

DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

...as, a par do qu
últimos decénios
firmado como um
na longa tradição:
stória da história,
a meta-história?

History of History

In the context of historical studies in Portugal, the field of history of historiography was a peripheral field for a long time as a specific approach with some degree of autonomy. However, in line with developments in other European countries, it has garnered significant interest among Portuguese historians over the past two decades, establishing itself as an area closely connected with cultural history. This development stems from a long-standing tradition: Portuguese historians and essayists have consistently valued the history of history, from the late 18th century to the present day, yet In what ways has this meta-history evolved?

In the early 19th century, the Enlightenment scholar Abbot Correia da Serra, one of the founders of the Royal Academy of Sciences (1779), offered a critical perspective on historical studies in Portugal during the 18th century: "Parmi les histoires des peuples européens, celle des Portugais est peut-être une des moins avancées; non qu'il y ait disette d'ouvrages sur cette matière, mais les ouvrages sont les échos les uns des autres, et dans le dix-septième siècle surtout un certain esprit fanfaron s'était emparé des historiens de toute la péninsule espagnole. Une autre maladie historique, qui consiste à inventer des fables au lieu de constater des faits, s'était manifestée au seizième siècle en Italie (...): elle infecta les Espagnols (...) et se communiqua par là aux historiens portugais" ("Coup d'oeil sur l'état des sciences et des lettres...", in Adrien Balbi, *Essai statistique...*, 1822, CCCXLVI). Educated in the rationalist spirit of the Enlightenment, Correia da Serra was one of the key proponents of research within the Academy of Sciences in Lisbon. His interest in historical memory, which he considered "absolument nécessaire", is thus understandable. He firmly believed that it could explain national laws and customs. Within the scope of this Academy, research and archive inventories were developed (1788–1795), and there was even the idea of producing a renewed history of Portugal. (It should be noted, however, that within the Royal Academy of Portuguese History, founded in 1720 and dissolved by the mid-18th century, the idea of a history of Portugal with a new chorographic dimension had already been asserted.) The intention was to break away from the earlier tradition of a history associated with rhetoric and eloquence, which merely elaborated on previous works. Instead, a paradigm of history as a science, grounded in documentary collections, began to take shape.

However, in the wake of the French invasions, Portugal entered a period of military conflict and great



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

political instability, spanning from the liberal revolution to the Patuleia (civil war). It would only be in the 1840s that the renewal of historiography would materialise, informed by the knowledge of the most advanced European historiographies of the time. By then, a profound transformation had occurred in the very writing of history across literate Europe: history had come to centre itself on a new protagonist and referential identity—the nation.

It was in the initial stages of this unstable period of constructing the liberal state that Alexandre Herculano published a series of articles on ancient Portuguese chroniclers from the 15th and 16th centuries in *O Panorama*. These articles were brief intellectual biographies in which he sought to characterise the chroniclers' works within the political contexts of their times. The historian viewed the liberal revolution as a necessary shift from historical tradition, though he acknowledged the risk it posed of severing social memory. This explains his attention to the memory constructed by the chroniclers and his critique of the mythical history fuelled by myths on the origin of Portugal (such as the identification of the Portuguese with the Lusitanians, the Miracle of Ourique, and the *Cortes* of Lamego). Of particular note is what Herculano most valued in Fernão Lopes, the great late-medieval Portuguese chronicler: 1) the poetic and dramatic nature of his narratives, which successfully evoked the past in its entirety (interestingly, this perspective came from the man who would later advocate for the separation of history from literature); 2) the fact that Lopes's chronicles not only captured the history of a generation, but also depicted the lives of various social groups and the movements of the masses. In Herculano's view, to some extent Fernão Lopes prefigured the type of national historian Herculano himself aspired to be in the 19th century. Conversely, he categorised the works of other chroniclers as "courtly literature," which, he considered amounted to little more than the apologetic biographies of princes, as was the case with Rui de Pina. From his liberal perspective, influenced by Tocqueville's municipalism, Herculano attributed the emergence of such royal biographies to the absolute state and the process of monarchical centralisation that had been underway since the late 15th century. And he wondered, "What other form could history take in an era when the social organisation had absorbed the people, the nobility, and even the clergy beneath the throne of the monarch?" ("Historiadores portugueses" [Portuguese Historians], *Opúsculos IV* [Opuscles IV] undated [1840], p. 183). His emphasis on the role of the individual in history (evident in his *História de Portugal* [History of Portugal], 1846–53) and his liberal and romantic ideals did not prevent him from situating historiography within a broader political and social context. In his view, ignorance of historical memory was a symptom of social decay, making it essential to bring the works of ancient chroniclers to light.

The critical interest in the historiography produced in Portugal continued to flourish during the period of the Constitutional Monarchy. Examples include the extensive debates surrounding Alexandre Herculano's *História de Portugal* and Oliveira Martins's *História de Portugal* (1879). It is telling that these debates largely centred on the question of the nation's origins. In the case of Herculano, the controversy arose from the fact that he disregarded the mythical and providentialist tradition of Ourique in the formation of Portugal in the 12th century and challenged another historical tradition that had been deeply rooted since the 15th century: the continuity



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

between the Portuguese and the Lusitanians. In 1880, debates around Oliveira Martins's work focused on the rational arguments he used to explain the formation of Portugal.; before Renan, Martins had defended an elective and voluntarist concept of the nation, emphasising the role of civic consciousness in the process of nationalisation and distancing himself from the ethnic determinism that was widely popular at the time. On the other hand, Oliveira Martins offered a highly critical assessment of Portuguese historiography, which included a relevant periodisation of the writing of history in Portugal. He identified three key moments: the Royal Academy of History (1720–31), the Royal Academy of Sciences (1779–96), and the contributions of Alexandre Herculano. He also dismissed the historical novel as a “hybrid and false genre” (“Notas sobre a historiografia...” [“Notes on historiography...”] *História de Portugal*, 1942 [1886], vol. II, p. 326). Another of Oliveira Martins's notable and debatable theories was that, in each of these moments, Portuguese historiography had failed to establish a tradition or “a school of historical studies.” His critical stance was also evident regarding the flourishing historical commemorative practices of positivist inspiration that emerged from 1880 onwards (e.g., the tricentennial of Camões).

The interest in historical memory—as a memory constructed by historians—persisted, albeit intermittently, and gained traction throughout the 20th century. In 1903, the first specialised history journal, *O Arquivo Histórico Português* [The Portuguese Historical Archive] was launched. Following the establishment of the First Republic, the Society for Historical Studies (1911) was founded, along with its journal, the *Revista de História* (1911–28), which established significant connections with other European historiographies. Contributors to this journal included figures such as Benedetto Croce and Edgar Prestage. The relative delay of this associativism among historians, compared to developments in France and Germany, is evident. During this period, the concept of positive or methodical history prevailed, in an environment heavily influenced by nationalist historicism of either liberal or more conservative leanings. The establishment of the First Republic in Portugal was accompanied by political propaganda largely justified through historical arguments. A dominant theory of decline attributed Portugal's decadence to three centuries of absolute monarchy and Catholicism, shaped by the ideals of the Counter-Reformation and the Inquisition, as well as the negative consequences of overseas expansion. It was argued that this decline had persisted into the 19th century under the Constitutional Monarchy. Republican historicism, centred on a concept of the nation identified with the people, viewed absolute monarchs and the clergy (particularly the Inquisition) as major obstacles to progress. This liberal and republican narrative strategy was challenged by a traditionalist and monarchist generation that emerged around 1914–15, exemplified by the group known as *Integralismo Lusitano*, deeply influenced by the conservative nationalism of Charles Maurras's *Action Française*. In the opinion of these authors, including António Sardinha, the causes of decline were instead rooted in liberalism, freemasonry (often associated with Iberian tendencies), and religious heterodoxy—including Judaism.

One of the boldest proposals for evaluating and reflecting on 19th-century Portuguese historiography did not come from a historian but from an ecclesiastical publicist and supporter of the former political Ancien



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

regime: Manuel Abúndio da Silva. In a study submitted (unsuccessfully) for a position at the *Curso Superior de Letras*, Abúndio da Silva demonstrated his familiarity with the sociological theories of his time (*A história através da história* [History through history]1904). Before Maurice Halbwachs, Abúndio da Silva had made a highly pertinent distinction between *organic memory*—possessed by the people and situated at the level of instinct and tradition—and *conscious memory* (which may be identified with historical memory, as Halbwachs would later describe it), cultivated by historians, who, as members of the elite, were uniquely equipped to preserve this memory. He questioned how social memory selects certain events and figures to remember while neglecting others. For Abúndio da Silva, the answer lay in the relevance and exceptionality of those events and personalities. What persisted in social memory, in his view, was the extraordinary, the extra-normal.

Such reflections faded into obscurity and would only be revisited in the late 20th century. This is hardly surprising: until the 1950s, many Portuguese historians—particularly those aligned with Salazar’s authoritarian regime—promoted a deeply entrenched retrospective cultural nationalism rooted in traditions forged under the Ancien Regime. Among these were the essentialist identification of the Portuguese with the Lusitanians, the *Plano da Índia* (the idea that the discovery of the maritime route to India had been planned by Prince Henry the Navigator), and the mythical *Escola de Sagres*, where 15th-century Portuguese sailors were supposedly trained. The first was a myth of origins, while the latter emphasised Portuguese pioneering in overseas discoveries. The *História de Portugal*, under Damião Peres (1928–35), still heavily influenced by cultural nationalism and historicism, marked a significant moment for professional historiography. However, the relationship between historiography and memory became critically assessed in the context of the historical rituals promoted by the *Estado Novo* in the 1940s, unequivocally separating the realms of history and commemorative practices (V. Magalhães Godinho, *Comemorações e história...*, [Commemorations and history...] 1947). Despite the official framework, some valid scientific contributions emerged from the Congress of the Portuguese World (1940), and later the International Congress on the History of the Discoveries (1960).

Not by chance, the post-World War II years saw the emergence of new critical assessments of Portuguese historiography. One of these came from a young historian, Vitorino Magalhães Godinho, who subjected the instrumentalization of history by the *Estado Novo*’s traditionalism to rigorous critique. Godinho left for Paris in 1947, after a brief but highly significant tenure as a professor at the Faculty of Arts in Lisbon. In an article published in the *Annales* (1948), he identified two areas in which Portuguese historiography was particularly deficient: economic history and social history. This marked an important initial step (see also *A crise da história e as suas novas directrizes* [The Crisis of History and Its New Guidelines], 1946, later included in *Ensaios III* [Essays III]) in establishing a rationalist, coherent, and global approach to historical theory and methodology, always considering history’s social function and echoing Herculano’s paradigm of the historian-citizen. A few years later (1955), in a detailed critical assessment, Godinho acknowledged “a rich tradition” of historical studies in Portugal, although he argued that research was undergoing a crisis—or was it perhaps more accurately a crisis of the *Estado Novo* regime? In any case, Godinho identified the obstacles at the root of this



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

historiographical crisis, highlighting historians' attitudes towards life, the lack of a "scientific environment," the poor state of archives, deficient historical methodologies, and inadequate teaching of the discipline ("A historiografia portuguesa do século XX" [20th Century Portuguese Historiography], *Ensaio III*, 1971 [1955], p. 242).

The *Estado Novo's* suppression of freedom significantly constrained historical writing. Thus, it is understandable that Godinho distinguished between "courtly and flattering historians" and "citizen historians" (a concept already advanced by Herculano in 1840 with reference to late medieval chroniclers). In 1940–41, the regime established SNI History Prizes, awarded to Portuguese authors who supported the regime politically (such as Alfredo Pimenta and João Ameal), while the censorship banned António Sérgio's innovative *Introdução geográfico-sociológica à História de Portugal* [Geographical and Sociological Introduction to the History of Portugal] (1941), preventing him from pursuing a more ambitious project. Under the *Estado Novo*, the study of the contemporary era at universities—associated with politics and journalism—was stifled. In the 1940s, Magalhães Godinho was barred from writing a doctoral thesis on Oliveira Martins. It was not until the 1960s that some works on the 19th century began to receive encouragement at the Faculty of Arts in Coimbra (Silva Dias) and the Faculty of Arts in Lisbon (Jorge Borges de Macedo). Unlike in Spain, these studies were developed primarily outside the university framework by authors connected to opposition circles, influenced by the historiography of the *Annales* school or Marxism: Joel Serrão, Armando Castro, Victor de Sá, Augusto da Costa Dias, and José Tengarrinha, among others.

Quite different from Magalhães Godinho's perspective was the analysis advanced by Fidelino de Figueiredo in 1954. A literary historian and essayist, a professor at the University of São Paulo at the time, and the author of studies on Portuguese literature that offered alternatives to those of Teófilo Braga (marked by heterodox positivism), Figueiredo valued the formative role of philosophy in its relationship with historical writing. To a certain extent, he distanced himself from the agenda of immediate political battles, whether in favour of or against the Republic. However, he emphasised the inevitability of the connection between politics and history: "All politics are either faithfully historicist or ambitiously anti-historical" (*Historiografia portuguesa do século XX*, pp. 338–339). While still in Portugal, as secretary of the Portuguese Society for Historical Studies, Figueiredo expressed a traditionalist intent in his activities. He succeeded in bringing together a highly heterogeneous group of historians around that association and the aforementioned *Revista de História*. This group shared a desire to renew the historical spirit, converging erudition, history-as-science, and art history, alongside an openness to external influences and a commitment to cultural roots—trends that were already emerging among the Portuguese cultural elites.

During that period, the establishment of two new universities in Portugal (Lisbon and Porto) and the 1911 reform, which linked History and Geography, stimulated reflection on the role of history in society and education. They also highlighted the importance of studying national identity through a historical lens (but in Porto, the Faculty of Arts would not be established until 1919, and, after its closure in 1928, would only



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

reappear in 1962). Fidelino de Figueiredo established connections with foreign historians such as Benedetto Croce, Edgar Prestage, and Bustamante. However, significant developments would have to wait until the post-World War II era. Portugal's peripheral situation did not facilitate exchanges with the European cultures where historiographical vanguards were having the greatest impact. Despite political constraints, the *Junta de Educação Nacional* [National Education Board]—later the Institute for High Culture—played an important role in supporting some research fellows in European universities, also in the field of human sciences.

Until the 1960s, the history of historiography in Portugal focused primarily on individual historians and their works. However, the contributions of V. Magalhães Godinho and Fidelino de Figueiredo marked a turning point by attempting to move beyond an individual perspective to trace general trends—typified in specific works—considered critically. University periodicals such as the *Revista Portuguesa de História* [Portuguese History Journal] (founded in 1941 in Coimbra) and *Do Tempo e da História* [Of Time and History] (Lisbon, 1965–72) revealed new dynamics in Portuguese historiography, which became modernised through contact with other European historiographies, particularly the French and Spanish. However, as the unbiased Silva Rego noted in 1956, Portuguese historians did not dedicate themselves to studying the history of other nations, and syntheses and works on the philosophy of history were sorely needed. Conversely, interest in the works of Alexandre Herculano (1810–77), the most influential figure of 19th-century Portuguese historiography, generated significant studies [Barradas de Carvalho, 1971 (1st ed. 1949) and A. José Saraiva, 1977 (1st ed. 1949)]. Interpretations of the historical thought of the author of *História de Portugal*, and the principal architect of 19th-century liberal narratives, diverged, particularly regarding his conception of history: What role did providence play in his historical narrative? To what extent did he value social conditioning in historical transformations? During this post-war period, which still lacked freedom of expression in Portugal and Spain, a central question arose: What place did the historian assign to the individual in history?

The prevailing idea was that Herculano's work represented a shift from earlier historiography insofar as, within the scope of a demand for documentary evidence, it distanced itself from foundational myths and, above all, introduced a critical and scientific method. In 1972, inspired by a concept from Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser, Barradas de Carvalho went so far as to describe Herculano's work as an "epistemological revolution," distinguishing it from all previous chronicles and historiography. Without referencing Barradas de Carvalho, Borges de Macedo (*Alexandre Herculano, polémica e mensagem* [Alexandre Herculano, controversy and message] 1980), later revised this interpretation, situating Herculano within a tradition of studies that dated back at least to the Academy of Sciences and the concept of history-as-science cultivated by historians associated with it (João Pedro Ribeiro and António Caetano do Amaral, among others). Without placing him in this tradition, Herculano's work would be incomprehensible.

An underlying question—and one that is present in various forms in the works of historians such as Magalhães Godinho, Barradas de Carvalho, and Joel Serrão—is the relationship between history, politics, and civic engagement. This issue is central to understanding liberal historiography itself. To what extent does the



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

historian—whether acknowledging it or not—act as a citizen and remain permeable to doctrinal agendas? For Jaime Cortesão and other Republican historians of the early 20th century, the historian's craft was inseparable from citizenship. It is therefore understandable that by the late 1960s, at a time when the cultural nationalism of the *Estado Novo* was in crisis, Joel Serrão recognised the political stance of historians in classifying historiographical trends ("Para uma perspectiva da historiografia portuguesa contemporânea" ["Towards a Perspective on Contemporary Portuguese Historiography"] (1800–1940)," [undated [1971]], in a comprehensive perspective with a view to understanding contemporary Portuguese historiography. Serrão distinguished between liberal-inspired historiography, the interpretations of ecclesiastical historians who preceded Herculano (some associated with the Academy of Sciences), Republican historiography, and the traditionalist historiography that emerged after the First Republic, largely as a reaction against it. However, is it appropriate to classify historiographical trends based on more or less structured currents of political thought?

While it is a fact that political conceptualisations shaped the writing of history, it is equally evident that, in many cases, these frameworks are entirely insufficient to explain the uniqueness of a particular historical thought. Consider the notion of liberal historiography. A careful study of the various historians who may fall under this label points to significant divergences in their perspectives on the traditions surrounding the nation's origins, as well as their concepts of *povo* (the people) and the *Cortes* (assemblies). For example, unlike Herculano, an advocate of a decentralising ideology and one of the main theorists of a highly negative view of absolute monarchy, Luz Soriano believed that the Portuguese monarchy had always been representative rather than despotic, with deliberative assemblies. Similarly, regarding the mythical tradition of the *Cortes* of Lamego (a narrative invented based on a 17th-century apocryphal document), the two historians held differing views: Herculano denounced its falsehood, while Soriano highlighted its social functionality. Could there have been a master narrative or a liberal canon in 19th-century Portuguese historiography? This is debatable. It may be more appropriate to refer to different narrative strategies within the framework of the liberal galaxy. However, it is true that within this galaxy, a memory was constructed by the victors of the Civil War (1832–34), which pitted the liberals, supporters of D. Pedro IV, against the absolutists, followers of D. Miguel. The memory of the defeated, by contrast, remained peripheral and did not produce any significant historical works (unlike what occurred in Spain).

In Portugal, especially during the long period of the *Estado Novo*, political positions became extremely polarised, either in support of or in opposition to the dictatorial regime. The historiographical field also reflected these divergences. Historians adopted distinct strategies in their relationship with political power. However, there was no necessary correlation between historiographical conceptions and political or philosophical tendencies. Significant examples illustrating this are the works of Paulo Merêa, Jorge Borges de Macedo, and António José Saraiva. Merêa, conservative in political terms, was a critic of positivism and an innovator in the field of legal and institutional history. The latter two, deeply influenced by the Marxist conception of history in the 1940s, diverged from it at different times (Macedo in the 1950s, Saraiva in the 1960s), producing unique



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

works that renewed cultural and literary history. For example, see *História da Cultura em Portugal* [Cultural History in Portugal] (1950–62), under Saraiva, and *História Diplomática Portuguesa* [Diplomatic History in Portugal] (1987) under Macedo, integrating multiple historical dimensions, in particular the economic, political, and diplomatic. From the 1960s onwards, Jorge Borges de Macedo played a significant role in the study of Portuguese chroniclers and historians such as Damião de Góis, Pedro de Mariz, Rebelo da Silva, Alberto Sampaio, and 20th-century historians who had faded into obscurity for various reasons, such as Lúcio de Azevedo, Marcelo Caetano, and Ruben Andersen Leitão.

Macedo considered the historical thought of these authors within the broader context of the society in which they operated, taking into account their education, social networks, political connections, mentalities, relationships with cultural traditions, and conceptual innovations. It is notable that his inaugural lecture as a candidate for a full professorship focused precisely on Portuguese historiography and historians (*Historiografia Portuguesa do Século XIX: Aspectos Fundamentais* [19th Century Portuguese Historiography: Fundamental Aspects], 1967). He did not disregard major historians like Herculano and Jaime Cortesão. Nor did he neglect comprehensive studies in which he sought to examine the historiographical works of individual authors (1995) or to explore how, over the long term, British historiography interpreted the history of Portugal (1974). The differentiated characterisation of genres, the intentionality behind the works, and the audiences they targeted were key lines of study considered by this historian.

The 1960s and 1970s, during which the *Dicionário de História de Portugal* [History of Portugal Dictionary] (1963-71), under Joel Serrão was pioneering new horizons, represent a significant period of renewal and expansion of knowledge concerning substantial changes in the writing of history in Portugal. Other authors sought to outline general perspectives on Portuguese historiography: Veríssimo Serrão compiled useful information on authors, the contents of their works, and historiographical trends. Meanwhile, Oliveira Marques published an initial anthology of Portuguese historiography (1974-75), which has remained a tool of reference. This work, preceded by a comprehensive and well-documented characterisation of trends, establishes connections with European historiographical currents and figures, such as the *Annales* group, highlighting the influence of Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch on the “Lisbon school” – a debatable concept since, in truth, multiple trends coexisted within the only school at the time in the capital where history was studied, the Faculty of Arts of Lisbon. In universities and the Portuguese Academy of History, the history of history occupied a significant place, marked by conferences and the publication of their respective proceedings: *A historiografia portuguesa anterior a Herculano* [Portuguese historiography prior to Herculano] (1977), *Alexandre Herculano à luz do nosso tempo* [Alexandre Herculano in the light of our times] (1977), and *Historiografia Portuguesa de Herculano a 1950* [Portuguese historiography of Herculano to 1950] (1978). Even after the April 25th Revolution, during a period of change and around the centennial of Herculano's death (1977) and thereafter, the historian's presence remained vibrant, with a significant portion of his work being republished and various studies dedicated to him.



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

The influence of French historiography in Portugal was notable from the liberal revolution and especially until the 1980s: prominent figures include Ferdinand Denis, the author of a swiftly translated History of Portugal, along with Thierry, Guizot, Michelet, Fustel de Coulanges, and Renan (to name just a few). In addition to this presence was the influence of German scholars (Schaefer, Niebuhr, Mommsen, among others). Beyond Herculano's work and the aforementioned *Dicionário de História de Portugal* (the latter marked by concepts linked to the *Annales*), a more recent example of the Francophone imprint should be noted: from the 1980s, as in France, a reevaluation of the issues surrounding memories emerged, reconsidering Maurice Halbwachs' conceptualisation through the lens of Pierre Nora's *lieux de mémoire*. The European commemorations of the bicentennial of the French Revolution (1989), Christopher Columbus's voyage (1992), and the Portuguese Discoveries (1986–2002), accompanied by major international exhibitions, scientific meetings, and publications of a highly varied nature, decisively contributed to reviving historical reflection on national memory, commemorative practices, and other ritualisations developed during that period. Shortly after Portugal and Spain joined the European Economic Community (1986), the role of nation-states in Europe was being redrawn in the wake of the fall of the Berlin Wall, the disintegration of the USSR, and the fragmentation of Yugoslavia. The viability of nation-states in a supposedly post-national era was being debated. Inevitably, the themes of national memory and oblivion also came into focus. Contributing to this discourse was the growing study of history and the memories associated with Nazism and Stalinism. Alongside the prominent influence of French historical culture in Portugal, the influence of Anglo-Saxon historiographies significantly expanded. This was still an underexplored area and required consideration of the numerous works undertaken, particularly from the 1960s onwards, by British and American scholars. These studies addressed not only the Portuguese colonial empire but also specific periods in the nation's historical trajectory (such as Pombalism, the First Republic, and the *Estado Novo*). Additionally, the so-called New Economic History, emerging from the 1980s, inspired a re-examination of the issues surrounding Portuguese economic underdevelopment.

However, in the field of the history of history, it was only in the following decade that a third stage can be identified, marked by a significant broadening of themes and a methodological renewal in multiple directions. This period coincided with a felt need, on a broader historical level, to develop new syntheses. This imperative was reflected in the publication—or initiation of the publication—of three new general histories of Portugal, directed by Joel Serrão and Oliveira Marques, José Mattoso, and João Medina. Sectoral critical assessments were conducted, ranging from prehistoric archaeology to the early 20th century (*La recherche en Histoire du Portugal*, 1989). Interest in the relationships between history and ideology, concepts of history, the teaching of history across different levels of the educational system, the ritualisation of historical memory—with a particular focus on commemorations—journalism, and the institutions associated with historians, such as universities, academies, other scientific societies, and archives, expanded the scope for observing and understanding historical thought within a broader framework. A significant collective work, (L. R. Torgal, J. M. Amado Mendes, and F. Catroga, *História da História em Portugal: séculos XIX e XX* [History of History in



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

Portugal: 19th and 20th centuries]) published in 1996, maintained a central focus on historical thought while closely linking it to all these fields and incorporating new research.

Other sectoral perspectives were enriching this field of study: views on overseas historiography published as part of the Portuguese Discoveries commemorations, medieval historiography, and the presence of the Middle Ages in universities, a gender study on women historians in the latter half of the 20th century—using quantitative methods—on the specific field of rural history, or biographies of historians (on Herculano or Teixeira da Mota). Partial studies were also being produced on historiography dedicated to the First Republic, the Estado Novo, or, more generally, on the historiographies produced in these periods after the April 25th revolution of 1974, in some cases using quantitative methods.

A valuable tool contributed to some of these works: the *Repertório bibliográfico da historiografia portuguesa* [Bibliographic Repertoire of Portuguese Historiography]1974-1994 (1995), which covered a total of 651 authors, allowing for a prosopographical study of this universe. In contrast to the situation during the dictatorship, after the April 25th revolution of 1974, Portuguese historians predominantly began studying contemporary times—a trend that aligned with their European counterparts. A significant portion of these "institutionalised" historians—linked to higher education—were women (35%). The themes of Historiography, Methodology, and Theory of History experienced a noticeable increase (M.H. Cruz Coelho, "Os historiadores e a historiografia portuguesa no pós-25 de Abril" ["Historians and Portuguese Historiography after the 25th of April Revolution"], pp.350-361). Another survey published in 1999 confirmed this preference for contemporary topics in catalogued books (1986-96) and doctoral theses (1986-97), also showing the overwhelming dominance of national history themes (85.3%) compared to the limited interest in the history of other countries, including Brazil and African peoples (V. Alexandre, *Perfil da investigação...*[Research Profile...] 1999, 9-11). This contrasts with the preference British historians have given to foreign history topics and aligns the Portuguese case with Italian and French historiographies (more focused on their respective national histories) (R.J. Evans, *Cosmopolitan Islanders...* 2009, pp.12-13 and C. Charle, *Homo Historicus*, 2013, pp.31-34). It should be noted, however, that many Portuguese historians have proven to be well-informed about other national histories, often relying on sources and bibliographies in languages other than their own. Meanwhile, the preparatory work for a European project by the European Science Foundation enabled the development of statistics on Portuguese historians, also taking into account the institutions to which they were associated (associations, archives, museums), and partially disclosing the general results. ("Portugal", *Atlas of European Historiography*, pp.122-124).

Since the 1990s, doctoral theses have been developed covering highly variable territories and chronologies: the study of the dissemination system of historiography, of the reception, and appropriation of historical thought in the 19th century, as well as a contribution to the prosopography of its disseminators; a reinvention of the image and political and historical thought of the most influential historians and political thinkers of that era by their contemporaries and by posterity—Herculano and Oliveira Martins—the memory



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

constructed by liberalism historians in Portugal—or institutions that sponsored historical studies—such as the Royal Academy of History.

More recently, comparative studies have been undertaken within well-defined scopes. Considering parameters such as nation, race, class, religion, and gender, works of comparative history between the history of history in Portugal and Brazil (1945-2000) and between Portuguese and Spanish historiography have been produced, examining the thoughts of two historians, one Portuguese (Oliveira Martins), the other Spanish (Rafael Altamira), based on concepts of the history of civilisation. Initial steps have been taken to gain further insights into the intellectual and experiential relationships between Portuguese historians and their counterparts from other nations, in particular Brazilians, Spaniards, the French, and English—such as Edgar Prestage and Charles Boxer. However, the study of these transnational cultural relationships needs to be expanded. Cases such as those of 19th-century figures Ferdinand Denis and Heinrich Schaefer are of great significance, as their general histories of Portugal enjoyed widespread readership in the country. The study of exiles is essential—consider the early proponents of liberalism in Portugal, who, at the end of the Ancien Regime, sought refuge in London (e.g., José Liberato and Rocha Loureiro), or the well-known case of the Viscount of Santarém, who, following the victory of the liberal regime in 1834, relocated to Paris, where he conducted important work on the history of the Discoveries and cartography. Another notable figure is Jaime Cortesão, admired by Fernand Braudel (“Au Portugal: avant et après les grandes découvertes,” *Annales E.S.C.*, vol. IV, 1949, pp. 193–196), who was exiled in Brazil for many years (1940–58). Studies already exist on the period before this historian of the Discoveries entered his second exile, as well as on Fidelino de Figueiredo (up to 1927). However, further work is needed to extend these studies to the period after these intellectuals left Portugal, particularly following the establishment of the Military Dictatorship or, in Cortesão's case, during World War II.

It is essential to explore the exchange of ideas with other historians, both national and international, as well as the intertextualities with other historiographical works, for instance, the reception of the *Annales* in Portugal. The *Dicionário de Historiadores Portugueses* [Dictionary of Portuguese Historians](1779-1974) will undoubtedly contribute to deepening the understanding of these authors' thoughts and the relationship between history and other human sciences. The relationship between Brazilian anthropologist Gilberto Freyre and Portuguese historical culture is an example worth exploring further.

The ways in which historians assert and legitimise themselves is an aspect that has been overlooked in case studies and historiographical research. How and where did they begin their research? What was the significance of periodicals in their debut and establishment as authors? In which social networks were they embedded? To which intellectual genealogies did they lay claim? As heirs and producers of historical memory, some historians also constructed their own memories, writing about their formative years, their university peers, and their craft. Some participated in surveys and interviews (from 1988, under the title *Espelho de Clío*, the journal *Ler História* [Reading History] began publishing a series of Portuguese historians). Others, as



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

noted, produced sectoral assessments of Portuguese historiography in various fields of study. It is also important to consider how a historian self-identifies. How does a historian represent their place within the national and European historiographical landscape? Are they part of a network? What intellectual genealogy do they claim for themselves? Among 20th-century Portuguese historians, two cases are exemplary in this respect. Vitorino Magalhães Godinho (1918–2011) occupies a distinctive position in the Portuguese historiography of his time, not least because of how he self-identified. In one of his most influential books, Godinho detailed in his curriculum the Portuguese and foreign authors who had influenced his intellectual formation: António Sérgio, Jaime Cortesão, Duarte Leite, and Veiga Simões (Portuguese) and, "among the foreigners, Lucien Febvre, Fernand Braudel, Georges Gurvitch, Marcel Bataillon, and the work of Marc Bloch". He established the theoretical focus of his work: "...to contribute to forging a historical and structuralist methodology rooted in Marx and in the intellectual current of the 'Annales' school of Bloch and Febvre" (*Estrutura da antiga sociedade portuguesa* [Structure of the former Portuguese society] 1977, p. 5). He formulated critical reflections on the Faculty from which he had earned his degree in History and Philosophy (where he also taught for a brief period from 1942 to 1944) and on other academic and research environments where he worked.

The enunciation marks used (or avoided) by historians is another point of interest. In the case of Magalhães Godinho, the use of the majestic plural to refer to himself is immediately evident (he even uses the designation "we ourselves"). In other historians, personal pronouns are erased, and the historical discourse appears to legitimise itself autonomously— as seen with Jorge Borges de Macedo.

Another unexplored dimension is the fixation on material supports of the memory of historians in urban statuary, painting and decorative arts, in toponymy, plaques, school names, stamps, coins, and illustrated postcards. It would be worthwhile to conduct a historically situated survey not only for Lisbon, Porto, Coimbra, Braga, and Setúbal but also in provincial urban centres where erudite and self-taught historians were represented and contributed to broadening and disseminating knowledge of local memories. It is significant, for example, that the public statues of the greatest figures of 19th-century historiography, Herculano, and Oliveira Martins, date back to the 1950s.

Finally, the near absence of debates in the field of the history of historiography in recent decades should be noted. Yet during the *Estado Novo*, despite censorship and the absence of freedom of expression, there were frequent historical controversies, many sparked by essayists—such as António Sérgio. Divergent interpretations regarding key moments in national history were confronted: for example, on the formation of Portugal, the nature of the 1383 revolution, the early stages of Portuguese expansion, the Inquisition, the liberal revolution, and the industrial revolution. There were disagreements in these debates regarding the use of key concepts such as *revolution*, *social class*, *decadence*, *underdevelopment*, or *foreign influence*. However, in the field of the history of historiography, debates were almost non-existent. Two exceptions should be noted: the extensive critique by J. Barradas de Carvalho of A. José Saraiva's book on Alexandre Herculano



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

(republished in J. Barradas de Carvalho, , *As ideias políticas e sociais de Alexandre Herculano* [The political and social ideas of Alexandre Herculano] 1971, pp.235-256) and the critique by A. Borges Coelho of V. Magalhães Godinho regarding the latter's *Ensaio II* [Essays II], focusing, among other factors, on periodisation and the concept of a historical and geographical complex (Questionar a História I [Questioning History I], 1983 [1970], pp.287-303). Divergent interpretations emerged—often without citing the names of authors with whom there was disagreement—but controversies among historians were infrequent and circumstantial.

What caused this scarcity of public debate? This issue deserves an in-depth study that is yet to be conducted (as also some controversies in the broader field of history remain unstudied). However, it may be assumed that it is linked to the long absence of freedom of expression in Portugal, the marginalisation of critical thought, the limited size of the historian community, and its focus on national history, as noted earlier. It is also linked to the historians' affiliation with institutions and networks of varying degrees of exclusivity. Sometimes, criticism was perceived as a personal attack. Conceptions of history and concepts were rarely discussed. Some criticism was reduced to identifying silences in the reference to authors. But since the early years of this new century, signs of change have emerged in both public criticism and the internationalisation of historians. Undeniable is the continuity of a self-critical sense among history professionals.

References: ALEXANDRE, V. *Perfil da investigação científica em Portugal. História*, Lisboa, MCT-FCT-OCT, 1999; ARRUDA, J.J e TENGARRINHA, J.M. *Historiografia luso-brasileira contemporânea*, Bauru, EDUSC,1999; BETHENCOURT, F. e CURTO, D. R. (Eds), *A memória da nação*, Lisboa, Sá da Costa, 1991; BOXER, Charles, "Some considerations on Portuguese Colonial Historiography", *Opera Minora* (ed. D.R.Curto), Lisboa, Fundação Oriente, 2002, vol.3, 5-27; BRAUDEL, F., "Au Portugal: avant et après les grandes découvertes", *Annales E.S.C.*, vol.IV, 1949, pp. 192-197; BRISSOS, José "Liberalismo: ideologia e história – lendo Jorge Borges de Macedo", *Jorge Borges de Macedo: saber continuar* (MACEDO, Jorge Braga de ed.), Lisboa, MNE/ID, 2005 pp.201-226; Id., "A cultura política liberal portuguesa do século XIX: a perspectiva de Jorge Borges de Macedo", *Nove ensaios na tradição de Jorge Borges de Macedo* (MACEDO, Jorge Braga de et al eds.), Lisboa, Tribuna da História, 2009, pp.217-225; BRITO, Ricardo de, *A Sociedade Portuguesa de Estudos Históricos no contexto historiográfico nacional (1911-1928)*, Lisboa, FLUL, 2012; CARVALHO, J.Barradas de, *As ideias políticas e sociais de Alexandre Herculano*, Lisboa, Seara Nova, 1971 [1ª ed. 1949], Id., *Da história-crónica à história-ciência*, Lisboa, L. Horizonte, s.d. [1972], pp. 90-91; CATROGA, F., *Memória, história e historiografia*, Coimbra, Quarteto, 2001; Id., *Os passos do homem no restolho do tempo. Memória e fim do fim da história*, Coimbra, Almedina, 2009; COELHO, A.Borges, *Questionar a História I*, Lisboa, Caminho, 1983 [1970], pp. 287-303; COELHO, M. H. da Cruz, "A história medieval portuguesa – caminhos percorridos e a percorrer", *Media Actas. Boletim do Núcleo de História Medieval, Universidade dos Açores*, Ponta Delgada, s.n., 1990, pp.1-17; Id., "Balanço sobre a história rural produzida em Portugal nas últimas décadas", *História. Revista do Departamento de História*,



DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

Universidade Federal de Goiás, 1997, vol. II, pp. 7-32; Id., "Os historiadores e a historiografia portuguesa no pós-25 de Abril", *Portogallo mediterraneo* (FONSECA, L. Adão da e CADEDDU, M.E. eds.), Caligari, Instituto Sui Rapporti Italo-Iberici, 2001, pp. 345-373; CORREIA, H., *Fidelino de Figueiredo: na cultura histórica e política do seu tempo, 1889-1927*, Lisboa, FLUL, 2002 [policopiado]; CUNHA, Norberto Ferreira da, *Elites e académicos na cultura portuguesa stecentista*, Lisboa, INCM, 2006; CURTO, D. Ramada, "O atraso historiográfico português", BOXER Charles, *Opera Minora* (ed. D.R. Curto), Lisboa, Fundação Oriente, 2002, vol. 3. XIII-XXV; *Dicionário de Historiadores Portugueses* (coorden. MATOS, Sérgio Campos) <http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/index.htm>; FIGUEIREDO, Fidelino de, *Historiografia portuguesa do século XX*, Separata da *Revista de História*, São Paulo, Out.-Dez., 1954, pp.; EVANS, R., *Cosmopolitan Islanders. British historians and the European Continent*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009; GODINHO, V. Magalhães *Estrutura da antiga sociedade portuguesa*, 3ª ed., Lisboa, Arcádia, 1977; Id., *Comemorações e história*, Lisboa, Seara Nova, 1947; *Ensaio III*, Lisboa, Sá da Costa, 1971 [1955]; HERCULANO, A. "Historiadores portugueses", *Opúsculos IV* (Jorge Custódio e J.M. Garcia eds), Lisboa, Presença, 1985 [1840], pp. 172-188; *A historiografia portuguesa anterior a Herculano*, Lisboa, Academia Portuguesa de História, 1977; *Alexandre Herculano à luz do nosso tempo*, Lisboa, Academia Portuguesa de História, 1977, e *Historiografia Portuguesa de Herculano a 1950*, Lisboa, Academia Portuguesa de História, 1978; JOÃO, M.I., *Memória e Império. Comemorações em Portugal (1880-1960)*, Lisboa, FCG/FCT, 2004; HESPANHA, António "Historiografia jurídica e política do direito (Portugal, 1900-50)" *Análise Social*, vol. XVIII (72-73-74), 1982-3.º-4.º-5.º, 795-812; HOMEM, A.L. Carvalho, "Mulheres historiadoras na Portugal das últimas décadas (anos 50/anos 90)", *Actas dos Cursos Internacionais de Verão de Cascais* (Cascais: CMC, 1997) 83-98; MACEDO, J. Borges de "A historiografia britânica sobre Portugal", *Palestra*, nº42, 1973, 7-43; Id., *Alexandre Herculano, polémica e mensagem*, Lisboa, Bertrand, 1980; Id., *Da história ao documento. Do documento à história*, Lisboa, ANTT, 1995; MARQUES, A.H. de Oliveira, *Antologia da historiografia portuguesa*, Lisboa, Pub. Europa-América, 1974-75, 2 vols., MARTINS, J.P. Oliveira, "Notas sobre a historiografia em Portugal", *História de Portugal*, Lisboa, PAMP, 1942, pp. 321-330; MATOS, A. Teodoro de e TOMÁS, L.F. (Eds.), *Vinte anos de historiografia ultramarina portuguesa 1972-1992*, Lisboa, s.n., 1993; MATOS, S. Campos, *Historiografia e memória nacional no Portugal do século XIX*, Lisboa, Colibri, 1998; Id., "Historiografia e memória social (1945-2000): balanço e perspectivas futuras", *Brasil-Portugal: História, agenda para o milénio* (Ed. ARRUDA, J.J. e FONSECA, L. Adão), São Paulo: EDUSC, 2001, pp. 537-558; MATOS, S. Campos e MOTA ALVAREZ, D., "Portuguese and Spanish historiographies – proximity and distance", *The Contested Nation. Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories* (Eds. BERGER, S. e LORENZ, C.), Londres, Palgrave MacMillan, 2008, pp. 339-366; MATOS, S. Campos e FREITAS, J. "Portugal", *Atlas of European Historiography. The making of a profession 1800-2005* (Ed. Ilaria Porciani e Lutz Raphael), Londres, Palgrave Macmillan/European Science Foundation, 2010, pp. 122-124; MATTOSO, J. (dir.) *The Historiography of medieval Portugal c.1950-2010*, Lisboa, IEM, 2011; MAURÍCIO, C., *Imagens de*

DICIONÁRIO DE HISTORIADORES PORTUGUESES

DA ACADEMIA REAL DAS CIÊNCIAS AO FINAL DO ESTADO NOVO

<http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/>

Alexandre Herculano na cultura portuguesa, Lisboa, s.n.,1987; Id., "História", *Dicionário de História de Portugal* (A.Barreto and M.F Mónica eds), Porto: Figueirinhas, 1999 vol.8, pp.172-176; Id., *A invenção de Oliveira Martins: política, historiografia e identidade nacional no Portugal*, Lisboa, INCM; 2005; MOTA, I.Ferreira da *A Academia Real da História : os intelectuais, o poder cultural e o poder monárquico no séc. XVIII*, Coimbra, Minerva, 2003; NÚÑEZ SEIXAS, X.M., "History of Civilization: transnational or post-Imperial? Some Iberian perspectives (1870-1930)", *Nationalizing the Past. Historians as Nation Builders in Modern Europe* (Ed. S. Berger e C.Lorenz) Londres, Palgrave MacMillan, 2010, pp.384-403; PINA, A.M., *A quimera do ouro : os intelectuais portugueses e o liberalismo*, Oeiras, Celta, 2003; PEIRÓ MARTÍN, I., "Historia de la historia y memoria de la profesión: ¿existieron historiadores liberales en la España de Franco?", *Historiografia e memórias* (Ed. MATOS, Sérgio Campos e JOÃO, Maria Isabel), Lisboa, GHFLUL/CEMRI, 2012 pp. 167-211; PEREIRA, Miriam H., "Breve reflexão acerca da historiografia portuguesa no século XX", *Ler História*, nº21, 1991, pp.5-15; PROTÁSIO, D., *O 2º Visconde de Santarém - pensamento histórico e acção política (1820-1855)*, Lisboa, FCSH da Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2008; *Repertório bibliográfico da historiografia portuguesa 1974-1994* (M.H. Cruz Coelho, M.M. Tavares Ribeiro e J. Ramos de Carvalho), Coimbra: Instituto Camões/Universidade de Coimbra, 1995; *Revista Portuguesa de História*, 42, 2011; REGO, A. da Silva, "Tendências da moderna historiografia portuguesa", Sep. das Publicações do XXIII Congresso Luso-Espanhol, Coimbra, 1956; SARAIVA, A. José, *Herculano e o liberalismo em Portugal*, Lisboa, Bertrand, 1977 [1949]; SÉRGIO, A., *Sobre história e historiografia (da "História de Portugal e dos "Opúsculos")*, Lisboa, Tip. da "Seara Nova", 1937, pp. 12-13; SERRA, A. Correia da, "Coup d'oeil sur l'état des sciences et des lettres parmi les Portugais pendant la seconde moitié du siècle dernier", BALBI, Adrien, *Essai statistique sur le Royaume de Portugal et de l'Algarve comparé aux autres états de l'Europe*, Paris: G.Rey et Gravier, 1822, pp. CCCXXXIII-CCCLVIII; SERRÃO, J. "Para uma perspectiva da historiografia portuguesa contemporânea (1800-1940)", MARTINS,Oliveira, *Alexandre Herculano*, Lisboa, Livros Horizonte, s.d., pp.9-41; SERRÃO, J. Veríssimo, *História breve da historiografia portuguesa*, Lisboa, Ed. Verbo, 1962; Id., *A historiografia portuguesa. Doutrina e crítica*, 3 vols., Lisboa, Ed. Verbo, 1972-1974; SILVA, M. Abúndio da, *A história através da história*, Lisboa, Tip.Universal, 1904; SOUSA, J.M. Guedes de, *Vitorino Magalhães Godinho: historiografia e cidadania (1934-47)*, Lisboa, FLUL, 2012. TORRAL, L.R., *História e ideologia*, Coimbra, Livraria Minerva, 1989; TORRAL, L.R., MENDES, J.M. Amado e CATROGA, F., *História da História em Portugal*, Lisboa, Circulo de Leitores, 1996; Id., "History. What History? The struggle for history as a «science»", in *Portuguese Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 11, number 1, pp. 41-54; *Universidade(s) História Memória Perspectivas*, Coimbra, Com. Org do Congresso "História da Universidade", 1991, 5 vols.; TRAVESSA, E., *Jaime Cortesão : política, história e cidadania (1884-1940)*, Porto, Asa, 2004; VAKIL, A. "Prestage, Edgar", *Suplemento ao Dicionário de Eça de Queiroz* (MATOS, A. Campos ed.), Lisboa, Caminho, 2000, pp- 473-478.

Sérgio Campos Matos



SUPPORTED BY:

