

## HISTORICISING HISTORICAL THEORY'S HISTORY OF CULTURAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

Alison Moore

ABSTRACT: Historical theory, as a mode of theoretical criticism, engages in both descriptive and prescriptive readings of historiographic practices, with a view to interpreting and evaluating their meaning as epistemological moves. But it also, often implicitly, situates these practices within its own historical narrative, replete with its own *telos* of rupture, revolution, and the loss of innocence. As such, historical theory has elaborated its own history of cultural historiography. But these elaborations too have a history. This paper considers a number of theory-driven accounts of cultural historiography, which situate it within a specific historical narrative about its origins. That narrative consists in a vision of radical rupture, distinguishing the 'new cultural history' both from prevailing modes of historical ontology and epistemology up until the end of the twentieth century, and most importantly, distinguishing it from earlier variants of cultural historiography as it was practiced in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This paper describes the narrative of rupture that has imbued theoretical views of cultural historiography and examines the history of their elaboration; Secondly, it proposes that this narrative may itself be inappropriate, and suggests an alternative narrative about why earlier forms of cultural historiography have not commonly been seen as continuous with its current expressions. It argues that several genealogical tentacles connected older forms of cultural historiography to the newer variants, and that these connections cannot be assimilated within the *telos* of epistemological rupture that is typically invoked to describe the "linguistic turn". Finally, a set of geo-political and institutional contexts are elaborated to explain the sensation of rupture reported by many cultural historians as, alternatively, the product of a series of nationalist hostilities and disciplinary exclusions from the late nineteenth century until after World War Two. Cultural historiography's apparent 'newness' can better be understood as a late-twentieth-century myth generated by both historical theorists and by cultural historians themselves, which has served to instantiate a new scholarly identity for historians as theory-sophisticates in the ambiance of post-structuralist university humanities cultures of the western world.

KEYWORDS: Cultural historiography; Historical theory

This paper concerns the historical temporality evoked by historical-theory scholars and cultural historians, in their accounts of the history of cultural historiography. These accounts have been marked by a striking insistence on rupture, allowing the 'new' cultural histories of the late twentieth century onwards to be conceived as unprecedented in their scope and theoretical sophistication. There is no denying that later forms of cultural historiography bear marked differences from earlier forms that were elaborated both practically and theoretically throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Britain, the US, France and Finland, among other places; later forms have been indelibly marked by late twentieth-century movements in the humanities and social sciences, ranging from those associated with the structuralist and post-structuralist currents in their translation from French to Anglophone forms of engagement, to the Geertzian shift in anthropological thought toward 'thicker' modes of cultural description. However, one element largely imported without scrutiny from post-structuralist modes of thinking has been an overemphasis on 'rupture' in how cultural historians and historical theoreticians have imagined cultural historiography's own past. This paper does not attempt to survey exhaustively all examples of earlier cultural historians, but rather emphasises those who specifically elaborated a theoretical account of cultural historical epistemology. It also does not attempt to survey exhaustively all those more recent trends that have informed late-twentieth and twenty-first-century cultural historiography, but focusses instead on how cultural historians and historical theorists have themselves historicised the practice.

Convoluting though the title of this paper may be, it is perhaps necessary to describe this article's peculiar form of contextualist historical account of something several levels removed from the simple practice of writing cultural history itself. Historical theory, as a mode of theoretical criticism, engages in both descriptive and prescriptive readings of historiographic practices, with a view to evaluating their epistemological value. But it also, often implicitly, situates these practices within its own historical narrative, replete with its very own *telos* of rupture, revolution, and the loss of innocence. As such, historical theory has elaborated its own history of cultural historiography. But these elaborations too have a history. This paper considers a number of theory-driven accounts of cultural historiography, which situate it within a specific historical narrative about its origins. That narrative consists in a vision of radical rupture, distinguishing the 'new cultural history' both from prevailing modes of historical ontology and epistemology up until the end of the twentieth century, and especially, distinguishing it from earlier variants of cultural historiography as it was practiced in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

This paper firstly describes the narrative of rupture that has imbued theoretical views of cultural historiography and examines the history of their elaboration;

Secondly, it proposes that this narrative may itself be inappropriate, and suggests an alternative narrative about why earlier forms of cultural historiography have not commonly been seen as continuous with its current expressions. It argues that several genealogical tentacles connected older forms of cultural historiography to the newer variants, and that these connections cannot be assimilated within the *telos* of epistemological rupture that is typically invoked to describe the “linguistic turn”. Finally, a set of geo-political and institutional contexts are elaborated to explain the sensation of rupture reported by many cultural historians as, alternatively, the product of a series of nationalist hostilities and disciplinary exclusions from the late nineteenth century until after World War Two. Cultural historiography’s apparent ‘newness’ can better be understood as a late-twentieth-century myth generated by both historical theorists and by cultural historians themselves, which has served to instantiate a new scholarly identity for historians as theory-sophisticates in the ambience of post-structuralist university humanities cultures of the western world.

#### NARRATIVES OF RUPTURE AND THE MYTH OF THE LINGUISTIC TURN

While several rigorous historiographic studies clearly acknowledge earlier precedent forms of cultural history, a far more common vision of its origins as a late twentieth-century radical innovation continues to dominate historical-theoretical accounts of it. Some recent advocates of cultural historical practice have themselves been complicit in this, with common claims made about its newness and postmodernism. Several important accounts of the origins of cultural historical approaches compare earlier antecedents to the more recent practices, nonetheless insisting upon a rupture between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’ cultural history and upon the incompatibility of the elitist style of Jacob Burckhardt’s 1860 *Culture of Renaissance Italy*, and the ‘new’ emphases on popular culture and textual hermeneutics in post-World-War-Two approaches.<sup>1</sup>

Certainly not all recent scholarship about cultural history is neglectful of its past or careless in understanding its epistemological prerogatives. In fact, there are a number of superb recent studies that have eloquently and subtly surveyed methodological antecedence in cultural history’s own history of praxis. Donald Kelley’s detailed work considers the strong place of the old movement of cultural historians within the wider history of historical scholarship.<sup>2</sup> But Kelley does not appear to consider the possibility,

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacob Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassikerverlag, 1989 [1860]). The work of Peter Burke is a particularly rich exploration of the theme of popular culture in history, which he takes to distinguish fundamentally his practices from those of Burckhardt: Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

<sup>2</sup> Donald R. Kelley, *Fortunes of History: Historical Inquiry from Herder to Huizinga* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

elaborated in this paper, that cultural historiography may have a more specific and continuous history of epistemological orientation of its own, that might be distinguished as a clear thread woven throughout the history of historians which he traces more generally. Similarly, John Docker and Ann Curthoys have examined the relationship of Jacob Burckhardt to other nineteenth-century historiographic traditions but do not pursue the fate of cultural historiography across its history in the way they do in relation to other historiographic trends.<sup>3</sup> Peter Burke too considers earlier examples of cultural history practice in some detail and across a several volumes.<sup>4</sup> But throughout these richly reflective studies, Burke pays rather light attention to the way earlier historians understood their epistemological approaches, and instead mostly situates them in broad social contexts, examining their practical methodological tools and their subject-choices as the ground for evaluating their usefulness (or rather, the limits of it) as exemplars for the present. The rejection of the old cultural historiography is then elaborated in some detail in Burke's opus, though in recent years he has somewhat softened this attitude of distancing, and recognized that the late twentieth-century 'newness' of recent cultural historiography may have been overstated.<sup>5</sup>

Throughout the 1980s and 90s, it was reasonably common to see assertions by cultural historians and historical theorists, of cultural historiography as an entirely novel approach invented sometime around 1980. Mark Poster remarked in 1997 that a "new genre has emerged among historians, this one called 'cultural history'," and which he viewed as radically destabilizing the opposing positions of histories of high and low culture, equated to intellectual and social history respectively.<sup>6</sup> It was also, more understandably, common to find descriptions of cultural historiography as new relative to particular national contexts. Richard Biernacki, for example charted the emergence of cultural history in Australia as a field that "took shape in the nineteen-eighties as an upstart critique of the established social, economic and demographic histories."<sup>7</sup> That statement is perhaps not erroneous in so far as it relates one of the ways in which cultural historiography found its place in Australian historiographic

---

<sup>3</sup> Ann Curthoys and John Docker, *Is History Fiction?* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2006), pp.69-76.

<sup>4</sup> Peter Burke, *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997); Peter Burke, *What is Cultural History?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004).

<sup>5</sup> Peter Burke, "Strengths and Weaknesses of Cultural History," *Cultural History*, vol.1 no.1 (2012), pp.1-13.

<sup>6</sup> Mark Poster, *Cultural History and Postmodernity: Disciplinary Readings and Challenges* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp.3-9.

<sup>7</sup> Richard Biernacki, "Method and Metaphor After the New Cultural History," in Hsu-Ming Teo and Richard White (eds), *Cultural History in Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2003), p.62.

practices. However, it does imply that within the nation, historiographic trends emerge in isolation from international influence - that we each reinvent historiographic innovations for ourselves in parallel fashion, and without reference to examples in other places. Might it be, instead, that we inherit approaches by diffuse influence, such that it is difficult to be aware of their complex webs of origin? Likewise we may inherit narratives about those past practices that are infused with a certain mythological *telos*.

Donald Kelley's work is particularly attentive to the problem of historiographic forgetting and reinvention, and graciously critical of those claims to innovation that ignore past examples.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, Bonnie Smith has made an elegant corrective to assumptions about women's history as a twentieth-century *de novo* invention, noting its important amateur practice in European and Asian cultures since the 11<sup>th</sup> century BCE.<sup>9</sup> As Smith shows, historical studies by and about women were among those which late nineteenth-century professional historians demarcated as amateur and unworthy of the status of a systemic knowledge (*Wissenschaft* in German or *Science* in French).<sup>10</sup> Smith's corrective might equally be applied to the forgetting of the old cultural history – like the old women's histories, cultural histories were abundantly produced by non-professional historians in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, including many by women, and their demarcation as amateur histories, not the true *scientifique* or *wissenschaftliche* kind of study, was undoubtedly part of how those within the university institutional culture came to excise them from professional historians' disciplinary norms.

The re-invention of both women's history and cultural history then, overrode their exclusion by the several generations of history's institutional instantiation, but that previous erasure also produced an ignorance of the earlier forms, resulting in assumptions of the later iterations' novelty. But the claim to newness and revolution cannot be explained merely as a form of forgetfulness. The old cultural history is indeed frequently enough invoked to remind all current practitioners and theorists that the twentieth century did not invent the very idea of the thing. In fact the old cultural history frequently features in accounts of why the new forms are so revolutionary – it is the backdrop for that statement of rupture that marks the announcement of 'historical theory' as the critical suspension of credence in the discipline of history's naturalistic methods.

---

<sup>8</sup> Kelley, *Fortunes of History*, p.304.

<sup>9</sup> Bonnie G. Smith, "Gender I: From Women's History to Gender History," in Nancy Partner and Sarah Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (London: Sage, 2013), pp.266-281.

<sup>10</sup> See also Bonnie G. Smith, *The Gender of History: Men Women and Historical Practice* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2000).

The intellectual historian Ian Hunter provides a vision of the ‘history of theory’ that is taken here to provide support for an alternative view of the history of cultural historiography via its relation to the emergence of historical theory. Hunter sketches a series of broader trends that might fruitfully elucidate both historical theory’s emergence, and stemming from it, the reconfiguration of cultural historical inquiry as a post-structuralist and post-modern set of practices. These trends, further help to explain the persistent *telos* implied in assertions of the ‘linguistic turn’ and the ‘revolution’ of ‘new’ cultural history, which might be viewed as foundational myths for the identity of both historical theory as it is currently constituted, and of the ‘new’ cultural history since the late twentieth century. In Hunter’s narrative, the Davos disputation between Heidegger and Cassirer in the Swiss Alps in 1929 marked the translation of German university post-Kantian metaphysics into a language of self-transformative transcendentalist scholarly personae, which then became exportable beyond the rather arcane local context in which they were generated, and later translated further into the forms of literary and hermeneutic critique in the deconstructionist version of Heideggerian metaphysics espoused by Derrida in his John Hopkins University address of 1966.<sup>11</sup> This, according to Hunter, is how ‘theory’ as a particular kind of scholarly work on the self, was constituted as an international multi-disciplinary phenomenon. Derrida’s reconfiguration of the contest between Heidegger and Cassirer as the post-structuralist revolution against structuralism, produced an ethics of transcendence that demanded the critical suspension of credence in all naturalistic grounds of knowledge, including the methods of historical inquiry that had solidified in twentieth-century universities throughout the western world.

Historical theory’s espousal of post-structuralist and post-modern metaphysics thus emerged as an offshoot of this suspension, in which historical naturalism could be transcended via a turning-inwards upon the self, toward a use of theory as something itself ‘outside history’, and which can be used to ascertain phenomenological truths about the character of historical inquiry. A countervailing current, however, has continued to entertain post-Kantian metaphysical concerns of the kind that predated the deconstructionist translation of Heidegger versus Cassirer (or with Husserl), producing the split between historical theory and philosophy of history, with various

---

<sup>11</sup> This address was published as Jacques Derrida, “Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences,” in Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donatio (eds), *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1972), pp.247-72. See Ian Hunter, “Scenes from the History of Poststructuralism: Davos, Freiburg, Baltimore, Leipzig,” *New Literary History*, vol. 41 (2010), pp.491-516. And also Ian Hunter, “The Time of Theory: The Return of Metaphysics to the Anglo-American Humanities Academy,” *Postcolonial Studies* vol.10 (2007), pp.5-22.

intermediary figures, such as Frank Ankersmit, spanning between the two;<sup>12</sup> or alternatively producing analytic philosophical accounts of historiography, such as those of Arthur Danto and Patrick Gardiner.<sup>13</sup> A fourth divergent trend, within which the current paper might be situated, has continued to treat historical inquiry, and indeed even historical theory, as objects of contextual historicity – effectively abstaining from theoretical performance in preference for naturalist description. Many forms of the latter generate rigorous scholarship that seeks to elaborate appropriate dispositions of present historians toward the past via a historicist appreciation of the discipline’s trans-disciplinary and epistemologically pluralist origins.<sup>14</sup> But many other examples of, ostensibly historiographic modes of inquiry in the field of historical theory, reiterate linear views of progress in cultural historical practice and theorization, toward a hubristic assertion of novelty and radicalism on ontological grounds.

Cultural historiography’s advocates have generally performed fusions of 2 or more of these exercises; for instance, positing on the one hand, post-structuralist hermeneutic claims about the primacy of language, in addition to refutations of realist and objectivist underpinnings in disciplinary professional historiography; additionally constructing historical narratives of cultural historiography’s own emergence, in which the *telos* of naïve past, rupture and revolution is rehearsed. These views have meant that practicing cultural historians, by centering their analyses on close reading of textual sources (always within the comfort zone of hermeneutic historical inquiry generally), are able to position themselves as “theory intensive” in relation to the concerns of historical theory, producing the expectation among historical theorists to

---

<sup>12</sup> See Frank Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005).

<sup>13</sup> Arthur Danto, *Analytical Philosophy of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965); Patrick Gardiner, *The Nature of Historical Explanation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952).

<sup>14</sup> It would be impossible to do justice to this large body of scholarship here. Some good examples, from among many, include: Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988); John Zammito, *A Nice Derangement of Epistemes: Post-Positivism in the Study of Science from Quine to Latour* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Mark Phillips, *On Historical Distance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013); See also, in addition to those already cited in this article: Herman Paul, “Distance and Self-Distanciation: Intellectual Virtue and Historical Method Around 1900,” *History and Theory*, vol.50 (December 2011), pp.104-116. Lutz Raphael, “The Implications of Empiricisms for History,” in N. Partner and S. Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (Sage, 2013), pp.23-40. Jan van der Dussen, “The Case for Historical Imagination: Defending the Human Factor and Narrative,” in N. Partner and S. Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (Sage, 2013), pp.42-66; and Alan Megill, “What is Distinctive about Modern Historiography?” in Q. Edward Wang and Franz L. Fillafer (eds), *The Many Faces of Clio: Cross-Cultural Approaches to Historiography. Essays in Honor of Georg G. Iggers* (New York: Berghahn, 2007), pp.28-41.

find natural allies among cultural historians.<sup>15</sup> And indeed advocates of cultural history's so-called 'linguistic turn' have tended to read French post-structuralist philosophy as implying an unavoidable rejection of historical methods and ideals inherited from nineteenth century historicist traditions, such as objectivity, archival reading and practical realism, even though most recent forms of cultural historical inquiry itself show no significant departures from the narrative styles, and research methodologies implied by these forms.

There were indeed elements of the kind of intellectual persona described by Hunter implied in the self-conscious claims to postmodern and post-structuralist history that began to appear in the nineteen-eighties in the work of Joan Scott, Lynn Hunt, Alan Muslow, and especially Keith Jenkins. But in historical debates, the assertion of the irruption of the "new cultural history" against other kinds of historical inquiry, and the rejection of the old cultural history and its continuous influence, have also been rehearsed by those critical of the recent trends toward cultural historiographic approaches. The theme of rupture then has served two separate, indeed opposing, purposes. On the one hand it enabled an excitement among some historical theorists and self-realized cultural historians about the "revolution" in historical studies in the late twentieth century; on the other, it has provoked anxieties about a sudden threat of recent textualist approaches to the realist and objectivist foundations of the discipline.

As the cultural historian Stephen Garton noted in the early 2000s, there was still a common perception in Australian academia that cultural history stands in relation to social history as post-structuralism does to structuralism.<sup>16</sup> Indeed the even more ambiguous term "postmodern" was been applied to the practice of cultural history by some of highly respected historiographers, such as Georg Iggers, Norman Wilson and John Tosh.<sup>17</sup> In a range of texts on the topic of cultural historiography, there were assertions about it as a new epistemological innovation in approaches to the past, part of a new "cultural" or "linguistic turn", and the sign of a loss of commitment to historical objectivity, to realism, and hence to academic integrity. Such accounts by professional historiographic historians typically attributed this "new" field to the

---

<sup>15</sup> See all of "Part II: Application: Theory-Intensive Areas of History" in Partner and Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory*, pp.221-396.

<sup>16</sup> Stephen Garton, "On the Defensive: Poststructuralism and Australian Cultural History," in Teo and White, *Cultural History in Australia*, pp.52-66.

<sup>17</sup> Georg Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century; From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Middletown CT, 1997), 133; Norman Wilson, *History in Crisis?: Recent Directions in Historiography*, second edition (Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice Hall, 2005), pp.90-91; John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, Fourth Edition (Harlow: Pearson and Longman, 2006), p.304.

convergence of history and cultural anthropological studies, and reference the late French *Annales* School, feminist theory, postcolonial studies and French post-structuralism as key influences, all occurring since the end of the Second World War. The gender historians Joan Scott and Lynn Hunt claimed cultural history specifically as a “postmodern” practice, and as a new approach to the past that, in privileging the self-conscious study of texts, radically overturned “empiricist” assumptions about the existence of an historical truth beyond those texts.<sup>18</sup> Mark Poster made this same assertion throughout his monograph on *Cultural History and Postmodernity* of 1997.<sup>19</sup> This view of cultural historiography appeared consistently to assume that textually focused historiographic approaches, in recognising the unavoidable textual mediation of reality limiting we can know about the past, we must embrace the radical denial of reality outside the text, and further abandon historical ethics such as the ideal of objectivity. This kind of leap from constructivism to relativism was importantly criticized in a large body of scholarship in the history of philosophy, and notably by a number of historical meta-thinkers, in the first half of the twentieth century, such as Carl Becker, E.H. Carr and R.G. Collingwood, who all referred to the relativistic leap as a kind of “skepticism” that might readily be discounted.<sup>20</sup> Realism remains a continuing zone of contention in contemporary historical theory, as played out in a series of debates between Frank Ankersmit and John Zammito from the late 1990s and continuing.<sup>21</sup> But bizarrely, in much of the historical theory produced by or about cultural historians, the relativist position was assumed to be a self-evident conclusion following from a Derridean hermeneutic constructivism.

Without reference earlier discussions about historical facts in the work of Becker, Carr and Collingwood, claims associating cultural history with relativism and the total rejection of any value of ideals of objectivity were made both by those celebrating the new cultural history and by those worrying about its emergence throughout the 1980s and 90s. The work of the self-proclaimed postmodern historian Keith Jenkins provides

---

<sup>18</sup> Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp.1-11; Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt (eds), *Beyond the Cultural Turn; New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), pp.2-4; Also: Lynn Hunt (ed), *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

<sup>19</sup> Poster, *Cultural History and Postmodernity*.

<sup>20</sup> See Carl Becker, “What are Historical Facts?” *The Western Political Quarterly*, vol.8, no.3 (September 1955), pp.327-340; Edward Hallett Carr, *What Is History?* (London: Penguin Books, 1961); Robin G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946).

<sup>21</sup> See John H. Zammito, “Post-Positivist Realism: Regrounding Representation,” in Partner and Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory*, pp.402-422; Also, Frank H. Ankersmit, *Meaning, Truth and Reference in Historical Representation* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2012).

a clear example of how this argument has often been made by invoking Derrida's statement, "il n'y pas de hors-de-texte", quoted from *De la Grammatologie*, as a new and radical metaphysical rejection of the apparently old-fashioned bourgeois modernist assumption that reality might exist outside what we construct it to be.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, the term "postmodern", understood here as relativistic, was attributed to cultural historiographic epistemology by the historiographers Georg Iggers, Norman Wilson and John Tosh.<sup>23</sup> It is surprising to see a scholar of such deep erudition and knowledge of the history of historical inquiry as Georg Iggers, in his survey of *Historiography in the Twentieth Century; From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*, attributing the emergence of recent cultural histories to an incursion of critical theory into the discipline. But it is also understandable given the dissociation of the new cultural historians in this period, from earlier iterations of its theorization and practice. The Derrida mistranslation appears in Iggers' view as well, presented as the thinker most directly responsible for inspiring the idealist metaphysical assertion that "there is nothing outside/beyond the text," which was assumed to underlie all forms of cultural historiographic methodology and the broader "linguistic turn" (in which forms of intellectual history might also be grouped) more generally.<sup>24</sup>

Derrida's statement that there is no "outside-the-text" was probably not intended as a metaphysical challenge to historical realism, which was certainly not one of Derrida's targets.<sup>25</sup> The sentence, badly translated, has nonetheless been fixated upon as an example of how the "new" cultural history's emphasis on text and language reflects a metaphysical postmodernism in which there is no admission of a reality outside historic texts and our interpretation of them, implying the need to abandon any notion of practical objectivity.<sup>26</sup> Similar misapprehensions have characterized

<sup>22</sup> Keith Jenkins, "No Going Back: A Case for Postmodern History," *Teaching History*, vol.84 (1996), p.37; See also Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan and Alun Munslow (eds), *Manifestos for History* (London: Routledge, 2007). Jacques Derrida, *De la Grammatologie* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1967), p.159.

<sup>23</sup> Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century*, p.133; Wilson, *History in Crisis?*, pp.90-91; Tosh and Lang, *The Pursuit of History*, p.304.

<sup>24</sup> Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century*, p.132.

<sup>25</sup> That point has been well made by a number of scholars who note that if a truly non-sensical anti-realism had been Derrida's intention then a very different French expression would have been used. See Max Deutscher, "Chasing After Modernity: Some Friendly Words for the Postmodern," in *In Sensible Judgement* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp.187-200; See also: Lawrence D. Kritzman, Brian J. Reilly, M.B. DeBevoise, *The Columbia History of Twentieth-Century Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), p.500; Also: Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), p.135.

<sup>26</sup> Mark Poster has remarked upon that fixation too: Poster, *Cultural History and Postmodernity*, p.41; The bad Derrida mistranslation is cited also in: Tosh and Lang, *The Pursuit of History*, p.296; Iggers, *Historiography in*

debates within the American historical academy about the status of intellectual history – another profoundly hermeneutic variety of historical inquiry. As Peter Novick notes, the common view of intellectual historians as philosophical relativists has often formed the pivot for claims of what Novick terms a “misleading invidious distinction” between an objective historiography responsible to the authentic truth of the past, and a text-focused approach assumed to have abandoned historicist all commitments.<sup>27</sup>

Joan Scott framed the constructionist practice of bracketing-out assumed categories (namely gender) as a post-structuralist innovation, albeit within the framework of a labor-focused “social” rather than “cultural” history.<sup>28</sup> Part of that concern - with the constructed nature of linguistic terms, and with the consequent need for cultural researchers to suspend credence in them - derives from Husserl’s elaboration of the *epoché* as espoused in his transcendental phenomenological works of the nineteen-thirties, and transmitted through the development of continental theory in the work of Merleau-Ponty, Foucault and Derrida, finally to arrive in the form that Scott absorbed through her fascination with French post-structuralism.<sup>29</sup> Partly also, it derived from Derrida’s translation of Heidegger, as sketched in Ian Hunter’s account of the history of theory.

The implications of occulting identification with the old cultural history are far more consequential than is generally acknowledged. The first implication is that it supports the broader, teleological claims commonly found in historical theory, about historiography progressing toward ever greater forms of sophistication over linear time, through the insistence that past attempts to conceive cultural historical epistemology were naïve, undeveloped and hence are irrelevant to current, more complete, forms of innovation in historical methods. This narrative *telos* is displayed, for instance, in the recent work of the philosopher of history Frank Ankersmit, whose 2013 chapter in the *Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* refers twice to the “naïve” times of historical theoretical understanding prior to the “complete revolution” of Hayden B. White, and congratulates present scholars for the “language-wise adults we have become since the linguistic turn”.<sup>30</sup> This example is precisely interesting as it occurs in the context of a paper which argues otherwise for a return to something Ankersmit

---

*the Twentieth*, p.9; Also in Jenkins, “No Going Back,” p. 37. The general interpretation of Derrida as anti-realist is even more widespread among the less informed of both his fans and detractors.

<sup>27</sup> Novick, *That Noble Dream*, p.6.

<sup>28</sup> Scott, *Gender and Politics of History*, pp.1-10.

<sup>29</sup> See Hunter, “The History of Theory”.

<sup>30</sup> Frank Ankersmit, “Historical Experience Beyond the Linguistic Turn”, in Partner and Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory*, pp.427-28.

terms “experience” which he argues predated the ‘linguistic turn’ and can be found suggested in the work of Gadamer, Johan Huizinga and Walter Benjamin. Ankersmit’s argument then is that the past of both historical philosophy and cultural historiography might usefully inform present understandings; nonetheless, he begins the chapter with a lengthy rehearsal of the more familiar narrative of naïve and infantile historical thinking ruptured by a ‘linguistic turn’, after which it has basked in the continuing crest of its mature consciousness.

#### GENEALOGICAL TENTACLES CONNECTING THE OLD AND NEW FORMS OF CULTURAL HISTORY

Cultural historical philosophers such as Wilhelm Dilthey, Ernst Cassirer and Hans-Georg Gadamer provide the most direct links between the ‘old’ (nineteenth-century Germanic) forms of cultural historical epistemology and the rise of modern continental philosophy, which in turn has been clearly influential on the ‘new’ (late twentieth-century Anglophone forms). This genealogy might be considered as one dimension of the continuity between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’. Cultural historiographic thinking in the model of Jacob Burckhardt and Karl Lamprecht, and the philosophy they engaged with, was born out of engagement with both Hegelian and Kantian forms of historicity and the competing emphases on context and interpretation these were seen as producing. In the work of Wilhelm Dilthey that produced the re-interpretation of Friederich Schleiermacher and the elaboration of a theory of humanities hermeneutics.<sup>31</sup> Dilthey read the work of Jacob Burckhardt in his elaboration of historical hermeneutics.<sup>32</sup> Karl Lamprecht was most influenced by Wilhelm Dilthey’s reading of Kant and his emphasis on psychology as an aspect of the human sciences, in opposition the more common neo-Kantian fixations that proliferated in both French and German intellectual circles in the late nineteenth-century, and which tended to produce narrower forms of definition of the human sciences based on a simplistic understanding of the natural sciences.<sup>33</sup> European university history departments in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century became dominated by this style of neo-Kantianism, manifesting in a positivistic Comptian vision that was conflated with English empiricism in the mode of Francis Bacon and John Locke and

---

<sup>31</sup> Wilhelm Dilthey, *Selected Works III: The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences*, eds R. A. Makkreel and F. Rodi (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002); and Wilhelm Dilthey, *Selected Works IV: Hermeneutics and the Study of History*, ed Rudolf. A. Makkreel and Frijhof Rodi (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid*, pp.271-278.

<sup>33</sup> See Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Second Edition, trans Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (London: Continuum, 2004), pp.216-217.

David Hume, and restated as a supposedly “Rankean” vision, producing a notion of history as a precise *science* or *Wissenschaft* – both terms that referred to the systematic qualities of knowledge, but which had stronger associations with the natural sciences in the English-language forms compared to the German and French expressions.<sup>34</sup> Cultural historians such as Karl Lamprecht specifically rejected that view of Kant and history in favor of Dilthey’s humanist-inspired vision of historical knowledge as *Verstehen* (understanding) and an alternative reading of Kant as an epistemological rather than metaphysical philosopher.<sup>35</sup> This discussion, in turn challenged and complexified in the work of philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer, continued to influence European cultural historians in the early to mid twentieth century in - particular Reinhart Koselleck, who studied with Gadamer in Heidelberg from 1947-53.<sup>36</sup>

Burckhardt’s direct followers also vigorously continued an ongoing elaboration of his approach in the early twentieth century, as well as a critique of its failings. One group of such historians in Germany congregated around the idiosyncratic personality of Aby Warburg. At the turn of century Warburg travelled to the US and undertook ethnographic research into Native American cultures, in particular the Hopi Indians of the South-West, and developed his own unique style of “iconology”, a system of reading images and symbols within a kind of anthropological contextualisation.<sup>37</sup> Warburg was a student of Karl Lamprecht, who had in turn closely studied the work of Jacob Burckhardt and credited Burckhardt with inspiring his own fascination with the pursuit a holistic account of past cultures.<sup>38</sup> The genealogy up to this point then is incontestably apparent in the strong tradition of German scholarship on the history of culture throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

But it is also proposed here that another continuity is implied by the relationship between French *Annales* School founders Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch, who were without doubt, aware of the second generation of Burckhardtian scholars in Germany, namely the ill-fated Karl Lamprecht, and shared with him mutual friendships with both the Belgian cultural historian Henri Pirenne, with the Dutch cultural historian

---

<sup>34</sup> Ernst Cassirer, *The Problem of Knowledge: Philosophy, Science, and History since Hegel*, trans William H. Woglom and Charles W. Hendel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p.226.

<sup>35</sup> Roger Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht: A German Academic Life (1856-1915)* (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1993), p.244.

<sup>36</sup> Reinhart Koselleck, *Begriffsgeschichten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 2006).

<sup>37</sup> Aby Warburg, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, trans D. Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Centre, 1999); Aby Warburg, “A Lecture on Serpent Ritual,” *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 4 (1939), pp.277-292.

<sup>38</sup> Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*, p.53; Karl Lamprecht, “Was ist Kulturgeschichte? Beitrag zu einer empirischen Historik,” *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* Bd.1 (1896), pp.75-150.

Johann Huizinga, and with the French polymath philosopher Henri Berr. The *Annales* School are considered, in many recent accounts of cultural historiography's history, to represent the moment of rupture – the beginning of something genuinely new that can be taken to distinguish radically late twentieth-century forms of cultural historiography from the nineteenth-century forms.<sup>39</sup> But the considerable continuities between the early *Annales* historians and the late Burckhardians suggest that this image of rupture is not as appropriate as is often assumed.

The *Kulturgeschichte* tradition exerted a powerful influence on thought currents throughout twentieth century history, lingering in the interstices of newly instantiated institutional disciplines of sociology, philosophy and history. It is proposed here that by paying attention to these interstices, we might retrieve an alternative narrative about the old cultural historiography as a continuous hermeneutic humanities trans-disciplinarity that indirectly nourished the revival of late twentieth-century cultural historical practices. The still commonly espoused view that history has itself only become inter-disciplinary and textually hermeneutic since the end of the Second World War, through the influence of other disciplines and of new domains of inquiry (cultural anthropology, literature, social theory, feminism, postcolonial studies) is unsustainable in light of a study of early twentieth century thinkers influenced by nineteenth century cultural historical scholarship. Historians – the old cultural historians that is – were deeply enmeshed in several of the most influential genealogies of twentieth-century continental thought; genealogies that were important in the articulation of the new cultural history in its relationship both to post-structuralism and to cultural anthropology, though often unbeknownst to new cultural historians themselves. The claim here is not that early cultural historical thinkers 'anticipated' later trends. We would only be tempted to indulge such wonder at the seemingly proto-post-structuralism of Huizinga, or proto-Geertzianism of Aby Warburg if we ignored the ways their approaches emerged from early twentieth-century dialogues between philology, history, anthropology and psychology, and the way those multi-disciplinary and cross-cultural fusions suffered in the environments of university professionalization and of inter-continental war. The point is not to say that the new cultural history is older than we think, but rather to consider how the earlier project of elaborating a polymath hermeneutic cultural historical epistemology was decisively pushed to the margins of disciplinary history somewhere in between the two world

---

<sup>39</sup> See for instance, the editors' remarks in Anna Green and Kathleen Troup (eds), *The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp.87-88; also Peter Burke, *The French Historical Revolution, The Annales 1929-1989* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).

wars, and how its survivors and relics continued nonetheless to influence the intellectual trends that enabled its later re-emergence.

The relationship between early cultural historians and the emergence of modern philosophical hermeneutics may not have been unidirectional. Gadamer's theory of play (*Spiel*), articulated in *Wahrheit und Methode* (Truth and Method) of 1960 bore many elements in common with Johan Huizinga's famous work, *Homo Ludens: On the Play Element of Culture* of 1938, which Gadamer referenced.<sup>40</sup> That text, as is well known, was probably one of the most salient works of inspiration for the field of cultural and historical anthropology. Clifford Geertz no doubt read Huizinga's work.<sup>41</sup> And it is Geertz above all who is often blamed (or praised) for the influence of cultural anthropology on historians such as Roger Chartier, Peter Burke, Robert Darnton, Lynn Hunt, and numerous other cultural historians of the late twentieth century.<sup>42</sup> Max Weber's engagement with the Burckhardt, as discussed by Reinhard Bendix, suggests another entry through which the old cultural history infiltrated the emergence of sociological thought.<sup>43</sup> While these are but fleetingly sketched correspondences, they are numerous and credible enough to suggest that earlier cultural historiographic thinking belongs in the heart of the development of twentieth-century cultural sciences and their hermeneutic complexification - a process of theoretical integration that has occurred continuously via broad polymath intellectual exchange, beginning at the end of the nineteenth century, and which continues still.

It is striking that discussions of the epistemological approach and methodological tools implied in a cultural historiographic framework have been a feature of the work of cultural historians throughout the twentieth century. Karl Lamprecht theorized on the matter (in 1896), as did Johan Huizinga (in 1929) and later E.H. Gombrich (in 1969), and Carlo Ginzburg (1989).<sup>44</sup> Lucien Febvre too wrote a considerable amount about historiographic method, as I discuss later in this chapter; and Peter Burke, in

<sup>40</sup> Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 169; Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture* (London: Routledge, 2000 [1938]).

<sup>41</sup> Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures; Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

<sup>42</sup> Ronald G. Waters, "Signs of the Times: Clifford Geertz and Historians," *Social Research*, vol. 47 (1980), pp. 537-556; Lynn Hunt, "Introduction: History, Culture, and Text," in Hunt, *The New Cultural History*, pp.12-13.

<sup>43</sup> Reinhard Bendix, *Embattled Reason: Essays on Social Knowledge*, vol 2 (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1989), pp.185-194.

<sup>44</sup> Lamprecht, "Was ist Kulturgeschichte?"; see also Johan Huizinga, *Cultuurhistorische verkenningen* (Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink en Zoon, 1929).  
Ernst H. Gombrich, *In Search of Cultural History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969); and also Carlo Ginzburg, *Clues, Myths and the Historical Method* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1989).

publishing several works on the practice and principle of cultural history has behaved entirely consistently with the continuous genealogy of cultural historians as epistemological thinkers. As Roger Chickering notes, it was not generally the case in nineteenth-century Germany for cultural historians to develop complex theoretical accounts of their approach to knowledge.<sup>45</sup> Had it not been for the bitter intellectual struggles into which they were drawn towards the end of the nineteenth century, as a result of both the ‘Rankean’ revival and the rise of nationalism, that theoretical apathy may well have remained the norm. In the environment of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century debates within European academies about the new imperatives of professionalized history, cultural historians were uniquely demanded upon to account for the discrepancies of method, approach and object that their interdisciplinary crossings produced, as well as for their tendency to dissent from nationalist agendas. The multi-disciplinary crossings they attempted were not without problems. Warburg and Lamprecht inherited from Jacob Burckhardt a quasi-Hegelian vision of historical eras as defined by a unified *Zeitgeist* infusing all aspects of culture, a position that was difficult to reconcile with the new expectations of Kantian historical methodologies. But while they both tended to consider culture in excessively unitary terms, they did not as in Hegel’s conception, imagine it situated teleologically within the march of progress of humanity toward greater enlightenment. It is not that their own studies are necessarily exemplary for current models of cultural history, so much as their elaboration what *Kulturgeschichte* entailed prompted complex forms of engagement from influential philosophical thinkers, and proved to be generative of multiple forms of re-evaluation by subsequent cultural historians.

The cultural and linguistic “turn” concept in recent historical theory typically associates it with new, “postmodern” or post-structuralist innovations. But the broader epistemological concern with understanding conceptual and linguistic structures as limiting or mediating knowledge about the world was precisely a very nineteenth-century preoccupation, and derived from even older traditions of philology with their origins in biblical exegesis. The interrogation of historical subjectivity and a critique of pretensions to knowing the “facts” of the past was also a core concern among historical philosophers at the end of the nineteenth and turn of the twentieth century. Immanuel Kant’s concept of Transcendental Logic as elaborated in the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (*Critique of Pure Reason*) of 1781 had specified a distinction between phenomena and cognition, emphasizing the unknowability of things beyond their appearances to

---

<sup>45</sup> Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*, p.90.

human perception, and opening new lines of thought into cultural epistemology.<sup>46</sup> This, broadly speaking, was the character of the engagement with Kant by polymath thinkers such as Wilhelm Dilthey, and later, Gadamer and Cassirer, and further, by the early cultural historians Karl Lamprecht, Johan Huizinga and Ernst Gombrich.

The theorization of what historical knowledge entails, of what historical truth exists, and of the relationship between history and other forms of knowledge were generally pressing and central concerns to a range of European, especially German thinkers throughout the nineteenth century. Both Kant and Hegel's writings about the meaning of historical knowledge were known to most scholars whose work cut across either history, philosophy, science and the emerging social and psychological sciences in the second half of the nineteenth century, and they tended to approach the question of historical fact and knowing through the rubric of the Kant-Hegel divide or variations of their fusion. Indeed the looming presence of those two iconic figures of Enlightenment philosophy haunted historians from Burckhardt to Lamprecht, as well as all manner of other historically-minded thinkers from Marx, to Comte, to Dilthey, to Weber, to Durkheim.<sup>47</sup> Questions of historicism cut across the divide since both Hegel and Kant were repeatedly cited as the origin of historicist moves. Kant could be maneuvered to articulate an historicism grounded in a recognition of the distinction between being and knowledge, producing the determination to see the past according to itself and not through the hopes and ideals of the present. Hegel gave inspiration to forms of historicist thought, as in Burckhardt's claim to locate the unique *Zetigeist* of the Renaissance, or in Lamprecht's notion of successive eras, which made the past different to our own reality, a whole unto itself, though matching another time and place inevitably at the completion of a cycle of the eras.<sup>48</sup>

#### GEO-POLITICAL AND DISCIPLINARY RUPTURES

Following the cues of recent innovations in Cambridge School intellectual history, this paper aims for a sketch of something broader than a strict intellectual genealogy, in recognition of the need to consider generational cultural ideals, institutional contexts

---

<sup>46</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. J.M.D. Meiklejohn (London: Meiklejohn and Holden, 1905 [1781]), pp.45-50.

<sup>47</sup> See David Boucher, *Texts in Context: Revisionist Methods for Studying Ideas* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985), pp.14-16.

<sup>48</sup> Ernst Cassirer, *The Problem of Knowledge: Philosophy, Science, and History Since Hegel*, trans W. H. Woglom and C. W. Hendel (New Haven, 1950), p.286

and intellectual personae in the history of historiographic thought.<sup>49</sup> In the case of cultural history old and new, there are several extra-genealogical contexts that help to explain the perceived ruptures, both between political and cultural historians at the turn of the twentieth century, and between the old Germanic cultural historiography and the later French and Anglophone variants. With the marginal place occupied by the early cultural historians at the edges of emergent academic disciplines, and sitting uncomfortably in their relation to the nationalist tensions that gripped the cultures in which they lived between the First and the Second World Wars, the old cultural historians were never strongly positioned to secure the place of their tradition in the institutionalization of historical studies in European universities. French and German rivalries throughout the interwar period contributed to the *Annales* School scholars' claims to innovation, both divorced from the German *Kulturgeschichte* movement, and reacting against what they viewed as the remnants of Ranke's influence on their teachers, Charles Siegnobos and Charles-Victor Langlois.<sup>50</sup>

The account sketched here does not aim to discount or contest the importance of post-World-War-Two intellectual trends such as cultural anthropology and French poststructuralist theory on the recent re-emergence of cultural history. Rather, it does suggest a need to reconfigure the relationship between cultural history old and new, and between cultural history and the rise of theory. Cultural historians first inspired European critical theory's reflections on historical epistemology, and not vice-versa. Of particular interest here, the work of Lamprecht, Burckhard and Warburg was critically engaged with by Dilthey, Cassirer and Agamben, all philosophers who were important figures in the genealogy of European continental philosophy and theory in each of their successive generations spanning the late nineteenth century to the mid twentieth.<sup>51</sup> Contrary to the view that cultural history was pioneered (badly) by Burckhardt and then forgotten about as a possibility of knowledge until its radical

---

<sup>49</sup> Ian Hunter and Conal Condren, "Introduction: The *Persona* of the Philosopher in the Eighteenth Century," *Intellectual History Review*, vol.18 (2008), pp.315-317; Conal Condren, "English Historiographical Revisionism, 'Cambridge School' Intellectual History: Some Aspects of the Problem of Contextualisation," *International Journal of Public Affairs*, vol.2 (2006), pp.19-28.

<sup>50</sup> Charles-Victor Langlois et Charles Seignobos, *Introduction aux études historiques* (Paris: Hachette, 1898). See also Hans Dieter Mann, *Lucien Febvre la pensée vivante d'un historien*, *Cahiers des Annales* 31 (Paris, 1971). For further discussion of the Febvre and Bloch's generational orientation see Alison M. Moore, "What Became of Cultural Historicism in the French Reclamation of Strasbourg After World War One?" *French History and Civilization* vol.6 (2014), pp.82-91.

<sup>51</sup> For Dilthey on Burckhardt see Dilthey, *Selected Works IV: Hermeneutics and the Study of History*, pp.271-278; For Cassirer on Lamprecht and Burckhardt see: Cassirer, *The Problem of Knowledge*, 242-289. For Agamben on Lamprecht and Warburg see: Giorgio Agamben, "Aby Warburg e la scienza senza nome," in *La potenza del pensiero: Saggi e conferenze* (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 2005), pp.123-146.

poststructuralist re-invention in the nineteen-eighties, an alternative account is suggested here - that cultural history has represented a continuous presence since its self-conscious emergence in the nineteenth century, and while it has lacked institutional security, and has hovered as a decentered presence around places of methodological innovation, its multiple genealogical tentacles remaining entangled within and throughout some of twentieth-century Europe's most significant epistemological currents.

Burckhardt proved to be a point of reference, both inspirational and critical, for continental European cultural and historical philosophers across the early twentieth century. Burckhardt's follower Karl Lamprecht was associated with the early French *Annales* historians Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre prior to World War One, and also influenced Carlo Ginzburg and the Italian "micro-history" tradition which in turn had an important impact on American postwar cultural historical studies due to Ginzburg's visits to the US. Ginzburg wrote about the methodology of both Aby Warburg and of Ernst Gombrich.<sup>52</sup> Ginzburg's work in turn influenced both the New Literary Historicist tradition, namely Stephen Greenblatt, and also Giorgio Agamben, who also wrote about Warburg.<sup>53</sup> Gadamer in turn had a major influence on Reinhart Koselleck and the entire German "history of concepts" tradition.<sup>54</sup> Karl Lamprecht's work also features as an example in the epistemological writings of Ernst Cassirer.<sup>55</sup> Cassirer's analysis of the Burckhardt tradition, written in the nineteen-thirties, showed how an emphasis on texts in cultural context threw up compelling questions about the role of historical sources in creating the historian's vision of the past, and about the need to think of texts not as reflecting the past but as mediating our knowledge of it. Cassirer valued the scholarship of Ranke and Croce far more than any of the cultural historians he discussed, but his epistemological reflections were nonetheless inspired by consideration of the approaches of Burckhardt and Lamprecht.<sup>56</sup>

The attacks on Lamprecht in the German academy at the turn of the twentieth century were vicious, and a number of Lamprecht scholars have suggested that by triggering such adverse reactions to his scholarship, Lamprecht might even be seen as

---

<sup>52</sup> Carlo Ginzburg, "Da Aby Warburg a Ernst Gombrich: Note su un problema di metodo," *Studi medievali*, vol.7 (1996), pp.1015-1065.

<sup>53</sup> Agamben, "Aby Warburg e la scienza senza nome."

<sup>54</sup> See John H. Zammito, "Koselleck's Concept of Historical Time(s) and the Practice of History," *History and Theory*, vol.43 (2004), pp.124-135.

<sup>55</sup> Ernst Cassirer, "History," in *Man and Culture, Hamburger Ausgabe, Gesammelte Werke*, 23, (Hamburg: Meiner, 2006), pp.215-217.

<sup>56</sup> Cassirer, *The Problem of Knowledge*, pp.242-289.

a “retarding” influence on the uptake of social scientific innovations that had begun to fascinate French-speaking scholars of the early twentieth century, especially Henri Berr, Henri Pirenne, Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch.<sup>57</sup> This is somewhat disingenuous though, since it was the *Methodenstreit* reaction against Lamprecht, not Lamprecht himself, which rejected what was viewed as inter-disciplinary incursions into the discipline. The French-speaking scholars’ relative receptivity to various forms of knowledge also cannot be divorced from the influence of Lamprecht. Bloch and Febvre consulted closely with the elder Pirenne in the planning stages of the *Annales* journal. Pirenne in turn had been heavily influenced by Karl Lamprecht. His correspondence with Lamprecht and collaborations with him throughout the eighteenthies and nineties have been well established by Geneviève Warland. Lamprecht’s own account of the value of anthropological thought for historians was ambivalent – on the one hand he derided much German scholarship in this field as “purely descriptive”, while also suggesting that comparative anthropology could help elucidate early Germanic culture.<sup>58</sup>

Lamprecht’s work represented an intriguing juncture in the disciplinary battles that surrounded the definition of historical professionalism in late nineteenth-century Germanic Europe. These battles point toward part of the reason why the old cultural history was unable to secure its intellectual progeny. Lamprecht was a renowned Saxon medievalist in his own time and taught at the universities of both Marburg and then Leipzig in the last decade of the nineteenth century and first decade of the twentieth. He was attacked by a number of his contemporaries for his multi-disciplinary approach to the Middle Ages and early modern era. Late in his career, in 1909, he founded his own *Institut für Kultur- und Universalgeschichte* in Leipzig. His magnum opus entitled, ambitiously *Deutsche Geschichte* spanned a vast array of topics on social relations, natural geography, psychology and literature.<sup>59</sup> Debates about this work among his compatriot disciplinary colleagues marked a profound rupture in German historiography in which the broad culturalist approach to the past that Lamprecht exemplified became officially anathema to professional historians. In the infamous *Methodenstreit* (methodology quarrel) that raged in the last decade of the nineteenth century, political historians such as Georg von Below, Dietrich Schäfer and

---

<sup>57</sup> Fritz Ringer, *Max Weber’s Methodology: The Unification of the Cultural and Social Sciences* (Harvard University Press, 1997), p.24; Fritz Ringer, *Fields of Knowledge: French Academic Culture in Comparative Perspective, 1890-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1991), pp.263-282.

<sup>58</sup> See Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), p.203.

<sup>59</sup> Karl Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte* (Freiburg im Breisgau: R. Gaertners, 1905).

Friederich Meinecke attacked Lamprecht's claims to innovation, his undisciplined approach and his use of sociological and psychological models of analysis in studies of past culture. Most dubiously, Lamprecht advanced the idea of cultures having a kind of psychology, a *Volksseele* or *Völkerpsychologie* - collective psyche - an idea that Meinecke ridiculed for its speculative and romantic foundations which he counterpoised to the Rankean study of political events that dominated his own work and stood at the centre of German historiographic thinking in the period.<sup>60</sup>

In part that debate might best be understood as a kind of culture war. As Charles McClelland noted, academic culture in the Bismarck era was dominated not only by a prevailing nationalism, but also by a new value placed on specialization as the mark of scholarly integrity.<sup>61</sup> Lamprecht represented neither of those things, and though he made his greatest fame through a study of Germanic civilization on the assumption of there being some obvious organic essence to that nationally constituted historical designation, the scope of his work spanned a number of European cultures, several eras, and many different disciplinary tools. He was both cosmopolitan and polymath in a time of nationalism and specialization. In fact, German academic cultures were marked by a growing pressure toward nationalism throughout the Wilhelmine period. Around the time of the First World War, both German and French intellectuals underwent considerable pressure from journalists, political opponents and colleagues to manifest an unambiguous nationalism – a pressure that Lamprecht, like Emile Durkheim in France, tried to resist while maintaining a softer cultural patriotism.

Meinecke's critique of Lamprecht in particular focused on these kinds of questions: Cosmopolitanism was a lower stage in the evolution of culture toward nationalism, and a conception of history in the style of Ranke represented the pinnacle of academic maturity.<sup>62</sup> Lamprecht, with his careless mysticism, his fascination with other cultures, and his multi-disciplinary borrowings helped Meinecke to see how nationalism and historical specialization might be linked. As Roger Chickering noted, "In Meinecke's eyes, the development of national consciousness corresponded to the maturation of German historiography."<sup>63</sup> Hence while Lamprecht was greeted warmly as a visiting lecturer in France and in the US, he received a cold reception among his compatriots right up to his death in 1915. In the years leading up to First World War, Lamprecht

---

<sup>60</sup> See Kelley, *Fortunes of History*, pp.304-306.

<sup>61</sup> Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany 1700-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp.315-316.

<sup>62</sup> Friederich Meinecke, *Cosmopolitanism and the National State*, trans R. B. Kimber (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970 [1908]).

<sup>63</sup> Chickering, *Lamprecht*, p.261.

promoted views about the need for a more cosmopolitan diplomacy among European nations, and in 1914, although he joined his colleagues in signing the Manifesto of 93 which declared the patriotic commitment to the war of some of Germany's most respected academics, he died practically disgraced by his ambivalence toward the question of national allegiance.<sup>64</sup>

Lamprecht's own students and others who pursued similar polymath historiographic approaches thereafter tended to be based not in Germany but in Florence where the majority of their research materials lay, reflecting their fascinations with the Italian 'Renaissance'. But the eccentric Aby Warburg, the eldest son of a wealthy Jewish banking family from Westphalia, was considerably more financially independent than most scholars, and remained in Germany to establish a massive library of early modern Italian resources that later formed the basis of the *Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg* founded in Hamburg in 1921. He had accumulated a similarly impressive knowledge base, undertaking his art-history dissertation with scholars based at the University of Strasbourg in the eighteen-eighties, and attending classes on cultural history with Lamprecht in Leipzig. His archival collection attracted a network of scholars inspired both by the historically contextual approach to Renaissance art in the mode of Jacob Burckhardt, and by the analyses of form developed by the Vienna school of Renaissance and medieval art historians in the first fifteen years of the twentieth century.<sup>65</sup>

In many respects, Warburg's own work on early modern Italian culture was a radical revision of Burckhardt's celebratory adulation of the Renaissance, as Warburg's iconological studies of early modern Italian paintings claimed that they exhibited a dynamic conflict between reason and passion to which he ascribed the Nietzschean dichotomy of Apollo and Dionysius.<sup>66</sup> The Renaissance for Warburg was a defining moment of modernity, though not the triumphant modernity of a Hegelian imagining, but a rather *fin-de-siècle* counter-Enlightenment view of civilization as always teetering between brilliance and doom in its rational trade with primitive essences. Here one can see the common heritage of early cultural history and of the later Frankfurt School social theory's visions of civilization, with the latter's uptake of Nietzschean Greek cosmology and claims to a universal dialectic of chaos and order.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Kelley, *Fortunes of History*, p.309.

<sup>65</sup> Ernst H. Gombrich, *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography*, Second Edition (Chicago: Phaidon, 1986).

<sup>66</sup> Warburg's relationship to Nietzsche was however ambivalent. See Mark A. Russell, *Between Tradition and Modernity: Aby Warburg and the Public Purposes of Art 1896-1918* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), p.26.

<sup>67</sup> Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans J. Cumming (New York: Continuum, 1972 [1947]), pp.93-95.

Late in his life, Warburg was also treated by the psychiatrist Ludwig Binswanger, whose writing Michel Foucault read closely.<sup>68</sup>

Following Warburg's death in 1929 and with the arrival of Nazi regime, the Warburg library's keepers, with the help of the American embassy in Hamburg, moved the massive *Kulturwissenschaftlicher Bibliothek* to Britain in 1933, and many of the Vienna School art scholars who relied on the remarkable resources within that library moved with it.<sup>69</sup> Hence it was that the Austrian art historian Ernst Gombrich became closely affiliated with the Warburg institute, and later acted as director of it from 1959-1976. On November 19<sup>th</sup> 1967 Gombrich delivered a lecture at Oxford University in which he articulated what cultural history represented in relation to the precedence of Jacob Burckhardt. This lecture was then expanded into a small book entitled *In Search of Cultural History*, published by Oxford University Press two years later.<sup>70</sup> Here Gombrich provides an account of cultural history as precisely the kind of "culturization" of historical knowledge that recent visions have attributed to post-structuralist influences. The approach, as Gombrich explained, was one of drawing connections across the kinds of texts commonly compartmentalized according to professional academic disciplines. In his explanation of the necessity to study languages, literatures, artworks and philosophies of an historical era, Gombrich extolled something like a vision of the inter-disciplinarity that is often assumed to be attributable to the new, late twentieth-century movements such as the emergence of cultural studies.<sup>71</sup> But in Gombrich's version of it, this style of scholarship was not called inter-disciplinary, but "polymath", and he related it to the common continental humanist educational approach that inspired countless European scholars of the Renaissance throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century. The epistemological culturization of history, so often viewed as a recent innovation, Gombrich shows us, had long been an integral part of cultural historiographic approaches among a certain kind of European intellectual - the kind that Karl Lamprecht, Johan Huizinga and Aby Warburg exemplified in each of their respectively flawed ways.

The Warburg historians were able to conceive history in this way in part because they derived their approaches from Burchkardt, whose conception of history pre-dated the emergence of professional academic disciplines; and from Lamprecht who insisted on the multi-disciplinarity of knowledge in the face of mounting pressure towards

---

<sup>68</sup> See Michel Foucault, Ludwig Binswanger, *Dream and Existence (Studies in Existential Psychology and Psychiatry)*, trans J. Needleman (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press International, 1986).

<sup>69</sup> Gombrich, *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography*.

<sup>70</sup> Gombrich, *In Search of Cultural History*.

<sup>71</sup> See for example, Gilbert B. Rodman, "Cultural Studies and History," in Partner and Foot (eds), *The Sage Companion to Historical Theory*, pp.342-353.

disciplinary compartmentalization and specialization. Cultural history then was not so much inter-disciplinary, as trans- and pre-disciplinary, and it attempted to remain so even as disciplinary boundaries became increasingly rigid, as the *Methodenstreit* indicated. In so doing it alienated itself from the emergent historical establishment in Europe.

From this perspective then, the view of cultural history as new and as postmodern on the basis of its textual constructivism, or on the basis of its challenge to historical objectivity, would both appear to indicate a puzzling amnesia or suggest rather that some extraordinary disavowal of earlier intellectual innovations has occurred in the development of historical theory in the late twentieth century. Early cultural historians did indeed appear to consider that there was a difference between metaphysical and epistemological types of claims. Both Johan Huizinga and Ernst Gombrich wrote about that exact question.<sup>72</sup> But in the later formations of the ‘new’ cultural history as necessarily postmodern, there appeared an assumption that such histories necessarily recognize “nothing outside the text”.

Other cultural historians also engaged richly with both Burckhardt and with Lamprecht’s work while being deeply critical of their unitary view of culture. Johan Huizinga, the Dutch historian of medieval Europe whose career spanned the end of the First World War until his death under Nazi imprisonment in 1945, wrote a chapter on the theory of cultural history in relation to Burckhardt’s work in his study of *Cultuurhistorische verkenningen* (Cultural Historical Knowing) of 1929.<sup>73</sup> Huizinga had begun his intellectual career as a comparative linguist and philologist. His interests spanned a wide array of different cultures, and he taught at the universities of Groningen and Leyden both as an Oriental language and culture scholar, and later as a scholar of Dutch medieval and early modern history. He was an erudite polymath, and with the wide span of his cultural knowledge, and the combination of linguistic and historicist interests, and he was able to elaborate a vision of cultural history informed by a sensitivity to the unique language content of historical texts, studied through literary techniques of close-reading.<sup>74</sup> Another consequence of that nexus of concerns was that he approached history against the trend of national frameworks and instead concordant with the appellation of cultures as they appeared in the given past

---

<sup>72</sup> Gombrich, *In Search of Cultural History*; Huizinga, *Cultuurhistorische verkenningen*.

<sup>73</sup> Huizinga, *Cultuurhistorische verkenningen*.

<sup>74</sup> Close reading and textual interrogation are particularly strong features of Johan Huizinga, *Herfsttij der middeleeuwen: studie over levens- en gedachtenvormen der veertiende en vijftiende eeuw in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden* (Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink, 1969 [1919]).

subjects' own linguistic constructions.<sup>75</sup> In recent views of cultural history, the features of linguistic sensibility and close textual reading in cultural historiographic approaches, as discussed earlier in this paper, have commonly been viewed as the product of French post-structuralist influences throughout Anglophone humanities academe in the last two decades of the twentieth century. But Huizinga's use of those techniques predated the post-Derridean "linguistic turn" by about fifty years.

Huizinga rejected the view of the Renaissance as a coherent era and critiqued the notion of a unified *Zeitgeist* (spirit of the age), but he defended Burckhardt for his definition of the historical object as "peoples, social groups, cultural figures, motifs, themes, symbols, concepts, ideas and styles...".<sup>76</sup> He paid homage to Burckhardt's polymath approach and poured scorn on the narrow conception of history as political events that continued to dominate among continental professional historians in his lifetime. He welcomed the possibilities of sociology in historical writing remarking that "Thanks to recent trends in the theory of knowledge....history can never be normative and does not have to be."<sup>77</sup> He was particularly scathing toward the "Rankean" dogma that dominated academic history departments in central and northern Europe, arguing that they had misused Ranke's claim to writing history "wie es eigentlich gewesen" (as it really was), turning it in an adage of the "inevitability of the preconceiving 'it'" - creating an arrogance that blinded historians to the reality of their inevitable subject position.<sup>78</sup> He referred to the importance of understanding "contexts" in a way that prefigured both Cambridge School intellectual history and new historicist approaches to cultural history in literary studies later in the century. Most importantly, he argued that historicist objectivity was not a naïve metaphysical assertion, but an instrumentalist epistemological ideal. It defined the historian's gaze as the "desire to find out how a certain thing 'really happened'," - as a movement toward that ideal, but not as a secure acquisition. For Huizinga the term historicism was a longing that created a particular kind of historical consciousness rather than a hubristic pretense to attaining a direct knowledge of past reality.<sup>79</sup> His position demonstrated precisely both how textualist histories might maintain historicist commitments, and how realism might operate instrumentally rather than

---

<sup>75</sup> As for instance in Johan Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*, trans F. Hopman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984 [1924]).

<sup>76</sup> Johan Huizinga, *Men and Ideas; History, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance*, trans James S. Holmes and Hans van Marle (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode 1960), p.65.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p.67.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.39-43.

metaphysically, informing an epistemological underpinning rather than an ontological stance.

It is difficult to know where Huizinga's subtle mind may have taken the question of cultural historiography if, like Marc Bloch, he had not died a premature death during the Second World War. In relation to these two significantly influential cultural historians, the invasion of Europe by the Nazi regime represented the most obvious rupture of cultural historiography's development as a result, not of postmodernism, but of war. That war also had an impact upon the Warburg approach to cultural history. In forcing Warburg's followers to flee the continent, as well driving the considerably larger Vienna School art historians out of Austria, both movements united as related ex-pat intellectual refugees in England, resulting in a fusion of their ideas in which art history came to hold a more dominant role than it had done in approaches of Lamprecht and Warburg. The characterization of the old cultural history as preoccupied uniquely with "high art" has been one unfortunate consequence of that elision.

#### THE FRANCO-GERMAN RUPTURE

Around the same time that Karl Lamprecht was being ostracized from the German historical academy prior to the First World War, a (now renowned but then obscure and young) French historian, Lucien Febvre began his own exploration of the place of cultural psychology in historiography that was not unlike Lamprecht's notion of *Volksseele*. One important distinction was that Febvre's version rejected the mystical framework of the nation as the basis of collective psyche, and he was later specifically critical of that approach.<sup>80</sup> Given Lamprecht's positive reception in France during Febvre's youth, it is credible to situate Febvre in relation to the Burckhardt/Lamprecht genealogy, and to reconsider the relationship of that tradition to the *Annales* School which Febvre helped to found along with Marc Bloch in 1929, and which he led in the postwar era, following Marc Bloch's death while fighting in the French Resistance under the Nazi Occupation. The connection is further suggested by the fact that Bloch spent the year from 1908-9 in Germany, and followed the lectures of Karl Lamprecht at Leipzig.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Throughout his life Febvre remained committed to a cosmopolitan outlook, and rejected the notion of long histories constituted in national terms, declaring "cardinal virtue of the historian" to be "Ce refus de prendre comme postulat une sorte de nécessité perpétuelle des nations et des formations politiques, supposées permanents de droit à travers les siècles." Lucien Febvre, *Combat Pour l'Histoire* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1952), p.98.

<sup>81</sup> Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century*, p.52;

In several respects Febvre's epistemological concerns strongly resembled those of the Burckhardt, Lamprecht and Huizinga, and it is undeniable that he read all of them. Febvre, like Burckhardt, emphasized the historian's subjectivity as an inherent factor in historiographic understanding, and as a necessary limit to any claims about historiographic practice as objective.<sup>82</sup> In that respect he was very much part of the intellectual current among cultural historians like Lamprecht and Warburg, who rejected the clichés about Ranke that were reiterated by the dominant trend of historical thinking in Germany, France, the UK and the US. In 1933 Febvre denounced the spirit of specialization that had become entrenched in interwar French academic disciplines.<sup>83</sup> He engaged with the work of Johan Huizinga, writing a preface to a new French translation in 1955 of Huizinga's study of Erasmus.<sup>84</sup> In his 1952 work *Combat Pour l'Histoire* (History's Struggles) he referred to Huizinga's work repeatedly, critically, but in a manner suggesting generative stimulation.<sup>85</sup> Like Huizinga, he had taken what was useful to him from the Burckhardt tradition and rejected what was not. He did not emulate either Burckhardt or Huizinga's general approach but he nonetheless engaged with their framework and was unmistakably nourished by the cosmopolitan and polymath counter-culture it represented in his generation of historical intellectuals. Of course, Febvre referred to the work of many other historians, sociologists and psychologists, and it might be objected here that his occasional mention of the Germanic tradition proves nothing about its deep influence on his ideas. But it is also reasonable to consider that Febvre probably, consciously or unconsciously, minimized their impact on his formation, both during the interwar period when French-German rivalry was culturally pervasive and extended far into academic life, and further still after the Second World War when the humiliation and horror of the Nazi Occupation made it fairly unpalatable in France to credit the contribution of German traditions to any major degree.

Bloch and Febvre were based at the University of Strasbourg. No location could better represent the rupture between French and German cultures, lying as it does in the heart of that territory which Imperial Germany designated Alsace-Lorraine and which was so perennially contested throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

---

<sup>82</sup> Febvre, *Combat pour l'histoire*, pp.18-33; Jacob Burckhardt, *Judgements on History and Historians*, trans Harry Zohn (Indianaolis : Liberty Fund, 1999), p.xiii. This collection of Burckhardt's lectures delivered at the University of Basel derives from the period 1865-1885, and was collated by his student Emil Dürr in 1929.

<sup>83</sup> Febvre, "Contre l'esprit de specialité. Une lettre de 1933," in *Combat pour l'histoire*, pp.104-106.

<sup>84</sup> Lucien Febvre, "Préface," in Johan Huzinga, *Erasmus*, trans V. Bruncel (Paris : Gallimard, 1955).

<sup>85</sup> Febvre, *Combats Pour l'Histoire*, p.215; pp.226-9; p.300.

– French territory in 1789, then German again after the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870; French again after the German defeat in 1918, annexed by the Nazis in 1940, made part of France again in 1944. When Strasbourg was returned to the French state under the Treaty of Versailles, there was an expulsion of all German academics who had worked there since 1870, and a movement *en masse* of French scholars now found position there – among them both Febvre and Marc Bloch.<sup>86</sup> A new divide emerged in this time between French and German scholars who had previously begun a fruitful dialogue. In his later writing Febvre, born and raised in Nancy in the Lorraine, referred still with great resentment to the German presence in Alsace-Lorraine from 1870 to 1918.<sup>87</sup> He and Bloch both fought in the First World War.<sup>88</sup> Following their return from combat there appears to have been no further contact with the German historical academy with whom they had previously been associated. In the aftermath of the Vichy occupation, French historians moved even further away from German-influenced culturalist approaches and the *Annales* School, now reconstituted firmly on economic and statistical foundations.

Here then already there is another reason to think that cultural historiography of both old and new kinds has a shared history from its first articulation in the ideas of Burckhardt through to the present, via the ideas of Lamprecht and Warburg in the early twentieth century, up to the recent elaborations of the late twentieth century in the work of Lynn Hunt and Peter Burke, with their obvious debt to the *Annales* school.<sup>89</sup> Strangely, Burke does not consider that there is any continuity from Burckhardt to the *Annales*, and neglecting the relationship of Bloch and Febvre to Lamprecht and Warburg, he constructs the history of the *Annales* as a “French historical revolution” that reacted against a century of continuous domination by empiricist political historians.<sup>90</sup> While it is certainly true that cultural historians nowhere occupied a position of dominance before the very end of the twentieth century, it is also possible that following the genealogy from Burckhardt to Lamprecht, there was a further link from Lamprecht to the *Annales*.

---

<sup>86</sup> Marc Bloch, Lucien Febvre, *Les Annales d'Histoire Economique et Sociale. Correspondance, tome 1, 1928-1933*, ed Bertrand Müller (Paris : Fayard, 1994), p.xix.

<sup>87</sup> Febvre, in *Combats pour l'histoire*, p.177.

<sup>88</sup> Georges Huppert, “Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch: The Creation of the *Annales*,” *The French Review*, vol.55 (1982), p.511.

<sup>89</sup> Lynn Hunt, “French History in the Last Twenty Years: The Rise and Fall of the *Annales* Paradigm,” *The Journal of Contemporary History*, vol.21 (1986), pp. 209-224.

<sup>90</sup> Peter Burke, *The French Historical Revolution: The *Annales* School 1929-1989* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), pp.8-11.

If we examine the opinions of Lamprecht that circulated both in his own time, and which prevail in recent accounts of him, then it is not difficult to see why a distancing has occurred. Cassirer, Roger Chickering and Georg Iggers all agreed that Lamprecht was a poor exemplar for the opening of historiography toward cultural concerns and that the only real posthumous value of his work is “little more than curiosity” (Chickering), or primarily of interest for what his fate helps us to understand about the politics of historiography in Wilhelmine Germany (Iggers).<sup>91</sup> He had exciting ideas, but he executed them badly. And yet something about his work, like that of Burckhardt, was irresistible to debate and critique, keeping the possibilities of cultural history generatively alive at the margins of European historical thought during the interwar period.

The old cultural history was a “failed paradigm”, and “found few emulators” according to Roger Chickering, Donald Kelley, and other scholars of the history twentieth-century ideas.<sup>92</sup> But the ongoing and vibrant academic culture of the Warburg Institute in the London School of Advanced Study suggests that this “failure” was not so generalized. Perhaps part of the difficulty in appreciating the influence of the old cultural history lies in its lack of blindly devoted emulators. Certainly, few have called themselves Burckhardtians, Lamprechtians, Warburgians or Huizingans; and yet these thinkers have certainly not lacked for engagement and re-interpretation. They have all been heavily criticized, and yet their approaches were profoundly interesting for many different kinds of historically-minded scholars throughout the twentieth century. For those of us who write cultural histories or appreciate reading them, we owe these scholars at least our acknowledgement of their precedents.

Western Sydney University  
alison.moore@westernsydney.edu.au

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, Theodor W. and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans J. Cumming (New York: Continuum, 1972 [1947]).
- Agamben, Giorgio, “Aby Warburg e la scienza senza nome,” in *La potenza del pensiero: Saggi e conferenze* (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 2005), pp.123-146.

---

<sup>91</sup> Cassirer, *The Problem of Knowledge*, p.281; Chickering, Lamprecht; xiii; Georg Iggers, “The Historian Banished: Karl Lamprecht in Imperial Germany,” *Central European History*, vol.27 (1994), p.92.

<sup>92</sup> Adam Kuper and Jessica Kuper (eds), *The Social Science Encyclopedia* (London, 1996), p.273.

- Ankersmit, Frank, "Historical Experience Beyond the Linguistic Turn", in Nancy Partner and Sarah Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (London: Sage, 2013), pp.427-28.
- Ankersmit, Frank, *Meaning, Truth and Reference in Historical Representation* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2012).
- Ankersmit, Frank, *Sublime Historical Experience* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005).
- Becker, Carl, "What are Historical Facts?" *The Western Political Quarterly*, vol.8, no.3 (September 1955), pp.327-340.
- Bendix, Reinhard, *Embattled Reason: Essays on Social Knowledge*, vol 2 (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1989).
- Biernacki, Richard, "Method and Metaphor After the New Cultural History," in Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt (eds), *Beyond the Cultural Turn* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), pp.62-92.
- Bloch, Marc et Lucien Febvre, *Les Annales d'Histoire Economique et Sociale. Correspondance, tome 1, 1928-1933*, ed Bertrand Müller (Paris : Fayard, 1994).
- Bonnell, Victoria E. and Lynn Hunt (eds), *Beyond the Cultural Turn; New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
- Boucher, David, *Texts in Context: Revisionist Methods for Studying Ideas* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985).
- Burckhardt, Jacob *Judgements on History and Historians*, trans Harry Zohn (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1999).
- Burckhardt, Jacob, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassikerverlag, 1989 [1860]).
- Burke, Peter, "Strengths and Weaknesses of Cultural History," *Cultural History*, vol.1, no.1 (2012), pp.1-13.
- Burke, Peter, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
- Burke, Peter, *The French Historical Revolution: The Annales School 1929-1989* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).
- Burke, Peter, *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997).
- Burke, Peter, *What is Cultural History?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004).
- Carr, Edward Hallett, *What Is History?* (London: Penguin Books, 1961).
- Cassirer, Ernst, *Man and Culture, Hamburger Ausgabe, Gesammelte Werke*, 23, (Hamburg: Meiner, 2006 [1929]).

- Cassirer, Ernst, *The Problem of Knowledge: Philosophy, Science, and History since Hegel*, trans William H. Woglom and Charles W. Hendel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).
- Chickering, Roger, *Karl Lamprecht: A German Academic Life (1856-1915)* (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1993).
- Clark, Elizabeth A., *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).
- Collingwood, Robin G., *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946).
- Condren, Conal, "English Historiographical Revisionism, 'Cambridge School' Intellectual History: Some Aspects of the Problem of Contextualisation," *International Journal of Public Affairs*, vol.2 (2006), pp.19-28.
- Curthoys, Ann and John Docker, *Is History Fiction?* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2006).
- Danto, Arthur, *Analytical Philosophy of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).
- Derrida, Jacques, "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences," in Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donatio (eds), *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1972), pp.247-72.
- Derrida, Jacques, *De la Grammatologie* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1967).
- Deutscher, Max, *In Sensible Judgement* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).
- Dilthey, Wilhelm, *Selected Works III: The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences*, eds R. A. Makkreel and F. Rodi (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).
- Dilthey, Wilhelm, *Selected Works IV: Hermeneutics and the Study of History*, ed Ruolf. A. Makkreel and Frijhof Rodi (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).
- Febvre, Lucien, "Préface," in Johan Huzinga, *Erasmus*, trans V. Bruncel (Paris : Gallimard, 1955).
- Febvre, Lucien, *Combat Pour l'Histoire* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1952).
- Foucault, Michel and Ludwig Binswanger, *Dream and Existence (Studies in Existential Psychology and Psychiatry)*, trans J. Needleman (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press International, 1986).
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, Second Edition, trans Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (London: Continuum, 2004).
- Gardiner, Patrick, *The Nature of Historical Explanation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952).

- Garton, Stephen, "On the Defensive: Poststructuralism and Australian Cultural History," in Hsu-Ming Teo and Richard White (eds), *Cultural History in Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2003), pp.52-66.
- Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Cultures; Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).
- Ginzburg, Carlo, "Da Aby Warburg a Ernst Gombrich: Note su un problema di metodo," *Studi medievali*, vol.7 (1996), pp.1015-1065.
- Gombrich Ernst H., *In Search of Cultural History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969). Ginzburg, Carlo, *Clues, Myths and the Historical Method* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1989).
- Gombrich, Ernst H., *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography*, Second Edition (Chicago: Phaidon, 1986).
- Green, Anna and Kathleen Troup (eds), *The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).
- Huizinga, Johan, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*, trans F. Hopman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984 [1924]).
- Huizinga, Johan, *Cultuurhistorische verkenningen* (Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink en Zoon, 1929).
- Huizinga, Johan, *Herfsttij der middeleeuwen: studie over levens- en gedachtenvormen der veertiende en vijftiende eeuw in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden* (Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink, 1969 [1919]).
- Huizinga, Johan, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture* (London: Routledge, 2000 [1938]).
- Huizinga, Johan, *Men and Ideas; History, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance*, trans James S. Holmes and Hans van Marle (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode 1960).
- Hunt, Lynn (ed), *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
- Hunt, Lynn, "French History in the Last Twenty Years: The Rise and Fall of the *Annales* Paradigm," *The Journal of Contemporary History*, vol.21 (1986), pp.209-224.
- Hunter, Ian and Conal Condren, "Introduction: The *Persona* of the Philosopher in the Eighteenth Century," *Intellectual History Review*, vol.18 (2008), pp.315-317.
- Hunter, Ian, "Scenes from the History of Poststructuralism: Davos, Freiburg, Baltimore, Leipzig," *New Literary History*, vol.41 (2010), pp.491-516.
- Hunter, Ian, "The Time of Theory: The Return of Metaphysics to the Anglo-American Humanities Academy," *Postcolonial Studies* vol.10 (2007), pp.5-22.

- Huppert, Georges, "Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch: The Creation of the *Annales*," *The French Review*, vol.55 (1982), pp.510-513.
- Iggers, Georg, "The Historian Banished: Karl Lamprecht in Imperial Germany," *Central European History*, vol.27 (1994), pp.87-92.
- Iggers, Georg, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century; From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Middletown CT, 1997).
- Jenkins, Keith "No Going Back: A Case for Postmodern History," *Teaching History*, vol.84 (1996), pp.34-38.
- Jenkins, Keith, Sue Morgan and Alun Munslow (eds), *Manifestos for History* (London: Routledge, 2007).
- Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. J.M.D. Meiklejohn (London: Meiklejohn and Holden, 1905 [1781]).
- Kelley, Donald R. *Fortunes of History: Historical Inquiry from Herder to Huizinga* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
- Koselleck, Reinhart, *Begriffsgeschichten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 2006).
- Kritzman, Lawrence D., Brian J. Reilly, M.B. DeBevoise, *The Columbia History of Twentieth-Century Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007).
- Kuper, Adam and Jessica Kuper (eds), *The Social Science Encyclopedia* (London, 1996).
- Lamprecht, Karl, "Was ist Kulturgeschichte? Beitrag zu einer empirischen Historik," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* Bd.1 (1896), pp.75-150.
- Lamprecht, Karl, *Deutsche Geschichte* (Freiburg im Breisgau: R. Gaertners, 1905).
- Langlois, Charles-Victor et Charles Seignobos, *Introduction aux études historiques* (Paris: Hachette, 1898).
- Mann, Hans Dieter, *Lucien Febvre la pensée vivante d'un historien, Cahiers des Annales* vol.31 (Paris, 1971).
- McClelland, Charles E., *State, Society, and University in Germany 1700-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- Megill, Alan, "What is Distinctive about Modern Historiography?" in Q. Edward Wang and Franz L. Fillafer (eds), *The Many Faces of Clío: Cross-Cultural Approaches to Historiography. Essays in Honor of Georg G. Iggers* (New York: Berghahn, 2007), pp.28-41.
- Meinecke, Friederich, *Cosmopolitanism and the National State*, trans R. B. Kimber (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970 [1908]).
- Moore, Alison M., "What Became of Cultural Historicism in the French Reclamation of Strasbourg After World War One?" *French History and Civilization* vol.6 (2014) pp.82-91.

- Novick, Peter, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Partner, Nancy and Sarah Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (London: Sage, 2013).
- Paul, Herman, "Distance and Self-Distanciation: Intellectual Virtue and Historical Method Around 1900," *History and Theory* vol.50 (December 2011), pp.104-116.
- Phillips, Mark, *On Historical Distance* (New Haven: Yale University Press: 2013).
- Poster, Mark, *Cultural History and Postmodernity: Disciplinary Readings and Challenges* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).
- Raphael, Lutz, "The Implications of Empiricisms for History," in Nancy Partner and Sarah Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (London: Sage, 2013), pp.23-40.
- Ringer, Fritz *Max Weber's Methodology: The Unification of the Cultural and Social Sciences* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1997).
- Ringer, Fritz, *Fields of Knowledge: French Academic Culture in Comparative Perspective, 1890-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1991).
- Rodman, Gilbert B., "Cultural Studies and History," in Nancy Partner and Sarah Foot (eds), *The Sage Companion to Historical Theory* (London: Sage, 2013), pp.342-353.
- Russell, Mark A., *Between Tradition and Modernity: Aby Warburg and the Public Purposes of Art 1896-1918* (New York: Berghan Books, 2007).
- Scott, Joan Wallach, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York,: Columbia University Press, 1988).
- Smith, Bonnie G., "Gender I: From Women's History to Gender History," in Nancy Partner and Sarah Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (London: Sage, 2013), pp.266-281.
- Smith, Bonnie G., *The Gender of History: Men Women and Historical Practice* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2000).
- Tosh, John, *The Pursuit of History*, Fourth Edition (Harlow: Pearson and Longman, 2006).
- van der Dussen, Jan, "The Case for Historical Imagination: Defending the Human Factor and Narrative," in Nancy Partner and Sarah Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (London: Sage, 2013), pp.42-66.
- Warburg, Aby, "A Lecture on Serpent Ritual," *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, vol.4 (1939), pp.277-292.
- Warburg, Aby, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, trans D. Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Centre, 1999).

- 
- Waters, Ronald G., "Signs of the Times: Clifford Geertz and Historians," *Social Research*, vol.47 (1980), pp.537-556.
- Wilson, Norman, *History in Crisis?: Recent Directions in Historiography*, second edition (Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice Hall, 2005).
- Zammito, John, "Post-Positivist Realism: Regrounding Representation," in Nancy Partner and Sarah Foot (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Historical Theory* (London: Sage, 2013), pp.402-422.
- Zammito, John, "Koselleck's Concept of Historical Time(s) and the Practice of History," *History and Theory*, vol.43 (2004), pp.124-135.
- Zammito, John, *A Nice Derangement of Epistemes: Post-Positivism in the Study of Science from Quine to Latour* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
- Zimmerman, Andrew, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).