



HAL
open science

ReintroducIng CIrculatIons: Historiography and the Project of Global Art History

Thomas Dacosta Dacosta Kaufmann, Catherine Dossin, Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel

► **To cite this version:**

Thomas Dacosta Dacosta Kaufmann, Catherine Dossin, Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel. ReintroducIng CIrculatIons: Historiography and the Project of Global Art History. Joyeux-Prunel; Dossin, Catherine; Da Costa Kaufmann, Thomas. circulations in the global history of art, Ashgate Publishings, pp.1-22, 2015, Circulations in the Global History of Art, 978-1-4724-5456-0. hal-01479039

HAL Id: hal-01479039

<https://hal.science/hal-01479039>

Submitted on 28 Feb 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Copyright

INTRODUCTION: REINTRODUCING CIRCULATIONS: HISTORIOGRAPHY AND THE PROJECT OF GLOBAL ART HISTORY

*Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Catherine Dossin,
and Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel*

World art history has gained much attention in recent years, opening many new possibilities for the discussion of the history of art in general. There are myriad ways to approach envisaging a history that is truly global, also meaning universal or comprehensive, an Enlightenment project that may perhaps no longer seem so utopian. This book suggests how a revival of attention to circulations can renew the practice of art history and contribute to the discussion of world, global art history. It proposes that following the transnational circulations of artists, artworks, and styles provides a means not only to escape from the national narratives in which previous approaches had been enmeshed, but also to write a global history of art for a globalized world.

We still employ the word “art,” although we recognize that the concept of art may be relativized, that for instance it might be conceived differently in one place than in another, that its meaning changes in time, and that this concept might not even be expressed in certain times and places. We do not mean, however, to fall into the trap of an ahistorical culturalism, associating a place with a “culture” as if “different arts” in “different spaces” would imply the existence of “different cultures.” Anthropologists have long pointed out how distinctions surrounding notions of art, space, and culture themselves run the danger of creating notions of essential cultural differences.¹ Hence we might even propose using the more general notion of “artifact” rather than “art.”

We advocate an approach to transnational, global history through the study of circulations for several reasons. In the first place, and most important,

global history as we understand it has to include the entire world, and not be the history of oneself and of “others.” Approaches toward the comprehension of circulations appear to us to be the only ones that have so far succeeded in taking into account “others” without shutting them inside the prison of the notion of alterity or dismissing them as peripheral. Attention to the constant operation of circulations indicates that what are usually designated “cultures” in effect result from the ceaseless transformation of the circulations and adaptations of ideas, objects, and images originating elsewhere, notably including regions that a point of view governed by a paradigm of center-periphery relations would deem “peripheral.” Hence, only an understanding of history as a result of the continuing circulation of materials, people, and ideas can escape from the hypostasis of cultural entities such as “Western and non-Western,” which derive from *a priori* essentialist definitions, and which also supply grist to the mill of politicized interests, themselves perhaps not even consciously articulated.

Historians have long worked outside national parameters, and artistic circulations have been an important research topic for the past forty years among art historians as well. In most cases scholars have studied the circulations of images, styles, and aesthetics, in order to trace influences and diffusions, and their questions have followed pre-determined ideas of cultural hierarchies. In response, some scholars (for example Rudolf Wittkower) reversed this approach and examined the influence of non-European art on Western art.² In both cases, however, discussion remained at the level of a diffusionist quest for influences, and so did not escape the model of vertical art history. A noted current diffusionist and hierarchical narrative of modern art history, for example, continues to rest on an understanding of the visual arts in which art equals images, or styles, or texts (but not material objects), where the best artistic production emerges in a center before spreading to peripheries.³ This idealist (in the sense of non-material) representation of artistic production has resulted in a narrative that a circulatory approach aims to counter.

Another long-lasting response to the trends of methodological nationalism in art history stimulated the formulation of tools and methods in the study of the circulation of persons, ideas, and *artifacts*, not just images or styles. This tendency has remained marginal in the discipline of art history, however. Those scholars who have promoted it have in the main not been trained in art history, and have moreover often found inspiration in what were already marginal reactions against mainstream methods of other disciplines such as history, anthropology, sociology, and comparative literature. A historical perspective allows us to see how the question of artistic circulations has, however, recently conjoined various trends, and led to the construction of a strong, internationally animated, if not yet widespread, direction for research.

The project of writing a “total history” as envisioned by the Annales School, whose foundations were in part anticipated by German scholars, arose as a reaction against the nationalistic, antagonistic, and even imperialistic approaches associated with national historiography. During the 1960s, after having been transformed into an attempt to understand the Westernization of the world, this project was quickly reassessed and redirected in response to post-colonial and related movements, and the rethinking of the notion of “culture” by anthropologists. In the meantime, the development of a school of thought that stressed cultural transfers underlined the impossibility of delimiting consideration of history to national parameters, and stressed their continuing international interaction and transformation. Since the 1990s and above all during the present millennium, numerous projects have merged these approaches, developing “crossed”; that is to say, more and more interconnected ways of writing and thinking about history. These newer tendencies reflect not only interest in the circulations of objects, ideas, and persons, but in the interrelated conditions in which people, including historians, treat objects in practice and represent them, which in turn affect their ways of seeing, thinking, creating, and writing about them.

In this historical survey, several questions are important for us: that the study of circulations of art objects appeared in antinationalistic intellectual milieus, which was not the case originally with studies of diffusion or influence that often contributed to the definition of artistic national identities and claims: (1) that issues involving *art* represent the domain where global history is currently reinventing its methods; (2) that the challenge of dealing with global history has very important theoretical consequences for the discipline of art history as a whole; (3) that a concern with this problem demonstrates above all the importance of *facts* in historical method; (4) that this urges us to work first on their circulations, if we want to tackle the difficult subject of “interculturalization” or “*metissage*” in a satisfactory way;⁴ and finally (5) that a reintroduction of an emphasis on facts and their circulations adds a new pragmatic agenda to the use of post-modernist, post-structuralist and deconstructivist approaches that dominate much of academic art history as it is now practised, including the much more recent field of “global art history.”

“Total History” versus National History

The study of artistic circulations is rooted more in the discipline of history than in that of art history itself. Art history developed in nineteenth-century universities and museums and addressed a number of issues that had an impact on the geographical framing of the field. On the one hand efforts were made to describe, date, and localize artifacts, and to categorize them according to national criteria that are still used today in a majority of museums. On the

other, art historians of a more philosophical inclination considered art and style as an indication of the evolution of man, society, or the human spirit in history. Art thus contributed to the formation of notions of a geography of art that accompanied, reflected, and assisted other political—nationalist and even imperialist—aims.⁵

The dominant nationalist model for historical narrative grew in the wake of victory over Napoleon in 1814, when German intellectuals like Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835) and historians like Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886) reacted strongly to what they perceived as the excesses of the French Revolution and the invasion of Germany by French armies. Thinkers of this ilk rejected the type of cosmopolitanism that they associated with the French as it had developed out of the Enlightenment, and instead embraced the idea of a strong nation-state. The shaping of the discipline of history thus became part and parcel of the movement for national unity that gained strength after the dissolution of the supranational entity represented by the Holy Roman Empire (“of the German Nation”) in 1806. For many German historians, nation, state, and people (*Volk*) came to be regarded as one; every nation-state was seen as having a unique identity, different from that of its neighbors.⁶ This vision resulted in an approach to history that focused on the political history of nation-states and their great men, and highlighted the uniqueness and non-transferability of political and institutional characters.

By the end of the nineteenth century German Historicism had become the model for professional history in the Western world. Everywhere in Europe, and also in the United States of America, historians embraced the idea of professionalization of the discipline, its separation from philosophy, its critical examination of sources, the seminar model, and, most important for the present argument, even the national approach. In most cases the nationalistic and essentialist dimensions of Ranke’s Historicism were overlooked or misunderstood.⁷ Within the closed hierarchy of German universities, where individual institutes were tightly controlled by the Ordinarius (professor), any other rival approach was strongly discouraged.⁸ When Karl Lamprecht (1856–1915) tried to consider the social and cultural elements that shaped the political history of Germany, introduced visual arts as historical documents, or attempted a history of the material culture of a region, he was severely criticized, and his work was marginalized within the German academy.⁹

While Lamprecht’s reception among art historians was even smaller, Aby Warburg provides a notable exception. Warburg studied with Lamprecht, and finished his doctorate in Strasbourg, which was then under German domination, and thus a site where various cultures mingled. In this context, Warburg articulated a view of *Kulturwissenschaft*, sometimes described as *kunstgeschichtliche Kulturwissenschaft*, which expressly spoke out against the “border guards” that stop easy passage between disciplinary or national traditions. He established a large private library free from any institutional

and hence any direct political or national agenda that was devoted to research according to his vision of *Kulturwissenschaft*. The transcultural and transnational—global—scope of the library and of Warburg's own work has not, however, been a subject of much interest for art historians, even though Warburg detailed instances of cultural exchange in several essays and lectures, where he defined them expressly as such, and explained some of the "vehicles" (*Fahrzeuge*) for their transmission. Warburg never occupied a university position, and the institute he founded was never fully integrated into the German system. With Hitler's rise to power his institute moved to the UK, where, despite becoming a degree-granting and teaching unit of the University of London, it has also never completely been integrated into the British university system either; in fact its very existence as an independent institute has recently been threatened by the university's authorities. Warburg's reception was also long limited by the lack of translation of his own, not very voluminous writings. While his impact has been immense in more recent decades, several generations' followers moreover took his interests in other specific philosophical and hermeneutical directions.¹⁰

It was rather in France that a multidisciplinary and non-national (that is, not conceived according to national boundaries or regionally or internationally) history would most fully develop from the late nineteenth century on, one different from the older conception of universal history as the history of all times and places, which had been discussed in many countries for several centuries. Instead it may be related to the approach taken in the nineteenth century by some French scholars like Louis Courajod (1841–96), who coined the term "international Gothic" and who had thus already envisioned the existence of art historical styles that transcended national boundaries.¹¹ More generally, after the establishment of the Third Republic in 1870, French scholars reacted to German nationalism, which was perceived as being mostly directed against France and the Republicanism, secularism, and cosmopolitanism of 1789.

From 1888, Lucien Herr (1864–1926), the librarian of the Ecole Normale Supérieure, where future French high school teachers and university professors were trained, developed a strong collection of German books on history and philosophy, including works by German "outsiders" such as Lamprecht and Karl Marx. As a socialist intellectual with cosmopolitan views, Herr was critical of mainstream German nationalism, and pushed students to seek for different approaches to history. He had a tremendous influence on an entire generation of French intellectuals, to which Marc Bloch (1886–1944) and Lucien Febvre (1878–1956), the founders of the *Annales*, belonged.¹²

Bloch moreover studied in Germany in 1908 and 1909. At just this time in Berlin, where he began his sojourn, Friedrich Meinecke (1862–1954) was creating a stir with the publication of *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat: Studien zur Genesis des deutschen Nationalstaates* (published 1908). Meinecke continued

the historicist approach of his predecessor Ranke, while proposing at the same time nationalist political views for whose origins he was in fact giving an account.¹³ After his stay in Berlin, Bloch spent time in Leipzig, where Lamprecht was founding the Institut für Kultur- und Universalgeschichte, an institute independent from the University that was dedicated to the kind of broader cultural and universal history that could not otherwise be pursued in German universities. After the First World War, in which they both fought, Bloch and Febvre were appointed to positions at the University of Strasbourg, where they came to replace the German professors who had left after the city and the rest of Alsace-Lorraine were reattached to France following more than thirty years under German domination. In this border region, whose history belonged both to France and Germany, nationalist attitudes were alive but muddled by multicultural reality. More than anywhere else a focus on nation-states seemed impractical, and discussion of incommensurability irrelevant. This place required a different, more encompassing—not to say global—approach.

To use the term “global” here might still not be completely anachronistic, since the origins of global history are often traced back to Marc Bloch’s *Histoire comparée* and the speech he delivered in Oslo at the 1928 *Congrès international des sciences historiques*, in which he called for a comparative historical approach.¹⁴ As Bloch explained, he was proposing nothing new: social scientists and even a few historians, including the Belgian Henri Pirenne (1862–1935), were already using this approach.¹⁵ But Bloch was strongly committed to promoting comparative history; by giving it a manifesto, he became a figurehead for this approach. To him historical comparisons were best made between neighboring and contemporaneous societies that were subject to similar influences and influenced each other.¹⁶ By expanding the frame of analysis beyond the topographic limits of nation-states, this approach promised to uncover interactions and dynamics that had previously gone unnoticed.¹⁷ Bloch’s essay was a condemnation of nationalism in favor of cosmopolitanism as much as it represented a manifesto of comparative history. He urged historians to read works written outside their own countries as well as studies devoted to countries other than those on which they were working. In his eyes, the main problem faced by the discipline of history was its national compartmentalization: each national school had created its own questions, methods, and vocabulary, making any international dialogue complicated. Bloch was thus inviting his colleagues to attempt to reconcile terminologies and methodologies across national schools.¹⁸ This plea had a particular resonance in Oslo, where reconciliation and international friendship were underlying themes.¹⁹

In the desire to foster a new type of history Bloch and Febvre founded the periodical *Annales d’histoire économique et sociale* a year later. As Febvre declared in 1929: “specificity, priority, nationality: words to be crossed off

from the vocabulary of history."²⁰ Febvre reacted not only to the nationalism which underlay historical writing but also to the political manipulation of history for the ends of propaganda. In order to renew history and depoliticize it, he looked—like Bloch—towards the social sciences. As social scientists, in his view historians were not merely keeping records and describing events; they were solving problems.²¹ Febvre thus engineered a shift not only in methodology but also in regard to the use of sources. In opposition to the *Ecole méthodique*, which then dominated the field of history in France, Febvre claimed that historians could and should use other sources in addition to written documents. As he explained in his programmatic 1929 essay on the origins of the French Reformation, one could not understand the extent of such a movement by only looking at written documents, for they did not reflect its profound emotional and intellectual origins.²² Images, “the book of the ignorant” as he called them, echoing St. Gregory, provided historians with access to the ideas that circulated at the time.²³ Febvre’s comparative and multidisciplinary approach was not only important in itself but also for its influence on Fernand Braudel (1902–85) and his project of a total history.

Having grown up in a border area of the Lorraine region that had remained French after the German annexation of parts of France in 1870, Braudel became acquainted early on with the kind of environment that Bloch and Febvre had discovered in Strasbourg, one fraught with nationalism yet highly multicultural. During his studies Braudel was confronted with the inertia they all perceived in the discipline of history; consequently he turned towards geography, the then avant-garde field of the social sciences in France, on which Febvre also wrote. Like many others in his generation, he was inspired by Paul Vidal de la Blache (1845–1918), whose work considered “landscape,” “milieu,” and “region” rather than countries, and combined physical, historical, and economic analysis.²⁴ In 1924, Braudel read Febvre’s *La Terre et l’évolution humaine*, which introduced such considerations to historical studies.²⁵ Another important element in Braudel’s intellectual evolution resulted from the years he spent first in Algeria and then in Brazil. These experiences shifted his outlook on the world and specifically on the Mediterranean. Through his conversations with Febvre, Braudel transformed the project from a study of Philip II’s Mediterranean diplomacy to an overview of the Mediterranean world at the time of Philip II, shifting analysis from the man to the milieu.²⁶ Working in Spanish, French, and Italian archives, Braudel followed the circulations of ships, goods, armies, men, ideas, and images from Spanish harbors to France, Italy, Sicily, and North Africa.²⁷

The resulting study, written in a German prison camp where Braudel spent World War II as a POW, was intended as a geohistory, in which geography was, as he explained, brought to “think history.”²⁸ Dedicated to Febvre, *La Méditerranée à l’époque de Philippe II* was organized in three parts. In the first, “*La part du milieu*,” Braudel examined the geographical milieus in which

history took place, from the Mediterranean mountains to its seas to its deserts. In the second part he considered the economic, political, social, and military structures in which the men of the sixteenth century were living. Only in the third part did he study events, the men involved, and their politics. Yet, following Bloch and Febvre, Braudel did not offer an overview of the national history of each Mediterranean country, but rather paid attention to their encounters and interactions, thereby providing a history of connections and combinations. No need here to repeat the originality and importance of this book, which is inevitably mentioned in any discussion of the origins of global history.

Braudel's second major study, *La Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe–XVIIIe siècle*, represented a similar "total history," but this time on a world scale. The first part of the book was devoted to the material life of humanity, from food to clothes and money; in other words the milieu in which capitalism developed. The second part, titled in French "*Les jeux d'échange*" (literally "the games of exchange"), contemplated the transformation of economic life from medieval markets to capitalist world trade; that is to say, the structures in which capitalism evolved. The third part, "*Le temps du monde*," focused on what could be described as the life of capitalism; a history of the successive poles or cities where capitalism flourished.²⁹ This work, whose first volume was published in 1967, offered a total history with several levels of analysis; it adopted a worldwide scope; it deployed a multidisciplinary approach; and finally it made use of a wide range of sources from statistics to visual arts.

The Realization of the Limits of Global History as a History of Westernization

In 1963 Braudel wrote an overview of world history for a high school textbook, in which he looked at successive civilizations with the understanding that a civilization is a result of geography, a society, an economy, and a way of thought.³⁰ This book bears many resemblances to William McNeill's *Rise of the West*, which was also published in 1963—a book which represents World History as it developed in North America after the Second World War. Neither a school nor a method, World History was a historiographical movement that emerged from a postwar desire to break free from any sort of nationalism; it stood as a call for international collaboration in a world divided by the Cold War. Its main proponents, including McNeill (born 1917) and Leften Stavros Stavrianos (1913–2004), who edited *A Global History of Man* in 1962, were associated freely with the University of Chicago, where the Committee on Social Thought promoted advanced research in the social sciences and had close ties with the French *Annales* group.³¹ McNeill's *Rise of the West* told the story of the progressive integration of the world by considering

its succeeding great civilizations from “The Breakthrough to Civilization in Mesopotamia” to “Cosmopolitanism on a Global Scale, 1850–1950,” and how these civilizations interacted and influenced each other, leading to the progressive Westernization of the world. McNeill concluded his book with a comment that anticipates in summary form the point of view of most later discussions of globalization:

... no matter how it comes, the cosmopolitanism of the future will surely bear a Western imprint. At least in its initial stages, any world state will be an empire of the West. This would be the case even if non-Westerners should happen to hold the supreme controls of world-wide political-military authority, for they could only do so by utilizing such originally Western traits as industrialism, science, and the public palliation of power through advocacy of one or another of the democratic political faiths. Hence “The Rise of the West” may serve as a shorthand description of the upshot of the history of the human community to date.³²

The Civil Rights movements that shook the US in the years following the publication of McNeill’s study, and the ensuing development in the 1970s of Cultural, Feminist, African-American, and Postcolonial studies undermined the established narrative of World History. They brought to the fore experiences which had, until then, been largely ignored. As the story of the world exploded into multiple local and individual stories, it became urgent to define a new narrative structure in order to teach the semester-long World History course that had become a core requirement in most US colleges.³³ The problem for teachers of World History was that the stories told by McNeill or Braudel were written from the perspective of the progressive Westernization of the world, and so implicitly emphasized Europe’s exceptionalism. The New World History, as it was defined by the members of the World History Association created in 1982, avoided this pitfall by focusing on either historical phenomena that arise on a world scale (feudalism, money, the treatment of children, and so on) and could thus be discussed across regional, cultural, and political borders, or on circulations and migrations.³⁴ Reflecting on “The Changing Shape of World History,” McNeill noted that one could not and should not study civilizations one after the other, because there exists no such thing as a separate civilization. Civilizations, he explained, are always internally commingled and complex, and always interacting with and transforming each other. In retrospect, he felt that he should have focused even more on human encounters and the ways they transformed world systems and generated new ones.³⁵

McNeill’s insistence on the importance of civilizations’ encounters and interconnections was shared by many European scholars, and stands at the origins of the growth in popularity of the concept of cultural transfer in the 1980s. The emergence of this school of thought can be traced to the

intensification of international academic exchanges from the 1970s onwards. Faculty and students were able to organize and attend international meetings, and find support to study and conduct research abroad especially in Western Europe, where the European Union provided a supportive framework for such collaborations.³⁶ In the particular context of Franco–German relations, a group of young scholars started investigating Heinrich Heine’s use of Saint-Simonian terminology to discuss German philosophy. This international collaboration on international topics allowed them not only to reach a new understanding of the early reception and adaptation of Hegel and Kant in France and the importance of Saint-Simon in Germany, but more importantly to question traditional understanding of literary reception and cultural identity. In 1985, Michel Espagne (born 1952) and Michael Werner (born 1946) created a research cluster for what they came to call Cultural Transfers. The group was international and multidisciplinary, as it brought together social scientists, philologists, and other scholars who specialized in interpretation and translation of texts.³⁷

While the notion of cultural transfer had previously been used in historical writing,³⁸ Espagne and Werner chose to use the term “transfers” to describe the focus of their research owing to its circulatory implication, and in particular its evocation of both monetary and psychoanalytic transfers. Their ambition was to go beyond the notion of national literature and to move against the comparative approaches that were then favored in the academic field of literature. Indeed, as their approach implied, simply and flatly comparing countries in order to stress their differences reinforces notions of specificity and uniqueness. In contrast, the approach of the Cultural Transfers group aimed at highlighting the phenomena of cultural mixing in order to demonstrate that national identities were nothing other than the result of cross-mixing with other cultures. Historians of Cultural Transfers in relation to literature paid particular attention to circulations, hence to facts in which literature exists: to the circulations of persons, or objects, the translations of books, and subsequently, as the movement developed, to such matters as the exhibition of artworks. They examined the transformations that ideas, texts, and eventually artworks underwent as they crossed borders and were assimilated in new contexts, as well as the transformations these contexts experienced as they were affected by objects.³⁹

This approach was obviously not limited to the group around Cultural Transfers. During the 1980s, a growing number of historians took up questions concerning culture and the circulation of cultural objects as subjects for research. The work of the *Annales* often provided the background for studies of cultural production, mediation, and assimilation. For example, in the UK Peter Burke (born 1937) wrote a history of the *Annales*,⁴⁰ and was also an important early proponent of this new sort of cultural and social history in the Anglophone world. In 1978, Burke published *Popular Culture in Early Modern*

Europe, where he set out to “discover the attitudes and values of craftsmen and peasants” in pre-industrial Europe, paying attention to the transmission of culture through wandering minstrels and actors, and examining the processes through which culture was either preserved or transformed.⁴¹ From the sociology of language to the cultural history of images, Burke’s work provides a model for a transnational and transdisciplinary approach to society and culture.⁴² From an early period in his career onward Burke has also offered models both for the application of a comparative approach to history and for the specific use of the notion of cultural transfer.⁴³

Among French historians, Christophe Charle (born 1951) has offered a synthesis of the traditions of the *Annales*, the Cultural Transfers, and the work of Pierre Bourdieu (under whom he studied), in particular his reflection on cultural fields and networks. Charle’s work, which could be described as a transnational social history of cultural transfers, took as its focus the emergence of a European cultural field in the nineteenth century. Not only has Charle studied European intellectuals, their encounters, and networks, as well as the circulation of their works and ideas, he has also considered the comparisons among and between intellectuals.⁴⁴ His work caught the attention of German *Sozialhistoriker* who, like Jürgen Kocka (born 1941), were working at the time on transnational subjects within the Western world, such as the rise of the bourgeoisie.⁴⁵ Yet the originality of Charle’s work rests on the attention he has paid to the complexity of cultural transfers, the absence of circulations, and the phenomena of resistance to exchange and transformation, what he calls the “*discordance des temps*” (Temporal Discordance).⁴⁶

In the 1980s a focus on connections and exchanges also entered the field of American history in the US under the double impulse of the growing internationalization of the discipline and of new perspectives brought by non-US scholars specializing on US history. In December 1988 Akira Iriye (born 1934) gave a speech at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in which he called for an internationalization of American history, urging US scholars not only to make contact with foreign specialists on American history, but also with specialists on other national histories. Like Bloch sixty years earlier, he invited scholars to read what others were doing outside their field and outside their country. Such a broadened perspective, he argued, would enable historians to talk with international scholars and jointly explore wider historical issues.⁴⁷

A few months later in April 1989, Ian Tyrrell, an Australian scholar, delivered a paper at the Organization of American Historians on “American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History.”⁴⁸ Like Iriye, Tyrrell denounced the remnants of nationalism that haunted the field of American history and prevented its renewal. He also rejected a merely comparative approach, arguing that it contributed to reinforcement of differences between countries, and so maintained the idea of US exceptionalism.

Instead he called for a transnational approach rooted in the work of the *Annales* School, in particular the works of Braudel and Bloch, which were not confined to national boundaries, and for which Immanuel Wallerstein (born 1930) had already offered an authoritative example in the US in his transnational study of the rise of capitalism as a world economy since the sixteenth century.⁴⁹ Such an approach was deemed necessary because the spread of European people, technology, and values had created a global context in which, Tyrell argued, “the inadequacy of a national framework for comprehending the present circumstances of the United States” was demonstrable.⁵⁰ The transnational history for which Tyrell was calling would study international organizations, ideologies, and movements, and it would be a collective project.⁵¹

Upon reading the published version of Tyrell’s lecture in 1998, Pierre-Yves Saunier, a French historian, recognized in Tyrell’s description of “transnational history” the type of research he was doing, and thus embraced the term.⁵² As he explained, “the transnational angle cares for movement and forces that cut across national boundaries. It means goods, it means peoples, it means ideas, words, capitals, might and institutions.”⁵³ As Saunier saw it:

One of the most immediate possibilities opened by the adoption of a transnational angle is a contribution to the historicisation of what is commonly called “globalisation.” Historians, by paying interest to the flows that cut across borders, would be in a position to offer a more precise contextualisation of the ways in which cultural models are diffused, markets extended, relationships between governments and non-governmental groups organised, links among individuals, groups and institutions multiplied on a global or macro-regional scale.⁵⁴

With Iriye, Saunier went on to co-edit *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*, which can be described as an ambitious project for a collective history of transnational circulations and interconnections.⁵⁵

New Approaches: More Critical, More Global, More Materialist

In the 1990s, the process of cultural, economic, and political integration of the world accelerated following the opening of the Soviet Bloc, the rise of low-cost carriers, and the growth of the Internet. As globalization became the topic of heated debate, some historians, especially those interested in economics, started using the phrase “global history” instead of “world history.” For instance, in 2006 William Gervase Clarence-Smith, Kenneth Pomeranz, and Peer Vries created the *Journal of Global History*, which was published by the London School of Economics and Political Science. As they explained in their first editorial, their ambition was threefold: to remedy the segmentation of the discipline by offering a platform for multidisciplinary

work, to encourage further examination of the processes of globalization, and to continue deconstructing the Western metanarrative. They also stressed that writing global history did not necessarily entail taking the whole globe as the framework of analysis, but that it rather meant “straddling traditional regional boundaries and proposing innovative comparisons.”⁵⁶ In the same issue, Patrick O’Brien, Professor of Economic History at the London School of Economics and Political Science, wrote a programmatic essay on “Historiographical Traditions and Modern Imperatives for the Restoration of Global History,” which he concluded with comments that revealed the moral dimension of the project:

As I read them, the commitments and agendas of modern global history ... require a reordering of classical and established historiographies from all cultures to make space for histories that are attempting to disengage from national, regional, ethnic and religious traditions. Such histories would become involved with the construction of meta-narratives that might, at one and the same time, deepen our understanding of diversities and scale up our consciousness of a human condition that has for millennia included global influences, and intermingled with local elements in all its essential dimensions.⁵⁷

For historians who reject the term Global History for its presentism and strong economical undertones, the phrase “Connected Histories,” proposed by Sanjay Subrahmanyam, has also offered an attractive alternative.⁵⁸ Subrahmanyam’s approach is closely related to that of Cultural Transfers, since it also reveals behind their supposed incommensurability and otherness the ways in which cultures adapt to and combine elements of each other, pointing to the phenomena of adaptation to “others” and to *métissages*. As he has explained, empires and civilizations are rarely ships sailing alone. They are always crossing and connecting with each other.⁵⁹ The difference between the approaches of Cultural Transfers and Connected Histories lies in Connected Histories’ reflection on the process of globalization, their underlying challenge to a Western metanarrative, and consequently the wider scope and pluralist nature of their narratives.

In 2004, Serge Gruzinski, whose approach is closely related to Subrahmanyam’s, published *Les quatre parties du monde: Histoire d’une mondialisation*, in which he expanded Braudel’s study of Philippe II’s world beyond the Mediterranean to the four corners of the world. Yet Gruzinski was aiming less at a “total history” than at connected histories of the world in the sixteenth century. His “*histoire de la mondialisation*” is the story of circulations, encounters, and *métissages* from Madrid to Mexico, Rio de La Plata to Genoa, or Seville to China related to Iberia.⁶⁰ As Gruzinski explains, the historian of the Connected Histories acts as an electrician, who reestablishes the continental and intercontinental connections that national historiographies had unplugged.⁶¹

Among other successful examples of Connected Histories are those related to Netherlandish encounters. Here may be mentioned the work carried on by scholars from Thailand, Myanmar, Taiwan, and elsewhere within the framework established by the TANAP project.⁶² Another related example is Romain Bertrand's *Histoire à parts égales* (2011), which examines in equal measure ("parts égales") the Dutch world and that of Java at the time of their first encounters in the late sixteenth century, from a Javanese and not only a Dutch point of view, in order to throw new light on the different meanings that these intercultural encounters took on in each of them.⁶³ In fields related more closely to art history, other studies have been produced on Dutch–Asian interchange.⁶⁴

Anthropologists have also started using the phrase "entangled histories" to describe an approach that focuses on Western countries' entanglements with their colonial empires. This approach invites historians to consider the history of Western societies through the post-colonial prism of their relationships with their colonies. As Shalini Randeria explains: "such a perspective of what I have termed 'entangled histories' of modernities within and outside the West overcomes both the methodological nationalism and Eurocentrism of the social sciences by seeing colonialism as constitutive of European modernity and not as external to it."⁶⁵ In his 1991 study of the *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture, and Colonialism in the Pacific*, Nicholas Thomas, for instance, offered a bidirectional approach to the colonial encounter, by examining not only how Europeans appropriated Oceanic objects but also how the Pacific people appropriated Western objects.⁶⁶

Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann have taken this idea of connected or entangled histories a step further by introducing into the historical equation the specific position of historians working on those histories, thus examining not only the intersections between the subjects of the analysis but also the connections between those subjects and the authors of the analyses. They explain: "it is a matter of placing at the center of the plan of research the relation between the artificiality of several particular stories and the analytical construction operated by the researcher who offers to grasp them and interpret them."⁶⁷ They term their approach "*Histoire croisée*," using a generic singular instead of a plural in order to move beyond the focus on the plurality and artificiality of histories, and the deadlock to which they tend to lead, to propose a reflective method, which borrows from social scientists a way to address the researcher's inevitable bias.⁶⁸ The end of the world's bipartition following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the acceleration of the processes of globalization has not only resulted in an intensification of global exchanges but also of clashes between different worldviews: for Werner and Zimmermann this situation demands that historians question their own modes of comprehension of the societies they study. They thus urge scholars to adopt a "crossed" approach that would "integrate in the analysis

the consequences of the historical moment that shapes the position and point of view of the researcher.”⁶⁹

Following these ambitions, a new generation of scholars is taking advantage of statistical, digital, and cartographic tools to retrace precisely circulations of artworks, artists, and important mediators of artistic internationalization and *métissages*. These young art historians, often trained in the methods of French social and geographical sciences, became rapidly aware of the limits of internalist, formal, or simply monographic approaches for understanding international artistic circulations. They thus turned towards different methods: they wanted to consider not only the actors and vectors of artistic circulations, but also to compare the political and social contexts of the countries studied, as well as the structures of exhibition practices and marketing strategies adopted, and the political and social stands of the actors involved.⁷⁰ They were also particularly eager to uncover and trace transnational circulations over long periods, hence the quantitative and cartographic method they adopted.

Braudel noted in 1949, “We have museum catalogs, but no artistic atlases.”⁷¹ Indeed, at the time quantitative and cartographic approaches were non-existent in art history. Since then, only a few forerunners such as the *Atlas of Western Art* edited by Anthony White and John Steer or John Onians’s *Atlas of World Art* have examined the intersection of geographical and historic questions in the form of atlases used to trace artistic circulations.⁷² This lacuna cannot derive solely from art historians’ mistrust of quantitative methods; it comes rather from their general lack of training in statistical and cartographic methods.

Acutely aware of this problem, a group of young international scholars has since 2009 tackled this problem within the framework of ARTL@s (www.artlas.ens.fr). This project aims at developing a transnational history of artistic circulations since the eighteenth century through the use of shared sources and tools. Among them is a database of exhibition catalogues. Exhibition catalogues have been chosen as a means to retrace artistic circulations in the modern period historically and concretely, because they provide serial data on artists, including addresses, birthplaces, schools attended, lists of previous exhibitions, and dealers, which in turn provide additional addresses that can be used to trace the circulation of people and objects. Quantitative analysis of the data they provide has facilitated the study of transnational circulations over long periods, and thus opened to challenge many aspects of the standard narrative of modern art history.⁷³

Renvoi: A Critical Return to Facts

Histoires croisées, Entangled or Connected Histories, Global History, Transnational History, New World History, these are but some of the terms that have emerged in the past decades to describe ways to approach history in

the context of a post-colonial, globalized world. As this brief historiographical overview shows, these different approaches represent the continuation of earlier models, especially Comparative History, Total History, and Cultural Transfers, and their adaptation to current historical and historiographic contexts.⁷⁴ That the project of a global history is not a matter of geographical scope but of questions and methods thus seems confirmed.

This orientation has always retained its base in a fundamental critique of nationalist methodologies. At the same time, it has followed the call for a universal historiography characteristic of the rationalist spirit of the Enlightenment that has developed since the eighteenth century. This universal or global approach has been accused of representing a culturally determined, hence political, prejudice, determined by its unconscious geopolitical orientation. We contend, however, that this universal ambition does not represent the death knell of global history. Instead we believe that it opens up the possibility of research on regions, populations, and values that have often been neglected by scholars as “peripheral,” “marginal,” or “minority.” At the same time only the study of circulations seems to have succeeded in reviving the geographical decompartmentalization of the global history of art. This decompartmentalization makes possible liberation from cultural and geopolitical hierarchies that post-colonial approaches have rightly denounced, while simultaneously avoiding the danger of falling into the trap of intoning value judgments. At the core of this circulatory or “crossed” approach there lies a concern with retracing circulations from indications that are most often material. Thus, in our point of view, the development of crossed and circulatory methods in history and the focus on artifacts lead to a call to reject the self-limiting rhetorical play of deconstruction that has not taken into account its own critical turn and has only remained a linguistic or visual game. In art history, a departure is needed from the perpetual discussion of “discourse” and “images,” in the realization that even texts and images are imparted by objects (books, engraved or printed objects, artifacts) that circulate in different spaces and contexts, and pass into the hands of concrete persons like ourselves. Thus we are not involved in the task of the deconstruction of their “unconscious” determinants. Instead, as historians we wish to study their origins in context. Hence, as historians occupied with tracing the transnational and transcultural circulation of artifacts we still believe in what used to be called facts, and assume that only a materialist historicism can lead to critical reflection on and help comprehend the reconstruction of sensibilities, points of views, and understanding of objects.

The global history of artifacts (or art) presents huge challenges: how to deal with, to “cross” as it were, the questions of the circulation of objects, the variation of the object as it circulates (or is circulated, modified, transformed, destroyed, broken, repaired), the variation of images associated with it, hence the visual practices and cognitive styles by which it is approached and

reproduced, the variability in time and place of interpretations of these objects, images of them, the variability of discourse on them, of ideas with which they are invested, the individuals, groups, and so on, who are interested in them. In short, one is obliged to apply different approaches simultaneously, for example cultural transfer, comparison, iconology, anthropology, semiotics, sociology—which is why in the presentation of this volume we have wanted to assemble very diverse approaches.

This book arises out of our shared belief that the study of circulations allows for an escape from the Western, or even Northern Atlantic limitations of art historical questions, methods, and institutions, and opens up a new and necessary articulation of theory that is conjoined with pragmatism and materialism in art history. It responds to the challenge of globalization, what Gruzinski has called *métissage*, without ignoring the important impact that cultural nationalism and artistic territorialization have had on the study of the history of art. Our ambition is twofold: to foster exchanges and discussions among people with different approaches, because we see them as rather connected and extremely complementary; and to promote reflection on circulations, whatever the methodology of the practitioner might be, in order to renew art historical research. In order to foster a transnational and transdisciplinary circulation of ideas, methods and discoveries, we have invited scholars to contribute who represent a wide range of perspectives: they come from different countries, belong to different generations, work on different periods, study different art forms, and employ different methodologies.

Of particular importance is the participation of Michel Espagne, Serge Gruzinski, and Christophe Charle, three historians whose contributions to the historiography outlined above are essential. Their contributions are also the opportunity to underline the multidisciplinary aspects of the global project. From Febvre to Gruzinski, artworks have been privileged subjects of analysis for the historians mentioned above. Not only do the circulations of artworks provide evidence for encounters between cultures, they also bear witness to the *métissages* that result from those encounters. In his essay on the connected histories of empires during the modern period, Subrahmanyam presented the three main themes of Connected Histories as diplomacy, war, and art.⁷⁵ Such an emphasis on artistic circulations in historical research only provides art historians additional incentives to explore those questions in their own terms.

The first chapter, written by Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, provides a critical discussion of historiography pertaining to global and world art history, thereby engaging in a dialogue with the larger historiography of global and world history outlined above and providing art historians with a comprehensive grasp of the issue as they relate to their own discipline.

The subsequent chapters illustrate how circulatory approaches, whatever they may be, allow us to rethink the usual frames of the (art) historical narrative. They also invite us not to universalize such terms such as the

“eye” or the “image,” but rather to examine how in different times and places the same object or idea could be seen differently, and to realize the extent to which the issue of cultural differentiation and variation of the “gaze” mattered to artists, their patrons, and audiences. In other words, they ask us not to adopt an omniscient viewpoint on the globalized world, but rather to see it from the limited and partial perspectives of the historical men and women we study, while being ourselves aware of the limits of our points of view as historians.

This helps us also to understand why a comprehensive, global approach does not have to include all possible points of view, national, cultural, ethnic, individual, whatever they may be. The project of global art history is often confused with non-Western art history. This assumption results from a questionable contrast of the “West” and the “non-Western,” as if there were no relationships between them. Moreover, confusing global art history with “non-Western” art history (African, Indian, Arabic or even Latin American, and so on) ignores the holes within “Western” art history itself; for example, much of Eastern Europe (which in this scheme is lumped with the “West”). We firmly believe that a local history of non-Western countries is not global, nor is one that takes into account every nation. Global art history is not the reverse side of Western art history, but of national art history and cultural separations, and the limitations imposed by similar categorizations.

The last chapter, a postscript written by James Elkins, offers a response to the chapters that constitute this volume and a critique of the Circulations project’s potentials and limits. His comments thus also start the conversation we wish to have with our readers, because we firmly believe that a global art history can only be the result of a collective project in which ideas circulate, are commented upon, and interconnected.

Notes

- 1 See for example Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, “Beyond ‘Culture’: Space Identity, and the Politics of Difference,” *Cultural Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (February 1992). This critique also reveals how such distinctions may participate in global and historical systems of domination.
- 2 See especially the collection of Wittkower’s essays published posthumously as Rudolf Wittkower, *Selected Lectures: The Impact of Non-European Civilizations on the Art of the West* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- 3 For a discussion of diffusionism in relation to art history see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004). Piotr Piotrowski has developed a critique of vertical art history. See Chapter 8 in this volume.
- 4 For other approaches to these issues and the historiography and philosophic bases of global art history, see further the essays collected in Wilfried van Damme and Kitty Zijlmans, eds., *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches* (Amsterdam: Valiz, 2008).
- 5 See Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*.
- 6 For a good overview, starting however in the late eighteenth century, see Georg G. Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*

- (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983); Horst Dippel, "1871 versus 1789 German Historians and the Ideological Foundations of the Deutsche Reich," *History of European Ideas* 15, no. 4–6 (1992): 829–37.
- 7 Georg G. Iggers, "The Image of Ranke in American and German Historical Thought," *History and Theory* 2, no. 1 (1962): 17–40; Georg G. Iggers, "Classical Historicism as a Model for Historical Scholarship," in *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1997), 23–30.
 - 8 On the results of the sclerosis of German universities in the first part of the twentieth century, see Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969).
 - 9 Karl Lamprecht, *Deutsches Wirtschaftsleben im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die Entwicklung der materiellen Kultur des platten Landes auf Grund der Quellen zunächst des Mosellandes*, vols. 1–3 (Leipzig: A. Durr, 1885–86); Karl Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vols. 1–12 (Berlin: Gaertner, 1891–1909). For more information on Lamprecht's career and the strong reaction against his work, see Roger Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht: A German Academic Life* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1993).
 - 10 See for instance Aby Warburg, *Der Bilderatlas Mnemosyne* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008); Werner Hofmann, *Die Menschenrechte des Auges: Über Aby Warburg*, Europäische Bibliothek, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1980); Horst Bredekamp, Michael Diers, and Charlotte Schoell-Glass, eds., *Aby Warburg: Akten des internationalen Symposions, Hamburg 1990* (Weinheim: VCH Verlag, 1991); Philippe-Alain Michaud, *Aby Warburg et l'image en mouvement* (Paris: Macula, 1998); Georges Didi-Huberman, *L'image survivante: Histoire de l'art et temps des fantômes selon Aby Warburg* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 2002).
 - 11 Henry Lemonnier and André Michel, eds., *Louis Courajod. Leçons professées à l'École du Louvre (1887–1896)*, 3 vols. (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1899–1903). In the Habsburg realms Julius von Schlosser also developed parallel notions of an international court style, although somewhat later. See for example "Ein Veronesisches Bilderbuch und die höfische Kunst des XIV. Jahrhunderts," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 16 (1895): 144–230.
 - 12 On Herr, see, for instance, George P. Schoyer, "Lucien Herr, Librarian and Socialist," *The Journal of Library History* 10, no. 1 (January 1975): 52–56.
 - 13 Friedrich Meinecke, *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat: Studien zur Genesis des deutschen Nationalstaates* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1908).
 - 14 The speech was then published as Marc Bloch, "Pour une histoire comparée des sociétés européennes," *Revue de synthèse historique* 46 (1928): 15–50.
 - 15 Henri Pirenne, who in 1922 penned a study on *Mahomet et Charlemagne*, is often regarded as the inspiration for the Annales School.
 - 16 Bloch, "Pour une histoire comparée des sociétés européennes," 19.
 - 17 *Ibid.*, 44–45.
 - 18 *Ibid.*, 47–49.
 - 19 For more information on comparative history, see Christophe Charle, "Histoire comparée," in *Dictionnaire des sciences humaines*, ed. Sylvie Mesure and Patrick Savidan (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2006).
 - 20 Lucien Febvre, "Une question mal posée: Les origines de la Réforme française et le problème général des causes de la Réforme," *La revue historique* 159 (1929): 73.
 - 21 Those ideas are already discussed in the text of his inaugural lecture at the University of Strasbourg in 1919, which was published a year later; see Lucien Febvre, "L'histoire dans un monde en ruines," *Revue de synthèse historique* 30 (1920).
 - 22 Febvre, "Une question mal posée," 6.
 - 23 *Ibid.*, 36.
 - 24 See, for instance, Paul Vidal de La Blache, *La terre, géographie physique et économique* (Paris: Delagrave, 1883).
 - 25 Lucien Febvre, *La terre et l'évolution humaine* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1922).
 - 26 The proposed title of his dissertation was "Philippe II et la politique espagnole en Méditerranée de 1559 à 1574."

- 27 On Braudel's intellectual evolution, see Paule Braudel, "Les origines intellectuelles de Fernand Braudel: Un témoignage," *Annales. Economies, sociétés, civilisations* 47, no. 1 (1992): 237–44.
- 28 Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1949), 295–96.
- 29 Fernand Braudel, *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe–XVIIIe siècle*, vols. 1, 2, and 3 (Paris: Armand Colin, 1979).
- 30 Fernand Braudel, Suzanne Baille, and Robert Philippe, *Le monde actuel: Histoire et civilisations* (Paris: Belin, 1963). The main part of the book written by Braudel was republished after his death in 1987 under the new title *Grammaire des civilisations*.
- 31 See Krzysztof Pomian, "World History: Histoire mondiale, histoire universelle," *Le débat* 154, no. 2 (2009): 20–24.
- 32 William H. McNeill, *The Rise of the West: A History of Human Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 806–07.
- 33 Arif Dirlik, "Performing the World: Reality and Representation in the Making of World Histor(ies)," *Journal of World History* 16, no. 4 (December 2005): 391–410.
- 34 On the New World History, see Michael Geyer and Charles Bright, "The World History in a Global Age," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 4 (October 1995): 1034–60.
- 35 William H. McNeill, "The Changing Shape of World History," *History and Theory* 34, no. 2 (May 1995): 8–26.
- 36 See Kaelble Hartmut, "Les mutations du comparatisme international," *Les cahiers Irice* 1, no. 5 (2010): 9–19.
- 37 In 1986, a conference organized by the *Mission historique française* in Göttingen played an important role in shaping the project. The proceedings of this international meeting were published in 1988: see Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, eds., *Transferts: Les relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand (XVIII et XIXe siècles)* (Paris: Editions recherche sur les civilisations, 1988).
- 38 Beyond Warburg and the tradition of scholarship associated with him, the notion seems to have become fairly widespread in discussions of intellectual and cultural history by the second half of the twentieth century: see, for example, Jürgen Herbst, *The German Historical School in American Scholarship: A Study in the Transfer of Culture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1965).
- 39 On the history and ambitions of the Cultural Transfers, see Michel Espagne, "Introduction," in *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999), 1–33.
- 40 Peter Burke, *The French Historical Revolution: The Annales School 1929–89* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990).
- 41 Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978).
- 42 See, for instance, Peter Burke, *Eyewitnessing the Uses of Images as Historical Evidence* (London: Reaktion, 2001); Peter Burke, *Towards a Social History of Early Modern Dutch* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005).
- 43 See Peter Burke, *Venice and Amsterdam: A Study of Seventeenth-Century Elites* (London: Temple Smith, 1974); Peter Burke, *Kultureller Austausch*, trans. Burkhardt Wolf (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000).
- 44 Christophe Charle, *Les intellectuels en Europe au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1996); Christophe Charle, *Théâtres en capitales, naissance de la société du spectacle à Paris, Berlin, Londres et Vienne, 1860–1914* (Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 2008).
- 45 Jürgen Kocka, *Industrial Culture and Bourgeois Society: Business, Labor, and Bureaucracy in Modern Germany, 1800–1918* (New York: Berghahn, 1999).
- 46 Christophe Charle, *Discordance des temps. Une brève histoire de la modernité* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2011).
- 47 It is worth noting that Dr. Iriye is a Japanese scholar based in the US. His speech was published two months later. See Akira Iriye, "The Internationalization of History," *American Historical Review* 94, no. 1 (February 1989): 1–10.
- 48 Tyrrell's speech was published in 1991. See Ian Tyrrell, "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History," *American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (October 1991).

- 49 See, for instance, Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, vol. 1, *Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York and London: Academic Press, 1974); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, vol. 2, *Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600–1750* (New York: Academic Press, 1980).
- 50 Tyrrell, “American Exceptionalism,” 1044.
- 51 *Ibid.*, 1050, 1055.
- 52 Pierre-Yves Saunier, “Learning by Doing: Notes about the Making of the Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History,” *Journal of Modern European History* 6, no. 2 (2008): 159–60.
- 53 Pierre-Yves Saunier, “Going Transnational? News from Down Under,” *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung* 31, no. 2 (September 2004): 119.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 122.
- 55 Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier, eds., *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History: From the Mid-Nineteenth Century to the Present Day* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).
- 56 William Gervase Clarence-Smith, Kenneth Pomeranz, and Peer Vries, “Editorial,” *Journal of Global History* 1 (2006): 2.
- 57 Patrick O’Brien, “Historiographical Traditions and Modern Imperatives for the Restoration of Global History,” *Journal of Global History* 1 (2006): 38.
- 58 See, for instance, Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Holding the World in Balance: The Connected Histories of the Iberian Overseas Empires, 1500–1640,” *American Historical Review* 112, no. 5 (December 2007): 1359–85.
- 59 Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Par-delà l’incommensurabilité: Pour une histoire connectée des empires aux temps modernes,” *Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine* 54, no. 4 bis (2007): 34–53.
- 60 Serge Gruzinski, *Les quatre parties du monde: Histoire d’une mondialisation* (Paris: Les éditions de La Martinière, 2004).
- 61 Serge Gruzinski, “Les mondes mêlés de la Monarchie catholique et autres ‘connected histories,’” *Annales. Histoire, sciences sociales* 56, no. 1 (2001): 87.
- 62 This series, whose acronym derives tellingly from the initials for the ideal “Towards a New Age of Partnership” has produced well over twenty books in the series “Tanap Monographs on the History of Asian-European Interaction,” the most recent of which (at time of writing) was Wei-Chung Cheng, *War, Trade and Piracy in the China Seas, 1622–1683* (Boston: Brill, 2013).
- 63 Romain Bertrand, *L’histoire à parts égales: Récits d’une rencontre Orient–Occident (XVIe–XVIIe siècle)* (Paris: Seuil, 2011).
- 64 Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann and Michael North, eds., *Mediating Netherlandish Art and Material Culture in Asia* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2014).
- 65 Shalini Randeria, “Entangled Histories of Uneven Modernities: Civil Society, Caste Solidarities and Legal Pluralism in Post-Colonial India,” in *Unraveling Ties: From Social Cohesion to New Practices of Connectedness*, ed. Yehuda Elkana et al. (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2002), 284–311.
- 66 Nicholas Thomas, *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture, and Colonialism in the Pacific* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).
- 67 Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, “Introduction,” in *De la comparaison à l’histoire croisée* (Paris: Seuil 2004), 8.
- 68 Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, “Beyond Comparison: ‘Histoire Croisée’ and the Challenge of Reflexivity,” *History and Theory* 45, no. 1 (February 2006): 30–50. In regard to the use of reflexivity in social sciences, see (for instance) Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J.D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
- 69 Werner and Zimmermann, “Introduction,” 9.
- 70 Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel, “‘Nul n’est prophète en son pays?’ L’internationalisation de la peinture avant-gardiste parisienne (1855–1914)” (Thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris I, 2005); Anaïs Fléchet, “Aux rythmes du Brésil: Exotisme, transferts culturels et appropriations. La musique brésilienne en France au XXe siècle” (Thèse de doctorat, Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne, 2007); Catherine Dossin, “The Stories of the Western Artworld, 1936–1986” (PhD diss., University of

Texas, 2008); Jérémie Cerman, "Le papier peint autour de 1900: Usages et diffusion de l'esthétique Art nouveau en Europe dans le décor intérieur" (Thèse de doctorat, Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne, 2009).

- 71 Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, trans. Siân Reynolds (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).
- 72 John Steer and Antony White, eds., *Atlas of Western Art History: Artists, Sites, and Movements from Ancient Greece to the Modern Age* (New York: Facts on File, 1994); John Onians, ed., *Atlas of World Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- 73 See Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel, "Nul n'est prophète en son pays?" *L'internationalisation de la peinture avant-gardiste parisienne (1855–1914)* (Paris: Musée d'Orsay / Nicolas Chaudun, 2009); Catherine Dossin, *The Rise and Fall of American Art, 1940s–1980s: A Geopolitics of Western Art Worlds* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015). See also Chapter 10, by Dossin and Joyeux-Prunel within this volume.
- 74 For further historiographical references to the issues discussed here, and an earlier call to renew attention to the francophone scholarly traditions, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Historiography," in *Toward a Geography of Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 14–104.

It should be noted that the tendencies discussed in the present chapter have also enjoyed a broader circulation: beyond the use of cultural transfer discussed above it has also been taken up in Austria (for example, Wolfgang Schmale, ed., *Kulturtransfer Kulturelle Praxis im 16. Jahrhundert*, Wiener Schriften zur Geschichte der Neuzeit (Vienna: Studien Verlag, 2003)) and in Germany (for example, Michael North, *Kultureller Austausch: Bilanz und Perspektiven der Frühzeitforschung* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009)). The same concept has also been introduced into other art historical contexts in the Baltic, the Americas, and East Asia: examples include Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Ways of Transfer of Netherlandish Art," in *Netherlandish Artists in Gdańsk in the Time of Hans Vredeman de Vries* (Gdańsk: Museum of the History of the City of Gdańsk, 2006), 13–22; also Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Cultural Transfer and Arts in the Americas," in *The Virgin, Saints, and Angels: South American Paintings 1600–1825 from the Thoma Collection*, ed. Suzanne Stratton-Pruitt (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006), 18–25; also Thomas DaCosta Kaufman, "Interpreting Cultural Transfer and the Consequences of Markets and Exchange: Reconsidering Fumi-e," in *Artistic and Cultural Exchanges between Europe and Asia, 1400–1900. Rethinking Markets, Workshops and Collections*, ed. Michael North (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 135–61.

- 75 Subrahmanyam, "Par-delà l'incommensurabilité," 34–53.