national educational system. In Hungary there is no doubt all public is familiar with *Trianon* and *Revision*; in Slovakia this applies for *SNP* (*Slovak National Uprising*).

There are also other not so famous events which have their narrative around them attached. Some of these events are shared by more countries and not surprisingly this narrative is different in each one of them. "... in May 1917 Charles IV. called together the Austrian Parliament. The representatives of the nationalities, *the Czechs*,

Ukrainians and South Slavs, which appeared there, followed the idea of federalization of the empire." (...IV. Károly 1917 májusára összehívta az ausztriai parlamentet. Az itt megjelent nemzetiségi képviselők, a csehek, az ukránok és a délszlávok egyaránt a birodalom föderalizálását követelték.)⁴¹² According to Czechoslovak historiography there were no Czech present at that sitting and Slovak historiography not really mentions the Parliament as that was another half of the imperia than Slovak territory belonged to.

There are several areas which are sensible to different terminology and which I analysed to document the discrepancies between the two national narratives. First of them is the area of physical territory, borders and geography in general. In Hungarian historical writing '*Hungary*' is referred to as the historic Hungary regardless whether that is relevant to the period or not. Kontler writes about the end of 1918 and the democratic revolution in Hungary: "...the Western Allies seemed more ready to satisfy their partners in the region, even at the expenses of departing from Wilson's principles, than to reward the political changes in Hungary, and not even full autonomy could keep Slovaks and Romanians within Hungary."⁴¹³ This gives almost a vivid picture of Slovaks and Romanians fleeing Hungary though in fact they haven't been rushing anywhere. They simply stayed where they lived and eventually found themselves in a new state. When '*Hungary*' is referred to in Slovak historiography for the same period, it is already the 'Hungary' of Trianon borders. It is important also to take into account that in Slovak (and some other languages) there is a distinction between the name of the historical Hungary ("Uhry") and post 1918 Hungary ("Madarsko"). This distinction does not exist in Hungarian, neither in English and usually it is avoided by referring to "historical Hungary" or using "Magyar" when referring to the modern times (including nationality) as opposite to the historical term.

⁴¹² Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) pp. 107

⁴¹³ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp.329

The distinction, however, is not particularly clear or clearly used. One of our authors says: “The Elizabeth University, created by the Magyars in Bratislava during the war, had moved to Hungary,…”⁴¹⁴ Chronologically just the opposite of the above interpretation. Kirschbaum apparently makes distinction between the territorial and other meaning of the words Hungarian and Magyar. The same author says in one paragraph from 1918: “...The generation that was about to change states had experienced the Hungarian political system, ...” and “The Magyar social and political system had inculcated in the population an attitude of defence towards authority...”⁴¹⁵. The author clearly does mix both terms freely at his own wish.

Not surprisingly Trianon is a big topic in terms of geography. Hungarians were by Trianon “*closed into the foreign state borders*” (“idegen államhatárok közé”)⁴¹⁶ but as Slovak historians maintain the division happened on a basis of strict rules: “Part of the founding of the Czecho-Slovakian state was also defining of the borders. This way in fact Slovakia was for the first time constituted not only as a traditional notion which defined the country inhabited by Slovaks, but also as an administrative territory circled by specific borders. Historical was only the border on the North with Poland. That was in principle accepted, Poland however compelled incorporation of some villages in Orava and Spiš which originally belonged to Hungary. The border with Carpathian Ruthenia on the East and with Moravia on the West was only an internal border with the Czecho-Slovakian state. The sort border sequence with Austria was with no trouble defined by the Saint Germain Treaty. More complicated was the south border with Hungary which was long discussed. The main problem was that because of long term migration of population within the historical Hungary the ethnical border did not exist and due to strong centralisation neither other

⁴¹⁴ Kirschbaum, Stanislav J., *Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival* (New York: St Martin’s Griffin, 1995) pp 174

⁴¹⁵ Kirschbaum, Stanislav J., *Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival* (New York: St Martin’s Griffin, 1995) pp 156

⁴¹⁶ Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) pp. 101

border existed. Trianon Treaty from 4th June 1920 has taken into account ethnical, strategical and economical aspects and constructed a border which in fact is valid until today.” (*„Súčasťou konštituovania sa česko-slovenského štátu bolo aj vytýčenie hraníc. Tak vlasne poprvýkrát v dejinách vzniklo Slovensko nielen jako tradičný pojem, ktorý znamenal krajinu obývanú Slovákmi, ale aj jako administratívne územie ohraničené konkrétnymi hranicami. Historická bola iba hranica na severe s Poľskom. Tá sa v zásade akceptovala, Poľsko si však vynútilo pripojenie niekoľkých obcí na Orave a Spiši, ktoré patrili pôvodne do Uhorska. Hranica s Podkarpatskou Rusou na východe a s Moravou na západe bola iba vnútornou hranicou v rámci česko-slovenského štátu. Krátky hraničný úsek s Rakúskom určila bez problémov saint-germainská zmluva. Zložitejšia bola južná hranica s Maďarskom, o ktorej sa dlho rokovalo. Hlavným problémom bolo, že vzhľadom na dlhodobú migráciu obyvateľstva v Uhorsku neexistovala etnická hranica a v dôsledku silnej centralizácie tu nebola ani nijaká iná hranica. Trianonská mierová zmluva zo 4. júna 1920 zohľadnila etnické, strategické i ekonomické aspekty a vytvorila hranicu, ktorá v zásade platí do súčasnosti.“*)⁴¹⁷ However, the event does not look quite the same from Hungarian point of view: "The peace treaty, signed.... by two representatives of the Hungarian government who did not want to take part in public life in the future (what a remark! - author's note) *deprived* Hungary of two-thirds of its former territory (without Croatia) and nearly sixty per cent of its population, including thirty per cent of ethnic Hungarians. Besides its new neighbours (Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom - later Yugoslavia - and Austria) even Italy (Fiume) and Poland obtained some of its former territory, now reduced from 282,000 to 93,000 square kilometres, with only 7,6 million of the former 18,2 million inhabitants."⁴¹⁸ Poloskei writes: "The participants (of the Paris Treaty Conference) agreed about the necessity

⁴¹⁷ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.184-185

⁴¹⁸ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 342

to settle with the (Hungarian) Communist Republic but have not yet decide for a commencement of the armed action. To that they rather tried to convince the neighbouring countries coming up with territorial claims." (*"A résztvevők egyetértettek a Tanácsköztársaság felszámolásának szükségességével, a fegyveres harc megindítását azonban egyelőre nem vállalták. Erre inkább a területi igényekkel föllépő, szomszédos országokat igyekeztek rábírní."*)⁴¹⁹

Hungarian historiography often uses special terms for former Hungarian territories, and that happen even after the former loss. An example is a term "Upper land" ("Felvidék")⁴²⁰ for Slovakia used in 1919, when formally the country was a part of Czechoslovakia. Though the used terminology has not to be an exclamation of a claim it is historically out of place and in the same connotation would never be used in Slovak historiography. Also "Upper Hungary"⁴²¹ is perfectly understandable for a Hungarian reader, however, would never be used in Slovak historiography for the same period. 6 December 1918 "on the basis of Hungarian-Slovak agreement in the Upper Country is the demarcation border declared more or less on the ethnical basis." (*"A magyar-szlovák megállapodással a Felvidéken nagyjából az etnikai határok mentén jelölnek ki demarkációs vonalat."*)⁴²²

Hungarian political aim - revision of the Trianon borders - was formally spoken about only since 1928. However, the term "*revision*" is in historical literature used for the period as early as 1920. " ...in the first half of the 20's some French political circles believed possible revision of the borders and also restoration of Habsburgs in Hungary." (*"... egyes francia politikai körök Magyarországon a 20-as*

⁴¹⁹ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 25

⁴²⁰ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.30

⁴²¹ Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) pp. 113

⁴²² Ormos, Mária, *Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945* (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 288

*évek első felében még a határrevíziót, illetve a Habsburgol magyarországi restaurációját is lehetségesnek tartották.")*⁴²³

The second area is related to the first and includes nationalities. The issue of “Hungarian” as an opposite to “Magyar” in English relates to nationalities as well. Authors often write about “Hungarians” and also about “Magyars”, the distinction is a question of personal choice and the usage is not unified. Hungarian historiography also writes about "*Hungarians*" or "*Hungarian population*" "*living in the neighbouring states*" or "*falling into territory of the new states*". Slovak historiography writes about the "*Hungarian minority*". Though in Slovak historiography the however conditioned union with Czechs is presented as rather a straightforward decision at a time, in Hungarian historiography there is a big question mark: "Although the Slovak Leader Milan Hodza was inclined to accept autonomy as a provisional solution until the peace treaty was signed, others, and particularly the Czechs, disavowed him and, while fighting broke out at the Slovak border, secured a memorandum from the Entente requiring the Hungarians to withdraw beyond a line which, by and large, became the later border of the country."⁴²⁴ Hungarian historiography even mentions *discrimination* in relation to law regarding Hungarians in neighbouring countries.⁴²⁵ Hundreds of thousands of Hungarians were either "*driven out*" or had to "*flee*" from their native countries.⁴²⁶ But there are also calmer notes in Hungarian historiography about Trianon. "The fact that, besides the plight of the Hungarian minorities in the neighbouring states, some of the country's social and economic problems could indeed be blamed on the peace settlement, was a convenient ideological pretext for a nationalist regime opposed to far-reaching reform

⁴²³ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.56

⁴²⁴ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 330

⁴²⁵ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 51

⁴²⁶ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 52

to impute all hardships to a vicious treaty whose revision became the alpha and the omega of its policies for a quarter of a century."⁴²⁷

In the area of more international events, neighbours get examined. Each historiography, however retains its specific approach. In November 1919 "Czech army cross in the area of Nagyszombat-Trencsen the Hungarian border. Occupation of Hungary has started." (*A cseh csapatok a Nagyszombat-Trencsen térségében átlélik a magyar határt. Megkezdődött Magyarország megszállása.*)⁴²⁸ Czechs are often those who *occupy Hungary* in spring 1919. When the Romanian armed forces launched an offensive against Hungarian Bolshevik government, armed forces of *Czechoslovakia* joined in. Regardless which nationality were the soldiers of the country (Czech or Slovaks) Czechoslovakia was already for half a year a reality; not for many Hungarian historians: "...a massive Romanian offensive was launched in mid-April in the east, soon reinforced by a Czechoslovak invasion from the north. ... *Czech forces* occupied the industrial region around Miskolc."⁴²⁹ "...Stromfeld's northern campaign drove a wedge between *Czech* and Romanian armies by penetrating into Slovakia, where even a short-lived Soviet Republic was proclaimed on June 16."⁴³⁰ In Slovak historiography the army of that time is clearly the Czechoslovak Army.⁴³¹

Often the authors are not consistent in their terminology. Maria Ormos mentioned in one paragraph Czechs and also Czechoslovakian army occupying the Hungarian territory. "The lines of Red Army re-captured the mountains occupied by Czechs, crossed the demarcation line and entered numerous other towns, neighbourhoods and villages... After the Romanian and Czechoslovakian attack, however, the leading politicians for some time believed that a elimination of the Budapest red power will be fully allowed" (*"A Vörös Hadsereg sorra visszafoglalta a*

⁴²⁷ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp.344

⁴²⁸ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 330

⁴²⁹ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp.337

⁴³⁰ Kontler, László: *A History of Hungary*. (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp.338

⁴³¹ Mannova, Elena (ed.), *A Concise History of Slovakia* (Bratislava: SAV, 2000) pp 243

*csehek által megszállt helységeket, átlépte a demarkációs vonalat, és számos további városba, községbe, faluba bevonult.....A román és a csehszlovák támadás után viszont a vezető politikusok egy ideig abban a hiszemben voltak, hogy az bőségesen elegendő lesz a budapesti vörös uralom felszámolására.)*⁴³² There is little clarity whether the occupation was carried out by Czechs or Czechs and Slovaks or by Czechoslovakia represented by both or either of them. From the point of view of Slovakian historiography, if the occupation is mentioned at all, it is certainly Czechoslovakian army.⁴³³

Well known is a problem of Slovak historiography is the *problem of hyphen*; problem how to relate to “Czecho-Slovakian” respectively “Czechoslovakian” past. This is not purely terminological problem; however its solutions can be well tracked in terminology. In fact the hyphen itself was used since the beginning of the republic in October 1918 till 1920 when it was dismissed by the Constitution. Later, it was used for six months between October 1938 and March 1939 when Slovakia formally achieved autonomy. Until 1920 the state is mostly regarded as a Czecho-Slovakian republic and one can find also the abbreviation as C-SR. But often this small but effective distinction is incorrectly used for the whole interwar period. For example Kováč refers to nearly everything shared by Czech and Slovaks for all time as Czecho-Slovakian. That is however a projection and it is far from historical correctness.⁴³⁴ Certainly, there is a significant need to distinguish the Slovak from the Czech. The strategy works, but this is a point where the Czech and Slovak historiography can well miss each other. Where the Czech historian writes about the

⁴³² Ormos, Mária, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945 (Debrecen: 1998) pp. 56-57

⁴³³ Mannova, Elena (ed.), *A Concise History of Slovakia* (Bratislava: SAV, 2000) pp 243

⁴³⁴ Compare Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.166 and 176, as a historian he stick to the correct version, however, as a teacher he uses an incorrect version for a heading of a chapter.

establishing of the Czechoslovakian Republic, Dušan Kováč, a mainstream Slovak historian, sees only "*Founding of Czecho-Slovakia*".⁴³⁵

I have already looked at another terminological conflict regarding transcription of Hungarian names in Slovak historiography. The Slovak transcription of Esterhazy's name is "Esterhazi". The transcription of the names of Hungarian aristocracy in Slovak history has been a big issue since it appeared. The issue has a lot to do with symbolical humiliation as the „y“ at the end of the name is a sign for aristocratic origin. In Slovak recently and selectively applied transcription the „y“ is simply substituted by „i“. One should not be superficial, but one's name is rather a very sensitive matter.

Very interesting question in Hungarian and former Czechoslovak historical writing is a proposed corridor between Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Poloskei writes: "Benés (Masaryk's fellow politician and Czechoslovakian future statesman) also asked from the Peace Conference to mark a corridor between Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia." ("*Benés kérte a békekonferenciától a Csehszlovákia és a Jugoszlávia közötti korridor kijelölését is.*")⁴³⁶ Slovak historiography usually does not mention the corridor, certainly not in our syntheses. For Slovak historiography this was Czech politics within the Czechoslovakian politics and therefore had a little importance for the Slovakian history. For Hungarian historiography, however it is an important evidence how the country was to be enormously exploited.

The fourth area consists of events of the mutual interest, where both countries got involved and therefore also both historiographies get involved with. In June 1919 the Slovak Republic of Councils (Soviet Republic) was established in Presov (Eperjes - in Hungarian). In *Magyarország Története 1918-1990* there is no mentioning of the event except for the chronology in the attachment. Perhaps, the

⁴³⁵ Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.173

⁴³⁶ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.52

Hungarian historiography does not wish the Communist Hungary to be blamed as responsible.

Slovak historiography very strictly links both facts together: "With the departure of the Hungarian Army, the short-lived Slovak Republic of Councils (Soviets), declared at Presov on 19th June 1919, also disappeared."⁴³⁷

" On 26 June 1941 unknown planes bombed Kassa, Munkacs and Raho. Until today it was not made satisfactorily clear which country's planes were responsible for this action." (*1941. június 26-án ismeretlen repülőgépek bombatámadást intéztek Kassa, Munkács és Rahó ellen. Májig nem sikerült megnyugtatóan tisztázni, hogy melyik ország gépei követték el ezt az akciót.*)⁴³⁸ No mentioning of the event was found in Slovak syntheses. The acceptable reason could hardly be the fact this part of the interwar (Czecho-)Slovakia was now under the Hungarian rule again. Simply the event is not significant and also straightforward enough to have a place in the Slovak historiography.

According to some authors in 1945 Budapest was "*liberated*"⁴³⁹. This probably relates rather to "liberation from Germans" than "liberation by Soviet army". Laszlo Kontler writes: "Budapest was taken by the Red Army on February 13, 1945."⁴⁴⁰ Naturally, Bratislava was also "liberated"⁴⁴¹, actually by the same Soviet Army, and both historiographies rush to show a picture taken from their burning and bombarded cities.⁴⁴² Neither historiography mention the neighbouring capital as it is therefore impossible to evidence their view of the other nation's liberation.

The terminology issues in the two studied historiographies are usually

⁴³⁷ Mannova, Elena (ed.), *A Concise History of Slovakia* (Bratislava: SAV, 2000) pp 243

⁴³⁸ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 159

⁴³⁹ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 337

⁴⁴⁰ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp.386

⁴⁴¹ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 244 and similarly elsewhere

⁴⁴² For example Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 243 and for example Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország Története a XX. században* (Budapest: 1999) or Molnar, Miklos, *A Concise History of Hungary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) pp. 294

surrounding the question of territory, nationality or events which are either international or involving in some way both countries. In the latest case not only the events are described in another words, often they are also avoided. The events missing from the syntheses are a different case from the events excluded from national corpus. The events from the national corpus relate to the history of one country and rarely would make sense if included into the neighbouring narrative. However, when the event is clearly engaging both countries to exclude it from the narrative is more of a strategic act. An example is bombing of Kosice in 1941 which is never mentioned in the Slovak historiography or the Slovak Republic of Councils (Soviet Republic) proclaimed in Presov in 1919 which usually does not play any role in Hungarian historiography. Interestingly, there are also specific issues around terminology such as problem of hyphen or transcription of Hungarian names in Slovak historiography. Both issues touch the same problem of a dominance and identity, though.

V. 3. National Enemy

All groups identities need except for their history and common beliefs also their enemy. It has to be clearly marked who are "we" and who the "others" are; the others which are marked "enemies" have a special role to tight the group together. Openly, only nationalistic historiography names enemies as enemies, however the role appears in any other historiography. In Hungary the enemy are those who caused the big tragedy - the Trianon. To blame is here the Great Entente, however conveniently the enemies are the new states which claimed the Hungarian territory and which also in 1920 signed a cooperation treaty the Small Entente. The enemies are likely to be involved in some kind of war; thus the war has to be referred to: "The Paris peace conference tore apart not only the 'prison of nations', as the Habsburg Monarchy was occasionally rhetorically referred to among its critics, but also what have been a well-functioning economic unit shaped by centuries of piecemeal adjustments of different

needs and services to one another, in which people and commodities travelled unhindered between Trieste (now in Italy –author’s note) and Lemberg (Lviv, Lvov, now in Ukraine –author’s note). After 1920, something like a permanent state of customs was developed among the states that inherited the various parts of that unit,..." "The new Prime Minister (Bethlen – author’s note) stood his first major test in October 1921, when the ex-monarch attempted a second coup. This time Charles did not intend to bargain with Horthy."⁴⁴³

All in all the notion of the “national enemy” is based on similar criteria as specific national terminology. The main issue is usually power, territory and armed conflicts and usually the “enemy” is as close as a neighbour. The Slovakian historiography has uneven relationships with Hungarians as well as with Czechs; in both cases it is a matter of power and Slovak national emancipation. The arguable remains a question whether Slovaks were in the First Republic together with Czechs a ruling nation or whether they alongside Germans, Hungarians, Carpathian Ruthens and Poles were a nationality ruled by Czechs.“ (*„Spornou otázkou zostáva, či Slováci boli v prvej republike spolu s Čechmi vládnucim národom, alebo spolu s Nemcami, Maďarmi, podkarpatskými Rusmi a Poliakmi národnosťou ovládanou Čechmi.“*)⁴⁴⁴ After all, Beneš was at least as strong a Czech jingoist as at his time Košút (Kossuth in Hungarian transcription – author’s note) and other Hungarian politicians were Hungarian ones. He was not prepared to step back even by an inch and did not intend to give the rule of Czechs.“ (*„Beneš však bol prinajmniej takým silným českým šovinistom jako svojho času Košút a iní maďarskí politici 19. storočia maďarskími. Nebol ochotný ustúpiť ani o piad’ a nemienil sa vzdať vlády Čechov.“*)⁴⁴⁵ “Beneš was not willing to give to Sudeten Germans and to Slovaks anything, although he

⁴⁴³ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp. 351

⁴⁴⁴ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp. 142

⁴⁴⁵ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp.148

promised to HSLS that he will solve the problem of autonomy if they will be voting for him in the presidential election. And so the Slovaks were betrayed not only by the first but also the second president of the state.” „*Beneš nebol ochotný sudetským Nemcom a Slovákom nič dať, aj keď HSLS sľúbil, že problém autonómie vyrieši, keď bude zaň hlasovať v prezidentských voľbách. A tak Slovákov oklamal nielen prvý, ale aj druhý prezident štátu.*“⁴⁴⁶ Beneš apparently betrayed Slovaks in their dreams and ambitions; the autonomy can be then understood as the national interest.

Slovakian historiography suggests not only a betrayal and that the enemy are Czechs, often the enemy is also named. For Špiez it is undoubtedly Beneš, but for other authors the enemy can hide even inside the country. V. Šrobár with his ‘temporary government’ under the protection of one hundred Czech policemen penetrate Slovakia and settled in Skalica.” („V. Šrobár so svojou „dočasnou vládou“ pod ochranou sto českých četníkov prenikol na Slovensko a usadil sa v Skalici.“)⁴⁴⁷ National Assembly in Prague passed an act on ‘exceptional transitional measures in Slovakia’ (private dictatorship of V.Šrobár). On this basis V. Šrobár passed the power onto hands of a handful of his colleagues, ‘hlasists’ formed by T. G. Masaryk.“ („*Národné zhromaždenie v Prahe schválilo zákon o „mimořádných přechodných opatřeních na Slovensku“ (osobná diktatúra V. Šrobára). Na tomto základe V. Šrobár odovzdal štátnu moc na Slovensku do rúk hŕstky svojich kolegov T. G. Masarykom odchovaných „hlasistov“.*“)⁴⁴⁸ Hlasists are also a group with characteristics of a national enemy. Hlasists are Slovaks who were educated in Prague or had strong links to Czechs and particularly to Czech political elite and with them Šrobár is blamed of being a Czech servant. By all means Šrobár is not particularly popular figure with right wing historians and the hatred goes as far as blaming him of all of Slovak quilts

⁴⁴⁶ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp.148

⁴⁴⁷ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp. 105

⁴⁴⁸ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp. 107

including measures against Hungarians and Slovaks: “At the end of February (1919 – author’s note) minister Vavro Šrobár without any consultation with the Holy Tribune recalled from Slovakia three bishops of Hungarian nationality, bishop Alexander Párvy from Spiša, bishop Vlk Radnai-Ritthammer from Banska Bystrica and bishop Viliama Baťáni (Batthyány) from Nitra who was deported from Slovakia even if he gave up his bishop title.” (*„Koncom februára (1919 – pozn. autora) minister Vavro Šrobár bez akéhokoľvek konzultovania so Sv. stolicou vypovedal zo Slovenska troch katolíckich biskupov maďarskej národnosti: biskupa Alexandra Párvyho zo Spiša, Biskupa Vlka Radnaia-Ritthammera z Banskej Bystrice a Biskupa Viliama Baťáňa (Batthyány) z Nitry, ktorý bol vyvezený do Maďarska napriek tomu, že sa vzdal svojho biskupského úradu.“*)⁴⁴⁹ “Minister V. Šrobár in limits of his dictatorship power dismissed the so far valid privileges of Jews (newspapershops and other licenses) .. He also interned many Jews.” (*„Minister V. Šrobár v rámci svojej diktátorskej moci zrušil doterajšie privilégia Židov (trafiky a iné licencie)...Mnohých Židov dal aj internovať.“*)⁴⁵⁰ Though the name of Šrobár is to be found on almost every single page of Ďurica’s book twice and twice in an invective the popular enemy for him remain Hungarians.⁴⁵¹ “22nd August * German Chancellor Adolf Hitler promised to the Hungarian Regent Miklós Horthy that if Hungarians will be willing to occupy Slovakia he will not stand in their way. They are to be ready by 1st October 1938.” (*„22. august * Nemecký kancelár Adolf Hitler prisľúbil maďarskému ríšskemu správcovi Miklóšovi Horthymu, že ak Maďari budú chcieť obsadiť Slovensko, on im v tom praxovať nebude. Majú byť pripravení k 1. októbru 1938.“*)⁴⁵² Ďurica’s description of Jews is changing over his book. It goes from one extreme to another.⁴⁵³

⁴⁴⁹ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp. 109

⁴⁵⁰ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996)

⁴⁵¹ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp.141 - január, 149-marec

⁴⁵² Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp. 134

⁴⁵³ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp. 139 - október, 143 - február, 162-marec, 163

Aparently, when blaming Beneš and Šrobár, Jews and Hungarians come to him useful. This, however, does not prevent them to become a strong enemy a page later.

The above suggests there is certain hierarchy between „enemies“, it seems likely that the closer the enemy the more dangerous it is; the most dangerous and the most treacherous then seems to be an inner-enemy. “27th September * Andrej Hlinka in his public speech said: ‘Not the Czechs are our biggest enemies. Our biggest enemies are Slovak Czechoslovakians whom we have to conquer in the political field by voting ballots, in the economic field by professional organisations and in the cultural field by magazines of all sorts.’” (*„27. september * Andrej Hlinka vo verejnom prejave povedal: „ Nie Česi sú našimi najväčšími nepriateľmi. Našimi najväčšími nepriateľmi sú slovenskí čechoslováci, ktorých musíme poraziť na politickom poli hlasovacími lístkami, na hospodárskom poli odbornými organizáciami a na kultúrnom poli časopismi všetkého druhu.“*)⁴⁵⁴ Another author commenting favourably on the above quotation by Ďurica wrote: „The representatives of the civil resistance were mostly old ‚Czechoslovakians‘ and had no problems to betray Slovak Republic in which they used to hold high positions and move to the Beneš‘ camp.“ (*„Predstavitelia občianskeho odboja boli väčšinou starí ‚čechoslováci‘ a nerobilo im problémy zradiť Slovenskú republiku, v ktorej mnohí zastávali vysoké funkcie a prejsť do Benešovho tábora.“*)⁴⁵⁵

Generally, the fact that the historiography uses expressions as “Czechs”, “Hungarians” or “Slovaks” is problematic as it assumes emotional involvement. The actors of whatever political decision are likely to be particular politicians and not national members as such. However, when talking about the country being invaded or occupied the invaders or occupants are likely to be Czechs, Hungarians or Slovaks.

⁴⁵⁴ Ďurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996) pp. 121

⁴⁵⁵ Comments by Bartl, Július to *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* by Milana Stanislava Ďurica, *HČ* 45, 1, 1997, pp.121

Sometimes the enemy is also not a national, but a member of a specific party or another group. In the extreme Ďurica's case those are among others the Communists.

Among the syntheses used in our comparison only two were going as far as naming the enemy and actually using the word "enemy" as such. These were two following Slovak syntheses of Milan Ďurica *Dějiny Slovenska a Slovakov* and Anton Špiez *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu*. It would have been difficult to find a matching example in Hungarian historiography and therefore I do not attempt any comparison. The two books above sufficiently serve as an example how the psychological need for an enemy works. It is, however, interesting that among the syntheses which are widely accepted in both countries (or have been accepted within 15 years after 1989) only in Slovakia two extreme examples were found.

V. 4. Event Symbolical

For Hungarian historical writing the symbolical event is certainly Trianon Treaty and its consequence. Trianon Treaty is called the tragedy: "...the greatest of Hungary's national tragedies since Ottoman times..."⁴⁵⁶ "Trianon was for the Hungarian history of the biggest tragedies..." (*Trianon a magyarság történetének egyik legnagyobb tragédiáját jelentette...*)⁴⁵⁷

Most importantly the historiography aims to prove the Entente wrong, in particular the Wilson's points. "In the sense of the Peace Treaty important in one grouping living Hungarians also came to neighbouring states. This way either those have not changed into the countries of one ethnic." (*"A békeszerződés értelmében jelentős egy tömbben lakó magyarok is kerültek a szomszédos államokhoz. Ilyen*

⁴⁵⁶ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp.330

⁴⁵⁷ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp.50

módon ezek sem válhattak egységes etnikumú országokká.")⁴⁵⁸ Similarly in another source: "On those territories (which fall into neighbouring countries) several millions Hungarian lived and their important section lived in groupings by the borders. Wilson's ideas were therefore not applied..." (*"Ezeken a területeken több millió magyar lakott, s jelentős részük a határok mentén egységes tömbökben élt. Nem érvényesültek tehát a wilsoni elvek..."*)⁴⁵⁹ "As for the Allies' decision, a host of well-known historical elements explain it, from Magyar domination over the minorities before the war to the necessity of holding Hungary to account for its belligerence and a number of outside factors in between, including the promises made by the Entente to the successor states. The Hungarains were refused a hearing at the peace conference – the treaty was a 'dictate'. The principles that had earlier been outlined in Wilson's Fourteen Points had been perverted. While the old minorities of Greater Hungary were given satisfaction, the treaty rode roughshod over the right of the Magyars to self-determination."⁴⁶⁰ "Despite all rational explanations, therefore, there remains in the Trianon verdict a deeply prejudiced, almost irrational element, largely determined by the attitudes of Clemenceau and Pichon. Through their policy, they created an unstable region, new centuries ripe for ethnic conflict, not to mention frustration among the main victims of this unfortunate and unjust peace deal the Hungarians."⁴⁶¹ The two words of Molnar's conclusion on the Trianon Peace characterise the event completely : the frustration and the irrationality. Not only the irrationality of the peacemakers, but also the consequent irrationality of Hungarians when the Treaty is in question. " Ever since, on the day the Treaty of Trianon was signed, hundreds of thousands protested against it in the streets of Budapest, it has

⁴⁵⁸ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 49

⁴⁵⁹ *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995) pp. 49

⁴⁶⁰ Molnár, Miklós, *A Concise History of Hungary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) pp262-3

⁴⁶¹ Molnár, Miklós, *A Concise History of Hungary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) pp 263

haunted Hungarian collective memory. The sheer magnitude of the losses, which can not be compared by anything but those occasioned by the Ottoman conquest in the sixteenth century, combined with the dubious arguments that were supposed to justify them, are sufficient to explain the bitterness they engendered.”⁴⁶² “On a broader horizon, if Hungarian policies in the dualist period poisoned ethnic relations in Central Europe, the post-war settlement did nothing to heal them, but served to keep, with tragic consequences, the nationalist agenda in its nineteenth-century form awake into the late twentieth , and quite possibly twenty-first century.”⁴⁶³

And this is how the Trianon is reflected in Slovak historical writing: „The big event was clear definition of Slovak borders, actually first time in history. The border with Austria on the West was defined by the Saint-Germain Treaty 10th Septemebr 1919; on the North Poland did not recognize old borders with Austro-Hungary and compeled concessions of several villages in the area of Orava and Spiš. On the East Slovakia adjoined Carpathian Ruthenia which also became a part of Czechoslovakia. There was no historicalprecedens for the south border with Hungary therefore the Czechoslovakian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference had to fight hard for it. The treaty with Hungary signed on 4th June 1920 at the Trianon Castle by Paris a borderline was eventually agreed which is a combination of the ethnical, strategical and economical elements.” („*Veľkou udalosťou bolo jasné vytýčenie hraníc Slovenska, vlastne prvýkrát v dejinách. Hranicu s Rakúskom na západe určila zmluva v Saint-Germaine 10.9.1919;na severe Polsko neuznávalo staré hranice s Rakúskom-Uherskom a vynútilo si územné ústupky niekoľkých obcí na Orave a Spiši. Na východe susedilo Slovensko s Podkarpatskou Rusou, ktorá sa stala tiež súčasťou republiky. Pre hranicu na juhu s Maďarskom nebol žiaden historický precedens, preto československá delegácia na mierovej konferenci v Paríži musela o ňu tvrdo bojovať.*

⁴⁶² Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp 344

⁴⁶³ Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London. Palgrave MacMillan, 2001) pp 344

V mierovej zmluve s Maďarskom, podpísanej 4. júna 1920 na zámku Trianon pri Paríži, bola napokon schválená hranica, ktorá je kombináciou prvkov etnických, strategických i hospodárskych.“⁴⁶⁴

These points of view mentioned were certainly the points of view of the winning countries and their allies i.e. Czechoslovakia in our case.

Dušan Kováč comes exactly to the same conclusion already presented in this work: “Part of the founding of the Czecho-Slovakian state was also defining of the borders. This way in fact Slovakia was for the first time constituted not only as a traditional notion which defined the country inhabited by Slovaks, but also as an administrative territory circled by specific borders. Historical was only the border on the North with Poland. That was in principle accepted, Poland however compelled incorporation of some vilages in Orava and Spiš which originally belonged to Hungary. The border with Carpathian Ruthenia on the East and with Moravia on the West was only an internal border with the Czecho-Slovakian state. The sort border sequence with Austria was with no trouble defined by the Saint Germain Treaty. More complicated was the south border with Hungary which was long discussed. The main problem was that because of long term migration of population within the historical Hungary the ethnical border did not exist and due to strong centralisation neither other border existed. Trianon Treaty from 4th June 1920 has taken into account ethnical, strategical and economical aspects and constructed a border which in fact is valid until today.“ (*„Súčasťou konštituovania sa česko-slovenského štátu bolo aj vytýčenie hraníc. Tak vlasne poprvýkrát v dejinách vzniklo Slovensko nielen jako tradičný pojem, ktorý znamenal krajinu obývanú Slovákmi, ale aj jako administratívne územie ohraničené konkrétnymi hranicami. Historická bola iba hranica na severe s Poľskom. Tá sa v zásade akceptovala, Poľsko si však vynútilo pripojenie niekoľkých obcí na*

⁴⁶⁴ Čičaj, Viliam/Kováč, Dušan/Lipták, Lubomír/Marsina, Richard: *Slovenské dejiny*. (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1990) pp.222

*Orave a Spiši, ktoré patrili pôvodne do Uhorska. Hranica s Podkarpatskou Rusou na východe a s Moravou na západe bola iba vnútornou hranicou v rámci česko-slovenského štátu. Krátky hraničný úsek s Rakúskom určila bez problémov saint-germainská zmluva. Zložitejšia bola južná hranica s Maďarskom, o ktorej sa dlho rokovalo. Hlavným problémom bolo, že vzhľadom na dlhodobú migráciu obyvateľstva v Uhorsku neexistovala etnická hranica a v dôsledku silnej centralizácie tu nebola ani nijaká iná hranica. Trianonská mierová zmluva zo 4. júna 1920 zohľadnila etnické, strategické i ekonomické aspekty a vytvorila hranicu, ktorá v zásade platí do súčasnosti.“)*⁴⁶⁵

Slovakia's symbolical event is not linked with the interwar Czechoslovakia because the historiography finds only very little identification with the republic. The big myth of the period is Slovak National Uprising (SNP) which is truly a Slovak event. The SNP is deeply rooted in Slovak national identity and is therefore difficult to be criticised in any way. Next to the myth of the Sámó's state and myth of Great Moravia⁴⁶⁶ this is yet another one of the state funding myths. Historiography which may decide to criticise the flow of the events of the SNP or its later historical interpretations may find itself accused of treachery and lack of national pride. Perhaps, that is the reason why for 10-15 years after 1989 in serious historiography there has been rather silence about the topic.

The Uprising is actually written with capital "U" which in Slovak is a very unusual thing in terms of grammar. Lubomír Lipták, one of the authors of the analysed books, published several very thorough works on physical reminders of the past – the past of SNP included. He said that monuments, memorials, memorial plates, statues and similar are not only the products but also significant creators of the historical memory. Out of three parts of the memory – the scientific kept by science,

⁴⁶⁵ Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska*. (Praha: LN, 1998) pp.184-185

⁴⁶⁶ Compare with Eva Krekovičová: Identity a mýty novej štátnosti na Slovensku po roku 1993, *Sn*, 50, 2, 2002, pp.158

official kept by whoever is in power and private, the statues and monuments and memorials are most strongly associated with the official memory.⁴⁶⁷ “The transition of the official evaluation of the interpretation of the uprising is possible to watch on the central figure of the monument. In the first years it is a soldier; gradually he is driven out by a member of guerrilla.”⁴⁶⁸

In 1976 the central institution for care for the monuments in Slovakia published hierarchy of the topics for the next memorials to be built. Immediately on the second place after the Communist Party memorials there are on the list SNP memorials.⁴⁶⁹ “Also quantitatively the memorials of SNP kept its supremacy. In 1976 it was 1333 of them, the liberation had 1040 and working class movement and Communist Party had 376.”⁴⁷⁰ The importance of the Uprising raised after 1968. Usually the raise of the monuments comes with anniversaries but an unexpected raise one can encounter also between 1970-71. It is due to the liberalisation in late 1960’s which also had an effect on re-interpretation of the Uprising. Because the process of the preparation of the monuments themselves was long most of them was exhibited only after 1970.⁴⁷¹

Dušan Kováč writes about the Uprising: “Though the standards in Slovakia were for the war circumstances very good, higher than in the neighbouring countries, the population was not satisfied with the government. The dissatisfaction grew into an organised resistance. Part of the population the dissatisfaction with the regime joint with a wish restore Czechoslovakian Republic.” (*„Aj keď úroveň na Slovensku bola na vojnové pomery veľmi dobrá, vyššia ako v susedných krajinách, nebolo obyvateľstvo s vládou spokojné. Nespokojenosť postupne prerastala do*

⁴⁶⁷ Lipták, Lubomír: Pamätníky a pamäť povstania roku 1944 na Slovensku, *HČ* 43, 2, 1995, pp.363

⁴⁶⁸ Lipták, Lubomír: Pamätníky a pamäť povstania roku 1944 na Slovensku, *HČ* 43, 2, 1995, pp.365

⁴⁶⁹ Lipták, Lubomír: Pamätníky a pamäť povstania roku 1944 na Slovensku, *HČ* 43, 2, 1995, pp.366

⁴⁷⁰ Quoted according to Lipták, Lubomír: Pamätníky a pamäť povstania roku 1944 na Slovensku, *HČ* 43, 2, 1995, pp.367

⁴⁷¹ Lipták, Lubomír: Pamätníky a pamäť povstania roku 1944 na Slovensku, *HČ* 43, 2, 1995, pp.368

organizovaného odboja. Čiast' obyvateľov nespokojnosť s režimom spájala s želaním obnoviť Československú republiku.“) ⁴⁷² More precise definition of how big „part“ of the public wished to renew the union with Czechs is carefully avoided.

There are several issues related to the Uprising. One is the still painful relationship with Czechs. There are attempts to clarify the aims of Beneš when he according to some almost stole the Uprising. “Beneš’ London speech from 8th September (1944 – author’s note) in which he tried to present the Uprising as his action completely leaving aside the Slovak National Assembly as a head operative authority was met in Slovakia with great uneasiness. The message from Beneš’ government sent on 23rd September to Banská Bystrica confirmed the apprehensions. Beneš asked to accept an authorised representative for the exile government who was supposed to be some sort of a commissioner and whose activity would be factually eliminate the function of the Slovak National Assembly.” (*„Benešov londýnsky prejav z 8. septembra, v ktorom sa pokúšal vydávať Povstanie za svoju akciu a Slovenskú národnú radu jako vrcholný riadiací orgán Povstania úplne obišiel, sa na Slovensku stretol s veľkými rozpakmi. Posolstvo Benešovej vlády, ktoré bolo 23. septembra odoslané do Banskej Bystrice, potvrdilo obavy. Beneš žiadal, aby bol prijatý splnomocnenec emigračnej vlády, ktorý mal byť akýmsi komisárom a ktorého činnosť by fakticky eliminovala funkciu Slovenskej národnej rady.*“) ⁴⁷³ In reaction to Ďurica’s book the following appeared: “When the Marxist historiography highly valued political meaning of the uprising and minimized its military activities which were unsuccessful also due to ‘betrayal of the bourgeois generals’, the opposite is true. The main political fault of the uprising was that its leaders were not able to keep the continuity of the Slovak statehood and for their fear of alibism deserted to the other side.” (*„Kým marxistická historiografia vysoko hodnotila politický význam*

⁴⁷² Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 231

⁴⁷³ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 241

*povstania a bagatelizovala jeho vojenské aktivity, ktoré sa nedarili aj „zradou buržoázných generálov“, opak je pravdou. Hlavnou politickou chybou povstania bolo to, že jeho vodcovia nedokázali udržať kontinuitu slovenskej štátnosti a zo strachu alebo alibizmu prebehli na druhú stranu.“*⁴⁷⁴ The author is suggesting that the leaders of the uprising had to ‘desert’ to join the Allies. What he means is deserting the Slovak statehood, but in the context one wonders whether there was a third way for Slovakia? Extremely right wing historiography even states the aims of the Uprising as follows: “ ... the political aims were as follows: 1. Suspend the regime of the 1. Slovak Republic; 2. Dissolve the Slovak state and renew the Czechoslovakia; 3. Launch a military action against Germany” (*„...išlo o tieto politické ciele: 1.Odstrániť režim 1.Slovenskej republiky; 2.Zlikvidovať slovenský štát a obnoviť Československo; 3.Uskutočniť ozbrojenú akciu proti Nemecku“*)⁴⁷⁵ The SNP is clearly not a popular event for many extremists.

On the other hand the mainstream is much milder though clear about the equality of two independent nations: “The home Slovak resistance in its majority did not accept Beneš’ plan for restoration state centralism and unitarism and demanded for Slovakia large autonomy on the principle that at the time started to be called ‘equal with equal’.” (*„Domáci slovenský odboj vo svojej prevažnej väčšine neprijal Benešov plán obnovy štátneho centralizmu a unitarizmu a požadoval pre Slovensko rozsiahlu samosprávu na základe princípu, ktorý v súdobej terminológii dostal názov „rovný s rovným“.*)⁴⁷⁶ Kováč is also rather careful when relating to the future of the republic how it was envisaged by the Uprising leaders. “The Ľud’ák government was to be overthrown and the power was to be taken by SNR (Slovak National Assembly

⁴⁷⁴ Comments by Bartl, Július to Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov by Milana Stanislava Ďurica, *HČ* 45, 1, 1997, pp.121

⁴⁷⁵ Bielik, Peter, Augustový puč a jeho charakter, in: *Dies Alter – Nešťastný deň 29. august 1944* (Bratislava: LÚČ, 1994) pp. 21

⁴⁷⁶ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 233

– author’s note) and national committees.” (*„Ľudácka vláda mala byť zvrhnutá a moci sa mala ujať SNR a národné výbory.“*)⁴⁷⁷

All in all the scale of interpretations of SNP is extremally wide. The following are rather extreme remarks on the topic. “The Slovak State propaganda marked the event of autumn 1944 in Slovakia as a coup.; the organisers and the participants of the resistance against Fascism call it Slovak National Uprising. The true lies somewhere in the middle.” (*„Propaganda Slovenského štátu označovala to, čo sa odohralo na Slovensku na jeseň 1944, za puč, organizátori a účastníci boja proti fašistom to označujú jako Slovenské národné povstanie. Pravda leží niekde uprostred.“*)⁴⁷⁸ Labeling of the national uprising can not be accepted in my opinion also because the military action was not joined by the whole nation as for example the nations of Yugoslavia. Ľudáks and many others did not join in, were satisfied with Tiso. Communists, guerrilla members and people oriented on Beneš did not present faisly significant part of the nation. In any case Tiso was at that time in Slovakia such an authority that neither Communists, nor people oriented on London and even less the military conspirators from Banska Bystrica reached his level.” (*„Pomenovanie národné povstanie sa podľa môjho názoru nemôže akceptovať už len preto, že ozbrojeného vystúpenia sa nezúčastnil celý národ jako napríklad národy Juhoslávie. Ľudáci a mnohí ďalší sa ho nezúčastnili, boli spokojní s Tisom. Komunisti, partizáni a na Beneša orientovaní ľudia nepredstavovali veľmi výraznú časťku národa. V každom prípade bol Tiso v tom čase na Slovensku takou autoritou, že mu ani komunisti, ani na Londýn orientovaní ľudia, a tým menej vojenski sprisahanci v Banskej Bystrici nesiahali ani po členky.“*)⁴⁷⁹ Sadly, this rather extreme interpretation may hide a simple truth that actually the civil parties members and other

⁴⁷⁷ Kováč, Dušan, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: LN, 1998) pp. 234

⁴⁷⁸ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp. 170

⁴⁷⁹ Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992) pp. 171

actors of the Uprising simply were a tiny minority and so was the Uprising a minor event magnified by later years.

The historiography is very specific about the losses for the country when it attempts to gain its place among other post-war democracies. “The direct outcome of the uprising was introduction of war horrors in so far peaceful and prosperous Slovakia.” („*Bezprostredným výsledkom povstania bolo uvedenie vojnových hrôz na dovtedy pokojné a prosperujúce Slovensko.*“)⁴⁸⁰ All material and strategic losses are clearly named. Eventually, the myth of a „sacrifice“ is created.

Both historiographies came up with a central myth to support the national narrative. As the central myth has been interpreted in the light of communist ideology in the past decades the historiography often reacts by not elaborating on the issue. The silence and lack of monographies on the subject only confirms sensitivity of the matter. The central myths are very carefully approached events as they bear important meaning. Both events give a mark to the period, in one case it is the tragedy in another it is sacrifice. Not only the functional similarity is in the fact that both providing a role for the nation in this period, the role is in both cases unfortunate yet heroic!

The influence of the myth however, is ceasing. In the most recent Slovak historiography we can detect decreased and more balanced interest in the subject (A Concise History of Slovakia). In Hungary the myth of Trianon is still relevant and on public agenda. The issue are no more the borders but more likely Hungarians in neighbouring countries and nation pride. The “tragedy” is certainly haunting the nation more in years of despair than in years of prosperity.

⁴⁸⁰ Ďurica, Milan S., Prístup historika k otázke povstania na Slovensku v roku 1944, in: *Dies Alter – Nešťastný deň 29. august 1944* (Bratislava: LÚČ, 1994) pp.5

V. 5. Formal Characteristics

One of the first syntheses published after 1989 *Magyarország Története 1918-1990* dedicates 167 pages to the 28 years of the interwar period 1918-1945 and only 154 pages to the period of 46 years from the end of the WWII to 1990. The book does not include illustrations or maps, but clearly focuses on the interwar period.

Magyarország története a XX. században by I. Romsics illustrates the interwar history by 27 pictures and also includes 11 maps and 15 tables. Out of 11 maps, 3 picture Hungarian military part in WWII and the rest is dedicated entirely to the "Trianon" - borders, nationalities, proposals - either before 1920 and the Trianon Treaty or after 1928 when the revision became an official aim of the Hungarian foreign policy.

Romsics is a valuable, extremely productive and rather popular historian, however when one looks at the illustrations in his books one can see a principally conservative man.

Ormos' book consists of 279 pages of text accompanied by maps of Hungary, chronology, index of names and pictures. The maps are taken from 1920 and 1941 and show precisely what territory was at that time the country losing or gaining back. Out of 13 pictures most are photographs of key figures who influenced history of Hungary in between wars. Four photographs picture troops returning from the First World War, National Uprising in October 1918, meeting of the League for (Territorial) Revision and troops on the Eastern Front in 1943. Laszlo Kontler dedicates 62 pages to the interwar period (27 years) and 82 pages to the next 45 years 1945-89. Again, the disproportion is rather clear. The book does not include any pictures, but several maps. Only one of them is illustrating the interwar history and interestingly, it is titled: Hungary and her neighbours after the Peace Treaty of Trianon.

Molnar's Concise History runs on 355 pages from its beginning till 1990. 45 pages are devoted to interwar period including WWII. The whole chapter is called

Between the Wars however it includes WWII. Out of 12 illustrations none is a map which is in the Hungarian case certainly refreshing. Otherwise the book includes maps within the text but none for the interwar period. Two photos picture a musician and a poet, two politicians in action (Bela Kun and Miklos Horthy), one pictures the whole government of 1921 and three soldiers or agricultural workers. Budapest is shown on two additional photos. Interestingly, two illustrations show two parts of a letter; one of the is a farewell letter by Pal Teleki written before his suicide and the other is a postscript tendering a resignation should his attempt fail. Molnar clearly steps back and reflect on the history not only in terms of writing but also bring new approach to popularisation.

Generally each of the Hungarian books dealing with a historical period exceeding 1914-1945 dedicates significantly more pages per year in the interwar period than in the period after the WWII. Hungarian historiography also gives a lot of details on neighboring states, first because of Hungarian population living in the neighbouring states, secondly because of its ideological ambitions. The books by authors living in or returning from abroad are less focusing on the “Tragedy” and loss of 1918/1920 and use less pictures and maps to illustrate it. In terms of formal presentation of the book one can easily distinguish between the “home made” one and the one printed abroad.

Dušana Kováč describes the history of Slovakia on 356 pages from the beginning until 1995. The interwar period of 20 years gets 26 pages, but already the period of the first independent Slovak state – a period of around 6 years – gets 28 pages. Kováč’s book, however, repeats the structure and form of the Slovak History volumes printed in 1980’s, enough to have a look at the almost identical

illustrations.⁴⁸¹ Out of 47 illustrations including maps 9 is dedicated to the Slovak National Uprising and the querrilla. *Slovenske Dejiny* in which Kováč also took a part, but the interwar period was written by L. Liptak, sums up the history up to 1990 on 289 pages including illustrations. Again, there is a distinction between the interwar period itself and the time of the WWII. The first gets 22 pages, while the other 38. The whole point is natuaraly the independence. The pictures, and more interestingly no maps, similarly to the Kováč's book show the leading figures of the Czechoslovak and Slovak state respectively, the Slovak University of Komensky, bombardment of Bratislava and Jews being taken for transpaortation.

History of Slovakia on the Road to Self-Consciousness uses 188 pages to sum up the Slovak history. It does not include any illustrations or maps or photos. The period 1918-38 is described on 14 pages and 1939-45 on 22 pages. The *Concise History of Slovakia* extends to 297 pages of which 19 is dedicated to he interwar times and 15 to the Slovak Republic 1939-45. This is already a very different approach not emphacising the Slovak State or the related National Uprising but rather describing the times proportionally. Out of 13 illustrations there are only two pictures related to the Uprising, but also another picturing an airlain used by Czechoslovac crew in Great Britain. A picture of Czechoslovak Army's oath from 4th February 1919 in Bratislava shows a soldier with clearly the Hungarian flag with a cut out hole in the middle where used to be the Hungarian heraldic symbol. Similar strategy was apparently used for a century because the flag looks the same in 1956 when Hungarians cut out the synbol of Communist Republic. Also, the picture of Jews assembled for the transportation specifies: 'The Hlinka's Guard assembling Jews from Michalovce to a concentration camp' where the same picture in *History of Slovakia* from 1990 is simply called: 'Transport of Jewish citizens from Michalovce'. Not only

⁴⁸¹ „Martinská deklarácia“, „Kremnickí baníci“, „Ulica v Hluštíne na Orave“, „Slovenská továrna XY“, „Práca na veľkostatku po čas vojny“, „Tiso u Hitlera“, „Evidencia židovského obyvateľstva“, „Bombardovanie Bratislavy anglo-americkým letectvom“

the Concise History dares to say, where these poor people were transported, but also by whom.

Đurica's book rather represents the other side of the political spectrum. The form Đurica has decided for is an unusual chronological list of detailed and commented events. Out of 179 pages till 1993 39 pages ere dedicated to the interwar period and 69 to the time till the end of the war. Yet again the Slovak states attracts all the attention regardless whether the author uses the fluent narration of a chronological list. Though, Stanislav Kirschbaum is also a strong believer in the independent state his believe does not make him blind, moreover he is an experienced Western world scholar. He does not uses illustrations either, but dedicates 29, respectively 64 pages out of 261 to The First Czechoslovak Republic and The Slovak Republic.

The national corpus in case of Hungarian as well as Slovak historiography has an aim to show a history of an independent and proud nation which has worked hard to achieve its own state. The corpus is dedicated to the national story picturing the past and the tradition to build on, explaining the form of the state as it is (including the borders), describing the ambitions of the state and finally explaining the situation during and after the war to easen the way of the country to the European family. The aim is then not only to build the story in isolation, but fit it into the European context. Though both historiographies come from entirely different directions, what unites them is the aim and the means or more precisely the strategy to achieve the aim.

The terminology issues in the two studied historiographies are usually surrounding the question of territory, nationality or events which are either international or involving in some way both countries. In the latest case not only the events are described in another words, often they are also avoided. The events missing from the syntheses are a different case from the events excluded from national corpus. The events from the national corpus relate to the history of one country and rarely would make sense if included into the neighbouring narrative. However, when

the event is clearly engaging both countries to exclude it from the narrative is more of a strategic act. An example is bombing of Kosice in 1941 which is never mentioned in the Slovak historiography or the Slovak Republic of Councils (Soviet Republic) proclaimed in Presov in 1919 which usually does not play any role in Hungarian historiography. Interestingly, there are also specific issues around terminology such as problem of hyphen or transcription of Hungarian names in Slovak historiography. Both issues touch the same problem of a dominance and identity, though.

Among the syntheses used in our comparison only two were going as far as naming the enemy and actually using the word “enemy” as such. These were two following Slovak syntheses of Milan Ďurica *Dějiny Slovenska a Slovakov* and Anton Špiez *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu*. It would have been difficult to find a matching example in Hungarian historiography and therefore I do not attempt any comparison. The two books above sufficiently serve as an example how the psychological need for an enemy works. It is, however, interesting that among the syntheses which are widely accepted in the countries (or have been accepted within 15 years after 1989) only in Slovakia two examples involving a form of hatred were found.

Both historiographies came up with a central myth to support the national narrative. As the central myth has been interpreted in the light of communist ideology in the past decades the historiography often reacts by not elaborating on the issue. The silence and lack of monographies on the subject only confirms sensitivity of the matter. The central myths are very carefully approached events as they bear important meaning. Both events give a mark to the period, in one case it is the tragedy in another it is sacrifice. Not only the functional similarity is in the fact that both providing a role for the nation in this period, the role is in both cases unfortunate yet heroic!

The influence of the myth however, is ceasing. In the most recent Slovak historiography we can detect decreased and more balanced interest in the subject (A Concise History of Slovakia). In Hungary the myth of Trianon is still relevant and on public agenda. The issue are no more the borders but more likely Hungarians in neighbouring countries and nation pride. The “tragedy” is certainly haunting the nation more in years of despair than in years of prosperity.

In terms of formal presentation of the book each of the Hungarian books dealing with a historical period exceeding 1914-1945 dedicates significantly more pages per year in the interwar period than in the period after the WWII. Hungarian historiography also gives a lot of details on neighbouring states, first because of Hungarian population living in the neighbouring states, secondly because of its ideological ambitions. The books by authors living in or returning from abroad are less focusing on the “Tragedy” and loss of 1918/1920 and use less pictures and maps to illustrate it. In terms of formal presentation of the book one can easily distinguish between the “home made” one and the one printed abroad.

All Slovak books divide the interwar period into two parts – when the country was a part of Czechoslovakia and since the country gained independence in March 1939. Similarly, as in Hungarian historiography the interwar period is comparably dedicated more space than any other period (particularly in comparison to 60 years after the WWII.) and also comparably more space is dedicated to the years of independence. Pictures and illustrations in general

Not only the historical books concentrate more on the interwar period than on the period after the WWII but also the time before the interwar period is dedicated less space. Simply, if you are a Central European historian the interwar period is the period to exercise your narrative on now.

VI. CONCLUSION

While conducting the first part of my research on the Slovak and Hungarian historiography 15 years after 1989 I came to several conclusions which characterise both historiographies as separate entities and also in comparison.

Throughout the period of existence of the Czechoslovak state we can speak of the existence of “Slovak historiography”, although the inter-war period was its cradle. Professional Slovak historiography was born only after 1918 in the new Czechoslovak state. It gained institutional anchoring at that time and could educate the first generation of professional Slovak historians. From the beginning it was clear that the history of the Czech lands and Slovakia, like the political aspirations of the two nations, have less in common, than was at the given moment necessary to achieve ideological merging. The two nations identified themselves differently, although convinced Czechoslovaks existed, and so they created different national histories. In syntheses on the history of Slovakia, starting from the sixties to eighties, a conception of “Slovak history” gradually became defined as the history of Slovakia and the Slovaks on the basis of a territorial-ethnic approach.

The year 1993 was an important milestone in Slovak historiography. After the origin of the independent Slovak state and in the political conditions of the time, a situation desired by the nationalists, who used history as one of the instruments in their argumentation. Therefore, the Slovak historical community turned to the theme of national history to provide an alternative to extremism and to keep pace with the interests of its readers. This turn appeared in the historiography of the second half of the nineties.

After the opening of Slovak historiography after the long period of normalization, the return of the Slovak exiles was the catalyst of nationalism. However, apart from straight-forward nationalism, we find many shadows of

exaggerated emphasis on the national theme in Slovak historiography. Apart from the nationalist parties and exiles, some of the intellectuals and historians also participated and are participating in the revitalization of national emotions and increased nationalism as an ideology in political and everyday practice. They still see their role as the interpretation of national history and strengthening of national identity. A certain frustration with the inadequate emphasis on the Slovak national theme in the preceding years may play a role in this, as well as the heritage of the authoritarian state – conformism and the allegiance of historians to the political establishment.

The interpretation of Slovak history is strongly connected with politics, whether as a storehouse of arguments or as an active component in the creation of public opinion. This can be documented by an example of the dispute over Milan Stanislav Ďurica's book which has been by the Ministry recommended for use in schools and the decision was strongly opposed by the Slovak Academy of Sciences. At that time Vladimir Mečiar was the Prime Minister and the Academy was represented by Dušan Kováč.

The extreme rightist interpretation of history is isolated in the academic environment, but it has resonance in society, especially among the older generation. The reason for this "success" of the Ľud'ák ideology was and is the inadequacy of historical reflection. The years from 1938 to 1945 have not been subject to Slovak historical self-reflection in a comparable to post-war West Germany or in Austria since the 1980s. There was no chance for this in the post-war history of Czechoslovakia for political reasons, and now it has already been successfully avoided for another 15 years. However, sooner or later self-reflection on wartime history will be very necessary.

A large part of the Slovak historical community shows passivity and behaviour from the periods of direction of its activity by an ideological, paternalist state. Historiography in Slovakia is faced with practical problems such as the

functioning of institutions, legislation, and the possibility of finding non-state resources to support research, which limit it. The dominance of political history, thematic and chronological fragmentation, and so a predominance of interpretation over deeper analysis, leading to manipulation of history, is characteristic of recent Slovak historiography.

Slovak historiography is now at a turning point. In the course of the next few years, the generations, which spent the greater part of their lives in the socialist normalization of Czechoslovakia, will finally leave, and space will open for today's young doctors and doctoral students. They will have the opportunity, on their study visits, to deal with their own nationalism and learn about new methodological currents in the subject. Some of them will use these opportunities, for others it will be "only once". The greatest problem of these young researchers, who have the ambition to place Slovak historiography in the European mainstream, is to gain a place for their future academic work. Their colleagues from the natural sciences are leaving Slovakia for foreign countries. The question is, where will the social scientists apply themselves?

The opportunities in Slovak historiography are great. Slovakia benefits from contact with Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Poland and Trans-Carpathian Ukraine. It also "benefits" from contact with the Hungarian minority in Slovakia. It lives in a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural world. This is its great opportunity.

In Hungary a strong communist heritage can be experienced. The academia in 80's found themselves relatively free and open which on the other hand might have caused unclear transition in early 90's. Some authors claim that Hungary has the strongest unbroken Communist heritage in academia among the Central European countries. In this case, obviously, the level is difficult to measure. Also, it has to be

said that some authors remained very socialist in their views which is in a way acceptable in Hungary.

Though there is a level of internationalism in the Hungarian historiography and the historiography has a long history is still focuses on the history of one nation. Hungary had a long history of historical writing lined with great historians writing in languages as Latin, German or eventually Hungarian. Latin was the official language of two of the Parliament Houses till 1848. In these terms Hungarian historiography has always been international because it aimed to write a history of great territory inhabited by Hungarians in terms of political nation rather than “nation” in national sense. This approach proved to be difficult not only during socialism, but long after. Domestically this may not cause conflict, but internationally the Hungarian academia is still facing awkward reaction from neighbouring “national academia”. Hungarian historiography has to face challenges from the site of its neighbours, but it is not at all inconceivable that Hungarian academic culture, getting ever closer to the European (and, for that matter, extra-European) structures, institutions and intellectual movements will be able to reformulate itself in a way that valorizes multiplicity not only in terms of the usual post-Herderian (or post-modern) legitimation, according to which every national culture adds something to the wholeness of human culture, but in the other direction as well, realizing that a culture gets richer and more interesting, and opens more windows to the external world, by the multiplicity of the pasts, sub-cultures and alternative intellectual canons it manages to incorporate.

There is a strong link between the historiography and the politics in Hungary. Spectrum of the political approach of the Hungarian historians is wide and visible. It is no secret where each of the leading academics is coming from and none of them has a problem to speak his/her mind openly. Another direction of bringing ideology back to historiography became popular mainly due to the politicization of intellectual production throughout the decade. The cleavages between the various intellectual and

meta-political sub-cultures that existed throughout the 1970-80s served as convenient structuring lines for the emerging multi-party system. Thus, some of the crucial points of – especially twentieth-century – Hungarian history were turned into symbolic identity-markers for one group or another. Furthermore –with rather divergent intentions, means and efficiency – all post-1990 governments made some efforts to devise an "official" discourse, prioritizing a certain combination of research institutions, historical figures, lieux de memoire, and cultural-historical references. At the same time, while some of the historians emerged as leading politicians in the new set-up, the mainstream of the craft kept to its own standards of avoiding direct involvement with either "too theoretical" interpretative schemes, or "too actualized" political narratives. Relying on more "ideological" narratives thus remained the strategy of the off-mainstream: providing "weapons" for those who were not yet accommodated, who were for some reason previously marginal, or who already lost their impact as proper scholars but, capitalizing on their prestige, decided to have a second try as ideological gurus.

Hungarian historiography nurtures a specific relationship with Hungarians abroad. The relationship is affecting researchers as well as general public. All the professional are treated on the first place as fellow Hungarians and only then as professionals in the field. The relationship is a strong point as well as a weak point of the Hungarian academia. On one hand it allows for broad international contacts, on the other hand it is the one nation contact which certainly overshadows the internationalism. Occasionally, this support may seem a little bit patronising and it traditionally includes support to historical Hungarian territories in Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia and elsewhere.

Public confrontation of anti-Semitic issues is one of the characteristics of Hungary in the Central European region. The historical research on anti-Semitism became one of the most contested and vivid fields of social research in Hungary after

1989. After the collapse of communism, it seemed to be possible again to negotiate the issue openly. The excitement of this topic was naturally increased by the long years of silence. At the same time, the phenomenon ceased to remain a topic purely intellectual discussion, often implying direct political considerations. This was fostered by many factors, like the post-1989 rediscovery and re-creation of Jewish identities, the emergence of ethnic nationalism, the attempts to "regenerate" national identity after the alleged denationalization of the socialist period, and the open appearance of right-wing radicalism.

Historiographical positivism was not really shaken by the arrival of new methodologies. Due to the relatively high level of de-ideologization of Hungarian historiography at the turn of the decade, the nineties were marked by various attempts to bring back a more 'coherent' image of history that was gradually dissolved by the positivist consensus of professional historiography in the previous two decades. One such attempt was connected to the adaptation of various Western methodological schools, which promised a more sophisticated relationship between the historian and his source-material, thus seeking to problematize the naïve-factological methodology. Along these lines, various schools and ideological directions emerging in the last two-three decades in Western Europe and the United States were offered to the broader public: post-structuralism, microhistory, oral history, historical anthropology, contextualist intellectual history, gender history, etc. As in all other Eastern European countries, this process of adaptation was happening with an accelerated speed, often concentrating merely on the very act of reception of the Western achievements, without making it possible for the representatives of these canons to engage themselves in a more detailed negotiation among their respective discourses. Not so surprisingly, those methodological offers, which questioned the hitherto unambiguous relationship between "the past" and its representation were unable to challenge the firm objectivistic conviction of the "guild". This was due partly to their

relatively belated reception. Those theoretical considerations that eventually influenced a ‘critical turn’ of the discipline in the West were arriving in Hungary only in the nineties, that is, together with their critical context. Historians were either absolutely disinterested in or ignorant of the post-modernist challenge or classified it as an erroneous attempt to blur the border between historical truths and historical myths. Albeit some of these scholars were aware of the theoretical complexity of the constructivist critique and even tended to accept that the past could not be known in its entirety, they regularly insisted on that history-writing was eventually based on objective factual documentation, approximating, if only tangentially, the “totality of knowledge.” Consequently, they also proved to be completely resistant to any subjectivist construction.

The Hungarian historiography is still looking for its identity in terms of ideological, geographical or historical borders. It is not particularly clear to this art where it begins and where it ends. But the Hungarian historiography is not in its search on its own.

There is a significant difference between how the communist heritage was treated in both countries – in Hungary and in Slovakia. In Hungary some authors remained very socialist in their views which is in a way acceptable in Hungary. The acceptance was not characteristic for the Slovakia in 90’s however. Slovakia was very sensitive in that matter and the subject was often avoided in conversation. However, the personnel often remained the same. Only, in the case of Slovakia the academics rushed to assure the public they are and always were against communism and they suffered under the regime. In Hungary many academics retained openly their socialist views as the distinction between the 80’s and the 90’s in terms of ideas was less strict.

Personal political believes are also treated differently in both countries. In Hungary there is no secret where each of the leading academics is coming from and none of them has a problem to speak his/her mind openly. This is a great difference in

comparison with Slovak historiography. In Slovakia the political orientation remain rather private if not hidden completely. Obviously, the extreme right wing is to be detected by the production itself, however, it can be discussed to which extent this production can be regarded to as “professional historiography”. At the same time similarly in both countries, while some of the historians emerged as leading politicians in the new set-up, the mainstream of the craft kept to its own standards of avoiding where possible direct involvement.

The re-creation of Jewish identities and the emergence of ethnic nationalism after the denationalization of the socialist period brought to Hungary return of anti-Semitism. However, these factors again can not exclusively explain the problem. In comparison the Czech Republic experienced all the above mentioned factors, re-creation of the Jewish identity was strong, so was the new right-wing radicalism. However, the end result was strong animosity and never solved issue with Romani minority and almost no problem with anti-Semitism. It is more likely that both these minority groups play in both countries similar role and the role itself is something worth comparing. In Slovakia in Romani minority is rather large and only slowly finding its way to the country’s history.

In Slovakia the extreme right interpretations are still widely accepted in public. Similarly, the awkward relationship between the “mother country” and the Hungarians living outside Hungary is considered normal among Hungarian public. In that sense both historiographies have their deeply rooted specifics.

Both historiographies bear signs of national discourse and will have to draw strength from its relations to neighbours, both external and internal (Hungarians abroad, Romani population etc.) to realize that a culture gets richer and more interesting, and opens more windows to the external world, by the multiplicity of the pasts, sub-cultures and alternative intellectual canons it manages to incorporate.

The national corpus in case of Hungarian as well as Slovak historiography has an aim to show a history of an independent and proud nation which has worked hard to achieve its own state. The corpus is dedicated to the national story picturing the past and the tradition to build on, explaining the form of the state as it is (including the borders), describing the ambitions of the state and finally explaining the situation during and after the war to ease the way of the country to the European family. The aim is then not only to build the story in isolation, but fit it into the European context. Though both historiographies come from entirely different directions, what unites them is the aim and the means or more precisely the strategy to achieve the aim.

The terminology issues in the two studied historiographies are usually surrounding the question of territory, nationality or events which are either international or involving in some way both countries. In the latest case not only the events are described in another words, often they are also avoided. The events missing from the syntheses are a different case from the events excluded from national corpus. The events from the national corpus relate to the history of one country and rarely would make sense if included into the neighbouring narrative. However, when the event is clearly engaging both countries to exclude it from the narrative is more of a strategic act. An example is bombing of Kosice in 1941 which is never mentioned in the Slovak historiography or the Slovak Republic of Councils (Soviet Republic) proclaimed in Presov in 1919 which usually does not play any role in Hungarian historiography. Interestingly, there are also specific issues around terminology such as problem of hyphen or transcription of Hungarian names in Slovak historiography. Both issues touch the same problem of a dominance and identity, though.

Among the syntheses used in our comparison only two were going as far as naming the enemy and actually using the word “enemy” as such. These were two following Slovak syntheses of Milan Ďurica *Dějiny Slovenska a Slovakov* and Anton Špiez *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu*. It would have been

difficult to find a matching example in Hungarian historiography and therefore I do not attempt any comparison. The two books above sufficiently serve as an example how the psychological need for an enemy works. It is, however, interesting that among the syntheses which are widely accepted in the countries (or have been accepted within 15 years after 1989) only in Slovakia two examples involving a form of hatred were found.

Both historiographies came up with a central myth to support the national narrative. As the central myth has been interpreted in the light of communist ideology in the past decades the historiography often reacts by not elaborating on the issue. The silence and lack of monographies on the subject only confirms sensitivity of the matter. The central myths are very carefully approached events as they bear important meaning. Both events give a mark to the period, in one case it is the tragedy in another it is sacrifice. Not only the functional similarity is in the fact that both providing a role for the nation in this period, the role is in both cases unfortunate yet heroic!

The influence of the myth however, is ceasing. In the most recent Slovak historiography we can detect decreased and more balanced interest in the subject (A Concise History of Slovakia). In Hungary the myth of Trianon is still relevant and on public agenda. The issue are no more the borders but more likely Hungarians in neighbouring countries and nation pride. The “tragedy” is certainly haunting the nation more in years of despair than in years of prosperity.

In terms of formal presentation of the book each of the Hungarian books dealing with a historical period exceeding 1914-1945 dedicates significantly more pages per year in the interwar period than in the period after the WWII. Hungarian historiography also gives a lot of details on neighbouring states, first because of Hungarian population living in the neighbouring states, secondly because of its ideological ambitions. The books by authors living in or returning from abroad are

less focusing on the “Tragedy” and loss of 1918/1920 and use less pictures and maps to illustrate it. In terms of formal presentation of the book one can easily distinguish between the “home made” one and the one printed abroad.

All Slovak books divide the interwar period into two parts – when the country was a part of Czechoslovakia and since the country gained independence in March 1939. Similarly, as in Hungarian historiography the interwar period is comparably dedicated more space than any other period (particularly in comparison to 60 years after the WWII.) and also comparably more space is dedicated to the years of independence. Pictures and illustrations in general

Not only the historical books concentrate more on the interwar period than on the period after the WWII but also the time before the interwar period is dedicated less space. Simply, if you are a Central European historian the interwar period is the period to exercise your narrative on now.

First hypothesis was confirmed, both historiographies follow the national discourse and every single synthesis has a very similar narrative. The national historical narration can not be open and also can not be expanded. The national history is therefore in serious trouble. It is also strongly influenced by ideological background and to certain extend it is used to build up the state ideology.

Understanding national historiography as influenced by politics is a step forward to make it self-conscious with regard to its political and cultural bias, a step forward towards a reflexive historiography.

The second hypothesis is not confirmed – all similarities in writing strategy can be explained by national discourse. Though in the analysis and comparison I have not found many similarities which would characterise specifically Central European writing, I found similarities in terms of historiography as party of practiced historical research and production.

One of them is a strong link between historiography and politics, historical writing is politically engaged and is an integral part of the power struggles. In the Central Europe a big political and therefore historical role generally belongs to historiography. Secondly, the similarity is the actual fact of drawing attention to the interwar period. That is identical in both cases and that is certainly not only due to the discourse, neither only due to the revival of nationalism. Third similarity is the fact that all Hungarian and Slovak intellectuals are in a way involved in the spiritual and ideological life of the country and they all know each other. In Western Europe different research areas were rarely come to a contact. In Hungary and Slovakia it is a norm. One can argue that it could be a case of “small states” having a bigger chance to link the intellectual elite together. Comparing the situation to Poland, however, one has to admit that the case of a 40 Million headed Poland is in this sense the same of Slovakia and Hungary. Could the listed similarities be characteristics of Central Europe in terms of a unique culture?

The main problems of national idea are two: that it is fixed emotionally and that it is wrongly fixed with the idea of a state.

Certainly it is truth; the parents decide the child's first language. They also decided about its cultural background. One can blame his parents because of choosing only one and a specific mother tongue, but one can also go and learn another. One's language and one's culture (even the national culture), one have learned during his lifetime. But that can be also during the lifetime changed. If one feels strong affection towards his parents, it is because one knows them so good and so long. It is the same with the language and the national culture. The life partner is usually learnt much more later, but after some time, a stranger can become much more closer than the parents. Adequate situation can be experienced with national identity. One can adopt a new identity and also a new national identity. One can even share more national identities.

Historiography could in that sense make sure that all identities, cultures and background in one way or another fit to the same picture and are not left out. The contemporary Central European historiography in its most recent works tends to cover former hidden areas of history of minorities or history of those, they did not fit to the simple national history. But does it as a cultural practice influences historical writing, or does it influences peoples perception? Historical writing is as theory and practice in one. By writing historians provide a theory in terms of understanding and provide also practice in terms of changing culture by for example changing perception. Practice in historiography is then the public debate about Durica's book in Slovakia.

Historiography is guilty with linking the emotional national identity with a state. The geographical principal force historians to question on possession rights of people of the territory. A possible and very usual result is that the area of national history is almost locked up. It is difficult to penetrate the national history from outside for several reasons, one of them being language. Even if the language is there a historian can still be excluded as an outsider if he or she fails to follow the obvious and accepted rules of dealing with the national story. It is in none's favour to explain, that even Czech Germans belong to Czech history; it is certainly not in interest 99% of population reading in Czech.

The question remains why it is history which is so important for the national identity. I suggest it is because it can not be done or undone by individuals, only by large groups as nations, therefore it can be a source of proud or identity for the members of the nation. That is why there is such a close link between a national identity and national history.

Better understanding and re-thinking historiography influences historiography as a cultural practice and can, perhaps, reconcile the past and the identity.

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Concise History of Slovakia*, ed: Mannová, Elena (Bratislava: Historický ústav, SAV 2000)
- „AETAS-körkérdés a magyar történetírás szerkezetéről és intézményrendszeréről” (AETAS survey on the structure and institutions of Hungarian historiography).
Aetas (1993) 4
- Báčová, Viera (ed.), *Historická pamäť a identita* (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1996)
- Báčová, Viera- Kusá, Z. (eds.) *Identity v meniacej sa spoločnosti* (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1997)
- Bácskai, Vera, *Család, háztartás, társadalom a 19. század elején* (Budapest: Történeti Statisztikai Füzetek, 1992)
- Bácskai, Vera, *Gyula gazdasága és társadalma a XV-XVI. században* (Gyula: Békés Megyei Levéltár, 1991)
- Bácskai, Vera, *Városok Magyarországon az iparosodás előtt* (Budapest: Osiris, 2002)
- Bakke, Elizabeth, *Doomed or failure? The Czechoslovak nation project and the Slovak autonomist reaction 1918-1938* (Oslo: 1998)
- Bakoš, Vladimír, *Kapitoly z dejin slovenskeho myslenia* (Bratislava: 1995)
- Bakoš, Vladimír, *Question of the nation in Slovak though. Several chapters on the national thought in modern Slovakia* (Bratislava: Veda, 1999)
- Bán D., András, *Pax Britannica: Wartime Foreign Office documents regarding plans for a postbellum East Central Europe*. (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, New York: Columbia Univ. Pr. 1997)
- Barnovcký, Michal, *Prvá vlna destalinizácie a Slovensko (1953-1957)* (Brno: 2002)
- Bartlová, Alena, *Andrej Hlinka* (Bratislava: 1991)
- Békés, Csaba, *Az 1956-os magyar forradalom a világpolitikában* (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1996)
- Belényi, Gyula, *A sztálini iparosítás emberi ára 1948-1956* (Szeged: JATE, 1993)
- Belényi, Gyula, *Az alföldi városok és a településpolitika (1945-1963)* (Szeged: k. n., 1996) Review in *Századok* 131 (March 1997)
- Bence, Györg, „Márkus és a kulcsszavak,” in: *Lehetséges-e egyáltalán? Márkus Györgynek – tanítványai* (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1993)
- Benda, Gyula, ‘A tárgyak termelése és fogyasztása a jobbágyfelszabadítást megelőző évszázadban’, *Néprajzi Értesítő* 76 (1994)
- Bene, Sándor *Theatrum Politicum* (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1999)
- Benkő, Samu. *Újrakezdések: Tanulmányok, előadások, beszélgetések, búcsúztatások, 1980-1995* (New beginnings: Essays, lectures, conversations, and farewell speeches, 1980-1995). (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémia, 1996)
- Berend, Iván T., *Central and Eastern Europe 1944-1993* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) Hungarian translation is: *Terelőúton* (Budapest: Vince, 1999)
- Bibliografický slovník etnografie a folkloristiky za roky 1986-1990* (Bratislava: Ústav etnologie SAV, 1994)
- Bielik, František – Borovský, Štefan (eds.), *Andrej Hlinka a jeho miesto v slovenských dejinách* (Bratislava: 1991)
- Bíró, Ferenc - *A felvilágosodás korának magyar irodalma* (Budapest: Balassi, 1994)
- Bíró, Judit – Székelyi, Mária, ‘A tudomány újjáépítése, 1945-1950’, *Szociológia*

- Szemle* (Autumn – Winter, 1996)
- Bódy, Zsombor - Mátay, Mónika - Tóth, Árpád, eds. , *A mesterség iskolája* (Budapest: Osiris, 2000)
- Bacsikai, Vera, *Városok és városi társadalom Magyarországon a XIX. század elején* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1988)
- Boia, Lucian, *Történelem és mítosz a román köztudatban* (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1999)
- Bojtár, Endre. *Kelet-Európa vagy Közép-Európa?* (Eastern Europe or Central Europe?) (Budapest: Századvég, 1993)
- Bokeš, František, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov od najstarších čias až po prítomnosť*(The History of Slovakia and the Slovaks from the Earliest Times to the Present.) (Bratislava: 1946)
- Borhi, László, *A vasfüggöny mögött* (Budapest, 2000)
- Borsi-Kálmán, Béla, *A békétlenség stádiumai: Fejezetek a román-magyar kapcsolatok történetéből* (The stages of restlessness: Chapters from the history of Romanian-Hungarian relations). Budapest: Osiris, 1999)
- Borsi-Kálmán, Béla, *Hungarian exiles and the Romanian national movement, 1849-1867.* (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 1991)
- Borsi-Kálmán, Béla, *Illúziókergetés vagy ismétléskényszer? Román-magyar nemzetpolitikai elgondolások és megegyezési kísérletek a XIX. században* (Chasing illusions or complexes of repetition? Romanian-Hungarian national ideas and attempts at reconcillation in the 19th century) (Bukarest, Budapest: Kriterion, Balassi, 1995)
- Borsi-Kálmán, Béla, *Kihívás és eretnokség: Adalékok a román-magyar viszony történetéhez* (Challenge and heresy: Contributions to the history of Romanian-Hungarian relations). Sepsiszentgyörgy: H-Press, 1996.
- Borsi-Kálmán, Béla, *Kockázatos viszonyok: Írások a román irodalom, művelődéstörténet és nemzeti önszemlélet tárgyköréből* (Hazardous relations: Writings on Romanian literature, cultural history and national self-perception). Pécs: Jelenkor, 1997
- Borsi-Kálmán, Béla, *Liaisons risquées: Hongrois et Roumains aux XIXe et XXe siècles. Consciences nationales, interférences et relations délicates.* (Pécs: Jelenkor, 1999)
- Borsi-Kálmán, Béla, *Nemzetfogalom és nemzetstratégiák: A Kossuth- emigráció és a román nemzeti törekvések kapcsolatának történetéhez* (The concept of the nation and national strategies: On the history of the relations of the Kossuth emigration and the Romanian national aspirations). (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1993)
- Bratislava a počiatky slovenského národného obrodenia.* Dokumenty. Ed: Hučko, Ján (Bratislava: Obzor pre Archív hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy, 1992)
- Bratislava, Matica slovenská 2003
- Buskó, Tibor László, *Az intézeti modell múltja és jövője.*
- Bystrický, Valerián – Fano, Štefan (eds.), *Slovensko na konci druhej svetovej vojny* (stav východiská, perspektívy) (Bratislava: 1994)
- Bystrický, Valerián (ed.), *Slovensko v politickom systéme Československa* (Bratislava: 1992)
- Bystrický, Valerián (ed.), *Slovensko v rokoch druhej svetovej vojny* (Bratislava: 1991)
- Cambel, S., *Státnik a národohospodár Milan Hodža 1878-1944* (Bratislava: Veda, 2001)
- Čarnogurský, Pavol, *14.marec 1939* (Bratislava: 1992)
- Čarnogurský, Pavol, *6.október 1938* (Bratislava: SAV, 1993)
- Česi na Slovensku*, ed. Zelinová, Hana (Martin: Slovenské národné múzeum, 2000)
- Česko-slovenská historická ročenka 2000* (Bratislava, 2000)

- Chmel, Rudolf, *Moje maďarská otázka* (Bratislava: 1996)
- Čičaj, Viliam/Kováč, Dušan/Lipták, Ľubomír/Marsina, Richard: *Slovenské dejiny*. (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1990)
- Čičaj, Viliam- Pickl, Othmar (ed.), *Städtisches Alltagsleben in Mitteleuropa vom Mittelalter bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhundert* (Bratislava: 1998)
- Čierna-Lantayová, Dagmar, *Pohľady na východ. (Postoje k Rusku v slovenskej politike 1934-1944.)* (Bratislava: Veda vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied 2002)
- Cornelius, Deborah S.: *In search of the nation. The new generation of Hungarian youth in Czechoslovakia 1925-1934*. Boulder 1998 (East European Monographs)
- Csaky, Moritz – Mannova, Elena (ed.), *Collective Identities in Central Europe in Modern Times* (Bratislava: 1999)
- Csáky, Mórítz – Mannová, Elena (ed.), *Kolektivne identity v strednej Európe v období moderny* (Bratislava: 1999)
- Csanádi, Márta, *Honnan tovább?* (Budapest: T-Twins - MTA Közgazdaságtudományi Intézet, 1995)
- Csetri, Lajos, *"Nem sokaság, hanem lélek". Berzsenyi-tanulmányok* (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1986)
- Csetri, Lajos, *Egység vagy különbözőség?* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1990)
- Csiki, Tamás, *Az északkelet, kelet-magyarországi városi zsidóság gazdaság- és társadalomtörténete* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999)
- Csizmadia, Ervin, *A magyar demokratikus ellenzék 1968-1988* Vols. 1-3. (Budapest: T-Twins, 1995)
- Csorba, László - *A vallásalap „jogi természete”. Az egyházi vagyoni problémája a polgári átalakulás korában Magyarországon 1782-1918.* (ELTE BTK Művelődéstörténeti Tanszék, Budapest, 1999)
- Csorba, László and Velkey, Ferenc, *Reform és forradalom 1790 – 1849* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1998)
- Čulen, Konštantín, *Po Svätoplukovi druhá naša hlava* (Partizánske: 1992)
- Czech and Slovak History. An American Bibliography.* Ed.: Kovtun, George J. (Washington: Library of Congress, 1996)
- Dangl, Vojtech - Kopčan, Vojtech, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 2. 1526-1711* (Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany SR, 1995)
- Dangl, Vojtech - Segeš, Vladimír, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 3. 1711-1914* (Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany SR, 1996)
- Dávid Géza and Fodor Pál (eds.), *Ottomans, Hungarians, and Habsburgs in Central Europe. The Military Confines in the Era of Ottoman Conquest. The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage, Politics, Society and Economy. Vol. 20.* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publisher, 2000)
- Deák, Ágnes. „'Nemzeti egyenjogúsító'” kormányzati nemzetiségpolitika Magyarországon 1849-1860 (Governmental policy in Hungary aiming at „national emancipation,” 1849-1860). (Budapest: Osiris, 2000)
- Dejiny Slovenska II.* (1526-1848). Bratislava 1987, *Dejiny Slovenska III.* (od roku 1848 až do konca 19. storočia). Bratislava 1992
- Dejiny Slovenska III.* Od roku 1948 do konca 19. storočia (Bratislava: Veda, 1992)
- Demény, Lajos, ed. - *Székely Oklevéltár – Új sorozat* (Szekler Archives – New Series). Vol. IV. *Székely népességösszeírások 1545-1627* (Szekler census, 1545-1627). Vol. V. *Székely népességösszeírások 1635* (Szekler census, 1635). Vol. VI. *Székely népességösszeírások 1635-1653* (Szekler census, 1635-1653). (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1998-2000)
- Dénes Iván Zoltán, *A „realitás” illúziója. A historikus Székfű Gyula pályafordulója.* (Budapest, 1976)

- Dérier, Ivan, *Československá otázka* (The Czechoslovak Question), (Praha: 1935)
- Dessewffy, Tibor, *Iskola a hegyoldalban* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1993)
- Dies Alter – Nešťastný deň 29. august 1944* (sborník) (Bratislava: ERPO, 1994)
- Dokumenty doby 1990-2000*, ed.: Šimulčík, Ján (Prešov: Vyd. Michala Vaška, 2002)
- Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti. Zv. 1.* (Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum - Dom slovenskej literatúry, 1998)
- Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti. Zv. 2.* (Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum - Dom slovenskej literatúry, 1998)
- Dokumenty. Zborník medzinárodných dohôd, vyhlásení a zákonov Slovenskej republiky o právach národnostných menšín. Zv. 1.-2.* (Bratislava: Danubiaprint, 1995)
- Domanovszky, Sándor, *A középkori Magyarország település- és nemzetiségpolitikája* (Budapest: Lucidus, 2002)
- Domanovszky, Sándor, *Magyarország története a felvilágosodás korában* (Budapest: Osiris, 2002)
- Domanovszky, Sándor, *Népiségtörténet* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1994)
- Dubček, Alexander, *Od totality k demokracii. Prejavy, články a rozhovory. Výber 1963 - 1992* (Bratislava: Veda vydavateľstvo, SAV 2002)
- Dudeková, Gabriela, *Sociálne dejiny 19. a 20. storočia na Slovensku – bilancia a nové impulzy* In: *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004
- Durčanský, Ferdinand, *Biela kniha – Právo Slovákov na samostatnosť vo svetle dokumentov* (Buenos Aires, 1954)
- Đurčiansky, Ferdinand, *Pohľad na slovenskú politickú minulosť* (A View of the Slovak Political Past) (Bratislava: 1943)
- Đurica, Milan Stanislav, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Košice: Pressko, 1996)
- Đurica, Milan, *Jozef Tiso slovenský kňaz a štátnik, 1887-1939* (Abano Treme 1989)
- Egyed Ákos. *Erdély, 1848-1849* (Transylvania, 1848-1849). 2 Vols., (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémia, 1998-1999)
- Egyed, Ákos. *A korszerűsödő és hagyományörző Erdély* (The modernizing and traditionalist Transylvania). 2 Vols. (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémiai, 1997)
- Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska. Zv. 1.-2.*, eds.: Botík, Ján - Slavkovský, Peter (Bratislava: Veda, 1995)
- Engel, Pál, *A nemesi társadalom a középkori Ung megyében* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1998)
- Engel, Pál, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1451*. Vols. 1-2. (Budapest: História - MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996)
- Erdmann, Gyula, *Begyűjtés, beszolgáltatás Magyarországon, 1945-1956* (Békéscsaba: Tevan, 1992)
- Erdődy, Gábor - *Kényszerpályán. A magyar politikai gondolkodás 1849-ben.* (Budapest: Argumentum, 1998)
- Erős, Vilmos - *A Szekfü-Mályusz vita* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 2000)
- Etnografický atlas Slovenska. Mapové zobrazenie vybraných javov ľudovej kultúry.* Ed.: Kovačevićová, Soňa (Bratislava: Veda - Slovenská kartografia 1990)
- Európa és Magyarország Szent István korában*, eds.: Kristó, Gyula – Makk, Ferenc (Szeged: Csongrád Megye Önkormányzata, 2000)
- Fenyő, István, *Valóságábrázolás és eszményítés. Irodalomkritikai gondolkodásunk fejlődése, 1830-1842* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1990)
- Ferencuhova, Bohumila (ed.), *Milan Rastislav Stefanik. Astronome, soldat, grande figure franco-slovaque et europeenne* (Bratislava: 1999)
- Férfiuralom*, ed.: Hadas, Miklós (Budapest: Replika, 1994)

- Ferncuhova, Bohumila (ed.), *La France et l'Europe centrale. Les relations entre la France et l'Europe centrale en 1867-1914. Impacts et images reciproques*, (Bratislava: 1995)
- Fodor, Pál, *A szultán és az aranyalma. Tanulmányok az oszmán-török történelemről*, (Budapest:2001)
- Föglein, Gizella, *Államforma és államfői jogkör Magyarországon 1944-1949* (Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 1993)
- Földes, György, *Az eladósodás politikatörténete 1957-1986* (Budapest: Maecanas, 1995).
- Földesi, Margit, *A Szövetséges Ellenőrző Bizottság Magyarországon 1945-1947* (Budapest: IKVA, 1995)
- Fordulat a világban és Magyarországon, 1947-1949*, eds.: Feitl, István - Izsák, Lajos - Székely, Gábor (Budapest: Napvilág, 2000)
- Fügedi, Erik, *Az Elefánthyak* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) (first edition 1992) English translation: *The Elefánthy: The Hungarian Nobleman and His Kindred* (Budapest, 1998)
- Fülöp, Mihály, *A befejezetlen béke* (Budapest: Héttorony, 1994)
- Gabzdilová, Soňa - Olejník, Milan, Odsun nemeckej menšiny zo Spiša v rokoch 1945-1948 In: *Spiš v kontinuite času* (Prešov-Bratislava-Wien: FF v Prešove UPJŠ v Košiciach - Österreichisches Ost- und Südosteuropa Institut Wien, 1995)
- Gabzdilová, Soňa, Nemecká menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1947-1950 In: *Etnické minority na Slovensku. História, súčasnosť, súvislosti* (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1997)
- Gabzdilová, Soňa, *Školy s maďarským vyučovacím jazykom na Slovensku po druhej svetovej vojne* (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1991)
- Galavics, Géza - *Kössünk kardot az pogány ellen. Török háborúk és képzőművészet.* (Budapest: 1986)
- Gángó, Gábor, *Eötvös József az emigrációban* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1999)
- Gerő, András, *Az államosított forradalom* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998) *Replika* 23-24 (December 1996)
- Gerő, András, *Modern Hungarian society in the making: The unfinished experience.* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995)
- Gerő, András, *The Hungarian Parliament: A Mirage of Power.* Atlantic Studies on Society in Change, no. 92. (Highland Lakes: Atlantic Research and Publications, Inc., 1997)
- Glatz, Ferenc, "Szaktudományos kérdésfeltevések és történetpolitikai koncepció. A fiatal Szekfű Gyula bécsi éveinek történetéből," in: *Történelmi Szemle*, 1974. 3
- Glatz, Ferenc, 'Hajnal István történetírása' in Hajnal, István, *Technika, művelődés* (Budapest: História - MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1993)
- Gunst, Péter, *A magyar történetírás története* (Debrecen, Csokonai K., 1995)
- Gyáni, Gábor and György Kövér *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a reformkortól a második világháborúig* (Social History of Hungary, 1830-1945), (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Gyáni, Gábor, *Történészdiskurzusok* (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2002)
- Gyáni, Gábor, "Történetírásunk az évezred fordulóján," *Századvég*, Új folyam, 18 (2000)
- Gyáni, Gábor, 'Patterns of Women's Work in Hungary 1900-1930'', *European Review of History* 5 (Spring 1998)
- Gyáni, Gábor, 'Mai várostörténet-írásunk: teljesítmény és irányzatok', *Századvég* 4 (Spring 1997)
- Gyarmati, György, *Március hatalma – a hatalom márciusa* (Budapest: Paginarium, 1998)

- Gyurgyák, János, *A zsidókérdés Magyarországon* (Jewish Question in Hungary) (Budapest: Osiris, 2001)
- Gyurkó, László, *1956* (Budapest: Szabad Tér, 1996)
- Haas, György, *Diktatúrák árnyékában* (Budapest: Magyar Napló, 2000)
- Hajdú, Tibor, *Tisztikar és középosztály, 1850-1914* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1999)
- Hajnal István: *Az újkor története.* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988)
- Hanák Péter: *Jászi Oszkár dunai patriotizmusa.* (Budapest: Magvető, 1985)
- Halaga, Ondrej R., *Počiatky Košíc a zrod metropoly* (Košice: Východoslov. vyd., 1993)
- Hanák, Péter, ed., - *Zsidókérdés, asszimiláció, antiszemitizmus* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1984)
- Hankiss, Elemér, *Kelet-európai alternatívák* (Budapest: Közgazdasági- és Jogi Kiadó, 1989). English edition is *East European Alternatives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)
- Hatalom és társadalom a XX. századi magyar történelemben*, ed.: Valuch (Budapest: Osiris,)
- Heltai, János, *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok* (Budapest: Balassi, 1994)
- Hermann, Róbert. „Az 1848-49-es forradalom és szabadságharc a magyar történetírásban,” (The 1848-49 Revolution and War of Independence in Hungarian historiography), *Aetas* (1999) 1-2
- Historický slovník slovenského jazyka I.-II.* Ed.: Majtán, Milan (Bratislava: Veda, 1991-1992)
- Historiografia na Slovensku 1990-1994. Výberová bibliografia.* Eds. Sedliaková, Alžbeta (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 1995)
- History-Image: Selected Examples of the Interplay between Past and Art in Hungary*, exhibition arranged by Katalin Sinkó and Árpád Mikó (2000). The catalogue was edited also by Árpád Mikó and Katalin Sinkó, (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, 2000)
- Hlinka, A., *Sila slabých a slabosť silných. Cirkve na Slovensku v rokoch 1945-1989* (Trnava: Spolok sv. Vojtecha, 1990)
- Holec, Roman, “Neresti” slovenských narodovcov z pred sto rokov In: *Historické štúdie* 42, 2002
- Holec, Roman, *Historik a peniaze (alebo podiel peniazí na poľudštení historika)*, *Historický časopis*, roč. 50, č.1, 2002
- Holec, Roman, *Poslední Habsburgovci a Slovensko* (Bratislava: 2001)
- Holec, Roman, *Zabudnuté osudy* (10 zivotnych príbehov novodobých slovenských dejin) (Martin: 2001)
- Holocaust na Slovensku. Dokumenty.* 1-4 ed. Nižňanský, Eduard (Bratislava: 2001, Prezident, vláda, Snem Slovenskej republiky a Štátna rada o židovskej otázke 1939-1945 (ed. E. Nižňanský – I. Kamenec), Bratislava 2003, Listy Gizely Fleischmannovej (1942-1944) /K. Hradská), Bratislava 2003, Dokumenty nemeckej proveniencie (1939-1945). (ed. E. Nižňanský), Bratislava 2003
- Horvath, Agnes, *The Dissolution of Communist Power: The Case of Hungary* (London: Routledge, 1992)
- Horváth, Miklós, *Maléter Pál* (Budapest: Osiris - Századvég - 1956-os Intézet, 1995)
- Horváth, Pavel, *Typy židovských osád. Párovce, Židovská Veča, Šarišské Lúky, Huncovce.* *HR* 6, 1995, č. 8
- Horváth, Pavel, *Neuvážený návrh na zrušenie slovenskej transkripcie starých rodových mien a priezvisk (Ill-judged porposal for the abolishment of Slovak transcription of old family namep.)* *Historický časopis* 47, 1999

- Hrabovec, Emilia, Zehn Jahre nach der Wende. Slowakische Historiographie: Ein schwieriger Weg zur Selbstverantwortung. In: *Osterreichische Osthefte* 44, 2002, H. ½
- Hronský, Marián - Krivá, Anna - Čaplovič, Miloslav, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 4. 1914-1939.* (Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany SR, 1996)
- Hrušovský, František, *Slovenské dejiny* (Slovak History) (T.S.Martin: 1939)
- Huszár, Tibor, *A hatalom rejtett dimenziói* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1995)
- Imre, Mihály, „Magyarország panasza”: a *Querela Hungariae* toposz a XVI-XVII. század irodalmában (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1995)
- Iordachi, Constantin, and Balázs Trencsényi, „A román történetírás kihívásai, (Challenges of Romanian historiography). *Replika* (November 2000) 40-41
- Ivantyšinová, Tatiana, O probleme continuity a diskontinuity historiografie všeobecných dejín na Slovensku. In: *Historický časopis*, 50, 2002, c.1
- Izsák, Lajos, Polgári pártok és programjaik Magyarországon 1944-1956 (Pécs: Baranya Megyei Könyvtár, 1994)
- Jablonický Jozef, *Podoby násilia (Statna bezpecnost 1945-51)* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2000)
- Jablonický, Jozef, Spomienky a životopisy ľudáckych predstaviteľov publikované po roku 1989, *Historický časopis*, roč. 43, č.2, 1995
- Jakešová, Elena, Kanadská historiografia, etnické skupiny a Slováci. *HŠt* 34, 1993,
- Jakó, Zsigmond, *Társadalom, egyház, művelődés: Tanulmányok Erdély történelméhez* (Society, church and culture: Studies on the history of Transylvania) (Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközössége, 1997)
- Jelinek, Yeshayahu Andrej, Historiografia o Slovensku v Izraeli. Historiography on Slovakia in Israel. *Historický časopis* 40, 1992, č. 6
- Juríček, J., *M.R.Štefánik*(Bratislava: Mladé letá, 1990)
- K problematike osídlenia stredodunajskej oblasti vo včasnóm stredoveku*, Ed. Čilinská, Zlatica (Nitra: Archeologický ústav SAV, 1991)
- K Ústavnímu vývoji v českých zemích a na Slovensku v letech 1938-1948*(Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny, 1992)
- Kahler, Frigyes - M. Kiss, Sándor, *Kinek a forradalma?* (Budapest: Püski - Kortárs, 1997)
- Kahler, Frigyes, *Joghalál Magyarországon, 1945-1989* (Budapest: Zrinyi, 1993)
- Kalmár, Melinda, *Ennivaló és hozomány* (Budapest: Magvető, 1998), Review in *Századok* 134 (September 2000)
- Kámán, Éva and Heltai, Gyöngyi, *A társadalomtudományi alap kutatások finanszírozási rendszere, 1990-2001.*
- Kamenec, Ivan, Postopách tragédie (Bratislava: 1991)
- Kamenec, Ivan, Stereotypy v slovenských dejinách a v slovenskej historiografii, *OS*, 1998/3
- Kántor, Lajos ed., *Szegényeknek palota: XX. századi román esszék* (Palace for the poor: Romanian essays from the 20th century) (Budapest: Balassi, 1998)
- Kapitoly z vedeckého života v Bratislave* (Bratislava: Veda, 1991)
- Karády, Victor and Don, Yehuda eds., *A Social and Economic History of Central European Jewry*, (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1990)
- Karsai, László, *Holokauszt* (Budapest: Pannonica, 2001)
- Kecskeméti, Gábor, *Prédikáció, retorika, irodalomtörténet. A magyar nyelvű halotti beszéd a 17. században* (Budapest: Universitas, 1998)
- Kende, Tamás, *Vérvád* (Budapest: Osiris, 1995) 'The Language of Blood Libels in Central and East European History' in *Pride and Prejudice*, ed.: Kontler, László (Budapest: History Department of the Central European University, 1994)

- Kenedi, János, *Kis Állambiztonsági Olvasókönyv* (Budapest: Magvető, 1996)
- Kiliánová, Gabriela – Rečianská, Eva (eds.), *Identities of Ethnic Group and Communities* (Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology of SAV, 2000)
- Kiliánová, Gabriela (ed.), *Identita etnických spoločienstev* (Bratislav: Ústav etnológie SAV, 1998)
- Kirschbaum, Stanislav, *A History of Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival* (New York, 1995)
- Kiszely, Gábor, *ÁVH* (Budapest: Korona, 2000)
- Klaniczay, *Az uralkodók szentsége a középkorban* (Budapest: Balassi, 2000), English edition: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses* (Cambridge - New York, 2002)
- Klaniczay, Gábor, *A civilizáció peremén* (Budapest: Magvető, 1990)
- Klaniczay, Gábor, *The Uses of Supernatural Power* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990)
- Klaniczay, Gábor, Heilige, Hexen, Vampire (Berlin: Klaus Wagenbach, 1991)
- Klein, Bohuš - Ruttkay, Alexander - Marsina, Richard, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 1.* (Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany Slovenskej republiky, 1994)
- Kókay, György, *Kereszténység, felvilágosodás, nemzeti kultúra* (Budapest: Universitas, 2000)
- Kollár, K., *Milan Hodža, moderný teoretik, pragmatický politik* (Bratislava: Infopress, 1994)
- Kollárová, Z. – Hams, J., *Sprievodca po slovenských archívoch* (Prešov: Universum, 1999)
- Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2001)
- Kónya, Peter, *Stručné dejiny Podkarpatskej Rusi Zv. 1.* (Prešov: Metodické centrum, 1996)
- Köpeczi, Béla, ed., *Erdély története* [The History of Transylvania], (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986)
- Körper-Zrínsky, Karol, *Môj život* (Bratislava: 1993)
- Kósa, László (ed.), *Magyar művelődéstörténet* (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Kováč, Dušan (ed.), *Slovak contributions to the 19-th international* (Bratislava: Congress of Historical Sciences, 2000)
- Kováč, Dušan: *Dejiny Slovenska.* (Praha: LN, 1998)
- Kováč, Dušan, Die Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung und die Sozialgeschichte in der slowakischen Historiographie seit 1945 In: *Mitteilungsblatt des Instituts für soziale Bewegung* 23, 2000
- Kováč, Dušan, Die slowakische Historiographie na 1989. Aktiva, Probleme, Perspektiven. In: *Bohemia* 37, 1996
- Kováč, Dušan, *Muži deklarácie* (Martin: 1991)
- Kováč, Dušan, *Nemecko a nemecká menšina na Slovensku (1871-1945)* (Bratislava: 1991)
- Kováč, Dušan, O slovenskej historiografii v Collegium Carolinum, *Historický časopis*, roč. 52, č.2, 2004
- Kováč, Dušan, Paradoxa und Dilemmata der postkommunistischen Geschichtsschreibung In: *Osterreichische Osthefte* 44, H. ½
- Kováč, Dušan, Probleme der sozialhistorischen Forschung zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in der slowakischen Historiographie. In: *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 34, 1994
- Kováč, Dušan, Slovenská historiografia desať rokov po. Zámery a ich realizácia, *Historický časopis*, roč.50, č. 1, 2002
- Kováč, Dušan, *Szlovákia története* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2001)

- Kovács, József Ö., *Zsidók a Duna-Tisza közén* (Kecskemét: Kecskeméti Lapok – Kecskemét Monográfia Szerkesztősége, 1996)
- Kovács, Mária M., *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) The Hungarian version was published as *Liberalizmus, radikalizmus, antiszemitizmus* (Budapest: Helikon, 2001)
- Kovács, Mária M., *The Politics of the Legal Profession in Interwar Hungary* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987)
- Kövér, György, 'A magyar gazdaságtörténetírás régi útjai' and 'Elmélet és módszer a legújabb gazdaságtörténetírásban' in his *A felhalmozás ive* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2002)
- Kövér, György, *Losonczy Géza 1917-1957* (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1998)
- Kowalska, Eva, Neue Wege zur Bewältigung der Geschichte der Slowakei in den 1990er Jahren In: *Osterreichische Osthefte* 44, 2002, H. ½
- Krajcovičová, Natália, Slovenská historiografia o dejinách medzivojnovnej ČSR. In: *Reflexe dejin prvé Československé republiky v české a slovenské historiografii*. Ed. , Josef Harna (Praha: HU AV CR, 1998)
- Krátke dejiny Slovenska* Ed. Mannová, Elena (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press, 2003)
- Kristó, Gyula – Makk, Ferenc, eds. - *Árpád előtt és után*. (Szeged: Somogyi Könyvtár, 1996)
- Kristó, Gyula, *A korai magyar államról* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996)
- Kristó, Gyula, *Honfoglalás és társadalom* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996)
- Kristó, Gyula, *Írások Szent Istvánról és koráról* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2000)
- Kristó, Gyula, *Magyarország története 895-1301* (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Kronika 20. storočia* (Bratislava: Fortuna Print, 2000)
- Kronika anonymného notára kráľa Bela. Gesta Hungarorum*. Ed.: Dvořák, Pavel (Budmerice: Vyd. Rak, 2000)
- Kronika Slovenska. Zv. 1. Od najstarších čias do konca 19. storočia* (Bratislava: Fortuna Print & Adox, 1998)
- Kronika Slovenska. Zv. 2. Slovensko v dvadsiatom storočí* (Bratislava: Fortuna Print, 1999)
- Krvácajúca hranica*, ed. Kirschbaum, Jozef (Matica slovenská, 1994)
- Kto bol kto za I. ČSR* (Bratislava: Q111, 1993)
- Kto je kto na Slovensku 1991* (Bratislava: Konzorcium Encyklopédia, 1991)
- Kusý, Miroslav, *Čo s našimi Maďarmi?* (Bratislava: 1998)
- Lackó, Mihály, *Halál Párizsban* (Budapest: Magvető: 1986)
- Lackó, Mihály, *Széchenyi elájul* (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2001)
- Lackó, Miklós. *Szechenyi es Kossuth vitaja* (The debate of Szechenyi and Kossuth) (Budapest: Megveto, 1977)
- Ladányi, Andor, *Felsőoktatási politika 1949-1958* (Budapest: Kossuth, 1986)
- Ladányi, Erzsébet, *Az önkormányzat intézményei és elméleti alapvetése az európai és hazai városfejlődés korai szakaszában* (Budapest: Márton Áron, 1996)
- Lafferton, Emese, 'Hysteria and Deviance in Fin-de-siècle Hungary', *Replika* (1998)
- Lakatos, László, "Az elfelejtett Hajnal István. Az íráskultúra és a kapitalizmus szelleme: Hajnal István 1933/34-es tanulmányai", *Medvetánc* 1982/2-3.sz
- Lakatos, László, *Az élet és a formák. Hajnal István történelemszociológiája*.

- (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1996)
- Lakatos, László, 'Egy szociológus történész: Hajnal István' in: Tanulmányok a magyar szociológia történetéből., (Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, 1988)
- Laluka, I., *Alexander Dubček. Politik a jeho doba* (Bratislava: Nova Praca, 2000)
- László Péter: *Historians and the History of Transylvania* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1992)
- Lederer, Emma, *A magyar polgári történetírás rövid története* (Bp. 1969)
- Lexikon katolíckych knazských osobnosti Slovenska* (Bratislava: Luc, 2000)
- Lipscher, L., *Židia v slovenskom štáte 1939-1945* (Print-servis, 1992)
- Lipták Lubomír, *Slovensko v 20. storočí* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1998)
- Lipták, Lubomír, Slovenská historiografia o medzivojnovom Československu. In: Valenta, Jaroslav – Voráček, Emil – Harna, Josef (ed.): *Československo 1918-1938. Osudy demokracie ve střední Evropě* (Praha: 1999)
- Lipták, L'ubomír, *Száz évnél hosszabb évszázad: a történelemről és a történetírásról* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2000)
- Lipták, Lubomír: Slovo k slovenskej historiografii, *Historický časopis* 52,2,2004
- Litván, György and Szücs László, *A szociológia első magyar műhelye* vols. I-II. (Bp. 1973)
- Litván, György *Magyar gondolat, szabad gondolat* [Hungarian Thought, Free Thought] (Budapest, 1978)
- Litván, György, ed. *The Hungarian Revolution of 1956: Reform, Revolt and Repression 1953-1963*, (London – New York: Longman, 1996)
- Londák, M.- Sikora, S. – Londáková, E., *Predjarie* (Bratislava: 2002)
- Magyar szabadelvűek*, ed András Gerő 12 volumes, appeared in 1998at Új Mandátum editing house
- Magyar, Zoltán, *Szent László a magyar néphagyományban* (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Magyarország története 1918-1990*, eds.: Pölöskei, Ferenc - Gergely, Jenő - Izsák, Lajos (Budapest: Korona, 1995)
- Májek, Stanislav, Dr. Josef Tiso (Bratislava: 2002)
- Makk, Ferenc, *Magyar külpolitika* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely) *A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1998)
- Malá slovenská encyklopédia* (Bratislava: Encyklopedický ústav SAV - Goldpress Publishers, 1993)
- Malé dejiny česko-slovenských vzťahov. Zv. 1-5. Prvá Československá republika*, Ed.: Radičová, Iveta (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku, 1994-1995)
- Malé dejiny česko-slovenských vzťahov. Zv. 6.*, Eds.: Kamenec, Ivan - Fialová, Zuzana (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku, 1996)
- Mályusz, Elemér, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1971) Domanovszky, Sándor, *Gazdaság és társadalom a középkorban* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1979)
- Mannova, Elena – Daniel, David P. (ed.), A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia. In: *Studia historica Slovaca* 20, 1995
- Mannová, Elena (ed.), *Bürgertum und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in der Slowakei 1900-1989* (Bratislava: 1997)
- Mannová, Elena (ed.), *Concise History of Slovakia* (Bratislava: 2000)
- Mannová, Elena (ed.), *Krátke dejiny Slovenska* (Bratislava: 2003)
- Mannová, Elena, Clio na slovenský spôsob. In: *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004
- Marsina, Richard, Das Judentum in der Slowakei im Mittelalter In: *Juden im Grenzraum. Symposium im Rahmen der "Schlaininger Gespräche" vom 19.-23. September 1990 auf Burg Schlaining. Eisenstadt* (Eisenstadt: Burgenländischen

- Landesmuseum, 1993)
- Marsina, Richard, O istých črtách terajšieho stavu slovenskej historiografie, *Historický časopis*, roč. 45, č.1, 1997
- Marsina, Richard, *Štúdie k slovenskému diplomatáru II.* (Bratislava: Veda, 1989)
- Márton, Szabó, *Diszkurzív térben: Tanulmányok a politika nyelvéről és a politikai tudásról* (Budapest: Scientia Humana, 1998)
- Márton, Szabó, ed., *Szövegvalóság: Írások a szimbolikus és diszkurzív politikáról* (Budapest: Scientia Humana, 1997)
- Márton, Szabó, Kiss, Balázs, Boda, Zsolt ed., *Szövegváltozatok a politikára: Nyelv, szimbólum, retorika, diskurzus* (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó-Universitas, 2000)
- Marušiak, Juraj, *Slovenská literatúra v druhej polovici pädesiatych rokov* (Brno: 2001)
- Mathé, Svätoslav, *Milan Hodža. Štátnik a politik* (Bratislava: 1992)
- Mazsu, János, *The Social History of the Hungarian Intelligentsia in the 'Long Nineteenth Century' 1825-1914* (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 1996)
- Medrický, Gejza, *Minister spomína* (Bratislava: 1993)
- Michálek, Slavomír - Krajčovičová, Natália, *Do pamäti národa. Osobnosti slovenských dejín prvej polovice 20. storočia* (Bratislava: 1998)
- Mikloško, F., *Nebudete ich moc' rozvrátiť* (Bratislava: 1991)
- Miskolczy Ambrus . *Eszmék és téveszmék. Kritikai esszék a román múlt és jelen vitás kérdéseit tárgyaló könyvekről* (Budapest, 1994), 97.
- Miskolczy, Ambrus . *Lélek és titok. A "mioritikus tér" mítosza, avagy Lucian Blaga eszmevilágáról* (Budapest: Közép-Európa Intézet - Kortárs Kiadó, 1994),
- Miskolczy, Ambrus . *Szellem és nemzet. Babits Mihály, Eckhardt Sándor, Szekfű Gyula és Zolnai Béla világáról* (Budapest, Napvilág, 2001)
- Miskolczy, Ambrus and Pászka, Imre, ed. - *Román eszmetörténet, 1866-1945. Önismeret és modernizáció a román gondolkodásban* (Budapest: Aetas -Századvég, 1994)
- Mistrník, M., *Slovenské divadlo ve 20. Storoči* (Bratislava: Veda, 1999)
- Mlynárik, Ján, *Českí profesori na Slovensku* (Praha: 1994)
- Mlynárik, Ján, *Pražané na Slovenksu ve 20. století* (Praha: 2000)
- Moderní dějin.* Sborník k dějinám 19. a 20. století (Bratislava: 2000)
- Molnár, Judit, *Zsidósors 1944-ben az V. (szegedi) csendőrkörületben* (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1995)
- Monok, István, Noémi Németh, and Sándor Tonk, eds. *Erdélyi könyvesházak. 2. Kolozsvár, Marosvásárhely, Nagyenyed, Szászváros, Székelyudvarhely* (Transylvanian libraries. 2. Kolozsvár, Marosvásárhely, Nagyenyed, Szászváros, Székelyudvarhely). (Szeged: Scriptum, 1991)
- Múdra, Darina, *Dejiny hudobnej kultúry na Slovensku II. Klasicizmus* (Bratislava: 1993)
- Murín, Karol, *Spomienky a svedectvo* (Ontario: Hamilton, 1987)
- Muži deklarácie*, Ed.: Kováč, Dušan (Martin: Osveta, 1991)
- Nagy, Zsuzsa L., *A haszonból élő kispolgár* (Debrecen: Debrecen University Press, 1997)
- Niederhauser, Emil. *A történetírás története Kelet-Európában* (The history of historiography in Eastern Europe). (Budapest: História- MTA TTI, 1995)
- Nitra. Príspevky k najstarším dejinám mesta* (Nitra: Archeologický ústav SAV, 1993)
- Nižňanský, E., *Kto bol kto za 1. ČSR* (Bratislava: 1993)
- November 1989 a Slovensko. Chronológia a dokumenty (1985-1990)* Ed.: Žatkuliak, Jozef (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku - Historický ústav SAV 1999)

- Novotný, Václav, *Z dějin československých* (From Czechoslovak History) (Brno: 1921)
- Nurmi, Ismo, *Slovakia. A playground for nationalism and national identity. Manifestations of the national identity of Slovaks 1918-1920* (Helsinki:1999)
- Obžalovaný prehovori. Dokumenty z dejín Maďarov v Československu*, Ed.: Szigety, László (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1994)
- Okál', Ján, *Výpredaj ľudskosti.....Slovensko* (Cambridge: Onotario, 1989)
- Ormos, Mária, 'Történelem és történetírás', *Korunk* (July 2000)
- Ormos, Mária, *Egy magyar médiavezér: Kozma Miklós*, vols. I-II. (Budapest: PolgART, 2001)
- Ormos, Mária, *Hitler* (Budapest: T-Twins, 1994)
- Ormos, Mária, *Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914-1945* (Debrecen: 1998)
- Ősök, táltosok, szentek*, eds.: Pócs, Éva - Voigt, Vilmos (Budapest: MTA Néprajzi Kutatóintézete, 1998)
- Őze, Sándor, „Bűneiért bünteti Isten a magyar népet”. *Egy bibliai párhuzam vizsgálata a XVI. századi nyomtatott egyházi irodalom alapján* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 1991)
- Pach, (ed.), *Magyarország története tíz kötetben.* (Budapest, 1979)
- Pál, Judit - *Procesul de urbanizare din scaunele secuiești în secolul al XIX-lea* (The urbanization process in the Szekler districts in the 19th century) (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1999)
- Palasik, Mária, *A jogállamiság megteremtésének kísérlete és kudarca Magyarországon 1944-1949* (Budapest: Napvilág, 2000)
- Pálffy, Géza, *A császárváros védelmében. A győri főkapitányság története, 1526-1598*, (Győr: Győr-Moson-Sopron Megye Győri Levéltára, 1999)
- Pálffy, Géza, *A tizenhatodik század története.* (Budapest: Pannonica, 2000)
- Pelle, János, *Az utolsó vérvádak* (Budapest: Pelikán, 1995)
- Pesek, J. – Barnovsky, M., *Statna moc a cirkvi na Slovensku 1948-1953* (Bratislava: Veda, 1997)
- Pesek, J.- Barnovsky, M., *Pod kuratelou noci. Cirkvi na Slovensku v rokoch 1953-1970* (Bratislava: Veda, 1999)
- Pešek, Jan (ed.), *V tieni totality. Politické perzekúcie na Slovensku v rokoch 1948-1953* (Bratislava: 1996)
- Pešek, Jan, *Slovensko v rokoch 1953-1957. Kapitoly z politického vývoja* (Brno: 2001)
- Péter, Katalin, 'Női családfők Sárospatakon a 16. és 17. században', *Századok* 123 (September - November, 1989)
- Péteri, György, 'Születésnap ajándék Sztálinnak', *Századvég* 1 (1989)
- Petneki, Áron, 'Advenae et peregrini', *Századok* 128 (March 1994)
- Pető, Andrea, *Nőhistóriák* (Budapest: Seneca, 1998)
- Petruf, Pavol, *Die slowakische Historiographie in den Jahren 1990-1994, Bohemia, Band 37, Heft 1*, 1996
- Petruf, Pavol, *Politické vzťahy medzi Francúzskom a Československom a Francúzskom a Slovenskom (1939-1948)*(Bratislava: Matica slovenská, 2003)
- Petruf, Pavol, *Slovensko v rokoch 1989-1998. Dokumenty. 2.* (Prešov: Metodické centrum Prešov, 2000)
- Pichler, Tibor, *Národovci a občania. O slovenskom politickom myslení v 19. storočí* (Bratislava: 1998)
- Plachá, Veronika - Hlavicová, Jana - Keller, Igor, *Slovanský Devín* (Bratislava: Obzor pre Mestské múzeum v Bratislave, 1990)
- Pod vládou anjouovských kráľov* Ed. Sedlák, Vincent (Bratislava: Literárne

- informačné centrum, 2002)
- Podoba, Juraj, Národná identita a "Erinnerungspolitik" v slovenskej historiografii: niekoľko kritických postrehov od "susedov", *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004
- Pokus o politický a osobný profil Jozefa Tisu*, ed. V. Bystrický (Bratislava: 1992)
- Politika, gazdaság és társadalom a XX. századi magyar történelemben*, eds.: Püski, Levente - Timár, Lajos - Valuch, Tibor, Vols. 1-2. (Debrecen: KLTE Történelmi Intézet Új- és Legújabbkori Magyar Történelem Tanszéke, 1999)
- Pótó, János, 'Harmadik nekifutásra', *Történelmi Szemle* 36 (Spring – Summer, 1994)
- Pótó, János, *Emlékművek, politika, közgondolkodás* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1989)
- Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov Zv. 1. Územie Slovenska pred príchodom Slovanov* ed.: Marsina, Richard (Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum, 1998)
- Pražák, Albert, *Češi a Slováci. Literárne dejepisné poznámky k československému poměru* (The Czechs and Slovaks. Literary Historiographic Comments on the Czechoslovak Relationship.) (Praha: 1929)
- Pražák, Albert, *Československý národ* (The Czechoslovak Nation.) (Bratislava: 1925)
- Prepuk, Anikó, *A zsidóság Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19-20. században* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1997)
- Prezident Jozef Tiso očami obhájcu Dr. Martina Greču* (Partizánska: 1993)
- Pride and Prejudice*, ed.: Kontler, László (Budapest: History Department of the Central European University, 1994)
- Priekopníci vedy a techniky na Slovensku* 3. (1. 2. Díl v letech 1986 a 1988) (Bratislava: AEP, 1999)
- Prvé povojnové voľby v strednej a juhovýchodnej Európe* (Bratislava: Veda SAV, 1998)
- Prvý cisár na uhorskom tróne* Ed.: Dvořák, Pavel (Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 2001)
- R.W.Seton-Watson and His Relations with the Czechs and Slovaks 1906-1951. Zv. 1.* Ed.: Rychlík, Jan (Praha: Ústav T.G.Masaryka, 1995)
- Rácz, István, *Parasztok, hajdúk, civisek* (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2000)
- Raffay, Ernő. *A vajdaságtól a birodalomig: Az újkori Románia története* (From the principalities to the empire: The history of modern Romania). (Szeged: JATE, 1989)
- Raffay, Ernő. *Magyar tragédia: Trianon 75 éve* (The Hungarian tragedy: 75 years of Trianon). (Budapest: Püski, 1995)
- Rainer, M. János, *Az író helye* (Budapest: Magvető, 1990)
- Rainer, M. János, *Nagy Imre. Politikai életrajz 1896-1953*, Vol. 1 (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1996) *1953-1958*, Vol. 2 (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1999)
- Ránki, Vera, *Magyarok-zsidók-nacionalizmus* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1999)
- Rašla, Anton-Žabkay, Ernest, *Proces s dr. Jozefom Tisom* (Bratislava: 1990)
- Restauráció vagy kiigazítás?*, eds.: Huszár, Tibor – Szabó, János (Budapest: Zrinyi, 1999)
- Rév, István, "In Mendacio Veritas". in: *Representations* vol. 35., Summer, 1991, Hungarian translation: 'In Mendacio Veritas' in *2000/5* (September 1994)
- Rév, István, "Parallel Autopsies," in: *Representations* 49, Winter 1995, pp. 15-39; 'Az atomizáció előnyei' in *Replika* 23-24 (December 1996)
- Révész, Sándor, *Aczél és korunk* (Budapest: Sik, 1997)
- Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1938-1945). Dokumenty. Časť 4.* Ed.: Hubenák, Ladislav (Bratislava: SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry, 1999)

- Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1938-1945)*. Dokumenty. Časť 5. Ed: Hubenák, Ladislav (Bratislava: SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry, 2000)
- Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1939-1945)*. Dokumenty. Časť 1.-2. Ed.: Hubenák, Ladislav (Bratislava: SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry, 1994)
- Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1943-1945)*. Dokumenty. Časť 3. Ed.: Hubenák, Ladislav (Bratislava: SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry, 1995)
- Ripp, Zoltán, *Ötvenhat októbere és a hatalom* (Budapest: Napvilág, 1997)
- Romsics Ignác: *Bethlen István. Politikai életrajz.* (Budapest, 1991)
- Romsics, Ignác, 'Az objektivitás mítosza és a mitizálás elfogadhatatlansága', *Rubicon* (Vol. 10., 2001 - Vol. 1 2002)
- Romsics, Ignác, ed. *Integrációs törekvések Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19-20. században* (Ambitions of integration in Central and Eastern Europe in the 19-20 th centuries). (Budapest: TLA, 1997)
- Romsics, Ignác, ed. *Magyarország és a nagyhatalmak a XX. században* (Hungary and the great powers in the XXth century). (Budapest: TLA, 1997)
- Romsics, Ignác, *Helyünk és sorsunk a Duna-medencében* (Our place and destiny in the Danubian basin). (Budapest: Osiris, 1996)
- Romsics, Ignác, *Hungary in the 20th Century* (Budapest: Corvina - Osiris, 1999)
- Romsics, Ignác, *Magyarország története a XX. században* (Budapest: Osiris, 1999)
- Romsics, Ignác, *Trianon és a magyar politikai gondolkodás, 1920-1953* (Trianon and the Hungarian political thought, 1920-1953). (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Romsics, Ignác. *Nemzet, nemzetiség és állam Kelet-Közép- és Délkelet-Európában a 19. és 20. században* (Nation, nationality and the state in East-Central and Southeast Europe in the 19-20th centuries). (Budapest: Napvilág, 1998)
- Rozprawy k slovenským dejinám*, ed. V. Čičaj (Bratislava: SA Press 2001)
- Rudinski, Norma L., *Incipient feminists. Women writers in the Slovak national revival* (Columbus, 1991)
- Rusina, Ivan - Zervan, Marián, *Životopisy svätcov* (Bratislava: Pallas, 1994)
- Rusina, Ivan, *Sväťci v strednej Európe/ Heilige in Zentraleurope* (Bratislava: Slovenská národná galéria, 1993)
- Rusinová, Z.: *Dejiny slovenského výtvarného umenia 20. Storočia* (Bratislava: Slovenská národná galéria, 2000)
- Rychlík, Jan , *Češi a Slováci v 20. století* [Diel 1.] Česko-slovenské vzťahy 1914-1945 (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press v Bratislave, 1997)
- Rychlík, Jan, *Češi a Slováci v 20. století* [Diel 2.] Česko-slovenské vzťahy 1945-1992. (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press v Bratislave, 1998)
- Rychlík, Jan, *České, slovenské a československé dejiny – vzťahy a souvislosti*, (Czech, Slovak and Czechoslovak History – Relations and Connections.). In: *Československo 1918-1938* (Praha: HÚ AV ČR, 1999)
- Rychlík, Jan, *První československá republika v slovenské ľudácké a neoľudácké historiografii*, (The First Czechoslovak Republic in Slovak Ľudák and neo-Ľudák Historiography). In: *Reflexe dejín prvej Československej republiky v české a slovenské historiografii* (Praha: HÚ AV ČR, 1998)
- Salner, Peter – Luther, Daniel, (ed.), *Etnicita a mesto. Etnicita a ko faktor polarizacie mestskeho spolocenstva v 20. storoci* (Bratislava: 2001)
- Salner, Peter, *Prežili holokaust* (Bratislava: 1997)
- Salner, Peter, *Taka bola Bratislava*. Bratislavciana Bratislvacanom o Bratislave (Bratislava: 1991)
- Salner, Peter, *Zidia medzi tradiciou a asimilaciou* (Bratislava: Ustav etnologie SAV, Židovska nabozenka obec Bratislava, 2000)
- Schmidt, Mária, *Diktatúrak ördögsekerén. Válogatott tanulmányok*. (Budapest: Magvető, 1998)

- Sedliaková, Alžbeta (ed.), *Historiografia na Slovensku 1990-1994* (Bratislava: 1995)
- Sedliaková, Alžbeta (ed.), *Slovenská historiografia 1995-1999* (Bratislava: 2000)
- Sedliaková, Alžbeta (ed.), Slovenská historiografia 2000 Výberová bibliografia, In: *Historický časopis* 50, 2002, c. 4
- Sedliaková, Alžbeta (ed.), Slovenská historiografia 2001. Výberová bibliografia, In: *Historický časopis* 51, 2003, c. 4
- Sidor, Karol, *Takto vznikol Slovenský štát* (Bratislava: 1992)
- Slovak History Chronology and Lexicon Ed.*: Škvarna, Dušan (Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 2002)
- Slovakia and the Slovaks. A Concise Encyclopedia* eds: Strhan, Milan - Daniel, David Paul (Bratislava: Encyclopedical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences - Goldpress Publishers, 1994)
- Slovaks in the Central Danubian Region in the 6th to 11th Century*, Ed.: Kučera, Matúš (Bratislava: SNM, 2000)
- Slovenské dejiny*, Eds.: M. Ferko, Richard Marsina, Viliam Čičaj, Dušan Kováč a Ľubomír Lipták (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1992)
- Slovenské vysťahovalectvo. Dokumenty. 5. Pramene k dejinám slovenského vysťahovalectva do Francúzska a Belgicka v rokoch 1920-1945* Ed.: Baláž, Claude (Martin: MS, 1990)
- Slovensko 2003. Súhrnná správa o stave spoločnosti* (Bratislava: IVO, 2003)
- Slovensko a druhá svetová vojna* (Bratislava: Vojenský historický ústav, 2000)
- Slovensko očami cudzincov*, Ed.: Marsina, Richard (Bratislava: Literárne a informačné centrum, 1999)
- Slovenský biografický slovník* (od roku 833 do roku 1990). Zv. 3. K-L. (Martin: MS, 1989)
- Slovenský biografický slovník* (od roku 833 do roku 1990). Zv. 4. M-Q. (Martin: MS, 1990)
- Slovenský biografický slovník* (od roku 833 do roku 1990). Zv. 5. R-Š. (Martin: MS, 1992)
- Slovenský biografický slovník* (od roku 833 do roku 1990). Zv. 6. T-Ž. (Martin: MS, 1994)
- Slovenský rodolub Dr. Jozef Tiso (1887-1947)* (Trenčín: 1992)
- Spetko, J., *Lisky kontra jeze. Slovenska politicka emigracia 1948-1989* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2002)
- Špiez, Anton, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt 1992)
- Städte im Donauraum. Bratislava - Pressburg 1291-1991*, Ed.: Marsina, Richard (Bratislava: Slovenská historická spoločnosť - Historický ústav SAV - Miestny úrad Bratislava-Staré mesto, 1993)
- Standeisky, Éva, 'Antiszemita megmozdulások Magyarországon a koalíciós idoszakban', *Századok* 126 (March 1992)
- Standeisky, Éva, *Az irók és a hatalom* (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1998)
- Stanovisko ku knihe M. S. Ďuricu: Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Bratislava: 1997)
- Stark, Tamás, *Magyarország második világháborús embervesztése* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1989)
- Stekl, Hannes – Mannová, Elena (ed.), *Heroen, Mythen, Identitäten. Die Slowakei und Osterreich im Vergleich* (Wien: 2003)
- Stolárik, Mark M., The Painful Birth of Slovak Historiography in the 20th century. In: *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 20, 2001
- Stredoevrópske národy na križovatke novodobých dejín 1848-1918*, Ed. Švorc, P.-Harbulová, L. (Prešov-Bratislava-Wien: Universum, 1999)

- Štvrtecký, Štefan, *Náš Milan Rastislav Štefánik* (Bratislava: Smena, 1990)
- Šutaj, Štefan - Vovkanyč, Ivan, *Súčasná ruská historiografia o československých dejinách v rokoch 1945-1948. SIŠT 1997 [vyd. 1999], č. 1*
- Šutaj, Štefan, *Reslovakizácia. Zmena národnosti časti obyvateľstva Slovenska po 2. svetovej vojne* (Košice: 1991)
- Šutaj, Štefan, *Maďarská menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1945-1948. Východiská a prax politiky k maďarskej menšine na Slovensku* (Bratislava: 1993)
- Svätopluk 894 - 1994* (Nitra: Archeologický ústav SAV, 1997)
- Svedectvo jednej generácie* Ed.: Imrich Kružliak (Cambridge: Onotario, 1990)
- Švorc, Peter, *Rozbíjali monarchiu. (Populárny slovník osobností česko-slovenského odboja 1914-1918.)* (Košice: Východoslov. vydav., 1992)
- Švorc, Peter, *Slovenská historiografia a regionálne dejiny 19. a 20. storočia*, In: *Historický časopis*, 52, č.2, 2004, str 295-308
- Švorc, Peter, *Stručné dejiny Podkarpatskej Rusi. Zv. 2. (1918-1946)* (Prešov: Metodické centrum, 1996)
- Szabó, Miklós, *Múmiák öröksége (The legacy of mummies)*. (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1995)
- Szakály, Ferenc, *Mezőváros és reformáció* (Budapest: Balassi, 1995) Szász, Zoltán, *A románok története (The history of the Romanians)*. (Budapest: Bereményi, 1993)
- Szekeres, András, *A társadalomtudományi kutatás intézményi feltételei Magyarországon 1990-2001 között*.
- Szekfű Gyula, *Der Staat Ungarn c. művében*, in: *Századok*, 1976./2.
- Szende, Katalin, 'A női munka a középkori gaydaságban', *Aetas* (Vol. 1-2. 1995)
- Szerencsés, Károly, *Magyarország története a II. világháború után, 1945-1975* (Budapest: Ikva, 1991) „Az ítélet: halál” (Budapest: Kairosz, 2002)
- Szita, Szabolcs, *A zsidók üldöztetése Budapesten, 1944-45* (Budapest: Magyar Auschwitz Alapítvány – Holocaust Dokumentációs Központ, 1994)
- Szlovák nemzeti fejlődés - Magyar nemzetiségi politika 1867-1918* (Slovak National Development - Hungary's Ethnic Minorities Policy 1867-1918) (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1995)
- Szücs, Jenő, *Az utolsó Árpádok* (Budapest: História – MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1993).
- Takáts, József, „Politikai beszédmodok a magyar 19. század elején (A keret),” in: *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*, 1998/5-6
- Tandlich, Tomáš, *Židia v stredovekom Uhorsku. HR 12, 2001, č. 8*
- Tibenský, Ján, *Poctivá obec budmerická* (Budmerice: 1996)
- Tímár, Lajos, *Vidéki városlakók* (Budapest: Magvető, 1993)
- Tiso, Jozef, *Prejavy a články. Zv. 1. (1913-1938)*(Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press - Historický ústav SAV 2002)
- Tkac, M. – Navrat, R. – Valach, J., *Mali sme lekarov?* (Bratislava: Prudy, 1996)
- Tkac, M. – Navrat, R., *Synovia a otcovia* (Bratislava: Offprint J. Holik, 2000)
- Toma, Peter – Kováč, Dušan, *Slovakia. From Samo to Dzurinda* (Stanford: 2001)
- Tóth, Ágnes, *Telepitések Magyarországon 1945-1948 között* (Kecskemét, 1993), Review in *Aetas* (Vol. 1-2. 1995)
- Tóth, Zoltán I., *Az erdélyi román nacionalizmus első évszázada* (The first century of Romanian nationalism in Transylvania). (Csíkszereda: Pro-Print, 2000)
- Trenczényi Balázs, Apor Péter: *Fine-Tuning the Polyphonic Past: Hungarian Historical Writing in the 1990's* in: *Narratives Unbound* (Budapest: CEU Press 2007)
- Trócsányi, Zsolt and Miskolczi, Ambrus, *A fanariótáktól a Hohenzollernekig. Társadalmi hanyatlás és nemzeti felemelkedés a román történelemben*. (From the

- Phanariotes to the Hohenzollerns. Social decline and national development in Romanian history). (Budapest: ELTE BTK, 1992.)
- Tüdös, S. Kinga - *Erdélyi védőrendszerek a XV-XVIII. században: Háromszéki templomvárak* (Transylvanian defense systems in the 15-18th centuries: Fortified churches in the Háromszék region). (Budapest: Püski, 1995)
- Tüskés, Gábor - Knapp, Éva, 'A katakombaszentek tisztelete', *Századok* 128 (January 1994)
- Ungvári, Tamás, *Ahasvérus és Shylock* (Budapest, 1999); *The 'Jewish Question' in Europe: The Case of Hungary* (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 2000)
- V kráľovstve svätého Štefana. Vznik uhorského štátu a čas arpádovských kráľov*, Ed. Dvořák, Pavel (Bratislava: Literárne a informačné centrum, 2003)
- Vadkerty, Katalin, *A belső telepítések és a lakosságcsere* (Pozsony - Bratislava: Kalligram, 1999)
- Valuch, Tibor, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében* (Budapest: Osiris, 2001)
- Vardy, Steven Bela, *Modern Hungarian Historiography* (New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1976)
- Vári, Sándor, 'Női hisztéria Budapesten az 1880-as években', *BUKSZ* (Summer 1999)
- Vároš, M., *Posledný let generála Štefánika* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1991)
- Vatikán a Slovenská republika (1939-1945)*, eds.: I. Kamenec, V. Prečan, S. Škorvánek (Bratislava, 1992)
- Végh, L. (ed.), *A Bibliotheca Hungarica (cseh)-szlovákiai magyar könyvgyűjtemények bibliográfiája (1918-2000)* 1-2, (Dunaszerdahely: Lilium Aurum 2000)
- Végh, L. (ed.): *A Bibliotheca Hungarica (cseh)-szlovákiai magyar könyvgyűjtemények bibliográfiája (1918-2000)* 1-2, Dunaszerdahely, Lilium Aurum 2000
- Verejnost' proti násiliu 1989-1991. Svedectvá a dokumenty* (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku, 1998)
- Vida, István, *Az állami-politikai vezető réteg összetétele az 1980-as évek elején* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1992) Vincze Gábor, „Magyarellenes hecckampány Romániában,” in: *Beszélő*, 1999/ 7-8
- Viedenská arbitráž 2. november 1938. Dokumenty. Zv. 1.ed.:* Deák, Ladislav (Bratislava: Matica slovenská, 2002)
- Viedenská arbitráž 2. november 1938. Dokumenty. Zv. 2. Ed.:* Deák, Ladislav (Bratislava: Matica slovenská, 2002)
- Vnuk, František, *Ma' svoj štát znamená život. Politická biografía Alexandra Macha* (Bratislava: 1991)
- Vnuk, František, *Neuveritelné sprisahanie* (Bratislava: 1993)
- Vonyó, József - Gömbös Gyula és a jobboldali radikalizmus (Pécs: Pro Pannonia, 2001)
- Vörös, Éva, 'Kunmadaras', *Múlt és Jövő* 5 (April 1994)
- Vörös, Károly, *Hétköznapiak a polgári Magyarországon* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1997)
- Winkler, Martina, Alte Bilder und Neue Perspektiven: Aktuelle Arbeiten zur slowakischen Geschichte. In: *Bohemia* 42, 2001
- Winkler, Martina: Pohľad z blízka i zďalšie: Výskum Slovenska v Severnej Amerike a stredoeurópske diskusie, *Historický časopis* 52, 2, 2004
- Women in Towns*, eds.: M. Hietala - L. Nilsson (Helsinki - Stockholm, 1999)
- Zemplényi, Ferenc, *Az európai udvari kultúra és a magyar irodalom* (Budapest: Universitas, 1998)

- Židia dnes.* ed. Egon Gál (Bratislava: 2003)
- Židia v interakcii II.* ed. Egon Gál (Bratislava: 1999)
- Židia v interakcii,* ed. Egon Gál (Bratislava: 1997)
- Zimányi Vera, ed., *Óra szablya, nyoszolya. Életmód és anyagi kultúra Magyarországon a 17-18. században.* (Budapest: 1994)
- Zsidóság a vészkorszakban és a felszabadulás után 1939-1955* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1995)
- Zsoldos, Attila, *A szent király szabadjai* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1999)
- Zsoldos, Attila, *Magyarország története, 1301-1457* (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1992)
- Zsoldos, Attila, *The Realm of St. Stephen* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2001)
- Zuberec, V., *Milan Rastislav Štefánik – léta hvězdna a válečná* (Praha: Melantrich, 1990)

VII. ABSTRACT

Comparing of Slovak and Hungarian historiography 15 years after 1989 there are several conclusions to be made which mark both historiographies and can therefore suggest there are common characteristics of Central European historical writing. There is a significant difference between how the communist heritage was treated in both countries – in Hungary and in Slovakia, however the link between the historiography and actual politics is very strong. Some of the historians emerged as leading politicians in the new set-up and the historiography in terms of cultural practice became in some cases a significant political player. Generally, the historiography and history-related questions play an important role in everyday politics. Both historiographies bear strong signs of national discourse and either was significantly shaken in its positivist approach.

In the case comparison several conclusions were made about the strategy each historiography employs to present the history of the country. The Hungarian as well as Slovak national corpus intends to show a history of an independent and proud nation which has worked hard to achieve its own state. The corpus is dedicated to the national story picturing the past and the tradition to build on, explaining the form of the state as it is (including the borders), describing the ambitions of the state and finally explaining the situation during and after the war to ease the way of the country to the European family. The aim is then not only to build the story in isolation, but fit it into the European context. The terminology issues in the two studied historiographies are usually surrounding the question of territory, nationality or events which are either international or involving in some way both countries. Both historiographies also come up with a central myth to support the national narrative. Though both historiographies come from entirely different directions, what unites them is the means or more precisely the strategy to achieve the aim.

Když jsme srovnali slovenskou a maďarskou historiografii patnáct let po roce 1989 došli jsme k několika závěrům, které jsou charakteristické pro obě historiografie a proto mohou být společnou charakteristikou středoevropských historických věd. Obě země – Maďarsko i Slovensko - se s komunistickým dědictvím vyrovnaly jinak, ačkoliv v obou zemích je charakteristické velmi silné pouto mezi historiografií a politikou. Někteří historici se objevili na politické scéně jako vedoucí osobnosti nového režimu a historiografie ve smyslu každodenní kultury se v mnoha případech stala nezávislým hráčem na politickém poli. Obecně vzato historiografie a otázky spojené s historií hrají svoji roli v každodenní politice obou zemí. Obě historiografie jsou silně pod vlivem národního diskursu a žádná z nich nebyla vážněji otřesena ve svém pozitivistickém přístupu.

V případovém srovnání jsme učinili několik závěrů, které shrnují strategii, kterou obě historiografie užívají při prezentaci dějin své země. Maďarský stejně jako český korpus národních dějin má za cíl prezentovat dějiny nezávislého a hrdého národa, který tvrdě pracoval na tom, aby dosahl vlastního státu. Korpus, který se věnuje meziválečné historii zobrazuje dějiny a tradici, na které je země (národ) zbudována, vyjadřuje se k formě státu (zároveň s hranicemi), popisuje ambice státu a konečně také vysvětluje situaci země během druhé světové války a po ní, aby tím usnadnil cestu země do velké evropské rodiny. Cílem tedy není jen vybudovat příběh země v izolaci, ale najít mu též místo v širším evropském kontextu. Terminologické problémy v obou historiografiích se obvykle týkají otázky území, národností a nebo událostí, které nějakým způsobem spojují obě země. Obě historiografie také vyprodukovaly hlavní mýtus meziválečných dějin, který podporuje celkové vyprávění. Ačkoliv obě země mají velmi různá východiska, co je spojuje jsou prostředky, nebo přesněji strategie, jakými operují ve své historiografii.