

# Discovering Moravian History

## The Many Times and Sources of an Unknown Land, 1830–1860

*Emma Hagström Molin*

In this chapter I analyze how actors in a specific region—Habsburg Moravia (*Mähren*)—discovered their land’s history through a variety of time-binding techniques: knowledge-making practices that connected different notions and layers of time.<sup>1</sup> In 1846, Moravia’s first official historiographer Antonin Boček (1802–1847) expressed his deepest concerns regarding the region’s past. According to Boček, Moravia was embarrassingly far behind the rest of Europe, especially in comparison to the neighboring, rival region of Bohemia, and was thus treated like a *terra incognita*—an unknown land—in European historiography.<sup>2</sup>

Boček stated this at a time when cultural heritage and historiography were being nationalized and scientific history had become a new scholarly ideal in Europe.<sup>3</sup> Since the 1830s, he had tried to catch up with these developments by collecting sources of Moravian history. Finally, in 1860, Moravia’s official historiographer at the time, Beda Dudík (1815–1890), published part one of the first written critical and general history of Moravia: *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*. To uncover the discovery of Moravian history, then, I will scrutinize the many times Dudík elaborated within his epos, and the decades of discovery between Boček’s collecting and Dudík’s publication of 1860, when Moravia’s historical existence was at stake.

This chapter follows a variety of actors and their knowledge practices in a number of places, institutions, and media; people and spaces that were sometimes only partly connected to universities and modern disciplinary history, the latter being of little relevance here. Instead, Moravian history emerged due to scholars who in thought and practice transcended the boundaries of the modern sciences, at least as we perceive them today. Similar to Staffan Bergwik’s chapter in this book on the methods of geologists and

dendrochronologists (Chapter 9), my contribution deals with the intersection of natural and historical times, but from a historiographical perspective. Martin Rudwick has proven that the sciences of the earth became historical at the end of the eighteenth century by borrowing thoughts and methods from human history.<sup>4</sup> Dudík's work, as I will demonstrate, equally illuminates the imprint of geohistory on historical scholarship. In direct connection to this, I will underscore that the knowledge practices used to manifest Moravian history had two distinct directions. One was vertical, digging deep into the Moravian ground, as Dudík considered sources hidden in the earth as he underpinned Moravia's ancient past. The other course was horizontal, going along the lines of historical time: meaning that archivists and historians perceived and organized Moravian sources (*Moravica*) according to a chronological timeline. Most importantly, and as the cream of the crop, Dudík synchronized vertical and horizontal notions of time in *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*, as his work brought to the fore multiple times. Despite these forceful efforts made to manifest the region's past, there never was a Moravian nation, and even after its definitive inclusion in Czech history, Moravia remained a periphery.<sup>5</sup> Even so, the time-binding techniques of Moravian actors illuminate how the times of nature and culture interconnected, as well as shed light on a general and significant problem of nineteenth-century European historiography: its material vulnerability and dependency.

## Introducing Moravia

The discovery of Moravian history can be said to constitute a particularly interesting case because it is atypical and nonteleological, the margravate being a small historical region that never developed into a modern and independent state. Under Habsburg rule for centuries, it then became a part of Czechoslovakia, and today, the Czech Republic. It should also be recognized that nationalism in nineteenth-century *Vielvölkerstaat* Austria clearly differed from the nationalism in the Western European nation-states: an Austrian nation never existed in a similar sense.<sup>6</sup> Within the Habsburg realm, Moravia was one of seventeen crownlands that differed in status, size, and degree of autonomy. Each crownland was a political entity, with its own regional constitution and coat of arms. Three strings of government were at work: the state administration, which reported to the central ministries in Vienna; and two regional ones, the dynastic administration directed by a representative of a Habsburg ruler (a governor, or after 1850 a *Statthalter*), and the independent administration controlled by the regional parliament and its administrative committee, the *Landesausschuss*, or the Committee of the Estates. This system of two- or threefold responsibility was complicated and made the crownlands difficult to govern.<sup>7</sup>

Societal spaces—such as a region with its political institutions—do not simply exist; they need to be made through various communicative practices that concretize them in spatial and temporal terms.<sup>8</sup> In this regard, the Moravian *Landesausschuss*, with its powerful individual members, was an important organ that supported and promoted scholarship and publications dealing with the region's past. As Boček initially illustrated, there were Moravians who eagerly tried to catch up with the European scholarly competition. Besides Boček, other male public actors like archivists, historians, and politicians—most of them privileged German-speaking noblemen but also others, like Dudík, of simpler backgrounds—were the driving forces in the Moravian historical enterprise. They understood the importance of establishing local institutions and providing both scholars and the public with access to historical evidence in order to support the Moravian past. A Moravian museum—*Franzensmuseum*—was inaugurated in 1817, and thus became the first public institution for Moravian knowledge and history in the Habsburg realm. The *Mährisches Landesarchiv*—Moravia's first historiographical archive—was established in the regional capital of Brno in 1839, and, at the same time Antonin Boček was appointed chief archivist and official Moravian historiographer. Alongside this, in the decades that followed several works were published presenting the archive's resources, together with historical source collections held in other Moravian locations.

The known Moravian sources at these institutions, however, were limited and could not provide evidence old enough to underpin the region's sovereignty during antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. These older periods were tremendously important, as little Moravia had its golden age then: the Greater Moravian Empire emerged in the 830s, only to be destroyed by the Magyars in 906. Greater Moravia covered far more territory than the Moravian margravate of the nineteenth century would, roughly today's Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland with Silesia, Hungary, and Serbia, with the actual margravate at its core. In the tenth century, the political shape of Central Europe as we know it today was gradually fleshed out. The then dynastically interlaced Bohemian and Moravian regions were conquered by the Holy Roman Empire, but retained a great amount of independence within this political sphere. Moravian-Bohemian expansions to the south in the thirteenth century eventually collided with the Habsburgs, who in time came to rule Moravia, along with Bohemia and Silesia, from 1526 until 1918.<sup>9</sup> The historical interlacements with the rivalry region of Bohemia were, as this chapter will underscore, problematic. Not only had the Moravian geographical scope decreased over time; it was a contested space that in 1848 had been proclaimed as Czech by historian Frantisek Palacký (1798–1876).<sup>10</sup> Twelve years later, Beda Dudík finally came to Moravia's defense.

## The Multiple Times of *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*

*Mährens allgemeine Geschichte* was published in twelve parts and covered approximately 1,350 years of the Moravian past. The large-scale project followed Beda Dudík throughout his career; the final book was not released until 1888, only two years before the author's death. Before Dudík's *opus magnum*, scholars had mainly collected Moravian sources and presented events and facts, but without producing a coherent historical narrative.<sup>11</sup> Dudík's approach to Moravian history reflected the qualities of Moravian patriotism and the state of the region's sources, as well as the author's scholarly profile. Dudík had studied history and theology in Brno, before entering the Benedictine Order and the Rajhrad monastery, where he was ordained in 1840. He then taught classical languages and history at the academy in Brno, adding geography and the natural sciences after the educational reform of 1848.<sup>12</sup> Dudík published a work dealing with Moravian statistics the same year, which underlines his engagement with the auxiliary sciences.<sup>13</sup> Other early-career missions included evaluating and organizing documents for the *Mährisches Landesarchiv* and collecting Moravian sources in Sweden and Rome, events I will return to later in this chapter. The latter missions were ultimately considered very successful, and were key to the Moravian estates appointing Dudík as Moravia's official historiographer in 1858.<sup>14</sup>

*Mährens allgemeine Geschichte* has been interpreted as conservative, and perceived as outdated even in its own time. The religious overtone in a time of secularization is one reason for this, while another is Dudík's advocacy of *Landespatriotismus*—a common feature of the crownlands in the late eighteenth century—at a time when ethnic nationalism had already won.<sup>15</sup> I argue, however, that Dudík's work is intriguing when we consider it in terms of how multiple timescales can be put to use, as this is a major feature of *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*. Regarding national history and time, Bonnie G. Smith has argued that, just as natural scientists produced a deep time in their studies of the earth, historians produced a similar time for the nation-state, which they filled with great national events. According to Smith, the historical time of a nation was cleansed from temporal localisms, ritual, and household qualities in order to create a transcendent, secular, and serial timeline.<sup>16</sup> While this fit well with the grand narrative of how the study of nature and of human culture was separated, Dudík's Moravian history deviates from this notion in several respects.

First, the crucial part Dudík ascribed to Christianity should not be dismissed as obsolete; rather, it vividly expressed the prominent position the Catholic faith held among the Moravians, which was a feature that *separated* them from most Bohemians, who were generally Protestant.<sup>17</sup> Conversely,

Frantisek Palacký viewed the Proto-Protestant Hussite movement of the early fifteenth century to be Bohemia's golden age, even if Palacký's narrative was far more secular than Dudík's.<sup>18</sup> Second, Catholic devotion influenced where Dudík began Moravian time, as he strove to unite Moravia with Christian chronology. The third and main part of volume one of *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte* indeed dealt with the Christianizing of Moravia, between the years 863 and 906. It was furthermore the Slavs, who arrived in Moravia in the seventh century, and then somewhat later Christianity, that gave Moravia its cultural history.<sup>19</sup> When establishing the origin of Moravia, then, Dudík intriguingly never gave an exact starting point for the region's history. Instead, he began by giving an account of the Celtic settlements in the "oldest times." However, it is clear that he placed Moravia's birth close to the year 0 according to Christian chronology. This reflects not only religious conviction but also a political choice. In the preface, Dudík reinterpreted a long existing Slavic-German antagonism, depicting the Moravian Slavs as agents of the Roman curia and thus making them into the patrons of Christianity as a whole. Moravia, Dudík wrote, had been a fortress against ancient Germany, which was seen as the great threat to the Church in those days.<sup>20</sup> The fortress metaphor certainly reflected the geopolitics of his own time; a possible German unification brought much anxiety to Central Europe.<sup>21</sup>

On the subject of historical time, Reinhart Koselleck has argued that it is subjective and inherently tied to social and political events—the actions of humans, and their institutions and organizations. Each of these units has its own temporal rhythm. Instead of talking about one historical time, Koselleck has suggested that one should think in terms of many times, which overlap one another.<sup>22</sup> Drawing on Koselleck, Helge Jordheim has claimed that the modern temporal regime, which began being established at the end of the eighteenth century, has constantly been challenged since then, especially in its youth. A way to handle these challenges was to combine different times through what Jordheim has called "practices of synchronization."<sup>23</sup> Taking this into account, Dudík's time-binding work, in which he clearly wanted to unite Moravian time with the birth of Christ, can be seen as such an act of synchronization.

But Dudík did not limit himself to the Christian and Moravian chronologies; he addressed Moravian geography, and additionally introduced a third time regime by going even further into the past. By digging deep into the Moravian earth, Dudík actually brought human history closer to the time of nature. It has been maintained that when European historians started paying less attention to God and more to earth, and simultaneously acknowledged civilizations other than the Christian ones, history became indefinitely longer. This meant that in the late eighteenth century, some historians could not even see a definite beginning or end to historical time.<sup>24</sup> To reconnect

with Koselleck, he has furthermore argued that “every historically relative chronology is based in a time that is pre-given by nature,” thus underlining the former’s dependency on the latter.<sup>25</sup> Intriguingly, while Dudík chose not to start Moravian history in an exact year, he effortlessly invoked nature, claiming that the key to understanding a region’s history all too often lies in its geographical location and geological characteristics, a statement that clearly interlaces nature with culture.<sup>26</sup> Dudík argued that the Moravian borders were natural, and in this way manifested the region as a distinct geographical space. In the west, Dudík wrote, the Moravian highlands separated the region from Bohemia; in the north, the Sudetes mountains provided a border with Silesia; in the east, the Carpathians formed the frontier to Hungary. Conveniently enough, it was only toward Austria in the south that a natural border was lacking, but the Danube could possibly be seen as such.<sup>27</sup> In other words, the area he initially described in *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte* was not the Greater Moravia of the ninth century but the Moravian borders of his own time.

Dudík’s scholarly antagonist, Palacký, had also turned to nature and the earth in his *Geschichte von Böhmen*, where he embedded the origin of the Bohemian nation in prehistorical time. He even included a history of Bohemia’s geological formation written by a naturalist (*Naturforscher*), Franz Xaver Zippe (1791–1863).<sup>28</sup> Monika Baár, who has studied East-Central European historians and nationalism, has argued that a geographical base for a nation’s origin was one way of handling the fact that nineteenth-century borders were not fixed according to ethnicity or languages. This circumstance generally divided the imagined national communities into diverse political entities, which were difficult to unite.<sup>29</sup>

Placing national origin in a specific geography and geology, however, could solve yet another problem. In *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*, Dudík had to acknowledge that the critical study of Moravian history had indeed begun with Palacký. When Dudík positioned himself against Palacký, the former claimed that his polarization was based on a thorough examination of evidence and the latest research; history was an empirical science.<sup>30</sup> But Palacký had pointed out something that troubled Dudík as well: that Bohemia and Moravia almost completely lacked written sources for the time before the twelfth century.<sup>31</sup> Dudík, then, openly expressed frustration at the fact that there were no internal writings that spoke about how the Moravians felt, thought, or acted in the oldest times. Instead, he had to rely on texts written by the enemy in times of war, which naturally reflected their point of view.<sup>32</sup> As Moravia’s golden age had taken place between the ninth century and the year 906, it was crucial to present this period as well as earlier periods with reliable evidence. This meant that Dudík, unlike Palacký, turned to archaeological evidence to underpin this period. Dudík wrote that, luckily, there were unwritten sources that “Mother Earth faithfully and unaltered has preserved for us.” He named

places of sacrifice, graves, shafts, jewelry, household utensils, weapons, castle and city ruins, old wall ruins, coins, and inscriptions; what the archaeologist of today would call material culture.<sup>33</sup> This kind of evidence had once been considered by Dudík's teacher Georg Wolný (1793–1871) in his Moravian topography, and later by Dudík himself in his 1854 publication on pagan burial sites.<sup>34</sup> Dudík described archaeological evidence as the historian's mine lantern, guiding him through the tunnels of prehistory, just as fossils do for the geologist.<sup>35</sup>

Dudík's use of this geological metaphor is intriguing. Many scholars occupied with the history of historiography of the nineteenth century have paid attention to the use of metaphors in relation to practices in researching and writing history. For example, Bonnie G. Smith has brought attention to the analogy between modern disciplinary history, established as a science of facts, and the natural sciences. Using the natural sciences when describing the historian's task was not uncommon in the nineteenth century.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, Anthony Grafton has pointed out that Leopold von Ranke (1785–1886) saw himself as an explorer, arguing that the darkness of the archives should be investigated by the historian in the same way that great men had discovered Africa and the Near East.<sup>37</sup> Boček's portrayal of Moravian history as an unknown territory, cited in the introduction, works in a similar, surface-oriented, way. Dudík's metaphors, however, went in a deep vertical direction, referring to mines and fossils. He considered hidden prehistorical evidence rather than evoking unexplored territories on the face of the earth. Remarkably, these geological types of metaphors shadow the opposite phenomenon within geology, as noted by Rudwick and Bergwik, whereby nature is likened to an archive or a calendar. As the cream of the crop, and to conclude the times put to work in *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*, Dudík synchronized vertical and horizontal time, in a seemingly effortless way. To Dudík in 1860, thinking with multiple times and excavating metaphors were useful means for the historical legitimization of Moravia. And, as he firmly placed the nation in the ground, this harmonized culture and nature.

## Discovering an Unknown Land

The following takes a look at how Moravian archivists and historians perceived and organized written sources of Moravian history. A source, *eine Quelle*, literally means "a place of origin."<sup>38</sup> Just as objects and fossils hidden in the Moravian soil were evidence that supported the region's deep time, texts—being the historian's most common resource—inherently served the same purpose. Evidence in the form of archival documents and manuscripts was collected and arranged chronologically by Moravian scholars in the 1830s,

40s, and 50s, and I argue that they imagined the region's past in the shape of a timeline. By timeline, I am not referring to actual graphical representations of time but rather how history was *perceived*, organized, and presented in printed inventories and catalogs.<sup>39</sup> Source collecting had been done before, of course, but for private purposes and on a more modest scale. From the 1830s, however, it was carried out with the intention that history should serve the public.<sup>40</sup> Step by step, the largely unknown Moravian historical landscape was mapped by archivists and historians, tracing and taking inventory of sources in city archives as well as in ecclesiastical and private collections.<sup>41</sup> As pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, the possibility for Moravia to have an independent history at all was at stake, hence Antonin Boček's dramatic phrasing.

Several political events in the past had given Boček and his fellows reason to worry. Archives and other forms of heritage had been threatened by political turbulence and destruction since the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, and the revolutions that followed. This transformed endangered archives into places of mystery, and many prominent historians, like Ranke, fetishized sources in their private correspondence and diaries.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, archives all over Europe were centralized, as this, along with publishing sources, was seen as a significant tool for preserving the past.<sup>43</sup> Archival centralization gave birth to the provenance principle, as it was convenient: instead of reorganizing incoming material, the origin of the collection was respected and thus documents remained together.<sup>44</sup>

Against this backdrop, I will circle the fact that evidence collected by Boček, Dudík, and others was first given value based on its ability or inability to be defined as Moravian, so-called *Moravica*. This category was made up of sources produced within Moravia and/or dealing with Moravia in one way or the other, mainly in Latin. Classification, being a subjective and interpretive practice, was inherently affected by nationalism.<sup>45</sup> As national identities were transferred to historical objects in post-Napoleonic Europe, the perception of heritage was forever changed.<sup>46</sup> Nonetheless, Susan Crane has argued that European nationalism could easily have been expressed without historical objects and the collecting of them. According to her, heritage spoke about historicity rather than the nation, and its value was determined by the ability to refer to already existing historical knowledge.<sup>47</sup> The already existing historical knowledge in the Moravian case was the timeline, materialized through collections, collecting, and source publications. Thus, one should not underestimate the role that material historicity played in nineteenth-century Europe; and most importantly, the new scientific history of the nineteenth century, as a science of facts, could not be performed without authentic sources.<sup>48</sup> Without historical evidence, then, the imagined community had a severe problem concerning legitimacy. This is also why archeological evidence could complement writings, as well as why forged sources were created.<sup>49</sup>

When the *Mährisches Landesarchiv* was established in 1839, it was the first institution solely dedicated to Moravian history. It was in some competition with the *Franzensmuseum*, which had been established by the Moravian Society for Agriculture twenty years earlier. From the beginning, the museum housed an archive and a library together with natural historical and science collections. Later, paintings, coins, and seals were added.<sup>50</sup> Importantly, the *Franzensmuseum* already functioned as an institution for archival protection, and received some documents from neglected archives and registries in the Moravian region.<sup>51</sup> Marlies Raffler has shown that the provincial museums in the Habsburg Empire were simultaneously regional and universal, as their collections served both a specific place and the universal history of mankind. Interestingly, the origins of these Austrian provincial museums can be found in the so-called *Ländesbeschreibungen*, documents depicting the different Habsburg regions and their inhabitants, compiled in order to inform the rulers.<sup>52</sup> This means that Moravian actors were drawing upon the older tradition of the *Ländesbeschreibungen* when they established their museum in 1817, the *Franzensmuseum* being one of the first of its kind in the Empire. Contrastingly, the archive came to deal with Moravian history only.

Just as in many other European cases, the establishment of historical institutions relied heavily on the benevolence of the local elite. Count Anton Friedrich von Mittrowsky (1770–1842) was one of the most generous patrons of Moravian history, involved in establishing both the *Franzensmuseum* and the *Landesarchiv*. He also solely financed the first volumes of *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae*, an edition of official Moravian documents published in fifteen volumes between 1836 and 1903 as a Moravian counterpart to the German *Monumenta germaniae historica*.<sup>53</sup> Boček had worked as a private tutor for the Mittrowsky family, before becoming a professor in Bohemian language and literature at the academy in Olomouc. Being Mittrowsky's protégé, Boček was appointed the first chief archivist and official historiographer of Moravia. As head of the archive, he kept himself busy with source collecting rather than writing. He had already started this as a private person, and now as an official it kept him and his assistant occupied for most of the 1840s, when sources were bought, transcribed, and excerpted for the benefit of the archive.<sup>54</sup>

During his collecting days in the early 1830s, Boček crossed paths with Frantisek Palacký. Interestingly, their interaction illuminates how Moravian history gradually came to be defined in relation to Bohemian history, and the political and scientific tensions between the two regions. Both Boček and Palacký were born in Moravia, but chose different paths in their scholarly lives. Palacký settled in Prague, where he became a vital figure within the Czech nationalist movement, and clearly thought of Moravia as part of the Czech nation.<sup>55</sup> Boček, on the other hand, was a Moravian patriot

and separatist, who consequently came to work with dividing the regions' histories.<sup>56</sup>

Nonetheless, the initial contact between Boček and Palacký was collaborative: they exchanged sources, and even discussed the possibility of publishing a joint *diplomatar* for Bohemia and Moravia at the expense of the Bohemian estates. Their correspondence illustrates how the histories of the two regions could sometimes be perceived as one, but simultaneously, sources were understood as either Bohemian or Moravian and thus separate pasts were suggested. Palacký, for example, argued that Bohemians and Moravians were one people, and that a *diplomatar* for their ancient history was more or less inseparable. At the same time, however, he claimed that “several pure *Bohemica*” (*viele reine Bohemica*) were to be found in Moravian archives.<sup>57</sup> And, when he wrote to Boček regarding documents from the eleventh century he requested copies of them, even if “they only were strict *Moravica*” (*auch wenn sie nur stricte Moravica wären*).<sup>58</sup> While these phrases capture a nationalization of sources, in this case they also reflect an ambiguity. Indeed, Beda Dudík later brought up the entangled annals of Bohemia and Moravia in *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*.<sup>59</sup> Trying to split these regions' histories from each other, then, was an ongoing process, which Dudík was still struggling with later in Sweden and Rome in the early 1850s. Ultimately, Boček's and Palacký's collaboration ended with a severe argument, reflecting their different understandings of the identity of sources. Boček accused Palacký of withholding evidence from him; Palacký answered that he was not aware that Boček perceived all Bohemian deeds as *Moravica*.<sup>60</sup> This clash in interpretation, then, underlines the politics of claiming sources from a national perspective. It should be noted that, while the rivalry between Bohemia and Moravia expressed here can hardly be contested, the sovereignty of Austria was never mentioned or questioned in this context. While Palacký came to fight for a federalization of the Habsburg Empire, he still considered it to be necessary well into the 1860s.<sup>61</sup>

## The Moravian Timeline and Its Gaps

The collecting and organizing of Moravian materials not only strove to identify sources as *Moravica* and separate them from other regions' and nations' histories, but, as the following will point out, mapping was also carried out in order to evaluate the Moravian past. As this evaluation was done, gaps were identified in the Moravian chronology, which raised questions regarding the loss and actual whereabouts of *Moravica*. Could the missing pieces still be found somewhere?

Boček died in 1847, before he had the chance to finish a “critically compiled history” of Moravia (*eine kritisch bearbeitete Geschichte*); the *opus magnum* is

still missing.<sup>62</sup> The results of his vast source mapping were published, though, presented in chronological order by his successor as chief archivist, Peter von Chlumecky (1825–1863). The publication included a preface Boček had written shortly before he died, and it was here that he expressed his deepest concerns regarding Moravian historiography, openly comparing it with that of Bohemia. While the latter had experienced six stages of historical scholarship, starting with Cosmas of Prague in the tenth century, Moravia barely had one. According to Boček, there were mainly two reasons why Moravia had turned into the *terra incognita* of continental historiography: the region lacked a learned society that exclusively engaged with and supported Moravian history; and the *Landesarchiv* was an inadequate historical resource. It was not only a question of too little existing material to support Moravian history, but the sources at hand had not even been processed enough.<sup>63</sup>

As Boček's successor von Chlumecky argued, the conditions for Moravia's history had recently improved. For example, new valuable source collections had been added to the *Landesarchiv*. Von Chlumecky did, however, point out gaps in the Moravian chronology. As the *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae* was a long-term project, a summary of all Moravian sources produced before 1620 present in Moravia was given in von Chlumecky's report.<sup>64</sup> The documents of the Moravian estates were presented as the region's most important sources. They had been stored in the Brno city hall since the mid-seventeenth century, but according to von Chlumecky there were substantial gaps in their chronology, as many documents dated before 1650 had been lost somehow.<sup>65</sup> These historical losses were combined with fears of new loss; that what yet remained in the country was under constant threat of destruction. These anxieties were not unique to Moravian actors, but had been expressed by historians and other intellectuals across Europe since the French Revolution, as pointed out earlier.<sup>66</sup> In the Moravian case, though, the anxiety was grounded in the severe fact that the region's history had not been fully explored yet. The Moravian historical landscape was still partly unknown and unorganized; Beda Dudík's history was not finished until the 1880s; and the *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae* was completed as late as 1903.

This became evident shortly after Boček's death, when the social unrest of 1848 spread to the Habsburg Empire. In Moravia, the turbulence placed history at the top of the political agenda; representatives from all classes came together in an advisory parliament, which agreed that one of the main issues was saving the Moravian historical enterprise. The *Landesausschuss* supported the wishes of the parliament in 1849, giving Beda Dudík the mission to continue Boček's work by inventorying a recently purchased collection, the J. P. Ceroni collection, and evaluating the documents Boček had compiled himself.<sup>67</sup> Both collections were regarded to be of national interest. J. P. Ceroni (1753–1826) was a prominent Moravian politician, historian, and collector;

he had acquired documents and manuscripts from dissolved monasteries and at library auctions, and over time his private collection had grown into one of the richest in the Bohemian crownlands.<sup>68</sup> Mittrowsky, until his death in 1842, had struggled for the collection to be bought from Ceroni's heir in Vienna, for Moravia's benefit. When this was finalized in 1844, sixty-eight manuscripts had already been sold off and were thus lost. The collection was nonetheless moved from Vienna to Brno the same year, where it was declared Moravian property.<sup>69</sup>

The purchase was seen as inestimable for Moravian history. In the introduction to Dudík's published inventory, he stated that his purpose was to describe the sources in a way that would protect them from "loss and exchange" (*Verluste und Auswechselungen*), by summarizing their main content and historical peculiarities.<sup>70</sup> Making inventories, then, in which sources were classified and described, and mediating them to the public was a way to protect history and secure its livelihood. Dudík did, however, have methodological concerns when bringing the collection into scientific order. His problem reflects the fact that the mentioned principle of provenance, which to this day is the Western archival regime, had not yet reached its full breakthrough, and nineteenth-century historians actually seem to have preferred sources in chronological order.<sup>71</sup> Dudík regretted that he could not apply what he called a "paleological-chronological" (*die Paläologisch-chronologische*) order when presenting Ceroni's treasures. In other words, while chronological organization was seen as the most appropriate, for Dudík it was impossible in the Ceroni case. Dudík felt obligated to respect the order already imposed by the former owner, despite its flaws.<sup>72</sup> About a decade before *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*, then, Dudík united nature's deep history with the Moravian timeline when discussing ordering principles. Thus, the winning order, based on the Moravian collector's legacy, reflects the emerging importance of provenance. Accordingly, Dudík presented the Ceroni collection's contribution to Moravia's political history in its table of contents. It is nevertheless remarkable that he did not perceive provenance as the most scientific order, but merely the simplest one.

The Moravian museum, the establishment of the *Landesarchiv*, Boček's collecting, and Dudík's inventorying practices reveal how Moravian history was defined in an independent manner, through attempts to separate it from Bohemia, and without involving Austria. As the Moravian historical landscape started to emerge with more clarity, new problems arose. Dudík had stated that historical research could not be done without descriptions of sources, as there was no way for scholars to know where to begin, or which gaps needed to be filled.<sup>73</sup> History was thought of as a whole—and the expectations for its evidence were high. The missing pieces, however, needed to be found and processed. Before his death, Boček had indicated several

locations outside Moravia where its history had been displaced. These places included Bohemia, Rome, and Sweden; Frantisek Palacký, through his Roman research, had shown that the Papal Archives were relevant to Moravia, and the source mapping in Moravia had brought new attention to historical events of looting.<sup>74</sup> The following will consider some of these dislocations and sources of Moravian history abroad.

## Excavating Moravica in Stockholm and Rome

Beda Dudík published *Forschungen in Schweden für Mährens Geschichte* in 1852, and as the title suggests, he had explored the Moravian past in Sweden. The historical background was well known to him and his fellow historians. During the leadership of Swedish Chancellor of Realm Axel Oxenstierna (1583–1654), archives and libraries in Bohemia and Moravia had been plundered during the Thirty Years' War, and ever since, politicians and scholars in the Habsburg realm had made efforts to retrieve the material. According to information circulating in the Moravian press in 1850, as many as seven to eight thousand volumes of printed books and manuscripts, along with other kinds of *Bohemica* and *Moravica*, were still to be found in Swedish collections. In 1851, the Moravian *Landesausschuss* decided to send an expert, Dudík, to investigate the veracity of these rumors.<sup>75</sup> In 1852 and 1853 he continued this mission in Rome, primarily to research the manuscripts Swedish Queen Christina had taken with her in 1654 when she abdicated and left for Rome. Her books were now housed in the Vatican Library.

During these two journeys, Dudík accomplished an extensive mapping and evaluation of a great number of sources, which generated new knowledge about Moravian history and contributed to filling holes in the Moravian timeline. The new knowledge was mediated through several publications: the summaries *Forschungen in Schweden* and *Iter Romanum I–II* (1855), which included a limited selection of important sources as appendices; and additional publications of single works printed later. Dudík's diplomatic skills even led to restitution, as twenty-one manuscripts in the Bohemian language were donated by the Swedish King to the Austrian Government in 1878. These manuscripts were transferred to the *Landesarchiv* in Brno, where they are still preserved today.<sup>76</sup>

In the following, I zoom in on Dudík's work in the archives. Even though his concern was Moravia he could not exclude Bohemia, or Austria, from his investigations. In a way similar to Boček's, when he was collecting for the *diplomatar* in the 1830s and 40s, the histories of Bohemia and Moravia were entangled in the foreign archives. In the introduction to *Forschungen in Schweden für Mährens Geschichte*, Dudík discusses the historical fate of the two

crownlands together, and concludes that the Swedish National Archives were essential to Austria, Bohemia, and Moravia.<sup>77</sup> The National Archives indeed became one of the most important sites of findings for Dudík in Sweden, and he argued that this collection was indispensable for an impartial history of the Thirty Years' War. Without this treasure, as he phrased it, Austrian history could not attain a true picture of these difficult times, and the sources at hand in Sweden were described as invaluable. In conclusion, Dudík valued this archive as equally important as the historical collections in Vienna.<sup>78</sup>

Hardly surprising, Dudík chose to focus on the Swedish occupation of Moravia during the period 1642–48. Despite this perimeter, he came across material that served history in general, as he expressed it. He used his findings in the Swedish archive to criticize a Prussian colleague, Friedrich Förster (1791–1868), who had written a three-part biography on the Bohemian baron Albrecht von Waldstein (1583–1634). Förster had based his study on records held in Vienna only, while Dudík—thanks to his Swedish research—could question Förster's knowledge on the subject. Consequently, Dudík listed evidence that essentially modified Förster's narrative.<sup>79</sup> Dudík's second most important archival finding was the fourth part of the *Königlichen schwedischen in Teutschland geführte Krieg*, written by official Swedish historiographer Bogislav von Chemnitz (1605–1678). Unlike the first parts, the fourth had never reached the printing press. This original manuscript, upon Dudík's closer inspection, dealt with the Swedish occupation of Moravia, making it a main piece of evidence in his eyes. He therefore presented the content of the full folio in *Forschungen in Schweden*, and made sure to copy two hundred letters and other documents used by Chemnitz, almost all of them strict *Moravica*, as he saw it. Having had the opportunity to compare Chemnitz's work with the original sources, Dudík offered much praise regarding the former's accuracy and craft.<sup>80</sup>

Dudík was extremely efficient during his eight-month stay in Rome. He examined all 2,322 manuscripts that had once belonged to Queen Christina. Besides the Vatican, he visited twelve other archives and libraries in Rome, and traveled to the monastery of Monte Cassino south of the city. In fact, the main part of *Iter Romanum I* deals with collections other than Queen Christina's manuscripts in the Vatican Library, and the second part is completely dedicated to the Papal registry. To the Benedictine Dudík, the Papal archive was the most important archive in the world, and even if he mentioned material that was relevant to Austria there, his main concern was to discover Moravian sources. It should be noted, though, that evidence associated with Moravia in the thirteenth century was sorted under Germany, or the Holy Roman Empire, of which the former was a part.<sup>81</sup> As mentioned, thanks to Frantisek Palacký's earlier research, Moravian scholars knew the Papal registry was relevant to their region. Dudík got permission from the chief archivist, Marino

Marini (1783–1855), to continue Palacký's review, which had been disrupted in 1837. Dudík started where Palacký had stopped his inquiry, in 1307, and went through fifty-nine folio volumes containing more than 68,000 deeds. It was not without pride that Dudík compared his endeavor with that of Palacký, who had worked through only forty-six volumes and approximately 4,500 deeds.<sup>82</sup> This was another example of how the scholarly rivalry was articulated.

What, then, did Dudík's archival work in Sweden and Rome mean for the discovery of Moravian history? Previous scholarship has rightly pointed out that collecting heritage and compiling source editions were manifestations of national pride, and means for legitimization.<sup>83</sup> In this way, Dudík's publications, with their catalogue and source edition parts, were important tools, helping the reader imagine what had once been lost as coherent collections and understand sources' scientific value, and allowing the reader to peruse some texts in full.<sup>84</sup> If publishing Moravian sources located within the region was a way to prevent future loss, the Swedish and Roman publications explored a loss that had already taken place. This made the mediations even more central; they contributed to the Moravian timeline and verified the region's historical existence.

Dudík's manuscript draft regarding his work in Sweden bears the working title *Forschungen in Schwedischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*.<sup>85</sup> The published version, however, with Moravian history in its title, consequently puts this in the spotlight. Bohemian history might have been impossible to separate from that of Moravia in the archives; still, the former region was not mentioned anywhere near Dudík's title. *Iter Romanum*, on the other hand, acknowledged the Papal registry as the finest historical resource in the world, which was also planetary. Dudík's research highlighted the precious relationship between Moravia and the Catholic Church. As Catholicism was such an important feature of Moravian identity, exploring this historical link was of great significance. A bit unconventionally, though, Dudík's research placed one of the nineteenth century's most coveted archives in the world—the Papal Archives in Rome—in relation to something as peripheral as the Swedish National Archives in the north. His work in Stockholm shows that this remote location held undiscovered treasures never studied by established continental scholars, and knowing the Stockholm sources allowed him to criticize his peers. Just like Ranke, Dudík was an explorer of unknown territories.

In the end, regardless of location, or other nations and regions embedded in the works, these publications manifested Moravian history: its deep time as well as its horizontal timeline. When Dudík described the historian's task at the beginning of *Iter Romanum I*, he interestingly used excavating and other vertical metaphors similar to those that would reappear in *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte* some years later. History, Dudík wrote, is a shaft (*Schacht*) where the

historian must be able to separate precious fossil from useless granite.<sup>86</sup> In other words, the historian's attention had to be pointed in the right direction, in order to excavate the right sources, before the actual interpretation of them could begin. Furthermore, Dudík described both the Royal Library and the National Archives in Stockholm as a *Fundgrube*, a mine rich of findings. This expression had multiple meanings. *Fundgrube* could of course be used in the literal sense, signifying a place where a valuable metal like gold was found; but it could also have a metaphorical meaning, and had been used since the fifteenth century to describe a book, a location, or a collection where knowledge was stored.<sup>87</sup> To Dudík, then, the Stockholm collections were sites of key findings for historical knowledge—and not just any kind, but Moravian knowledge.

## Moravian History Discovered

This chapter has analyzed the time-binding techniques of an unknown land. In 1846, historian Antonin Boček judged Moravia's history to be inadequate. Successively, though, Moravia did come into being as a historical space—through different knowledge-making practices of collecting, organizing, and mediating sources, and with the help of archaeological evidence, geological metaphors, and temporal synchronizations. Beda Dudík's way of framing Moravian history in 1860, based on an outdated *Landespatriotismus* and permeated by Catholic devotion, had specific consequences for establishing Moravian time. Dudík brought Moravia's history into sync with Christian chronology, as well as with the deep time of the earth. Thus, Moravia was related to far more extensive and planetary time scales than that of a nation. The collecting, organizing, and mediating of Moravian history that preceded Dudík's epos were carried out intensively in the 1830s, 40s, and 50s, with the purpose of finding *Moravica*, and establishing a Moravian timeline so that the region could finally be marked out on the European historiographical map. In this context, Moravian history was perceived as a chronology, materialized through a lineage of sources. When gaps were identified in this timeline they interrupted the historical whole, and Moravian historians eventually searched for *Moravica* abroad. While this source collecting was transnational, Moravia's past needed to be separated from that of other regions and nations, in knowledge practices as well as publications. The actors involved worked under severe pressure, seeing Moravian history as being threatened; in the past, the present, and the future.

In conclusion, the history of how Moravian history was discovered contributes to current scholarly debates on temporal regimes, and to deepening

the knowledge of how the times of nature and humans were understood, used, and fused in the nineteenth century. Moreover, while Western European perspectives have dominated research dealing with nationalism, heritage, and historiography so far, this chapter has demonstrated that the Moravian case can bring new insights to these discussions. It is widely acknowledged that the Rankean ambition to study the past “how it actually happened” has dominated Western historiography for the last two hundred years. However, historians of marginal regions, such as Boček and Dudík, were rather occupied with asking themselves where the past is located and to whom does it, in its material forms, actually belong? Moravia’s history can certainly be ruled as failed; especially considering Dudík’s *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*, which was outdated before it was even finished. Even so, the idea that there once existed a Greater Moravia is still alive in the part of the Czech Republic that once constituted the Moravian margravate. As this chapter has demonstrated, Moravian actors came up with energetic solutions for dealing with being inferior in a European context; and mapping and mediating history was a significant strategy for dealing with loss. The founding of a Moravian timeline was primarily about securing a material source base. Mediations of dislocated sources could fill holes in the Moravian historical void, as lost evidence was uncovered. There was indeed never a Moravian nation according to Western standards. Even so, by its own qualities, Moravian history ultimately shows that knowing historical matter and time, vertically as well as horizontally, both literally and metaphorically, is fundamental to all historiography.

## Acknowledgments

The research on which this article is based has been funded by the Swedish Research Council (“Materializing Historical Knowledge,” project no. 2016–00234).

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Staffan Bergwik and Anders Ekström, the coauthors of this volume, and to the two outside reviewers for their comments on earlier versions of this chapter. A special thanks to my Berlin colleague Eric Engstrom, for our thought-provoking discussions and his generous advice on my work.

**Emma Hagström Molin** is a Researcher at the Department of the History of Science and Ideas at Uppsala University, Sweden. Her first book, to be published by Brill in 2022, explores the fate of seventeenth-century spoils of war taken by Swedish regents and field marshals during their respective military campaigns in Central and Eastern Europe. Her current project analyzes provenance, as a historically contingent concept, organizing principle, and research practice that emerged in nineteenth-century Europe.

## NOTES

1. See Staffan Bergwik and Anders Ekström's discussion of "time-binding techniques" in the introduction to this book.
2. *Die Regesten der Archive im Markgrathume Mähren, und Anton Boczck's Berichte über die Forschungen in diesem Lande* (Brno: Nitsch & Grosse, 1856), xv.
3. See for example Peter Aronsson and Gabriella Elgenius, eds., *Building National Museums in Europe 1750–2010: Conference Proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen, Bologna 28–30 April 2011* (Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press, 2011); Monika Baár, *Historians and Nationalism: East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press: 2010); Mitchell G. Ash and Jan Surman, eds., *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Ilaria Porciani and Raphael Lutz, eds., *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
4. Martin J. S. Rudwick, *Bursting the Limits of Time: The Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 182.
5. Miroslav Hroch and Jitka Malecková, "The Construction of Czech National History," *Historein* 1 (1999): 105.
6. Emma Bentz and Marlies Raffler, "National Museums in Austria," in *Building National Museums in Europe 1750–2010: Conference Proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen, Bologna 28–30 April 2011*, ed. Peter Aronsson and Gabriella Elgenius (Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press, 2011), 25–26.
7. Peter Haslinger, "How to Run a Multilingual Society: Statehood, Administration and Regional Dynamics in Austria-Hungary, 1867–1914," in *Region and State in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Nation-Building, Regional Identities and Separatism*, ed. Joost Augusteijn and Eric Storm (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 119–20.
8. Konstanze N'Guessan, Carola Lentz, and Marie-Christin Gabriel, "Performing the National Territory: The Geography of National-Day Celebrations," *Nations and Nationalism* 23, no. 4 (2017): 687.
9. Tomasz Kamusella, *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 16–19. The idea of Greater Moravia already existed in the eighteenth century, see Milan Horňáček, "Imaginiertes Großmähren: Zur Erfindung von Traditionen in der mährischen Historiographie des langes 19. Jahrhunderts," *Brücken: Germanistisches Jahrbuch Tschechien Slowakei* 18 (2010): 242–44; and is still represented in the Moravian *Landesmuseum*; see "Grossmähren," last modified January 26, 2021, <http://www.mzm.cz/de/grossmaehren>.
10. Hroch and Malecková, "Czech National History," 105.
11. Maurus Kinter, *Der mährische Landeshistoriograph Dr. Beda Dudík* (Brno: Carl Winiker, 1890), 10. Two forerunners worth mentioning are Joseph W. Monse, see Horňáček, "Imaginiertes Großmähren," 242–45; and Dudík's teacher Georg Wolný's *Die Markgrafschaft Mähren: Topographisch statistisch und historisch geschildert* (Brno: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1835).

12. Kinter, *Dr. Beda Dudík*, 5–6.
13. Beda Dudík, *Mähren's gegenwärtige Zustände vom Standpunkte der Statistik* (Brno: Carl Winiker, 1848); Kinter, *Dr. Beda Dudík*, 4.
14. Kinter, *Dr. Beda Dudík*, 6–7.
15. Horňáček, “Imaginiertes Großmähren,” 247; Hroch and Malecková, “Czech National History,” 107.
16. Bonnie G. Smith, *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 151.
17. Horňáček, “Imaginiertes Großmähren,” 245–47; Kamusella, *Language and Nationalism*, 501.
18. Baár, *Historians*, 237–39.
19. Beda Dudík, *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte* (Brno: Georg Gastl, 1860), 60–62, 79–80.
20. Dudík, *Mährens allgemeine*, viii.
21. Horňáček, “Imaginiertes Großmähren,” 245, 247–48; Kamusella, *Language and Nationalism*, 18–19.
22. Reinhardt Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 110.
23. Helge Jordheim, “Multiple Times and the Work of Synchronization,” *History and Theory* 53, no. 4 (2014): 513–18.
24. Lucien Höschler, “Time Gardens: Historical Concepts in Modern Historiography,” *History and Theory* 53, no. 4 (2014): 581.
25. Koselleck, *The Practice*, 106.
26. Dudík writes “geognostische Beschaffenheit,” from “Geognosie,” literally “earth knowledge”; Dudík, *Mährens allgemeine*, 1; see Rudwick, *Limits of Time*, 84–87.
27. Dudík, *Mährens allgemeine*, 6. Dudík writes of the Moravian mountains; today, however, the area is referred to as the Bohemian-Moravian highlands.
28. František Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen: Grösstentheils nach Urkunden und Handschriften* (Prague: Kronberger und Weber, 1836), 10–17.
29. Baár, *Historians*, 68.
30. Dudík, *Mährens allgemeine*, xi–xii.
31. Palacký, *Böhmen*, vi–vii.
32. Dudík, *Mährens allgemeine*, vii–viii.
33. Dudík, 4.
34. Beda Dudík, *Über die alten heidnischen Begräbnisplätze in Mähren* (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei zu Wien, 1854).
35. Dudík, *Mährens allgemeine*, 4.
36. Smith, *Gender*, 133–35.
37. Anthony Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (London: Faber, 1997), 48–49.
38. “Source,” last modified January 27, 2021, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/source>; “Quelle,” last modified January 27, 2021, <https://www.duden.de/recht-schreibung/Quelle>.
39. Regarding graphic representations of time, see Daniel Rosenberg and Anthony Grafton, *Cartographies of Time: A History of the Timeline* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010), 10–12.

40. Baár, *Historians*, 47–48.
41. A summary of this enterprise is given in *Die Regesten*, i–xxi.
42. Smith, *Gender*, 116–20.
43. Susan A. Crane, *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 38–44.
44. Bodo Uhl, “The Significance of the Principle of Provenance for Archival Science and Historical Research,” *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 84, no. 1 (2001): 95–96.
45. Geoffrey C. Bowker and Susan Leigh Star, *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999), 1–6.
46. Bénédicte Savoy, *Kunstraub: Napoleons Konfiszierungen in Deutschland und die europäischen Folgen* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2011), 392–97.
47. Crane, *Collecting*, 7–8, 19–21.
48. Smith, *Gender*, 133, 135–37; in the sources, actors speak about “critical” history; *Die Regesten*, xv.
49. Baár, *Historians*, 32.
50. Marlies Raffler, *Museum—Spiegel der Nation? Zugänge zur historischen Museologie am Beispiel der Genese von Landes- und Nationalmuseen in der Habsburgermonarchie* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2007), 247–50.
51. Michael Hochedlinger, *Österreichische Archivgeschichte: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum Ende des Papierzeitalters* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2013), 86–87.
52. Bentz and Raffler, “Austria,” 25–26.
53. Hochedlinger, *Archivgeschichte*, 91; regarding *Monumenta*, see David Knowles, *Great Historical Enterprises: Problems in Monastic History* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963), 65–97.
54. Hochedlinger, *Archivgeschichte*, 91.
55. This was made clear in the title of Palacký’s *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě*, or “The History of the Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia,” which was the Czech version of Palacký’s *Geschichte von Böhmen*, first published in 1848, see Baár, *Historians*, 142–44, 240.
56. Emil Schieche, “Frantisek Palacký, Antonin Boček und der Mährische Separatismus,” *Bohemia* 13, no. 1 (1972): 211–52.
57. Schieche, “Mährische Separatismus,” 213. I am relying on Schieche’s translations and quotations; his interpretation of the sources clearly speaks in favor of Palacký.
58. Schieche, “Mährische Separatismus,” 225.
59. Dudík, *Mährens allgemeine*, xi.
60. Schieche, “Mährische Separatismus,” 246–48.
61. Baár, *Historians*, 241.
62. *Die Regesten*, xv.
63. *Die Regesten*, xiv–xv.
64. *Die Regesten*, i–xxi. 1620 was the year of the Battle of White Mountain, where Bohemian Protestants were defeated by combined Catholic armies.
65. *Die Regesten*, xiii; see Hochedlinger, *Archivgeschichte*, 91; the deeds, *Urkunden*, of the estates constituted category 1 in the archive, *Bericht über das mährische ständische Landes-Archiv* (Brünn: Georg Gastl, 1858), 3.

66. Smith, *Gender*, 116–17; Crane, *Collecting*, 111–12.
67. Beda Dudík, *J.P. Ceroni's Handschriften-Sammlung* (Brno: Carl Winiker, 1850), viii–ix; Kinter, *Dr. Beda Dudík*, 6.
68. Constantin von Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich: Zweiter Theil* (Vienna: Verlag der typografisch-literarisch-artistischen Anstalt, 1857), 324.
69. Dudík, *Handschriften-Sammlung*, 1–7.
70. Dudík, *Handschriften-Sammlung*, x.
71. Tomas Lidman, *Libraries and Archives: A Comparative Study* (Oxford, UK: Chandos, 2012), 45.
72. Dudík, *Handschriften-Sammlung*, xiv.
73. Dudík, xi–xii.
74. *Die Regesten*, xvi.
75. Beda Dudík, *Forschungen in Schweden für Mährens Geschichte* (Brno: Carl Winiker, 1852), v–vi, 9–11.
76. Emma Hagström Molin, “Dudík: Correspondence with Gustaf Edvard Klemming,” *Translocations: Anthologie: Eine Sammlung kommentierter Quellentexte zu Kulturgutverlagerungen seit der Antike*, last modified January 28, 2021, <https://translanth.hypotheses.org/ueber/dudik>.
77. Dudík, *Forschungen*, 4–16.
78. Dudík, 288–90.
79. Mainly correspondence from and to Swedish Chancellor of Realm Oxenstierna; see Dudík, *Forschungen*, 290–92.
80. Dudík, 292–96. The importance of the Chemnitz manuscript is highlighted by Kinter, *Dr. Beda Dudík*, 7.
81. Beda Dudík, *Iter Romanum 2 Theil: Das päpstliche Regestenwesen* (Vienna: F. Manz & Comp., 1855), 67.
82. Dudík, *Iter Romanum 2 Theil*, 4–5.
83. See for example Astrid Swenson, *The Rise of Heritage: Preserving the Past in France, Germany and England 1789–1914* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Per Widén, “Creating a Patriotic History: Historical Source-Editions as National Monuments,” *Romantik* 5 (2016): 9–31. Source editions were important for the professionalization of the historical discipline; see for example Christine Ottner, “Für den Mann vom Fache’: Redaktion und Standardisierung historischer Publikationen der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien,” in *Geschichtsforschung in Deutschland und Österreich im 19. Jahrhundert: Ideen, Akteure, Institutionen*, ed. Christine Ottner and Klaus Ries (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2014), 241–65.
84. On the meaning of catalogs, see Sophie Raux, “From Mariette to Joullain: Provenance and Value in Eighteenth-Century French Auction Catalogs,” in *Provenance: An Alternate History of Art*, ed. Gail Feigenbaum and Inge Rest (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2012), 87.
85. Box 167, E6 (Benediktini Rajhrad), Moravský Zemský Archive, Brno.
86. Beda Dudík, *Iter Romanum 1 Theil: Historische Forschungen* (Vienna: F. Manz & Comp., 1855), viii.

87. Fundgrube, in *Trübners deutsches Wörterbuch. Bd 2, C-F*, ed. Karl Trübner and Alfred Götz (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1940), 475–476; Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, “Fundgrube,” last modified January 27, 2021, <https://www.dwds.de/wb/etymwb/Fundgrube>.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aronsson, Peter, and Gabriella Elgenius, eds. *Building National Museums in Europe 1750–2010: Conference Proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen, Bologna 28–30 April 2011*. Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press, 2011.
- Ash, Mitchell G., and Jan Surman, eds. *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Baár, Monika. *Historians and Nationalism: East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Bentz, Emma, and Marlies Raffler. “National Museums in Austria.” In *Building National Museums in Europe 1750–2010: Conference Proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen, Bologna 28–30 April 2011*, edited by Peter Aronsson and Gabriella Elgenius, 21–43. Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press, 2011.
- Bowker, Geoffrey C., and Susan Leigh Star. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999.
- Crane, Susan A. *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Die Regesten der Archive im Markgrathume Mähren, und Anton Boczck’s Berichte über die Forschungen in diesem Lande*. Brno: Nitsch & Grosse, 1856.
- Duden. “Quelle.” Retrieved March 19, 2019 from <https://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Quelle>.
- Dudik, Beda. *Forschungen in Schweden für Mährens Geschichte*. Brno: Carl Winiker, 1852.
- . *Iter Romanum 1 Theil: Historische Forschungen*. Vienna: F. Manz & Comp., 1855.
- . *Iter Romanum 2 Theil: Das päpstliche Regestenwesen*. Vienna: F. Manz & Comp., 1855.
- . *J.P. Ceroni’s Handschriften-Sammlung*. Brno: Carl Winiker, 1850.
- . *Mährens allgemeine Geschichte*. Brno: Georg Gastl, 1860.
- . *Mähren’s gegenwärtige Zustände vom Standpunkte der Statistik*. Brno: Carl Winiker, 1848.
- . *Über die alten heidnischen Begräbnissplätze in Mähren*. Vienna: Kaiserlich-königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei zu Wien, 1854.
- Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. “Fundgrube.” Retrieved January 27, 2021 from <https://www.dwds.de/wb/etymwb/Fundgrube>.
- Fundgrube. In *Trübners deutsches Wörterbuch. Bd 2, C-F*, edited by Karl Trübner and Alfred Götz, 475–76. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1940.

- Grafton, Anthony. *The Footnote: A Curious History*. London: Faber, 1997.
- Hagström Molin, Emma. "Dudík: Correspondence with Gustaf Edvard Klemming." *Translocations. Anthologie: Eine Sammlung kommentierter Quellentexte zu Kultur- gutverlagerungen seit der Antike*. Retrieved December 15, 2020 from <https://translanth.hypotheses.org/ueber/dudik>.
- Haslinger, Peter. "How to Run a Multilingual Society: Statehood, Administration and Regional Dynamics in Austria-Hungary, 1867–1914." In *Region and State in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Nation-Building, Regional Identities and Separatism*, edited by Joost Augusteijn and Eric Storm, 111–28. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Hochedlinger, Michael. *Österreichische Archivgeschichte: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum Ende des Papierzeitalters*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2013.
- Horňáček, Milan. "Imaginiertes Großmähren: Zur Erfindung von Traditionen in der mährischen Historiographie des langes 19. Jahrhunderts." *Brücken: Germanistisches Jahrbuch Tschechien Slowakei* 18 (2010): 239–57.
- Höschler, Lucien. "Time Gardens: Historical Concepts in Modern Historiography." *History and Theory* 53, no. 4 (2014): 577–91.
- Hroch, Miroslav, and Jitka Malecková. "The Construction of Czech National History." *Historein* 1 (1999): 103–12.
- Jordheim, Helge. "Multiple Times and the Work of Synchronization." *History and Theory* 53, no. 4 (2014): 498–518.
- Kamusella, Tomasz. *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Kinter, Maurus. *Der mährische Landeshistoriograph Dr. Beda Dudík*. Brno: Carl Winiker, 1890.
- Knowles, David. *Great Historical Enterprises: Problems in Monastic History*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- Lidman, Tomas. *Libraries and Archives: A Comparative Study*. Oxford, UK: Chandos, 2012.
- Mährisches Landesmuseum. "Grossmähren." Retrieved November 22, 2018 from <http://www.mzm.cz/de/grossmaehren>.
- Merriam-Webster. "Source." Retrieved March 19, 2019 from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/source>.
- N'Guessan, Konstanze, Carola Lentz, and Marie-Christin Gabriel. "Performing the National Territory: The Geography of National-Day Celebrations." *Nations and Nationalism* 23, no 4 (2017): 686–706.
- Ottner, Christine. "'Für den Mann vom Fache': Redaktion und Standardisierung historischer Publikationen der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien." In *Geschichtsforschung in Deutschland und Österreich im 19. Jahrhundert: Ideen, Akteure, Institutionen*, edited by Christine Ottner and Klaus Ries, 241–65. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2014.

- Palacký, František. *Geschichte von Böhmen: Grösstentheils nach Urkunden und Handschriften*. Prague: Kronberger und Weber, 1836.
- Porciani, Ilaria, and Raphael Lutz, eds. *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Raffler, Marlies. *Museum—Spiegel der Nation? Zugänge zur historischen Museologie am Beispiel der Genese von Landes- und Nationalmuseen in der Habsburgermonarchie*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2007.
- Raux, Sophie. “From Mariette to Joullain: Provenance and Value in Eighteenth-Century French Auction Catalogs.” In *Provenance: An Alternate History of Art*, edited by Gail Feigenbaum and Inge Rest, 86–103. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2012.
- Rosenberg, Daniel, and Anthony Grafton. *Cartographies of Time: A History of the Timeline*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010.
- Rudwick, Martin J. S. *Bursting the Limits of Time: The Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Savoy, Bénédicte. *Kunstraub: Napoleons Konfiszierungen in Deutschland und die europäischen Folgen*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2011.
- Schieche, Emil. “Frantisek Palacký, Antonin Boček und der Mährische Separatismus.” *Bohemia* 13, no. 1 (1972): 211–52.
- Smith, Bonnie G. *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Swenson, Astrid. *The Rise of Heritage: Preserving the Past in France, Germany and England 1789–1914*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Uhl, Bodo. “The Significance of the Principle of Provenance for Archival Science and Historical Research.” *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 84, no. 1 (2001): 91–122.
- Widén, Per. “Creating a Patriotic History: Historical Source-Editions as National Monuments.” *Romantik* 5 (2016): 9–31.
- Wolný, Georg. *Die Markgrafschaft Mähren: Topographisch statistisch und historisch geschildert*. Brno: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1835.
- Wurzbach, Constantin von. *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich: Zweiter Theil*. Vienna: Verlag der typografisch-literarisch-artistischen Anstalt, 1857.