Traditions, Topics and Trends in Cultural History in Europe—an Introduction[1]

Jörg Rogge

In the debates about the theory and methods of European historical science in the past thirty years, cultural historical approaches and formulations of questions played and do play an outstanding role. The interest in this was stimulated by the changing prevailing political and social conditions, on the one hand, and an increasing dissatisfaction with the dominant historical-scientific concepts on the other. Thus at the beginning of the 1980s in the Federal Republic of Germany, criticism of Social History or Historical Social Science interested in socio-economic structures and processes, which paid hardly any attention to the cultural meaning dimensions of historical reality, was the starting point for the newly awakening interest in culture and the people who had produced their respective culture. The invitation given by historical science to pay more attention again to the actors—admittedly not to the *great men*—corresponded to the attitude that the individual in his respective place could or must contribute towards changing social and political conditions. Because it was the people themselves who created the world they lived in by acting and interpreting; they were not simply at the mercy of anonymous structures, but invited, e.g. to demonstrate against the nuclear industry and environmental pollution, to stand up for peace and security or also to demand equal rights for men and women, and thus overcome traditional gender roles.

With the political watershed of 1989/90 and the experiences of the Germans in and with the GDR, the sensibility for the diversity of the pasts experienced by human beings increased further. Precisely the experiences which people make,

1 Many Thanks to John Michael Deasy, Kristina Müller-Bongard and Cathleen Sarti for their manifold support during the editing process of this volume.

contribute to their behaviour and are the basis for their interpretation of their world. People were (and are) linked together and with their environment by social practices and various forms of communication. The historical actors express their opinion on their opposite numbers and the environment; they thus generate meanings and give their (living) world a meaning.[2]

Against this background, a new form of cultural history developed in Germany, differing from the old cultural history of the closing years of the 19th and early part of the 20th century. In disassociation from social history, one let oneself be influenced above all by everyday and mentality history—the concepts of the *Annales* primarily[3] - as well as historical anthropology.[4] In addition came gradually French, but above all Anglo-American concepts and methods, such as the *New Cultural History*, methodological approaches of gender history[5] and in part also of cultural studies. But in Germany, older key players in cultural studies in the 19th and 20th centuries (Karl Lamprecht, Eberhard Gothein, Ernst Cassirer, Max Weber) were also rediscovered and used in the development of current cultural study concepts. However, the forbears' ideas and concepts have been treated mainly up to now with a view to their potential for a historical cultural science and have not yet been exploited for empirical research.[6] Even if the works of older German cultural history have been read again in the last few years, it is rather the works of European and American historians, which have in the meantime acquired the status of classics, that have gained a model character for German cultural historians.[7]

The publication of the results of cultural historical works after the turn of the millennium, both in the German-speaking area and in Europe, supplied the basis for first summaries of the discussion of methods and theory,[8] introductions to a European cultural history[9] and cultural historical syntheses for individual centuries.[10] These publications prove that cultural history is on the way to estab-

2 On this cf. Rogge, 2010.

3 Raphael, 1994.

4 Dülmen, 2001; Tanner, 2004; Winterling, 2006.

5 Methodologically pathbreaking was Scott, 1986. See also Opitz, 2005.

6 On this for instance the works by Oexle, 2000, and Oexle, 1996.

7 These are e.g. Ginzburg, 1980; Davis, 1984, Darnton, 1989, Burke, 2002.

8 Green, 2008; Tschopp/Weber, 2007; Poirrier, 2008; Tschopp, 2005, Arcangeli 2010.

9 Landwehr/Stockhorst, 2004, Maurer, 2008.

10 Salmi, 2008.

lishing itself as a conception for research into the past alongside other methods of access in historical science.

However, that has not been made easy for it—especially not in Germany. There cultural history was and is not undisputed. It has been criticised by representatives of historical-scientific conceptions for whom diversity was (and is) a synonym for arbitrariness.[11] Admittedly, the advocates of cultural historical approaches have fostered this criticism to a certain extent by leaving open what exactly cultural history is meant to be and is.[12] Therefore the notions of what cultural history is meant to be with regard to methodology and concept range from cultural history as a sectoral discipline of historical science, like technological or economic history, through the view that cultural history is a specific method of historical science, to the position that history as a whole should be conceived as a historical cultural science. At all events, an increasingly widely held consensus, objects and topics were thus intended to be examined from a cultural historical point of view, too, which—like politics and law—which previously lay outside the focus of cultural historians. Topics, on which the traditional form of cultural history had explicitly turned its back.[13]

But one of the distinguishing features of cultural history is at all events its claim to reflect its own activity—the research concepts, topics and fields. Because the result, not only of cultural historical research, is ultimately a construction by historians who are influenced by their respective current social and cultural circumstances. This view is—so at any rate the cultural historical credo—the prerequisite for the fact that the research results are based on a scientific-rational gain of knowledge.[14] This process of self-reflection is an integral part of cultural historical work and therefore it is important that this reflection be made the object of consideration. The discussion about the objects and fields of work, as well as about methodological access and operationalisation is to be continued, just as questions must be asked about the achievements of cultural history and its capability in comparison with other concepts. This applies *grosso*

11 Perhaps the most prominent German critic is Hans-Ulrich Wehler; see e.g. his review of Ute Daniel's *Kompendium Kulturgeschichte*, Wehler, 2003, cf. Kocka, 1999. For the defendants' arguments see e.g. Medick, 2001.

12 Daniel, 2006; Maurer, 2008.

13 At the centre of this perspective are above all processes of communication by which social, political and legal institutions are first created; see for instance Stollberg-Rilinger. 2005. A survey of the history of cultural historiography by the collection of essays compiled and commented by Tschopp, 2008.

14 Tschopp, 2008, p. 32 and Daniel, 2006.

modo for all European countries in which cultural history is pursued and where it is more or less installed at universities and research institutions.

For this reason, I asked colleagues from twelve European countries to sketch out the respective current basic conditions—scientific-political and social assessment of cultural history—or also the historical development of these basic conditions for cultural historical research in their countries. The contributors give, in part from very personal perspectives and on the basis of their experience with the subject of cultural history in their countries and in Europe as a whole, an assessment of institutions, topics and perspectives of cultural history. In addition, they outline their assessments of the further development of topics and fields of work in their countries, whereby the degree of institutionalisation of cultural history at universities, research institutes and other institutions is dealt with in varying evaluation, typical national traditions are presented, important current research topics and formulations of questions are touched on, and a look is taken at the perspectives and the relationship to other concepts of historical science and to cultural studies.

ANNE ERIKSEN presents the common tradition of cultural history in the Scandinavian countries Denmark, Sweden and Norway, the common roots of which go back to the 19th century. Eriksen emphasised that the development of ethnology and folklore in these countries was closely connected with the process of modernisation and nation building in Scandinavia. In the countries studied by her, cultural history developed in the recent past out of the disciplines European ethnology and folklore which, according to Eriksen, can be described as a *special way* in European comparison. She illustrates this by the example of the University of Oslo where, in 2003, both disciplines were combined into the subject *Cultural History*. She describes the relationship to cultural studies as being relaxed and productive. There is no strict differentiation between cultural history and cultural studies, as they developed from the same disciplines and thus have a common history.

HANNU SALMI sketches out, on the one hand, the development of cultural history in Finland since the end of the 19th century, dealing on the other hand with its integration into research institutions. First of all an Institute for Cultural History was founded at the Swedish-speaking Åbo Akademi in Turku in 1953. The research conducted there was, however, for the most part ignored by Finnish-speaking cultural historians. On the other hand, at the Finnish-speaking University founded in Turku in 1919, it took until 1972 before cultural history became institutionalised as a discipline in the form of the *Department for Cultural History*. Today the department is among the most important university institutions in the country working on cultural history, both in teaching and research, with an influence also in Scandinavia. Salmi sees in semiotics, struc-

turalism and British Cultural Studies important stimuli for the methodological-theoretical development of cultural history in present-day Finland.

LUDMILLA JORDANOVA emphasises the institutionally problematical situation of cultural history in England. Although there are certainly historians working on cultural history in England—such as e.g. Peter Burke—cultural history as a subject is not very present in teaching and research institutions, hardly institutionalised and organised there in departments of its own. One reason for this is that until the 1970s, in research practice, social and cultural history were dealt with together, enjoying in principle equal rights. Under the influence of historical anthropology, as well as cultural sociology and increasingly also the Warburg Institute, a newly conceived cultural history then diverged from social history of the classical kind. According to Jordanova, this new cultural history differs from older social history through its interdisciplinarity and from cultural studies through its more pronouncedly theoretical, polymorphous, flexible and open approach.

NICK FISHER reports on his personal experiences with the institutionalisation of the subject at the University of Aberdeen. He and his colleagues had understood cultural history as an opportunity to free themselves from the conventional boundaries of disciplines. It was also a reaction to the first financial cuts in the mid-1980s and an attempt to make the location Aberdeen attractive for students. Since 1989, the course of studies recorded a continuous rise in the numbers of students. Fisher shows how, despite or on account of its successes, cultural history was criticised both by the administration and within its own university on account of its contents. An example of the difficulties of consolidating interdisciplinary, new directions in studies institutionally in the long run. Finally, the successful programme of studies fell victim to the restructuring in the University in 2002. The until then independent subject was connected more closely again to the Department of History, losing as a result not only its autonomy, but also staff posts. After the course of studies had in this way been made unattractive, the numbers of students fell dramatically, leading ultimately to the cessation of the course with the last graduate in 2011.

In contemporary Latvia, cultural history is hardly institutionalised—apart from the Academy of Culture founded in 1990—and has therefore only poor possibilities for developing. MĀRTIŅŠ MINTAURS attributes this finding above all to Soviet rule under which Latvian historiography was ideologically controlled and to a large extent isolated from external influences. Although these restrictions no longer applied after 1991 and access to new methods and approaches has been easily possible since then, political history dominates Latvian historiography. That is a reflex of the new political independence. However, since the mid-1990s, some works of the French *Annales*, gender history and

social anthropology have been translated into Latvian. Mintaurs sees the reorganisation of research and teaching in Latvia as still not yet complete and emphasises the importance of exchange programmes with which the latest methods and theories of cultural history could be imported into Latvian research institutions and universities.

IGOR KĄKOLEWSKI concerns himself above all with the Institute for the History of Material Culture of the Polish Academy of Sciences (IHMC PAN) founded in 1953/54 because different varieties of cultural history were institutionalised there. After the establishment of Communist rule, the methodological reconstruction and centralisation of the sciences took place. The central issue for research work after 1956 was material culture and, above all, the means and techniques of production which became the starting point for research into culture as a whole—above all of the Middle Ages and the early Modern Period.[15] The research programme was developed further until the 1970s: the topics and fields of work were everyday life, communication and travels. These works had their methodological foundation above all in the French *Annales* school that in addition was the *window on the world* for Polish historiography until the end of the 1960s. In the 1970s and 1980s, a general opening towards international approaches to cultural history took place in Poland, above all outside of the IHMC. In 1992, the IHMC was renamed the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology. At present, both theoretical-methodological topics are dealt with and empirical research is conducted on concrete questions. In the current debate on methods—under different conditions from those in the 1960s and 1970s—the question of the importance of material artefacts for the world people lived in plays a great role, and linked with that the question how a methodological access to that can be developed.

In Hungary after the First World War, a cultural history was written under national auspices. According to ANDREA PETŐ, the tendency of historical science before the Second World War was best described by Cooper's statement "empires produced a strong empire-centred imagination"[16]. In the interwar period in Hungary, a trend of cultural history dominated in Hungary, with the Department of Cultural History at the University of Budapest, that had been established in 1898 as its centre, in which culture was closely linked with nation. The objective was to at least emphasise its own cultural superiority after Hungary had lost political dominance in the Carpathian region after 1920.[17] After 1945/50, historical materialism with its understanding of culture as a superstructure phenomenon of the

15 KĄKOLEWSKI in this volume, p. 132.

16 COOPER, 2005, p. 23; here from PETŐ, in this volume, p. 144.

17 PETŐ, in this volume, p. 147.

material basis did, it is true, dominate, but in the 1970s, as in Poland, the *Annales* with their concept of culture as a unity gained influence. In addition, the concepts of older German cultural history were adopted,[18] until finally in the mid-1980s a general opening for further western historical scientific concepts took place. Pető states that after 1989 a conceptional and methodological modernisation of Hungarian historical science failed to materialise for the most part. Interestingly enough, even historians of the new generation have hardly concerned themselves with cultural history. In addition, the institutionalisation of cultural history in Hungary has been greatly hindered by financial bottlenecks at the state universities and the Bologna process, because in education the classical fields, such as political, economic and social history dominate. Therefore in Hungary, the privately financed Central European University in Budapest with its decidedly cultural historical orientation is the great exception.

CHRISTOF DEJUNG emphasises the importance of the "Swiss cliché" and multilingualism for cultural history in Switzerland. The main fields of focus in Swiss cultural history are currently national identity, the history of mentality, economy and knowledge. One characteristic of cultural history there is its relatively close co-operation also with Swiss academics at foreign research institutions. Cultural history in Switzerland is also promoted outside of the universities by numerous private foundations. Dejung is of the opinion that the work on and with cultural history has only just begun and that in particular works on the history of the body and national identity are to be expected from Swiss cultural history in the next few years.

CHRISTINA LUTTER opens her article with a theoretical-methodological situation analysis, starting out from Lynn Hunt's and Roger Chartier's reflections, of what had characterised *New Cultural History* since the 1980s. Then she explains cultural historical and, in a wider sense, cultural studies research activities and opportunities in Austria, taking the University of Vienna in particular into consideration. Lutter observed that cultural historical research in Austria, in comparison with other European countries, with the exception of Germany, has a strong presence at universities, but particularly also at non-university research institutions[19] and networks. One important reason for this was the *younger generation's* increased interest in international, theoretically informed and interdisciplinary cultural studies research, particularly with reference to the political cultural

18 Pető, in this volume, p. 148.

19 Among the internationally well-known institutions is the IFK in Vienna. Admittedly its scope for action is jeopardised on account of the current interventions in extra-university research institutions by the Austrian government.

concept of British cultural studies. The abundance of existing research activities and results, particularly at the *micro level*, of individual institutes and research networks corresponds only in part with the research objectives of the large universities and institutions for the promotion of research. This incongruence becomes especially clear through the fact that there are still hardly any institutionalised programmes of study for cultural studies or cultural history at Austrian universities.

ACHIM LANDWEHR assesses that cultural history in Germany is, on the one hand, already well established institutionally. Cultural historical research programmes are being conducted in research centres, research groups, projects and excellence clusters (e.g. Heidelberg, Münster, Berlin, Konstanz and Mainz). On the other hand, this finding should not obscure the fact that cultural history is being conducted, up to now, first and foremost in projects and institutions for limited periods of time. With regard to the establishment of *New Cultural History*, Landwehr recalled that in the 1980s it was felt by the representatives of social and political history to be a provocation, if not indeed a threat to the history established at the universities. In the meantime, however, cultural history in Germany is regarded as a recognised method of approaching the past. According to Landwehr, the New Cultural History sees itself more as a method or a specific perspective and is less fixed on certain topics or fields of research. Despite these comparatively good institutional conditions, it is, however, also true that in fact this just marks the beginning of intensive work in cultural history.

In Spain, too, cultural history is in great demand at present. As in Germany, there, too, cultural history was at first conducted by historians specialising in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period. CAROLINA RODRÍGUEZ-LÓPEZ explained this by Spain's imperial position in the Early Modern Period, on the one hand, and the instrumentalisation of this *brilliant epoch* in Spanish history during Franco's rule until 1975 on the other. However, the conception and implementation of a modern cultural history using the international discussion only became possible in the post-Franco era. Since 1989 there have been research groups, institutions and academic programmes dealing in particular with Spanish cultural history. The starting point for cultural history in Spain was above all the social history of the labour and trade union movement. A further important influence for the conception of modern Spanish cultural history was the history of ideas and research into the importance of Spanish intellectuals who had also fought politically against Franco and the authoritarian regime.

ALESSANDRO ARCANGELI states that cultural history is not established at Italian universities. In his estimation, this is because cultural historical approaches appear first and foremost as *imports* from France and Britain in Italy and one contents oneself with their reception. In addition, cultural history is

seldom studied as a main subject at universities. Therefore it is difficult to develop one's own approaches or indeed to implement them in the Italian university system. Currently, historians still refer for the most part to the approaches embodied in traditional Italian historical science approaches. On this basis, special research works, e.g. on the history of the book, nutrition, or even the genders have been produced which are, however, seldom understood as being in a greater context. Arcangeli observes that cultural history is being conducted now and then, without being designated or reflected as such. But precisely the lack of reflection hinders the establishment of a theoretically and methodologically sound, independent cultural history; such as, for example, in Germany. The main focus of cultural historically oriented research in Italy is to be found at present in Pisa, Bologna and Venice, with chronological emphasis on the Modern Period and early Modern Period.

On the basis of these observations and descriptions, influences, traditions and interactions can be recognised which have shaped the development and form of cultural history practised in each case in the countries considered here, and still shape them today. It shows which countries have traditions in common in cultural studies, but also what differences exist with regard to how cultural history is conceived in each case, what approaches are preferred in the countries and for what political purpose cultural history was and is employed. As a result, the basic political conditions for the adaptation of cultural history are addressed. In addition, perspectives can be named which the contributors see for cultural history in their countries and as a trend in Europe. Thus in the survey of the contributions from twelve European countries, a more exact—even if not complete—picture of the current situation of cultural history in Europe results, and topics and perspectives for the future of cultural history become apparent.

Cultural studies traditions and influences

There is a trend towards several important lines of tradition to be recognised which have considerably influenced cultural historical research in Europe in the past 20 to 30 years. The most important traditions and influences mentioned in the papers are summarised briefly here below. There is a strand of tradition in European cultural history that has its methodological and theoretical roots in intellectual history and the history of ideas, as well as the older German cultural history of the 19th century, such as in Austria, Germany, Italy, Spain and the Baltic countries. The French *Annales* establish a second line of tradition. Their representatives and concepts did not only have considerable influence in West-

ern Europe, but also supplied conceptional and theoretical input to historical science in Poland and Hungary during communist rule.

With regard to Switzerland, it has to be added that since the late 19th century the development of cultural history was shaped by three approaches.[20] On the one hand, Jacob Burckhardt's concept, in which art and religion are emphasised as the most important aspects of culture, in which the singularity of a historical epoch (e.g. the Renaissance) is reflected. Burckhardt is, it is true, still invoked today as an important reference for cultural history, but his approach is hardly present any more in current European cultural history. Secondly, in Fribourg academics have tried to show the cultural binding force of Catholicism, in order to be able to use it politically as an important means for securing federalism in the modern national state. However, the recognisably greatest influence on current concepts of cultural history in Switzerland has emanated from the University of Zurich where cultural anthropology and ethnology were established institutionally. These subjects were interested above all in the everyday culture of ordinary people. In England, a social history had a great influence on historical scientific concepts that was more profoundly influenced by anthropology than by sociology or other social sciences.[21] A social history dominated which, in contrast for instance to that in Germany, was less greatly interested in economic and social structures as the impulse for historical developments. People's notions and convictions interested British social historians who, with recourse to concepts of social or cultural anthropology, examined, for example, systems of belief as cultural systems with their own integrity. On account of the reception of anthropological approaches by British social historians, in research practice, the limits to topics and fields of work, which are regarded as a cultural historical alternative to social and political history in other countries, have been open. Thus there was no need—unlike, for instance, in the German-speaking academic area—to draft and institutionalise a cultural history separate from social history. The cultural history practised in Britain shows points in common with Norway and Sweden with regard to the central importance of family and gender history, as well as the *Post Colonial Studies*. Because the Empire was (or is?) of outstanding importance in Britain for her national identity. Only recently have French concepts, such as the history of mentality or discourse, been received without, however, the approaches, e.g. of Roger Chartier or Philippe Ariès being directly continued.[22]

20 Dejung, in this volume, p. 159.

21 Jordanova, in this volume, p. 66.

22 Jordanova, in this volume, p. 7: "[…] apart from France, the cultural-historical methods and approaches of European countries are rather little known in the UK."

The third great line of tradition to be named for the conception of current cultural historical trends are—as already mentioned for Switzerland—folklore and ethnology. Formulations of questions and methods from these disciplines have had a powerful effect, not just in Switzerland, but also for the conception and research practice of cultural history in Scandinavia and Finland. This is shown by the fact that a main focus of cultural historical research is the people's material culture and everyday life.

Political significance and function of cultural history in the 19th and 20th centuries

Cultural history had the function of elaborating the cultural bases of the way nations see themselves in many countries in the 19th century and until the middle of the 20th century. As shown by the contributions in this volume, that is true for Finland and Scandinavia, but also for the Baltic states and Central East European countries during the interwar period and after 1989/90. In 1809, Finland became part of the Russian Empire and, in the following decades, the call for political independence was substantiated by the reference to the Finns' cultural independence. Their own language, literature and culture were invoked whereby German influence (Johann Gottfried Herder) was of considerable importance. Even after Finland had become an independent state in 1917, the Finns defined themselves as a nation more through their history and culture than through statehood.[23] In Norway, Sweden and Denmark, the folk culture became part of the compensation process in the transformation of monarchies into national states in the 19th century. In Norway the specific folk culture was a legitimation factor for the national state.[24] It was stated that the language, customs and mentality had become clearly distinct from those in Denmark or Sweden and had existed since the Middle Ages, even in times when there was no Norwegian state. This was substantiated by means of fairy tales, poetry, but also the material culture of ordinary people. One result of this work was the 12-volume series *Everyday Life in the North of the 16th Centur*y which appeared in 1879-1893. A detailed picture of the people's life was given in this.[25]

The political utilisation of cultural history in Poland, Hungary and Latvia results from the special development of their statehood and political indepen-

23 Salmi, in this volume, p. 46.

24 Eriksen, in this volume, p. 31.

25 Eriksen, in this volume, p. 35.

dence in comparison with Western European countries. The contributions make it clear that in these three countries cultural history—regardless of how it was conceived from a methodological-theoretical point of view in each case—was employed as an instrument for shaping the current social and political conditions in each case. In the history of these countries, which had, of course, only experienced comparatively short phases of sovereignty until 1989/90, there were again and again periods in which recourse to cultural history, mostly understood as the history of their respective own culture, was of political relevance. Thus in Latvia in the interwar period, the main task of cultural history was seen as being to prove continuity of the Latvian nation since the 13th century, at the same time showing the differences of the genuine indigenous Latvian culture from that of the immigrant Baltic Germans.[26] And after 1989/90, cultural historical work was under the maxim that the cultural history of the Latvians is part of the history of the Latvian nation. Cultural unity and identity with the help of scholarship was invoked and will always be so in times in which no state of their own exists.[27]

In Hungary after 1989/90, one turned to the cultural historiography of the interwar period which offered a starting point for finding the nation. After decades under Soviet dominance, which was covered up as *internationalism*, it was a matter of safeguard or again uncovering the historical roots of the nation. One means for this was the *Cultural History of Hungary* which was published between 1939 and 1942 and was often reprinted in 1990/91. One thus had at the same time—whether consciously or unconsciously—also established intellectual contacts with the Horthy era again (Miklós Horthy, Regent of Hungary 1920-1944). In Andrea Pető's opinion this became the basis for the new conservative historiography in Hungary.[28]

26 Mintaurs, in this volume, p. 99-101.

27 This applies admittedly also for Scandinavia, Italy and Germany in the 19th century.

28 Pető, in this volume, p. 196. But in the 1970s, in Hungary and also in Poland the concepts of the *Annales* (Braudel, Chaunu) and the old German cultural history were the methodological tools in order to get round the dominant materialistic view of history (according to Petö remarkably many young conservative to national-right historians as sympathisers of Premier Viktor Orbán, who advocates authoritative and national positions).

Institutionalisation

Cultural history is institutionalised at universities and extra-university research institutions. In addition, relevant research is conducted in project-related activities for limited periods. In Germany and Austria, in comparison with other European countries, such as Britain, Italy and Spain, cultural history is not only present at universities, but also relatively well institutionalised. Thus, for instance, at German universities in the form of M.A. courses of studies. However, it is also noticeable that until today it is only firmly integrated institutionally in the form of chairs and departments at a few universities. Among the exceptions are the university in Frankfurt an der Oder, where cultural history is established under cultural studies, the University of Augsburg with a chair and an Institute of European Cultural History, as well as the University of Jena with a professorship of cultural history and the university of Potsdam with a proffessorship for cultural history of the modern era. Extra-university institutions of great importance in Germany and Austria are the Cultural Studies Institute in Essen, the International Research Centre for Cultural Studies in Vienna and the Max Weber College in Erfurt. All in all, institutional locations for limited periods at present dominate cultural historical work: The graduate schools and excellence clusters at the universities in Giessen, Heidelberg, Berlin, Münster and Konstanz.[29] In addition, there are still university research centres for a limited period, such as the FSP Historical Cultural Sciences in Mainz or the Historical Cultural Sciences Research Centre at the University of Trier.[30]

Therefore, it can hardly be stated that cultural historical approaches have been sustainably institutionally established in the structures at German universities—even if names have been replaced.[31] At the University of Mainz, in the course of the reorganisation of the faculties a few years ago, a *Faculty of History and Cultural Studies* was established. However, just like elsewhere, a budgeted established post for cultural history was not included. [32]

29 Landwehr, in this volume, p. 198.

30 http://www.historische.kulturwissenschaften.uni-mainz.de/, 01.03.2011 and http://www.hkfz.uni-trier.de/, 01.03.2011.

31 Lutter in this volume on the situation in Austria.

32 There is no chair of cultural history in Western Germany that is filled by a historian. Silvia Serena Tschopp in Augsburg is a literary specialist by training. Even historians who see themselves firmly as cultural historians, such as Ute Daniel (Braunschweig, Professor of Modern History), Achim Landwehr (Düsseldorf, Professor of

This result nevertheless proves a comparatively well institutionalised cultural history, as the articles on Italy, Hungary, Spain and Britain as well as Latvia show. Finland is an institutional exception with the Department of Cultural History at the University of Turku in southern Finland. But in order that cultural history can exist in the long term and make its contribution for contemporary societies, it needs an appropriate institutional basis at universities and research institutions. Merely because only thus does it give at least minimal prospects of a university career for some of the up-and-coming academics now being trained at graduate schools and clusters.

In Scandinavia, apart from the universities, above all museums are still to be made out as important places for cultural historical research. At the end of the 19th century, museums were established in Sweden and Norway (1891 Nordic Museum in Stockholm, 1894 Nordic Museum in Oslo) which are important institutions for imparting and researching into cultural history to the present day. The basic idea with the establishment of the museums at that time was that anyone who knows the material folk culture, would also know the national history. However, in Norway in the meantime, the presentation of culture in museums is being reviewed in order to adapt it to present conditions. Norwegian national culture is challenged by migration and multiculturalism. There, as in other European countries, too, there is no longer a uniform culture, however one may like to define it. Therefore, it is intended to research into how cultural diversity can be exhibited at and with the museums in Norway.[33] In Finland, cultural history was institutionalised by the establishment of chairs at the universities. After the Second World War, Åbo Akademi, as well as since the 1970s the Department of Cultural History at the University of Turku became the most influential institutions for cultural history in Finland, because chairs and departments were established there. Teaching and research were thus able to be well combined.[34] In Britain, cultural history, unlike social history is hardly apparent institutionally. Professor Jordanova observes "cultural history is remarkably uninstitutionalised in formal, structured ways".[35] There is a lack of a specific tradition such as e.g. that at the museums and universities of institutionalised folklore in Scandinavia and Finland which could—as happened for example in Oslo—be further developed into departments of cultural history. Just as little were there recognisable

History of the Early Modern Period) or in Austria Christina Lutter (Vienna, Professor of Austrian History) do not hold nominally cultural historical chairs.

33 Eriksen, in this volume, p. 41.

34 Salmi, in this volume, p. 51.

35 Jordanova, in this volume, p. 64.

cultural historical schools in Britain around which interested parties could gather. Traditionally, classical and possible topics and questions of cultural history are also pursued outside of historical science in other disciplines.[36]

In the German-speaking part of Switzerland, cultural history has been developing in parallel to social history since the 1960s and has since then been an undisputed and accepted approach for historical analysis. On the other hand, the situation in the French-speaking part of Switzerland is different where, until the 1980s the history of ideas and literary history dominated, before anthropologically oriented cultural history succeeded in finding its feet there too.[37] Admittedly, Dejung observes that in contrast to the German-speaking part of Switzerland, historians in the French-speaking region of the country are still hardly touched by the *cultural turn*.[38] Dejung describes the Research Centre for Asia and Europe (Main focus *Postcolonial Studies*, cultural transfer) in Zurich as one of the most important research institutions dealing with cultural history in Switzerland. The University in Lucerne has been working on cultural historical-cultural studies image building for about 15 years, also linking research and teaching through interdisciplinary collaboration.

In Italy, according to Arcangeli's observations, there have only been endeavours to establish cultural history more firmly at the universities since recently. An appropriate academic network has been established at the Universities of Bologna, Padua, Pisa and Venice since 2009. In addition, seminars with international speakers are being held and a book series *Cultural studies. Concepts and practices* has been planned. Until now in Italy, cultural historical (individual) projects have dominated which are financed by state—in particular by the National Council of Research—and private promotional institutions. One main focus here is the saving and archiving of material in databases,[39] another cultural contacts in the Mediterranean area. In Hungary departments of cultural history were at least founded at the universities in Pécs in 2000 and Miskolc in 1995. Admittedly, according to Pető, the Central European University in Budapest has the most logically consistent cultural historical orientation in the country.

In the European perspective, further organisational forms and formats are to be perceived in cultural historical research practice. There are interdisciplinary centres at universities, such as the Centre for Cultural Studies (Graz) and university interdisciplinary study groups, such as the *Cultural Studies Working Group*

36 Jordanova, in this volume, p. 73.

37 Dejung, in this volume, p. 160.

38 Dejung, in this volume, p. 166.

39 Arcangeli, in this volume, p. 248.

in Vienna or the *Group for Cultural History Studies* in Madrid (University Carlos III). And then there are research centres, such as the Historical Cultural Sciences Research Centre in Mainz at which historians have a platform for cultural historical problems. In addition, there are research networks, spread over several universities in a country, such as the new network already mentioned between Bologna, Padua, Pisa and Venice. In addition, there are formats transcending national borders, such as the international networks of up-and-coming academics of the German Research Community, or cooperation agreements between two or more universities, such as e.g. the *Group de Recherche sur L'histoire des Intellectuels* at the Universities of Paris VIII (St Denis) and Barcelona. Finally, since 2007, the *International Society for Cultural History* regularly offers cultural historians the opportunity for cooperation and the development of new ideas for joint projects in the cultural historical field of work with annual conferences and the claim to involve all continents.[40] These research formats—which are in part also used in training students working for a doctorate—are currently the best possibilities for implementing the methodological approaches of cultural history on an interdisciplinary and inter-country basis.[41]

However, in the majority of cases in the articles it is argued that cultural history needs a firm place at universities as the prerequisite for a longer-term existence as a separate research movement. Only in this way can cultural history also influence the necessary training of the rising generation of academics. Both in research and in teaching, cultural history is distinguished by the fact that international cooperation and network-forming are cultivated. In addition, in the articles you find a plea for work with flexible cultural studies concepts which are distinguished by openness and are intended to avert the danger of getting caught in academic impasses.

In addition, cultural history obtains its relevance as a means of defending positions of the humanities in the ever fiercer competition for financial resources. Whereby—as the controversies in Scotland and Germany in particular prove—it has to be noted that new perspectives and research approaches always lead to fierce discussions. Successful new directions of research are claimed to be a threat

40 www.abdn.ac.uk/isch/, 01.03.2011. Since 2007, conferences have taken place in Aberdeen, Gent and Turku. Oslo is following in 2011, then Nancy in 2012 and Istanbul in 2013.

41 The general problem of academic policy is to promote great plans and activities instead of supporting the "genuine" projects at working level, Lutter, in this volume, p. 186.

to established scholarship as they—apart from financial and personnel aspects—might potentially decide what the subject matter of historical science was.[42]

Problems, perspectives and potentials

Salmi and Eriksen emphasise that cultural history offers a special perspective of the past. One important question is how did people in the past form the world they lived in and how did they communicate with their environment.[43] In addition, Eriksen stresses that cultural history has been a reaction to dominant trends in historical science and can be regarded as a corrective to these trends.[44] Since the 1990s, in her opinion, two *turns* have influenced cultural history in Scandinavia: The *reflective turn*, by which it became clear that through their work on a phenomenon, e.g. people and folk culture in Norway, researchers themselves contributed to the existence of this phenomenon. The subject of investigation by cultural historians does not exist in itself, but is jointly constituted by the choice of method and conception. Then there was the *anthropological turn*, according to which culture is understood as a universe of meanings, symbols and as the result of communication.

The observations made on the Norwegian example can be applied to European cultural historical research. Cultural history should not fall behind these two heuristic basic assumptions. The research field (national) identity is still topical as, for example, Dejung reports for Switzerland, where it is difficult to achieve such an identity given the linguistic and geographic diversity, as well as the federal constitution. In Italy, too, great attention is devoted to identity. Research is conducted into the identities of late medieval burghers and also that of the inhabitants of the Mediterranean area in the 19th and 20th centuries. European cultural history has currently a further point of focus in the history of knowledge together with the academic culture and its central medium of book production, the study of academic institutions and the formation of an elite. It is also becoming apparent that research into collective and communicative memories will still play a role, and also the occupation with bodies as well as the culturally coded gender and behavioural attributions will produce further

42 These controversies did not take place in this intensity in Italy and Spain. There was and is no intensive discussion of method, rather for certain topics one reverts pragmatically to cultural historical approaches.

43 Salmi, in this volume, p. 55. Eriksen, in this volume, p. 42-43.

44 Eriksen, in this volume, p. 37.

important insights. In addition, cultural transfer and cultural exchange play an important role in current works and *Postcolonial Studies* are applied in country contexts.

Apart from the fields of work already mentioned, for the further development of the content of cultural history, the contributors estimate that artefacts and material culture will play an important role. In this connection, questions are asked both about the symbolic significance of the artefacts, as also about their materiality as such and the way in which they were worked. Or put differently: How do objects function in cultural contexts?

How financial support will develop will also be of great importance for the further development of cultural history in Europe. Thus for example in Finland, after a phase of institutional expansion of cultural history at the University in Turku, the question will be how the further development of studies and teaching can be safeguarded if further cuts are made in the academic budget after 2010 and universities expect budget losses. In Italy, Arcangeli discerns a trend towards cultural history among young researchers, but he has doubts whether these scholars will find a place in the Italian university and research scene and fears further emigration. In Germany, we must wait and see what success cultural historical formats will have in the competition for excellence staged by the Federal and state authorities. In Sweden, the trend is towards social sciences and contemporary history, with the cultural inheritance being further cultivated in the museums. In Copenhagen, on the other hand, cultural history has a strong position. In Norway there is the movement of *Cultural Studies* mainly oriented towards contemporary societies (University of Bergen) and Cultural History (University of Oslo) with projects on the cultural representation of minorities in museums after the end of the great national narratives or the history of knowledge.[45] The future development of cultural history will depend anyway on its succeeding in asserting the significance of its cognitive possibilities and research results compared with those of *Cultural Studies* in academic and social competition.

45 Eriksen, in this volume p. 39-40.

Literature

ARCANGELI, ALESSANDRO (ed.), La storia culturale: una svolta nella storiografia mondiale?, Verona 2010.

BURKE, PETER, Papier und Marktgeschrei. Die Geburt der Wissensgesellschaft, Berlin 2002.

DANIEL, UTE, Kompendium Kulturgeschichte, 5th ed., Frankfurt/Main 2006.

DARNTON, ROBERT, Das große Katzenmassaker. Streifzüge durch die französische Kultur vor der Revolution, München 1989.

DAVIS, NATHALIE ZEMON, Die wahrhaftige Geschichte der Rückkehr des Martin Guerre, München 1984.

DÜLMEN, RICHARD VAN, Historische Anthropologie: Entwicklung, Probleme, Aufgaben, Köln 2001.

GINZBURG, CARLO, Der Käse und die Würmer—die Welt eines Müllers um 1600, Berlin 1980.

GREEN, ANNA, Cultural History, New York 2008.

KOCKA, JÜRGEN, Historische Sozialwissenschaft. Auslaufmodell oder Zukunftsvision? in: Oldenburger Universitätsreden 107, Oldenburg 1999.

LANDWEHR, ACHIM/STOCKHORST, STEFANIE, Einführung in die europäische Kulturgeschichte, Paderborn 2004.

MAURER, MICHAEL, Kulturgeschichte. Eine Einführung, Köln 2008.

MEDICK, HANS, Quo vadis Historische Anthropologie? in: Historische Anthropologie 9 (2001), p. 78-92.

OEXLE, OTTO GERHARD, Geschichte als Historische Kulturwissenschaft, in: Kulturgeschichte Heute, ed. by WOLFGANG HARDTWIG/HANS ULRICH WEHLER, Göttingen 1996, p.14-40.

ID., Kultur, Kulturwissenschaft, Historische Kulturwissenschaft, in: Das Mittelalter 5 (2000), p. 13-33.

OPITZ, CLAUDIA, Um-Ordnungen der Geschlechter, Einführung in die Geschlechtergeschichte, Tübingen 2005.

POIRRIER, PHILIPPE (ed.), L'Histoire culturelle: un "tournant mondial" dans l'historiographie?, Dijon 2008.

RAPHAEL, LUTZ, Die Erben von Bloch und Febvre. Annales-Geschichtsschreibung und nouvelle histoire in Frankreich. 1945-1980, Stuttgart 1994.

ROGGE, JÖRG, Historische Kulturwissenschaften, in: Historische Kulturwissenschaften. Positionen, Praktiken und Perspektiven, ed. by JAN KUSBER et al., Bielefeld 2010, p. 351-379.

SALMI, HANNU, Nineteenth-Century Europe. A Cultural History, Cambridge 2008.

Scott, Joan W., Gender. A useful category of historical analysis, in: American Historical Review 91 (1986), p. 1053-1075.

Stollberg-Rilinger, Barbara (ed.),Was heißt Kulturgeschichte des Politischen? Berlin 2005.

Tanner, Jakob, Historische Anthropologie zur Einführung, Hamburg 2004.

Tschopp, Silvia Serena (ed.), Kulturgeschichte, Stuttgart 2008.

Id., Einleitung. Begriffe, Konzepte und Perspektiven der Kulturgeschichte, in: Kulturgeschichte, ed. by Id., Stuttgart 2008, p. 9-32.

Id., Die Neue Kulturgeschichte—eine (Zwischen-)Bilanz, in: Historische Zeitschrift 289 (2009), p. 573-605

Id./Weber, Wolfgang E. J., Grundfragen der Kulturgeschichte, Darmstadt 2007.

Wehler, Hans-Ulrich, Kursbuch der Beliebigkeit: Das "Kompendium" der "Neuen Kulturgeschichte", in: Id., Konflikte zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts. Essays, München 2003, p. 177-184.

Winterling, Aloys (ed.), Historische Anthropologie, Stuttgart 2006.

http://www.historische.kulturwissenschaften.uni-mainz.de/, 01.03.2011

http://www.hkfz.uni-trier.de/, 01.03.2011

http://www.abdn.ac.uk/isch/, 01.03.2011