

## 'We are heading for a more global history'

In gesprek met Peter Burke

Peer Vries en Wilma Goossen

Op 19 september hield Peter Burke een lezing in het Amsterdams Historisch Museum met als titel 'Louis XIV. The fabrication of an image'. In deze lezing gaf Burke de aanwezigen een voorproefje van zijn nieuwste, nog te verschijnen boek, waarin hij de beeldvorming rond Lodewijk de Veertiende bekijkt vanuit historisch-anthropologisch perspectief. Leidschrift maakte van de gelegenheid gebruik om deze bekende Britse historicus te interviewen. Peter Burke, reader in cultural history aan de Universiteit van Cambridge en fellow aan het Emmanuel College van diezelfde universiteit, is een zeer vruchtbaar schrijver. In brede kring staat hij waarschijnlijk vooral bekend als auteur van *Popular culture in early modern Europe* (Londen 1978) en als specialist op het terrein van de Italiaanse Renaissance. Behalve de in de tekst genoemde boeken schreef hij - naast een zeer groot aantal artikelen - ook nog de volgende: *The Renaissance sense of the past* (Londen 1969); *Venice and Amsterdam. A study of seventeenth-century elites* (Londen 1972); *Montaigne* (Oxford 1981); *Vico* (Oxford 1985). Van het boek over Venetië en Amsterdam zal in het voorjaar van 1991 een Nederlandse vertaling verschijnen. Bovendien trad hij ook op als redacteur van diverse boeken. Wij noemen hier slechts zijn meest recente publikatie (samen met Roy Porter) getiteld *A social history of language* (Cambridge 1987).

The first book I read of the many you wrote, was *Tradition and innovation in Renaissance Italy: a sociological approach*.<sup>1</sup> I think it is a fine example of your work because in it you combine your interest in Renaissance Italy with a plea for integrating history with other disciplines, in this case sociology. Your love for the history of early modern Italy and for an interdisciplinary approach has not ended. I would like to ask two questions relating these two 'loves'. The first one is the following: You have been publishing studies on the Renaissance ever since, but has not the concept of 'Renaissance' dissolved into thin air? Is there still something to be called 'Renaissance'? When I read your recent book *The Renaissance* I got the impression the whole concept has become nothing but a 'myth'.<sup>2</sup>

As long as we do not think that the Renaissance is in some sense a thing, instead of a useful concept; as long as we do not think that changes in culture take place overnight rather than gradually; as long as we do not think that the Middle Ages did not have cultural achievements and provided we take all these factors into account, then I think that 'Renaissance' is a useful piece of shorthand to refer to a complex of connected cultural changes, often gradual ones, most of which began in Italy and then affected other parts of Europe, but some of which began in other parts of Europe and then affected Italy: admit all that and I am still quite happy with it.

So this means you have a rather 'extended' conception of 'Renaissance'. In your lecture you were even referring to 'Renaissance art' in the seventeenth century. My other question is about the subtitle of the book : 'a sociological approach'. It seems to me your love for the Renaissance has been more enduring than your love for this particular approach. In a book you wrote a few years later *Sociology and history* you were still rather optimistic with regard to the results of such a fusion. I quote:

**'In short, historians may have a contribution to make to a future model of social change which would take more account of diversity and of long-term trends than previous models have done, and specify the alternative paths and the constraints more clearly than before. To move a step or two closer to such a model is a primary aim of this book'.<sup>3</sup>**

**It is my impression that you are no longer looking for such a model.**

I do not spend much of my working life self-consciously looking for a model of social change. I am still interested in the question whether it is possible to find one or not and unlike the period when I wrote this book, in the late seventies, I now have the sensation that many more sociologists are also looking for such a model. I think that the climate has changed and is now more favourable to collaborative work between historians, sociologists and anthropologists focused on this kind of questions.

**In the last chapter of *Sociology and history* you discussed four works you regarded as exemplary, Braudel's *Méditerranée*, Le Roy Ladurie's *Les paysans de Languedoc*, McNeill's *Europe's steppe frontier*, and Wachtel's *La vision des vaincus*.<sup>4</sup> Do you still think they are exemplary?**

Yes, I suppose that as I get older I have become a bit more critical of Braudel than before. But I still think his achievement is very great. I consider *The Méditerranée* one of greatest historical works ever written, although it would have even been better if Braudel would have written it the other way around, beginning with the 'événements' and finishing with the 'structures'. But yes, I would still regard all the four works you mentioned as exemplary.

**In the same book you are talking about using sociology as 'a basic conceptual tool kit'.<sup>5</sup> Do you think your ideas have had any impact in Britain? Have historians actually started to use these tools?**

Yes, and I think they are doing so more and more. It is true that in the nineteen eighties there was also a kind of reaction against this by political historians who felt really threatened by the kind of social historians who use sociological concepts. There has been a kind of backlash. But meanwhile, talking to graduate students and so on, I get the impression that more and more people are really doing it. We no longer have to make a fuss and write lectures and books called 'sociology and history'. It has got to the second, more interesting stage which is as follows: given the fact we are going to use sociological concepts, which are the useful ones for a particular piece of historical research?

**Have such developments, like using a sociological approach or other changes in historiography, like the rise of cultural history led to institutional changes at British universities?**

Not at all.

**So everything depends on the people who actually do the teaching? When a specific person leaves the university, his approach simply disappears?**

Yes, and I am not certain that this is actually such a bad thing. It is like having an unwritten constitution. Provided the people in the community, teachers and students, who are interested in using sociological or anthropological concepts or in doing cultural history have the chance to do so, I do not care whether a chair exists in cultural history or historical anthropology. I am in a university which does not dream of creating these new things. It is true that in this situation when someone innovative leaves there will not be a formal search for a successor, but then one of the problems is that if you name a chair for somebody's interest and he or she goes away, you might get the wrong person, because you are trying to find somebody

to fit the chair description rather than looking for a good historian. So whichever way you do it, there are going to be some disadvantages as well as some advantages.

**I think your most famous book is *Popular culture in early modern Europe*, a kind of half-way house between historical sociology and historical anthropology.<sup>6</sup> It can be interpreted as a reaction against the Huizinga-Burckhardt type of ‘cultuurgeschiedenis’ or ‘beschavingsgeschiedenis’. According to you Huizinga and Burckhardt did not pay enough attention to differences in place, time and social group.<sup>7</sup> Is not an attempt like yours to describe popular culture in early modern Europe destined to attract the same kind of criticism? Could not critics say: ‘He is looking for the same kind of “Zeitgeist”, for the same kind of general ideas? The only difference between him and Huizinga or Burckhardt is that he is not (only) looking at the elites’.**

I think I self-consciously problematized this issue. I deliberately wrote a chapter called ‘Unity and variety’ to discuss that particular problem. And there are chapters completely focused on change over time.<sup>8</sup> Whereas I think the problem with Burckhardt’s great book on the Renaissance, which I still think is one of the greatest works of history in the last 150 years, is that he is simply descriptive. Again each chapter deals with the whole period, but in some chapters he seems to think that period is the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, while at other times he goes back to Dante. I think that with many strengths that is a weakness in Burckhardt’s book. The same goes for Huizinga’s *Waning of the Middle Ages* because all the chapters are about the whole period which is more or less the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

**Ever since you published your book studies which focus on popular culture flood the market. In my opinion at least there is a danger of the disintegration of the subject. Would you like, or perhaps I should say, would you dare to write another ‘Popular culture of early modern Europe’ at this moment?**

I would very gladly revise it.

**What revisions would you make?**

I do not think I would change the main lines. I would want to incorporate the results of new research. I think that since the book came out there has probably been more historical research on popular culture than in the 50 years before. And of course that must modify particular statements I made. But I do not think it modifies the basic

structure. The new work has made me conscious of two problems. That is why I wrote this introduction to the Dutch edition.<sup>9</sup> In a sense I am saying there are only two real problems for the history of popular culture. The one: is who are the people and the other one: what is culture. They are really fundamental. On the question who are the people I have probably not changed my views very much. I still urge the thesis that in one sense popular culture is everybody's culture, because at least until the middle of the seventeenth century the elites participated. On the question what is culture I really would try to write the book a bit differently now. It would be closer to the anthropologist's culture, that is, it would be dealing more with everyday life as an expression of attitudes and values and not so much with folksongs, folktales, popular images, what you could call the popular equivalent of high culture.

**So you would pay more attention to material culture?**

Yes, I think I was quite correctly criticized by somebody for saying very little about sexuality because surely that expresses values. And now thanks to Martin Ingram who said that and published a book about the subject, it would be possible to have a serious discussion.<sup>10</sup> So yes, it would be a book which enlarged its scope by employing a wider definition of culture, but I think I would include the same trends over time and the same kind of discussion about the different parts of Europe.

**Historical anthropology at the moment has surely come to the front line of the historical enterprise. In your book *The historical anthropology of early modern Italy* you mention five features of this approach:<sup>11</sup>**

1. It is deliberately qualitative and it concentrates on specific cases.
2. It is deliberately microscopic and it focuses on small communities.
3. It concentrates on the interpretation of social interaction in a given society in terms of that society's own norms and categories.
4. Historical anthropologists make the place of symbolism in everyday life one of the central concerns in their studies.
5. Historical anthropologists tend to be interested in theory, but their 'great tradition' runs from Durkheim through Van Gennep and Mauss to contemporary figures as Geertz, Turner and Bourdieu.

**Of course you are aware of the fact that this approach is liable to criticism. Critics fear that history will disintegrate into an unconnected mass of interpretive micro-studies. Do you agree there is a danger that history as a**

**discipline could disintegrate because of all these micro-studies in which historians are only, or at least primarily, concerned with the 'native's point of view'?**<sup>12</sup>

If everybody did micro-history and no other kind of history, there would be exactly the danger you say. But I never thought when I wrote a book about this topic that people would think I am recommending everybody to do this and only this. I only meant to say this has to be done as well. I am not against the old sociological approach. I am not against writing macro-history in the style of Marx and Weber, provided people realize there is an other kind of history as well. So then the question arises if an integration of the two will be possible when, maybe in the nineties or in the early next century, we will be thinking more in terms of producing a synthesis.

**In your lecture you gave the impression you have doubts about that.**

I did not mean to give that impression. I think it is not going to be easy, but I think it is possible. I am now writing a book on Louis XIV.<sup>13</sup> Dealing with Louis XIV in an anthropological way is already to invade the territory of the conventional historian. Which means it can not be the same kind of anthropological history as before. I am dealing with the state, with kings and so on. After that I want to try and do an anthropology of the Renaissance, that is of the high culture. And in doing so you could say in a sense historical anthropology is dissolving into something wider. And I think this dissolution will be good. It will be a kind of search for the centre. The thing to do now that historical anthropology is more or less established is to try and connect it more closely with the more conventional kinds of history. I think that will be good for both of them.

**I think some kind of synthesis between the macro and the micro-approach could be made when one uses Bourdieu's approach. But what struck me is that you seem to be very impressed by the work of Clifford Geertz. I must say I find it hard to imagine how the results of his approach can be integrated in a bigger synthesis or theory. At least in his more 'theoretical' works he is not exactly fond of theory-building, nor of striving for generalization or studying 'the hard surfaces of life'.**<sup>14</sup>

Several times he has been prepared to deal with these. A very fine example you can find in his study on agricultural involution.<sup>15</sup>

**I agree. But I was referring to the theoretical works he wrote afterwards. It seems to me that in *The interpretation of cultures, Local knowledge or Works and lives. The anthropologist as author* he is increasingly losing interest in economics, demography and the problem of power to focus exclusively on 'meaning'.<sup>16</sup>**

But then again, I do not want to give the impression that I think that Geertz is good and Bourdieu is bad. I simply think that in a particular discussion of a certain problem, like the presentation of a monarch the Geertz-model is more useful. For another piece of work I might very well use the work of Bourdieu. I find him very stimulating. I have also some criticisms of his work, but that does not stop me from using him.

**One of the central issues in discussions on historical anthropology hinges on the possibilities and limits of the so-called 'symbolic approach'. In your opinion historians have normally been too literal-minded.<sup>17</sup> You even called the symbolic approach the most exciting recent development in historical studies.<sup>18</sup> In this approach one tries to show how problematic everyday life is.<sup>19</sup> Why do you think that most scholars study the non-modern or non-western world when they try to show the problematic of everyday life.<sup>20</sup> Is our everyday life not problematic?**

No, but it is merely that an outsider sees the problems of our everyday life more easily than we can and we can see the problems of other people more easily. Yes, the ultimate aim definitively is to be reflexive. Bourdieu is somebody who really is prepared to study the everyday in this way and so was the late Michel de Certeau. I think he is another one of the really major theorists of the later twentieth century. I am thinking in particular of his book *L'Invention du quotidien*.<sup>21</sup>

**Rumour has it that you have studied your colleagues in Cambridge from an anthropological point of view. Are you planning to publish the results of this 'field-work'?**

I have published them! I published them twice. Once under a false name in the *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* and once under my own name in a German journal called *Freibeuter*.<sup>22</sup> So it is in the public domain now. In the *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* it is published in English. Bourdieu decided it was not possible to translate it because there were so many special Oxford and Cambridge words in it that like a good anthropologist he thought the only way to publish it was in the original language.

**Have your colleagues read it and reacted to it?**

Some of my colleagues in Cambridge have, but as far as I know nobody in my college has seen it. People wrote me and said this was just what they were thinking and that they were glad somebody had put it in print.

**In articles and interviews you like to call yourself a British empiricist.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand you have a liking for symbolism. Are these two things really compatible?**

I do not see any incompatibility between the two. To say that I am an empiricist merely means that I do not like to generalize without some concrete evidence. And I do not see why there can not be concrete evidence about the use of symbols.

**But then the question arises, what is the value of this 'symbolic' evidence. I mean, is it possible to interpret symbols in such a way that one can say one has 'proved' something or do you think there is a real difference between symbolic evidence and what for example economic historians or historical demographers use to call 'hard' evidence?**

I think symbolic evidence is 'softer'. It is more capable of different interpretations. I think now anthropologists would recognize not only that there is a difference between the way they interpret symbols and the way the indigenous people do, but - much more exciting and dangerous - that the indigenous people themselves disagree about the interpretation of their own symbols as we disagree about the interpretation of our own political and religious symbols. But when I said that I am an empiricist, which was half a joke anyway, I did not mean to say that I believe that using general concepts makes no sense. I was not aligning myself with William of Occam who said that any general concept is 'empty breath'. I meant something more moderate. It was just a reaction against those theoretical books in which people do not talk about anything concrete at all. It is a better summary of my position to say that I believe in the interpenetration of the abstract and the concrete, theory and practice.

**Does not this same tension between empiricism and symbolism exist in the use of pictorial sources?**

There is another tension. It is using one medium to comment on an other. So I am trying to put into words, verbal symbols, what is expressed in visual symbols. And



when you change medium like that, there are always problems. So there is a tension, but I am not quite sure whether it is the same tension.

**What do you think of the way Simon Schama uses pictorial sources in his book on Dutch culture?<sup>24</sup>**

I think that he was absolutely right to try and do it. Some of the time he convinces me. I think he is very intuitive and some of his intuitions come off. On the other hand there are times in that book where a particular image will not bear the weight of interpretation which he gives to it. There is one example which impressed me particularly, so I even put it into the review I wrote of the book.<sup>25</sup> It is the interpretation of a painting of a carriage in front of a country-house. Schama claims to know that the people we see have come out of the house, that they are getting into the carriage to drive away and then he makes this a microcosm of a whole unified Dutch culture. What I wanted to say at one level is that we do not even know whether they are getting into the carriage or out of the carriage, but more important, that if you look at the micro-context of this work, it is painted for a particular group of people, probably Catholic, in a particular province. So what does it tell one about the values of the Protestant Dutch or of the Dutch that live in an other province? So we come to my biggest quarrel with Schama, much as I admire his work in other ways, which is his attempt to deal with the Dutch as if they were a homogeneous group in the seventeenth century. No social variation, no regional variation! And that is a danger inherent in the anthropological method, or better it *was* inherent in this method in the fifties and sixties when it was still very Durkheimian.

**But is it not still inherent in the *Annales*' concept of 'mentalité'. You have called yourself a 'fellow-traveller' of the *Annales*.<sup>26</sup> Does not this concept, which is very popular amongst Annalists, have a collective ring?**

It depends on which Annalists you have in mind. I think that when Febvre used that term, he did fall into just this trap when he talked about 'the mentality of the sixteenth-century Frenchman'.<sup>27</sup> But Mandrou and other people later on spoke of the mentality of a particular social group or class.<sup>28</sup> Even then there are problems, but still one can not accuse Mandrou of having this unified, Durkheimian vision of France. He is much closer to Marx than to Durkheim.

**Then what exactly did you learn from the *Annales*? As I said you have called yourself their 'fellow-traveller', while at the moment you have just finished a book about the history of the *Annales*.<sup>29</sup> So I must assume you are very impressed**

**by the Annales-historians and think they are very influential in twentieth-century historiography.**

I would go further. I would say that personally I have learned more from that group, above all from Bloch, Febvre and Braudel, but from others too, than from any other historian, even Burckhardt and Huizinga who I also admire. I learned in the first place that every human activity can have a history, or at least is capable of having its history written, so that one can extend the frontiers first from the political to the economic and social, but then to the history of the everyday, the history of dreams, the history of smells, the history of sexuality, et cetera. That was the biggest thing. Apart from that Braudel taught me the importance of the 'longue durée', Febvre and Bloch showed me the importance of mentality or collective representations.

**You are referring to the 'old' Annales, to the so-called first and second generations. Does this mean that in your opinion the Annales is dead, or at least not as alive as it used to be?**

I almost think that, but not quite. In the book, in the last chapter, I really face this issue and I say I think it is disintegrating. That is, within the third generation Annales-people there are so many different points of view, for events against events, for political history against political history, for quantitative methods against quantitative methods, and so on. And simultaneously France is no longer the one great centre of innovation in this profession. I think we are now living in a state of polycentrism. What goes on in Princeton or in Berkeley and in other places is just as significant as what goes on in Paris. Let me give an example. Roger Chartier, I think, is a very gifted historian, one of the most interesting historians in his generation. He is innovating and he identifies with the Annales-tradition. But he does not innovate any more than Carlo Ginzburg in Bologna, than Natalie Zemon Davis in Princeton, or than the group of people around *Representations* in Berkeley.<sup>30</sup> In that sense the Annales-movement is over.

**A final question about these recent developments in historiography. You are the editor of a book called *New perspectives on historical writing*.<sup>31</sup> The word perspective is written in plural. Does this mean you do not see any general development in contemporary historical writing, no central tendency?**

I think there are several paradigms and that was one reason why I thought it would be better to have a book with some ten essays. I think the author of one essay will not necessarily agree with any of the others. And I think that is good.

**There is no chapter in the book on economic history.**

There *was* a *new* economic history, but I think it is now an *old* new economic history, that is the attempt to measure GNP in the past, the quantitative revolution associated with Fogel and Conrad. What I think is replacing it is so different that probably it should not be called economic history at all. On one side people are moving from the history of production to the history of consumption, for example the Brewer, Plumb, McKendrick group writing on the history of commercialization, looking at this process from the point of view of buyers and consumers.<sup>32</sup> Then on the other side you have people who are interested not in industries so much as in the whole environment. What I think is coming is some kind of eco-history. Some very distinguished contributions have already been made, I think above all of William Cronon's book on changes in the land in New England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>33</sup> But I think that because of these two exciting movements the steam has gone out of economic history. 'Economic history' is not the best label for these new movements. Would you agree?

**I do. I do not see any general, nor any exciting developments in what we used to call 'economic history'.**

I was interested to read that relatively new book by Donald Coleman, somebody whose whole career has been in economic history, who says, sadly I think, it is declining.<sup>34</sup> He says he wishes it were not, but he admits the steam has gone out of it.

**But is it not 'dangerous' to history as a human science - or at least remarkable to have to admit it - that so important an aspect of human life as economics is no longer a serious object of historical study?**

If we would lose interest in material life altogether, that would be terrible. But what I think is happening, is something different. The economic is integrated in a much bigger unit so that we are now talking about material culture and the relation between human beings and the physical environment. I think I am a good enough Annales-person to welcome this. We are heading for a more global history.

**But then, is there not still the necessity of studying the traditional subjects of economic history?**

Yes, but as a part of a bigger whole. So that can go on, but it is not new. And what

is new and important, will not fit the old category 'economic history'. I have not been saying any of the time that the traditional forms of history should disappear but only that they have to be supplemented by these new forms. I still believe that political narrative has some place, we should not throw it out. What was good is that we stopped it being dominant.

**You are right. I think the 'old' Annales, especially Braudel, overreacted in their war against 'histoire événementielle' which they identified with political history.**

I agree, but he never reacted as strongly as people said he did. He was always interested in events, but he simply said they do not change the structures, they are merely a good way to understand them. I think that was not enough. I think it is interesting that when Braudel talked about events he always quoted the battle of Lepanto or something from the sixteenth century, but did not talk about 1789, 1914-1918, let alone 1939-1945.

**I read an interview in which he plays down the importance of even these events - even of the atomic bomb! - because as he puts it 'in the long run life has the upperhand and not death'.<sup>35</sup>**

I am more impressed by the arguments of people like Jurgen Kocka and Arthur Marwick to the effect that as an accelerator of social change in certain countries in Europe the First World War was of crucial importance. It marked the real end of the Ancien Regime.<sup>36</sup>

## Noten

1. P. Burke, *Tradition and innovation in Renaissance Italy: a sociological approach* (Londen 1974). Het betreft hier een herziene uitgave van P. Burke, *Culture and society in Renaissance Italy, 1420-1540* (Londen 1972). Van het eerst genoemde boek bestaat ook een Nederlandse versie getiteld *De Italiaanse Renaissance* (Amsterdam 1988).
2. P. Burke, *The Renaissance* (Houndmills 1987). Ook van dit boek bestaat een Nederlandse versie getiteld *De Renaissance* (Nijmegen 1989).
3. P. Burke, *Sociology and history* (Londen 1980) 105.
4. F. Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II* 2 delen (2e herziene en uitgebreide druk; Parijs 1966); E. Le Roy Ladurie, *Les paysans de Languedoc*. 2 delen (Parijs 1966); W. McNeill, *Europe's steppe frontier* (Chicago 1964); N. Wachtel, *La vision des vaincus: les Indiens du Pérou devant la conquête espagnole, 1530-1570* (Parijs 1971).
5. Burke, *Sociology and history*, 32

6. P. Burke, *Popular culture in early modern Europe* (Londen 1978). Van dit boek bestaat ook een Nederlandse versie getiteld *Volkscultuur in Europa 1500-1800* (Amsterdam 1990).
7. P. Burke, 'Cultural history. Past, present and future', *Theoretische Geschiedenis* 13 (1986) 187-196.
8. Burke, *Popular culture*, de hoofdstukken 8 en 9.
9. Zie noot 6.
10. Burke verwijst hier naar M. Ingram, *Church courts, sex and marriage in England 1570-1640* (Cambridge 1987).
11. P. Burke, *The historical anthropology of early modern Italy* (Cambridge 1987) 3-4. Ook van dit boek bestaat een Nederlandse versie getiteld *Stadscultuur in Italië tussen Renaissance en Barok* (Amsterdam 1988).
12. Zie voor dergelijke kritiek bijvoorbeeld de literatuur genoemd in P.H.H. Vries, *Vertellers op drift. Een verhandeling over de nieuwe verhalende geschiedenis* (Hilversum 1990) 52-57.
13. Dit boek is op dit moment nog niet afgerond en de titel ervan is nog niet bekend.
14. Zie voor 'theoretische' bespiegelingen van Geertz over de aard van de menswetenschappen in het algemeen en de antropologie in het bijzonder C. Geertz, *The interpretation of cultures. Selected essays* (New York 1973); idem, *Local knowledge; further essays in interpretive anthropology* (New York 1983) en idem, *Works and lives. The anthropologist as author* (Stanford 1988). Voor een kennismaking met de ideeën van Bourdieu zie D. Pels, ed., *Pierre Bourdieu. Opstellen over smaak, habitus en het veldbegrip* (Amsterdam 1989).
15. Burke verwijst hier naar C. Geertz, *Agricultural involution. The process of ecological change in Indonesia* (3e druk; Berkeley 1968).
16. Zie noot 14.
17. Deze opmerking van Burke staat in Burke, 'Cultural history', 197.
18. Zie het interview met Burke door K. van Lierop in *Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 11, 3 (1984) 578-586, aldaar 582.
19. Zie voor een toelichting Burke, 'Cultural history', 190-191.
20. Deze vraag werd ook reeds aan Keith Thomas gesteld. Zie voor Thomas' antwoord *Leidschrift* 6, 2 (1990) 103-105.
21. M. de Certeau, *L'Invention du quotidien* (Parijs 1980). Deze publikatie bestaat uit twee delen. De Certeau schreef alleen deel I, *Arts de faire plus* de inleiding van deel 2. Dat deel getiteld *Habiter, cuisinier*, is geschreven door L. Girard en P. Mayol. De Certeau's, *Arts de faire* verscheen in het Engels onder de titel *The practice of everyday life* (Berkeley 1984).
22. P. Burke, 'St. Dominics: an ethnographic note on a Cambridge college', *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* nummer 70 (1987) 74-77. Burke schrijft hier onder het pseudoniem William Dell; idem, 'Emmanuel: Zur Ethnographie eines College in Cambridge', *Freibeuter* 30 (1986) 3-20. Het betreft hier zoals gezegd een Duitse vertaling (door Robin Cakket) van het voornoemde artikel.
23. Zie voor Burke als 'empiricist' bijvoorbeeld het debat tussen Burke en Löfgren in *Sociologisch Tijdschrift*, 11,3 (1984) 561-577, aldaar 564.

24. S. Schama, *The embarrassment of riches* (Londen 1987). Een Nederlandse vertaling verscheen onder de titel *Overvloed en onbehagen. De Nederlandse cultuur in de Gouden Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1988).
25. Burke verwijst hier naar zijn bespreking in de *London Review of Books* 12 november 1987, 13-14. Zie voor de gewraakte interpretatie Schama, *The embarrassment of riches*, 291. Het betreft een interpretatie van een schilderij van Ludolf de Jonghe.
26. Dat Burke zichzelf als als fellow-traveller van de Annales heeft aangeduid, vermeldt hij zelf in zijn *The French historical revolution. The Annales school 1929-89* (Cambridge 1990) 4.
27. Burke doelt hier op Febvre's aanpak in diens *Le problème de l'incroyance au 16e siècle. La religion de Rabelais* (Parijs 1942).
28. Voor Mandrou's aanpak zie bijvoorbeeld zijn *Magistrats et sorciers en France au XVIIe siècle; une analyse de psychologie historique* (Parijs 1968) en zijn *Introduction à la France moderne (1500-1640): essai de psychologie historique* (2e herziene druk; Parijs 1974). Dat onder Annales-historici wel degelijk zeer lang de neiging heeft bestaan - en wellicht nog steeds bestaat - om het begrip mentaliteit een sterk collectieve connotatie te geven blijkt bijvoorbeeld in J. Le Goff, 'Les mentalités; une histoire ambiguë' in: J. Le Goff en P. Nora, ed., *Faire de l'histoire* (Parijs 1974) drie delen, III 76-94. Voor een kritiek op een dergelijke collectivistische en vaak ook 'deterministische' visie op mentaliteiten in kringen van Annales-historici, zie M.A. Gismondi, 'The gift of theory'; a critique of the histoire des mentalités', *Social History* 10 (1985) 211-230 en S. Clark, 'French historians and early modern popular culture', *Past and Present* nummer 100 (1983) 62-99.
29. Burke, *French historiographical revolution*.
30. Het tijdschrift *Representations* waarvan in 1983 het eerste nummer verscheen, wordt uitgegeven door de University of California Press, Berkely. De inhoud ervan bestaat vooral uit artikelen op het terrein van de cultuurgeschiedenis in de ruimste zin des woords met een sterke nadruk op de intellectuele geschiedenis, de kunstgeschiedenis en de literatuurgeschiedenis. Meer nog dan door de onderwerpkeuze wordt het gekenmerkt door de gehanteerde aanpak. Die is zeer 'narratief-interpretatief'.
31. P. Burke ed., *New perspectives on historical writing* (Cambridge 1991).
32. Zie voor deze benadering bijvoorbeeld: N. McKendrick, J. Brewer en J.H. Plumb, *The birth of a consumer society: the commercialization of eighteenth-century England* (Londen 1983).
33. W. Cronon, *Changes in the land: Indians, colonists and the ecology of New England* (New York 1983).
34. Burke verwijst hier naar D. Coleman, *History and the economic past: an account of the rise and decline of economic history in Britain* (Oxford/New York 1987).
35. Zie voor deze uitspraak het interview dat F. Backus en H. Bootsma Braudel afnamen voor *NRC-Handelsblad* 30-7-1983. Zaterdag Bijvoegsel, 3.
36. Zie bijvoorbeeld: J. Kocka, *Klassengesellschaft im Krieg: Deutsche Sozialgeschichte, 1914-1918* (2e herziene en uitgebreide druk; Göttingen 1978) en A. Marwick, *War and social change in the twentieth century: a comparative study of Britain, France, Germany, Russia and the United States* (Londen 1974).