

Ivan Moškato

Diplomski studij povijesti, istraživački smjer: Srednjovjekovna povijest
Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

An Interview with Professor Jonathan Harris



Jonathan Harris

(Photo: <https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/research-and-education/departments-and-schools/history/about-us/staff-key-contacts/jonathan-harris/>)

About Prof. Jonathan Harris:

Jonathan Harris is Professor of Byzantine history at the Department of History at Royal Holloway, University of London. He specializes in the period from 900 to 1460, namely the relationship between Byzantium and the West during the Crusades and the Renaissance. Ever since attaining his PhD at Royal Holloway, he has been particularly interested in the Byzantine diaspora after the year 1453. As a result, between 2017 and 2019 he and Prof. Nada Zečević from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb worked on the project *A Comparative Diachronic Analysis of Post-Byzantine Networks in Early Modern Europe (15th–18th c.)*, which was funded by the European Union. Recently, he has published *The End of Byzantium* (2010), *The Lost World of Byzantium* (2015), *Constantinople: Capital of Byzantium* (2017), *Introduction to Byzantium, 602–1453* (2020), *Theosis* (2023), *Byzantium and the Crusades* (2022) and *Byzantine Sources for the Crusades, 1095–1204* (2024), co-edited by Georgios Chatzelis. The 2015 study is his most notable, and has been translated into Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Greek, and Romanian. On December 13, 2024, Prof. Harris delivered

an online lecture *The Historiography of the Post-1453 Byzantine Diaspora* at the scientific conference *Intelektualna povijest i hrvatska historiografija: stanje i perspektive II*, which was held in Zagreb. Shortly after the lecture, we spoke with him via Zoom.

As a professor, you teach courses on Medieval and Renaissance History at Royal Holloway, University of London. Besides that, you are the author of numerous publications on Byzantium and the Crusades. What research or projects are you currently working on?

I've got a number of projects going on. One of them is what I spoke about in the lecture. It goes back to my PhD work which was about the Byzantine diaspora after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. I published that in 1995 and in the thirty or so years since then a great deal of work has been done and there has been a great deal more information come to light. So, me and my colleague Nada Zečević, and other colleagues in the field like Thierry Ganchou, are in the position where we can make very informed hypotheses or put forward theories about the kind of networks that allowed refugees to move across Europe—from Italy to France, to England, to Scotland, even to Scandinavia. So, I am working on that. I am also continuing my Crusades work. I am currently working on an article about the diplomatic contact between Byzantine Emperor Constantine X and the Antipope Honorius II in 1062. This is an earlier example of a Byzantine emperor approaching the pope about military aid before the famous 1095 approach made by Alexios I Comnenus.

Tell us more about the two-year project you began in 2017 with Nada Zečević on post-Byzantine networks in Early Modern Europe. How did it come about?

So, this was one of those happy accidental meetings. I was at a conference in London in 2006 and that is when I met Nada Zečević. She came up to me right after the cater and we were delighted to discover that we were both working on refugees moving westwards. I personally was studying those in Constantinople, and Nada was looking more at the people coming from the area which is now former Yugoslavia, that kind of area. We found we have a great deal in common, particularly the issue of networks: who knows who and how those networks are going to help people to move along the next stage westwards and finally settle in a particular country, in a particular area. So, what did we do? We thought it would be a good idea to apply for some funding for it. We applied for the EU Marie Curie Fund, and we were successful and obviously delighted. So, Nada was able to come over and join us in London and she was with us at Royal Holloway for two years. She also then moved to Goldsmith College for a time. We had the two years of the Marie Curie fellowship and then we had a few more extra years. That has been a very fruitful cooperation, and I hope it will continue now that Nada has moved to Zagreb.

Among other things, you mentioned the goal is to reach the popular audience by reflecting on the subject of migration in European history. Are you satisfied with the results?

Yes, I think I am. It is always a mistake to go too far down the line of showing “the relevance” of what you are doing when you are studying the long past and trying to suggest that this is the same phenomenon we are experiencing in a contemporary situation. If you start with that premise, you are likely to fall into the trap of massaging the past to fit in with the present. And I don’t think we should do that because... what have we got? Obviously, migration is an issue today and it was an issue in the 15th century. But these are very different phenomena. What we’re getting in the 21st century is people arriving in Europe with no connections there in the hope that they can claim political asylum or to claim political asylum. Back then we had people arriving who already had some kind of link which they could exploit. Not just anybody. They are almost always drawn from the elites—well-connected and well-educated elites. And it’s their education that very often gives them the key to get into Europe. So, I think there is plenty of room here for reflecting on the current experience, but I think you have to be a bit careful not to massage the past too much and try to make these the same thing. Because they are not. It’s a different demographic of people moving into western Europe.

In your lecture earlier this day, you addressed the issue of Byzantine intelligentsia in the post-Byzantine world. As you already pointed out, it is a common myth that it initiated the Italian Renaissance, a myth that is still taught in schools. If that is true, how significant was their role exactly?

As I said, if you are a member of the Byzantine elite, I think your education gives you the means of getting into Europe because people there are looking for your expertise. If you can teach and write Greek, you can get yourself a very comfortable position. That is exactly what John Argyropoulos did, the studium in Florence. However, of course that’s something different from starting the Renaissance. We know that Leonardo Bruni, for example, knew Greek very well. There is no indication that he derived that from the Byzantine émigré and in any case, he learned Greek long before they turned up. That’s why I think the approach of Nigel Wilson in the book that I put up on one of the slides is excellent. He analyzes the writing of the Byzantine scholars in Italy and the Italians, and by looking at them and looking at the commentaries on ancient literature he is able to see the different approaches. There is a kind of cocktail of approaches to ancient literature which all come together. And the Byzantine émigrés are a part of that. That’s how I think I would understand it.

There is a long history of byzantophobia, dating back to the Early Middle Ages and the whole conflict with the Papacy. Especially from the 18th century onwards, Byzantium has rarely been seen as a positive force. But it has been 230 years since the death of Edward Gibbon, famous for pioneering the modern study of the Roman Empire, and historical narratives

have certainly changed a great deal. How does our present-day perspective differ from those of the past?

I think it really depends on your whereabouts. Who you are, really. I am certain I can speak about the UK. I am not so sure about the situation in Croatia. And it's going to be different again obviously in Serbia or in Russia, Orthodox countries who have a kind of cultural affinity. So, I'll speak about what I really know, which is the UK. The main issue here is not so much hostility as complete ignorance. You'll be surprised most people don't even know that there was such a thing as Byzantium, or when and where it was. I had a strange experience once I gave a lecture at a university. It was soon after the war began in Ukraine, and I was asked to come along and give a little bit of background about early Russia and the foundation of Kyiv. But afterwards, a colleague came up, a lecturer and said she never knew that Constantinople, Istanbul had ever been a Christian city. And this was a lecturer! I am sure that probably wouldn't happen in Croatia, but I think that's the measure of the kind of divorce between our culture and Byzantium.

The lecture I most commonly give—I do give general lectures, I go to towns and if there is a church hall, I would give the talk there—is the one called *Byzantium, the Forgotten Empire*, which is literally the basics of Byzantium. For most people it's completely new. I think that really is because it's not linked directly to our culture in the way the Romans are - they occupied Britain. The Byzantines never did. I'd say that about the UK. America is a different kettle of fish altogether. Over there it's very much different because of the Greek community. I think Americans drive the study of Byzantium. And again, Russia is very different. I noticed that Mr. Putin in a speech earlier this year in fact gave a long lecture about Byzantine history to justify his claim on Ukraine. It's different again. But I think we moved on from Gibbon. I'm sure there is hope.

You mentioned Croatia. One can say that, although rarely mentioned, “Byzantium” here mostly has negative connotations. A certain well-known politician used it occasionally to describe either his adversaries or policies commonly labeled as “medieval” or even “Balkan”. So, it is archaic, but it is still around.

Right. In English we can use “Byzantine” to say “excessively complicated” and “devious”. You hear the road system in London is Byzantine, because it's very complicated and the roads curve interestingly. So, I am intrigued to hear you can do it in Croatian! It's a negative connotation that is actually in the dictionary, and we have it as well.

Recently, scholars have written extensively on the subject of the Byzantine identity, a phenomenon we may never fully grasp, particularly considering the empire's millennium-long history. Some of them—and this is obviously a simplification—like Anthony Kaldellis, defend the long-denied Romaness of the Byzantines, while others, such as Yannis Stouraitis, emphasize the composite nature of their identity, which included both

Roman and Hellenic elements. In your opinion, who are the Byzantines, if we can even call them that?

Yes, it's a problem, isn't it? Because it's a made-up name anyway. They didn't call themselves that. It's a name - and this is where Kaldellis has a good point - which in English, Croatian and probably some other languages has a negative connotation. So, it is very problematic. You summed up Stourairis and Kaldellis very well! It's a debate I never felt the need to be involved in, nor I should because unlike Stouraitis and Kaldellis, I am not of Hellenic heritage, so it doesn't strike me as much. I am sympathetic to Kaldellis because he wants to get away from this image of Byzantium which he blames for the negativity that is felt towards it. It's always associated with something a bit weird and wonderful - the icons, the mystery - whereas he is saying it's actually Roman, a tradition that should be taken seriously. I sympathize with him, but I think some of his views maybe go too far. He is trying very hard to rehabilitate Byzantium. I mean, if he had it his way, we would ditch the Byzantine word and replace it with "Medieval Rome". And maybe one day that will come, I don't know. I personally have carried on using the word (Byzantium) because big publishers tell me that it does actually sell books. If you put "Medieval Rome" people wouldn't know what you are talking about, so that's why I haven't gone down that road. In many ways I'd say I'm kind of an interested spectator of that debate. I sit in the crowd, watch and cheer, but I don't actually take part. It's like a football match. I am perfectly happy to watch it, but I really don't want to take part, thank you very much.

You pointed out that you are not "of Hellenic heritage". So, there is also a certain ideological layer to these debates that one should be aware of, right?

Well, there is, and it is also like what they say about rainbows. We all see a different rainbow because of the refraction of the light. It's the same with Byzantium. We all see a different Byzantium depending on our cultural background. Somebody from Bulgaria will see a different Byzantium from somebody from Denmark. They will see it through their cultural prism. I certainly see Byzantium through my cultural prism of somebody living in London in the 21st century who is interested in Byzantium but has no cultural or ethnic link with it. That's the way it is. So that's why I can have my construction of Byzantium, but I would never hold it up to be the way everyone else should see Byzantium. I think that would be very presumptuous of me.

You are a historian, but you also write historical novels. In 2023 you published a book called Theosis, set in the court of emperor Basil II. It is not unusual to see historians write novels. There is, in fact, a long tradition, beginning with the great 19th-century figures such as Michelet and Carlyle, just to name a few. What was your motivation for writing? Was it the need to break from the constraints of academic discourse or was there something else?

Well, there was something else, really. It was the Covid pandemic. When the summer came, we couldn't go on holiday, so you had to have something to

do. Some of my friends took up yoga, some of them did baking, and some of them painted their garages. And I thought, “I don’t want to do those things, so I’ll write this novel”. Because I did have a vague idea for it and I thought, “maybe when I am retired, I could write it”. So, that was my project, and I enjoyed writing. I did a draft and then Trivent publishers in Budapest were kind enough to take it on, so we did that. And then people asked me that very same question, “Is this because you want to get away from the constraints of academic history?”. I thought about this and actually I don’t because I see this as pretty much part of the same project. I don’t think I necessarily agree that there is such a huge gulf between academic history and fiction. That is to say, when we write academic history, we’re not writing absolute incontrovertible truth. We are writing our construction of past events, our interpretation of the evidence, our particular emphasis.

Now, it is true that we have evidence for everything we say we are showing, but that evidence all depends on how we interpret it. Two different historians can cite the same piece of evidence and arrive at completely different conclusions. I suspect you have a Roman law system in Croatia, but in English law, in a trial, you have a defense lawyer and a prosecution lawyer. They have the same evidence on the table in front of them, but they use that same evidence to argue that the accused is either guilty or not guilty. It’s the same here. If academic history is like fiction, it isn’t so different in a way, because it’s a construction. You can actually just create. You can create a character, a situation. But a lot of what is in the book, the main narrative, the main spine, the main political events, are all in the record. I’d say it’s not a departure from academic history but a kind of complementary activity to it. Not that everyone would agree with me.

So, do you think that literary prose can serve educational purposes just as academic prose does?

I think it can, because human beings are perfectly well aware of the difference between fact and fiction. When television first started, there was a great fear in some circles that children would see violent scenes and would then rush out and do them. Or they would see something like Superman flying through the air and would jump out of the window. There were one or two cases when that did happen. So, when Batman used to come on television, he used to appear beforehand and say: “Now, children, it’s only television, don’t jump out of the window. Batman can’t fly, it’s only a pogo”. And then the message got through, so the children now don’t think they can fly or jump out of the window. I think that we need to trust our readers to know that. It’s true that there are some lazy people who will take a film or a book to be an absolute record of the past, but I think they are fairly few and far between. Take *Gladiator II* for example, everyone knows perfectly well that the events are made up, although some characters are real. I think we should trust people to be intelligent enough to see the difference.

But is it not also the case that many common misconceptions about early Christianity come from Dan Brown's novels?

That's partly because the history of early Christianity is shrouded in mystery anyway. That's the thing, isn't it? We don't really know. Now Brown has come in and given a particular version of Jesus Christ marrying Mary Magdalene and that kind of myth is not particularly new, but it is a mythological past. I think although we do have the Gospels, there are huge gaps in our knowledge about Jesus Christ, the apostles and the spread of Christianity. So inevitably in those situations mythology will fill the gap. The thing about Dan Brown and people like him is they come and go. I remember in the 80s there was a book called *Holy Blood and Holy Grail*. It sold millions of copies, and we were told the exact same story. Except, unlike Dan Brown, it said it was history. Of course, it has vanished now, nobody has heard of it now, whereas people have still heard of Jesus Christ. So, I think Jesus Christ and Christianity are strong enough, at the end of the day, to weather the storm, because they've weathered lots of storms and they're still here. After two thousand years we still have the Christian Church, but we don't have *Holy Blood and Holy Grail*. I'm sure they've all been thrown in the dust, pulped or end up in second-hand stores. I wouldn't want to blame Dan Brown, I say good luck to him. If people are dumb enough to believe him, that's their problem.

Recently you also published a book of sources together with Georgios Chatzelis, called Byzantine Sources for the Crusades, 1095-1204. How do Byzantine authors shape our understanding of events in comparison to Latin ones? What challenges do they present?

First of all, what I would say about this book straight away is that Georgios is the main author because he is the one whose command of Greek is much better than mine. He is in Thessaloniki now and works at Aristotle University, a public university. I think he also teaches at Democritus University in Thrace so in many ways I am the sleeping part or the junior partner on this book. But I think Georgios would answer as follows: what we have here is the body of Byzantine texts, most of which are created in the imperial palace by members of the Byzantine educated elite. Byzantium is different from the Medieval West in this period insofar as there is higher education available for laymen. So, we have an educated secular elite. In western Europe educated men are clergymen. All these individuals (in Byzantium) are dependent on the emperor for their post. They are administrators in the imperial palace. One exception is Anna Komnene insofar as she is female rather than male, but she is actually a member of the Byzantine royal family, rather than an employee.

Many of these texts are encomia, speeches in praise of the emperor. Obviously, they are going to present events which are colored in such a way as to adorn praise for the emperor. Even the histories such as one of John Kinnamos or Anna Komnene's *Alexiad* are effectively encomia because they are going to be written from the Byzantine viewpoint, and they are going to praise the Byzantine emperor. What is interesting about the texts – and Georgios is better at this than me – is the subtexts. It's what they say between the lines. This is where

the Greek language can be very creative indeed where you can use puns and innuendo to suggest something. So, you can actually in your speech in praise of the emperor suggest the subtle bit of criticism, that “Maybe, oh, emperor, wonderful as you are, and greater than Alexander the Great you are and Julius Caesar, but even so, you might consider this, or you might consider that.” Because these are designed to be read aloud in court. They are written in a language which most Byzantines couldn’t understand. They are written in classical Greek, not the everyday Greek of the street. So here you are in court; the emperor is sitting there. It’s Epiphany, say, a big festival on a day when you read out your speeches in praise of the emperor and you want to advise the emperor to abandon a certain policy. You can read out this speech and say “emperor, you outshine the sun, you are wiser than Solomon, more energetic than David,” all the rest of it, and then throw in a little bit of subtle criticism like “M-maybe you should have dealt with Emperor Frederick Barbarossa a little bit more leniently.” Because you can’t just walk up to him and say, “Hey emperor, that wasn’t a very good move.” That would be the end of your career, possibly your life. So, that is the fascinating part of the texts, and what Georgios was able to bring out in his translation. His command of English is extraordinary, and the fact that he can express these nuances so well. Hats off to Georgios.

Like Byzantium, the Crusades can stir up a lot of controversy. While they were once romanticized, in recent times they are frequently met with remorse. Even more, they are quite often used to criticize the medieval period as a whole. So, they obviously come with heavy historical baggage. How should we deal with it? Should we rather aim to explain these events within the context of their own time?

It’s true the Crusades are controversial, but they are the opposite of Byzantium in my country because they are very well known. There is a kind of fascination with them. I have a friend that writes about the Knights Templar – oh, to Dan Brown again – and he enjoys doing that. He is involved in war gaming and computer gaming, advising on the simulations for Crusade gameplay and this kind of thing. Now, on one level, you can say that all publicity is good publicity. The Crusades do a good job of getting the Middle Ages better known in a world which often has a terribly short-term kind of memory. But you are right on the other hand that there is a problem that the Crusades are politically a little bit explosive, a famous example being George W. Bush, the president of the US back in 2001 who went on TV after the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington and said that the US is going to have a crusade against terrorism. This of course was very badly received in the Islamic world because the crusades were seen historically as being the western attempt to eradicate Islam. Jews also have a very uneasy view of the Crusades because they were victims of the Crusades as much as Muslims were. Many departing Crusade armies took the opportunity to massacre Jews in the Rhineland and other places before they left. Greek Orthodox likewise were very often the victims of western Crusades, notably in Constantinople in 1204 when the Fourth Crusade captured the city. So, you are right. You do have to tread a little bit carefully.

Now, at my college there was a very great scholar who passed away called Jonathan Riley-Smith. His argument was exactly the one you mentioned, that we should see the Crusades in the context of their own time. We shouldn't try to fit them into the way things are now, like Marxist historiography always saw the Crusades as some kind of proto-western imperialism, economically motivated. He always argued that there was a belief that by undertaking the armed pilgrimage to Jerusalem you could achieve salvation. This is what lies behind the Crusades. Not economic motivation, not islamophobia, not anti-semitism, not any of these things and that's the best way to understand them. I think that's a very sensible approach. The only problem is that it leaves you open to the accusation that you are taking the Crusades at their own word. Because let's face it, motives are mixed. There are always some people who are on it to save their souls and other people who are on it basically to get rich. There is no doubt about it. There were definitely some people in it for the plunder. Human motivation is always very mixed. To give you an answer, I think Riley-Smith's idea is generally good but should always be tempered with the realization that any ideological movement, whatever it claims to be doing often has all kinds of sub-agendas underneath which are operating on it and help to mold it just as much as the original intentions of whoever got it going.

Quite a few years ago, your British colleague Christopher Tyerman, author of the over a thousand pages long God's War: A New History of the Crusades, proposed that there were no Crusades in the 12th century, arguing that the First Crusade was a unique event that didn't immediately establish a concept of "crusading". Among other things, he points to the lack of papal endorsement as a key reason to question the traditional timeline of the Crusades. In your view, what makes a crusade, and how many major ones can we identify?

Tyerman, I would say, is a scholar like Anthony Kaldellis. He is like a bull in a china shop, isn't he? He wants to pull down the pillars to start again, and he is impatient with some of the intellectual constraints we've been working under. I think scholars like that do a great service even if not everything they say is accepted and shouldn't be. I think Tyerman does a very good job. To some extent he is deliberately reacting against Riley-Smith. You can see his point. For example, we are always told that there were eight or nine Crusades. There is the First Crusade in 1095 and then the last one is the one where Prince Edward of England turns up in the Holy Land in 1271. Now, the problem with these numbers is that they leave out all kinds of expeditions. For example, there was a large Crusade in 1197 which went to the Holy Land and was very well equipped and was launched by the German emperor Henry VI. But it's not numbered! It isn't numbered because these numbers were invented by French people in the 17th century.¹ They only counted the Crusades that were led by or were largely composed of French knights. The Crusades composed of Ger-

¹ He is mainly referring to Louis Maimbourg (1610 – 1686) and his work *Histoire des croisades pour la délivrance de la Terre Sainte* (1675–6).

mans got left out. It's a completely meaningless number system. You can see where Tyerman is coming from. We know the Second Crusade as the Second Crusade, but it wasn't necessarily the Second Crusade. There had been lots of expeditions between the first two Crusades, it's just the French give it the name second crusade because the main leader is the king of France, Louis VII. Tyerman is trying to break away from all that baggage that we've got from the past and I think that's a very useful exercise. Certainly, he hasn't won himself quite the audience Jonathan Riley-Smith has, but I think he has done a very good job of introducing an element of skepticism into what otherwise would be a rather bland and self-satisfied orthodox view that this is how we see the Crusades. So good luck to him.

Can the Baltic Crusades, the Italian Crusades and the Crusades against the Ottomans be considered part of the same movement?

Yes. I think one of the most exciting things that has been happening in the Crusades studies over the last twenty, thirty years is this move away from an obsession with the Holy Land. There used to be this idea: in 1291 Acre falls to the Mamelukes, therefore the Crusades are over. But of course they are not! There are all kinds of crusading expeditions going on, and you've mentioned some of them. For example, in Edinburgh there is a guy called Mike Carr. He has been studying the Aegean Crusades of the early 14th century. We also have my retired colleague, Norman Housley. He has really made a study of later Crusades generally. Crusading ideology and rhetoric remained part of European consciousness well into the 17th century. You actually get the pope issuing an indulgence for the defense of Vienna. In fact, he even issues indulgences for the war in Ireland in 1689 which is extraordinary because he issues the indulgences for those fighting on the protestant side. He doesn't back the Catholic claim and James because he is allied with the king of France who is at odds with the papacy. So, you get a kind of protestant crusade. It's ridiculous. It remains part of European thought and psychology, and a lot of people are working on this at the moment. I had a PhD student, Charlotte Gautier, who completed a thesis about the use of crusade ideology and wording in diplomacy of the 16th century. I think it's an area of study developing really quickly. Give it a few more decades and we will be understanding the Crusades in a completely different way.

That is something to look forward to. Is there any advice you would like to offer to young aspiring scholars, maybe something from personal experience?

Yes. I suppose the main thing is you never know what is going to happen. So many academic careers, and careers generally don't go along with a straight path and can often seem absolutely hopeless, but you never know what is around the next corner. It might not be what you expected, but it might be something even better than that. The main thing is to be true to yourself at the end of the day. Don't be discouraged, even though you will meet an enormous amount of discouragement. This is natural if you really want to pursue

academic research - and there are good reasons for not doing so. But some of us persist and we do succeed. In that case, if that's what you must do, do it and believe in yourself. Believe that there may well be something around the next corner because very often there is.

Thank you for this interview and good luck with your further research!

Pro Tempore

ČASOPIS STUDENATA POVIJESTI BROJ 20 2025.

Pro Tempore

Časopis studenata povijesti,
godina XX, broj 20, 2025.

Glavna i odgovorna urednica
Marija Bišćan

Zamjenik glavne urednice
Ruben Prstec

Uredništvo

Filip Bačurin
Marija Bišćan
Adrian Filčić
Nera Kapustić
Karlo Košir
Ivan Moškato
Marko Perišić
Ruben Prstec
Matija Pudić

Urednici pripravnici

Tita Mikulaš
Benjamin Pintarec

Redakcija

Filip Bačurin
Marija Bišćan
Adrian Filčić
Nera Kapustić
Karlo Košir
Tita Mikulaš
Ivan Moškato
Marko Perišić
Benjamin Pintarec
Ruben Prstec
Matija Pudić

Tajnik Uredništva

Marko Perišić

Recenzenti

dr. sc. Zrinka Blažević
dr. sc. Arijana Kolak Bošnjak
dr. sc. Inga Vilogorac Brčić
dr. sc. Neven Budak
dr. sc. Mihovil Dabo
dr. sc. Vinko Korotaj Drača

dr. sc. Stipe Grgas
dr. sc. Branimir Janković
dr. sc. Maja Katušić
Dea Marić
dr. sc. Lidija Nikočević
dr. sc. Ana Rajković Pejić
dr. sc. Filip Šimetin Šegvić
dr. sc. Luka Špoljarić
dr. sc. Peter Štih
dr. sc. Nikola Tomašegović
dr. sc. Hrvoje Tutek
dr. sc. Nada Zečević
Andrija Živković

Lektura za hrvatski jezik

Antonia Buti
Nikolina Fajt
Grgur Gržetić
Lorenia Jantolek
Nera Kapustić
Mihaela Pokrivač
Martina Prosen

Lektura za engleski jezik

Marko Perišić
Ruben Prstec
Matija Pudić

Oblikovanje

FF Press

Izdavač

Odsjek za povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

Tisak

d. o. o. Studio moderna

Naklada

Tiskano u 75 primjeraka.

ISSN: 1334-8302

Tvrđnje i mišljenja u objavljenim radovima izražavaju isključivo stavove i mišljenja autora i ne predstavljaju nužno stavove i mišljenja uredništva i izdavača.

Izdavanje ovog časopisa finansijski je omogućeno:

sredstvima koja je ustupio Odsjek za povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

sredstvima dobivenim na Natječaju za studentske programe Studentskog zbora Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

Redakcija časopisa Pro tempore im iskreno zahvaljuje na finansijskoj podršci.

Časopis se ne naplaćuje.

Adresa uredništva

Odsjek za povijest

(za: Uredništvo Pro tempore)

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

Ivana Lučića 3, 10 000 Zagreb

Kontakt

casopis.protempore@gmail.com

Web-stranica

<https://protempore.ffzg.unizg.hr/>