

related to river Sava. Water economists and hydrologists rarely speak of the river's social and economic aspects, and the way they influence the city. Therefore, a historical research might bring new information which could present a better understanding of the problem. Cooperation of various experts can give us a better view of the current situation. Their comparative analysis, based on historical research, could provide new possibilities for plan-makers and urbanists, as well as new evaluations of the relationship of Sava and Zagreb.

— **Marko Lovrić**, Zagreb, 20th October, 2010

A REPORT FROM THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE „ANNALES IN PERSPECTIVE: DESIGNS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS“

In 2009 we have marked eighty years since the publication of the journal *Annales d'Histoire Économique et Sociale*, founded by Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch. By this endeavour, Bloch and Febvre began that which they could only have wished for: they directed the development of history through the whole of the 20th century by creating the most influential historiographical course in the 20th century, the so-called *Annales* School (some „Annalistes“ do not think that there is such a thing as an *Annales* „school“). By renouncing traditional historiography, a dominant force in French institutions since the 19th century, and by turning towards economic and social history, they developed the New history which left a significant mark on generations of historians and many national historiographies. Among them we count Croatian historiography, which was first acquainted with the Annalists through Miroslav Brandt, Mirjana Gross, and others.

On the occasion of the anniversary, the journal of history students *Pro tempore*, in cooperation with the Department of History of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, and the support of the French embassy in Zagreb, organised a conference under the title „*Annales* in Perspective: Designs and Accomplishments“ with the guest and keynote speaker Professor André Burguière, a former editor of the *Annales*, and a member of the advisory board in today's *Annales*. The conference was held in the multimedia hall of the library of the Faculty of Humanities on April 26th 2010, in a round table form, with English as the conference language. The keynote lecture was given by Prof. Dr. André Burguière, and the other speakers were, Prof. Dr. Nenad Ivić, Prof. Dr. Boris Olujić, Prof. Dr. Mario Strecha, Branimir Janković, and the students Filip Šimetin Šegvić, Tomislav Brandolica, Marta Fiolić and Marko Lovrić. The round table was moderated by Prof. Dr. Drago Rokсандić, Filip Šimetin Šegvić and Tomislav Brandolica.

The introductory speeches were given by the dean of the Faculty of Humanities, Prof. Dr. Damir Boras, Prof. Dr. Iskra Iveljić on behalf of the Department of History, Prof. Dr. Drago Rokсандić on behalf of the moderators, the French ambassador in Croatia, Jérôme Pasquier, Filip Šimetin Šegvić as chief editor of *Pro tempore*. Tomislav Brandolica introduced Prof. Burguière by briefly outlining his biography.

At the beginning of his lecture, André Burguière thanked for the initiative which resulted in this round table and introduced the theme of his lecture, an „analysis of the

new Annaliste generation“ and the mentality concept. This was a part of his new book: *L'école des Annales: Une histoire intellectuelle*, published in 2006.⁸ Burguière said that his book was not an account of the history and development of the *Annales* „School“, but a map of its influences and shifts, among them, a theory of the history of mentality. The development of historical anthropology, especially in the 1970s, brought about a new concept of mentalities. Historical anthropology took up the topics which had interested historians of mentality in earlier times, but it placed them in a wider context, so this approach came to be widely accepted. Many would place the history of mentalities in the said period, but Burguière gave more space to this demystification of the mentality, and studied them from the beginnings of the *Annales*, since the time of Febvre and Bloch, and in both of their work, and not as it was done previously when it was thought that mentalities were present only in Febvre's work. He finds the forerunner of *historie mentalités* in the research of the human spirit (*history of the human soul*) and in the science of human societies. Burguière said that Febvre was fond of the first construct, and Bloch of the other, and this debate between the two *Annales* founders is the basis for his lecture. Bloch's approach to the history of mentalities was closer to a sociological view of *collective representations*, which is not strange when we take into account Durkheim's influence on Bloch, while Febvre's approach is a realisation of historical psychology inspired by Henri Berr. Bloch preferred the study of the unconscious or routine patterns in *mental life* which is included in organisation and institutionalisation, that is in the patterns of social life where the individual properties are lost. Burguière concludes that Febvre's idea of mentalities is a „bridge between the psychological and sociological in the question of the individual and collective consciousness“. This difference is seen in Febvre's criticisms of Bloch's work *Feudal Society (La société féodale)* in which he criticised the lack of the individual and emotional activity. Febvre's view on mentality was translated into the research of unbelief, and Robert Mandrou continued his research, as Jacques Le Goff continued Bloch's. Burguière finds that the research of the *mentalités* phenomenon and an insight into its complexity brought about the development of historical anthropology, which put the phenomenon into a wider context and popularised it. In the research of mentalities he finds a much wider circle of possibility for a professional historian, than we might at first assume. In his lecture he put an emphasis on the *Annales* foundations, Bloch and Febvre, and thereby he uncovered the possibilities: for Bloch, who gave special attention on man, his changes and transformations that enabled him to recognize concepts of different temporalities or the temporality which is suitable for the research of mentalities, *anthropological time* is close to Braudel's *longue durée*. According to Burguière, Febvre, on the other hand, had a much more „historicist concept of the mental universe“. Through Febvre's works *Un Destin. Martin Luther* and *Le problème de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle. La religion de Rabelais* there comes a psychological moment and the problems connected to the notion of *mentalités*, so the study of mentalities does not open only the horizon of social history, but also intellectual history.

After André Burguière's lecture there were questions from the audience. The first noticed the problem of the reception of mentalities in non-French historiographies. It is a question of accepting mentalities, but also a question of terminology. The question was connected to Geoffrey Lloyd who believed that mentalities were constructed individually, which conforms with the opinion of Reinhart Koselleck on mentalities as a

problem of the individual. When referring to terminology, an example from German historiography was brought up, by which *Alltagsgeschichte* can be seen as close to *histoire mentalités*. Burguière answered that it is not a problem of concepts of terminology, but whether there is such a practice in a certain historiography or not.

The next question touched upon the problem of the individual and the collective, that is, how can a life of one man (Martin Luther, to be more exact), be used as an example and transferred to the whole of society. Burguière answered that it was not a typical biography, as Febvre did not see Luther as someone special or separate, but as a mirror to his time, with regard to the era of two dominant traditions, the Catholic and Protestant ones, and Luther and his expression represent the Protestant tradition.

The last observation questioned the culture of memory and history; what we memorise and how the collective memory and society reflect on the individual in an unconscious manner, or the relation society-individual, past-present. Burguière began his answer by the search for memorised places in French history, which he connected to the research of mentalities and forgotten or memorised practices; because, as Pierre Nora said, collective memory is a normative for the creation of national history. However, the limits are obvious when one looks into „forgotten“ eras, which is required of historians. This is why one must go further than remembrances, or memory. Nora emphasised that the need for history becomes clear when one loses the memory of something. Yet, the strength and charm of history is in the very psychological distance which must be penetrated, but still remembered.

After a ten minute break the round table continued with less audience. The lectures of the other contributors followed, they were shorter and lasted up to fifteen minutes, and after every lecture Prof. Burguière gladly gave his own thoughts and comments, again answering the audiences questions. The audience accepted this approach as it was aware that a member of the *Annales* „School“ was there, and not just any theoretician.

Nenad Ivić, a professor of French literature at the Department of Romance Languages, opened the second part of the round table. The title of his lecture, *Operation Annales*, gave away the author's intention, putting the approaches and traditions of the *Annales* historians into a specific context. In this case, it was a poststructuralist context of French intellectuals, such as Michel de Certeau, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and others. When speaking of a metalanguage as a „pre- and descriptive autoreflexion“, the descriptive reflection on a text opens the question of the relationship between history-writing and its subject. Ivić spoke of some other problems present in the poststructural analysis, where one is bound to the Annaliste terminology, „in the moment when the new history became global, the globality of history is questionable“. He looked into the problem of the existence, or non-existence, of the „School“. Ivić believes that, if we speak of an *Annales* School, it is a „curious bypass“ and not a uniformity which is a part of global historiography, it is impossible to frame, even at this round table.

André Burguière commented that he did not agree with all that was said and that he believes that a globalising operation is always necessary. He mentioned that an operation of totality can be discussed, that is the question of contextualisation. The *Annales* wanted to change historiography and question notions, he noted that he does not prefer the term *nouvelle histoire* which was intensely used in the 1970s. He noted that the editorial board of the *Annales* did not mark the anniversary of its journal.

Boris Olujić, assistant professor of ancient history at the Department of History, touched upon the topic of ancient history in the journal, or in the *Annales* tradition (Jean-Pierre Vernant, Paul Veyne...) which is less represented in the various studies of the *Annales* historians. He believes that historians who have worked in that period are close to the Annalistes because of the multiple source varieties. Olujić states that the tradition of the *Annales* helped historians of ancient civilisations in approaching topics from cosmography, social history and the history of the environment. Boris Olujić noted that he teaches a course titled *Theoretical approaches and paradigms in the historiography of ancient history*, where he teaches on the tradition of the French *Annales* and the research encouraged by that tradition. Olujić held his lecture in French. Although the official language of the round table was English, he considered that it was difficult to talk about the *Annales* in a non-French language. He briefly reiterated the main parts of his talk in Croatian.

After Professor Olujić's lecture, André Burguière touched upon the difference between material sources and texts, elements which are probably most important in the study of ancient history. He believes that texts give meaning and should be read accordingly, or translated, and he highlighted the importance of serial history. On the other hand, material sources contextualise the problem which is under research.

Mario Strecha, associate professor at the Department of History, whose research interest is Church history in the 19th century, talked about the problem of secularisation and dechristianisation in Croatia with a special emphasis on the methods inspired by the research by Michele Vovelle and Pierre Chaunu. He said that Vovelle made his mark by studying wills in 18th century Provence, by which he pointed to the usefulness of the quantitative method in the history of mentality. This was also the basis of Chaunu's research, and it resulted in two main methods for the research in the mentioned topics.

In the context of the quantitative method he mentioned Ernest Labrousse (a historian who is not necessarily a part of the *Annales* circle, but cooperated with them on some occasions), who was responsible for the development of cliometrics. Strecha again emphasized the example of Vovelle, whose notable work *Piété baroque et déchristianisation* changed the view on dechristianisation which was by then tied to the French revolution, and put it at the end of the baroque piety, at the very end of the enlightenment. Strecha said that until the 1960s secularisation was the chief preoccupation of historians. Still, even today we can find new results in that field. He also designated a new research assignment for Croatian historiography, which should use these methods to seek out a correlation between the history of religion and secularisation in Croatia and Croatian society, as Vovelle himself came to his results by leaving classical narration to look at all dimensions of the religious experience.

After Professor Strecha's lecture, André Burguière posed the question whether secularisation necessarily meant dechristianisation, pointing to the different teachings of Michelle Vovelle and Philippe Ariès, noting that he was favoured the approach of Ariès, by which there was a set of non-changing representations, emphasising that mentalities were more complex than representations.

After this, Branimir Janković, a researcher at the Department of History gave his presentation. He tried to explain how the first information about the *Annales* historians came into Croatia and Yugoslavia and how their approaches influenced

different generations of historians. In that context he reviewed the historians who looked at problem in a new way since the 1970s, and tried to compare historiographies of Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia. He mentioned the translations of books by Braudel, Le Goff and others. When speaking about Croatia he pinpointed certain omissions and oversights which should be rectified (emphasising the point that there was no translation of a text by Febvre). He briefly sketched the most important historiographical texts who dealt with the *Annales* journal, such as Mirjana Gross and Nenad Ivić, and some editions of Croatian journals that had covered segments of the School (*Gordogan, Naše teme*).

This historiographical activity was especially interesting to André Burguière as he had the chance to hear, for the first time, about the influence of French *Annales* history on Croatian historiography. Professor Drago Roksandić elaborated on this question as a direct participant in closing the gap between the two historiographies, by his editorial work for the journal *Naše teme*, and by starting the Croatian-French historiographical workshop. By reminiscing about his own journey and education, during which he encountered French historiography, especially while writing his dissertation, he painted a picture of the state of historiography in Yugoslavia. He believes that it was never monolithic, and he described contacts he had with historians such as Albert Soboul.

As Branimir Janković's lecture showed one aspect in the reception of the *Annales* in Croatian historiography (a foreign historiography), a debate began about the spreading influence of this School. There were questions on how to comment the great diversity of writing on the *Annales* historians. Prof. Burguière answered from his own example. By reading some foreign reviews of his last book he found that some did not find him a *outsider*, which did not make him suitable for writing such a book. He feels that he is no more or less prepared than other historians to write such a work, and due to the aforementioned attitude, foreign historians might have found themselves more suitable for writing theoretical/critical works on the *Annales* tradition. He expected more from foreign historiographies. He thought that they would develop a completely different tradition and that new tendencies would appear. Italian microhistory is closest to that ideal, but Burguière is not certain if it is a totally new development.

The next question was on the relationship between the *Annales* and the postmodern, stating that American medieval studies criticised the *Annales* from a postmodern standpoint. Burguière began his answer by asking what postmodern actually meant, saying that the postmodern or poststructuralism were a sensibility, and not an achievement. he concluded by saying that American historiography belongs to a different intellectual tradition, and that it is primarily a conceptual question.

The third section of the conference was opened by the students and editors of *Pro tempore*, Marta Fiolić and Marko Lovrić. In a brief Powerpoint presentation which followed a presentation titled *Annales du cinéma*, they tried to elucidate and highlight some segments from the history of cinematography on which the *Annales* historians had a direct or indirect influence. A special point was made of the relationship which Marc Ferro, the most distinguished Annaliste-film historian, had with that subject. It was said that from the very beginnings Febvre and Bloch were connected to the phenomenon of film and the cinema, and were in favour of a project which would constitute a history of that modern medium.

Tomislav Brandolica and Filip Šimetin Šegvić gave a brief overview of the research in the *Annales* tradition as a historiographical problem. The overview was split into several categories, depending on the thematic and methodological approach to the problem. They presented a category of historians studying the historiography of the *Annales* (André Burguière, Peter Burke, Lutz Raphael, etc.) or those who used it as a segment of their own research (the best example for this would be the *Annales paradigm* of Traian Stoianovich), and those who dedicated their research to one historian (Patrick H. Hutton who studies Philippe Ariès). Of course, one has to mention the translators who introduced their home audience with the *Annalists*. A special category is formed by historians who researched special problems in the tradition of the journal (for example, Peter Schöttler who „rediscovered“ Lucy Varga, a historian close to the first *Annales* generation, or Febvre's and Bloch's relationship with the rise of Nazism). The last part of their presentation was made of excerpts from the *Pro tempore* interviews with *Annalists* or with historians of historiography, presenting the interview method as a potential historiographical method.

Seeing that by the end of the third section the time allocated for the round table was exceeded, there was no more time for a discussion. It should be emphasised that the conference was important for the consideration of the Croatian historiographical tradition which is divided between the traditions of French and German historiographies. The organisers hope that they have initiated new contacts between Croatian and French historiography, especially as a collection of papers is being prepared which will gather papers from those present at the round table, as well as experts outside French historiography who study it, or on which that historiographical tradition has had an influence.

— **Nikolina Šimetin Šegvić**, Zagreb, 12th June, 2010

ENDNOTES

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>1 Jacques Barzun, <i>What is a School? An Institution in Limbo. Trim the College! A Utopia</i> (Hudson Institute, 2002.), 1. Accessed at: www.aale.org/pdf/Barzun_What_is_a_School.pdf (last accessed 11.3.2011.).</p> <p>2 N.S.B. Gras, „Les affaires et l'histoire des affaires”, <i>Annales d'histoire économique et sociale</i> 3/9 (1931.), 5-10.</p> <p>3 Marc Bloch, <i>Apologija historije ili zanat povjesničara</i> (Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2008.), 81.</p> <p>4 Krzysztof Pomian, „The Era of the <i>Annales</i>”, in: <i>Rethinking France</i>:</p> | <p><i>Les Lieux de Memoire, Volume 4: Histories and Memories</i>, ed. Pierre Nora i David P. Jordan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.), 430.</p> <p>5 Fernand Braudel, <i>On History</i> (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1982.), 60.</p> <p>6 See: Geoffrey Jones and Jonathan Zeitlin, <i>The Oxford Handbook of Business History</i> (Oxford University Press, 2008.), 11.</p> <p>7 For example: Patrick Fridenson, „Les organisations: un nouvel objet”, <i>Annales. Économies</i>,</p> | <p><i>Sociétés, Civilisations</i> 44/6 (1989.), 1461-1477.</p> <p>8 English edition: <i>The Annales School. An Intellectual History</i> (Cornell University Press. 2009.). André Burguière is known to those familiar with the French intellectual tradition by his article <i>Historijska antropologija</i> published in the journal <i>Gordogan</i> in 1995. That double issue of <i>Gordogan</i> was dedicated to French new history, so Prof. Burguière's article was published in it. André Burguière, „Historijska antropologija”, <i>Gordogan: kulturni magazin</i> 16 (1995), 39/40, 125-145.</p> |
|---|---|---|



Pro Tempore

Pro Tempore

ČASOPIS STUDENATA POVIJESTI BROJ 8/9, 2010.-2011.

Pro Tempore

Časopis studenata povijesti
godina VII, broj 8-9, 2010-2011.

Glavni i odgovorni urednik
Filip Šimetin Šegvić

Počasni urednik
André Burguière

Uredništvo
Tomislav Brandolica, Marko Lovrić,
Andreja Piršić, Filip Šimetin Šegvić,
Nikolina Šimetin Šegvić, Stefan
Treskanica

Urednici pripravnici
Marta Fiolić, Kristina Frančina, Sanda
Vučićić

Redakcija
Tomislav Brandolica, Marta Fiolić,
Kristina Frančina, Marko Lovrić,
Andreja Piršić, Nikolina Šimetin Šegvić,
Filip Šimetin Šegvić, Stefan Treskanica,
Sanda Vučićić

Tajnica uredništva
Martina Borovčak

Recenzenti
dr. sc. Damir Agičić
dr. sc. Ivo Banac
dr. sc. Zrinka Blažević
dr. sc. Ivan Botica
Miodrag Gladović, d.i.e.
dr. sc. Borislav Grgin
dr. sc. Mirjana Gross
dr. sc. Željko Holjevac
dr. sc. Nenad Ivić
Branimir Janković, prof.
dr. sc. Bruna Kuntić-Makvić
mr. sc. Hrvoje Klasić
dr. sc. Isao Koshimura
dr. sc. Mirjana Matijević Sokol
dr. sc. Hrvoje Petrić
dr. sc. Radivoj Radić
Danijel Rafaelić, prof.
dr. sc. Drago Roksandić
dr. sc. Relja Seferović
dr. sc. Boris Senker
Marina Šegvić, prof.
dr. sc. Božena Vranješ-Šoljan

Lektura i korektura
Marta Fiolić
Ana Jambrišak
Vedrana Janković
Nikolina Kos
Marko Pojatina
Tihomir Varjačić
Tajana Vlasisavljević

Dizajn i priprema za tisak
Tomislav Vlainić
Lada Vlainić

Prijevodni s engleskog jezika
Tomislav Brandolica
Jelena Krilanović
Tina Kužić, prof.
Marko Lovrić
Marija Marčetić
Judita Mustapić
Andrea Pečnik
Marko Pojatina
Prijevodi s njemačkog jezika
Sara Katanec
Mirela Landsman Vinković
Azra Plićanić Mesić, prof.
Filip Šimetin Šegvić
Prijevodi s francuskog jezika
Marta Fiolić
Tea Šimičić
Marina Šegvić, prof.
Mihaela Vekarić
Prijevodi sa slovenskog i srpskog jezika
Krešimir Matešić
Prijevodi s talijanskog jezika
Marina Šegvić, prof.

Izdavač
Klub studenata povijesti - ISHA
Zagreb

Tisak
ZT ZAGRAF

Naklada
Tiskano u 300 primjeraka

ISSN: 1334-8302

Tvrđnje i mišljenja u objavljenim
radovima izražavaju isključivo stavove
autora i ne predstavljaju nužno stavove
i mišljenja uredništva i izdavača.

Izdavanje ovog časopisa financijski su
omogućili:
Odsjek za povijest Filozofskog fakulteta
Sveučilišta u Zagrebu,
DTM GRUPA d.o.o.,
NARCOR d.o.o.,
TRANSPORTI KRAJAN d.o.o.,
HEMA d.o.o.,
KEMOKOP d.o.o.,
EUROGRAF d.o.o.,
Privatne donacije: S. S., M. F., prof.
dr. Drago Roksandić, Marko Lovrić,
Filip Šimetin Šegvić, Nikolina Šimetin
Šegvić, Tomislav Brandolica.

Redakcija časopisa Pro tempore svim
se donatorima iskreno zahvaljuje na
financijskoj podršci!
Redakcija se također posebno
zahvaljuje gospodinu Zlatku Ožboltu,
dia na trudu i pomoći. Zahvaljujući
njemu, put do izdavanja ovog broja
bio je mnogo lakši. Gospodinu Zoranu
Ivankoviću isto tako dugujemo veliku
zahvalu što nam je izašao u susret
prilikom tiskanja časopisa.

Časopis se ne naplaćuje.

Adresa uredništva:
Klub studenata povijesti - ISHA
Zagreb
(za: Redakcija Pro tempore),
Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilišta u Zagrebu,
Ivana Lučića 3, 10000 Zagreb

E-mail:
pt.redakcija@gmail.com
phillip.simetinsegvic@gmail.com