

Zitierhinweis

Stefanidis, Ioannis D.: Rezension über: Paschalis M. Kitromilides / Triantaphyllos E. Sklavenitis, Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας, 1833-2002: Πρακτικά. Historiography of modern and contemporary Greece, Athēna: Kentro Neoellēnikōn Ereunōn Ethniku Idrymatos Ereunōn, 2004, in: Südost-Forschungen, --, 67 (2008), S. 364-366, <https://recensio-stag.lorax.syslab.com/r/9a4f09313bc61a0d32a33a4590f71248>



copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

² Vgl. Wolfgang-Uwe FRIEDRICH, Die bulgarische Geschichtswissenschaft im Spannungsverhältnis zwischen ideologischem Anspruch und historischer Realität. Die Geschichtsschreibung der Befreiungsbewegung und der Anfänge des Nationalstaates, *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* NF 29 (1981), 412-435; Maria N. TODOROVA, Die Osmanenzeit in der bulgarischen Geschichtsforschung seit der Unabhängigkeit, in: Die Staaten Südosteuropas und die Osmanen. Hg. Hans Georg MAJER. München 1989 (Südosteuropa-Jahrbuch, 19), 127-162.

³ Vgl. Krumka ŠAROVA, Diskusija za roljata na buržoazijata v bālgarskoto osvoboditelno dvīženie i predstojašti izsledovateliski zadači, *Istoričeski pregled* 34 (1978), 93-102.

⁴ Vgl. Rumjana RADKOVA, Bālgarskata inteligencija prez vāzraždāneto (XVIII – pārvata polovina na XIX v.). Sofija 1986; DIES., Inteligencijata i npravstvenostta prez vāzraždāneto (XVIII – pārvata polovina na XIX v.). Sofija 1995.

⁵ Vgl. Nikolaj GENČEV / Krasimirova DASKALOVA (Hgg.), Bālgarskata vāzroždenska inteligencija. Enciklopedija. Sofija 1988; Nikolaj GENČEV, Bālgarska vāzroždenska inteligencija. Sofija 1991.

⁶ Vgl. Roumiana PRESHLENOVA, Freiheit als Verantwortung. Die Historiographie in Bulgarien nach dem Umbruch, und Wolfgang HÖPKEN, „Kontinuität im Wandel“. Historiographie in Bulgarien seit der Wende, in: Alojz IVANIŠEVIĆ u. a. (Hgg.), Klio ohne Fesseln? Historiographie im östlichen Europa nach dem Zusammenbruch des Kommunismus. Wien u. a. 2002, 473-486, 487-498; Daniela KOLEVA / Ivan ELENKOV, Did „the Change“ happen? Post-socialist historiography in Bulgaria, in: (Re)Writing History – Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism. Hg. Ulf BRUNNBAUER. Münster 2004 (Studies on South-East Europe, 4), 94-127.

Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας, 1833-2002: Πρακτικά [Die Historiographie des neuzeitlichen und modernen Griechenlands, 1833-2002: Berichte] 2 Bde. Hgg. Paschalis M. KITROMILIDES / Triantaphyllos E. SKLAVENITIS. Athen: Institute for Neohellenic Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation 2004. 630, 766 S., ISBN 960-7916-37-9, 960-7916-38-7

Assembling seventy-three practitioners of history to assess the record of generations past and, at least in part, reflect on the contribution of themselves and their – sometimes present – colleagues to the field is no small achievement. Thanks to the labours of the editors and their supporting staff at the Institute for Neohellenic Research, most of the impressive corpus of information and critical assessment thus collected is now available in print. Admittedly, since only short résumés and two commentaries by foreign scholars are in languages other than Greek, this major publication will first and foremost serve an indigenous public; and as it was pointed out in the proceedings, despite the occasional attraction of *enfants terribles* such as Arnold Toynbee or Mark Mazower, modern Greek history remains the domain of Greek historians who in turn rarely venture beyond its limits – with the partial exception of neighbouring regions, particularly in the Balkans. As this scholarly endeavour indicates, while the history of modern Greece is inadequately integrated to the broader context of European and world history, historical studies in Greece largely remain introvert and ethnocentric.

But again, this collective effort was intended to provide a broad assessment of nearly two centuries of Greek historiography – or, rather the historiography of the Greek world since the process of state formation and national unification began in the third decade of the 19th century. The contributors chart the long phase of Greek historiography as an intellectual undertaking committed to the process of nation-building and its recent transition to a discipline conversant with international trends and open to self-reflection and revision. As a result of political and social change, accelerated since the end of authoritarian rule in 1974, the writing of Modern Greek history passed into the hands of generations of full-time practitioners who exhibited both greater professionalism and intellectual pluralism than their predecessors. They infused the study of their subject matter with the theoretical assumptions, methodological tools and analytical concepts of trends that had long flourished in European and North American centres of scholarship: on the one hand a blend of Marxist analysis and the perspectives of the *Annales* school inspired much of the “new history” that is extensively reflected in the parts of volume II dealing with social and economic history; on the other hand an empirical approach, mainly of “Anglo-Saxon” provenance, held the ground in political and diplomatic history. The end of the bipolar world and the “revival” of the national question in Europe, in the early 1990s, brought new concerns to the fore. Whether focusing on class conflict, economic issues or “high politics” in 19th and 20th century Greece, no study could ignore the impact of culture and ideas, such as nationalism, without undermining its analytical effectiveness.

The new research agendas of recent generations of Greek historians can be glimpsed in the first part of volume I, referring to the construction or “elaboration” of Greek national historiography. For more than a century the field was cultivated against the ideological backdrop of the historical continuity of a nation ever-present from remote antiquity through the Byzantine era down to modern times. This construct owed much to the intellectual force and synthetic capacity of Konstantinos Paparrhigopoulos (1815-1891) who, in the age of romantic nationalism, met the need of the fledgling Greek nation and its state for a secure and ample foothold in space and time. It is a tribute to Paparrhigopoulos’ achievement – and its reproduction as state ideology – that only fairly recently Greek historians began to question its basic tenets. Those who did so found themselves at odds with state ideology and still have to bridge the gap between their work and the prevailing public view of national history. Recent controversies about history textbooks indicate the lag between scholarship and education, and reveal the tensions inherent in the historian’s metier, his social role in particular, and the reach of her/his oeuvre. Perhaps, a study in the dissemination and the reading public of Greek historiography, past and present, might be pertinent in revealing yet another aspect of the complex, occasionally thorny, and very often controversial relation between history and Greek society.

Following the “elaboration” of national historiography *per se*, the record in the fields of culture, the economy, society, the state, state and non-state institutions cover much of the contents with ad hoc sections on two ongoing historiographical debates, the Greek War of Independence and the 1940s, especially the Greek Civil War. Apart from surveying and assessing 170 years of historiography, several papers contribute to the lively dialogue on the directions and research agendas – the so-called new trends in Modern Greek historiography,

to remember the title of an important, though less ambitious similar project that appeared in 1982 – as well as the relation with other social disciplines, e.g. social anthropology. Admittedly, there is little on political history and nothing on what is still referred to as “diplomatic history” – partly because a number of participants failed to submit their papers in time. Such absences might feed the unwarranted impression that political history remains an outdated mixture of positivism and romantic ideology. By and large, however, the Institute for Neohellenic Research has accomplished the tasks it set upon itself. It has encouraged the dialogue among historians of modern and contemporary Greece and produced a work that will serve as standard reference book for the study of Greek historiography while constituting a major contribution to Greek intellectual history.

Thessaloniki

Ioannis D. Stefanidis

Pulverfass, Powder Keg, Baril de Poudre? Südosteuropa im europäischen Geschichtsschulbuch. South Eastern Europe in European History Textbooks. Hg. Andreas HELMEDACH. Braunschweig: Georg-Eckert-Institut, Hannover: Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung 2007 (Studien zur internationalen Schulbuchforschung. Schriftenreihe des Georg-Eckert-Instituts, 118). 316 S., ISBN 978-3-88304-318-0, € 15,90

In den Fußspuren von Maria Todorova hat Andreas Helmedach als Herausgeber für das Georg-Eckert-Institut für internationale Schulbuchforschung Autoren zusammengebracht, die die Darstellung des Balkanraumes in den Schulbüchern eines jeweiligen Landes erörtern. Angesichts des erwartungsgemäß folgenden Fazits, wonach die Region vernachlässigt bzw. diffamiert werde, birgt die Zweiteilung des Sammelbandes in „West- und mitteleuropäische Fallbeispiele“ und „Fallbeispiele aus dem Donau-Balkan-Raum“ eine gewisse Ironie. Während das einzige echte „europäische Schulbuch“ oder die Schulbuchreihe des Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe (CDRSEE) in Thessaloniki nicht mit einbezogen wurden,¹ verfolgen die Autoren, die (mit Ausnahme von Stefan Albrechts „Byzanz in deutschen, französischen und englischen Schulbüchern“) jeweils die Schulbücher eines Land untersuchten, unterschiedliche Ansätze. HANS-CHRISTIAN MANER (Deutschland) und STEFAN IHRIG (Großbritannien) integrieren z. B. auch die historische Dimension der Entwicklung des Balkanbildes in den Schulbüchern der letzten 50 bis 100 Jahre in die Analyse, während ANDREAS HELMEDACH oder AUGUSTA DIMOU (Griechenland) nur die letzte Generation Schulbücher untersuchen. Manche Autoren analysieren die Schulbücher eines nach dem anderen, was der Lesefreundlichkeit nicht zugute kommt, und einige wenige verwenden sogar Raumanalyse als besondere Art der Schulbuchforschung – wie viel Textumfang wird einem Thema eingeräumt? Da der Haupttenor kaum Überraschungen birgt, macht eine historische Dimension die Länderdarstellung wesentlich interessanter und nur die wenigsten Leser werden sich für eine Analyse auf dem Niveau individueller Schulbücher interessieren.