

Arthur Alfaix Assis¹

Schemes of Historical Method in the Late 19th Century: Cross-References between Langlois and Seignobos, Bernheim, and Droysen

At the end of the 19th century, most professional historians – wherever they existed – deemed history to be a form of knowledge ruled by a method that bears no resemblance with those most commonly traceable in the natural sciences. The bulk of the historian's task was then frequently regarded as being the application of procedures frequently referred to as 'historical method'. In the context of such an emerging interest on historical methods and methodology, at least three textbooks stand out: Johann Gustav Droysen's *Grundriss der Historik* (Outline of the Theory of History), Ernst Bernheim's *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (Handbook of Historical Method), and Charles Langlois and Charles Seignobos's *Introduction aux études historiques* (Introduction to the Study of History). These books were quite influential in Germany, France, and elsewhere, and they very much helped promote a general idea of historical method that would become relatively consensual among historians of many nationalities by the early 20th century. Such a relative agreement on historical method sponsored both the communication and the development of a sense of disciplinary identity among historians trained within different and sometimes conflicting national traditions. It was then partially extended, partially challenged, and surely made more complex when, from the 1920s on, social and economic historians became a good part of the historiographical establishment in many countries.²

The three books by Droysen, Bernheim, and Langlois and Seignobos were already pieced together by Rolf Torstendahl, who studied them as a group of texts that, despite their differences, contributed to shape the developments outlined above.³ However, Torstendahl's primary aim was to show how Droysen, Bernheim, and Seignobos all resorted to 'method' as a way to circumvent skepticism

¹ Department of History, University of Brasília.

² Michael Bentley (1999). *Modern Historiography: An Introduction*, London: Routledge, 105-107.

³ Rolf Torstendahl (2003). 'Fact, Truth and Text: The Quest for a Firm Basis for Historical Knowledge around 1900', *History and Theory*, Vol. 42, No. 3, 305-331.

against the possibility of historical knowledge, rather than investigate the internal interrelationships between the three texts. In this chapter I follow precisely this latter, not yet taken, road, focusing on crucial cross-references between the *Grundriss*, the *Lehrbuch*, and the *Introduction*. I intend to show that, at a general level, the schemes of historical method found in these texts are largely convergent, and that this convergence is due to Bernheim's reading of Droysen and to Langlois and Seignobos's reading of Bernheim. I will attempt to do it through a regressive approach that starts with an analysis of the *Introduction*. Aspects of the editorial history and circulation of the three texts will also be briefly addressed, as a way to illustrate their special importance within the framework of early 20th century historical theory. Because my argument calls for a focus on the most general lines of Droysen's, Bernheim's, and Langlois and Seignobos's schemes of historical method, I will, for the sake of consistency, refrain from analysing in-depth the complex epistemological and ontological arguments in which those schemes are nested.

① One common meaning historians use to associate with the term 'method' is that of a set of research operations and rules whose application can guarantee the validity of knowledge produced out of past materials.⁴ In line with this understanding, historical methodologists have traditionally been occupied with analyzing 'the procedures by which the historian collects, criticizes and elaborates

4 Jerzy Topolski is the author of what is perhaps the most comprehensive treatise on historical methodology ever published. According to his classification, I am actually addressing only one aspect of the problem of 'method' in history. Topolski differentiates between objective, pragmatic and apragmatic methodologies of history. Within his framework, I would be dealing here with a moment in the history of the 'pragmatic' methodology of history, that is, of that branch of methodology that focuses on the cognitive operations in historical research. Topolski further associates the 'pragmatic methodology of history' with 'reflections on the results of research, i.e. on the science of history interpreted as a set of statements on the domain under investigation'. The 'objective methodology of history', on its part, specializes in 'reflections on the subject matter of historical research, i.e. on history in the sense of the past events'. Jerzy Topolski (1976). *Methodology of History*, translated by Olgierd Wojtasiewicz, Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 30. Topolski's book is full of powerful insights and deserves much more attention than it has received since its English translation was published in 1976. But he works with an unusual and overly inflated notion of methodology that covers almost the whole field of theoretical reflection on history and historiography. It encompasses not only the research procedures employed by historians, but also the operations involved in historical explanation and writing, in addition to issues more frequently addressed by substantive philosophers of history.

on the documents upon which their science is founded.⁵ It has been so at least since Johann Gustav Droysen's well-known statement that 'the essence of historical method is to understand by means of research (*forschend Verstehen*)' (*OPH*, 12, translation slightly modified).⁶ But the hermeneutical link between 'method' and 'research' that this definition presupposes did not prevail in all times. Early-modern methodologists, from Jean Bodin in the 16th century to August Schölzer in the late 18th century, rather spoke of 'method' to point to principles related to the presentation and learning of historical knowledge. Theirs was, as Jörn Rüsen pointed out, a mostly didactical and rhetorical concept of method.⁷

The emergence of a research-oriented notion of method in the middle of the 19th century was an important aspect of the amplified process of professionalization and institutionalization then experienced by historians and history in many countries. This process unfolded according to chronologies that differ from land to land, but Protestant Germany undoubtedly pioneered it. Here by mid-century (and later also elsewhere), history became the kind of academic discipline we encounter in most university landscapes until today.⁸ Historians were then becoming 'professionals' of historical knowledge, as the institutionalization of their discipline enabled a mounting number of scholars to work full-time with research

5 Louis Halphen (2005). *Introduction à l'histoire*, Chicoutimi: Les classiques des sciences sociales <<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1522/cla.hal.int>> (1st ed.: Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1946), 53.

6 Here and below, *OPH* refers to: Johann Gustav Droysen (1893). *Outline of the Principles of History*, translated by E. Benjamin Andrews [translation of the last version of the *Grundriss der Historik*, 1882], Boston: Ginn & Company.

7 Jörn Rüsen (1988). 'Historische Methode', in: *Historische Methode. Beiträge zur Historik*, Band 5, edited by Christian Meier and Jörn Rüsen, München: DTV, 62-80 (cit. 62-64); Jörn Rüsen (1982). 'Von der Aufklärung zum Historismus. Idealtypische Perspektiven eines Strukturwandels', in: *Von der Aufklärung zum Historismus. Zum Strukturwandel des historischen Denkens*, edited by Jörn Rüsen and Horst Walter Blanke, Paderborn: Schöningh, 15-58 (cit. 35-40). On early modern theories of historiography, see Anthony Grafton (2007). *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8 Georg Iggers (1994). 'Ist es in der Tat in Deutschland früher zur Verwissenschaftlichung der Geschichte gekommen als in anderen europäischen Ländern?', in: Wolfgang Küttler et al. (eds), *Geschichtsdiskurs*, Vol. 2: *Anfänge modernen historischen Denkens*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 73-86; Gabrielle Lingelbach (2011). 'The Institutionalization and Professionalization of History in Europe and the United States', in: *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, Vol. 4: 1800-1945, edited by Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca, and Attila Pók, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 78-96.

and teaching, and to devote most of their working lives to these activities.⁹ Besides, historiography was experiencing what could be called its 'archival turn': historians were increasingly impelled to base historical knowledge on materials stored in archives – and less on non-archival sources like former historiographical accounts, autobiographies, newspaper articles, published speeches, among others.¹⁰ Concomitantly, virtues and skills closely linked to the philological work with documents, such as meticulousness and diligence, were more and more emphasized as the most important stances of the historians' professional ethos.¹¹

By the end of the 19th century, when all these processes reached a peak in many countries, the idea that the knowledge produced by professional historians is essentially shaped by the operations gathered together in the notion of 'historical method' was already well-established. 'Method' then corresponded, among other things, to a distinctive mark of the professional historians' special way of researching evidence and understanding past experiences. It helped delimit the space of academic history, secluding it from that of non-professional, amateurish historians, as well as from other sciences regarded as tributary to different 'methods'. In addition, the reflection on 'historical method' was also ascribed propaedeutic and reflexive functions, as it was supposed to provide history students and practitioners with the means to approach the formal problems related to the study of history and historical inquiry.¹²

Several 19th century historians, philologists, and philosophers wrote on historical method.¹³ But for sure no text on the matter was as influential as the *In-*

9 Jeremy Telman (1994). 'Review Essay', *History and Theory*, Vol. 33, Nr. 2, 249–265 (cit. 260).

10 Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen (2013). 'Inventing the Archive: Testimony and Virtue in Modern Historiography', *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 26, Nr. 4, 8–26.

11 Herman Paul has recently shown that this emphasis on a professional ethos disproportionately focused on the criticism of sources – and thus on the exercise of 'philological' virtues – was already contested by 19th century historians and theorists such as Droysen, Jacob Burckhardt, and Ottokar Lorenz. See Herman Paul (2013). 'The Heroic Study of Records: The Contested Persona of the Archival Historians', *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 26, Nr. 4, 67–83.

12 Blanke, Horst Walter, Dirk Fleischer & Jörn Rüsen (1984). 'Theory of History in Historical Lectures: The German Tradition of Historik, 1750–1900', *History and Theory*, Vol. 23, Nr. 3, 331–356 (cit. 351–352).

13 See, for instance, Edward Augustus Freeman (1886). *The Methods of Historical Studies*, London: MacMillan; Ottokar Lorenz (1886, 1891). *Die Geschichtswissenschaft in Hauptrichtungen und Aufgaben kritisch erörtert*, 2 vols., Berlin: W. Hertz; Pietro Dolci (1887). *Sintesi di scienza storica*, Napoli: Vincenzo Morano; Hendrik Cornelis

Introduction aux études historiques, published in 1898. This text is the product of a partnership between the medievalist and palaeographer Charles-Victor Langlois (1863–1929), and Charles Seignobos (1854–1942), methodologist and historian of the modern world. In 1896–97, when both were junior faculty members at the University of Paris, they decided to join forces on lectures aiming at introducing their students to the practice of historical inquiry. Out of this propaedeutic enterprise emerged their famous *Introduction* (*ISH*, 3).¹⁴ Since the historians connected to the so-called *Annales* School began to play the leading role in the French historiographical mainstream in the 1930s, Langlois and Seignobos's textbook has been much more criticized for being epistemologically naïve than praised for the eventual merits it might have. Antoine Prost showed that a good part of the criticism nourished particularly against Seignobos by many leading 20th century historians was actually unfair, since it was not based on careful readings of his texts, but rather on stereotypes – the most effective of those were propagated by Lucien Febvre in the 1930s, within the context of a fierce struggle for power among French historians of different generations.¹⁵

There is no doubt that Prost is right, but it is interesting to recall that as Febvre was hypercritical against his methodological predecessors, so were Langlois and Seignobos against theirs. Their *Introduction's* foreword is particularly distinguished by a very sharp polemical tone. Here Langlois and Seignobos make an effort to isolate the methodical and methodological issues they intend to deal with from those typically discussed in (substantive) philosophies of history – a

Rogge (1890). *De wetenschap der geschiedenis en hare methode*, Amsterdam: Y. Rogge; Alexandru Xenopol (1899). *Les principes fondamentaux de l'histoire*, Paris: Ernest Leroux (2nd ed.: 1908, *La théorie de l'histoire*, Paris: Ernest Leroux); Charles Seignobos (1901). *La méthode historique appliquée aux sciences sociales*, Paris: A. Colin; Kristian Erslev (1911). *Historisk Teknik. Den historiske Undersøgelse fremstillet i sine Grundlinjer*, København: John Martin Vincent (1911). *Historical Research: An Outline of Theory and Practice*, New York: Holt; Ludwig Rieß (1912). *Historik. Ein Organon geschichtlichen Denkens und Forschens*, Berlin: Goschenschen Verlagshandlung; Wilhelm Bauer (1921). *Einführung in das Studium der Geschichte*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

14 *ISH* refers to: Charles Victor Langlois & Charles Seignobos (1909). *Introduction to the Study of History*, translated by G. G. Berry, New York: Henry Holt and Co. (1st French edition: 1898). On the history of the later editions of this text, see Anaclét Pons & Justo Serna (2005). 'Apología de la historia metódica', *Pasajes. Revista de pensamiento contemporáneo*, No. 16, 128–136.

15 Antoine Prost (1994), 'Charles Seignobos revisité', *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire*, Nr. 43, 100–118.

field they simply despised. They also state that the majority of the works they knew on the issues of historical method and historical writing were 'superficial, insipid, unreadable, sometimes ridiculous' (*ISH*, 5). But they are also self-critical enough as to raise doubts even towards their own methodological undertaking, from which, according to them, experienced professionals had nothing to learn (*ISH*, 12). Nonetheless, Langlois and Seignobos thought their book would be useful for young history students, as it would help them develop a 'clear consciousness of the methods they use' (*ISH*, 8). The authors thus justify their enterprise by arguing that even though methodology was not a real necessity for historical research, it would surely be important for the training of young historians.

Langlois and Seignobos's *Introduction* presents itself as 'an essay on the method of the historical sciences' (*ISH*, 3). The text is divided into three major sections – called books – each of which is dedicated to a basic aspect of historical research. Historical method is hence characterized as something that emerges out of the interface of three different operations: the 'preliminary studies', the 'analytical operations', and the 'synthetic operations'.

In Langlois and Seignobos's picture, historical research presupposes pre-knowledge of the relevant sources, their extension and location, as well as of the so called auxiliary sciences that should help the historian extract information from the chosen documents. However, more important than these preliminary studies are the analytical operations, which start with the external criticism of the sources. While carrying it out, a historian first tries to emend the corruptions added to a past text in the process of its transmission into the historian's present, cleansing it of interpolations, and thus 'restoring' the text, as well as possible, to its original form (*ISH*, 74-75). The researcher then has to ascertain, as accurately as possible, issues related to the authorship and dating of the considered document (*ISH*, 87). After locating, emending, and investigating authorship and date of documents, historians have to organize the thus far collected material, and to classify it in a 'rational and convenient manner' (*ISH*, 101). External criticism is completed with this critical classification of sources. According to Langlois and Seignobos, after this stage, the documents can be examined in terms of what they really have to say, and this examination is the task of internal criticism. The first step is then to ascertain whether what the author of a document meant is being rightly understood, that is, to go through hermeneutic and linguistic criticism (*ISH*, 143-147). Next, historians contrast correctly understood statements from their sources with pre-given knowledge of both the issues addressed by them and the period in which they were written. The result of this confrontation is a kind of negative criticism that enables one to establish whether the source's author was or was not lying, and to what extent the information conveyed is reliable and

accurate (*ISH*, 155). For Langlois and Seignobos, source criticism is culminated with the determination of particular facts. After a set of documents undergoes the chain of critical operations detailed above, information accruing from all processed sources can be compared. The establishment of particular historical facts is what almost naturally follows.

Considered together, all these critical procedures form what Langlois and Seignobos call analytical operations. But the authors' view of historical method also included another dimension of historians' work, a dimension they labelled 'the synthetic operations'. Criticism only renders particular historical facts, but in the synthetic operations these facts are put together and synthesised in order to form a 'historical construct' (*construction historique*) (*ISH*, 211). The first synthetic procedure is then the grouping of the particular facts that are going to be part of the historical construction (*ISH*, 232-234). The next step consists of filling the gaps in the selected group of facts, by making use of what Langlois and Seignobos call constructive reasoning, that is, by a cautious and trained application of the faculty of imagination (*ISH*, 252). This is followed by the construction of general formulae, a kind of mental interpretation that condenses factual knowledge and elucidates their causal connections (*ISH*, 229). Finally, these formulae have to be communicated to the audience, and this is the task of exposition, an operation to which Langlois and Seignobos dedicate only a short discussion.

It is surprising to find such strong ^{***}constructivist arguments in a textbook that many still see as the quintessence of positivism in historiography. As Itamar Freitas has stressed, for Langlois and Seignobos the past actions historians address with the aid of their sources can only be approached via an entirely *intellectual* operation.¹⁶ This operation does not culminate in a mirror-like form of knowledge, but rather in a synthesis that, as they point out, is only reachable through constructive reasoning. Also interesting is the fact that Langlois and Seignobos only claimed a very partial originality for their exposition of the principles of historical method. Indeed, they made it very clear that they were heavily indebted to another methodological handbook published a decade before: precisely, Ernst Bernheim's *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*. As Langlois and Seignobos considered Bernheim's textbook to be already the reference work in the field of historical methodology, they felt like they had to justify their writing another similar work. They knew that Bernheim had 'worked through nearly

16 Itamar Freitas, '100 anos de um manual: comentários sobre *Introduction aux études historiques*, de Langlois e Seignobos', in: Itamar Freitas, *Histórias do ensino de história no Brasil*, Aracaju: Ed. UFS, 2006, 259-284 (cit. 267).

all the modern works on historical method'; and they thought that 'the fruit of Bernheim's labours is an arrangement under appropriate headings, most of them invented by himself, of a great number of reflections and selected references'. Langlois and Seignobos expressly did not intend to 'do over again what had already been done so well' by Bernheim. But they thought the *Lehrbuch* was composed in a style that would be unappealing to French readers, and they knew that in any case no French translation of the text was available. So they thought their literary enterprise was justified (*ISH*, 10-11).

Ernst Bernheim (1850-1942) was a trained medievalist who spent most of his professional career at the University of Greifswald, where he taught from 1883 to 1921. His methodological interests were cultivated in association with his engagement for the reform of both the German university system and the study of history at the higher education level.¹⁷ His first attempt at a systematic exploration of theoretical and methodological issues materialized in the volume on *Historical Research and Philosophy of History*, from 1880.¹⁸ Published a decade later, in 1889, the *Lehrbuch* corresponds to Bernheim's second theoretical endeavor, yet much larger in thematic scope and extension. In fact, as many contemporary commentators would remark, the book is one of the most impressive attempts at reflecting on historical method undertaken in the second half of the 19th century. Fred Fling, for instance, himself an author of methodological texts published in the United States in the years around 1900, judged that Bernheim's book marked an epoch, as it was the first 'real textbook on method' ever produced.¹⁹ Up until 1970, Bernheim's treatise on method would go through six re-editions and some reprints. In 1903, when the third edition came out, he amended not only the body of the text, but also the book's title, which was expanded into *Handbook of Historical Method and of Philosophy of History*.²⁰

17 Andreas Gestrich (2006). "Ist vielleicht der Universitätsunterricht selber verbesserungsbedürftig?" Ernst Bernheim und die Diskussion um die Reform des universitären Unterrichts um 1900', in: *Vorlesung, Seminar, Repetitorium: Universitäre geschichtswissenschaftliche Lehre im historischen Vergleich*, ed. Gabrielle Lingelbach, München: Martin Meidenbauer, 129-154.

18 Ernst Bernheim (1880). *Geschichtsforschung und Geschichtsphilosophie*, Göttingen: Robert Peppmüller.

19 Fred Morrow Fling (1899). *Outline of Historical Method*, Lincoln: J.H. Miller, 17.

20 Ernst Bernheim (1908). *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie*, 5th and 6th revised and extended edition, Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. This edition will be quoted here as *LHMGPh*. On the changes and new contents introduced by Bernheim from one edition to another, see Knut Langewand (2009). *Historik im Historismus. Geschichtsphilosophie und historische Methode bei Ernst Bernheim*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 40-42.

Bernheim's purpose in the *Lehrbuch* was, as he states in the short foreword to the first edition of the book, to take the first steps towards the establishment of a historical methodology.²¹ He does not spell out which kind of audience he had in mind, but it is clear that his book – differently in this regard from Langlois and Seignobos's *Introduction* – aims not only at familiarizing students with practical and theoretical issues situated at the core of the historical discipline. Bernheim's writing is a treatise that delves deeply into the matters discussed rather than a didactical introduction to them. Actually, the book presents itself as a contribution to the discussion on the principles of historical knowledge, which in the late 19th century was being carried out by historians, philosophers, philologists, jurists, economists, biblical scholars, among other scholars.²²

Compared to Langlois and Seignobos, Bernheim's general depiction of historical method reveals some slight differences. The most significant is that he prefers to distinguish four – rather than three – major operations in historical method: heuristics (*Heuristik* or *Quellenkunde*), criticism, conception (*Auffassung*), and exposition (*Darstellung*). Whereas Bernheim considers exposition to be a fourth autonomous methodical operation, Langlois and Seignobos integrate it into what they call the synthetic operations. But, in spite of this, the similarities between the two textbooks are large, and they confirm what Langlois and Seignobos admitted right in the beginning of their *Introduction* where they mentioned how much indebted they were to Bernheim's book. Bernheim's concept of 'heuristics', for instance, roughly equals what the French authors call 'the search for documents'. Likewise, both criticism and conception in Bernheim's text are

21 Ernst Bernheim (1889). *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*, 1st Edition, Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, vi-vii.

22 Knut Langewand has recently pointed out that Bernheim's arguments on historical method were strongly tied to an eclectic set of theoretical ideas borrowed from contemporary authors such as Rudolph Hermann Lotze and Wilhelm Schuppe, who were, by the way, outsiders within the context of German late 19th century philosophy. See Langewand, *Historik im Historismus*, esp. 61-72. That the 'epistemology' on the basis of Bernheim's notion of method was far from being naïve was recently demonstrated by Herman Paul, with special regard to the issue of 'historical distance'. According to Paul, Bernheim argued for 'distance' less in terms of a temporal seclusion between the historian and the historicized experience. He rather thought of distance as self-distanciation, i.e., as the never fully accomplishable product of the exercise of an ascetic epistemic virtue, a virtue by means of which one tries to take some distance from one's own view of reality to better open oneself to the strangeness of the past. Herman Paul (2011). 'Distance and Self-Distanciation: Intellectual Virtue and Historical Method Around 1900', *History and Theory*, Vol. 50, Nr. 4, 104-116 (esp. 107; 109-110).

deeply related to the issues treated respectively under the titles 'analytical and synthetic operations' by the French authors.²³ In addition, Bernheim's section on criticism is, like Langlois and Seignobos's, structured upon the differentiation between internal and external criticism, a feature that actually was already established in the literature on source criticism at least since the 18th century.²⁴

However, just like Langlois and Seignobos, Bernheim also did not claim complete originality for his work. As a matter of fact, Bernheim recognized that he borrowed his general scheme of historical method from another 19th century German textbook: Johann Gustav Droysen's *Grundriss der Historik*. In a remark found in the first edition of the *Lehrbuch* – but that would curiously be excluded from later editions – Bernheim agreed that Droysen's booklet was 'the only theoretical and methodological overview that did justice to the then contemporary progresses of historical science'.²⁵ Moreover, after distinguishing the four operations of his methodology – heuristics, criticism, conception, and representation – Bernheim found it necessary to write a footnote to explain that he was grouping the basic methodical operations 'as Droysen was the first to do in his "Grundriss" (*LHMGP*, 250-251).²⁶ The most general elements that structure his scheme of historical method were thus, according to Bernheim himself, borrowed from Droysen's.

Johann Gustav Droysen (1808-1884) was trained as a historian of Ancient Greece, but after his appointment as professor at the University of Kiel in 1840, he turned into a student of the political history of modern Prussia. In the 1850s

23 See Table 1, below.

24 Blanke, Fleischer & Rösen, 'Theory of History in Historical Lectures', 342.

25 Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*, 1st ed., 149: 'Wachsmuths Entwurf einer Theorie der Geschichte ist das erste neuere Buch, welche lediglich eine allgemeine Orientierung über Begriff und Methode der Geschichtswissenschaft bezweckt und die Hilfswissenschaften nur in diesem Rahmen behandelt (...). Das einzige Handbuch ähnlicher Tendenz und das einzige, das zugleich auf der jetzigen Höhe der Wissenschaft steht, ist Joh. Gustav Droysens Grundriß der Historik.'

26 Original quote: 'Wie wir in der Einleitung dieses Kapitels sagten, sollen die folgenden vier Kapitel die einzelnen Grundsätze und Operationen enthalten, welche die angewandte Methodologie oder die Methodik ausmachen. Dieselben lassen sich nämlich in vier verschiedene Gruppen zusammenfassen: die Quellenkunde oder Heuristik, welche die Sammlung und Kenntnisaufnahme des Stoffes begreift, die Kritik, welche sich mit der Sichtung des Stoffes und der Konstatierung des Tatsächlichen beschäftigt, die Auffassung, welche die Bedeutung und den Zusammenhang der Tatsachen zu erkennen hat, die Darstellung, welche die in ihrem Zusammenhang erkannten Tatsachen in erkenntnisgemäßem Ausdruck wiedergibt'. The footnote comes after 'Gruppen zusammenfassen' and states: 'Wie zuerst J. G. Droysen in seinem Grundriss getan'. See also Torstendahl, 'Fact, Truth, and Text', 316.

he moved briefly to the University of Jena and then to the University of Berlin, where he established himself as an important figure in the German academic landscape of the second half of the 19th century.²⁷ Apart from being a historian of both Hellenism and Prussian politics, Droysen also cultivated a life-long interest for theoretical issues related to historical research and writing. While writing and teaching on historical theory, he intended, according to his own words, 'to pierce deeper into the questions of our science, to establish its procedure and its task' (*OPH*, 8, translation slightly modified).

Droysen's scheme of historical method is structured on the differentiation between four basic moments in the historian's research: heuristics, criticism, interpretation (*Interpretation*), and exposition (*Darstellung, Apodeixis*). Droysen conceived of heuristics, to begin with, as the art of properly finding and selecting what he called 'the historical material', that is, objects and texts from the past that are still accessible in the historian's present, and that can be used, as he poetically expounds, to 'cause light to shine back into the empty darkness of the past' (*OPH*, 11). His typology of historical materials encompasses 'remains' (*Überreste*) and 'sources' (*Quellen*). The basic difference between them is that the 'sources' are past registers that were produced with the intention of establishing how certain events or actors would be remembered. In contrast, 'remains' are phenomena that were produced not to serve memory in the future, but rather to fulfill more practical functions in the past itself – like a pottery vase once used to carry water, unearthed by an archeologist, or an old law that is still in use in a justice system (*OPH*, 18-20).²⁸ Bernheim, by the way, later assimilated Droysen's typology of historical materials in his methodology, with some adaptations (*LHMGP*, 255-259).²⁹

The point of departure for heuristics, in particular, and for the whole research, in general, is the formulation of what Droysen calls 'the historical question'. It is this 'question' that functions as the highest criterion of relevance for the selection and analysis of historical materials. As Droysen puts it, 'research is not premised on

27 On Droysen's personal and professional biography, see Wilfried Nippel (2008). Johann Gustav Droysen. Ein Leben zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik. Munich: C. H. Beck; Otto Hintze (1904). 'Johann Gustav Droysen', in: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Vol. 48, Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 82-114.

28 Droysen also differentiates a third type of historical materials, the 'monuments' (*Denkmäler*), which he sees as composed of combinations of attributes found in both sources and remains.

29 Curiously, Bernheim notices that Langlois and Seignobos did not follow the classification of historical materials developed by Droysen and then by himself, as they completely ignored the specific problems posed by the 'remains', and focused unilaterally on written sources (*LHGPh*, 256 n 1).

coincidental discovery'. Historians must already possess at least an idea of what they expect to find in the historical record, before they can benefit from exploring it. This pre-existing idea is closely associated with what he refers to as the historical question. Similarly to Francis Bacon, for whom scientific knowledge emerged out of the scientist's initiative of actively questioning nature,³⁰ Droysen, referring to historical inquiry, argues that 'one must correctly ask the things; only then they can answer'.³¹

The way towards an answer to a historical question also involved, for Droysen, submitting the materials found and selected to the procedures of criticism. 'Criticism' is actually the second grand operation of historical method, which he subdivides into criticism of genuineness, diacritical procedure, criticism of validity, and finally the critical arrangement of the verified material (OPH, 21-26). Droysen does not deny the value of establishing the authenticity, the credibility, and the accuracy of what can be seen or read in historical materials. But as he assumes that the essence of the historian's task does not lie in criticism he changes the latter's methodological status from that of a leading to a supporting role in the process of historical knowledge. At the core of his method Droysen places instead a third operation: interpretation.³² Whereas the 'historical question' guides the historian's approach to historical materials, it is the interpretation that decisively gives shape to an answer. 'Interpretation' for Droysen is not yet the writing of historical texts, but the process of relating the critically verified information to the broad contexts that together can be seen as forming the historicity of an historical event or reality. According to him, four types of interpretation are applicable, depending on the nature of the materials to be understood, namely: pragmatic interpretation, interpretation of conditions, psychological interpretation, and interpretation of ideas (OPH, 26-32).

Droysen's fourth methodical operation is exposition, that is, the writing of historical texts; the presentation of historical knowledge. In his discussion of the issue, he again develops a fourfold typology, now of the modes of historical writing. There he expatiates on the investigative (*untersuchende*), the narrative (*erzählende*), the didactic, and the discussive forms of exposition (OPH, 49-56, translations slightly modified). However, for the purposes I am pursuing here,

30 Robin G. Collingwood (1994). *The Idea of History*, revised edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 269.

31 Johann Gustav Droysen (1971). *Historik. Vorlesungen über Enzyklopädie und Methodologie der Geschichte*, 6th unaltered ed., edited by Rudolf Hübner, Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 35-35 [1st ed. 1937].

32 Arthur Alfaix Assis (2014). *What is History For? Johann Gustav Droysen and the Functions of Historiography*, New York: Berghahn, 67.

more important than Droysen's surprising insights on the issue of historical representation is the fact that in the last version of the *Grundriss*, the exposition is no longer introduced as the last methodical operation historians perform. It is then discussed instead as a third major issue, autonomously placed beyond Droysen's theory of historical method and the ontology of historicity he developed under the heading 'Sistematik'. Droysen's late promotion of 'exposition' to the rank of an independent operation taking place outside the realm of method introduces a clear differentiation between *researching* past materials available at a given present, on the one hand, and, on the other, *writing* a text that aims at communicating an understanding of the past, developed out of the historian's engagement with past materials (but not simply extracted from them). Thereby Droysen narrowed the field of application of the notion of 'method', limiting it to the procedures of research, i.e., to the relationships historians entertain with the materials of the past they investigate. This internal rearrangement attests to a more specialized idea of method than previous ones, in which issues related to historical research, writing, and reading tended to blend together. Furthermore, it already points to history writing's autonomy from research, something many 20th century theorists would later emphasize with differing degrees of intensity.

Perhaps the US-American constitutional historian Allen Johnson had a point when, in the 1920s, he argued that Droysen 'must be accounted the first writer on method to lay a sound philosophical basis for historical research'.³³ Johnson's praise was surely related to the fact that Droysen's methodological arguments usually go beyond the mere descriptive kind of discussions that were usual in former treatises on source criticism.³⁴ Droysen seeks to correlate the operational and technical issues of historical research – such as the finding of materials, and the establishment of their authenticity and reliability – with broader philosophical (epistemological, ontological, and ethical) contexts. The methodology summoned in Droysen's *Grundriss* actually attempts to mediate between critical inquiry of past materials, a perspective focused on developments and individualities in the realities addressed, and a pragmatic view of the nature of knowledge. Especially because of this third aspect, he, much more than Bernheim and Seignobos, rooted his theory of historical knowledge in the hermeneutical notions of 'understanding' (*Verstehen*) and interpretation.³⁵

33 Allen Johnson (1934). *The Historian and Historical Evidence*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 133 (1st ed. 1926).

34 Torstendahl, 'Fact, truth and text', 308-309.

35 On Droysen's historical hermeneutics, see Michael J. Maclean (1982). 'Johann Gustav Droysen and the Development of Historical Hermeneutics', *History and Theory*, Vol. 21, Nr. 3, 347-365.

In fact, many other differences and attempts at differentiation in the relationship between the three texts can be pointed out. One would, for instance, search in vain for a positive word on Droysen in Langlois and Seignobos's textbook. They discuss Droysen's *Grundriss* in their initial literature review, referring to it as 'heavy, pedantic and confused beyond all imagination' (*ISH*, 7). Bernheim also did not usually show any special regard for Droysen's ideas, even when he admitted that the latter had had a strong influence on his general scheme of the methodical operations – as well as on his basic differentiation between 'tradition' and 'remains' (*Überreste*) as a means to classify sources. Perhaps this is due to Bernheim's intellectual proximity to Leopold von Ranke, an author frequently perceived as frontally opposed to the politicizing and 'engaged' Droysen, and whom Droysen himself exaggeratedly deemed as one of his intellectual antagonists. In any case, Bernheim's reservations towards Droysen contrasts with his professed admiration for Ranke's intellectual accomplishments, as expressed in his acknowledgement that 'essential parts of the knowledge and the principles presented in this book can be traced back to Ranke's example and inspiration' (*LHMGP*, 238).

Between Bernheim's and Langlois and Seignobos's texts many theoretical differences can also be evinced. Regarding their schemes of historical method, for instance, an important one is that, like Droysen, Bernheim depicts the whole research as embedded in a logic of questions and answers (*LHMGP*, 253-254). Langlois and Seignobos, on the other hand, only relate such a logic to part of their methodology, namely to the synthetic operations. In their view, particular facts are a direct outcome of the criticism, and can be established through the analytical operations, without the mediation of subjectively shaped questions (*ISH*, 226). Besides, Bernheim's notion of 'conception', the equivalent to Langlois and Seignobos's 'synthetical operations', is ultimately tied to the kind of philosophical underpinnings from which the authors of the *Introduction* wished to free history. For Bernheim, part of the work of arriving at a historical conception from critically obtained facts had to do with showing the general causes and determinations of a set of facts, and these causes and determinations, according to him, could only be clarified by reference to a general conception of historical development, i.e., by a philosophy of history (*LHMGP*, 746).

However, as we have seen, Langlois and Seignobos referred to Bernheim's methodology in a highly positive way; and Bernheim on his side credited Droysen as having been the sole predecessor of his own scheme of historical method. Despite their many differences, the four authors shared the assumption that history is a science in its own right, placed on the same footing as theology,

philosophy, and the natural sciences. All of them, while attempting to justify history's disciplinary autonomy, resorted to the idea that historians follow a method of their own. All of them shunned easy and unsatisfactory methodological solutions in which method is regarded as equivalent to source criticism. Furthermore, they called attention to pre- and post-critical issues such as heuristics, explanation, and to a lesser extent, representation. In their general outlines, the images of historical method projected by these authors are indeed very similar. This similarity is not just a coincidence; it was produced by the cross-readings highlighted above. Langlois and Seignobos's scheme is an adaptation of Bernheim's, and the latter is admittedly inspired in Droysen's. Droysen (or more specifically, the later Droysen) in turn was, according to Horst Walter Blanke, the first theorist who conceived of method as the combination of three basic operations in historical research, namely: heuristics, criticism, and interpretation.³⁶

Table: Droysen's, Bernheim's, and Langlois & Seignobos's Schemes of Historical Method

Textbook	Basic Operations of Historical Method			
	Heuristics [Heuristik]	Criticism [Kritik]	Interpretation [Interpretation]	Exposition [Darstellung] ³⁷
Droysen's <i>Grundriss der Historik</i> (1st ed. 1857-58)	Heuristics [Heuristik]	Criticism [Kritik]	Interpretation [Interpretation]	Exposition [Darstellung] ³⁷
Bernheim's <i>Lehrbuch der historischen Methode</i> (1st ed. 1889)	Heuristics [Quellenkunde (Heuristik)]	Criticism [Kritik]	Conception [Auffassung]	Exposition [Darstellung]
Langlois & Seignobos's <i>Introduction aux études historiques</i> (1st ed. 1898)	Search for Documents [Recherche des documents]	Analytical Operations [Opérations analytiques]	Synthetic Operations [Opérations synthétiques]	Exposition [Exposition] ³⁸



³⁶ Horst Walter Blanke (1991). *Historiographiegeschichte als Historik*, Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 235: 'Grundlegend innovativ sind die Klärung der theoretischen Voraussetzungen und Prinzipien wissenschaftlicher Geschichtsschreibung in der von ihm (Droysen) getroffenen logisch-systematischer Differenzierung der historischen Methode in die vier Hauptoperationen der Heuristik, Kritik, Interpretation und Apodeixis (bzw. Topik) sowie die Begründung der historischen Methode als eines ‚forschenden Verstehens‘.

³⁷ As already mentioned, in later versions of his text, Droysen removed this section on exposition from the realm of his theory of historical method, placing it in a special major section entitled *Topik*.

³⁸ In Langlois and Seignobos's scheme, the exposition is actually not a fourth autonomous procedure, but the last of the synthetic operations.

④ As already mentioned, the late 19th century gave rise to many more texts and authors who contributed to the discussion on historical methodology. Nonetheless, there is no doubt that during the first half of the 20th century, Bernheim and Langlois and Seignobos were particularly influential in that discussion. To be sure, Droysen's *Grundriss* was by far the least influential of the three texts here compared. During the author's lifetime, this text, which similarly to Langlois and Seignobos's *Introduction* came out of academic lectures, was the main record of Droysen's historical theory. Droysen had the booklet's first edition privately printed in 1858. He handed it out to some colleagues, as well as to the students that attended his first course on theory and methodology of history at the University of Jena – since the booklet was conceived actually as a summary of the classes. In 1868, the first commercial edition of the text was published, supplemented with three theoretical articles formerly published by Droysen in the 1860s. Re-editions with corrections and changes would come out in 1875 and 1882.

In the end of the 19th century, the third edition from 1882 was translated into French and English, but these translations only had a rather limited impact.³⁹ For several years they remained the sole attempts to directly convey Droysen's theory of history outside Germany, and they were never reedited – a fact that does not exactly point to an enthusiastic reception. Even in Germany, the concise *Grundriss der Historik* remained until 1937 the only accessible testimony of Droysen's philosophical and methodological reflections on history and historiography. But then as full versions of his theoretical lectures were published,⁴⁰ and after his methodology started to be assessed within the context of the history of 19th century hermeneutics, Droysen's reputation as an insightful historical theorist would significantly

39 Johann Gustav Droysen (1887). *Précis de la science de l'Histoire*, translated by P.-A. Dormoy, Paris: E. Leroux (translation of the last version of the *Grundriss der Historik*, 1882); *OPH*.

40 Johann Gustav Droysen (1937). *Historik. Vorlesungen über Enzyklopädie und Methodologie der Geschichte*, edited by Rudolf Hübner. Munich: R. Oldenbourg; Johann Gustav Droysen (1977). *Historik*, vol. 1: *Rekonstruktion der ersten vollständigen Fassung der Vorlesungen* (1857); *Grundriß der Historik in der ersten handschriftlichen* (1857/58) *und in der letzten gedruckten Fassung* (1882), edited by Peter Leyh. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog; Johann Gustav Droysen (2007). *Historik*, vol. 2: *Texte im Umkreis der Historik* (1826–1882), edited by Horst Walter Blanke. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog. Jörn Rüsen is the analyst who most insistently argued for Droysen's centrality within the framework of 19th century historical and philosophical thought. See Jörn Rüsen (1969). *Begriffene Geschichte. Genesis und Begründung der Geschichtstheorie* J. G. Droysens, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.

grow.⁴¹ This strongly contrasts with the constant decrease in audience experienced by Bernheim's and Seignobos's methodological texts as the 20th century advanced.

The editorial history of Bernheim's *Lehrbuch* indicates a more widespread reception than that of Droysen's *Grundriss*. From 1889 to 1908, six editions of the text were published in Germany, and the last of these would be reprinted at least three times in German by a New York publishing house up until 1970 – indicating a good circulation of the textbook in the US, at least among scholars who were familiar with the German language.⁴² The *Lehrbuch* would never be translated into English, but in the first half of the 20th century some methodology scholars – especially US-American – used to complain about this deficit. Chapters Three and Four (dealing respectively with heuristics and source criticism) were translated into Italian by Amadeo Crivellucci in 1897, and a translation of the entire text was then published in 1907. A Japanese translation of the entire text would follow in 1922. Bernheim also published an abridged version of his *Lehrbuch* under the title *Einleitung in die Geschichtswissenschaft (Introduction to the Science of History)*, a text that had four German editions and was translated to many languages during the first half of the 20th century.⁴³ This book was particularly influential in China and Japan, where its arguments were assimilated and adapted by methodologists such as Liang Qichao and Kumezo Tsubo.⁴⁴

41 MacLean, 'Johann Gustav Droysen and the Development of Historical Hermeneutics', 347-348; Hayden White (1987). *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 83-85.

42 In the foreword to his famous work on historical method published in the 1940's, Gilbert Garraghan remarked that 'it is generally recognized that *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*, by Ernst Bernheim, is the classic work in the field of historical method'. See Gilbert Garraghan (1973). *A Guide to Historical Method*, edited by Jean Delanguéz, Westport: Greenwood Press (Reprint from: New York: Fordham University Press, 1946), v; See also Albion Small (1923). 'Some Contributions to the History of Sociology. Section VII. Present Historical Methodology', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 29, No. 1, 83-84 (cit. 83): 'Not historical students alone, but all students of social science, because all have more or less occasion to evaluate historical evidence, should, as a part of their necessary equipment, master Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (6th ed., 1908). An infallible authority on the technique of any portion of social science is hardly conceivable'.

43 Ernst Bernheim (1905). *Einleitung in die Geschichtswissenschaft*, Leipzig: Göschen. For a complete list of the translations of Bernheim's theoretical texts, see Langewand, *Historik im Historismus*, 97-98.

44 Massayuki Sato (2002). 'Cognitive Historiography and Normative Historiography', in: *Western Historical Thinking. An Intercultural Debate*, edited by Jörn Rüsen, New York: Berghahn Books, 128-141 (cit. 129).

No doubt, Droysen's and especially Bernheim's versions of historical method did have some direct impact on the methodological discussion of the early 20th century, but they were not the most important conveyors of the new synthesis of historical method that came out of the context of 19th century European academic historiography. As already mentioned, that place belongs to the Frenchmen Langlois and Seignobos, whose *Introduction* enjoyed, by and large, the widest circulation around 1900.⁴⁵ Until the end of the long 19th century, its original version would be re-edited at least four times in France. Moreover, during the same period, the English translation would reach its fifth edition. The book was also translated into several other languages. Until 1914, it appeared in Greek, Polish, Spanish, and Russian. Later, translations into Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese would still emerge.

Table: Editions and Translations of Ch. V. Langlois & Ch. Seignobos's *Introduction aux études historiques*

Country	1898-1914	1915-1950	After 1950
France	1898	1925	1992
	1899		
	1905		
	1909		
USA-England	1898	1925	1966
	1889	1932	1968
	1905		1969
	1909		1979
	1912		1996
Spain-Cuba-Argentina	1913	1962	1972
			2003
China		1926	1942
		1933	
Russia	1899		
Greece	1902		
Poland	1912		
Japan		1942	1989
Brazil		1946	

45 Lutz Raphael (2003). *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeitalter der Extreme. Theorien, Methoden, Tendenzen von 1900 bis zur Gegenwart*, München: C. H. Beck, 41; Topolski, *Methodology of History*, 112.

What I have been trying to show is that the general lines of what Langlois and Seignobos popularized as the method of professional historians were the same also found in Droysen and Bernheim. Assimilated and adapted by the French scholars, the schemes of historical method initially developed by the German authors were conveyed to several national audiences in the translations of the *Introduction*. Together, Droysen, Bernheim, Langlois, and Seignobos forged and adapted interesting tools that historians from the early 20th century could have used to enrich their reflexivity vis-à-vis their own practice. Even though in this regard the four methodologists were far from being entirely successful, this failure does not negate the fact that their inter-textual relations helped set a general agreement on the issue of historical method. This agreement turned out to be a significant contribution to the larger process of internationalization of historical studies that was taking place around 1900.

The textual network Droysen-Bernheim-Langlois & Seignobos was very much representative of the late 19th century trend to think and write on the methods of historical science – which is noticeable, by the way not only in France and Germany, but also elsewhere. Ultimately, the theories of historical method that flourished at that time were attempts to abstractly depict the procedures that every professional historian performed (or was supposed to perform) while doing her or his intellectual work. Texts such as those discussed above greatly contributed to the establishment of 'minimal standards' that soon became characteristic of the historical professional in many different national landscapes.⁴⁶ Hence, when historical methodologies popularized a standardizing image of historians' research practice, the discipline of history was awarded a powerful reference that further supported its delimitation not only from other sciences, but also from amateurish history. Many academic historians around the globe could recognize themselves and their work in the abstract images methodological textbooks were projecting. They agreed that such methodologies contained valid descriptions of the daily work of historians – or at least the valid norms of what good historical research should ideally be. In any case, with the aid of the notion of 'historical method', professional historians then became able to clearly conceive of themselves as an autonomous, relatively homogeneous, and transnational academic community. As a result, their disciplinary identity was strengthened.⁴⁷

46 Raphael, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeitalter der Extreme*, 40-44.

47 Gabriele Lingelbach (2003). *Klio macht Karriere. Die Institutionalisierung der Geschichtswissenschaft in Frankreich und den USA in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 386. See Torstendahl, 'Fact, truth and text', 309.

Jointly, the textbooks by Droysen, Bernheim, and Langlois and Seignobos helped in the shaping of this disciplinary identity, while the international circulation of the books – especially the *Introduction* – guaranteed that such identity would reach audiences beyond the borders of France or Germany. But it is important to mention that, around 1900, the emerging methodologies were only one aspect of the much larger processes of disciplinarization and internationalization of historiography. At the end of the day, those processes were quite strongly sponsored by the creation or expansion of teaching and research institutions such as history departments at universities, research academies, national organizations of historians, as well as of academic journals, and archives, libraries and museums.⁴⁸

Such a diffusion of institutions that became typical of modern historical scholarship was not limited to Western Europe. Similar processes were actually taking place also in many Eastern European countries, in the American hemisphere, in the Iberian and Scandinavian countries, in Japan, China, Russia, and elsewhere.⁴⁹ In particular, French and German authors, ideas, and institutions were being employed as leading models, but the proliferation of new institutional forms of teaching and researching history was characterized by numerous practical and conceptual adaptations, as well as misinterpretations.⁵⁰ Besides, even though the consolidation of such institutions around the globe occurred within a context of transnational exchanges and transfers, the communities of historians that emerged throughout the late 19th and the early 20th centuries were essentially national communities. Within this period, in spite of their sincere plea for historical method, critical knowledge, and objectivity, the majority of professional historians usually bound historical writing strongly with the ideational side of processes of nation-building.⁵¹ This circumstance

48 Lingelbach, *Klio macht Karriere*, 23-24.

49 For China and Japan, see Axel Schneider and Stefan Tanaka (2011), 'The Transformation of History in China and Japan', in: *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, Vol. 4: 1800-1945, edited by Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maignushca, and Attila Pók, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 491-519. For a good analysis of the Spanish case, see Ignacio Peiró Martín (2006). *Los guardianes de la Historia. La historiografía académica de la Restauración*, Zaragoza: Institución Fernando El Católico.

50 Jürgen Osterhammel (1997). 'Einige Tendenzen der Epoche', in: *Geschichtsdiskurs*, Band 4: *Krisenbewußtsein, Katastrophenerfahrungen und Innovationen (1880-1945)*, edited by W. Küttler et. al., Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 393-398 (cit. 394).

51 Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan & Kevin Passmore (1999). 'Apologias for the nation-state in Western Europe since 1800', in: *Writing National Histories. Western Europe since 1800*, edited by Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan & Kevin Passmore, London: Routledge, 3-14.

alone clearly points to the limits of the process of internationalization I have been stressing. In practice, one must not forget that the ideal of historical method was in many ways combined with nationalistic ideologies that were typical of the golden age of imperialism.

However, the very idea of historical method as propagated in the works of authors such as Droysen, Bernheim, and Langlois and Seignobos already represented a balancing mechanism that helped moderate the force of nationalism in the field of historiography. At the very least, the popularization of an abstract image of historical research provided historians with a self-image that was not only cross-thematic and cross-ideological, but also cross-national. The notion that a professional historian, by working under the directives of method, produces a kind of knowledge that was to be taken into consideration by colleagues from his and other countries was, of course, a very timid development within the context of the age of national empires. In any case, such a notion was at least accompanied by the first steps towards the institutionalization of a trans-national community of historians. When the first *International Congress of Historical Sciences* took place in The Hague, this community found one of its most interesting forms of materialization. Since then, similar conferences have taken place on a more or less regular basis; since 1924, under the coordination of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. In these and many other events, historians of different nationalities learned to recognize participants from other countries as professional colleagues.⁵² Within the context of a discipline so negatively influenced by different forms of nationalism, the fact that historians from different countries were able to accept each other as professional equals was no small feat.

52 Karl D. Erdmann (1987). *Die Ökumene der Historiker. Geschichte der Internationalen Historikerkongresse und des Comité International des Sciences Historiques*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

This book bears witness to the tightening of bonds that has been taking place among the Brazilian and the German historiographical communities in the last years. It presents a wide array of historiographical issues by various scholars: the role played by history writing in modern processes of nation-building, Alexander von Humboldt's indirect Brazilian experience, the humanistic and methodical legacies of 19th century German historical thinking, current perspectives in the history of concepts, and the potentials and limits of history as a means for political education.

Luiz Estevam de Oliveira Fernandes, Luísa Rauter Pereira, and Sérgio da Mata are Professors of History at the University of Ouro Preto, Brazil.

www.peterlang.com

ISBN 978-3-631-66163-5



36

Luiz Estevam de Oliveira Fernandes / (eds.) · Contributions to Theory and
Luísa Rauter Pereira / Sérgio da Mata · Comparative History of Historiography



Contributions to Theory and Comparative History of Historiography

German and Brazilian Perspectives

Luiz Estevam de Oliveira Fernandes /
Luísa Rauter Pereira / Sérgio da Mata (eds.)

 PETER LANG
EDITION

Civilizations & History

Edited by
Ina Ulrike Paul and Uwe Puschner

Volume 36

Luiz Estevam de Oliveira Fernandes / Luísa Rauter Pereira /
Sérgio da Mata (eds.)

Contributions to Theory and
Comparative History of
Historiography

German and Brazilian Perspectives

*Zu Qualitätssicherung und Peer Review
der vorliegenden Publikation*

Die Qualität der in dieser Reihe
erscheinenden Arbeiten wird vor
der Publikation durch
einen Herausgeber der Reihe geprüft.

*Notes on the quality assurance and
peer review of this publication*

Prior to publication, the quality of
the work published in this series
is reviewed by one of
the editors of the series.

 PETER LANG
EDITION

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Contributions to theory and comparative history of historiography : German and Brazilian perspectives / Luiz Estevam de Oliveira Fernandes, Luísa Rauter Pereira, Sérgio da Mata (eds.). -- 1st edition.

pages cm. -- (Civilizations & history ; volume 36)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-3-631-66163-5

1. Historiography--Germany--History. 2. Historiography--Brazil--History. I. Fernandes, Luiz Estevam de Oliveira, 1979- editor. II. Pereira, Luísa Rauter, 1977- editor. III. Mata, Sérgio da, 1968- editor.

D13.5.G3C66 2015

907.2--dc23

2015022050

Cover image:

Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Ouro Preto,
Campus Mariana.
Courtesy of Lillian Souza

ISSN 1867-092X

ISBN 978-3-631-66163-5 (Print)

E-ISBN 978-3-653-05745-4 (E-Book)

DOI 10.3726/978-3-653-05745-4

© Peter Lang GmbH

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Frankfurt am Main 2015

All rights reserved.

Peter Lang Edition is an Imprint of Peter Lang GmbH.

Peter Lang – Frankfurt am Main · Bern · Bruxelles ·

New York · Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

Contents

Abstracts	7
<i>Luiz Estevam de Oliveira Fernandes, Luísa Rauter Pereira & Sérgio da Mata</i> Introduction: Historiographies in Dialogue	9
<i>Estevão de Rezende Martins</i> Brazil, Germany: Historiographies and Identities	21
<i>Helmut Galle</i> “Aesthetical Representation of Natural History Objects”: Narrative Strategies in A. v. Humboldt’s <i>Ansichten der Natur</i>	41
<i>Vera M. Kutzinski</i> Facts and Fictions: Alexander von Humboldt in Brazil	59
<i>Luiz Estevam O. Fernandes</i> Humboldt and the Writing of New Spain’s History	87
<i>Arthur Alfaix Assis</i> Schemes of Historical Method in the Late 19 th Century: Cross-References between Langlois and Seignobos, Bernheim, and Droysen.....	105
<i>Leopoldo Waizbort</i> Erich Auerbach – <i>Conditio humana</i>	127
<i>Gunter Scholtz</i> What is Conceptual History and to What End Do We Use It?.....	149

<i>Valdei Lopes de Araujo</i> The History of Concepts and the History of Historiography: a Brazilian Trajectory.....	175
<i>Moshe Zimmermann</i> History as an Instrument Use and Misuse of German History – An Israeli Perspective.....	195

Abstracts

Português

O diálogo entre alemães e brasileiros no campo do conhecimento histórico se iniciou relativamente cedo. Em 1845 era publicada a dissertação do naturalista Carl Friedrich von Martius *Como se deve escrever a história do Brasil*. Não muito tempo depois, em 1860, vem a lume a *História do Brasil* de Heinrich Handelmann, então catedrático em Kiel. Da Escola de Recife a Capistrano de Abreu, de Sérgio Buarque de Holanda à enorme influência de que desfrutou o marxismo ao longo da segunda metade do século XX, a historiografia brasileira sempre se manteve em contato, ora maior, ora menor, com o pensamento histórico alemão. Mas se até relativamente pouco tempo se podia falar em algo como „trocas desiguais no mercado historiográfico“ (Carlo Ginzburg), a última década mostra um desenvolvimento diferente. De um lado, o interesse pela tradição e pela língua alemã readquiriu força nos meios historiográficos brasileiros. De outro, os desenvolvimentos recentes da pesquisa histórica feita no Brasil têm sido acompanhados com curiosidade crescente na Alemanha. Multiplicam-se os sinais de que as duas comunidades historiográficas caminham atualmente no sentido de um crescente estreitamento de laços e de intensificação de projetos comuns.

Em 2013, por ocasião do Ano Brasil-Alemanha, o Simpósio Brasileiro de História da Historiografia (Universidade de Ouro Preto, 12 a 15 de agosto) teve por objetivo contribuir para a ampliação do contato e intercâmbio científico entre duas culturas históricas que sempre estiveram abertas uma aos estímulos da outra.

Fruto das discussões realizadas no Campus de Mariana, este livro pode também ser lido como o mais novo capítulo dessa longa história.

Deutsch

Der deutsch-brasilianische Dialog im Bereich der historischen Forschung begann relativ früh. 1845 veröffentlichte der Naturforscher Carl Friedrich von Martius seine Dissertation *Bemerkungen über die Verfassung einer Geschichte Brasiliens*. Kurz danach, im Jahre 1860, erschien die *Geschichte Brasiliens* von Heinrich Handelmann, damals Professor in Kiel. Von der sogenannten Recife-Schule bis zur Capistrano de Abreu, von Sérgio Buarque de Holanda bis hinein in die zweite Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts, als der Marxismus weltweit eine große Verbreitung erlebte, blieb die brasilianische Geschichtsschreibung, manchmal