


**Martin Pácha<sup>1</sup>**



## ***Losing the „Universal”***

View metadata, citation and similar papers at [core.ac.uk](https://core.ac.uk)

brought to you by  CORE

provided by ELTE Digital Insti

### **Abstract**

The purpose of the paper is to investigate the historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Habsburg monarchy based on the example of two prominent historians – Mihály Horváth and František Palacký. The first part is concerned with the fundamental processes, which influenced the historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the second part provides a small comparison of the two historians. This study shows how historians partially lost the enlightened call for the „universal” and how they gradually entered the national frame of thinking.

*Keywords:* nation building process; national narrative; Hungary; enlightenment; historiography; Habsburg Monarchy;

It is often said that 19<sup>th</sup> century was a century of historicism or golden age of history.<sup>3</sup> This era is mostly associated with German states and with Leopold von Ranke.<sup>4</sup> It is much less investigated what it means elsewhere especially in East-Central Europe is not often clear. In my essay I would like to do a probe into the historiography of 19<sup>th</sup> century Habsburg Monarchy and find out some aspects of this almost paradigmatic change in historiography.

In the first part, I will explore few elements and clarify some terms that are fundamental for the topic. These are – traditional historiography, the Enlightenment, liberalism, romanticism and nation-building process. In the second part, I will try to do a small comparison between two major historians of this era – Mihály Horváth and František Palacký. I do not suppose that I will discover some universal definition of the 19<sup>th</sup> century historiography, but I still believe that it is important to challenge established terms like historicism and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Student, Charles University, Prague, Pacha.Martin@seznam.cz

<sup>2</sup> I want to thank to Károly Halmos for all his help and his lectures „*Social History of Nineteenth-Century Hungary*“, which was hugely inspirational for this paper. I would also like to thank to Gábor Benedek, Ondřej Vinš and my sister Anna Páchová for consultations.

<sup>3</sup> About this problematics: FELDNER, Heiko: *Nová vědeckost v dějepisectví kolem roku 1800*. 11. IN: BERGER, Stefan; FELDNER, Heiko; PASSMORE Kevin (ed.): *Jak se píšou dějiny*. Brno: CDK, 2016. 11–32.

<sup>4</sup> For example IGGERS, Georg: *Historiography in the twentieth century. From scientific objectivity to the postmodern challenge*, Wesleyan University Press, Hanover, 1997.

method of even a small comparison is very useful to do that. Especially because by comparison we can escape national narratives, paradoxically created by historians in the era of our interest.

### **Roots and terms**

Although many authors proclaimed the 19<sup>th</sup> century century that of historicism<sup>5</sup> if we want to know what it means and what is the relationship with historiography, we need to go a little further. In the following text, I am not going to explore the term in its complexity, but I will try to make few points concerning some elements, that in my opinion are inseparably linked with our topic – traditional historiography, the Enlightenment, liberalism, romanticism and nation-building process.

First, if we want to talk about historiography in 19<sup>th</sup> century, we must explore its roots. Michel Foucault in one of his essays pointed out a big shift in European historiography at the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century. According to him, the basic narrative structure for many authors became a struggle between two binary opposite elements, in other words a war. That simply means that this new style heavily accented ethnic, cultural and linguistic differences.<sup>6</sup> But this was not the case all the time. The basic plot of medieval chronicle is genealogical axis of ruling dynasty. Chronicler is narrating about origins of the dynasty, about heroic acts, ancient laws etc. In other words, traditional historic discourse used to defend and strengthen the power of the ruler. „*The great history*” is guarantor of the order and could legitimize often banal everyday life.<sup>7</sup>

Second, during this era, the modern development of historiography has begun. Although there is no universal definition of the Enlightenment, we could say it was a philosophical movement based around the idea of reason. The situation of being human is radically changed. Beginning of human existence was no longer just based on God’s creation, but on Adam’s and Eve’s original sin, where they got understanding and made first steps towards „*freedom*”.<sup>8</sup> In other words, they became actual human persons in the moment when they entered history. History has its own meaning and inherent value. It is a road towards real freedom or towards real humanity. So, historiography as a

---

<sup>5</sup> HROCH, Miroslav: *Hledání souvislostí*, Sociologické nakladatelství (SLON), Praha, 2016. 121.

<sup>6</sup> FOUCAULT, Michel: „*Society must be defended*”, Picador, New York, 2003. 60.

<sup>7</sup> ČINÁTL, Kamil: *Dějiny a vyprávění*, Argo, Praha, 2011. 163–164.

<sup>8</sup> Although individual interpretations differ, we can say that Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant and even Johann Gottfried Herder shared a thesis, that human being existed in a certain natural state, which changed due to the original sin to the human state.

subject gained much more prestige, because it no longer meant mere eulogizing stories, but it is principle, which constitutes a human being.<sup>9</sup>

The very idea of science has also changed from the Aristotelian model. This old theory is based on the distinction between searching for individual as opposed to cognition of the universal and abstract. The first one, concerning humans and their acts can be only known in particularity. The second, can be known in fulness and that is called a science.<sup>10</sup> However Aristotelian paradigm has gradually changed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. As a result of this, empiricism was on a rise and knowledge from now on should be useful and used in everyday life. Consequences of this epistemological change for the history were first expressed by Giambattista Vico in his *Scienza Nuova* (1725/1744). He made an argument that we should shift our attention from studying nature to studying history, because only God knows his own creation – the natural world. Vico wrote that we could hope for reliable knowledge only in case of studying „*the civil world*” because it is created by men in the same sense that nature is created by God. For this reason, we can think history based on sources as a science and historians as scientists.<sup>11</sup>

The secularization and thinking about reason as one of the highest values have influenced historiography as well. Guarantor of truth from this point were not just organizations, which claim to the truth was based on God’s revelation, but also institutions which claim was based on the idea of secular science. For writing history, it means, that it should be founded on empirical data and sources not on guessing. It should be reflected from viewpoints of goals and methodology. In principle, every scientific discussion should be open to educated public, which was small but essentially not reclusive. To conclude there were two strong urges: to equip historiography with theoretical thinking and make it available to the public sphere.

Third, we should briefly mention liberalism, which influenced the entire 19<sup>th</sup> century. Basically, it is a set of ideas based on liberty, equality and individualism without any precise definition, at least in this era. It became a distinct political movement during the Enlightenment, which rejected the prevailing political system based on privileges.<sup>12</sup> Liberalism

---

<sup>9</sup> This interpretation is partially inspired by lectures „*Kleió a Sofia. Filozofické myšlení v historiografii českých zemí 19. století*” by Marek Fapšo in academic year 2016/2017 at Faculty of Arts, Charles University.

<sup>10</sup> FELDNER, Heiko: *Nová vědeckost v dějepisectví kolem roku 1800*, p. 14. IN: BERGER, Stefan; FELDNER, Heiko; PASSMORE Kevin (ed.): *Jak se píšou dějiny*, CDK, Brno, 2016. 11–32.

<sup>11</sup> FELDNER, Heiko: *Nová vědeckost v dějepisectví kolem roku 1800*, 19. IN: BERGER, Stefan; FELDNER, Heiko; PASSMORE Kevin (ed.): *Jak se píšou dějiny*, CDK, Brno, 2016.

<sup>12</sup> HEYWOOD, Andrew. *Politické ideologie*, Eurolex Bohemia s. r. o., Praha, 2005. 41–51.

is connected with the Enlightenment, which was a problem in the Habsburg Monarchy, because those ideas were almost always enforced by the government and there was no space to create a numerous movement from below. In other words, the inhabitants were only slowly creating a mental framework for accepting liberalism. But on the other hand, there was a certain liberalization of the economy which helped in this process.<sup>13</sup> But this kind of liberal experience in a massive scale not took shape until the revolution of 1848/1849 and especially in East-Central Europe was often interconnected with national frame of thinking.<sup>14</sup> The important thing concerning historiography, is that liberal philosophy was often used to legitimize political change to representative democracy and the rule of law and many historians acted as politicians in this process.

Fourth, romanticism was artistic, literary, musical and intellectual movement that started in Europe at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. There is also no clear definition, but for our purposes I just want to mention some major themes concerning „*romantic approach to life*”. There was a strong emphasis on sentiments, on subjectivization of attitudes, social alienation and a feeling of loneliness, which „*stems from a sense of insecurity, from the disrupted harmony of life.*”<sup>15</sup> It was also a reaction to enlightened rationalism, and it is often said that romanticism replaced the Enlightenment as a dominant outlook in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>16</sup> This is oversimplified because romantics authors often drawn inspiration from authors like Herder, who was clearly associated with the Enlightenment. In other words, there was a crisis of identity, which was brought about by changes of forthcoming modernization: „*the loss of religious legitimacy and also therefore the loss of axiomatically formulated principles, the weakening of the old traditional feudal and patriarchal bonds, and from that, the loss of security.*”<sup>17</sup> To conclude, this movement influenced the historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> century as well, especially in that way that historians often wrote with emotional flare and they were passionately looking in history for other ways of collective identity, especially a nation.

---

<sup>13</sup> VEBER, Václav et al.: *Dějiny Rakouska*, NLN, Praha, 2002. 395–399.

<sup>14</sup> URBAN, Otto: *Český liberalismus v 19. století*, 16. IN: ZNOJ, Milan; HAVRÁNEK, Jan; SEKERA, Martin (ed.): *Český liberalismus*, Torst, Praha, 1995. 15–27.

<sup>15</sup> HROCH, Miroslav: *National romanticism*, 4. IN: KOPEČEK, Michal; TRENCSENYI, Balázs. (ed.): *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*, CEU Press, Budapest, New York, 2007. 4–18.

<sup>16</sup> For example IGGERS, Georg G.; WANG, Edward Q.: *A Global History of Modern Historiography*, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, London; New York, 2013. 70.

<sup>17</sup> HROCH, Miroslav: *National romanticism*, 7. IN: KOPEČEK, Michal; TRENCSENYI, Balázs. (ed.): *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*, CEU Press, Budapest, New York, 2007. 4–18.

Finally the fifth, I would like to make some brief notes concerning probably the most influential process in the 19<sup>th</sup> century – nation-building.<sup>18</sup> I am deliberately avoiding the term “nationalism” because this term as a concept is heavily burdened with so many debates that is losing its explanatory value. Certainly, I am aware that even the term „*nation*” is not without its complication either.<sup>19</sup> Nation as a kind of emotion is a modern phenomenon, it is not an eternal category. It is a socially constructed community in the imagination of the people who perceive themselves as members of that group.<sup>20</sup> Also according to Miroslav Hroch’s typology we can distinguish three ideal<sup>21</sup> phases of nation-building process. Phase A is when a small group of intellectuals make an effort to learn the language, history, traditional culture etc. of non-dominant ethnic group. Phase B is when a new group of activists emerge and try to agitate for the project of fully-fledged nation. And Phase C is when a majority of the population responded to the patriotic call and the full social structure of the nation would usually come into being.<sup>22</sup>

There are three typical characteristics of the nation: increased communication intensity inside the group in comparing to outside groups; certain form of „*collective memory*”, the idea of common past and fate; the concept of equality of all members of the nation, at least in theory.<sup>23</sup> In other words we could argue that concept of the nation is influenced by all four already mentioned phenomena – history, traditional historiography, the Enlightenment, liberalism and romanticism.

### ***Mihály Horváth and František Palacký***

In this part I shortly introduce the two historians that I chose for the comparison – Mihály Horváth and František Palacký. First, we need to say, that both of them lived in different part of Habsburg Monarchy and from their point of view they were not members of the ruling group. They both engaged in nation-building process at the turning point of the phases B and C, according to Hroch’s typology. The historic difference is that the Bohemia used to be a part of the Holy Roman Empire and

---

<sup>18</sup> The concept refers to what was expressed in some cases with the phrase ‘*national awakening*’ in the Czech case, and ‘*national independence*’ in the Hungarian one.

<sup>19</sup> For example, the difference between connotation with the term in English and German language environment.

<sup>20</sup> ANDERSON, Benedict R.: *Imagined communities*. Verso, London, 1991, 6–7.

<sup>21</sup> „*Ideal*” in a Weberian sense.

<sup>22</sup> HROCH, Miroslav: *Comparative Studies in Modern European History*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Hampshire, 2007. 68.

<sup>23</sup> HROCH, Miroslav: *V národním zájmu*, NLN, Praha, 1999. 10–11.

sometimes Czechs, even Palacký, were considered to be Germans,<sup>24</sup> which was not the case for the Hungarians. The other main difference between Czech and Hungarian national movement is a different strategy for achieving its goals influenced by actor's mental framework and their geostrategic situation. In Hungarian case, the elite was not afraid to go to open conflict with Habsburgs, in Czech case the elite was trying to apply strategy of small demands and therefore is often called cautious elite.<sup>25</sup>

***Thus, it was only natural that the Hungarians claimed their thousand-year-old historical rights and fought to strengthen the historical nation by emphasizing the legacy of their constitution.***<sup>26</sup>

Mihály Horváth (1809-1878) was born in Szentés, south-eastern Hungary, in a family of seventeen children. His family belonged to the lower nobility and by the time he was born, his father worked as a barber. He finished his secondary education in a Piarists school and started to visit seminary. This choice was probably not motivated by a desire to become a priest, but rather to gain access to higher education and higher social status. In this time, he also showed a great interest in history.<sup>27</sup> After finishing his doctorate in theology, he was ordained and started to hold clergy position. Due to his low income, he also worked as a private tutor for wealthy families. His situation somehow improved in 1834 by getting awarded by literary-learned institution called Marczibányi Society for his publication on the civilization of the ancient Hungarians. After publishing many studies including *Az ipar és kereskedelem története Magyarországon a XVI. század elejéig* (The History of Commerce and Industry in Hungary Until the Early Sixteen Century<sup>28</sup>) he was elected a member of Hungarian Academy in 1842.

Horváth became a major public figure in the reform movement, especially due to his liberal views and to his important position within liberal clergy. In 1848 the revolutionary government nominated him bishop of Csanád and he was the only one among the Catholic high churchmen who followed the Hungarian government to Debrecén. In 1849, he became Minister of Religious Affairs and Education. After the

---

<sup>24</sup> PALACKÝ, František: *Psaní do Frankfurtu*, Národní noviny, 15. 4. 1848. 1.

<sup>25</sup> ŠTAIF, Jiří: *Obezřetná elita*, Dokořán, Praha, 2005.

<sup>26</sup> HORVÁTH, Mihály: *Huszonöt év Magyarország történelméből (1823-1848)*, volume II, Geneva, 1864. 116. Translated by BAÁR, Monika: *Historians and Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2010. 260.

<sup>27</sup> BAÁR, Monika: *Historians and Nationalism*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010. 35.

<sup>28</sup> Translation to English by: BAÁR, Monika: *The Intellectual Horizons of Liberal Nationalism in Hungary: The Case of Mihály Horváth*, 25.

revolution, he was forced to escape to Belgium and later he settled in Geneva, where he abandoned his clerical duties and married his housekeeper. Also he wrote several studies focusing on the Reform Age and history of revolution including *Magyarország függetlenségi harcának története 1848 és 1849-ben* (History of the Hungarian war of independence of 1848-1849). In this work he distanced himself from Kossuth's vision of full independence and started to support the idea of compromise between Austria and Hungary. Due to his serious homesick he wanted to return to Hungary. Finally, he received an amnesty in 1867. He was well accepted by Hungarian scholars and in 1877 he became the president of the Hungarian Historical Society. Horváth's research in this era declined in significance but he remained an important figure in the institutionalization of the historical discipline.<sup>29</sup>

Mihály Horváth is usually categorized as a typical exponent of European national-liberal school of historiography and with László Szalay (1813-1864) is considered to be a great historian of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Hungary. His most important work, *Huszonöt év Magyarország történelméből* (Twenty-five years of the history of Hungary) established canonical narrative of the Hungarian „national awakening” and had influence on preserving the cultural memory of „1848 generation” alive.<sup>30</sup>

\*\*\*

***Thus, the main content and the basic thrust of the whole history of the Czech-Moravian (...) is constant engagement and struggle between ideas of Slavs, Romans and Germans.***<sup>31</sup>

František Palacký (1798-1876) was born in the town called Hodslavice in Moravia, near to the historical borders of Hungary and Silesia, in a family of seven children. His family had a long protestant tradition and his father was a teacher. He studied at Lutheran school in Trenčín and after that, at Lutheran Lyceum in Bratislava<sup>32</sup>, which was a prominent theological institution. Although he received no formal

---

<sup>29</sup> BAÁR, Monika: *Historians and Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2010. 39.

<sup>30</sup> KOPEČEK, Michal; TRENCSENYI, Balázs. (ed.): *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*, CEU Press, Budapest, New York, 2007. 57.

<sup>31</sup> PALACKÝ, František: *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a na Moravě*. Volume I, Kvasnička a Hampl, Praha, 1939. 10. translated by MP: „Hlavní tedy obsah a základní tah celého dějinstva českomoravského jest, (...) ustavičné stýkání a potýkání se slovanství s římanstvím a němectvím (...).”

<sup>32</sup> Bratislava (Pozsony) and Trenčín (Trencsén) were parts of the Kingdom of Hungary.

historical education he became well-read due to his rigorous self-education and ability to learn languages. In 1820 he moved into Vienna where he wrote several papers concerning aesthetics, which gave him a philosophical background for his later historian work. Also in this time, he was already able to network and he acquired many contacts that later helped him very much in his career.<sup>33</sup>

In 1823 he moved to Prague where he cooperated with prominent Czech scholars like Josef Dobrovský and Josef Jungmann. He also started to work for Bohemian aristocracy, first as a private tutor, later as an archivist. He especially for Kašpar Šternberk, who enabled him to start publishing museum journal called *Časopis Společnosti vlasteneckého muzea v Čechách*.<sup>34</sup> In 1827 he got married to daughter of landowner Jan Měchura, which solved his financial issues. In 1836 he was assigned by Bohemian estates to write history of Bohemia in German (*Geschichte von Böhmen*) and in 1838 he became their official Historiographer. In 1840, he began to publish *Archiv Český*, which is series of sources to Czech history.<sup>35</sup> From 1844 he started to translate *Geschichte von Böhmen* (History of Bohemia) to Czech language, but he changed the work significantly and in 1848 he published the first volume of his magnum opus *Dějiny národa českého v Čechách a na Moravě* (History of Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia). The change of his perspective is usually overlooked, but it is apparent just from the title. Palacký changed the conceptualization from the land to the people.<sup>36</sup>

In 1848 Palacký actively entered politics. He tried to mediate the disputes between Czechs and Germans and promoted an idea of legalism and liberal constitutionalism. After his refusal to join Frankfurt Parliament with argumentation, that he is not a German but Czech, he practically became a leader of Czech national movement. He also tried to promote the concept of Austro-Slavism, which was an idea, that Slavic nations within the Habsburg Monarchy should become a decisive force in the state. He also became a member of the so called Kroměřížský sněm (Kremsier Imperial Diet), where he tried to support federalism. After the defeat of the revolution, he became persona non-grata and in 1851 he left politics altogether.

František Palacký in his later years became unquestionable moral figure in Czech society and even his political rivals acknowledged him as „*Otec národa*“ (Father of the nation).<sup>37</sup> He is also considered as the father of modern Czech historiography and his major work *Dějiny*

---

<sup>33</sup> ŠTAIF, Jiří: *František Palacký*, Vyšehrad, Praha, 2009. 19–35.

<sup>34</sup> Which is the oldest historical scientific journal, still published today under the name *Časopis Národního muzea*.

<sup>35</sup> The series was published to 1944 and was renewed in 2000.

<sup>36</sup> KOŘALKA, Jiří: *František Palacký*, Argo, Praha, 1998. 256–257.

<sup>37</sup> ŠTAIF, Jiří: *František Palacký*, Vyšehrad, Praha, 2009. 235–240.



ÖT KONTINENS, az Új- és Jelenkori Egyetemes Történelmi Tanszék tudományos közleményei, N° 2015/2.  
ELTE, BTK, BUDAPEST, 2018.

*národa českého v Čechách a na Moravě* (History of the Czech nation from „beginning of times” to 1526) still bears some relevance. Even though his work was later criticized especially for factographic reasons, his concept of Czech national narrative remained visible practically to these days.

### ***An attempt to compare***

At this point I would like to make my examination of the 19<sup>th</sup> century historiography by a short comparison. According to Jürgen Kocka there are three main benefits of comparison. Heuristic (identification of new problems), descriptive (clarification of single cases) and analytical (asking and answering causal questions).<sup>38</sup> Although all this is true, in my opinion, the main benefit of the following comparison lies in the weakening of the national narrative, which is still very influential in historiography today.

I will focus on a few topics that occupy central space in the narratives of František Palacký and Mihály Horváth. I will not talk about them in any full or rounded way, but instead I will use them as a probe into 19<sup>th</sup> century historiographic thinking. First, I will look into their interest in origins and early societies, second, I will explore where they saw peak of their histories and third I will try to make some notes concerning their conceptual thinking.

To begin with, if we want to talk about origins of the nation we will see a big difference between Palacký and Horváth. For Palacký the arrival of Slavs into Bohemia is one of the central topics. According to him Slavic chieftain Čech came into the Bohemia and took control over the scattered remnants of the original population.<sup>39</sup> In his argumentation is important that Slavs (Čechové) created a state with national unity, where they live almost in an egalitarian society, before and without Germans. Germans, ancestors of Palacký’s German contemporaries, came later as a result of colonization to an already created state. This is crucial for his later argumentation that Czechs have bigger claim for living in Bohemia than Germans. Also the struggle between the idea of Slavs – democracy, peace, freedom and German idea – Christianity, bourgeois law, technology and education is the central plot of Palacký’s narration.<sup>40</sup> This struggle Palacký did not see a priori negatively, because even when his affection was for the Czech side, he saw dialectic benefits of those interactions. On the other hand, Horváth

---

<sup>38</sup> KOCKA, Jürgen: *Comparison and Beyond*. In: *History and Theory*. Vol 42, No 1. 39–44.

<sup>39</sup> Tribe of Boii (Galic origin) and tribe of Marcomanni (Germanic origin).

<sup>40</sup> PALACKÝ, František: *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a na Moravě*. Volume I, Kvasnička a Hampl, Praha, 1939. 10.

did not attribute too much attention to beginnings of Hungarians but in European context he was an exception in this matter.<sup>41</sup> He just stated that Hungarians originally led a peaceful life of equality, simplicity and independence<sup>42</sup> and that they arrived into Carpathian Basin as a free society, described as a „national family”.<sup>43</sup>

The question remains why Horváth did not put almost any importance to the topic, maybe he did not have enough sources, which did not prevent Horváth’s contemporary László Szalay from writing about it, or more probably he did not have the urge to defend Hungarian presence in Carpathian Basin. However, the importance for Palacký is quite clear. He wanted to make a compelling narration for the justification of Czech presence in Bohemia and there was no better way to do it, than on a basis of historical argument.

Second, Horváth’s idea of the peak period of Hungarian history lies in the Reform era: „(That period) became, by the nation’s efforts and struggles, ... the most glorious period, a progress following the principles of liberalism.”<sup>44</sup> Central to his argument were: the issues of religious freedom, imposing tax on nobility, the extension of civil rights to the people and the reform of the penal code.<sup>45</sup> Especially the issues of nobility were really important to him. He saw feudalism (imported from West) as opposed to freedom, because it lacks strong middle class.<sup>46</sup> In other words the nation was formed of the privileged classes only, because other people deprived of their rights cannot constitute a real community, a nation.<sup>47</sup> According to him nobility was one to blame for its crippling attitude towards national unity and advancement. He argued that nobility had its historical role in defending the country against enemies, but it failed and now there are no reasons for them to be in privileged position.<sup>48</sup> No need to say, that this topic resonated quite heavily with Horváth’s idea based on the Enlightenment and „plebeian” liberalism.

---

<sup>41</sup> BAÁR, Monika: *The Intellectual Horizons of Liberal Nationalism in Hungary: The Case of Mihály Horváth*, 22. IN: TRENCSENYI, Balázs (ed.): *Nation-Building and Contested Identities*, Regio Books, Budapest, 2001. 21–41.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid, 23.

<sup>43</sup> KOPEČEK, Michal; TRENCSENYI, Balázs. (ed.): *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*, CEU Press, Budapest, New York, 2007. 58.

<sup>44</sup> BAÁR, Monika: *The Intellectual Horizons of Liberal Nationalism in Hungary: The Case of Mihály Horváth*, 22.

<sup>45</sup> BAÁR, Monika: *Historians and Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2010. 245–246.

<sup>46</sup> BAÁR, Monika: *The Intellectual Horizons of Liberal Nationalism in Hungary: The Case of Mihály Horváth*, 23.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, 32.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, 33.

For Palacký the most glorious period of Czech history was Hussitism in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. In his point of view, it was not just the demand for renewed Church, but it was a movement which influenced heavily not only Czech history, but European history as well. It was social and national movement, reaction to feudal and foreign influences.<sup>49</sup> This discourse based on war was much more convincing than myths of Slavs. According to Michel Foucault „*A history that takes as its starting point the fact of war itself and makes its analysis in terms of war can relate all these things – war, religion, politics, manners, and characters – and can therefore act as a principle that allows us to understand history.*”<sup>50</sup> This is exactly what Palacký did. Hussitism is for him a cornerstone basically for everything. It is a movement that has predicted not just reformation but social justice and freedom. Palacký’s reader could easily have had the feeling that modern historical processes have reacted on Czech models and not the other way around.<sup>51</sup>

Third, I want to briefly mention some conceptual aspects of the Horváth’s and Palacký’s work. Both historians tried to widen historical writings in that way that they included unprivileged classes into the narrative and one could even say, they played a major role. On the other hand I would argue, that major „*figure*” was actually the nation, which should consists of all classes and just the role of aristocracy is more questionable. This is a serious change compared to tradition historiography. Palacký’s and Horváth’s discourses no longer hold the legitimizing function of the old order, they tried to unveil the true nature of current power.<sup>52</sup> They offered a different history, which „*has to disinter something that has been hidden, and which has been hidden not only because it has been neglected, but because it has been carefully, deliberately, and wickedly misrepresented.*”<sup>53</sup> In other worlds Palacký and Horváth tried to undermine contemporary social order and create a new one. This does not mean in any case that they just made some ideological fabrications. They proceed according to contemporary idea of scientific practice and we need to realize that it was generally accepted that correct representation of the past events should serve as an argument for the present.<sup>54</sup> Also, it is understandable they chose questions and sources that would correlate with their viewpoints, they did not stand outside their studied objects and I would argue that this practice has not change that much even nowadays.

---

<sup>49</sup> BAÁR, Monika: *Historians and Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2010. 237.

<sup>50</sup> FOUCAULT, Michel: *“Society must be defended”*, Picador, New York, 2003. 163.

<sup>51</sup> ČINÁTL, Kamil: *Dějiny a vyprávění*. Argo, Praha, 2011. 187.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid, 164.

<sup>53</sup> FOUCAULT, Michel: *“Society must be defended”*, Picador, New York, 2003. 72.

<sup>54</sup> HORCH, Miroslav: *Národy nejsou dílem náhody*, SLON, Praha, 2009. 168.

To conclude this part, the most innovative and positive aspect of writings of Horváth and Palacký is that they included all sorts of new topics into their histories. But on the other hand we can observe that they strictly closed themselves into the national narratives. Though Palacký seeks some kind of humanity<sup>55</sup> and shows contribution of Hussites to whole European civilization and Horváth often speaks about freedom and liberalism, they both try to legitimize their own nation. In that sense they both lost the Enlightenment's call for the universal and we can still experience this effects in today's historical writings.

### **Conclusion**

At the beginning of our queries there was a question about 19<sup>th</sup> century historicism and historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Not surprisingly we found that this a complex phenomenon and there is no clear definition. Nevertheless, I think we can make some more general assumption concerning historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, especially in Bohemia and Hungary.

With Miroslav Hroch we can identify four basic purpose of national history: 1) To strengthen national identity. 2) To create the legitimacy of existence of the nation. 3) To offered sense of security to the individual. 4) To serve as a basis for the formation of national values.<sup>56</sup>

The position of history radically changed during the Enlightenment. We can observe the importance that history got especially in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in every philosophical system inspired by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel.<sup>57</sup> Not only that, but historiography as a subject, also got more prestige by claiming the same scientific status as natural sciences.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century historiography, it is an often-used strong argument, but we cannot say that historians were just ideologists. We need to realize that for historians past development was an organic part of the present and present was an organic part of the past.<sup>58</sup> For every regime, state or nation at least in modern era is typical an effort to create unique image of the past, which help to justify various social and political decisions.<sup>59</sup> This follows the legacy of traditional history, but it is amplified in the 19<sup>th</sup> century because of the disintegration of traditional order and legitimacy based on divine principle. The very idea of nation-building process is based on history, it is timeless community whose justification of existence is derived from preserving the

---

<sup>55</sup> Especially in his younger age.

<sup>56</sup> HORCH, Miroslav: *Národy nejsou dílem náhody*, SLON, Praha, 2009. 177–178.

<sup>57</sup> For example the works of Ludwig Feuerbach, Moses Hess, Karl Marx.

<sup>58</sup> HORCH, Miroslav: *Národy nejsou dílem náhody*, SLON, Praha, 2009. 172.

<sup>59</sup> HAVELKA, Miloš: *Zamyšlení nad legitimizační funkcemi dějin*, Soudobé dějiny 8, 2001, č. 1. 101.

inherited.<sup>60</sup> In other words many scholars and members of the elite agreed that everything that existed must express and justify the right to exist by means of history.<sup>61</sup> This strength and ubiquity of historical argument can be found even outside the realms of nation-building, for example even Communist manifesto starts with „*all history is history of class struggle*”.

We also observed that the main pseudo-character of the Horváth's and Palacký's narrative was the nation. The readers are not reading about some distant old time, they are reading about themselves, about their present, about their struggles. In other words, historical knowledge helps to constitute subjects of the readers as members of the national community.<sup>62</sup> This in my opinion is the most accurate characteristic of the national historiography of 19<sup>th</sup> century.

I would like to end with the notion that national histories or any history for that matter have no meaning by itself, but the meaning is given to them by contemporary historians or by anyone who has the social capital to proclaim it.<sup>63</sup> We need to realize that interpretation of any historical object is influenced by the present of the person who is doing the inquiry. In my mind this is actually a good thing, because if we accept the thesis that the act of interpretation of history by itself widens our experience in today's world,<sup>64</sup> we can study the experience of Horváth and Palacký in 19<sup>th</sup> century and widen ours in the same process.

### **Bibliography**

- ANDERSON, Benedict R.: *Imagined communities*, Verso, London, 1991.  
BAÁR, Monika: *Historians and Nationalism*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010. 237.  
BAÁR, Monika: *The Intellectual Horizons of Liberal Nationalism in Hungary: The Case of Mihály Horváth*. IN: TRENCSENYI, Balázs (ed.): *Nation-Building and Contested Identities*, Regio Books, Budapest, 2001.  
ČINÁTL, Kamil: *Dějiny a vyprávění*, Argo, Praha, 2011.  
FELDNER, Heiko: *Nová vědeckost v dějepisectví kolem roku 1800*, 19. IN: BERGER, Stefan; FELDNER, Heiko; PASSMORE Kevin (ed.): *Jak se píšou dějiny*, CDK, Brno, 2016.  
FOUCAULT, Michel: „*Society must be defended*”, Picador, New York, 2003.

---

<sup>60</sup> THIESSE, Anne-Marie: *Vytváření národních identit v Evropě 18. až 20. století*, CDK, Brno, 2007. 13.

<sup>61</sup> HROCH, Miroslav: *European Nations*, Verso, London; New York, 2015. 168.

<sup>62</sup> ČINÁTL, Kamil: *Dějiny a vyprávění*. Argo, Praha, 2011. 167.

<sup>63</sup> RANDÁK, Jan: *O národních příbězích*. 147. IN: ŘEPA, Milan (ed.): *19. století v nás*, Historický ústav, Praha, 2008. 139–151.

<sup>64</sup> GADDIS, John Lewis: *The Landscape of History. How Historians Map the Past*. Oxford, 2002. 10.

- GADDIS, John Lewis: *The Landscape of History. How Historians Map the Past*, Oxford, 2002.
- HAVELKA, Miloš: *Zamyšlení nad legitimizační funkcemi dějin*, *Soudobé dějiny* 8, 2001. n. 1.
- HEYWOOD, Andrew: *Politické ideologie*, Eurolex Bohemia s. r. o., Praha, 2005.
- HORCH, Miroslav: *Národy nejsou dílem náhody*, SLON, Praha, 2009.
- HROCH, Miroslav: *Comparative Studies in Modern European History*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Hampshire, 2007.
- HROCH, Miroslav: *European Nations*, Verso, London; New York, 2015.
- HROCH, Miroslav: *Hledání souvislostí*. Sociologickénakladatelství (SLON), Praha, 2016.
- HROCH, Miroslav: *National romanticism*. IN: KOPEČEK, Michal; TRENCSENYI, Balázs. (ed.): *Discourses of Collective Identity in Cenral and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*, CEU Press, Budapest, New York, 2007. 4–18.
- HROCH, Miroslav: *V národním zájmu*, NLN, Praha, 1999.
- IGGERS, Georg G.; WANG, Edward Q.: *A Global History of Modern Historiography*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, London; New York, 2013.
- IGGERS, Georg: *Historiography in the twentieth century. From scientific objectivity to the postmodern challenge*, Wesleyan University Press, Hanover, 1997.
- KOCKA, Jürgen: *Comparison and Beyond*. In: *History and Theory*. Vol 42, No 1. 39–44.
- KOPEČEK, Michal; TRENCSENYI, Balázs. (ed.): *Discourses of Collective Identity in Cenral and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*, CEU Press, Budapest, New York, 2007.
- KOŘALKA, Jiří. *František Palacký*, Argo, Praha, 1998.
- PALACKÝ, František: *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a na Moravě*. Volume I, Kvasnička a Hampl, Praha, 1939.
- PALACKÝ, František: *Psaní do Frankfurtu*. *Národní noviny*, 15. 4. 1848.
- RANDÁK, Jan: *O národních příbězích*. IN: ŘEPA, Milan (ed.): *19. století v nás*. Historický ústav, Praha, 2008. 139–151.
- ŠTAIF, Jiří: *František Palacký*, Vyšehrad, Praha, 2009.
- ŠTAIF, Jiří: *Obezřetná elita*, Dokořán, Praha, 2005.
- THIESSE, Anne-Marie: *Vytváření národních identit v Evropě 18. až 20. století*, CDK, Brno: 2007.
- URBAN, Otto: *Český liberalismus v 19. století*. IN: ZNOJ, Milan; HAVRÁNEK, Jan; SEKERA, Martin (ed.): *Český liberalismus*, Torst, Praha, 1995. 15–27.
- VEBER, Václav et al.: *Dějiny Rakouska*, NLN, Praha, 2002.