

HISTORISK TIDSKRIFT

2007 4



UTGIVEN AV SVENSKA HISTORISKA FÖRENINGEN

From periphery to centre

The internationalisation of the historiography of Portugal

By Mafalda Soares da Cunha & Pedro Cardim

Around four years ago, on the occasion of the launch of the online e-Journal of Portuguese History (e-JPH)¹ a debate was published on the internationalisation of Portuguese historiography. Eight renowned historians participated in this debate, and although their perspectives differed, they shared a common concern on this subject.² The timing was particularly propitious, since

1. <http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Portuguese_Brazilian_Studies/ejph/>. The idea for the creation of this journal came from four Portuguese historians working on different historical periods and subjects at Portuguese universities: Luís Adão da Fonseca, medieval history at the Faculty of Arts, University of Porto; José Luis Cardoso, history of economic thought at the School of Economics and Management, Technical University of Lisbon; António Costa Pinto, contemporary history, Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon; and Mafalda Soares da Cunha, early modern history at the University of Évora – and was immediately welcomed by Onésimo T Almeida at Brown University. In this way, a partnership emerged to handle the production of the journal, between the University of Porto and Brown University, under whose auspices two editions a year are published with open access. It has been shown to be an extremely useful instrument in the dissemination of the most recent Portuguese historiography on Portugal, not only in terms of the articles published, but also for the lists of masters' theses and doctoral theses being defended at Portuguese universities, of institutions responsible for historical research and of current research projects.

2. Cf. "Internationalization of Portuguese Historiography", *E-Journal of Portuguese History*, 1:1–2, 2003–2004, with the participation of Luís Adão da Fonseca (University of Porto), Jean-Frédéric Schaub (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris), Diogo Ramada Curto (European University Institute, Florence), Rui Santos (New University of Lisbon), Jorge Pedreira (New University of Lisbon), António Costa Pinto (Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon), Abdoolkarim Vakil (King's College, London), Pedro Lains (Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon).

PhD Mafalda Soares da Cunha, b. 1960, is professor at the department of History at the University of Évora. Her latest publications are "Nobreza, rivalidade e clientelismo na primeira metade do século XVI. Algumas reflexões", *Penélope: revista de história e ciências sociais*, n.º 29, 2003 (2006), and, with Leonor Freire Costa, *D. João IV*, (2006).

Address: Departamento de História, Palácio do Vimioso, Universidade de Évora, Apartado 94, 7002-554 Évora, Portugal

E-mail: mafaldascunha@mail.telepac.pt

PhD Pedro Cardim, b. 1967, is professor at the department of History at the New University of Lisbon. His latest publications are, with Angela Barreto Xavier, *D. Afonso VI* (2006), and "Nem tudo se pode escrever". Correspondencia diplomática e información 'política' en el Portugal de Seiscientos", *Cuadernos de historia moderna*, Anejo IV (2005): *Cultura Epistolar en la alta Edad Moderna. Usos de la carta y de la correspondencia entre el manuscrito y el impreso*, pp. 95–128.

Address: Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Av. de Berna 26C, 1069-061 Lisbon, Portugal

E-mail: pedro.cardim@fcs.h.unl.pt

one of the express aims of the creation of this journal, exclusively online and in English, was the international promotion of the historiography of Portugal. The editors of the e-JPH reacted to the shared observation that the international historiographical community lacked knowledge on the realities of Portuguese history, on the work of Portuguese historians and those who worked on what we can generically call historical realities of Portugal. However, the aims of the project went beyond the intention of merely making this knowledge available in a language and media that is almost universally accessible. It sought to demonstrate that historical studies of Portugal are relevant to problematics at a more general level, offering useful nuances and perspectives that enhance the diversity of contexts, practices and solutions found throughout European and extra-European history. By doing this, it sought to place Portugal "in the loop" of historiography and as such bypass the chronic ostracism to which it has been subjected.

Summary of a debate

The reflection presented by the eight historians primarily sought explanations for the low level of internationalisation of Portuguese historians and their institutions. Their diagnosis was relatively exhaustive. In essence, they found that the main justifications for Portuguese-speaking historians' difficulties in going beyond either geographical boundaries and subjects relating to the history of Portugal and its empire, or nationalist resistance based on the argument of the specificity of Portugal's evolution and national trajectory, were the internal conditions of production and the type of stimuli to which they were exposed. That is to say, they placed the blame primarily on the lack of institutional incentives – the internal organisation of the universities and the career structure, the characteristics of curricular evaluation, and the consistent and ongoing absence of any financial support specifically aimed at mobility and internationalisation. In the same way, they pointed out that the majority of journals specialising in history in Portugal still do not have a single or double-blind referee system.

Among the other issues noted in the course of this debate, the fact that Portuguese historiography is dominated by subjects of national history stands out, along with the fact that Portuguese historians do not exhibit much willingness to study non-Portuguese subjects. This tendency is reinforced by the fact that there are few grants and financial resources available for the study of non-Portuguese subjects, and that the institutions favour the study

of issues that are directly or indirectly related to Portugal. Equally relevant is the fact that, within the Portuguese academic world, specialisation in non-Portuguese history makes university careers impracticable, or at least difficult. Again, these problems are rooted in the structure of the Portuguese universities, where staff positions are informally linked to specialisation in the history of Portugal.

While recognising that the undergraduate courses in history offered in Portugal have for some time now offered disciplines in the history of other countries including non-European countries, the participants in this debate maintain that these disciplines, despite being taught by Portuguese historians, have never generated autonomous areas of research, since the historians concerned continue to have the history of Portugal as their primary research area. This more general knowledge was utilised in order to promote a comparative history approach. In relation to the disciplines of "world history" or "transnational history", it is only now that these are beginning to appear in the context of postgraduate courses. One thing is sure: all these studies always have some kind of connection to the history of Portugal.

In short, this group of historians recognised that the weak "international" dimension in the global evaluation of the results of historians and academic institutions went some way to explaining the isolationism and immobility of the Portuguese historiographical community.

As contributing factors to the ongoing "ghettoisation" of Portuguese historiography, arguments continue to surface relating to the peripheral nature of Portugal and its marginal role in relation to global historical movements, as well as the issues of language, demographic limitations and the small size of its historiographical community. In fact, of the thirteen Portuguese public universities, only eight have degree courses in history, and only two from the range of private universities offer courses in history. A total of around three hundred academic professionals teach history across the different disciplines and periods. This figure includes not only pure historians, but also those who belong to history departments that are linked to faculties of economics or departments of sociology or geography. Be that as it may, the number is clearly minimal. To give an example, there are only two full professors in medieval history in the entire country, and seven in early modern history and the Portuguese expansion. Contemporary history continues to attract more interest.

In terms of doctoral theses on history, no more than fifteen of these are

submitted in Portugal each year. The fact that until recently doctoral theses were mainly produced by researchers involved in teaching at a university level explains the small number of theses defended each year. Even so, this is a trend that is changing as a result of the arrival of doctoral programmes in the universities and the allocation of grants for young researchers, without any firm connection to university teaching.

In any case, the international community's low levels of interest in the general themes of the history of Portugal tend to reinforce this propensity for isolation and for the continuation of endogenous forms of reproduction within the academic system.

The general tone of the observations of these eight historians was, thus, rather pessimistic, although some of them advocated ways of integrating Portuguese historiography into the agendas of international research. They recognised modification of the institutional demands in relation to curricular results, as well as orientation of research towards major historiographical problematics, as being crucial factors.

An undecided transformation

We believe that in recent years, some of the institutional efforts initiated in the 1990s have been consolidated and become more visible. We would argue that some of the problems identified in the debate mentioned above are in the process of being resolved. The efforts carried out include the vast majority of historians joining research centres funded by the Foundation of Science and Technology under the auspices of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education, whose results are periodically evaluated by international panels. The creation of a systematic and scientific system for supporting research, with several-year funding, dates from the mid 1990s and constitutes without doubt a profound change in the research conditions for social sciences and humanities, and for history in particular. Currently there are just over twenty research centres, all under the auspices of universities and accommodating teaching staff from these institutions and postgraduate students, as well as external researchers. Their main objective is to promote historical research. They have received funding for several years, which has resulted in a number of PhD researchers being based at these centres, with international classification awarded by an international evaluation panel that meets every three years. They fund research-related activities (foreign travel and translation; publication of scientific works; organisation of scientific

events). Even so, current scientific policy seeks to reduce the number of research units by concentrating the existing teams and by creating larger centres, thus rationalising resources and giving the centres the capacity to compete on an international level. The current political agenda also places a close dependency between recognition of excellence in research and the possibility of offering postgraduate education.

In addition, the annual competitions for postgraduate research grants and research project funding instil external evaluation routines in the members of the community. Bearing in mind that one of the analysis criteria is the pertinence of the objects of study to international comparison and dissemination of results, the stimulus of publication abroad has made a positive impact. This applies not only to the evaluation of the centres, but also to the annual competition for funding of research projects and the awarding of doctoral and post-doctoral grants. All of this support comes as a result of the evaluation of international panels (for the centres and the projects) and national panels (in the case of the grants), and the volume of international publications is taken into account, which in the case of history is not limited to the journals cited in the Web of Science. It is important to mention that the range of criteria used in these evaluations is still not rigorously defined since there is no ranking system for national publications in Portugal. Neither is there direct access to rankings produced by other countries, although the hierarchy of the research centres is already reflected in the evaluation of the candidates applying for postgraduate educational grants.

There are other funding institutions that regularly offer support towards the cost of participation in international conferences or research in foreign libraries and archives (the Gulbenkian Foundation, the Council of Rectors of Portuguese Universities, the Orient Foundation, the Luso-American Foundation for Development, etc). This criterion has also been used with increasing frequency in the context of individual curricular evaluation and has been echoed in academic promotions. This evidence, which shows the pertinence of the argument on institutional conditions cited by the participants in the *e-JPH* debate, also confirms the appropriateness of the measures adopted by public institutions.

Equally positive has been the recent incentive on the part of European institutions such as the European Science Foundation in order to promote research teams in the form of European transnational networks. This imperative generated an intense movement to promote contact with different

countries within the European historiographical community – a movement in which Portugal participated. In some cases these networks included connections with countries outside Europe, which contributed to the expansion of communication with other historiographical communities, primarily in Latin America. This kind of European funding programmes may explain why the internationalisation of Portuguese historiography has been realised more in the context of Southern European and Brazilian historiography than in Anglo-Saxon historiography.

On the other hand, it is necessary to recognise that the methods of research and dissemination of results in this field of study have hindered the effective communication of this transformation via the indicator used by one of the participants in this debate – the publication of articles in international journals. In fact, contrary to common practice in most of the Social Sciences, where the results are primarily channelled into journals, in History (perhaps with the exception of the Anglo-Saxon world), the habit of arranging colloquia and congresses is more common, the wordings of which are subsequently edited. Another approach which has gained ground is that of research projects which include the publication of collective works as one of their objectives. This peculiarity diverts a significant proportion of research results away from international journals, although the publications produced may still be effective on an international level. Examples of relevant collective efforts that have marked Portuguese historiography and been perfectly aligned with the latest international trends include the publication in the 1990s of the *História Portugal* edited by José Mattoso,³ and other more recent works including the *Nova História Militar de Portugal* (New Military History of Portugal, edited by Nuno Severiano Teixeira and M. Themudo Barata),⁴ the *História Religiosa de Portugal* (Religious History of Portugal, edited by Carlos Moreira de Azevedo),⁵ the *História da Expansão Portuguesa* (History of the Portuguese Expansion, edited by K. Chauduri and F. Bethencourt)⁶ or even the *História Económica de Portugal* (Economic History of Portugal, edited by Álvaro Ferreira da Silva and Pedro Lains)⁷ as well as the recent collection of biographies of the kings of Portugal, developed by professional academics

3. José Mattoso (ed.), *História Portugal*, 1–8, Lisbon 1992–1994.

4. Nuno Severiano Teixeira & M. Themudo Barata (eds.) *Nova história militar de Portugal*, 1–5, Lisbon 2003–2004.

5. Carlos Moreira Azevedo *História religiosa de Portugal*, 1–7, Lisbon 2000–2002.

6. K. Chauduri & F. Bethencourt, *História da expansão Portuguesa*, 5 vols., Lisbon 1997–1999.

7. Álvaro Ferreira da Silva & Pedro Lains (eds.), *História económica de Portugal*, 1700–2000, 1–3, Lisbon 2005.

with a number of substantial connections with other countries and in which the comparative angle is almost always evident.⁸

In this way, it would seem to us that a quantification of participation in international congresses and of publications of collective works would offer a less negative vision of the internationalisation taking place in the field of History. Since the main reference databases are produced by North American institutions and report almost exclusively on periodicals published in English, this recent European and Latin American dynamic of internationalisation tends to remain hidden if we resort to solely using these instruments of evaluation. Although in recent years there have been efforts in various European countries to establish a hierarchy of specialist publications and academic institutions, accessing this information is not always easy for researchers from other countries. It is therefore important to create instruments for the dissemination of this information – instruments that are able to offer evaluation parameters complementary to those of the Anglo-Saxon domain.

Aside from the difficulties in finding appropriate indicators for measuring international dissemination of results, it is impossible to ignore the fact that the process of internationalisation faces genuine obstacles. Some of these are ongoing; others are related to the recent changes in Portuguese social structure.

At this stage, Portuguese historiography continues to be dominated by the exclusive study of subjects relating to national history. A contributing factor here is the inadequate working conditions of the researchers, specifically in terms of access to foreign libraries. The Portuguese university libraries remain inadequate, with insufficient opening hours, incomplete bibliographic collections and a range that is both thematically and chronologically limited, all of which makes it difficult to gain knowledge of the agendas of international research. Of course the internet and major international databases reduce the extent of the problem, but some serious limitations remain, since few institutions have access to the majority of resources provided by the main online bibliographical databases.

On the other hand, it is clear that Portuguese historians continue to show minimal interest for the study of non-national subjects. In addition to the institutional constraints already mentioned, the centrality of the national perspective in the work of the historian in Portugal is indisputable. Every-

8. 34 volumes corresponding to the 34 kings of Portugal, written by around 40 historians and edited by Círculo de Leitores between 2005 and 2007.

thing points to the assumption that at this level, the historiography of Portugal is no different from that of the majority of other small European countries. What sets the Portuguese reality apart is the magnitude of this phenomenon in an extremely small historiographical community that lacks institutional openings for alternative routes. Perhaps also because of this, the number of non-Portuguese people teaching Portuguese history at universities in Portugal, as well as the number of Portuguese scholars teaching non-Portuguese subjects at foreign universities, remains small. Nevertheless, in recent times, communication with foreign researchers in Portugal has deepened, in particular as a result of the temporary placement of young researchers at Portuguese research centres. These are mainly Brazilian and Spanish researchers who choose to carry out their research in Portuguese archives and libraries. Their objects of study evolved in relation to changes in historiographical trends. The majority of foreign researchers sought initially to study Portugal in the context of her overseas empire. Later, from the 1980s onward, a growing number of foreign researchers searched the Portuguese archive materials for the history of their own countries (in the cases of Spain and Brazil, to cite the most obvious cases), and in this way they ended up interacting with the Portuguese historiographical community. Now we are seeing the emergence of the first transnational approaches. Since this presence implies an institutional framework, this means that the international community recognises that Portugal is home to educational skills from which undergraduate students can benefit.

Nonetheless, there are still very few Portuguese post-doctoral students working in foreign institutions on non-Portuguese subjects. Indeed, one of the factors that have made the internationalisation of Portuguese historiography difficult in recent years is connected to the extremely limited dimensions of the Portuguese historiographical community and the small number of students both in undergraduate and in postgraduate programmes. This fact, which can be confirmed by the decline in the number of degrees being awarded in History and the decrease in the number of academics in this area, has a dramatic effect on the reproductive capacity of the historiographical community in Portugal. This fairly bleak picture – which History shares with other Humanities – is a result of a combination of factors including demographics and the structure of the employment market, which offers Humanities graduates very little other than teaching positions. However, this situation also has other implications for the development of historians' academic activi-

ties. As the stock of qualified researchers decreases, the number of requests for researchers within the same market grows, putting pressure on the few available academics to work on a variety of activities, diverting them from the more slow and complicated processes which could have led to the internationalisation of their work. This is compounded by the fact that the Portuguese editorial market is relatively active and has been prolific in producing expansive works – histories of Portugal, histories of the Portuguese overseas expansion, biographies of political and socioprofessional groups, to name but a few – that absorb a large part of the energies available. Some of the collective works referred to earlier are examples of good quality historiography, whose poor international visibility is essentially a result of the inertia of the editors or the lack of contact between Portuguese editorial houses and their foreign counterparts. Without doubt there are cases in which the works of Portuguese historians have been translated into other languages, but this has often been a result of the initiatives taken by the authors themselves, since there is a lack of financial support within Portugal for the translation of reference works.

Best practice in internationalisation

Internationalisation cannot and should not be seen as an end in itself, but as a method of raising the quality of the work produced by opening it to peer evaluation. It is therefore fundamental to distinguish between the different types of internationalisation. On one hand is the kind of internationalisation that is based on more or less individual initiatives, which manifests itself in contact with researchers who are studying similar subjects. This type of internationalisation may lead to individual advantages, but it does not necessarily lead to the elevation of the quality standards of the historiographical community.

Collective and/or institutional internationalisation can play a much more decisive role, in the form of lasting relationships between educational institutions, realised in the form of shared research agendas; exchanges involving both junior and senior researchers; scientific conferences; the organisation of specific postgraduate teaching programmes; joint publications, etc. As well as favouring an increase in quality standards, this type of internationalisation also allows the acquisition of a certain "scientific cosmopolitanism", in other words, it engenders familiarity with a variety of academic methods and awareness of the concerns, concepts, categories and scientific protocols of these methods.

In essence, this is a matter of distinguishing between an internationalisation that is conducted on a purely voluntary and individual basis and one that uses institutional structures and forums. We argue that the latter holds more potential for exercising a positive impact on the calibre of national historiographical communities. However, in order for this to become a reality, it will also be essential to be aware of the spokespersons chosen to participate in this dialogue. This is more than just a proliferation of relations beyond national boundaries. It is necessary to be judicious in the selection of partners, as this terrain is also home to hierarchies in terms of quality, which we need to be aware of and recognise. It is not irrelevant to be aware of where texts are published, both in terms of journals and of editors and publishing houses. Not all academic institutions have the same reputations in all subject areas.

In the same way, we should not assume that all research produced in other countries is good and that all research developed in Portugal is of a lesser quality. Many studies in the field of European history in general reflect a lack of awareness of relevant information and a simplistic or even erroneous use of comparative analysis. A good example of this is the almost automatic application, in the Portuguese case, of certain structural aspects which are considered to be characteristic of southern European countries (Italy or Spain). Catholicism, intolerance, social immobilism, and lack of economic development are some of the stereotypes that are still in use in international historiography to explain the historical evolution of Portugal. In choosing not to consult more up-to-date studies that clarify or contradict these ideas, international historiography often reproduces representations of the Portuguese reality that are based on poor sources. In this specific case, the responsibility cannot be put down to the less developed nature of Portuguese historiography, but to the lack of interest or superficiality with which the producers of syntheses at an international level relate to peripheral historiographies.

The truth is that the international community of academics in the field of history do not always show an interest in research carried out in more peripheral countries and in some cases it can even be said that it holds in low regard any research on countries where the language spoken is less universal. This phenomenon has contributed to the marginalisation of the historiography of more peripheral countries, as is the case for Portuguese historiography. Prime examples include jointly edited or collectively produced works that rarely include chapters on Portugal. And when they do, they reference works by non-Portuguese authors or only those edited in the languages spoken by the

authors. As a result, it is not often that the Portuguese language bibliography is appropriately referenced. These issues cause problems not only for the Portuguese historiographical community, but also for another Lusophone country, namely Brazil. An example of the lack of visibility of historians working in the Portuguese language is the volume recently edited by Jeremy Black on the subject of slavery.⁹ It is difficult to comprehend that a collective work such as this, which seeks to become an international reference volume, does not include the work of a single Portuguese historian and includes only one Brazilian. Instead the subject areas relating to Portugal are analysed by Anglo-Saxon historians. This issue becomes even more pertinent when we consider that there has been a recent surge in research on the subject of slavery in the Brazilian academic community. Similar examples could be cited on other subjects, such as the history of the European empires in the modern era, the history of the European nobility or the economic history of Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This is an academic routine that leads to the reproduction of less recent approaches to European history – bearing the seal of Fontana Press¹⁰ or Cambridge University Press – where the sections on Portugal are clearly insufficient. Nonetheless, it is important to recognise that these kind of omissions tend to abate in the more specialised academic community, although as a rule they remain present in works aimed at a wider readership.

In any case, the peripheral nature of Portuguese subjects is reinforced by the fact that Portuguese historiography does not have the custom of writing Portuguese historical texts in concise formats in a language that is more accessible internationally, such as English, French or Spanish. This type of work could help the international historiographical community to reach a greater degree of familiarity with the history of Portugal and thus help prevent the aforementioned omissions.

It is important, therefore, not to assume that all non-internationalised historiography is necessarily of a lower calibre, nor that internationalisation per se always guarantees good results. Rather, the opposite may be true. There are numerous studies of a high quality in Portugal that have had minimal international dissemination. This is the case for many of the doctoral theses produced in Portugal in the 1980s and 90s. In many cases, these

9. Jeremy Black (ed.), *The Atlantic slave trade*, London 2006.

10. Carlo M. Cipolla (ed.), *The Fontana economic history of Europe*, 1–9 Hassocks & New York 1972–1976.

pieces of work were examples of studies that were perfectly in tune with the methodological and historiographical trends of their time.¹¹ However, because they were published in Portugal, they had a minimal impact at the level of international historiography, which at times continues to repeat stereotypes and clichés originating from works translated no later than the 1970s.¹² This happens because many Portuguese historians do not cultivate contacts with other historiographical media, as a result of their belief that such dialogues will not contribute to the value of their research. This attitude is as prevalent among historians working on earlier historical periods as those researching contemporary Portuguese history, and it tends to be most visible among historians coming from the background of a Humanities curriculum. It is necessary to underline the fact that this attitude is, sometimes, the result of ideological positions based on the irreducibility of the national phenomenon that emphasises the peculiarities and uniqueness of historical evolution in Portugal. In other cases, this more parochial historical perspective simply serves to affirm local or regional objectives.

Again, this issue does not distinguish the case of Portugal from that of other historiographies. In Portugal, this characteristic has been compounded by the long period of political and intellectual isolation that came about as a result of the authoritarian regime that governed the country until 1974. In reality, save for a few exceptions, the prevalence of the national perspective lasted until the mid-1980s, and it was only at this time that a greater number of studies emerged that did not lose sight of the national reality but used it as a point of departure for comparative analyses. As well as contributing to a deeper understanding of the national situation, this kind of approach brought a more acute awareness of its specificity, but also of its similarities with other countries, allowing a deeper dialogue with other historiographies, such as those of Brazil, Spain, the UK, the US and even France and the Netherlands. Even so, it was still rarely the case that historians used Portugal as a case study in order to explain processes such as social movements, phenomena relating to economic development, power structures, etc, in the context of the more general historical evolution of Europe.

The popularisation of this kind of approach perhaps countered the idea

11. Cf. list of doctoral theses defended in Portugal since the 1970s in several of the volumes of the *e-Journal of Portuguese History*.

12. A good example of this is David S. Landes' book, *The wealth and poverty of nations: why some are so rich and some so poor*, New York 1998.

that, as a result of its peripheral nature, Portugal offered a very small set of subjects of interest capable of attracting the interest of an international public. For a long time, it was thought that only the Portuguese overseas expansion of the early modern period, or the Salazar regime and the transition to democracy in the twentieth century, would arouse the interest of the non-Portuguese academic community. This idea was based on the fact that these were the thematic areas that attracted studies by renowned historians from other countries, such as, for example, Charles R. Boxer, or more recently, Frédéric Mauro, Stuart Schwartz, A. J. R. Russell-Wood, Dauril Alden, Francis Dutra, Kenneth Maxwell, Douglas L. Wheeler, Kirti Chaudhuri, Stanley G. Payne or Stuart Woolf. However, the way in which they studied these subjects differed significantly from the approaches that prevailed in Portugal. Instead of reading these phenomena through a strictly national lens, they integrated them into more general movements and considered them significant case studies to explain, for example, European colonialism or the authoritarian regimes of the twentieth century. Several Portuguese research projects and studies took an identical approach in the area of the economic history of Portugal,¹³ and these not only reached an international level, but also, without great difficulty, captured the interest of students in a diverse range of countries.

If Portuguese historiography rapidly became involved in international discourse in relation to Salazarist authoritarianism and the transition to democracy, albeit primarily via Political Science rather than via History, the same was not the case for the history of the Portuguese empire. It is worth mentioning here that this subject was, for a long time, dominated by the nationalistic representations of Portuguese history employed by the New State (*Estado Novo*),¹⁴ which ensured that in the two decades following the 1974 revolution the subject was more or less forgotten about. As a result, only recently has there been renewed interest in the subject of the Portuguese overseas empire, bringing new analytical perspectives that, without losing sight of the national dimension, raise new questions and seem more open compared to analogous studies in other European countries. This also explains why, over the last decade, historiographical exchange with Brazil has

13. Some examples: Jaime Reis, Pedro Lains, José Luís Cardoso, Jorge Pedreira, Rui Pedro Esteves, Rui Santos, Álvaro Ferreira da Silva, Helder Adegar Fonseca, Leonor Freire Costa, José Vicente Serrão, Fernando Dores Costa.

14. The "Estado Novo" is the name given to the authoritarian regime of A. O. Salazar and M. Caetano, which began in 1928 and was brought down by the revolution of April 1974.

become particularly intense, manifesting itself in a growing number of joint studies and publications.¹⁵ As a result of this dynamic, we are seeing a greater integration between European history and the history of European colonialism in modern and contemporary times.

Another good example of the effects of a shift in focus is the recent collection of studies on the period in which Portugal formed part of the territory of the Spanish Hapsburg Monarchy (1581–1640). Until the mid-1980s, this period rarely came under the scrutiny of Portuguese historiography and, whenever it was the subject of research, strictly national approaches dominated. However, the emergence of a series of studies carried out by foreign historians transformed the way in which this subject was approached.¹⁶ Clarifying the significance of the national perspective and comparing the Portuguese case with that of other territories that were ruled by the Spanish Monarchy, these studies stimulated the growth of research carried out in Portugal. In this way, a kind of historiography emerged that was more in tune with international trends, where it became clear that many of the phenomena that, until now, were thought to be unique to the Portuguese reality are, in fact, similar in all the territories that made up the Hapsburg domains. However, in order to study other realities, such as that of the Spanish Monarchy, it would be necessary to develop the transnational agenda by establishing common lines of enquiry in all the affected territories, creating models of analysis and allowing systematic comparisons. It is clear that this kind of enquiry is ideally suited for application to other chronologies and subjects, and

15. José Jobson Arruda & José Manuel Tengarrinha (eds.), *Historiografia luso-brasileira contemporânea*, Bauru 1999; José Jobson Arruda & Luis Adão da Fonseca (eds.), *Brasil-Portugal: história, agenda para o milénio*, Bauru 2001; José Manuel Tengarrinha (ed.), *História de Portugal*, São Paulo 2000; João Fragoso, Maria Fernanda Bicalho & Maria de Fátima Gouvêa (eds.), *O antigo regime nos Trópicos: a dinâmica imperial portuguesa (séculos XVI–XVIII)*, Rio de Janeiro 2001; Cristiana Bastos, Miguel Vale de Almeida & Bela Feldman-Bianco (eds.), *Trânsitos coloniais: diálogos críticos luso-brasileiros*, Lisbon 2002; Júnia Ferreira Furtado (ed.), *Diálogos Atlânticos: Minas Gerais e as novas abordagens para uma história do Império Ultramarino Português*, Belo Horizonte 2001; Maria Fernanda Bicalho & Vera Lúcia Amaral Ferlini (eds.), *Modos de governar: idéias e práticas políticas no Império Português (séculos XVI–XIX)*, São Paulo 2005.

16. Fernando Bouza Álvarez, *Portugal en la Monarquía Hispánica (1580–1640): Felipe II, las Cortes de Tomar y la génesis del Portugal Católico*, Madrid 1987; Fernando Bouza Álvarez, *Portugal no tempo dos Filipes: política, cultura, representações (1580–1668)*, Lisboa 2000; Santiago de Luxán Meléndez, *La Revolución de 1640 en Portugal, sus fundamentos sociales y sus caracteres nacionales. El Consejo de Portugal: 1580–1640*, Madrid 1988; Rafael Valladares Ramírez, *Felipe IV y la Restauración de Portugal*, Málaga 1994; Rafael Valladares Ramírez, *La Rebelión de Portugal, 1640–1680: guerra, conflicto y poderes en la Monarquía Hispánica*, Valladolid 1998; Jean-Frédéric Schaub, *Le Portugal au temps du comte-duc d'Olivares (1621–1640): le conflit de juridictions comme exercice de la politique*, Madrid 2001; Jean-Frédéric Schaub, *Portugal na Monarquia Hispânica*, Lisbon 2001.

this evidence removes any basis from the idea of selecting "preferred" subjects for internationalisation.

None of what has been said seeks to question the usefulness and pertinence of a historiography that is more focused on explaining the history of each country. What is being defended here is that historiography that focuses on strictly national research objects has something to gain from the circulation of ideas and models of analysis that are inherent to internationalisation. This movement may even come to break the predetermined research routines that have been part of Portuguese academia for a long time. The fact that, traditionally, European reference history has been constructed from the viewpoint of England or of France has brought about bias and led many to believe that Portugal, because of its peripheral nature, was less interesting or less archetypal than other countries. However, if we look at European history using other thematic bases as starting points, different frames of reference emerge where, for example, the historical experiences of the countries and regions of Southern Europe assume indisputable relevance in the understanding of the contemporary world.

Från periferi till centrum

Historieämnets internationalisering i Portugal

I uppsatsen redogörs för hur portugisiska historiker förhåller sig till ämnets internationalisering. Den debatt som förts i den elektroniska tidskrift som grundats med syfte att sprida den portugisiska historieforskningen utanför Portugal, har lyft fram olika orsaker som svar på frågan varför de portugisiska historikerna i så ringa grad varit delaktiga i denna internationalisering. Bland orsakerna har framhållits universitetens organisering och karriärstrukturerna, där först och främst specialister på portugisiska historia efterfrågas för att fylla behovet av lärare, avsaknaden av bidrag för utlandsvistelser och för internationella konferenser samt det faktum att de portugisiska tidskrifterna inte håller måttet internationellt – nästan ingen av dem tillämpar ett anonymt granskningsförfarande.

Cunha och Cardim menar dock att en del av de problem som debatten pekat på nu håller på att lösas. Ett flertal nya forskningscentra knutna till universiteten har tillkommit på regeringens initiativ. Vid dessa centra kan lärare, forskare och doktorander söka långsiktig forskningsfinansiering, något som väsentligt förbättrat villkoren för forskning inom humaniora och samhällsvetenskap. Dessa forskningscentra, liksom den offentligt finansierade forskningen som sådan, genomgår regel-

bundna utvärderingar av kolleger från det internationella historikersamfundet. Även om dessa centrumbildningar innebär att forskningen koncentreras och specialiseras så kompenseras detta av att de samtidigt fått resurser till bland annat översättningar, publikationer, konferenser och resor. Bidrag från europeiska forskningsfinansiärer har hjälpt till att skapa europeiska forskningsprojekt genom vilka portugisiska historiker kunnat integrera den portugisiska historieskrivningen i den övriga sydeuropeiska historieskrivningen.

Trots dessa incitament är antalet artiklar publicerade av portugisiska historiker i tidskrifter utanför Portugal relativt litet. En av anledningarna, hävdas det, är att portugisiska historiker liksom andra historiker utanför den anglosaxiska världen inte har för vana att företrädesvis publicera sina uppsatser i tidskrifter, utan lika gärna publicerar i konferensrapporter och forskningsantologier.

Det är också märkbart att majoriteten av de portugisiska historikerna fortsätter att visa minimalt intresse för ämnen utanför den nationella historien. Det nationella perspektivet är centralt i portugisisk historieskrivning, liksom i andra mindre länder.

Under de sista åren har en expansiv bokmarknad uppmuntrat de portugisiska historikerna att producera översiktsverk och biografier. Förlagen har dock inte gjort några försök att få dessa översatta. I de fall det har skett har det varit på författarnas initiativ.

Internationaliseringen skall dock inte, understryks det, ses som ett mål i sig utan som ett sätt att höja kvalitén på den historiska forskningen. Internationaliseringen kommer förhoppningsvis att ge upphov till en "vetenskaplig kosmopolitism" där vi kan bekanta oss med ett bredare spektra av metoder, frågeställningar, koncept, kategorier och tillvägagångssätt. Historiker från andra länder som visat intresse för Portugals stormaktsvälde, men ur andra perspektiv än det nationella, har på senare tid inspirerat portugisiska historiker att se på sitt forna imperium med nya ögon. Samma sak har skett med Portugal och det habsburgska väldet. Detta har inneburit ett nytt sätt att se på Portugals historia, ett sätt som inte postulerar det unika i Portugals historia.

I uppsatsen framhålls samtidigt att man inte får låta sig förblindas av vad internationaliseringen kan ge. Det är inte självklart att den forskning som sker någon annanstans alltid är bättre liksom det inte alltid är självklart att små länders historia intresserar historiker från andra håll. Detta är tydligt i många översiktsverk som har tendens att oreflekterat och okunnigt ta för givet att Portugal kan jämföras med närliggande större länder som Italien och Spanien. Det är sällan som portugisiska historiker bjuds in att bidra till de internationella översiktsverken, även om dessa verk behandlar frågor där den portugisiska erfarenheten är viktig.

Keywords: historiography Portugal, history Portugal, academic careers Portugal, higher education and state Portugal, research system Portugal