

INTERVJU BROJA: prof. dr. sc. Patrick Boucheron

INTERVIEW OF THE ISSUE: Professor Patrick Boucheron, PhD



Povjesničar Patrick Boucheron rođen je 28. listopada 1965. godine u Parizu. Obrazovao se na Lycée Marcelin Berthelot u Saint-Maur-des-Fossés i Lycée Henri IV u Parizu. Diplomirao je na École normale supérieure de lettres et sciences humaines u Saint-Cloudu, na kojem je 1988. godine stekao *agrégation* u povijesti. Doktorirao je povijest na Sveučilištu u Parizu 1994. godine pod mentorstvom Pierrea Touberta, s temom „Urbanizam, politika velikih radova i kneževska vlast u Milanu na kraju srednjeg vijeka“ (fra. orig. *Urbanisme, politique des grands travaux et pouvoir princier à Milan à la fin du Moyen Âge*). Rad profesora Boucheron se usredotočio na urbanu povijest srednovjekovne Italije

Historian Patrick Boucheron was born on October 25th 1965 in Paris. He received education on Lycée Marcelin Berthelot in Saint-Maur-des-Fossés and on Lycée Henri IV in Paris. He graduated on École normale supérieure de lettres et sciences humaines in Saint-Cloud, in which he gained title *agrégation* in history in 1988. He gained a doctorate in history on the University of Paris in 1994 under the mentor Pierre Toubert on the topic entitled ‘Urban planning, big works politics and principate in Milano at the end of the Middle Ages’ (Fr. origin. *Urbanisme, politiques des grands travaux et pouvoir princier à Milan à la fin du Moyen Âge*). The work of professor Boucheron focused on the urban history of medieval Italy and on grandiose display of princely power. That history was therefore considered in all its dimensions, from the most material, which is observed through the economy of wealth and construction techniques, to the most abstract, which is seen through political thought and architectural styles.

From 1994 to 1999 he was a lecturer in medieval history at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, and since 1999 at Panthéon-Sorbonne University. From 2004 to 2009 he was a junior member of the French University Institute (*Institut Universitaire de France*), while in 2012 he was elected as professor of history at the University of Paris. From 2015 to 2020 he was the president of the

i na grandiozni prikaz kneževske moći. Ta se povijest prema tome razmatrala u svim njenim dimenzijama, od one najmaterijalnije, koja se promatra kroz ekonomiju bogatstva i građevinske tehnike, do najapstraktnije, koja se pak gleda kroz političku misao i arhitektonske stilove.

Od 1994. do 1999. godine predavač je srednjovjekovne povijesti na Ecole Normale Supérieure, a od 1999. godine na Sveučilištu Panthéon-Sorbonne. Od 2004. do 2009. godine bio je mlađi član Francuskog sveučilišnog instituta (*Institut Universitaire de France*), dok je 2012. godine izabran za profesora povijesti na Sveučilištu u Parizu. Od 2015. do 2020. obnašao je dužnost predsjednika znanstvenog vijeća Francuske škole u Rimu (*École française de Rome*), dok je od 2018. član znanstvenog vijeća Pariškog instituta za napredne studije (*Institut d'études avancées de Paris*). Od 2015. obavlja profesorsku dužnost na Collège de France te kao nositelj katedre za povijest vlasti u zapadnoj Europi od 13. do 16. stoljeća.

Od 1999. godine je član uredništva časopisa *L'Histoire*, a od 2013. godine znanstvenog vijeća *Rendez-vous de l'Histoire de Blois* i znanstvenog vijeća Muzeja europskih i mediteranskih civilizacija. Od 2008. redovito sudjeluje na *Banquet du Livre de Lagrasse*, kao i na razna ostala javna događanja, festivale i predstave poput *Théâtre national de la Colline* u Parizu, *Festival d'Avignon*, *Grand T* u Nantesu i drugima. Godine 2017. imenovan je predsjednikom znanstvenog odbora za redizajn stalne galerije Nacionalnog muzeja povijesti imigracije.

Profesor Boucheron je aktivan i preko javnih medija. Tako je kreirao radijske emisije „Ljeto s Machiavellijem“ (*Un été avec Machiavel*) i „Stvari o kojima treba razmisliti“ (*Matières à penser*) i televizijsku seriju od 30 dokumentaraca pod naslovom „Kada povijest stvara datume“ (*Quand l'histoire fait dates*), u produkciji Films d'Ici pour Arte za razdoblje od 2018. do 2020. godine. Osim produkcije, uključen je i u izdavaštvo. Tako je od 2010. do 2015. godine

scientific council of the French School in Rome (*École française de Rome*), while since 2018 he became a member of the scientific council of the Paris Institute for Advanced Studies (*Institut d'études avancées de Paris*). Since 2015 he has been a professor at the Collège de France and head of the chair for the history of governing in Western Europe from 13th to 16th century.

Since 1999 he has been a member of the editorial board of *L'Histoire* magazine, and since 2013 a member of the scientific council of *Rendez-vous de l'Histoire de Blois* and the scientific council of the Museum of European and Mediterranean Civilizations. Since 2008, he regularly participates in the *Banquet du Livre de Lagrasse*, as well as in various other public events, festivals and performances such as *Théâtre national de la Colline* in Paris, *Festival d'Avignon*, *Grand T* in Nantes and others. In 2017, he was appointed president of the scientific committee to redesign the permanent gallery of the National Museum of Immigration History. Professor Boucheron is also active in the public media. He created radio shows 'Summer with Machiavelli' (*Un été avec Machiavel*) and 'Things to think about' (*Matières à penser*) and a television series of 30 documentaries entitled 'When history creates dates' (*Quand l'histoire fait dates*), produced by *Films d'Ici Pour Arte* from 2018 to 2020. In addition to production, he is also engaged in publishing. From 2010 to 2015 he was the director of publication on Sorbonne, and since 2018 he is the head of the committee 'History and Humanities' of the National book center, as well as the committee 'Archives, editions, libraries' of the Collège de France. In the end, from 2012 he is the director of collection *L'univers historique* in the edition of Éditions du Seuil.

He is the author of 11 works and 5 edited books. Among them is the work 'France in World: New Global History' (*Histoire mondiale de la France*, 2017), for which professor Boucheron was the chief editor and whose

bio direktor publikacija na Sorbonni, dok od 2018. godine predsjedava povjerenstvom „Povijest i humanističke znanosti“ Nacionalnog centra za knjigu, kao i povjerenstvom „Arhivi, izdanja, knjižnice“ Collège de France. Na koncu svega, od 2012. je godine direktor zbirke *L'univers historique* u izdanju Éditions du Seuil.

Autor je 11 djela i 5 uređivačkih knjiga. Među njima se ističe djelo „Francuska u svijetu: nova globalna povijest“ (*Histoire mondiale de la France*, 2017.), za koju je profesor Boucheron bio glavni urednik, a čijem su sadržaju doprinjela čak 122 povjesničara. Drugo je djelo znano pod naslovom „Machiavelli. Čovjek koji je naučio ljude čega se trebaju bojati“ (*Un été avec Machiavel*, 2017.). Osim navedenih djela napisao je i „Moć gradnje: urbanističko planiranje i građevinska politika u Milanu (14. – 15. st.)“ (*Le pouvoir de bâtir. Urbanisme et politique édititaire à Milan (XIV^e-XV^e siècles, 1998.)*); „Gradovi Italije: oko 1150. – oko 1340.“ (*Les villes d'Italie (vers 1150 – vers 1340, 2004.)*); „Leonardo i Machiavelli“ (*Léonard et Machiavel, 2008.*); „Budi povjesničar“ (*Faire profession d'historien, 2010.*); „U međuvremenu: razgovori o povijesti (*L'entretemps: conversations sur l'histoire, 2012.*); „Dočarati strah. Siena, 1338. Eseji o političkoj snazi slika“ (*Conjurer la peur. Sienne, 1338. Essai sur la force politique des images, 2013.*); „Arhitektonska elokvencija. Milano, Milano, Urbino, 1470. – 1520.“ (*De l'éloquence architecturale. Milan, Milan, Urbino, 1470-1520, 2014.*); „Što povijest može?“ (*Ce que peut l'histoire, 2016.*); „Kako se pobuniti? (*Comment se révolter?, 2016.*); te „Trag i aura. Posmrtni životi Ambrozija Milanskog (4. – 16. stoljeće) (*La Trace et l'Aura. Vies posthumes d'Ambroise de Milan (IV^e-XVI^e siècle), 2019.*

Profesore Boucheron, zahvaljujemo Vam na prihvaćanju naše pozivnice i na tome što ste pristali odraditi intervju s nama. Velika je čast pričati s Vama. Započnimo ovaj intervju s pitanjem koje se može činiti banalnim, ali koje

content was contributed by 122 historians. Another work is titled 'Machiavelli. Man Who Taught People of What to Be Afraid of' (*Un été avec Machiavel, 2017*). In addition to said works he also wrote, 'The Power of Construction: Urban Planning and Construction Policy in Milano (14th – 15th century)' (*Le pouvoir de bâtir. Urbanisme et politique édititaire à Milan (XIV^e -XV^e siècles, 1998*); 'Cities of Italy: around 1150 - around 1340.' (*Les villes d'Italie (vers 1150 – vers 1340, 2004*); 'Leonardo and Machiavelli' (*Léonard et Machiavel, 2008*); 'Be a Historian' (*Faire profession d'historien, 2010*); 'In the Meantime: Conversations About History' (*L'entretemps: conversations sur l'histoire, 2012*); 'Conjuring fear. Siena, 1338 Essays on the Political Power of Images' (*Conjurer la peur. Sienne, 1338. Essai sur la force politique des images, 2013.*); 'Architectural eloquence. Milano, Milano, Urbino, 1470 – 1520' (*De l'éloquence architecturale. Milan, Milan, Urbino, 1470 – 1520, 2014*); 'What Can History Do?' (*Ce que peut l'histoire, 2016*); 'How to Rebel?' (*Comment se révolter?, 2016*); and 'Trace and aura. Afterlife of Ambrose of Milan (4th – 16th century)' (*La Trace et l'Aura. Vies posthumes d'Ambroise de Milan (IV^e – XVI^e siècle), 2019*).

Professor Boucheron, thank you for accepting our invitation and for giving us the opportunity to do this interview with you. It is a great honour to speak with you. Let's start this interview with a question, which may seem banal, but which we all ask ourselves: what are the reasons that led you to become interested in medieval history?

This question is not so banal, and I thank you for asking it, because in my opinion, one should always ask oneself about the real reasons for one's vocation. For my part, I won't really talk about a vocation, because it was late in life that I decided to become a medievalist. I was first interested in books, in a general way, hesitating between history,

svi postavljamo sebi samima: koji su Vas razlozi doveli do toga da budete zainteresirani za srednjovjekovnu povijest?

Ovo pitanje nije toliko banalno i zahvaljujem Vam što ga postavljate zato što, po mom mišljenju, svatko bi trebao preispitati vlastite razloge zbog kojih se bavi svojom profesijom. Što se tiče mene, ja neću govoriti o svojoj profesiji zbog toga što sam tek kasnije u životu odlučio baviti se srednjovjekovnom poviješću. Prvo su me zanimale općenito knjige, dvoumeći se između povijesti, filozofije i književnosti odabrao sam povijest, kojoj me prije svega privuklo zadovoljstvo putovanja po različitim mjestima - ljubav prema europskim gradovima, recimo, vjerojatno je najistinitija i najtočnija, što je prevagnulo na stranu povijesti. Mislio sam raditi na povijesti Francuske revolucije, a onda sam otputovao u Italiju i to me natjeralo da to postane moj predmet proučavanja. Tako sam počeo raditi na povijesti Milana u kasnom srednjem vijeku. Govoreći istinu, također moram priznati da me povijest srednjeg vijeka zanimala u to vrijeme jer sam otkrio da nudi mnogo slobode, između oskudice antičkih izvora i preplavljenosti suvremenim izvorima, u radu s temom što god se s njom htjelo učiniti, od sociologije do antropologije. Čitao sam Georgesa Dubya, Jacquesa Le Goffa, Petera Browna, ali i Umberta Eca i Bronislawa Geremeka, te u njima pronašao majstore slobode.

Što su Vam bili izvori za inspiraciju u Vašem poslu povjesničara? Je li povijest doista neiscrpno vrelo za razmatranje i preispitivanje ustaljenih teza?

Ne vjerujem da je povijest neiscrpno vrelo znanja. Čak mislim da je nedovoljno. Ako bih nazvao svoje uvodno predavanje na College de France „Što povijest može?“, napravio bih to zato što znam da povijest ne

philosophy and literature, and what brought me to history was first of all the pleasure of travelling through places - a love of European cities, let's say, is probably the truest, the most accurate, of my desire for history. I thought to work on the history of the French Revolution, and then I travelled to Italy and that made me want to make it my subject of study. So I started to work on the history of Milan at the end of the Middle Ages. To tell the truth, I must also admit that the history of the Middle Ages interested me at that time because I found that it offered a lot of freedom, between the scarcity of ancient sources and the overflow of the contemporary, to do with its subject what one wished to do with it, between sociology and anthropology. I read Georges Duby, Jacques Le Goff, Peter Brown, but also Umberto Eco and Bronislaw Geremek, and I found there masters of freedom.

What have been your sources of inspiration in your work as a historian? Is history really an inexhaustible source for considering and re-examining established theses?

*I do not believe that history is an inexhaustible source of knowledge. I even think it is insufficient. If I entitled my inaugural lecture at the Collège de France *Ce que peut l'histoire*, it is because I know that it cannot do everything. For my part, I like the discipline of history when it admits its doubts, weaknesses and uncertainties with sufficient frankness. This is why what brought me to history was philosophy, and in particular the work of Michel Foucault. It may seem strange to arrive at history by reading books that are not really history books, but this allowed me to develop a somewhat undisciplined relationship with historical work, which does not mean, and it is very important to emphasize this, that it is based on a rigorous method that allows one to defend a specific regime of*

može sve. Što se mene tiče, ja volim disciplinu povijesti kada dovoljno iskreno prizna svoje sumnje, slabosti i nesigurnosti. Ovo je razlog tome što me povijesti privukla filozofija, osobito radovi Michela Foucaulta. Možda izgleda čudno što su me povijesti privukle knjige koje ustvari nisu o povijesti, ali to mi je omogućilo da razvijem pomalo nediscipliniran odnos prema povijesnom radu, što ne znači, a to je vrlo važno naglasiti, da se temelji na rigoroznim metodama koje omogućuju obranu određenih istina. Ovako možemo uvjeriti naše suvremenike o onom što im se čini kao kontradikcija: da, povijest se konstantno preispituje, a da to nije slučaj onda ne bismo trebali povjesničare. No, isto tako, povjesničari su promicatelji i govornici istine.

U svom uvodnom predavanju na College de Franceu iz 2015. godine naslova „Za što je povijest sposobna?“ govorili ste o gomilanju prošlosti čiji nam „aktivni slojevi“ pomažu da razumijemo „političku stvarnost današnjice“. Ne otežava li konstantna akumulacija takvih „slojeva“ posao povjesničarima? I koje bi bile granice „filtriranja“ ovih „slojeva“ u povijesnom istraživanju, za interpretaciju ili reinterpretaciju povijesnih činjenica?

Ako govorimo o aktivnim slojevima kojima evociramo gomilanje prošlosti, ako prepoznajemo da ono što nazivamo sadašnjošću nije ništa drugo nego akumulirana prošlost, tada usvajamo arheološku metaforu kojom pričamo o povijesnom znanju. Vjerujem da je to iskonsko. To je bio slučaj kod mene, koji sam prvo sanjao o arheologiji prije nego što sam utvrdio da se bavim poviješću. A zašto? Zato što nas je arheologija naučila da ono što znamo o prošlosti ovisi o onome što pronađemo u sadašnjosti. Ovo je istina za povijesne ostatke, koji su naši suvremenici. Ali je isto tako istina i za tekstove, za koje se moramo zapitati iz kojih su

truth. This is how we can reassure our contemporaries about what seems to them to be a contradiction: yes, history is constantly being rewritten, and if this were not the case we would not need historians. But yes, these historians also speak the truth.

In your inaugural lecture in 2015 at the Collège de France entitled *De quoi l'histoire est-elle capable*, you spoke of the accumulated past whose 'active layers' help us to understand 'the political reality of today'. Doesn't the constant accumulation of such "layers" make the work of historians more difficult? And what would be the limits of "filtering" these different "layers" for historical research, in the interpretation (or reinterpretation) of historical facts?

If we speak of active layers to evoke the accumulation of the past, if we recognize that what we call the present is nothing but accumulated past, then we adopt an archaeological metaphor to speak of historical knowledge. I believe it to be primordial. It was for me, who first dreamt of archaeology before claiming to do history. And why? Because what archaeology teaches us is that we only know about the past what is emerging in our present. This is true of the remains, which are our contemporaries. But it is also true of texts, which we must always ask ourselves why they have been preserved. This is why the question of memory is, in my opinion, inseparable from that of history. That is why we must always ask ourselves about the conditions of memory.

You mentioned in the same lecture the characteristics of power and of the "symbolic revolution" initiated by the Church and taken up by the laity from the 13th to the 16th century. During this period, we can see that Western Europe took a big step towards the

razloga oni sačuvani. Zbog toga je sjećanje, po meni, neodvojivo od povijesti. Zbog toga se stalno moramo pitati o uvjetima sjećanja.

Na istom predavanju ste spomenuli karakteristike moći i „simbolične revolucije“ koju je započela Crkva, a provodili su ju laici od 13. do 16. stoljeća. U ovom periodu je zapadna Europa napravila veliki korak prema razvoju obrazovanja, znanosti, institucija i umjetnosti. No, bio je to također period sa brojnim krizama između ovozemaljske moći kraljevskoga dvora i duhovne moći Crkve utjelovljena u papi. U kojoj se mjeri ova „simbolična revolucija“ može smatrati prvom fazom sekularizacije između ovozemaljske i duhovne moći?

U pravu ste. Za mene, snaga Gregorijanskih reformi dolazi od toga da one nisu uspjele. Nisu uspjele uspostaviti teološko-politički oblik vladavine u Europi. Ono što se razvilo umjesto toga bila je velika raznolikost ovlasti koju osobno ne mogu ograničiti na suverenitet samih država. I također ovlasti gradova, ali i država i ruralnih zajednica. To je razlog zašto možemo u isto vrijeme pričati o političkoj nestabilnosti i kulturnoj kreativnosti. Po meni, inventivnost srednjeg vijeka jest ono što nas danas interesira, sve dok odbijamo imati čisto genealoški ili identitetski odnos s njim.

U Vašoj knjizi, „Machiavelli: Umjetnost poučavanja ljudi čega da se boje“, prikazujete Machiavellia kao neopravdano ocrnjenu osobu. Također pokazujete da su neke njegove političke misli i danas relevantne. Mislite li da ste, barem djelomično, uspjeli uspostaviti neku pozitivniju sliku Machiavellia?

Machiavelli ne treba mene da uspostavim pozitivniju sliku o njemu. Odavno je

development of education, science, institutions and arts. But it was also a period of many political crises between the temporal power of the princes and the spiritual power of the Church, embodied by the Pope. To what extent can this ‘symbolic revolution’ be considered as a first phase of secularisation between the temporal and spiritual powers?

You are right. For me, the strength of the Gregorian reform comes from the fact that it failed. It failed to impose a theological-political type of power in Europe. What developed instead was a great diversity of powers that I do not accept to limit to the sovereignty of the states. And also the powers of cities, but also of states and rural communities for example. This is why we can think of political instability and cultural creativity at the same time. For me, the inventiveness of the Middle Ages, its interest for us today, as long as we refuse to have a purely genealogical or identity-based relationship with it.

In your book Machiavelli: The Art of Teaching People What to Fear, you present Machiavelli as an unjustly maligned person. You also point out that his political thoughts are still relevant today. Do you think you have succeeded in rehabilitating a more positive image of Machiavelli, at least partially?

Machiavelli does not need me to rehabilitate him. It has long been known that Machiavellianism is a caricature, or at least an invention of the anti-Machiavellians. After his death in 1527, many people, especially the Jesuits, wanted to get rid of the man they could not forgive for having detached politics from common morality. They therefore reduced his philosophy of political action to a miserable little pile of tricks. It is obviously much more than that, and that is why we have been rereading Machiavelli ever since. As I often do, I see my work

već poznato da je makijevalizam karikatura ili izmišljotina anti-makijavelista. Nakon njegove smrti 1527. godine, mnogi ljudi, osobito jezuiti, željeli su se riješiti čovjeka kojemu nisu mogli oprostiti činjenicu da je odvojio politiku od morala. Stoga su smanjili njegovu filozofiju političkog djelovanja na bijednu malu hrpu trikova. Očigledno je Machiavelli puno više od toga, a to je i razlog zašto mu se od tada stalno vraćamo. Često svoj zadatak povjesničara vidim kao dvostruku zadaću. Prvi je vratiti Machiavellija u njegovo vrijeme, a drugi je ne ograničiti ga razmatranjem njegove moći na aktualnosti. Čitati Machiavellija danas znači čitati sve one koji ga interpretiraju u sadašnjosti.

U današnjem svijetu postoji prava hijerarhija moći između svjetskih država. Najmoćnije države svijeta poput SAD-a i Kine se miješaju na dnevnoj bazi u poslove država širom svijeta, često na štetu manjih država i njihova stanovništva. Nalazimo li slične situacije u srednjovjekovnoj Europi? Koje su se poluge mogle koristiti kako bi se stavio pritisak na države i vlade?

Ne znam je li ikada postojala takva monopolizacija moći u svijetu. Na početku 16. stoljeća, u vrijeme Machiavellia kojega ste spomenuli, Francuska se može smatrati najmoćnijom državom svijeta, dok je prije toga bila prisutna ravnoteža moći. To je slučaj u Italiji u 15. stoljeću, što je osobito važno za mene. Milano, Venecija, Firenca, Rim i Napulj su bili međusobno suparnici, ali su i ovisili jedni o drugima – nitko od njih nije mogao sam ujediniti Italiju, ali je svatko mogao spriječiti onog drugoga da to učini. U tom su kontekstu oblici pregovaranja i institucije poput stalnih veleposlanstva jedne države u drugoj bili osmišljeni. Možemo također pričati o osnivanju diplomacije – koja također podrazumijeva upotrebu jezika

as a historian as a twofold task. The first is to bring Machiavelli back into his time, the second is not to confine him by considering his power of actualisation. To read Machiavelli today is therefore to read all the readers who have interpreted him in the present.

In today's world, there is a real hierarchy of power between states. Super-power states, such as the United States and China, interfere in all parts of the world on a daily basis, often to the detriment of smaller states and their populations. Do we find similar situations in the Middle Ages in Europe? What levers could be used to put pressure on states or governments?

I don't know if there has ever been such a monopolisation of power in history. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, at the time of Machiavelli to whom you referred, the "great monarchy of France" could hold this role of superpower, but before that, what prevailed was the balance of power. This is the case in fifteenth-century Italy, which is of particular interest to me. Milan, Venice, Florence, Rome and Naples were competing but interdependent states - none was able to unify Italy on its own, but each could prevent the others from doing so. It was in this context that forms of negotiation and institutions such as the permanent embassy of one state in another were invented. We can even talk about the invention of diplomacy - which also implies the use of a common language of negotiation. It is in this sense that there is an Italian laboratory: modern Europe will be an Italy of the 15th century in a big way.

Why does the expression "medieval" have such a negative connotation? Are the incessant wars between feudal lords, the massacres, the epidemics that run through this

pregovora. U tom smislu postoji talijanski laboratorij: moderna Europa će uvelike biti slična Italiji iz 15. stoljeća.

Zašto izraz „srednjovjekovni“ ima tako negativan prizvuk? Jesu li neprekidni ratovi između feudalaca, masakri i epidemije bolesti koje su bile u tom periodu, jedino objašnjenje za to popularno mišljenje? Zašto? Ima li ikakve istine u toj izreci?

To je izraz koji iritira medievaliste i s pravom ste ga istaknuli. Oni nastoje isticati pozitivne aspekte tog perioda. Na primjer, nije uopće očito da je razina nasilja bila veća u 13. stoljeću u odnosu na 16. stoljeće kada su bili aktualni vjerski ratovi i kolonijalni masakri. Što se tiče rata, on je definitivno sredstvo za izgradnju država te je zbog toga teško tvrditi da je manje prisutan kod Luja XIV. ili Napoleona u odnosu na Luja IX. Svetog. No, nesumnjivo je uzaludno pokušavati suprostaviti svijetlu i tamnu legendu o povijesti, odnosno braniti srednji vijek od njegovih protivnika. Sami izraz srednji vijek dolazi iz renesanse, kao pejorativni izraz kojim se htio označiti period između antike i modernog doba.

U Hrvatskoj razvoj kurikuluma povijesti u osnovnim i srednjim školama je predmet intenzivne rasprave već godinama, a u isto vrijeme broj studenata povijesti na sveučilištima je u stalnom padu. Kako objašnjavate ovaj manjak interesa? Kako možemo napraviti mjesta za proučavanje povijesti na sveučilištima uz sve veću popularnost drugih znanosti poput matematike, fizike i informatike? Kakvo je mjesto povijesti u našem modernom društvu gdje vladaju zakoni tržišta i gdje sveprisutna tehnologija stalno napada naš svakodnevni život?

Nisam siguran da Vi i ja imamo isti pogled na stanje stvari. Ne propitujem Vašu tezu da kriza u povijesti postoji – u brojčanosti

period the only explanation for this popular imagination ? Why? Is there any truth in this sentence?

This is an expression that irritates medievalists, and you are right to point it out. They keep on pointing out the positive aspects of the period. For example, it is not at all obvious that the level of violence was higher in the thirteenth century than in the sixteenth century, a time of confessional clashes and colonial massacres. As for war, it is certainly a structural engine of state-building, and consequently it is difficult to argue that it is less present under Louis XIV or Napoleon than under Saint Louis. But it is undoubtedly futile to want to oppose the pink legend to the black legend, to defend a Middle Ages of troubadours against a Middle Ages of crusaders. For the very idea of the Middle Ages is an invention of the Renaissance, a pejorative way of designating an intermediate period between Antiquity and modernity (modern ages).

In Croatia, the development of the history curriculum for primary and secondary schools has been the subject of intense debate for many years, while the number of students studying history in our universities is constantly decreasing. How do you explain this lack of interest? How can we make room for history research in the world of university research in the face of hard sciences such as mathematics, physics, new technologies and computer science? What is the place of history in our modern society where the laws of the market and the omnipresence of technology invade our daily lives?

I'm not sure I see things the same way you do. Not that I question the observation that there is a crisis in history - in student recruitment it is possible, in the political culture of the elites too, but in the interest of the public I don't think so. You speak of a market: there is also a market for public

studenata povijesti pa i u političkoj kulturi elita, ali ne i u interesu javnosti. Govorite o tržištu: postoji i tržište javne povijesti u Europi - tržište knjiga, ali i dokumentarnih filmova, kulturnog turizma i baštine. Općenito govoreći, čini mi se da povijesna kultura ne bi trebala biti suprotna znanstvenoj kulturi – uostalom, i matematičari se s pravom mogu žaliti na krizu po broju studenata na sveučilištima, a štoviše, to nije kompenzirano javnim tržištem. Tako da mi se čini da je u pitanju opća ofenziva protiv znanja, i to ono je na što moramo usmjeriti svoju energiju.

Izrazili ste svoju želju da želite povezati povijest s ljudskim životom. Drugim riječima, vjerujete da se znanje ne može prenositi odvojeno od emocija koje ga prate. Mislite li da bi ovaj pristup mogao pomoći uspostavljanju veze između stanovništva i njegove povijesti? Zašto neki ljudi toliko mrze povijest?

Da, mislim da se povijesno znanje mora rješavati, odnosno da ono ne smije pasti s neba, kao mjerodavno, bestjelesno i nadvijeno znanje. To podrazumijeva igranje na emocije, ali i općenito na pojam iskustva. Za mene ne postoji kontradikcija između prenošenja znanja i dijeljenja emocija. Ali morate uzeti izraz u doslovnom značenju: u francuskom jeziku „emocija“ znači pokret koji može biti poremećen – govorimo o popularnim emocijama u slučaju pobuna. Ovo dokazuje da je za mene povijest zapravo umjetnost emancipacije, koja se prvo obraća osobama individualno, kako bi ih oslobodila kobnosti. Ako neki ljudi kao što kažete mrze povijest, to je zato što je vide kao školu kobnosti, koja im drži predavanja i koja tvrdi da spaja zajednice jednoglasnim vjerovanjima.

Predvodili ste pisanje kolektivnog djela naslova „Globalna povijest Francuske“ u koje

history in Europe - that of books but also of documentary films, cultural tourism and heritage. Generally speaking, it seems to me that historical culture should not be opposed to scientific culture - after all, mathematicians too can rightly complain about a crisis in university recruitment, and moreover it is not compensated for by a public “market”. So it seems to me that what is at stake is rather a general offensive against knowledge, and it is against this that we must arm our energies.

You have stated that you have a desire to link history to human life. In other words, you believe that knowledge cannot be transmitted separately from the emotions that accompany it. Do you think that this approach would help to recreate the link between the population and its history? Why do some people hate history so much?

Yes, I think that historical knowledge must be addressed, that is to say that it must not fall from the sky, as authoritative, disembodied and overhanging knowledge. This implies playing on emotion, but also more generally on the notion of experience. For me, there is no contradiction between transmitting knowledge and sharing an emotion. But you have to take the expression literally: in French, an ‘emotion’ means a movement, which can be disordered - we speak of popular emotions in the case of revolts. This proves that for me, history is indeed an art of emancipation, which first addresses individual intelligences, to free them from fatalities. If some people hate history, as you say, it’s because they see it as a school of fatality, which lectures them, and which claims to weld communities together by unanimous beliefs.

You directed the writing of the collective work entitled “Histoire globale de la France”,

ste uključili ni manje ni više nego 122 povjesničara. Na koje ste poteškoće naišli? Koji su bili razlozi Vaših izbora (povjesničara, podjela poglavlja itd.)? Koje su bile glavne kritike Vaše knjige?

Bio je to očito težak pothvat, ali smatrali smo da je potreban, upravo kako bismo pomirili kritičko mišljenje sa živom umjetnošću pripovijedanja. Konkretno, radilo se o tome da se predloži knjiga koja je istodobno kolektivna, znanstvena i dostupna. Naš projekt je dakle prije svega bio urednički i zato smo uvijek razmišljali o konačnom cilju: napisati knjigu za čitatelje, iznenaditi ih i naučiti ih stvarima. Stoga smo donijeli neke od izbora: favoriziranje starih razdoblja, počevši od prapovijesti, izmjenjujući poznate datume s iznenađujućim datumima – budući da je narativ bio organiziran po datumima. Otuda i određeni nesporazumi koji objašnjavaju turbulentni, a ponekad i polemički prijem od strane kritike. Neki ljudi nisu razumjeli da odabirom jednog datuma, nismo odbijali drugi. Ali nema veze: najvažnije je da je djelo, ako ga već neki kritičari nisu razumjeli, javnost vrlo dobro razumjela. Zato je knjiga i bila sjajan uspjeh u Francuskoj (više od 150 000 kopija prodano) i Europi (gdje je bila prevedena i prilagođena u desetak zemalja koje su napisale vlastitu globalnu povijest).

O čemu je riječ u Vašem trenutnom istraživanju? Susrećete li se često s pitanjima, pojmovima i konceptima čija je kompleksnost izvan vašeg razumijevanja i na koje niste u stanju dati jasne odgovore?

Naravno, i upravo zato što je ta kompleksnost izvan mog razumijevanja, volim se s njom suočiti. Dvije godine držim kolegij Crna smrt u Europi (1347. – 1352.). Mislim napisati i knjigu o toj temi. Izabrao sam tu temu puno prije pandemije koronavirusa, ali očito da ona mijenja situaciju. Kao da

bringing together no less than 122 historians. What difficulties did you encounter? What were the reasons for your choices (which historians, the division of the chapters, etc.)? What were the main criticisms of this book?

It was obviously a difficult undertaking, but we thought it was necessary, precisely in order to reconcile critical thinking with a lively art of narrative. In concrete terms, it was a question of proposing a book that was at once collective, scholarly and accessible. Our project was therefore first and foremost editorial, and that is why we always thought about the final destination: to write a book for the readers, by surprising them, by surprising them, by teaching them things. Hence some of the choices we made: favouring ancient periods, starting in prehistory, alternating known dates with surprising dates - since the narrative was organised by date. Hence also certain misunderstandings which explain a turbulent, sometimes polemical reception. Some people did not understand that by choosing one date, we were not rejecting another. But it doesn't matter: the main thing is that the work, if it was not understood by some critics, was very well understood by the public. Thus it was a great success in France (more than 150,000 copies sold) and in Europe (where it was translated, but above all adapted in a dozen countries, each one making "its" own world history).

What is your current research about? Do you often face questions, notions, concepts whose complexity is beyond your grasp and to which you are unable to give clear answers?

Of course, and it is precisely because this complexity is beyond me that I like to confront it. I have been teaching a course on the Black Death in Europe (1347 – 1352) for two years. I intend to write a book about it. I had chosen this subject long before the

progonstva u sadašnjosti mijenjaju naše razumijevanje prošlosti. To je u biti glavna dilema povjesničara: treba li raditi na tome da se odvoji od prošlosti, da izbjegne invaziju na nju svojim osjećajima i predrasudama ili može prihvatiti da se prošlost osjeti, čak i ako to znači poistovjećivanje s njom?

Što biste savjetovali studentima povijesti i onima koji to još nisu? Kako biste mogli potaknuti studente povijesti da se uključe u istraživanje povijesti? Kako odabrati? A što je dobar predmet?

Postoji samo jedna dobra tema: ona kojom se želite baviti. Za mene ponavljam, povijest je škola slobode. Morate vjerovati sebi i slijediti vlastitu želju.

Profesore Boucheron, puno Vam hvala na Vašim odgovorima!

COVID health crisis, but it is obvious that it changes the situation. It is as if the haunts of the present are transforming our understanding of the past. This is basically the main dilemma of the historian: should he work to separate himself from the past, to avoid invading it with his affects and prejudices, or can he agree to make it felt, even if it means identifying with it?

What advice would you give to history students and to those who are not yet history students? How could you encourage history students to engage in history research? How to choose? And what is a good subject?

There is only one good subject: the one you want to deal with. For me, I repeat, history is a school of freedom. You have to trust yourself and follow your own desire.

Professor Boucheron, thank you very much for your answers!