

Strengths and Weaknesses of Cultural History

Peter Burke, Emmanuel College,
University of Cambridge

Cultural history, like its neighbour discipline cultural studies, has never been so popular, in academic circles and perhaps beyond them as well.¹ Since the year 2000 at least nineteen introductions to the subject were published in eight languages. In the last five years, 2007–11, these introductions include three in German,² two in Italian,³ one in English,⁴ and one each in French⁵ and Romanian.⁶ The Reformation and the French Revolution have been approached as cultural movements, while the idea of a cultural revolution has been used to describe changes in both ancient Rome and the Russia of Peter the Great.⁷

The so-called ‘new cultural history’ in particular is flourishing in its different forms: the history of the everyday, history of the imagined, the history of the body, the history of material culture, the history of cultural practices, etc. Indeed, almost everything seems to be having its cultural history written these days. To quote once again books published since the year 2007, we can now read cultural histories of alcohol, comics, impotence, insomnia, the night, obesity, the sea, shoplifting, tea, terrorism, widows and wine.⁸ Two recent multi-volume collections have been published on the cultural history of animals and of the human body.⁹ Some of these books have been written by journalists, others by academic historians. Topics that were once considered part of economic or social history have been colonized by cultural historians, as in the case of the history of consumption.¹⁰

The boom has lasted longer than I expected or – since I should declare a personal interest – even dared to hope in the 1980s. Needless to say, this historiographical trend is part of something much larger. Outside departments of history, the empire of cultural studies continues to expand. There has been a turn from literary to cultural

Cultural History 1.1 (2012): 1–13

DOI: 10.3366/cult.2012.0003

© Edinburgh University Press

www.eupjournals.com/cult

history, most obvious in the 'new historicism' movement in the USA but visible elsewhere as well.¹¹ It is now commonplace to speak of cultural sociology, cultural geography, cultural psychology and cultural archaeology.¹² Studies arguing the merits of a cultural approach to political science and economics are in preparation.¹³ Even the lawyers and the biologists have discovered culture. A Centre for the Study of Law and Culture has been founded within the Law School at Columbia University, while biologists argue that animals, notably chimpanzees, have culture because they share through learning.¹⁴ These academic trends are part of a still larger shift. In a recent book, the French sociologist Alain Touraine noted a major change of paradigm in social studies in the last generation, the shift from the concept of 'society' to that of 'culture'. He linked this intellectual shift to what he calls 'la chute et disparition de l'univers que nous avons appelé "social"'.¹⁵ To employ the language that Touraine now rejects, a major social change underlies the abandonment of the concept of society. Some sociologists now speak of the 'postsocial' – implying that they should really be called 'postsociologists'.¹⁶

Whatever we may think about the value of the word 'society', in ordinary language it has become increasingly common, at least in English, to speak of 'the culture' of almost everything: the culture of apology, the culture of blame, the culture of violence, the culture of insurance, the culture of football, and so on. By the late 1990s, for instance, the phrase 'cultural memory' was supplanting 'social' or 'collective' memory, at least in book titles. The cultural turn is not confined to the academic world. A German anthropologist who carried out research in a multi-ethnic neighbourhood of London, Southall, in the 1990s, discovered that the anthropologist's favourite term, 'culture', was constantly on the lips of his informants, whether they happened to be Jamaican or Irish, Sikh or Muslim.¹⁷

In what follows, however, my intention is neither to celebrate cultural history nor to discuss its history. On this occasion it seems more useful to problematize it.¹⁸ The emphasis will fall on five problems in particular, the 'weaknesses' to which the title refers. 1. In the first place, the problem of the concept of culture, often criticized as too vague. Hence some anthropologists, sociologists and historians – including Lynn Hunt, a leader of the movement for 'new cultural history', are attempting to go 'beyond culture', or at least 'beyond the cultural turn'.¹⁹

The recent success of the movement has made this problem still more acute, as well as depriving cultural historians of the pleasure of seeing themselves as they once did as a collective David fighting the

Goliath of political history. Cultural history was once a movement of opposition to the dominant form of history, concerned as it then was with political events and institutions.²⁰ The movement was held together precisely by its common opponent. As cultural history has become dominant in its turn, the movement has been disintegrating. The label 'cultural' is increasingly employed by different individuals and groups for very different purposes. The frontier between social history and cultural history has become difficult to locate, witness the increasing use in English of the hyphenated term 'socio-cultural history'. Since culture is now the dominant partner, the term should perhaps be 'culturo-social' history, but 'socio-cultural' sounds better.

The very topics against which cultural historians used to define themselves, notably politics, events and institutions, have all been incorporated, by some practitioners, into the new cultural history. For example, the term 'political culture', already employed by so-called 'political scientists' in the 1950s, has gradually come into use among historians.²¹ A cultural history of nationalism appeared recently.²² The concept of 'institutional culture' appears in studies of early modern Europe, while the term 'corporate culture' is employed not only by some historians of businesses and banks but also by historians of the Jesuits.²³

In Germany in particular, attempts have been made to absorb constitutional history, diplomatic history and even economic history into cultural history.²⁴ In Britain too, legal history and economic history have been studied from a cultural point of view.²⁵ Military history may well be the last frontier, but some studies of the cultural history of war (especially the First World War) have already made their appearance, as well as a cultural approach to naval history.²⁶

Today, rather than asking what is cultural history as I did a few years ago,²⁷ like Karl Lamprecht a century earlier, we should perhaps be asking, what is not cultural history? The problem is that if all history is cultural history, we do not need the adjective at all.

2. The recent and apparently irresistible rise of cultural history is sometimes described as part of a 'cultural turn'. It is one of a number of recent turns in the history of historical thought and social studies. Indeed, there have been so many recent turns and in so many different directions that speaking or even thinking about them is enough to induce intellectual vertigo. First there was the linguistic turn, then the visual or pictorial turn, the material or bodily turn, the turn to practice, the narrative turn (or return), and still more recently what may be called the 'performative turn', to be discussed later.

All these turns have their own reasons and they also have their value. Personally, I welcome them according to the Chinese principle – misused by Mao Zedong in the 1960s – ‘Let a hundred flowers bloom, let a hundred schools of thought contend’. At this point I should perhaps admit to a belief in the continuing value of what might be called the ‘old cultural history’ in its different forms, among them the social history of art and literature as practised by Frederick Antal (1947), for instance, or Raymond Williams (1961).²⁸ Different varieties of cultural history produce different insights, just as they suffer from different weaknesses. All the same, it must be admitted that these different approaches are not consistent with one another. The turns are in different directions, so that an emphasis on language, for instance, is in conflict with an emphasis on material culture, and so on. Alternatively, we might speak of competition between different approaches, since academics are competitive people and universities are arenas of competition for resources.

3. Pluralism of the kind described above is not necessarily a problem for individual scholars working in these different fields, although it certainly makes life more difficult for anyone trying to describe the state of cultural history today. What has generated problems – as well as opportunities – for cultural historians is the idea of culture as a ‘language’, as a ‘text’ or as a ‘script’ that scholars can ‘read’. Ever since the late Clifford Geertz published his much-cited essay on the Balinese cockfight in 1973, many cultural historians have employed this method – or more exactly, this metaphor.²⁹

The metaphor has real advantages. It has encouraged historians to interpret as well as to describe everyday life, for instance. All the same, we need to be aware not only of analogies between cultures and texts, but also of what might be called ‘dis-analogies’. These problems are perhaps most obvious in the history of visual culture.

Cultural historians have discovered the need to take images seriously as an autonomous form of communication, rather than treating them as mere ‘illustrations’ of what is already known from written or printed texts. Attempts have been made to formulate a few rules or principles of source criticism when using images as historical evidence.³⁰ We surely need to go further in this direction, asking what happens when we ‘translate’ images into words (it seems impossible to avoid a verbal metaphor) and noting the importance of the untranslatable. Images often have a subliminal appeal which resists verbal translation.

For their part, historians of ritual and other cultural phenomena such as emotions, who used to work with the concept of a more or less fixed ‘script’ (another variety of the textual metaphor), are coming to

replace it with the more fluid or flexible notion of a 'performance' that is improvised or at any rate semi-improvised.³¹ One aim of rituals is repetition, an attempt to abolish linear time and replace it with cyclical time. In practice, though, the same ritual is never performed twice. For example, mistakes often occur, almost inevitably when a large number of people are working together on a collective performance.

However, besides mistakes, which might, after all, be seen as failures to follow a script, historians also need to take account of the conscious adaptation of rituals to new circumstances. This kind of adaptation is particularly clear when circumstances change, a change in the physical setting for instance. It might be interesting to investigate the case of the annual rituals of the late medieval Papacy from this point of view, asking about the changes that followed the move from Rome to Avignon. Adaptation of this kind virtually dissolves the notion of 'script'.

4. Another general problem is the problem of explanation. The rise of cultural history is associated with an emphasis on cultural interpretations at the expense of economic, social or political explanations, as in the case of a controversial book on the decline of the industrial spirit in Britain in the later nineteenth century.³² In other words, the cultural turn is not just a shift in domain, in the objects of historical research. A concern with culture also offers us a new vision of the whole historical process as driven by values rather than by material conditions.³³ There is little doubt that this vision has brought new insights. The problem is that it also excludes valuable old insights.

Cultural historians at work today might be well advised to learn some lessons from the fate of their predecessors a generation ago, the social historians. In the age of social history, c.1950–80, preceding the present age of cultural history, great emphasis – too much, according to some people – was placed on social explanations. These explanations were frequently expressed in terms of social class, making claims such as 'X did Y because he or she was a bourgeois'. It has become easy to see that this kind of explanation is reductionist, omitting the specific aims of individual agents and reducing them to representatives of their class. As a result, historians have become reluctant – perhaps too reluctant – to offer any kind of social explanation.

Today, in the age of culture, the preferred mode of explanations seems to be that X did Y because he or she was a Croat or a Serb, a Sunni or a Shia. However, this kind of explanation is almost equally reductionist, turning individual agents into mere representatives of

their ethnic group or their religion (I say 'almost equally' because 'culture' is a more complex concept than 'class'). The twin challenges that historians face in this domain are those of bringing society back in while avoiding reductionism.³⁴

5. Another recurrent problem in cultural history as it is practised today is the problem of construction. The new cultural history has become associated with what might be called 'constructivism', the idea of the cultural construction or 'discursive construction' of entities such as nations, social classes or genders.

The rise of constructivism is part of a wider movement, a general rejection of social determinism and an embracing of its opposite, voluntarism. Where an older social history emphasised the constraints on human action and the force of social structures, the new cultural history often emphasises the relative freedom of individuals (including ordinary people) to shape their own lives. Well-known examples concern the protagonists of two classics of microhistory: Menocchio, in Carlo Ginzburg's *Cheese and Worms* (1976) and Giambattista della Chiesa, in Giovanni Levi's *Inheriting Power* (1981).³⁵ More generally, the micro-historical movement may be viewed as a reaction to and against a vision of history in terms of what the late Charles Tilly liked to call 'big structures, large processes, huge comparisons'.³⁶

In 1983, by coincidence – or was it really coincidence? – two now famous examples of historical works that expressed this kind of constructivism appeared in English. They both became well known internationally, selling many copies and being translated into many languages. Readers will have guessed by now which books I am thinking of.

One was Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, which adopted a cultural approach to the problem of the rise of nationalism in the nineteenth century, suggesting that political changes did not precede but followed a shift in the ways in which communities were imagined in the age of 'print capitalism'.³⁷ The other book published in 1983 was a collection of essays inspired by Eric Hobsbawm, *The Invention of Tradition*.³⁸ I hasten to add that I am not suggesting that Hobsbawm himself was a constructivist. However, the thrust of the volume was in that direction and at least equally important, the book was perceived as constructivist. Indeed, this was surely a factor in its remarkable success.

This constructivism is problematic. If we are going to employ a term such as invention or construction, we surely need to ask ourselves three large questions. In the first place, who is supposed to be doing the inventing or constructing? In the second place, given that the term 'culture' is sometimes used to evade a discussion of social or political

problems, what are the constraints on construction? And thirdly, out of what materials are new entities such as nations constructed?

At this point it may be useful to employ an analogy from cosmology. Constructivists believe in the Big Bang theory of tradition. However, a more useful model is closer to what cosmologists call 'continuous creation'. In the case of tradition, what we see most of the time is not invention *ex nihilo* – even though this may happen sometimes and apparently did with particular frequency in the late nineteenth century, not only in Europe but also in the Americas and in Japan. What we see much more often is continuous construction, or more exactly, continuous reconstruction, a kind of bricolage. Take the case of nations, often described nowadays in terms of invention. A more subtle position has been expressed by Alberto Banti, whose study of the Italian *Risorgimento* explains the appeal of the new idea of the nation by referring to the re-employment or transposition of traditional themes or motifs, for example the family or saints and martyrs.³⁹

As was noted earlier, it seemed useful to take advantage of the launching of a new journal devoted to cultural history to offer the frank expression of certain doubts and difficulties concerning a movement in which I have been personally involved for more than forty years – in a period of constant change, which has made for quite an exciting life. All the same, I want to avoid not only celebration, what the Australian historian Geoffrey Blainey calls 'three cheers history', but also its opposite, 'black armband history'.⁴⁰ Hence this article will conclude by returning to the positive aspects of cultural history, its strengths.

The problem of what is not cultural history can be given a tolerably clear answer. Despite the difficulties of imposing a strict or stable definition on such a fluid subject, it may still be contrasted to something. The distinction between culture and the economy, for instance, surely remains a useful one, even if in our age of 'soft capitalism', the relation between the two domains is becoming increasingly close.⁴¹ All the same, cultural history is best regarded not as a field with a fence around it but rather as a history written from a particular angle or viewpoint, concentrating on the symbolic element in all human activities.

The history of consumption, that of food, for instance, can be studied in an economic or social manner, focussing on nutrition and counting calories. Alternatively it can be studied, as it often has been studied in the last few years, in a cultural or symbolic manner, treating food as a message or a series of messages about love,

ostentation, solidarity and so on. 'Say it with food' as well as 'say it with flowers'.⁴²

As for the many strengths of cultural history, it may be sufficient to make three final points.

a) Returning for a moment to the problem of explanation, it may be suggested that explanations in terms of culture are as necessary as economic, social or political explanations, even if they are not sufficient by themselves. Explanations of this kind are especially necessary when scholars work on the history of a culture that is not their own or write for readers outside that culture. In other words, so far as historical explanations are concerned, cultural relativism rules. When I was at school we were given a textbook of European history which listed fourteen causes for the French Revolution. My own view, on the contrary, is that if they are to understand a major event such as the French Revolution, different people need to be told different things. What the French can take for granted, the English cannot. For instance, the Frenchness of the French Revolution is probably more visible to foreigners than to the French themselves. It was a refugee from Germany, Nikolaus Pevsner, who drew attention to the Englishness of English art.

b) Cultural history has the advantages as well as the disadvantages of vagueness. It reaches parts of the past that other kinds of history do not reach, allowing us to reclaim more of that past for history. To compare the rigorous intellectual history practised today in Cambridge and elsewhere with the history of mentalities, which is closer to cultural history, is to perceive strengths and weaknesses in both approaches. Intellectual history in the strict sense concentrates on the consciously expressed ideas of original thinkers. The history of mentalities, by contrast, finds room for everyone's ideas. It also finds a place for unconscious assumptions and for feelings as well as conscious thoughts; for imagination as well as for reason. Historians cannot afford to leave out these aspects of the past, even if they cannot be studied by methods as systematic or as rigorous as those of Anglo-American intellectual historians or indeed German practitioners of *Begriffsgeschichte*.

Hence there is a case for a middle way between the history of mentalities and intellectual history, an approach that might be described as 'the cultural history of ideas', or better, 'the cultural history of intellectual practices', concerned, for instance, with the reception of ideas such as liberty and democracy in different cultures, their translation into other languages and their 'cultural translation' or adaptation to local circumstances.⁴³

c) The cultural approach encourages us to write history, as I believe we should, with an emphasis on the variety of human cultures. It privileges encounters, dialogues, viewpoints, conflicts, misunderstandings and translations (including mistranslations).

To privilege encounters between people from different cultures is not of course to deny the death and destruction that these encounters have caused on occasion, including the deracination or ‘deculturation’ of individuals and even the destruction of whole cultures. The extent to which this happened to the millions of slaves shipped from Africa to the New World is a matter of debate, though the many traces of Africa in the Americas, from Virginia to Pernambuco, suggests that the slaves were able to bring some of their culture with them and so contribute to the hybrid cultures of Cuba, Brazil and elsewhere.⁴⁴

In any case, from a methodological point of view, encounters reveal more clearly than usual major differences of viewpoint, mentality or assumptions between people from different cultures, making open or explicit what is normally hidden or implicit. A vivid example is the classic – and controversial – case of the encounter between the Hawaiians and Captain Cook and his men in 1778.⁴⁵

Cultural encounters are often both conflictual and unequal, so that it is necessary to attempt to reconstruct what has been called ‘the vision of the vanquished’ as well as that of the victors.⁴⁶ In more peaceful settings, it is illuminating to study dialogues between representatives of different cultures. These exchanges – for there is usually traffic in both directions, even if the balance is often unequal – might include dialogues of the deaf and also misunderstandings, a topic that does not so far seem to have attracted as much attention from historians as it surely deserves.⁴⁷

Dialogue and exchange lead to the idea of ‘cultural translation’, a phrase coined by British social anthropologists half a century ago in the circle of Edward Evans-Pritchard in order to refer to both the conscious and the unconscious adaptations or as scholars now say, ‘negotiations’ of ideas, artefacts or practices when they cross the border between one culture and another. Translation between languages offers some vivid examples of such translation between cultures.⁴⁸ The choice of texts for translation, for example, reveals what a given culture, or some people in that culture, found of interest in another. What might be called the ‘balance of trade’ between languages is also revealing. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, for instance, Italy and Spain dominated exports, while England, like Scandinavia and Eastern Europe, was essentially an importer of translations.⁴⁹

Even for writing the history of a single culture, the model of encounters, negotiations and translations may be helpful. Historians and anthropologists alike once treated cultures as if they were homogeneous. In contrast, it may be illuminating to approach the history of all cultures as the product of a series of encounters: not only encounters with other places, but also encounters between social classes, between regions, between the sexes, between town and country, and so on. For example, Edward Thompson's great *Making of the English Working Class* (1963) might have been a still richer as well as an even longer book than it is if the author had given himself room to consider interactions between the working and middle classes, whether they took the form of imitation or rejection. Widening out still further, the value of ideas such as 'encounter' or 'dialogue' is not confined to a relatively narrow field called 'culture'. They enrich our understanding of history in general. This is as it should be, for cultural history is no more than a part of history, of what the French call or called *histoire totale*, 'total history'.

Notes

1. This article has emerged from a paper given at seminars and conferences in Aberdeen, Cambridge, Godalming, London, Mainz, Oxford and Taipei. My thanks to the listeners for their questions and comments.
2. Landwehr, Achim (2009), *Kulturgeschichte*, Stuttgart: UTB; Maurer, Michael (2008), *Kulturgeschichte: eine Einführung*, Köln: Böhlau; Tschopp, Silvia S. (ed.) (2008), *Kulturgeschichte*, Stuttgart: Steiner.
3. Arcangeli, Alessandro (2007), *Che cos'è la storia culturale*, Roma: Carocci; Hunt, Lynn (2010), *La storia culturale nell'età globale*, Pisa: ETS.
4. Green, Anna (2007), *Cultural History*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Poirrier, Philippe (ed.) (2008), *L'histoire culturelle: un tournant mondial de l'historiographie?*, Dijon: EUD.
6. Lung, Ecaterina (2009), *Istorie culturala: origini, evoluții, tendințe*, București: Universității din București.
7. Pettegree, Andrew (2005), *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Kennedy, Emmet (1989), *A Cultural History of the French Revolution*, New Haven: Yale University Press; Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew (2008), *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Cracraft, James (2004), *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap/Harvard University Press.
8. Gately, Iain (2009), *Drink: A Cultural History of Alcohol*, London: Gotham; Chapman, James (2011), *British Comics: a Cultural History*, London: Reaktion; McLaren, Angus (2007), *Impotence: a Cultural History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Summers-Bremner, Eluned (2007), *Insomnia: a Cultural History*, London: Reaktion; Bronfen, Elisabeth (2008), *Kulturgeschichte der Nacht*, München: Hanser; Gilman, Sander L. (2008), *Fat: a Cultural History of Obesity*, Cambridge: Polity Press; Mack, John (2011), *The Sea: a Cultural History*, London: Reaktion; Shteir, Rachel (2011), *The Steal: a Cultural History of Shoplifting*, New York: Penguin Press; Krieger, Martin (2009),

Strengths and Weaknesses of Cultural History

- Tee: eine Kulturgeschichte*, Köln: Böhlau; Burleigh, Michael (2007), *Blood and Rage: a Cultural History of Terrorism*, New York: Harper; Kruse, Britta J. (2007), *Witwen: Kulturgeschichte eines Standes im Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, Berlin: De Gruyter; Varriano, John (2010), *Wine: a Cultural History*, London: Reaktion.
9. Lestel, Dominique (2001), *Les origines animales de la culture*, Paris: Flammarion; Kalof, Linda and Brigitte Resi (eds) (2008), *A Cultural History of Animals*, 6 vols., Oxford: Berg; Kalof, Linda and William Bynum (eds) (2011), *A Cultural History of the Human Body*, 6 vols., Oxford: Berg.
 10. Brewer, John and Roy Porter (eds) (1993), *Consumption and the World of Goods*, London: Routledge; Capuzzo, Paolo (2006), *Culture del consumo*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
 11. Veeger, H. Aram (ed.) (1989), *The New Historicism*, London: Routledge; Grabes, Herbert (ed.) (2001), *Literary History/Cultural History*, Tübingen: Narr; Irimia, Mihaela and Ivana Dragoş (eds) (2009), *Literary into Cultural History*, Bucureşti: Institutul Cultural Român.
 12. Alexander, Jeffrey C. (2003), *The Meanings of Social Life: a Cultural Sociology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press; Friedland, Roger and John Mohr (2004), *Matters of Culture. Cultural Sociology in Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Cole, Michael (1996), *Cultural Psychology: a Once and Future Discipline*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press; Morris, Ian (2000), *Archaeology as Cultural History: Words and Things in Iron Age Greece*, Oxford: Blackwell; Duncan, James S., Nuala C. Johnson and Richard H. Schein (eds) (2004), *A Companion to Cultural Geography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 13. Respectively by Patrick Chabal and by Virgil H. Storr.
 14. Wrangham, Richard et al. (eds) (1994), *Chimpanzee Cultures*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
 15. Touraine, Alain (2005), *Un nouveau paradigme: pour comprendre le monde d'aujourd'hui*, Paris: Fayard, p. 10.
 16. Knorr-Cetina, Karin (2001), 'Postsocial Relations', in George Ritzer and Barry Smart (eds), *Handbook of Social Theory*, London: Sage, pp. 520–34.
 17. Augé, Marc (1994), *Le sens des autres: actualité de l'anthropologie*, Paris: Fayard; Baumann, Gerd (1996), *Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-ethnic London*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; cf. Hannerz, Ulf (1999), 'Reflections on Varieties of Culturespeak', *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 2, pp. 393–407.
 18. Cf. Mandler, Peter (2004), 'The Problem with Cultural History', *Cultural and Social History*, 1:1, pp. 94–117.
 19. Bonnell, Victoria E., and Lynn Hunt (eds) (1999), *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*, Berkeley: University of California Press; Fox, Richard G., and Barbara J. King (2002), *Anthropology beyond Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 20. Christiansen, Palle Ove (2000), *Kulturhistorie som opposition*, Copenhagen: Samleren.
 21. Baker, Keith M. (1987), *The Political Culture of the Old Regime*, Oxford: Oxford University Press; Lucas, Colin (ed.) (1988), *The Political Culture of the French Revolution*, Oxford: Oxford University Press; Hoak, Dale (ed.) (1995), *Tudor Political Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 22. Leerssen, Joep (2006), *National Thought in Europe: a Cultural History*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
 23. Goldgar, Ann, and Robert I. Frost (eds) (2004), *Institutional Culture in Early Modern Europe*, Leiden: Brill; O'Malley, John W. (ed.) (1999), *The Jesuits, II: Cultures, Sciences*

Cultural History

- and the Arts, 1540–1773, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 47, 233, 334, 354–5, 361.
24. Reinhard, Wolfgang (2000), 'Verfassungsgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte', *Jahrbuch für Europäische Geschichte*, 1, pp. 115–31; Lehmkuhl, Ursula (2001), 'Diplomatiegeschichte als internationale Kulturgeschichte', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 27, pp. 394–423; Urbach, Karina (2003), 'Diplomatic History since the Cultural Turn', *Historical Journal*, 46:4, pp. 991–7; Berghoff, Hartmut and Jakob Vogel (eds) (2004), *Wirtschaftsgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte*, Frankfurt: Campus.
 25. Raffield, Paul (2004), *Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Glaisyer, Natasha (2006), *The Culture of Commerce in England, 1660–1720*, Woodbridge: Brewer and Boydell.
 26. Winter, Jay (1998), *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: the Great War in European Cultural History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Wilson, Peter H. (2007), 'Military culture in the Reich, c.1680–1806', in Simms, Scott and Brendan Simms (eds) (2007), *Cultures of Power in Europe during the Long Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 36–57; Rueger, Jan (2007), *The Great Naval Game: Britain and Germany in the Age of Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 27. Burke, Peter [2004] (2009), *What is Cultural History?*, Cambridge: Polity.
 28. Antal, Frederick (1947), *Florentine Painting and its Social Background*, London: Routledge; Williams, Raymond (1961), *The Long Revolution*, London: Chatto and Windus.
 29. Bachmann-Medick, Doris (1996), *Kultur als Text: die anthropologische Wende in der Literaturwissenschaft*, Frankfurt: Fischer.
 30. Burke, Peter (2001), *Eyewitnessing*, London: Reaktion; Burke, Peter (2010), 'Interrogating the Eyewitness', *Cultural and Social History*, 7:4, pp. 435–43.
 31. Martschukat, Jürgen and Steffen Patzold (eds) (2003), *Geschichtswissenschaft und 'performative turn': Ritual, Inszenierung und Performanz vom Mittelalter bis zur Neuzeit*, Köln: Böhlau; Burke, Peter (2005), 'Performing History: the Importance of Occasions', *Rethinking History*, 9:1, pp. 35–52.
 32. Wiener, Martin J. (1981), *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850–1980*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 33. Kalifa, Dominique (2005), 'L'histoire culturelle contre l'histoire sociale?' in Laurent Martin and Sylvain Venayre (eds) (2005), *L'histoire culturelle du contemporain*, Paris: Nouveau Monde, pp. 75–84.
 34. Conrad, Christoph (2000), 'Kultur statt Gesellschaft?', in Siegfried Fröhlich (ed.) *Kultur: ein interdisziplinäres Kolloquium zur Begrifflichkeit*, Halle: Landesamt für Archäologie, pp. 117–24.
 35. Ginzburg, Carlo [1976] (1992), *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press; Giovanni Levi [1981] (1988), *Inheriting Power*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
 36. Tilly, Charles (1984), *Big Structures, Large Structures, Huge Comparisons*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
 37. Anderson, Benedict (1983), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.
 38. Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence O. Ranger (eds) (1983), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 39. Banti, Alberto M. (2000), *La nazione del Risorgimento: parentela, santità e onore alle origini dell'Italia unita*, Torino: Einaudi.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Cultural History

40. Blainey coined these terms in the John Latham Memorial lecture in 1993, published as Blainey, Geoffrey (1993), 'Drawing Up a Balance Sheet of Our History', *Quadrant*, 37, pp. 7–8. See Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark (2003), *The History Wars*, Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, pp. 128–32.
41. Ray, Larry and Andrew Sayer (eds) (1999), *Culture and Economy after the Cultural Turn*, London: Sage.
42. Mennell, Stephen (1985), *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*, Oxford: Blackwell; Capatti, Alberto and Massimo Montanari (1999), *La cucina italiana: storia di una cultura*, Roma: Laterza; Flandrin, Jean-Louis (2002), *L'ordre des mets*, Paris: Jacob.
43. Howland, Douglas R. (2002), *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press; Burke, Peter (2011), 'The Cultural History of Intellectual Practices: an Overview', in J. Fernández Sebastián (ed.) *Political Concepts and Time*, Santander, Cantabria University Press, pp. 103–27.
44. Freyre, Gilberto [1933] (1946), *The Masters and the Slaves*, New York: Knopf; Mintz, Sidney W. and Richard Price (1976), *An Anthropological Approach to the Afro-American Past: a Caribbean Perspective*, Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
45. Sahlins, Marshall (1985), *Islands of History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Sahlins, Marshall (1995), *How 'Natives' Think: About Captain Cook, for Example*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Obeyesekere, Gananath (1992), *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
46. León-Portilla, Miguel (ed.) [1961] (1989), *Visión de los vencidos*, Mexico: UNAM; Wachtel, Nathan [1971] (1977), *The Vision of the Vanquished*, Hassocks: Harvester.
47. Distinguished exceptions to this rule include Dorward, David C. (1974), 'Ethnography and Administration: The Study of Anglo-Tiv "Working Misunderstanding"', *Journal of African History*, 15:4, pp. 457–77 and Li, Wenchao (2000), *Die christliche China-Mission im 17. Jht: Verständnis, Unverständnis, Missverständnis*, Stuttgart: Steiner.
48. Howland, *Translating the West*.
49. Burke, Peter and R. Po-chia Hsia (eds) (2007), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 22–4.