

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.