

The Persona of the Historian: Repertoires and Performances, 1800-2000

Institute for History, Leiden University, the Netherlands, January 26-27, 2017

Conference venue: Matthias de Vrieshof 4, room 008a (unless otherwise noted)

Program

Thursday January 26	
8:30	Registration, coffee
9:00	<i>Plenary session 1 (chair: Herman Paul)</i>
9:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Michael Bentley (University of Oxford) – Born with the Century: A Generation of European Historians, 1795-1850
10:15	Coffee
10:30	<i>Plenary session 2 (chair: Christiaan Engberts)</i>
11:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Herman Paul (Leiden University) – Schlosser's Statue: Scholarly Personae in Nineteenth-Century German Historiography Elise Garritzen (University of Helsinki) – Edward A. Freeman, Edith Thompson and the Gendered Persona of a Late-Victorian Historian
12:30	Lunch (for speakers) (<i>De Grote Beer, Rembrandtstraat 27</i>)
14:00	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 48%;"> <p>Parallel session 1: Between Romanticism and Positivism (<i>room 005</i>) (<i>chair: Léjon Saarloos</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travis E. Ross (University of Utah) – The Genius of History: Romantic Authorship and the Scholarly Persona of the Historian in the Victorian Era Michael Riordan (St. John's College, Oxford) – The Feud with Froude: Contested Personae in Mid-Victorian Historical Practice Camille Creighton (University of Amsterdam) – Erudite and/or Imaginative: Scholarly Personae in French Historiography, 1870-1940 </div> <div style="width: 48%;"> <p>Parallel session 2: The Rankean Tradition (<i>room 007</i>) (<i>chair: Herman Paul</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shih-chieh Su (Delaware Valley University) – National History and the Formation of a Tripartite Selfhood of Leopold von Ranke Michael Facius (Freie Universität Berlin) – Ranke on the Wall: Envisioning the Ideal Historian in Japan at the Turn of the Twentieth Century Reinbert Krol (Utrecht University) – Personae from the Past: Friedrich Meinecke's Appropriation of Goethe </div> </div>
15:45	Tea
16:00	<i>Plenary session 3 (chair: Katharina Manteufel)</i>
17:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> David N. Myers (University of California, Los Angeles) – Graetz-Baron-Yerushalmi: Three Typologies of Scholarly Personae in Modern Jewish Historiography
17:00	End of program
18:30	Conference dinner (for speakers) (<i>Faculty Club, Rapenburg 73</i>)
Friday January 27	
9:15	<i>Plenary session 4 (chair: Léjon Saarloos)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monika Baár (Leiden University) – Nineteenth-Century Fathers in Times of National Communism (Hungary)

10:15	Coffee	
10:30	<p>Parallel session 3: The Lectern and the Pulpit (<i>room 005</i>) (<i>chair: Katharina Manteufel</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Samuel J. Kessler (Virginia Technic Institute and State University) – Between Pulpit and Professor: Three Case Studies on Adolf Jellinek Geneviève Warland (Université catholique de Louvain) – The ‘Scientific Persona’ as a Model for ‘Academic’ and ‘Independent’ Historians? German Jewish Historians in the Nineteenth Century and Martin Philippon’s Case Carolyn Biloft (Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva) – Taking Queues from Cassandra: Prophecies of Western Decline and World Historians since 1918 	<p>Parallel session 4: History and Politics (<i>room 007</i>) (<i>chair: Adriaan van Veldhuizen</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> António Rêgo (Birkbeck, University of London) – Historians and Their Personae in Times of Fascism Gary W. Davies (University of Leicester) – Urban History in Britain: A One Man Mission? Sina Talachian (King’s College, London) – The Invention of the Marxist Historian’s: A History of the Communist Party Historians’ Group, 1946-1956
12.15	Lunch (for speakers) (<i>De Grote Beer, Rembrandtstraat 27</i>)	
13:45	<p>Parallel session 5: Representing Scholarly Personae (<i>room 005</i>) (<i>chair: Elise Garritzen</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Henning Trüper (Helsinki Collegium of Advanced Studies) – Writing Pirenne: Bryce Lyon and F. L. Ganshof on the Constitution of Scholarly Personae Mihail Evans (New Europe College/Institute for Advanced Studies, Bucharest) – William Trevor, T. W. Moody, and the Person of the Historian 	<p>Parallel session 6: Contemporary Scholarly Personae (<i>room 007</i>) (<i>chair: Christiaan Engberts</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> João Rodolfo Munhoz Ohara (São Paulo State University) – Scholarly Personae, Exemplary Conducts, and Virtuousness in Brazilian Professional Historiography (1970-2000) Van Troi Tran (Laval University) & Patrick-Michel Noel (University of St. Boniface) – Opening the Black Box of the Historian’s Craftsmanship
15:15	Tea	
15:30	<p><i>Plenary session 5</i> (<i>chair: Herman Paul</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q. Edward Wang (Rowan University) – Passion and Persona of a Chinese Historian: The Case of Gu Jiegang (1893-1980) and His Role in Shaping Modern Chinese Historiography 	
16:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing remarks 	
16:45	End of program	

Abstracts

Born with the Century: A Generation of European Historians, 1795-1850

Michael Bentley, University of Oxford

So much of the work done in relation to modern historiography has underlined the modest, but often ignored, insight that historians are persons caught up in the cultural entanglements of their own day. They write their books out of a given present that is not value-neutral; and as their present manifestly undergoes transformation so it proves possible, in principle, to chart its rolling history and ask questions about the relationship between environment, scholarship and what it is to be an author. This paper does not assert that historians are special in that regard but it does want to insist that no understanding of historiography can make sense without an acknowledgement of personal, as well as intellectual, context. What comes under scrutiny in this paper is a particular context – the nature of European historical writing in the first half of the nineteenth century – but, in keeping with the theme of this conference, the lens through which this huge canvas is discerned will not focus on process (national identity, professionalization, industrialisation) but rather with the individual experience of a small group of scholars, each dealing with a post-Enlightenment sensibility yet each turning that environment towards different perspectives and objectives.

In speaking of a ‘generation’, the word is taken more literally than might be thought. The argument here will turn on five scholars, each of whom made a major contribution to the study of history. That by itself helps to glue together the life-experiences of Ranke, Michelet, Carlyle, Macaulay and Palacký. But I choose a different stress by dwelling on something more personal and individual: their date of birth. All these scholars were born between 1795 and 1800. All grew up under the shadow of revolution and the Napoleonic empire. All had some sort of relationship with an emerging state apparatus. All produced thoughts about their own nation and people. Yet those commonalties seem to me far less significant than the differences that they occlude. Part of the point of comparative study, after all, resides in the location of difference as much as similitude. Seen in that way, the question becomes one of identifying and, more pointedly, trying to explain, why these members of the same generation constructed a view of the past so markedly different one from another. Much of the substance of this contribution to the conference will concern itself with that difficult question.

Schlosser’s Statue: Scholarly Personae in Nineteenth-Century German Historiography

Herman Paul, Leiden University

In 1877, the German dramatist, novelist, and literary critic Paul Lindau convened an imaginary parliament to discuss the question whether Friedrich Christoph Schlosser had been great enough an historian to be honored with a commemorative address on the occasion of his hundredth birthday. The debate that ensued was a fictive one, but only to a point: the opinions on Schlosser’s historiographical merits that Lindau put into the mouth of his characters were often paraphrases or quotations from “real” books and articles. Thus, when Lindau invoked the “representative H. v. Treitschke” as arguing that Schlosser had

lacked “one of the first virtues of the historian,” this accurately mirrored a debate among German historians to which categories of virtue and vice had been central indeed. This paper argues, in the first place, that such language of virtue and vice offers a glimpse on an often neglected dimension of nineteenth-century historical studies – that of dispositions, character traits, or virtues deemed necessary for pursuit of historical inquiry. Secondly, the paper shows that phrases like “highest” or “first virtues” invoked hierarchical constellations of virtues corresponding to distinct conceptions of the historian’s vocation, which may well be characterized as scholarly personae. From this it follows, in the third place, that personae can be historicized: they need not be seen as modern, analytical categories, but can be encountered already in such nineteenth-century debates as the one parodied by Lindau in 1877. Fourthly, the paper argues that such personae tended to be associated with outstanding historians and often came in contrastive pairs: Schlosser vs. Ranke, Waitz vs. Sybel, and Treitschke vs. Lamprecht. What these examples, finally, illustrate is that pairs of personae could change over time, in tandem with changing debates over the historian’s vocation and the virtues it demanded.

Edward A. Freeman, Edith Thompson and the Gendered Persona of a Late-Victorian Historian

Elise Garritzen, University of Helsinki

In the dozens of letters that Edward A. Freeman, the ardent supporter of the scientific history, wrote to Edith Thompson, he implied time and again that she was one of those historians with whom he did not mind to spend time with. Nevertheless, she was not quite as the “carl bodies,” the young men Freeman groomed to the historical profession. Focusing on the student–teacher –relationship of Freeman and Thompson, this paper explores the gendered nature of a historian’s *persona* in late-Victorian Britain and suggests that men and women were not expected to cultivate the very same persona. Although Freeman did not exclude women from the practice of history, he did not expect them to practice history in similar fashion than men did. The decisive difference was that men were supposed to conduct independent research that resulted in original knowledge, whereas women were assigned a role in performing either supportive tasks such as translating and indexing or in producing educational narrative histories that summarized the results that men produced. The gendered differences in a persona derived from this division of tasks and Edith Thompson was a personification of the possibilities and challenges that this posed on women. She occupied a terrain somewhere between the professional historians and the amateurs they loathed. She was expected to cultivate a persona that corresponded with this “in-between” position.

The Genius of History: Romantic Authorship and the Scholarly Persona of the Historian in the Victorian Era

Travis E. Ross, University of Utah

The development of history as an academic discipline in the late nineteenth century coincided with the emergence of history as a genre distinct from literature. In this paper, I will explore the cultural history the scholarly persona of the historian through authorship. It

will interrogate the cultural construction of authority and expertise by analyzing the shifting expectations of readers in that nascent genre. I use readers liberally to include erudite reviewers, early academic historians, and popular readers. I will demonstrate that they idealized the persona of the historian, borrowing heavily from the ideal Romantic author: a lone genius, writing purely for art, and divorced from the whims of the market. This remains significant in part because the shared construction of the historian as a Romantic genius actually drove the now-familiar polarization of the genre as scholarly and popular readers came to trust mutually exclusive groups of historians based on very similar expectations, but also because the ideal historian survived the ostensible death of the author in the twentieth century.

This essay is a transnational reception history of Hubert Howe Bancroft's thirty-nine volume historical series, *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*. Their simple eponymous title tried—though not very hard—to obscure the collaborative research and writing of Bancroft's for-profit History Company. At the center of that international intellectual network of employees and volunteers was a thinly-veiled corps of ghostwriters who wrote collaboratively under the moniker of their boss, the titular Bancroft. Most reviewers in the late 1870s and early 1880s praised Bancroft's innovative research and writing "system." They lauded the collaborative effort, claiming it made the prodigious *Works* more comprehensive and reliable than what any single historian might have produced in several lifetimes. Beginning rather abruptly in the 1890s, though, the popular and erudite critics "discovered" the corporate authorship the company had never tried very hard to hide. The scandal that followed forever tarnished the reputation of the *Works*. The Romantic persona of the historian, I argue, transformed the collective genius of the History Company into chicanery, its titular author into a charlatan. Only the reputation of its library survived. Though produced by the same people and under the same conditions as the *Works*, the company's collection remains the core of the world famous Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley.

This case study offers an opportunity to examine the cultural history of the scholarly persona of the historian in the auspicious moment in the history of knowledge between the late republic of letters and the rise of the modern university. Combined with the ironic disregard many historians have for the history of our discipline and its epistemology, the breadth of expertise required of anyone attempting to write about the history of history across so many artificial borders—national or intellectual—makes this an especially challenging and important topic. Its inclusion would offer a cultural perspective rooted in book history. In turn, the feedback afforded by such diverse and likeminded experts would significantly strengthen its arguments and publishing prospects.

The Feud with Froude: Contested Personae in Mid-Victorian Historical Practice

Michael Riordan, St. John's College, Oxford

In 1856 JA Froude published the first part of his twelve-volume history of sixteenth century England, which came under immediate attack from other historians. The fiercest of these was EA Freeman who indulged in a sustained attack on Froude and his work over nearly two decades in the 1860s and 1870s, one of Freeman's most common charges being that Froude did not have any proper historical training.

This paper will argue that Freeman's charge arises out of the fact that he and Froude based their work around conflicting historical narratives and that both men adopted *personae* in order to sustain them. Freeman accused Froude of being a dangerous amateur, over-reliant on archival sources and unable to correctly interpret them because he was not read widely enough (i.e. did not have the training) to be able to place them in the proper narrative context; while identifying himself with its positive flipside. Froude, however, responded with his own *persona*, that he was simply writing what he found in the archive, a faux-naivety which allowed him to challenge the existing orthodox narrative.

It will be argued that both *personae* were adopted in response to the particular problems of the mid-Victorian period, particularly the need to write books that would appeal (and sell) to a wide readership while also making claims to veracity, the existence of an historical orthodoxy which could be bolstered or challenged, the increasing availability of archival sources and the change to working practices this allowed, and both men's conflicting political and religious prejudices. Furthermore, these *personae* cut across the binary conceptions (e.g. scientific/amateur, primary/secondary, popular/scholarly) that are recognizable in the twentieth century, while laying down elements that are still used in the *personae* of historians today.

Erudite and/or Imaginative: Scholarly Personae in French Historiography, 1870-1940

Camille Creighton, University of Amsterdam

Starting point for this paper is a remarkable incongruence that can be observed in the discourses of French historians in the period 1870-1940 about themselves, their methods, practices and the required talents for being a good historian. In the first place, there is a "scientific" discourse stressing the importance of erudition and the virtues associated with it, such as industriousness and objectivity. But in addition to this, there exists a more "creative" discourse that values "historical imagination" and literary writing skills. For Gabriel Monod, for instance, both erudition, belonging to the domain of science, and imagination, belonging to the domain of art, were necessary for being a good historian. Moreover, the case of Lucien Febvre shows that this mingling cannot be considered a temporarily incident due to the uncertainties that go with the process of history becoming a science, but that it is instead a persistent feature of French historiography.

This paper will, first, analyse the ways in which these two repertoires or discourses are conflated in the work of some historians, while they are sharply distinguished or even opposed by others. How and why is this synthesis of two apparently different discourses made, especially, but not exclusively, in the work of Monod and Febvre, and what function have their frequent references to the "romantic" Jules Michelet in it? In addition, the paper will explore the ways in which the a *persona* approach can contribute to overcoming the sharp but often inaccurate distinction traditionally made in French historiography between a "romantic", a "positivist" and an "Annales" paradigm.

Its ultimate aim, however, is to discuss the more fundamental issue of the coherence of scholarly *personae*. Does the mingling of these two discourses point at the co-existence of two different scholarly *personae*? Or, to the contrary, is there just one scholarly *persona* that precisely consists of a synthesis of more "romantic" and "scientific" ideas on the historian's scholarly self? This, of course, addresses the issue to what extent scholarly *personae* should be understood as well-rounded wholes, or rather as "essentially contested".

National History and the Formation of a Tripartite Selfhood of Leopold von Ranke

Shih-chieh Su, Delaware Valley University

During the nineteenth century, the development of nationalism, modern historiography and the professionalization of the discipline of history happened in tandem. The historical profession was essentially founded on the prospect of resolving the theoretical inconsistency regarding the maintenance of national historiography as an objective science while advocating an extreme nationalist cause. In the face of this, the career development of the founding father of modern historiography, Leopold von Ranke, demonstrated a two-faceted struggle that professional historians commonly experienced during the age of nationalism. The challenges included how the historian identified himself as a custodian of memory for his nation, and how he harmonized the conflict between the private self and professional persona through forgetting and rigorous study of history. To mitigate the tensions, Ranke initially formulated a new conception of history as a “stable narrative.” He deployed his “objective” investigation of the national past as the solution for stabilizing his formation of a tripartite selfhood with his vision of German nationhood, where individuality, national community and the universe intertwined harmoniously. Nevertheless, this notion of self persistently stayed in a critical state of instability and fluctuated between a competing allegiance to the old and the new politics, and between the contesting authorities of historical representation. Ranke responded with an action of synthesis by framing his self-formation and concept of history in binary terms of religious and secular, old and new, subjective and objective on a nationalist platform that aimed to address the unsettled imagery of a unified Germany. In addition, the collective quest of “becoming national” compelled Ranke to imagine himself as the personification of a public space for German politics of nationalism. In this way, Ranke consciously redefined history as an “unstable narrative,” or a narrative in motion. Its purpose was to explain the past and the present, and to help forecast the future by stabilizing the national past from one’s subjective reminiscence to the normative past that objectively reflected the national pursuit of universal humanity.

Ranke on the Wall: Envisaging the Ideal Historian in Japan at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

Michael Facius, Freie Universität Berlin

Not long ago, Western and Japanese historians alike were keen to stress that Ludwig Riess, the young German historian invited to teach Western history at Tokyo University from the late 1880s onward, was a pupil of Leopold von Ranke. While Riess met the aging scholar only a few times, emphasizing this lineage allowed to simultaneously point to the derivative character of Japanese historiography and its connection to the sources of the modern discipline. Recently, historians of knowledge are toning down the influence of Riess and Ranke and attend instead to the indigenous sources of “modern” academic historiography. But the curious fact remains that from around 1900, Japanese historians began to identify with Ranke. The central journal of academic history, the *shigaku zasshi*, featured articles on his methodology and accomplishments, and at least one historian is known to have had his

portrait on his office wall. This paper argues that to reconcile these narratives – and to better understand the transformation of historical scholarship in Japan – it is helpful to examine the scholarly personae that circulated in this period. The paper explores the views of influential historians at the turn of the century from Shigeno Yasutsugu and Mitsukuri Genpachi to Ludwig Riess and Kuwabara Jitsuzo on the significance of Leopold von Ranke as an embodiment of scholarly virtues. Contrasting Ranke's image in Japan with that prevalent among German and European practitioners and comparing it with earlier ideas of the exemplary scholar, the paper argues that Ranke did not function as a marker of a “Western” or “modern” way of doing history, but as a universally appropriable icon of a globalizing discipline.

Personae from the Past: Friedrich Meinecke’s Appropriation of Goethe

Reinbert Krol, Utrecht University

‘Models of scholarly selfhood’ or personae are variable: they change in the course of time and place. ‘Personae are’, as Daston and Sibum put it, ‘creatures of historical circumstance; they emerge and disappear within specific contexts’. Not only are these models bound to time and place, they can also be cross-disciplinary. Thus, historians can adopt a scholarly model outside of their own field (and context). A case in point is the renowned German historian Friedrich Meinecke (1862-1954) who is generally associated with the nineteenth-century persona of a conscientious, objective, and sometimes painstaking archivist. At the same time, however, Meinecke was also an empathic (*empfindende*), intuitive (*ahnende*), idiosyncratic, and romantically dispositioned historian, as well as, above all, a follower of Goethe, in particular Goethe’s philosophy of nature and his ‘positive’ view of history. Apparently Meinecke could not conform to contemporary models associated with names like Lamprecht, Treitschke, Droysen, Sybel, and Dilthey. Instead, he developed an interest in Goethe, which deepened over the years and had a huge impact on his scholarly persona. In fact Meinecke considered Goethe – a poet, playwright, and natural scientist – to embody what it takes to be a (good) *historian*. Moreover, he used this Goethean model to reinforce his own authority as a historian. Drawing on Meinecke’s Goethean model, this paper argues that scientific personae on which historians orient themselves are not always or only ‘new models’ that circulate in their own time, field and context, but can also be models from the past or even from outside the historical discipline which ‘reappear’ in different historical contexts.

Graetz-Baron-Yerushalmi: Three Typologies of Scholarly Personae in Modern Jewish Historiography

David N. Myers, UCLA

This paper will explore three generations of modern Jewish historians, covering a century and a half, each of whom represented a distinct scholarly persona for the succeeding generation. This paper will show that the later reflection on the preceding generation often reduced the diverse and even competing sensibilities of the earlier historian to a single canonical persona. Our story begins with Heinrich Graetz (1817-1891), who is usually considered the leading scholar of Jewish history in the nineteenth century. To his successors,

Graetz was often cast as the classic *engagé* scholar, passionately invested—indeed, over-invested—both in castigating villains from the past and in promoting the cause of Judaism in the present. And yet, Graetz also deeply imbibed the prevailing ethos of *Wissenschaft*, through which he believed it possible to overcome the bias of previous generations of scholars.

Salo Baron (1895-1989) regarded Graetz as chiefly responsible for introducing a “lachrymose” perspective into Jewish history. His own corrective pushed back against the view of pre-modern Jewish history as beset by constant tragedy and cut off from the wider non-Jewish world. As a result, he came to be regarded not only as one of the great macro-historians of the Jewish past (author of an 18-volume history), but as far more alive to the constant interplay between Jews and non-Jews than his predecessor. And yet, if Baron’s scholarly persona was linked to this more integrated and anti-lachrymose view of the past, he also was known at the end of his career for his role as chief historical witness in the Eichmann trial. In that setting, he was called upon to chronicle the scale of destruction of modern European Jewish life. This role of historian as witness stood in some tension with Baron’s earlier scholarly persona, while echoing Graetz’s own reputation for engaged scholarship.

The final figure in our triptych is Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi (1932-2009), who was Baron’s most important student. Yerushalmi represented, in quantitative terms, the antithesis of Baron, producing a small body of work that may betray the anxiety of influence of competing with his teacher’s vast *oeuvre*. Whereas Baron sought to elevate Jewish historical study above the partisanship of Graetz, producing a highly textured but nonetheless dispassionate account, Yerushalmi evinced great power of empathy in plumbing the depths of his protagonists. Whereas Baron revealed few traces of emotion in his monumental *Social and Religious History*, Yerushalmi approached his task as historian with the register of a romantic poet. And yet, in contrast to Baron, he assumed a far less public role beyond the academy. The overarching lesson of this survey is to urge us not only to pay attention to the received reputations of leading Jewish historians, but to seek out the multiple personae circulating within each of them.

National Communism and the Heritage of Romantic Historians in East Central Europe

Monika Baár, Leiden University

The presentation examines a range of attitudes and performances in the work and life of historians in communist Eastern Europe. It is concerned with scholars from Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia whose main research focus was in national history. The presentation discusses various strategies which were used by historians to reconcile Marxist ideology with national interests. It also examines how their work was influenced by their relationship with the regime – which could be either be cordial or antagonistic and could include various degrees of collaboration or, by contrast, a certain distancing and inner emigration. The presentation reveals that even the most radical attempts ‘to break away from the past’ in a communist vein remained thoroughly indebted to the Romantic tradition.

Between Pulpit and Professor: Three Case Studies on Adolf Jellinek

Samuel J. Kessler, Virginia Polytechnic and State University

Throughout his adult life, Adolf Jellinek (1821-1893) was both a practitioner of the academic study of Judaism (*Wissenschaft des Judentums*) and a religious leader (as communal rabbi in Leipzig and Vienna). Trained in Oriental philology, classical philosophy, and higher Biblical criticism at the University of Leipzig (where he received his doctorate), Jellinek was also a renowned Talmudic scholar (educated in Prague), and one of the leading voices in German Jewry advocating a symbiosis between traditional religious practice and modern urban life. This paper's overarching purpose is to address some of the key questions of the conference: Does a focus on the scholarly personae illuminate formerly obscured aspects of historiography? Can a focus on the scholarly personae occlude more important contextual or theological commitments on the part of past scholars?

This paper uses the two sides of Jellinek's intellectual personae--university trained scholar and public proponent for religious practice--as the framework for three brief case studies, each designed to interrogate the line between "scholar" and "advocate" in mid-nineteenth century German (and German-Jewish) intellectual life. (The scholar/advocate line, of course, remains contentious in today's politically conscious Academy, and will be addressed in the paper's conclusion).

The first case study interrogates the relationship between Jellinek's rabbinic training in Prague and his early scholarly publications in Leipzig, suggesting that his work in, and advocacy for, (nonreligious) historical methodology was enhanced by his extensive Talmudic education. The second study reads Jellinek's writings in Vienna as an attempt to establish a form of Jewish public intellectualism. How, I ask, does a historian choose to navigate the public diffusion of his work? (I also suggest that Jellinek's model informed the values and expressions of Jewish Viennese secular cosmopolitanism that arose in the *fin de siècle*.)

The third study explores Jellinek's final works, which were dedicated to the investigation of Jewish ethnicity. In traditional Jewish historiography these works would be analyzed almost exclusively as responses to new forms of European racial anti-Semitism. In my reading, we look at them through the lens of Jellinek's dual personae as scholar and advocate, thereby offering not only a more robust interpretative apparatus for studying these (neglected) works, but also seeking to give a more subtle reading of how personality and social responsibility are often intertwined in the writing of history.

In this paper, each case study builds on the one before, questioning but ultimately upholding (through continued definitional and methodological detail) the line between scholarship, public intellectualism, and advocacy. Because of his many roles in German Jewish (and more generally modern intellectual) history, Adolf Jellinek's life and work offer an excellent lens through which to discuss and debate the historiographical importance of the "personae of the scholar."

The 'Scientific Persona' as a Model for 'Academic' and 'Independent' Historians? German Jewish Historians in the Nineteenth Century and Martin Philippon's Case

Geneviève Warland, University of Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve

Nineteenth century historiography has set up the fundamental skills' repertoire of the professional historian. Such a repertoire was explicitly oriented towards scientific purposes – critical stance, exhaustiveness, empiricist approach with regard to the sources, etc. –, but left generally aside the issue of the social, political and religious bias of historian's self. This

issue is sometimes taken into account under the label of subjectivity, but – as far as I know – never as well problematized as the skills which build up historian’s scholarly persona.

It is such obstacles to the full development of a scholarly persona, which are embedded in a particular context, national but also ideological, that I want to investigate in my contribution. It tends to look at the tensions between a kind of “counter-scholarly persona” and the scientific ideal type historians were striving for. Such a “counter” or a “reverse” to the scientific persona should not only be understood as expressing historian’s ideological (political or religious) intentions, which comes out of his narrative. It shall also be seen as a “matter of fact”, a reality linked to historian’s social or religious belonging. It is for instance the case of German Jewish historians who had less chance to get a position as *ordinarius* professors in Wilhelminian Germany, particularly in Prussia. They were not perceived, mainly by public officers, as endowed with the capacities to understand properly German history and to teach it; consequently, they were very often denied their nomination, even if they were supported by university’s authorities. To pursue an academic career for German historians with a Jewish ascendency, mainly three options were at stake: to convert to Protestantism; to apply in foreign universities or to work as independent scholars.

To tackle the conflicting question between the academic historian and the independent historian and look at the models of scientific persona they both refer to, I shall use several cases studies on Jewish German historians: mainly that of the surprisingly neglected historian Martin Philippon (1846-1916), who served as a scientific intermediary between Belgium, France and Germany during the years 1879-1914 and worked as a cofounder of Jewish scientific institutions like the *Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums*. I shall compare him to other German Jewish historians like Ernst Bernheim (1850-1942), the well-known author of the *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (1889), who embraced Protestantism and was more successful in his academic career.

The main questions I shall address here regarding the definition of the scientific persona are the following ones: Is there a difference in the use of the model of ‘scientific persona’ by Philippon at the time he was an ordinary professor in Belgium and, later, after his resign, when he worked as an independent scholar in Berlin? Did he legitimate at that later time his non-academic position under reference to other existing repertoires of being a scholar or not? Which aspects of the ‘scholarly persona’ did he put in both cases on the forefront?

Taking Queues from Cassandra: Prophecies of Western Decline and World Historians since 1918

Carolyn Biloft, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva

This paper ponders the *prophetic urge* among scholars that self identified as “world” or “global” historians since 1918. In particular, it explores why world historians have engaged in forms of historical prophesy about the imminent or inevitable decline of “western civilization.” Reviewing diverse and divergent civilizational disintegration theses from Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee to Andre Gunder Frank and Giovanni Arrighi, the paper seeks to identify shared mentalities between these historians. It proceeds by asking a number of linked questions: What drove these historians to describe the “world’s” destiny in terms of the east-west axis? What then drove them to paint a picture of a shared human future

where nonetheless something called “eastern civilization” would supplant something called “western civilization”? How did they merge or differ in terms of their conceptions of the cyclical or linear nature of historical time? Finally, more theoretically, the paper asks if the prophetic urge has been a special characteristic of world historians and if so, then to what extent has it locked the project of world history within the flattening frame of “totalizing discourse”?

Historians and Their Personae in Times of Fascism

António da Silva Rêgo, Birkbeck, University of London

History of historiography typically focuses on liberal democratic settings in its studies, and often the connections between the writing of the past and other regimes are hastily forgotten. One could argue that fascism did not last long enough to have an impact in the discipline, and that could be true in cases such as Germany or France. In Spain and Portugal, on the other hand, their impact was enormous, as regimes lasted close to half a century.

In this paper, we will take Portugal as a case study of a fascist regime in peace time, looking at its scholarship and academic organization for the first 20 years of the Estado Novo dictatorship (1926-1948). First, we will look at the most shared characteristics of the historian’s role-identity – a kind of overarching persona of the historian: (1) a commitment to knowledge, focused on the virtues of scientific inquiry and the skills that revolve around document analysis, (2) a commitment to the nation, mostly through the cultivation of the virtues of patriotism and justice, not forgetting the cult of tradition, and (3) a commitment to unity, with the organizational virtues that led to the making of the first collective histories in Portugal, the foundation of the Portuguese Academy of History, and ultimately the formation of the discipline as we know it.

Yet this would only be half the picture, as historians were characterized by what divided them as much as by what united them. We will look at two pairs of personae along the lines of which historians often found themselves separated. First, there were the *men of letters*, with so much cultural capital that they could afford to work alone, while *academic scholars* worked mostly in Academies, instead of writing for newspapers in between their scholarly work. Second, we find a rift between those who valued asceticism – often characterized by an ironic style of writing – , and those who favored styles that were more effective towards nation-building, leaning towards the use of metaphor, using Hayden White’s terminology.

Urban History in Britain: A One Man Mission?

Gary W. Davies, University of Leicester

Responding to the post-1945 widening of participation in higher education, academic History in Britain underwent an institutional change leading to a plethora of new and specialised sub-fields of historical study. With each focused on increasingly delimited objects of research, historians steering the establishment of these new fields required many of the skills redolent of an impresario attempting to create a successful business enterprise: dynamism, entrepreneurial and promotional skills underpinned with innovative and insightful leadership. Yet, for the historian, it was equally imperative they maintained their

scholarly persona concomitant with the discipline of History. The extent that the two personae meshed will be explored through the prism of British Urban History and the historian at the heart of its foundation discourse: H.J. (Jim) Dyos (1921-1978). In the memorials and obituaries following Dyos' death, many colleagues noted how he was in the rare position of guiding the formation of an entirely new sub-field of History. As a pioneer, with only the development of the field in the United States to mirror, his role was described as a 'complex phenomenon of entrepreneurship and guru-ship'. Renowned for his global networking skills, evident in his editorship of a newsletter and prolific personal correspondence, Dyos was routinely labelled the *doyen* of the nascent field; indeed, many argued Urban History's success rested on his unique 'drive and personality'. To demonstrate how Dyos attempted to combine academic and entrepreneurial personae, his role in the formation of the field will be explored alongside his personal and professional motivations which will be placed within the context of prevailing academic structures. Dyos' placement at the heart of the new field's foundation discourse provides a rare opportunity to explore the incongruities of combining the scholarly and entrepreneurial personae.

The Invention of the Marxist Historian's: A History of the Communist Party Historians' Group, 1946-1956

Sina Talachian, King's College, London

The Communist Party Historians' Group, founded in 1946 and dissolved in 1956, produced some of the most influential historians of the twentieth century, Eric Hobsbawm and E. P. Thompson foremost among them. It also gave birth to the scholarly persona of the Marxist historian, forged in opposition to the 'bourgeois' *other* valorized in the academy. Yet the Group itself was internally split along the same lines; between the world of academia and the politically enclosed space of the Communist Party—a schism profoundly affecting the development of the persona. In this study I investigate how these two elements or factions of the Historians' Group—the academic and non-academic—collectively invented the Marxist historian's scholarly persona during its decade-long existence. The Group's founders, Dona Torr, A. L. Morton, Maurice Dobb and Christopher Hill, representing the non-academic and academic factions respectively, are the main focus of my study given the primary roles they played in the persona's formation.

My investigation proceeds through an analysis of various what I call 'key moments of persona formation' that occurred within the Group, delineated by a particularly intensive level of contestation among its members concerning the persona's nature, revealing most clearly the stakes involved on all sides in its making. Some key moments I cover are the English Revolution debates that preceded and enabled the Group's formation; the so-called 'Pokrovsky Affair' that signaled its independence from Soviet and Communist Party (historiographical) ideology, and the 1956 rebellion against the Communist Party that culminated in the Group's disintegration. These show the Marxist historian's persona to have been comprised of a distinctive set of certain shared epistemic and moral/political commitments—or to put it another way, commitments to obtaining goods of that kind through the exercise of the appropriate virtues—which took shape through these moments of persona formation. By revealing these commitments over the course of the Communist Party Historians' Group's decade-long existence via an analysis of the key moments of

persona formation, the nature of the Marxist historian's persona invented within it is laid bare, while also illuminating the many factors involved in its making.

Writing Pirenne: Bryce Lyon and F. L. Ganshof on the Constitution of Scholarly Personae

Henning Trüper, Helsinki Collegium of Advanced Studies

In the 1960s and early 1970s, the American medievalist Bryce Lyon was busy writing a work of recent historiography, his biography of Henri Pirenne. In the writing of this book, a process documented in extensive correspondence, he heavily relied on advice and detailed corrections by François Louis Ganshof, Pirenne's former student and successor. I propose (1) an analysis of this body of correspondence with a view to bringing out several implicit negotiations about the nature of scholarly personae between Lyon and Ganshof that shaped the biographical perspective on Pirenne and on historical writing generally that Lyon's study betrays. I will (2) seek to show how the biographical constitution of the history of historical writing impinged on the very sense of historical knowledge in place in Lyon's project. I will (3) argue that the personae in question were profoundly shaped by subtle generational divides, which entailed the distancing of successive generations from previous norms of comportment. This process, I submit, explains the gradual disappearance of specific patterns of self-fashioning over time. These patterns were not entirely autonomous cultural phenomena; instead they relied on an infrastructure provided by political discourse. For Ganshof and Lyon it was, as I will show, the dichotomy of equality and inequality that organized their exchanges, a feature which helps understanding the question of why the 1960s and 70s marked a particularly salient watershed in the history of scholarly personae.

William Trevor, T.W. Moody and the Person of the Historian

Mihail Evans, New Europe College/Institute for Advanced Studies, Bucharest

If the virtues of the historian are a way of understanding how various historical practices are legitimated, the idea of the vices of the historian, those attributes which disqualify him and/or his work from interest and attention, must also exist and call for our attention. My paper will look at how writers of fiction have contested with writers of history via a study of the case of William Trevor and/or T.W. Moody.

In the late 1970s William Trevor (1928-), recently described by *The New Yorker* as 'the greatest living writer of short stories in the English language', published a short story set at the Christmas party of a 'Professor Skully', said to be a Trinity College Dublin History chair. Commentators have claimed that even without the identificatory comments later made in *Excursions in the Real World: Memoirs* (1995), the character is clearly that of T.W. Moody (1907-1984), professor of Modern History at that university from 1940 to 1977. Moody was a major driving force in the professionalisation of Irish history in the mid to late-twentieth century: he had studied in London at the Institute for Historical Studies and when he returned to Ireland, together with Robert Dudley Edwards founded the Irish Committee of Historical Sciences, *Irish Historical Studies* and projected the defining collaborative *A New History of Ireland* (Oxford University Press, 1982-2011). The short story is a personal demolition of Skully, his wife and their relationship. Such is its force that Denis Donoghue remarked, 'what did Moody and his wife do to Trevor to incur such a drubbing?'

Significantly, Donoghue did not seem to be aware that Trevor had read History as an undergraduate at Trinity in the late 1940s.

In his analysis of Skully, or what we may take to be Moody and the caste of historians as he found them, he presents us with his own antithesis. The character of the historian for Trevor is unconcerned with character, that is, he has no interest in that which is above all worth observing in human life. This is, then, the particular 'vice' of Moody and, it is implied, of historians more generally. Yet when Moody's oeuvre is placed against that of Trevor we can discover parallels in what both were trying to do. As a historian T.W. Moody's did much to breakdown the nationalist mythology of the newly independent Ireland and, as such, parallels Trevor's own work which so often deals with the daily minutiae of intracommunal life in provincial Irish small towns and the ways in which at an individual level interactions are of a complexity that goes beyond common stereotypes (the secondary literature on him makes much of this). At a broad level, we might say, both Trevor and Moody sought to overcome sectarianism through their respective works. Yet this shared task is unremarked in 'The Time of Year'. The way that Trevor so prizes psychological insight leads him to overlook the way in which Moody's history can be complementary to his own concerns.

Scholarly Personae, Exemplary Conducts, and Virtuousness in Brazilian Professional Historiography (1970-2000)

João Rodolfo Munhoz Ohara, São Paulo State University

When writing obituaries and homage pieces, historians usually employ evaluative language in order to think about the work of their late masters or peers. Praising their historical sensibility and their erudition, remembering their dedication to the complex art of making history, or recalling anecdotes from past classes or talks, these authors not only share their admiration for another historian, but they also make explicit certain tacit rules of their craft. Moreover, these textual pieces bring forward an assertion that few historians, if any, would disagree with: that it takes more than technical prowess to be a historian. By cultivating certain traits and dispositions, either epistemic or not, individuals relate to repertoires of scholarly personae that are available to them; that is to say, they learn and practice *ways of being a historian*. This paper aims at mapping the axiological and evaluative discourses present in obituaries of historians published in Brazilian academic journals from 1970 to 2000 in order to better understand what kinds of personae were part of the disciplinary repertoire during that period. Following the proposal by Herman Paul, I understand scholarly personae to be constellations of both epistemic and non-epistemic virtues, or characteristics deemed necessary for one to be a good historian. The study of the late 20th century historiography in Brazil comprises the period in which academic, university-based historiography is consolidated, with growing numbers of post-graduate programs and research grants. Mapping the evaluative discourses in this period should allow us to better understand and to provide subsidies to evaluations of contemporary professional historiography in Brazil. Furthermore, while some might take for granted that 19th century historians used virtue and exemplary language to educate their peers and students, case studies in the late 20th century should bring forward discussions regarding the processes of subjectivation which exert power over our present selves. Therefore, this paper operates in two different levels: on the one hand, by presenting a historical account of a specific historical context; on the other, by taking a critical attitude towards our present standards.

Finally, the study of contemporary Brazilian historiography should provide resources for comparing the different configurations of contemporary historiography in such distinct contexts as Europe, North, and South America.

Opening the Black Box of the Historian's Craftsmanship

Van Troi Tran (Laval University) & Patrick-Michel Noel (University of St. Boniface)

In her book, *How Professors Think*, on the different cultures of evaluation across academic disciplines in the United States, Michèle Lamont tagged history as the "consensual" discipline. Apparently, according to her informants, historians widely share an agreement over what constitutes a good historians, namely a sense of careful archival work. But, as we know, when there is a consensual agreement among a community, especially upon such a floating signifier as "craftsmanship," this warrants a deeper ethnographic exploration into what appears to be a black box or an invented tradition. It is interesting that despite this insistence on the craftlike image of the profession, there seems to be a lack of actual field investigations of historians at work, ethnographies that would precisely attend to the craftiness of history and the multiple practicalities of doing history across different contexts. This talk will present the first results of an ethnography of historians of different generations in France and Canada. We will address in this paper the different conceptions and performances of the historian's craft in order to highlight transnational transfers and local specificities in the processes of becoming a historian and the crystallization of ideal-types of the persona of the historian. The paper will be divided into three parts, the first will present the different versions of the historian persona as evoked by our informants. The second part will focus on how these conceptions are translated and reworked in the actual practicalities of research and writing. The third part will focus on the implications and the limits and discrepancies of this figure of the artisan on the production of a public identity of historians in France and Canada.

Passion and Persona of a Chinese Historian: The Case of Gu Jiegang (1893-1980) and His Role in Shaping Modern Chinese Historiography

Q. Edward Wang, Rowan University

Arguably the most well-known historian of modern China to the world, Gu Jiegang (Ku Chieh-kang) established a sterling career from the late 1920s as a leader in the "Historical Source School." The School advocated the need to reexamine many well received sources about early China in order to re-present its historicity. For his contribution, Gu has received ample attention in both Chinese and English scholarship--his first biography appeared in English in the 1970s, followed by a number of Chinese studies well into this day. But few have looked at, much less analyzed, Gu's persona shown in his writings. By experimenting with the idea of persona and using his well kept diary, my attempt is to reveal the lesser known factors that drove Gu's pursuit and career in his long life span.