

gingen — war der Internationale Historikerkongreß eine inoffizielle Begegnung der Historiker und Gelehrten Südosteuropas mit den Südostforschern aus allen übrigen Ländern, wie sie in diesem Ausmaß kaum erwartet worden war. Die Einzelgespräche wie die öffentlichen Diskussionen gaben vielen der Teilnehmer wertvolle Anregungen und trugen außerdem zum Abbau gewisser Mißverständnisse und Irrtümer bei, die sich in den historischen Vorstellungen mancher Länder seit mehr als einer Generation verwurzelt hatten.

Mit dem Kongreß verbunden waren zahlreiche Buchausstellungen privater und staatlicher Verlage, die auf engem Raum einen guten Überblick der neuesten Publikationen und der Verlagsprogramme vermittelten. Frankreich, Jugoslawien, Rumänien und andere Länder gaben aus Anlaß des Kongresses wertvolle historische Neuerscheinungen heraus, die an alle Kongreßteilnehmer kostenlos verteilt wurden, so z.B. die zweibändige Bibliographie des Französischen Komitees für Geschichtswissenschaft, die die Zeit von 1940 bis 1965 umfaßt, und die Bibliographie der jugoslawischen Geschichtsschreibung für die Zeit von 1955-1965. Rumänien hatte dem Kongreß den 3. Band der "Nouvelles Études d'Histoire" gewidmet und auch einige andere Länder verteilten historische Veröffentlichungen.

Zusammenfassend kann festgestellt werden, daß der Kongreß neben der allgemeinen eine ganz besondere Bedeutung für Südosteuropa hatte, da er sowohl im sachlichen wie im persönlichen Bereich günstige Voraussetzungen für eine Festigung der balkanischen wie der europäischen Integration schuf. Mit um so größerem Interesse wird man auf die Vorbereitungen blicken, die seitens der Association Internationale d'Études du Sud-Est Européen (AIESEE) für den Kongreß in Sofia getroffen werden, da auch dort den historischen Vorträgen breiter Raum gegeben werden soll.

München

E. TURCZYNSKI

"PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN CENTRAL AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE"

Among the several sessions devoted to the historical problems of Eastern Europe at the Twelfth International Congress of Historical Sciences in Vienna that on "*Mouvements paysans du centre et du sud-est de l'Europe du XVe au XXe siècle*" was in most respects the most controversial.

Saddled with the unsurmountable task of synthesising the nature and development of peasant movements over an enormous area and chronological span in approximately twenty-five printed pages, Professor Ştefan Pascu

of the University of Cluj resorted to generalizations unacceptable to the majority of the discussants of his contribution. In fairness to the author it must be stated that the paper presented at the Congress was only an abbreviated version of a longer study which, in turn, incorporated materials submitted to him by three Russian collaborators Professors V.V. Mavrodin, B. F. Porchnev and I.G. Antelava dealing with peasant movements in European Russia. In agreeing to the inclusion of Russia into central and southeastern Europe Professor Pascu, *volens nolens*, transcended the limits of a historically and geographically justifiable analysis; indeed, most of the paper's difficulties stem from this overexpansion.

The fundamental thesis of the contribution is that the peasant movements in central and southeastern Europe no matter what their form — "migration, brigandage, résistance partielle, émeutes locales, révoltes" — had one basic aim "émancipation sociale" and "libération nationale." All illustrations, richly drawn from the vast repertoire of peasant movements from the fifteenth to the twentieth century, are intended to demonstrate the accuracy of that thesis. There can be no quarrel with Professor Pascu's basic premises; in fact the enunciation and substantiation of the "social" and "national" theme have long been overdue in the historical literature on central and southeastern Europe. The general agreement on the "social" character of peasant manifestations expressed at Vienna reflects wide acceptance of this point of view in the historical profession. If the equating of social revolution with national liberation movements drew audible reservations, the consensus of historical opinion endorsed Pascu's views at least with respect to events of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. However, few voices were heard in support of the validity of the "duality" in the Russian manifestations or, for that matter, for linking Russia to central and southeastern Europe in the first place.

Indeed, no matter how indispensable such inclusion might have been a few years ago when the program of the Congress was first formulated and no matter how ably Pascu circumvented the problems raised thereby, the resultant geographic and methodological distortions did major violence to the essay's essential theses. After all, the national liberation movements were directed not only against the empires of the Habsburgs or Ottoman sultans but also against that of the tsars. Considering, however, the preponderance of anti-Austro-Hungarian and anti-Ottoman manifestations the paper could have concentrated on the problems of these two multi-national empires had the exclusion of the third been possible. As this was not feasible, Professor Pascu's methodology suffered. Using the technique of merely listing peasant movements in chronological order the account is strikingly similar to a historical parody of Leporello's catalogue aria. Moreover, by failing to concentrate on the specific pro-

blems of the Habsburg and Ottoman empires the paper does not single out the characteristic features of the peasant movements in the two states. Yet the socio-economic, political and cultural differences between the Christian Habsburg monarchy and the Moslem Ottoman profoundly affected the attitude of the masses both toward social revolution and national liberation.

It is possible that even if freed of the burden of including Stenka Razin and his more or less distinguished predecessors and successors in the discussion, Professor Pascu would have avoided the comparative approach. The tendency to evade clear definition of terms, including "masses" and "peasantry," and consider the essential problem of leadership of the peasant movements in meaningful detail is in keeping with the current Marxist doctrine of crediting the masses collectively and indiscriminately with superior revolutionary prowess and socio-political foresight. In this context the irresistible force of the abused masses — no matter what their occupational pattern, political or cultural horizons, or geographic location — would inevitably triumph regardless of the oppressors' source of power or *raison d'être*. Thus the category "peasants" includes Albanian tribesmen, Greek *armatoles*, Czech agriculturists, Hungarian "*kulaks*," Rumanian *mosneni*; that of "oppressors" Turkish sultans, Magyar magnates, Austrian archdukes, Russian boyars, Habsburg emperors and the Polish *szlachta*. The national aspirations of the masses are also remarkably similar whether they involve liberation from an Albanian *pasha*, a Phanariote *voevod*, a Russian tsar or Francis Joseph. It is not that Professor Pascu does not recognize the existence of qualitative differences but given the structure and scope of the paper he is unable to elaborate and refine them.

For the same reasons another key methodological and substantive factor, that of leadership, is also given cursory treatment. The role of the church, so different in the Ottoman and Habsburg empires, is generally ignored with the result that the "crusading" element so characteristic of the peasant movements of the Moslem empire is at no time placed in juxtaposition to the refraining factors associated with the *Kaisertræue* invoked by the conservative clergy of the Christian Habsburg monarchy. Similarly short shrift is made of the crucial relationship between the ruling Balkan monarchs — of post-Ottoman days — and the masses which more often than not directed peasant dissatisfaction into evolutionary rather than revolutionary channels. By contrast, exaggerated emphasis is placed on the less significant ties between the rural masses and the urban proletariat and intelligentsia. Whereas this approach is justifiable in terms of the constant stress on the revolutionary aspects of the peasant movements the moderation characteristic of peasant, social and political behavior deserved consideration even in the restricted context of the paper.

Professor Pascu was aware of these methodological deficiencies and provided measured and sensitive replies to the questions raised by the discussants. It is therefore likely that the longer version of his study will provide the *addenda* and *corrigenda* suggested in the several interventions.

Wayne University, Detroit

STEPHEN FISHER-GALATI

DIE BYZANTINISCHE COMMISSION
DES 12. INTERNATIONALEN HISTORIKERKONGRESSES
WIEN 1965

Vom 29. August bis 5. September 1965 fand in Wien der 12. Internationale Historikerkongreß statt. Über 2500 Gelehrte und historisch Interessierte aus allen Kontinenten samt ihren Angehörigen waren dem Ruf des Kongreßkomitees gefolgt. Auf viele Teilnehmer hatte vielleicht auch die alte Residenzstadt der Habsburgermonarchie oder die Möglichkeit, in einem neutralen Staat in unmittelbare Nähe des nunmehr schon etwas durchlöchernten "Eisernen Vorhangs" zu kommen, eine gewisse Anziehungskraft ausgeübt. Die Byzantinische Kommission bildete innerhalb dieses Monsterkongresses nur eine kleine Zelle, deren Aktivität sich auf einen Tag des Kongresses konzentrierte. Byzantinisten im engeren und weiteren Sinn waren aus Ost und West, aus der Sowjetunion und aus den Vereinigten Staaten, erschienen; leider fehlten Vertreter der Deutschen Bundesrepublik.

Das Rahmenthema für die von der Association Internationale des Études Byzantines vorgesehenen Referate hieß "Le monde de Byzance dans la pensée historique de l'Europe à partir du XVII^e siècle." Es sprachen

1. A. Pertusi über: *Le siècle de l'érudition*
2. A. Guillou über: *Le siècle des lumières*
3. D. Zakythinos über: *Le XIX^e siècle: du romantisme au nationalisme*
4. H. Hunger über: *Byzanz im europäischen Geschichtsdenken des 20. Jahrhunderts.*

Das Referat von Herrn Guillou wurde in Abwesenheit des Autors von Herrn Thiriet verlesen.

In Ergänzung zu diesen Referaten des Vormittags sprachen nachmittags folgende Redner vom ethnographischen Standpunkt aus zum Hauptthema

5. D. Obolensky über: *Le point de vue des Slaves du Nord*
6. I. Dujčev über: *Le point de vue des Slaves du Sud*
7. D. Zakythinos über: *Le point de vue des épigones.*

Das Referat von Herrn Dujčev, der am Erscheinen verhindert war,