A grant from the EUCE/ESC in the summer of 2011 (combined with a School of Arts & Sciences Type II grant) enabled me to visit the libraries of Oxford, Cambridge, and Manchester Universities in the United Kingdom and Leiden University in the Netherlands to explore the reception of the Greek historian Herodotus during the European Renaissance. I am embarking on a study of the recovery and reception of ancient history and its representation in early modern thinking in Europe, with a focus on the three great narrative poets of the Italian Renaissance: Matteo Maria Boiardo (1441-1495), Ludovico Ariosto (1474-1533), and Torquato Tasso (1544-1595). All three were associated in varying degrees with the Este court in the northern Italian town of Ferrara, whose leading family, the house of Este, established an innovative school in 1429 and supported the expansion of the town's university. Both institutions were renowned for an aggressive incorporation of secular classical texts into their curricula. I am interested in what these poets knew of classical history and of Greek and Roman theories on the relation between history and literature, between fact and fiction, or as they often put it, between *storia* and *fabula*. Aristotle and his many epigones had much to say about the complicated interaction between these two ways of knowing, and we have evidence that Tasso studied and absorbed much of Aristotle’s teachings on this question. Aristotle points out that poetry, by which he means fiction, should deal with universals, whereas the writing of history deals with particulars (*Poetics* I, chapter 9). So, what happens when a poet deliberately incorporates the particular details of the historical record into a fictitious poem full of wonderful marvels? How does one reconcile the way things ought to be with the way they really are? Tasso, it seems, literally went insane trying to grapple with this problem; Boiardo and Ariosto responded to the question of literature vs. history differently, but it was no less a problematic issue for them too.
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Snapshots of several EUCE/ESC visitors and events from the past month.

Above: Students, faculty, staff, and friends of the Center reconnect and enjoy refreshments at the annual EUCE/ESC Welcome Back Reception on September 14th.

Right: EUCE/ESC Associate Director Timothy Thompson among other staff and affiliated faculty at the Welcome Back Reception.

Above Left: Werner Sonne, Senior Correspondent for ARD German TV and Berlin Bureau Chief for ARD Morning Show Morgenmagazin, spoke on Germany, Europe, and the Euro crisis on September 27th in an event co-sponsored by the German Department and the EUCE/ESC.

Above Right: Dr. Anthony R. Zito, Reader in Politics, Joint Editor of Environmental Politics, Co-Director of the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence at Newcastle University, lectured on the management of environmental agencies on September 22nd.
Political Tolerance and Its Consequences

by Aaron J. Abbarno
PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science

Political tolerance is the only democratic value that is also extolled as a virtue. In theory, citizens who countenance ideas and interests they oppose not only enhance democratic competition, but also pass what Polish philosopher and Member of European Parliament Ryszard Legutko describes as the “ultimate and almost the only generally accepted litmus test for morality.” This is perhaps because, in practice, political tolerance is extremely difficult. It means, for instance, protecting radical Christians’ right to protest military funerals and Neo-Nazis’ right to march near synagogues. Such forbearance may be central to conceptions of liberal democratic government and citizenship, but it is not clear how extending procedural rights and civil liberties to offensive groups affects individuals’ real attitudes toward, and participation in, liberal democratic politics.

When citizens make political tolerance judgments, they take sides in the classic dilemma facing liberal democracy: how and to what extent a liberal state can accept illiberal behavior. This tension is tangible in contemporary Europe, where immigration and related demographic shifts force citizens to choose between political rights and civil liberties to offensive groups. Whether states err on the side of political or social liberty also shapes the consequences of tolerance for individuals’ attitudes and behavior. Political cultures of rights repression provide “cues” to citizens about standards of acceptable behavior. Where states generally repress illiberal expression, intolerance is normatively desirable; where states generally protect illiberal expression, tolerance is preferable. I argue that citizens whose tolerance judgments conflict with these prevailing standards will experience palpable psychological discomfort.

Civil liberties disputes in Europe increasingly pit beliefs about liberal political rights (e.g. to stand for election; free speech) against attitudes toward liberal social norms (e.g. secularism, multiculturalism). My dissertation argues that these tensions shape not only whether citizens are willing to uphold political rights of groups that challenge these norms, but also the consequences of such political tolerance judgments for citizens’ democratic attitudes and participation.

The choice to protect political rights at the expense of social liberties depends much on a citizen’s own characteristics—in particular her education, political views, and attitudes toward the group and rights in question. But it also depends upon political culture. Domestic laws that exalt freedom of speech, religion, and assembly sometimes—and to varying degrees—also outlaw unsavory associations and offensive expression. Where states more vigorously repress illiberal expression, I find that citizens are also more likely to trade liberal political rights to protect liberal social norms.

Consider citizens’ willingness to outlaw public meetings by racist associations in the United States, France, and the Netherlands. In the U.S., racist organizations are largely protected against state interference; no legal instruments to disband racist groups exist, and bans on public demonstrations are rare. By contrast, judges in the Netherlands can outlaw racist political parties and severely repress political demonstrations by racist groups, and they have done so frequently since the 1970s. France lies somewhere in between. Racist groups may be dissolved, but parties may not be outlawed; public demonstrations may be, but rarely are, prohibited. International Social Survey Programme data suggest that citizens are less willing to protect political minorities’ right to free association in states that more commonly enforce restrictions on expression.

Whether states err on the side of political or social liberty also shapes the consequences of tolerance for individuals’ attitudes and behavior. Political cultures of rights repression provide “cues” to citizens about standards of acceptable behavior. Where states generally repress illiberal expression, intolerance is normatively desirable; where states generally protect illiberal expression, tolerance is preferable. I argue that citizens whose tolerance judgments conflict with these prevailing standards will experience palpable psychological discomfort.
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known as “cognitive dissonance.” Drawing on social psychological research, I hypothesize that individuals will resolve this discomfort by developing political attitudes or behavior that increase their confidence in their tolerance judgment, in order to reduce cognitive dissonance.

With generous funding from the EUCE through a European Union Center Dissertation Fellowship, I will conduct experiments in the U.S., France, and the Netherlands that assess the degree to which practicing tolerance incites cognitive dissonance in each context and how dissonance is reduced. The experiments will simulate real civil liberties disputes, such as the ground zero “mosque” dispute in the U.S., the burqa ban in France, and the hate-speech trial of Geert Wilders in the Netherlands. Where dissonance is experienced, I expect tolerant individuals in more repressive regimes to find their political enemies less threatening to democracy and to express more positive attitudes toward disagreement and competition after upholding a political minority’s rights. By contrast, intolerant individuals in less repressive regimes will find political minorities more threatening to democracy and will be less confident that disagreement and competition are important to democracy.

Civil liberties disputes are increasingly common in Western democracies, especially in Europe, where socially conservative religious minorities increasingly claim liberal political rights. My dissertation sheds light on how citizens grapple with the tradeoff between social and political liberty at the core of these disputes, and how their tolerance judgments influence democratic attitudes and behavior. The potential paradox is that tolerance is highly beneficial to citizens only where it is in shortest supply.

Management and Modernity in Interwar Romania

by Justin Classen
PhD Student, Department of History

What does it mean to be backward? This is an important question for historians of modern East-Central Europe, particularly as the region has been historically characterized as suffering from economic “backwardness.” Generally, the term “backward” denotes a lack of modern industry and a reliance on traditional, atavistic forms of production; it also suggests an inherent structural opposition to or incompatibility with the social, political, and even intellectual currents of the developed world. In this respect, interwar Romania—with eighty-five percent of its population engaged in peasant agriculture—has been viewed as almost prototypically “backward,” particularly in the context of the heavily industrialized and increasingly globalized world of the early twentieth century. Yet the label of “backward” masks the presence, activities, and influence of important nodes of industrial civilization in Greater Romania. These nodes, especially Romanian involvement in the international Scientific Management movement, serve as the subject of my proposed dissertation research. With the aid of an EUCE/ESC Summer Pre-Dissertation Grant, I was able to spend nearly three months in Romania this summer conducting preliminary archival research on this topic in preparation for my overview defense.

After arriving in Bucharest in late May, I began my summer research in the Romanian National Archives. As Bucharest was the largest and most heavily developed Romanian urban center during the interwar period, the site of both domestic Romanian industrialization and significant foreign direct investment, I also spent a good deal of time examining the holdings of the Archive of the Municipality of Bucharest. Collections of interwar periodicals, books, and other primary and secondary sources were available at the Central University Library, which was thankfully open on Saturdays, unlike the National and Municipal Archives. In early July, I travelled to Brașov, a city in the mountainous center of the country, where I attended an intensive summer
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language program run by the Romanian Cultural Institute. After completing the language courses each morning, I spent my afternoons in the Archives of the Brașov județ (a Romanian administrative unit that roughly corresponds to the American county), as Brașov was the site of sizeable interwar industrial concerns, such as the Industria Aeronautică Română aircraft factory and Astra railway and locomotive works.

My work in these institutions did much to reveal the extent to which interwar Romanians—though inhabitants of an overwhelmingly agrarian, “backward” country—were exposed to and influenced by what might be termed the culture of modern industrial production. This was particularly evident in Romanian interest in the international Scientific Management movement, as hundreds of the country’s leading businessmen, intellectuals, and statesmen joined the Romanian Institute for the Scientific Organization of Labor (Institutul Românesc pentru Organizarea Științifică a Muncii, or IROM). Formed in 1927 to promote the application of Taylorist, Fordist, and Fayolist production methods in Greater Romanian industry, IROM hoped to improve the efficiency of existing industry and, as a result, facilitate the continued development of the Romanian economy. Joining a robust international discourse on Scientific Management, IROM delegates journeyed to international conferences, imported texts, films, and other educational materials from similar organizations abroad, and hosted cultural expositions designed to showcase the achievements of “rationalized” Romanian industry.

A member organization of the International Management Institute headquartered in Geneva, the IROM newsletter covered Romanian Scientific Management success stories alongside reports from “rationalizers” at work as far afield as the United States and Japan.

At the same time, the influence of the international Scientific Management movement may have contributed to the gradual centralization and étatization of Greater Romanian life throughout the 1930s. “Rationalizing” national industry led to state approval of collusion, monopolization, and cartelization, and by the end of the 1930s, Romania had the most heavily cartelized economy in East-Central Europe. The concept of managerial capitalism may have also influenced the theories of internationally recognized political economist Mihai Manoilescu, a charter member of IROM and later government minister and champion of corporatism, autarky, and nationalization. The reconciliation of peasant-laborers with modern industrial discipline inspired fascination with the burgeoning international discipline of “psychotechnics” (psihotehnică): an early form of applied industrial psychology that sought to manipulate workers’ psyches to maximize productivity and minimize discontent. Romanian students of psychotechnology appear to have been as interested in and familiar with the practices of American, British, and Dutch oil companies in Ploesti as the experiments conducted at a large Soviet psychotechnics research facility in Kazan.

Overall, the information I discovered in the archives of Bucharest and Brașov provides a promising base for future research. Examining the extent to which Scientific Management found resonance in interwar Romania is an important first step in rethinking “backwardness” and re-evaluating the conceptual division between historically developed and underdeveloped regions.

Note: Justin Classen’s research was supported by the Provost’s Research Fund for European History and awarded by the Department of History.
The Greek historian Herodotus (Cicero calls him the “father of history” whereas Plutarch labels him the “father of lies”) provides an interesting test case on the crucial issue of the relation between literature and history and by extension on the definition of history and the practice of historiography. His investigation into the history of the Greek wars with Persia in the 5th century BCE, the *Histories*, is full of ethnography, anecdotes, fables, and myths, much of which might be considered a tabloid version of history. In any case, it is not the kind of political and military history that Thucydides, Julius Caesar, Tacitus, and others would later write and which would become the canonical model for subsequent historians in the Renaissance. Aristotle, for his part, is clear that Herodotus is a historian as opposed to a poet or storyteller; in *Poetics* 51b2, he says explicitly that Herodotus’s work would fall under the genre of history even if it were recast in verse. My project considers how European Renaissance culture assessed the problematic text of Herodotus in light of these issues about the essential nature of history vs. literature and how the reception of Herodotus affected the development of vernacular narrative in the Italian tradition.

With a Bowman grant from the University of Pittsburgh’s Nationality Rooms in summer 2010, I was able to study in detail the poet Boiardo’s translation of Herodotus’s *Histories*, the first in any vernacular, completed in the 1490s and published in five separate editions in the 1500s. The grants typically range in size from $2,500 to $7,500. The purpose of the EUCE Faculty Grant Competition is to develop and strengthen faculty expertise on the European Union. For faculty just beginning work on the EU, this could involve participation at a conference or research or collaboration with a colleague. For all faculty, on-site field work and research likely to lead to publication is preferred.

Grants are awarded competitively with a fixed application deadline. Significant consideration is given to how the proposal contributes to the mission of the EUCE. Applicants will be expected to show efforts to secure matching funds from their department or school. As a condition of an award, travel or other activities must be coordinated with the Center’s Associate Director to ensure that the award funds are disbursed by August 15. Unused awards cannot be carried over to a subsequent year.

For more information, please visit http://www.ucis.pitt.edu/euce/node/41, or contact Associate Director Timothy Thompson at tst@pitt.edu or 412-624-3503. The deadline for applications is December 9, 2011.
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specialists in the field, interpreted an ancient historian in light of potential comparisons they drew between ancient and modern times.

In order to take the project further in summer 2011, I examined the personal copies of Herodotus’s Histories (among other classical texts) that belonged to two of the greatest classicists of the late Renaissance, Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609) and Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614). Scaliger was the son of an Italian who grew up in France and ended his years in the Netherlands; many of his books, manuscripts, and notebooks are housed in Special Collections at the University of Leiden Library. The library is also the site of an institute named after Scaliger that attracts scholars from around the world who work on the reception of the classical tradition in Europe. A second collection of Scaliger’s books and writings, including additional copies of the works of Herodotus and other Greek historians, is housed in the Cambridge University Library.

Scaliger’s personal copies of Herodotus reveal him to be a meticulous reader of the original, often rewriting and paraphrasing snippets of the Greek in the margins of his copies as he comments on given passages. He is also constantly deciphering, unraveling, and rewriting abbreviated words, which are common in the Aldine edition of 1541 he consulted (Leiden 756 B 2:2). Since the printed fonts of the early sixteenth century were modeled on scribal calligraphy, a reader must learn the idiosyncratic style of each individual printer’s typography. While Scaliger frequently makes comments in Latin—the language of the educated in his day—it is clear that he is using Herodotus in order to develop his mastery of Greek. As much as anything else, the historical text becomes the occasion of an advanced course of language study through which Scaliger teaches himself (or reminds himself of) features of Greek morphology and syntax. At least when he reads his copy of Herodotus the first time through, he appears to have been as interested in unusual verbal forms as in Lydian kings, Egyptian mummies, and Scythian warriors, not to mention Persians and Greeks. He reads like a philologist, first and foremost.

There is one topic, however, aside from language study, that consistently catches Scaliger’s attention. Scaliger is obsessed with universal chronology and frequently seems to be weighing the extent to which he can situate Herodotus against other later sources to take the measure of standard historical chronologies as understood in his day. To that end, he annotates his copy of Herodotus with passages from other historical authors such as Tacitus, Dionysius Siculus, and Dionysius Halicarnassus; he recalls passages from Seneca, Ovid, and other Latin authors that have some bearing on questions of chronology. The ubiquitous Pliny is referenced throughout, as well as less well-known authors, such as the rhetorician Iulius Pollux.

Isaac Casaubon, the owner of the other copy of Herodotus’s Histories I examined this summer, was born in Geneva, spent much of his life in France, but concluded his years to great acclaim in England. Most of Casaubon’s books, manuscripts, and notebooks are housed in the Bodleian Library at Oxford University, but his personal copy of Herodotus’s Histories is in the Cambridge University Library (Adv.a.3.2 1-2). Casaubon’s copy of Herodotus (the Estienne edition of 1570) is overflowing with his annotations through the entire work, in Latin and Greek. Many margins are completely filled with his notes. In addition, Casaubon reads the various paratexts that accompany his copy of the Histories carefully, glossing them too, seeming to absorb all he can about Herodotus’s life and times. Casaubon is an aggressive reader who tends to comment on the content of the Herodotean text itself, whether simply identifying names of historical figures and places or offering a parallel passage in another text that sheds some light on the passage in question. Like Scaliger, Casaubon is interested in complex questions of chronology, drawing up lists of the succession of rulers around the Mediterranean, for example, and trying to come up with dates to attach to various figures. A master of Greek mor-

Detail of a page from Casaubon’s copy of Herodotus’s Histories. Courtesy of Dennis Looney.
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phology and questions of language and syntax, we see Casaubon venturing some parallels with Hebrew here and there, and in separate notebooks, we have evidence of his study not only of Hebrew but also Arabic and Persian. We are extremely fortunate to have extensive notebooks that Casaubon compiled, in which he reflects more generally on Herodotus among his papers, which are in the Bodleian Library. In addition to his forays into other languages, these papers include drafts for a lecture or talk on Herodotus probably delivered to a close circle of friends (MS Casaubon 52) in which Casaubon defends Herodotean history precisely on the issue of its accuracy, attacking Plutarch for his criticism of the historian as a liar.

While I have yet to finalize my findings from this summer, my initial sense is that the perspectives of Scaliger and Casaubon will serve as an end piece to my research into the impact of Herodotus on vernacular narrative. That is, these two highly specialized and erudite readers are, I believe, for the most part indifferent to the vernacular adaptations of Herodotus that I am tracking in my overall project. Their readings reclaim Herodotus as an authoritative ancient classic, taking him back from the many (primarily Italian) adaptations and rewritings that had turned Herodotus into a vernacular classic in the sixteenth century. But try as they might, the two classicists could not undo or check the process that had started under the impetus, in part, of an intense Italian reading of the Greek historian through a vernacular filter. That process of popularization would continue into the twentieth century with the work of Ryszard Kapuscinski, Michael Ondaatje’s The English Patient, and the journalism of Patrick Leigh Fermor, Justin Marozzi, and others.