

Radway, Robyn; Grusiecki, Tomasz; Born, Robert; Ivanič, Suzanna; Noyes, Ruth
Sargent ; Pevny, Olenka

Globalizing early modern central and eastern European art : a discussion forum

Art East Central. 2022, vol. [2], iss. 2, pp. 11-47

ISSN 2695-1428 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/AEC2022-2-2>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/digilib.76698>

License: [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Access Date: 28. 11. 2024

Version: 20221007

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Globalizing Early Modern Central and Eastern European Art: A Discussion Forum

Robyn Radway (radwayr@ceu.edu)

Central European University, Vienna

Tomasz Grusiecki (tomaszgrusiecki@boisestate.edu)

Boise State University, Boise Idaho

Robert Born (robert.born@bkge.uni-oldenburg.de)

Federal Institute for Culture and History of the Germans in Eastern Europe (BKGE), University of Oldenburg

Suzanna Ivanič (s.ivanic@kent.ac.uk)

University of Kent

Ruth Sargent Noyes (ruth.sargent.noyes@natmus.dk)

National Museum of Denmark

Olenka Pevny (ozp20@cam.ac.uk)

University of Cambridge

Abstract

The following **roundtable** is the result of a conversation between six scholars who met in the summer of 2021 to share their views on the challenges and opportunities associated with tracing and popularizing central and eastern Europe's global and transcultural histories with a focus on early modern art and material culture. The topics addressed include the long tradition of studying art from a global perspective in the region, groups of objects ripe for reinterpretation, preferred methodologies, and the unique contributions scholars of the region are poised to make to the global turn.

Keywords

The global turn; transnational; transcultural; decentering art history; decolonializing art history; historiography; methodology

<https://doi.org/10.5817/AEC2022-2-2>

Globalizing Early Modern Central and Eastern European Art: A Discussion Forum

Robyn Radway et al.

Introduction

In recent years, global approaches to the study of art and material culture have gained momentum, particularly in Anglo-American academia. An increasing number of scholars of central and eastern Europe are embracing this newly expanded purview by integrating comparative and transcultural methods into their research and teaching. The new approach is nonetheless still awaiting wider recognition from the incipient field of central and eastern European Art History, particularly for histories of the early modern period. Elsewhere, the global turn led to new transgeographical perspectives which have begun to challenge the once-dominant national paradigm in various art-historical traditions. The question remains, however, how to meaningfully include central and eastern Europe in the discipline's ongoing explorations of cultural heterogeneity and global circulations of artefacts, and—more importantly—whether other scholars have anything new to learn about these processes from the study of the region. Of equal concern are the repercussions of this transcultural inquiry into central and eastern Europe's past on the region's more recent history, often read through the prism of modern ethno-nationalism and cultural uniformity.

To probe the ways historians of early modern central and eastern European art might productively engage with the global turn and increase the visibility of the region's diverse material and visual cultures in the English-language academe, a group of pioneers of this emerging field, **Robert Born** (BKGE Oldenburg), **Tomasz Grusiecki** (Boise State University), **Suzanna Ivanič** (University of Kent), **Ruth Sargent Noyes** (National Museum of Denmark), **Olenka Pevny** (University of Cambridge), and **Robyn Radway** (Central European University), met on 23 July 2021 to share their views on the challenges and opportunities associated with tracing and popularizing central and eastern Europe's global and transcultural histories. What follows is an edited version of this conversation. The questions were posed, recorded, and redacted by Grusiecki and Radway.

QUESTION 1:

There is a sense that historians of Western European maritime empires fit in more naturally with the global turn given the increased movement of people, goods, and capital within the trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific colonial frameworks. Since central and eastern Europe did not participate in early modern capitalism on equal terms with these supra-continental polities, what can be done to secure the region's inclusion in the global narratives in the future? How have historians of the region's art incorporated it in global narratives in the past?

[R. BORN] Linking global concerns in historical and art-historical studies predominantly with Western European maritime powers is a relatively recent development. What needs pointing out is, on the one hand, the distinctive ethno-confessional mosaic that had evolved over the centuries in central and eastern Europe, and, on the other hand, the long-standing tradition of addressing the diverse artistic legacies in the region. Georg Vasold has recently foregrounded the role of Austria-Hungary around the middle of the nineteenth century in opening up the discipline to non-European impulses, pointing to, among others, the 1837 study *Aus dem Tagebuch eines in Grossbritannien reisenden Ungarns* (From the Diary of a Hungarian Travelling in Britain) published in Pest by Ferenc Pulszky (1814-1897), who was probably the first scholar to use the term *Weltkunst* (World Art).¹ In addition to the terminological novelty of his study, Pulszky also criticized the notion of canon established by Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768), and addressed the unresolved historical relationship between European and Asian art. In the imperial capital Vienna, prominent figures such as Franz Wickhoff (1853-1909) and Alois Riegl (1858-1905), were asking similar questions, particularly concerning entanglements between European and Asian art.² Riegl spoke of a 'Hellenistic-Roman world art', which he saw as the result of a permanent exchange between the Orient and the Occident.³ In the studies written in the wake of the 1891 Vienna exhibition of 'Oriental carpets', Riegl became a pioneer in the study of the rugs preserved in Transylvanian churches, which rank among the most important examples of luxury objects from Anatolia fully integrated into early modern European culture.⁴

Josef Strzygowski (1862-1941), deemed the 'Attila of Art History' by his rivals, was a particularly divisive figure, who nonetheless remains important for the global study of art. Although between 1909 and 1933 he held the first Chair in Art History at the University of Vienna, Julius von Schlosser who chaired the second Art History department consequently pushed him to the margins of the Vienna School of Art History. Strzygowski's anti-Semitic and strongly

1) See Georg Vasold, 'Pulszky, Böhm und Eitelberger. Die Anfänge der Weltkunstforschung in Wien um 1840,' in Eva Kernbauer et al., eds, *Rudolf Eitelberger von Edelberg: Netzwerker der Kunstwelt*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2019, 137-53, here 143-9.

2) Franz Wickhoff, 'Über die historische Einheit der gesamten Kunstentwicklung,' in Max Dvořák, ed, *Die Schriften Franz Wickhoffs*, II, Berlin: Meyer & Jessen, 1913, 81-91. See also Craig Clunas, 'The Art of Global Comparisons,' in Maxine Berg, ed., *Writing the History of the Global: Challenges for the 21st Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 165-76, here 167-8.

3) Alois Riegl, *Stilfragen: Grundlegung zu einer Geschichte der Ornamentik*, Berlin: Georg Siemens, 1893, 18; Vasold, 'Pulszky, Böhm und Eitelberger,' 139-40.

4) Alois Riegl, *Altorientalische Teppiche*, Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1891; Ágnes Ziegler and Frank-Thomas Ziegler, *Gott zu Ehren und der löblichen Zunft zur Zierde und Gebrauch: Die osmanischen Teppiche der Schwarzen Kirche*, Kronstadt: Foton, 2019.

polemical texts, and especially his endorsement of National Socialism in his later work, eventually prompted a *damnatio memoriae* that lasted for several decades. Against the background of recent criticism of the Eurocentric perspective of the discipline, proposals however have repeatedly been made for a new reading of his work, first and foremost of the *Krisis der Geisteswissenschaft* (Crisis of the Humanities). In it, inspired by comparative linguistics, he outlined the agenda for a global history of art, which was meant to materialize with the establishment of a research institute somewhere in Central Europe, with branches in Tehran and Beijing.⁵ While it remained an unfulfilled idea, Strzygowski's Viennese students played an important role in the development of art history in central and eastern Europe, as well as the promotion of Persian, Armenian, Turkish, and Indian art.⁶ In this respect, the 'discovery' of our region and its formative role in shaping art history is thus also part of the discovery of the discipline's global legacy.

[T. GRUSIECKI] Strzygowski's reprehensible politics aside, I agree that we often fail to celebrate scholars from the region who pioneered transcultural narratives. A Polish example can illustrate the point. Although it is sometimes seen as a methodological laggard when compared to North America and Western Europe, it is important to emphasize that in many ways the historiography of Polish art had been shaped by interest in transcultural narratives long before the global turn gained momentum in Anglo-American art history. Thus it is admittedly somewhat misleading to claim to 'introduce' early modern Poland to this discourse, for already in the 1900s Polish scholars were considering the effects of the region's proximity to the Ottoman Empire and its consequences for local self-perceptions.⁷ The most notable contributions have been those by the historian of art and culture Tadeusz Mańkowski (1878–1956) who was among the first to study the impact of Ottoman and Persian costume, textiles, and metalwork on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Polish ways of life. He claimed, for example, that Old Poland

5) Josef Strzygowski, *Die Krisis der Geisteswissenschaften vorgeführt am Beispiele der Forschung über bildende Kunst. Ein grundsätzlicher Rahmenversuch*, Vienna: Schroll, 1923. Cf. Ulrich Pfisterer, 'Origins and principles of world art history: 1900 (and 2000),' in Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme, eds, *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, Amsterdam: Valiz, 2008, 69–89, here 80–2; Joachim Rees, 'Vergleichende Verfahren – verfahrenre Vergleiche. Kunstgeschichte als komparative Kunstwissenschaft – eine Problemskizze,' *Kritische Berichte*, 40: 2, 2012, 32–47, here 37–8.

6) Ivan Foletti and Francesco Lovino, eds, *Orient oder Rom? History and Reception of a Historiographical Myth (1901–1970)*, Rome: Viella, 2018; Piotr Otto Scholz and Magdalena Anna Długosz, eds, *Von Biala nach Wien. Josef Strzygowski und die Kunstwissenschaften: Akten der internationalen wissenschaftlichen Konferenzen zum 150. Geburtstag von Josef Strzygowski in Bielsko-Biala, 29.–31. März 2012*, Vienna: European University Press, 2015; Nenad Makuljević, 'The political reception of the Vienna School: Josef Strzygowski and Serbian Art History,' *Journal of Art Historiography* 8, 2013; Oya Pancaroğlu, 'Formalism and the Academic Foundation of Turkish Art in the Early Twentieth Century,' *Muqarnas* 24, 2007, 67–78; Georg Vasold, 'The Reevaluation of Art History: an Unfinished Project by Josef Strzygowski and his School,' in Pauline Bachmann et al., eds, *Art/Histories in Transcultural Dynamics*, Leiden: Fink, 2017, 119–38; Kris Manjappa, *Age of Entanglement: German and Indian Intellectuals across Empire*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014, 239–46; Julia Orell, 'Early East Asian Art History in Vienna and its Trajectories: Josef Strzygowski, Karl With, and Alfred Salmons,' *Journal of Art Historiography*, 13, 2015, n.p.; Karl Johns, 'The Long Shadow of Emmy Wellesz: with a Translation of her "Buddhist Art in Bactria and Gandhāra",' *Journal of Art Historiography* 19, 2018, n.p.; Jo Ziebritzki, *Stella Kramrisch: Kunsthistorikerin zwischen Europa und Indien. Ein Beitrag zur Depatriarchalisierung der Kunstgeschichte*, Marburg: Büchner-Verlag, 2021.

7) Władysław Łoziński, *Patrycjat i mieszczaństwo lwowskie w XVI i XVII wieku*, Lviv: Księgarnia H. Altenberga, 1902; Beata Biedrońska-Słota, 'The History of Polish Studies on Islamic Art and the History of the Artistic Relations between Poland and the Islamic Countries,' in Jerzy Malinowski, ed., *History of Art: History in Central, Eastern, and South-Eastern Europe*, I, Toruń: Society of Modern Art, 2012, 273–80.

(and the wider Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in general) ‘became the territory where East and West met, where their cultural and artistic influences came into touch and intermingled very often creating new, mediate forms of an interesting and peculiar kind’.⁸ He went as far as to assert that Poles ‘looked to the East as the cradle of their nation.’⁹ Such transcultural approach *avant la lettre* is often neglected from reflection on central and eastern European art history, giving the false impression of the region’s unfettered attachment to nationalist scholarship.

[R. BORN] Even nationalist scholarship may be seen through a transcultural lens, most notably in Hungary. Several private as well as government-sponsored expeditions departed towards Central Asia from that country. Among the state-sponsored projects was a survey of the history of art published by the Hungarian Ministry of Education. Its second volume featured an extensive chapter on Islamic art written by Max (Miksa) Herz Bey (1856-1919), a Hungarian-born architect serving as director of the Arab Museum in Cairo and chief architect of the Commission for the Preservation of Monuments of Arab Art, in which role he became a key protagonist in the creation of a Mamluk revivalist style.¹⁰ Another important state-led initiative was the short-lived Hungarian Research Institute in Constantinople, where between 1916 and 1918 studies were conducted on Byzantine-Hungarian and Ottoman-Hungarian relations.¹¹ The Institute also published several important contributions by both Hungarian and foreign scholars, including Heinrich Glück’s (1889-1930) examinations of Turkish art. All this may be seen as global art history *avant la lettre*.

[R. RADWAY] The second half of the twentieth century was, in many ways, a century of forgetting. Many traditions that existed before Communism became inaccessible for international scholars. This includes the innovative products of local historiography and the objects of analysis themselves. The 1990s were an era of rediscovery for those intrepid enough to tackle the linguistic variety and nationalist scholarship to search for ideas and artworks. This process of ‘rediscovery’ is ongoing. Of course, local scholars were often keenly aware of the potential of their traditions to disrupt broader narratives on Renaissance art, but they did not always have the means or the vocabularies to do so.

[R. BORN] An interesting facet of the process of rediscovery mentioned by Robyn is the work by scholars from central and eastern Europe produced between 1945 and 1989. Certainly, the official internationalism of the Communist regimes in the region led to scholarship which may be seen as less Eurocentric as that of the Western world.¹² The region’s scholars were also active participants in the congresses organized by the International Committee of the History of Art

8) Tadeusz Mańkowski, ‘Influence of Islamic Art in Poland,’ *Ars Islamica*, 2:1, 1935, 92–117, here 93.

9) Tadeusz Mańkowski, *Genealogia sarmatyzmu*, Warsaw: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze Łuk, 1947, 97.

10) Miksa Herz Bey, ‘Az iszlám művészete,’ Zsolt Beöthy, ed., *A művészetek története a legrégebbi időktől a XIX. század végéig*, II, Budapest: Lampel R., 1907, 108–262.

11) Gábor Tóth, ‘Az első külföldi magyar tudományos intézet,’ *Századok*, 129: 1-6, 1995, 1380–94.

12) Antje Kempe, Marina Dmitrieva and Beáta Hock, eds, *Universal – International – Global. Art Historiographies of Socialist Eastern Europe*, Vienna: Böhlau, 2022 (in press).

(CIHA).¹³ Here I would like to draw attention to the activities of Lajos Vayer (1913–2001) and Jan Białostocki (1921–1988), both of whom held leading positions in the CIHA from the late 1960s onward. At the congress in Budapest in 1969, chaired by Vayer, the discussion focused on the critical reassessment of Western art and culture and its alleged centrality, including vis-à-vis regions such as (East) Central Europe, which was taken into consideration for the first time as an independent artistic region.¹⁴ Białostocki's role was critical in this regard, particularly following the publication of his *Art of the Renaissance in Eastern Europe* (1976).¹⁵ Equally important were Białostocki's contributions to the congresses in Bologna (1979) and Washington, DC (1986).¹⁶ In his Washington lecture, 'Some Values of Artistic Periphery', drawing on George Kubler's work on Latin America, Białostocki emphasized the innovative potential of central and eastern Europe by situating it in a wider global perspective.¹⁷

[O. PEVNY] While I agree that a transgeographical interest already informs the historiography of early modern central and eastern European art historical studies, I take issue with the phrasing of the posed question. I do not see the global turn in early modern studies as confined to European imperial expansionism. The early modern growth of extended trade, commerce, and exchange between European empires and their colonies is only one aspect of study in the global turn of historical studies. For me, an art historian of Eastern Europe, the global turn is first and foremost a call to look at the early modern world from a perspective that problematizes the imposition of hard boundaries, and especially modern national boundaries, on pre-modern culture. Exposing the relativism of such dichotomies as 'centre' and 'periphery' or 'inclusion' and 'exclusion', the global turn beckons a levelling of the playing field in cultural and historical studies. It compels us to reckon with the historical presence of visual culture beyond the framework of canonical centres and ancillary peripheries; to recognize that the monuments of Cracow are not just pale imitations of those in Rome, and that monuments of L'viv are not just feeble replicas of those in Cracow. It holds that the primary significance of visual sources is contextually determined, and that difference is not inevitably a marker of value. In deconstructing the dichotomy of centre and periphery, the global turn moves beyond identifying directional transmissions of influence to the study of the connectivity and fissures of networks that result in endless cultural discourses and contingent interaction which habitually produce new situational identities and landscapes.

Central and eastern Europe already are an integral part of the global narrative and there is no need to frame our research in accordance with the imperatives of trans-Atlantic or trans-Pa-

13) Jennifer Cooke, 'CIHA as the Subject of Art Theory: The Methodological Discourse in the International Congresses of Art History from Post-War Years to the 2000s,' *RIHA Journal*, 0199, 2018, n. p.

14) Cf. Robert Born, 'Commentary on the English translation of Lajos Vayer's *Allgemeine Entwicklung und regionale Entwicklungen in der Kunstgeschichte – Situation des Problems in Mitteleuropa*,' in Kempe, Dmitrieva and Hock, eds, *Universal – International – Global* (in press).

15) Jan Białostocki, *The Art of the Renaissance in Eastern Europe: Hungary, Bohemia, Poland*, London: Phaidon, 1976.

16) Jan Białostocki, 'A comparative history of world art, is it possible?' in Lajos Vayer, ed, *Problemi di metodo*, 207–16. See also Jan Bakoš, 'Jan Białostocki and Center-Periphery Problem,' in Magdalena Wróblewska, ed, *Białostocki. Materiały z Seminarium Metodologicznego Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki 'Jan Białostocki – między tradycją a innowacją*,' Warsaw: Stowarzyszenie Historyków Sztuki, 2009, 63–75.

17) Jan Białostocki, 'Some Values of Artistic Periphery,' in Irvin Lavin, ed, *World Art. Themes of Unity in Diversity. Acts of the XXVIth International Congress of the History of Art, Washington D.C. 1986*, I, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989, 49–54.

cific powers. In his preface to *The Location of Culture*, Homi Bhabha suggests that globalisation begins at home, and that the global progress of a nation can be evaluated by its dealing with ‘the difference within’ – ‘the rights and representations of minorities in the regional domain’.¹⁸ The cultural hegemonies of central and eastern Europe, the fluctuating perspectives on who and/or what constitutes a nation, social degree, confession, military unit, and who and/or what is excluded, are salient topics to the understanding of the processes of globalisation.

[T. GRUSIECKI] The point that globalisation begins at home is well supported by historical evidence from the region, and this certainly includes Olenka’s and my own subfield, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The merchants and nobility of this vast polity were not living in an isolated outpost, off the map; they in fact participated actively in the increasingly global economic system of early modernity, even if only from the edges.¹⁹ Danzig (Gdańsk), the largest city in the eastern Baltic and an important seaport serving both Prussia and the Polish interior, was particularly well placed to benefit from early global capitalism, as a point of entry for American, African, and Asian goods arriving in the region via Amsterdam.²⁰ Research on the implications of Dutch colonial trade for Polish-Lithuanian identities and lifestyles is still in its early stages, and we need a clearer picture of this impact before reaching any conclusions about Poland-Lithuania’s association with Dutch colonial networks.²¹ But certainly to claim that early modern central and eastern Europe was detached from European expansion and colonialism is becoming increasingly untenable.²² We, of course, know a great deal more about the Commonwealth’s ties with the Ottoman Empire as garments of silk, weapons, and carpets flowing into the region from this direction have been studied for over a century.²³ Of other possible routes, links with Muscovy, Crimea, and Persia, but also the operations of Armenian, Jewish, Greek, and Italian diasporas have been methodically examined, and some of this research is available in English.²⁴ Persian textiles, Ottoman metalwork, Muscovite

18) Homi Bhabha, ‘Preface to the Routledge Classics Edition: Looking Back, Moving Forward: Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism,’ *The Location of Culture*, New York: Routledge, 1994, xv.

19) Witold Kula, *An Economic Theory of the Feudal System: Towards a Model of the Polish Economy, 1500-1800*, London: NLB, 1976; Dariusz Żiemelis, *Feudalism or Peripheral Capitalism?: Socio-Economic History of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th to 18th Centuries*, Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2011.

20) Teresa Grzybkowska, *Artyści i patrycjusze Gdańska*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 1996.

21) See J.G. van Dillen, *Mensen en achtergronden: Studies uitgegeven ter gelegenheid van de tachtigste jaardag van de schrijver*, Groningen: Wolters, 1964, 470–71; Milja van Tielhof, *The ‘Mother of All Trades’: The Baltic Grain Trade in Amsterdam From the Late 16th to the Early 19th Century*, Leiden: Brill, 2002, 4.

22) See Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, ‘The Export of Silver Coin Through the Polish-Ottoman Border and the Problem of the Balance of Trade,’ *Turcica*, 28, 1996, 105–16.

23) Konstancja Stępowka, ‘Polskie dywany wełniane,’ *Sprawozdania Komisji do Badania Historii Sztuki w Polsce*, 8: 3/4, 1912, 352–71.

24) Tadeusz Mańkowski, ‘Some Documents from Polish Sources Relating to Carpet Making in the Time of Shāh Abbās I,’ Arthur Upham Pope, ed., *A Survey of Persian Art*, VI, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938, 2431–36; Francis W. Carter, *Trade and Urban Development in Poland: An Economic Geography of Cracow, from Its Origins to 1795*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006; Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania: International Diplomacy on the European Periphery (15th-18th Century)*, Leiden: Brill, 2011; Wojciech Tygielski, *Italians in Early Modern Poland: The Lost Opportunity for Modernization?*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2015; Michał Kopczyński and Wojciech Tygielski, eds, *Under a Common Sky: Ethnic Groups of the Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania*, New York: PIASA Books, 2017; Alexandr Osipian, ‘Between Mercantilism, Oriental Luxury, and the Ottoman Threat: Discourses on the Armenian Diaspora in the Early Modern Kingdom of Poland,’ *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 116, 2017, 171–207.

pelts, and other Eurasian commodities were used enthusiastically by the inhabitants of Poland-Lithuania, becoming part and parcel of their daily lives.²⁵

What emerges from this picture is the level of cultural entanglement comparable in scope to the processes taking place in Western European metropolises and their colonies. But while mainstream ‘global’ art history is programmed to pay attention to colonial, and increasingly also to Eastern Mediterranean cultural exchanges, Poland-Lithuania opens up another direction of inquiry: art objects and cultural forms arriving in Europe from places as remote as Siberia and Persia, but via the continental routes cutting through Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire, often with a heavy presence of networks ran by the minorities inhabiting the Commonwealth. Embedded in noncolonial, though often similarly exploitative contexts (i.e. serfdom, Black Sea slavery, the nobility’s dominance over other social groups), the region is necessary to fully understand early modern globalism. By bringing forth new case studies, previously unknown sources, and otherwise ignored regional perspectives, we will not only make our own burgeoning field more visible, but—in doing so—might also be building a powerful platform from which to shape the future of art history as a whole.

[S. IVANIČ] As Ulrike Strasser notes for Germany, without the obvious imperial routes into global history, the historian of central and eastern Europe needs to look for ‘new entry points’.²⁶ I would argue that art and, more broadly, material and visual culture provide a rich seam of evidence for the global character of this non-maritime region. Objects and images clearly attest to its flows and connections in the early modern period such as the existence of items like a lapis lazuli rosary made for Rudolf II in Prague (c. 1600) or a collection of rings set with turquoise, emerald and ruby in the seventeenth-century inventory of a burgher. While Robert J. W. Evans and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann have explored these currents, there is still work to do to raise awareness and further examine these connections in both the fields of art history and history.²⁷ The green shoots of a much-needed refurbishment of Bohemian history as an exciting and connected region is most evident in two stunning exhibition catalogues from the past twenty-five years that showcase the material culture of Prague: Eliška Fučíková’s *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City* (1997) and Olga Fejtová’s *Barokní Praha—Barokní Čechie 1620–1740* (2004).

A material approach can counteract the nationalization of Czech history in the twentieth century, constructing a ‘national’ history around myths, language, and indigenous heroes.²⁸ This ‘nationalization’ of history has arguably served to isolate the territory from greater relevance beyond its borders and had a chilling effect. From the perspective of Anglophone stud-

25) Zdzisław Żygulski Jr., ‘The Impact of the Orient on the Culture of Old Poland,’ in Jan K. Ostrowski, ed., *Land of the Winged Horsemen: Art in Poland, 1572-1764*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999, 69–79; Dirk Uffelmann, ‘Importierte Dinge und imaginierte Identität: Osmanische “Sarmatica” im Polen der Aufklärung,’ *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung*, 65: 2, 2016, 193–214.

26) Renate Dürr, Ronnie Hsia, Carina Johnson, Ulrike Strasser and Merry Wiesner-Hanks, ‘Globalizing Early Modern German History,’ *German History*, 31: 3, 2013, 366–82.

27) See especially: Robert J. W. Evans, *Rudolf II and His World: A Study in Intellectual History, 1576–1612*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973; Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Court, Cloister & City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe 1450–1800*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1995.

28) Compare work on Ukrainian nationalized history: Georgiy Kasianov, ‘“Nationalized” History: Past Continuous, Present Perfect, Future...’ Georgiy Kasianov and Philipp Ther, eds, *A Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*, Budapest: Central European University Press, 2009, 7–23.

ies, at least, research on central and eastern Europe tends to be siloed off as ‘special interest’. An examination of material culture can help revitalize central and eastern Europe’s connections, but it is also important for historians of the region to find ways to make their work speak to broader audiences. In a recent forum of articles on ‘Global Prague: Renaissance and Reformation Crossroads’ (*Austrian History Yearbook*, Vol. 52, 2021), the contributing scholars see themselves not just as scholars of ‘Rudolfine Studies’ or historians of Prague, but as historians of religion, material culture, music, art and Jewish culture. We need to talk about the region’s connections, but we also need to connect our research with scholars beyond the region.

[R. BORN] A recent, and in my view very successful attempt to venture out beyond the region is the study of diplomatic exchanges between the Habsburg Empire, Poland-Lithuania, the Muscovite Empire, the Ottoman tributary states (Transylvania, Wallachia, and Moldavia), and the Sublime Porte.²⁹ Another example is the already-mentioned study of transimperial groups, such as the Jews, Greeks, or Armenians.³⁰ Sometimes there were overlaps between these groups, as in the case of the Karaim – also called Crimean Karaites. These were followers of a Jewish movement that accepted only the canon of the Hebrew Bible (Torah) as the supreme authority of law. The Karaim, like the Armenians living in Crimea, used Kipchak, the lingua franca of the Golden Horde. The Armeno-Kipchak language also assumed an important function in communication within the network of Armenian trading communities that stretched from Poland-Lithuania to the Indian subcontinent. The luxury goods (silks, carpets, and weapons) imported by Armenian merchants from the Persian Safavid Empire and the Ottoman Empire, as well as the textiles and military equipment produced in their factories and workshops in the south-eastern regions of Poland-Lithuania, fostered a material culture that combined West Asian and local components. It should also be noted that the largest legally protected Muslim population in Christian Europe, the Lipka Tatars, lived since the late Middle Ages in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. They were loyal subjects of the Grand Dukes while retaining connections with the Arabian Peninsula through pilgrimage.³¹

Moving on to other transcultural topics, the region was home to some of the earliest European networks of specialists in Oriental languages. The principality of Transylvania, which was an Ottoman tributary state, promoted the training of its own interpreters as early as the seventeenth century. In the second half of the eighteenth century, Poland established

29) Derya Ocak, *Gift and Purpose: Diplomatic Gift Exchange between the Ottomans and Transylvania during the Reign of István Báthory (1571–1576)*, Master’s thesis, Central European University Budapest, 2016; Robyn Radway, *Vernacular Diplomacy in Central Europe: Statesmen and Soldiers Between the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires, 1543–1593*, PhD Dissertation, Princeton University, 2017, <http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01m900nx07q>; Gábor Kármán, ‘Transylvanian Envoys at Buda: Provinces and Tributaries in Ottoman International Society,’ in Tracey A. Sowerby and Jan Hennings, eds, *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410–1800*, London: Routledge, 2017, 44–64; Michał Wasiucionek, *The Ottomans and Eastern Europe: Borders and Political Patronage in the Early Modern World*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2020; Hedda Reindl-Kiel, ‘Breads for the Followers, Silver Vessels for the Lord: The System of Distribution and Redistribution in the Ottoman Empire (16th–18th Centuries),’ *The Ottoman Studies Journal*, 17, 2013, 93–104.

30) Sushil Chaudhury and Kéram Kévonian, eds, *Les Arméniens dans le commerce asiatique au début de l’ère moderne / Armenians in Asian Trade in The Early Modern Era*, Paris: Maison des sciences de l’homme, 2008; Waldemar Deluga *Art of the Armenian Diaspora: Proceedings of the Conference, Zamość, 2010*. Warsaw: Polish Society of Oriental Art, 2011.

31) Michael Polczyński, ‘Seljuks on the Baltic: Polish-Lithuanian Muslim Pilgrims in the Court of Ottoman Sultan Süleyman I,’ *Journal of Early Modern History* 19: 5, 2015, 409–37; Paul K. Żygas, ‘The Muslim Tartars of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and their Architectural Heritage,’ *Centropa* 8:2, 2008, 124–33.

a language school for its diplomats in Istanbul.³² The specialists from central and eastern Europe working in this environment played an important role in the ‘translation of the Turk’ (Peter Burke’s term), that is, in the transfer of concepts and images of the Ottoman Empire to various European publics. A telling example is the Moldavian prince Demetrius Cantemir (1673-1723), who between 1687 and 1710 spent most of his time in Constantinople. Based on his knowledge of Oriental languages and Ottoman history that he acquired there, he later published a history of the Ottoman Empire, which received much attention in Western Europe. In the wake of his coup against the Ottomans and the subsequent exile in the Russian Empire, he prepared translations from Arabic, Persian, and Turkish for Tsar Peter the Great, and even suggested the establishment of the first printing press with Arabic type in Russia.³³ A somewhat opposite development can be seen in the case of Ibrahim Müteferrika. A Calvinist born in the Transylvanian town of Kolozsvár (Germ. Klausenburg, today Cluj-Napoca in Romania), he emigrated to the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of the eighteenth century, where he converted to Islam and founded the first Turkish printing press with Arabic type.³⁴

[R. S. NOYES] Moving north to the Baltic Sea takes us to another integrated and culturally heterogeneous cultural space, with diverse communities interconnected by trade, imperial expansion, immigration, and religion.³⁵ Numerous examples show how these dynamics can be excavated from distinct genres of textual, visual, and material early modern source materials. Take, for instance, Tuscan Grand Duke Cosimo III de’ Medici’s coronation portrait (c. 1670, Fig. 1), showing him enrobed in regalia marked by over seventy dangling black-tipped ermine tails. The presence of ermine in this portrayal is telling as, together with sable, it was intrinsically linked to the history of Western European relations with the Baltic, fuelled for centuries by trade in furs.³⁶

32) Gábor Kármán, ‘Translation at the Seventeenth-Century Transylvanian Embassy in Constantinople,’ Robert Born, and Andreas Puth, eds, *Osmanischer Orient und Ostmitteleuropa: Perzeptionen und Interaktionen in den Grenzzonen zwischen dem 16. und 18. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 2014, 253–77; Tadeusz Majda, ‘L’École polonaise des langues orientales d’Istanbul au XVIIIe siècle,’ in Frédéric Hitzel, ed., *Istanbul et les langues orientales*, Paris: L’Harmattan, 1997, 123–8.

33) Michiel Leezenberg, ‘The Oriental Origins of Orientalism. The Case of Dimitrie Cantemir,’ in Rens Bod, Jaap Maat and Thijs Weststeijn, eds, *The Making of the Humanities*, II, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012, 243–63.

34) Maurits H. van den Boogert, ‘The Sultan’s Answer to the Medici Press? Ibrahim Müteferrika’s printing House in Istanbul,’ in Alastair Hamilton and Bart Westerweel, eds, *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Leiden: Brill 2005, 265–92.

35) See recent studies including Krista Kodres and Merike Kurisoo, eds, *Art and the Church: Religious Art and Architecture in the Baltic Region in the 13th-18th Centuries*, Tallinn: Eesti Kunstiakadeemia, 2008; Michael North, *The Baltic: A History*, trans. Kenneth Kronenberg, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015; Carsten Selch Jensen, ed, *Saints and Sainthood Around the Baltic Sea: Identity, Literacy, and Communication in the Middle Ages*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2018; Nils Holger Petersen et al., eds, *Ora Pro Nobis: Space, Place and the Practice of Saints’ Cults in Medieval and Early-Modern Scandinavia and Beyond*, Copenhagen: National Museum of Denmark, 2019; Kristoffer Neville, *The Art and Culture of Scandinavian Central Europe, 1550–1720*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2019; Krista Kodres, Merike Kurisoo, and Ulrike Nürnberger, eds, *Indifferent Things? Objects and Images in Post-Reformation Churches in the Baltic Sea Region*, Petersberg: Imhof, 2020; Anu Mänd and Marek Tamm, eds, *Making Livonia: Actors and Networks in the Medieval and Early Modern Baltic Sea Region*, Milton: Taylor and Francis, 2020.

36) Janet Martin, *Treasure of the Land of Darkness: The Fur Trade and Its Significance for Medieval Russia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.



Figure 1: Baldassare Franceschini, Portrait of Cosimo III de' Medici. Oil on canvas, post 1670.

Source: Royal Castle in Warsaw, Poland. Photo: Public domain.

Ermine should also be understood in the context of contemporary exchanges between Cosimo and scions of the Polish-Lithuanian Pac family, who dominated politics in the Lithuanian Grand Duchy and during the 1670s dispatched from Vilnius to Florence gifts including live sables and ermine, other animal pelts, a ‘Turkish’ slave boy, and amber *devotionalia*.³⁷ This Italo-Baltic exchange, in turn, should be viewed against the background in Cosimo’s portrait depicting the so-called *Quattro Mori* (Four Moors) monument in the Tuscan slave and trading port of Livorno, where the Medici maintained thousands of mainly Muslim prisoners of war to power their galleys, and imported critical supplies of Baltic grain from primarily Poland-Lithuania.³⁸ Thus the Pac gifts of furs and human *spolia* gestured to Tuscany’s direct connection to and even dependence on the Baltic, and to early modern Italy’s culture of slavery, which was closely associated with Eastern Europe and Eurasia as a source of captives sold as slaves in Italy.³⁹ It also reified to propagandistic ends what both the Tuscan and Lithuanian grand duchies perceived as a common Muslim threat.⁴⁰ The amber entangled notions of Baltic maritime provenience, and the substance’s supposed origins in the Italian Po river valley of ancient Etruria, invented locus of the Medici and Pac dynasties.⁴¹ This creates a different narrative than the conventional pushing of the region to the margins of history. For much of the Baltic this region enters the (Western) written historical record as a colonial territory of the mediaeval crusades, which, among other things, consolidated the rise of a once pagan Lithuania into the ranks of a power to be reckoned with, and entangled the histories of Latvian and Estonian peoples with that of the Germans.⁴² Thus the region’s inclusion in the annals of Western history was concurrent to a movement to conquer it for Catholicism; dynamics repeated, from a different perspective, during the modern period of Soviet invasion and occupation.⁴³ This speaks to a broader long-term ‘othering’ of the area, which has served all different kinds of political, sociopolitical and cultural agendas, both interior and exterior.⁴⁴ I sometimes resist capitulating to calling it ‘Central and Eastern’ or something that looks like a qualification of Europe because it feels like surrendering to those mechanisms of othering, tacitly acknowledging their validity, while also contradicting the Baltic states’ self-determination to re-join Europe following the restoration of their independence in 1991.

37) On this exchange see the essay: Ruth Sargent Noyes, ‘“The Polar Winds Have Driven Me to the Conquest of the Treasure in the Form of the Much-Desired Relic” (Re)moving Relics and Performing Gift Exchange between Early Modern Tuscany and Lithuania,’ in Gustavs Strenge and Lars Kjar, eds, *Gifts and Materiality: Gifts as Objects in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, London: Bloomsbury, forthcoming.

38) For the monument and Livorno in this period see Mark Rosen, ‘Pietro Tacca’s Quattro Mori and the Conditions of Slavery in Early Seicento Tuscany,’ *The Art Bulletin*, 97: 1, 2015, 34–57.

39) Monica Boni and Robert Delort, ‘Des esclaves toscans, du milieu du XIVe au milieu du XVe siècle,’ *Mélanges de l’Ecole française de Rome*, 112: 2, 2000, 1057–77; Sally McKee, ‘Domestic Slavery in Renaissance Italy,’ *Slavery & Abolition*, 29: 3, 2008, 305–26.

40) Ariel Salzmann, ‘Migrants in Chains: On the Enslavement of Muslims in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe,’ *Religions*, 4: 3, 2013, 391–411.

41) Tomasz Grusiecki, ‘Foreign as Native: Baltic Amber in Florence,’ *World Art*, 7: 1, 2017, 3–36.

42) See e.g. Marek Tamm et al., eds, *Crusading and Chronicle Writing on the Medieval Baltic Frontier: a Companion to the Chronicle of Henry of Livonia*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.

43) Alan Murray, ed, *Crusade and Conversion on the Baltic Frontier 1150–1500*, London: Routledge, 2001.

44) The classic study remains Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe. The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.

[R. BORN] Adding to Ruth's point, several recent studies position central and eastern Europe within the framework of colonial history. They have addressed the long-known practice of enslaving various groups from the region in the Middle Ages and in the early modern period. Involved in this infamous business, alongside the Italian maritime republics of Genoa and Venice, were the Mamluk rulers of Egypt and, in their succession, the Ottomans.⁴⁵ The last phase in this trafficking is now in the focus of some of the projects conducted at the Bonn Centre for Dependency and Slavery Studies.⁴⁶ It seems to me that an engagement with central and eastern Europe also provides interesting conclusions for a number of developments that have so far largely been viewed through the lens of a West-East dichotomy, not least with reference to issues that have surfaced within the context of postcolonial studies.

[T. GRUSIECKI] As the global turn in art history emerged mainly in the context of the Anglo-American academe, it is not surprising that the geographical areas most typically represented (if not overrepresented) in the ongoing attempts to 'globalize' the discipline are those with an existing research and training infrastructure, often institutionally embedded in the world's leading universities, including the Ivies, Oxbridge, and the like. This means an increasing prominence of Latin America, the Atlantic World, the Indo-Pacific, the Eastern Mediterranean, and China, but only insofar as they are connected to Italy, Iberia, France, the Low Countries, Germany, and England, the polities conventionally studied by North American and Western European art historians. On a political level, the recent demands to diversify curricula made by, among others, students of Latin American descent, and the growing awareness of structural inequalities, including anti-Black racism, chauvinism towards Asian communities, and Islamophobia, all contribute to a gradually increasing inclusion of new areas in mainstream art history. In this respect, the global turn is a welcome development with a potential to open up and broaden the core of the discipline through contestations, stirrings, and deconstructions of preconceived concepts and theories.

In this context, the omission of central and eastern Europe from the list of global turn's beneficiaries may be explained by the dearth of institutional opportunities to study Slavic, Baltic, and Finno-Ugric languages in the West (particularly after the collapse of the Soviet Union), and the relative collective demobilization of central and eastern European diasporas (particularly in North America). There is nothing ominous about the region's exclusion from dominant art-historical narratives; note a similar leaving out of Scandinavia and Ireland. But whatever the reasons for its exclusion from the art-historical mainstream, the result is a shortage of English-language, French-language, and to a lesser extent also German-language publications on the region, causing a lack of critical mass for promoting and popularizing the still largely unknown art and culture of central and eastern Europe in the Euro-American academe. We must come up with actionable solutions to this conundrum so that the exclusion of the region from art-historical narratives does not become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

45) Hannah Barker, *That Most Precious Merchandise: The Mediterranean Trade in Black Sea Slaves, 1260–1500*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019.

46) Bonn Centre for Dependency and Slavery Studies, University of Bonn: <https://www.dependency.uni-bonn.de/en> (last accessed 15 June 2022).

[O. PEVNY] It is true that the global turn as it is represented in Western cultural-historical studies responds to the concerns and agendas of Anglo-American academe. It often seems that central and eastern European nations fall wayside in the context of current global priorities; their prolonged association with Soviet realities and their relative economic and military weakness complicate the conception of a united Europe. Moreover, while most Central European states now find themselves within the European Union, Eastern European nations, such as those within which my primary interest falls, Ukraine and Belarus, are concurrently trying to assert their national identities and respond to demands that would earn them a seat in the supra-national European Union. We must always keep in mind that globalization is not experienced equally; those who live in some of the lands we study, still very much find themselves to be side-lined in global discourses. The parameters of our engagement with the global turn in the study of the early modern central and eastern Europe must consider the current realities of the lands we study.

I agree with Robert and others, that we must be true to our sources and avoid appropriating methodologies and approaches simply to achieve recognition for our fields within the broader parameters of contemporary art historical scholarship. This does not mean that we should remain wayside of current scholarly trends, but rather that we should engage with them fittingly and selectively. I would also like to point out that while we are gathered here to speak specifically about the integration of central and eastern European material into the Anglo-American and European academic discourse, we all acknowledge that one of the ways to achieve this is by construing our research in terms of ideas and subjects that transgress political and regional boundaries. The question of what can be done to make materials and sources on central and eastern Europe accessible to a broader scholarly audience, is another matter. Here, I believe, our field is at a bit of a disadvantage in comparison to Western European studies. As Robyn has pointed out, this is not just an issue of the languages in which materials are written, but the fact that until thirty years ago, the existence of the Soviet Union prevented free academic exchange in central and eastern Europe. I think we will see a steady increase in the incorporation of Central and East European cultural production in global art historical studies. Our aim must be to produce the type of research that speaks across borders and to publish this research in journals, periodicals, and with presses that engage in scholarship that recognizes visual culture as an inter-contingent force that endlessly and indefinitely reverberates throughout the globe.

[R. RADWAY] One of the most important things historians of the region can do is take imperial claims of representational status seriously, even if this means going against nationally-oriented historiographical traditions. Empires were not just oppressive forces seeking to politically dominate and economically exploit regions from the outside. Empires were also embraced by those individuals who chose to display a measure of loyalty to its institutions or the dynasty leading it. This allowed empire to transform from an external force into an internal opportunity. Empire created channels for people and objects to circulate beyond their immediate environments, thereby branching out beyond local and regional networks. This resulted in interactions with individuals, ideas, and objects on an unprecedentedly trans-regional and occasionally global scale. For central and eastern Europe, this means dealing seriously with

both the Habsburg and the Ottoman imperial projects as well as accounting for other dynastic activities that occasionally resulted in situations resembling imperial formations. Individual patterns of loyalty and patronage were often wrought by imperial infrastructures, thereby challenging received narratives centred on nation states.

Dariusz Kołodziejczyk published a provocative essay in 2013 in which he challenged historians to think about Habsburg, Polish, Venetian, and Muscovite history as part of Ottoman history rather than set in perpetual opposition against it. Of course, none of these places were real ‘vassals’, but they all engaged in different practices that led to a ‘nuanced political mosaic’ in which the Ottomans played an important role.⁴⁷ For art historians, it can be useful to take this nuance and use it to help explore the visual vocabularies and practices usually chalked up to ‘influence’. Something more complicated was going on than just a passive reception and adoption of beautiful Anatolian carpets and İznik tiles. For similar reasons, I also take issue with the term East-Central Europe, which has often been used to refer to the non-German-speaking lands of the Habsburg monarchy, Hungary, and Poland-Lithuania. Although geographically admissible, the term implies that the Habsburg dynasty and the Holy Roman Empire are somehow separable from the histories of the various small and large polities that stretched across the region. Do we need to forget that the Habsburgs were the Kings of Hungary and Bohemia, and even serious contenders for the Polish crown on several occasions? Why set aside imperial narratives in favour of national ones? Are we supposed to ignore all the German-speaking artists and patrons working in Bohemia, Silesia, Poland-Lithuania, Transylvania, and Hungary? Even if a place was never integrated politically, legally, or culturally into an empire, nearly all central and eastern Europe had some imperial entanglements which allowed for the movement of people and objects. Examining what made these entanglements possible allows us to better understand the objects commissioned and consumed in the region. This makes central and eastern Europe a fascinating place to test out how local and global dynamics played out in the first age of globalization.

QUESTION 2:

What is our unique contribution to the global turn in art history? Can we produce scholarship that is of interest to a wider constituency of early modernists, including Latin Americanists, Ottomanists, and Africanists? Can we pose new questions, introduce unseen objects, or introduce different archives? How can art-historical study of central and eastern Europe interrogate and modify claims to Global Art History?

[T. GRUSIECKI] Our strength lies in the untapped potential of central and eastern European archival and visual sources in asking new questions and providing new answers for the character and scope of early modern globalisation. While the Americas, Asia, and increasingly Africa feature widely in Europe’s ‘global’ art histories, central and eastern Europe is virtually left out from these considerations. The region, however, offers a wide variety of documented examples

47) Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, ‘What Is Inside and What Is Outside? Tributary States in Ottoman Politics,’ in Gábor Kármán and Lovro Kunčević, eds, *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Leiden: Brill, 2013, 421–32.

of transculturation that defy expectations and plant the seeds for making Europe's history more inclusive and diverse. By transculturation, I mean processes of merging and converging cultures, first defined by Fernando Ortiz, resulting in transformative changes which alter societies as they adopt foreign cultural forms into their way of life.⁴⁸ To give an example from my own research, the otherwise heterogeneous inhabitants of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (created in 1569) embraced visual images and objects of material culture, including maps, illustrated histories, costume, portraits, and carpets, as they found themselves in the midst of searching for convincing stories of their shared place in the world. Yet, while these artefacts acted as signifiers of cultural distinctiveness, they were often appropriated from abroad, particularly the Ottoman Empire, thus challenging the notion of culture as a coherent and self-contained realm.⁴⁹ What was considered foreign or exotic to begin with gradually became local, or even native. This assimilation of foreign things into local tradition brings to the fore the often-overlooked extrinsic aspect of nativism, using Poland-Lithuania as a useful methodological laboratory for challenging the theories of nations' cultural distinctiveness.

What is particularly relevant here is that central and eastern Europeans often appropriated transcultural forms into their local tradition in a way that we normally associate with the processes of hybridity or *métissage*, more familiar in the colonial context but not so much in Europe itself. The study of central and eastern Europe could thus bring about a renewed interest in European transculturation and its implications for European cultures, rewriting the history of Europe as a less Eurocentric enterprise. To fully appreciate that Europe is not an autonomous civilisation, but that it has been co-shaped by other cultures and traditions, is particularly urgent in the era of populism and ethno-nationalism ushered by Donald Trump, Boris Johnson, Marine Le Pen, Jarosław Kaczyński, Viktor Orbán, and other wannabe autocrats. On a more pragmatic point, a provincialized Europe is a realm where the antinomies of East vs West, maritime vs contiguous, colonial vs national, exotic vs native no longer seem relevant as analytical tools, therefore affording a more prominent place for central and eastern Europe in a potentially coeval and decentred art history.

[R. BORN] For me, the region's major contribution is its corpus of unexplored case studies. Ottoman robes of honour (hil'at) preserved in monasteries in Greece, Romania, and the Holy Land are an example of such rich sources.⁵⁰ They were ritually bestowed upon diplomats and princes from the tributary states, who often donated them to Orthodox monasteries, thus blending in Byzantine symbolism with Ottoman sense of luxury in the external presentation of Orthodox dignitaries. Further study of these objects may offer a better contextualisation of the integration of Ottoman and Persian luxury goods into the representational culture of elites in central and eastern Europe, a process which is currently subsumed under the label of

48) Fernando Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint, Tobacco and Sugar*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1995, 32–3.

49) See, for example, Tomasz Grusiecki, 'Doublethink: Polish Carpets in Transcultural Contexts,' *The Art Bulletin*, 104.3: 29–54.

50) Nikolaos Vryzidis, 'Towards a History of the Greek Hil'at. An Interweaving of Byzantine and Ottoman Traditions,' *Convivium*, 4, 2017, 176–91, and 'Ottoman Textiles and Greek Clerical Vestments. Prolegomena on a Neglected Aspect of Ecclesiastical Material Culture,' *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 42: 1, 2018, 92–114; Robert Born, 'The Ottoman Tributaries Transylvania, Walachia and Moldavia. Reflections on the Mobility of Objects and Networks of Actors,' *Diyâr* 2:1, 2021, 27–58.

‘Ottomanisation’.⁵¹ A possible perspective is presented by the cross-cultural clothing practices outlined by Finbarr Barry Flood for the Indian subcontinent in the Middle Ages,⁵² which has recently been utilised in the study of the Caucasus as well.⁵³ Such an approach provides an alternative to the ‘Byzance après Byzance’ concept coined by Nicolae Iorga, which still dominates research on the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. Here’s hoping that new methods and approaches will contribute to a more nuanced discussion of phenomena and concepts such as the Turqueries or the different manifestation of Orientalism.

[S. IVANIČ] I agree that our biggest pull factor may be the heterogeneity of historical central and eastern Europe. It is a region filled with many ethnicities, cultures, and languages. In the early modern period, it was at the intersection of empires: neighbouring Habsburg lands to the west and the Ottoman Empire and Russia to the east. Borders within it were continually shifting. Land-locked between these powerful entities, it was in constant flux: an ever-changing borderland between ‘East’ and ‘West’. Viewing its diverse communities in relation to their neighbours not only allows us to draw comparisons with other supra-regions (the Atlantic, the Pacific or the Mediterranean), but also shows how connections and entanglements (with imperial and other entities) work in a region that is surrounded by land rather than sea and that was not the subject of conquest in the same way as other territories in the period. As a vast borderland, it also holds challenges. Scholars must deal with ‘modern’ borders and categories that run starkly counter to the lives of our historical subjects. The men and women of early modern central and eastern Europe belonged to communities that stretched far and wide, connected as much through religious and professional affinity – as musicians, Catholics, Jews, or scientists – as by geography.⁵⁴ Working on this region demands working across many national borders, speaking multiple languages, and working with numerous archives.

Here, I would also like to present a further point about the exceptional ability of research on central and eastern Europe to advance studies of global early modern history. Working with decorative arts – objects often belonging to men and women of lesser means, and without identifiable lines of provenance – presents a further challenge. It starts with a very simple problem. The researcher looking for relevant objects in museums to study the region’s connections is confronted with an obstacle. Artefacts are often labelled generically as ‘Central European’, which obfuscates the vastly complex cultural landscape that this category encompasses. Objects from central and eastern Europe are the product of skills, materials and techniques that are integrally linked with other European places. They also share a long history of Christian influence in iconography. This makes determining their provenance and production

51) Adam Jasiński, ‘A Savage Magnificence: Ottomanizing Fashion and the Politics of Display in Early Modern East-Central Europe,’ *Muqarnas*, 31, 2014, 173–205; Tomasz Grusiecki, ‘Uprooting Origins: Polish Lithuanian Art and the Challenge of Pluralism,’ in Beáta Hock and Anu Allas, eds, *Globalizing East European Art Histories. Past and Present*, London: Routledge, 2018, 25–38.

52) Flood, Finbarr Barry, *Objects of Translation: Material Culture and Medieval “Hindu-Muslim” Encounter*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009, 63–87.

53) Erik Thunø, ‘Cross-Cultural Dressing: the Medieval South Caucasus and Art History,’ in Erik Thunø and Ivan Foletti, eds, *The Medieval South Caucasus. Artistic Cultures of Albania, Armenia and Georgia*, Brno-Lausanne: Brepols, 2016, 145–159.

54) Suzanna Ivanič, Anna Parker, Ivana Horáček, Erika Supria Honisch, Howard Louthan, ‘Global Prague: Renaissance and Reformation Crossroads,’ *Austrian History Yearbook*, Special Issue, 52, 2021, 13–16.

problematic. It is a mammoth task to unravel where these objects really come from. With museum curators and through scientific analysis, we need to develop a more nuanced understanding of these objects in collections – where they were produced, traded, and owned or used and what materials they contained. Once we have a better understanding of these ‘Central European’ objects, we can start to use them to piece the early modern world back together in a more nuanced way. A current project, ‘Connected Central European Worlds, 1500-1700’ (AHRC Networking AH/V00848X/1) seeks to begin examining these themes with researchers and curators from Europe and North America.⁵⁵ It will show the potential for scientific analysis of objects to broaden our understanding of how art and craft connected people across the globe in this period and has implications for new methodologies for global art history.

[R. S. NOYES] To paraphrase a recent 2021 RSA panel précis on globalizing early modern art history, by shifting central and eastern European art from an add-on to a heuristic, our expanding horizons of scholarship can contribute to challenging conventional perceptions about the broader early modern world. We can do so by contravening persistently anachronistic teleologies and revealing marginalized ecologies and economies of artistic production. A few potential vectors come to mind that might also enable scholars more generally to address challenges following the global turn in histories of art (e.g. the role of place-based research and relationships to sources, explaining change and preserving historical hierarchies, rethinking notions of canonicity and overcoming comparative approaches that perpetuate a paradigm where different cultures appear as parallel but separate fields of inquiry).⁵⁶ These include tethering inquiry to spatially oriented materials, bodies and objects; accounting for manifold aspects of exchanges through contextualized object biographies; subjecting written and material sources to thick description to preserve asymmetries; and adopting layered approaches to re-situating material things as liminal nodes composed of diverse accretions to avoid parallelisms.

They might also contribute to pivoting from recent approaches in global object and material studies that tend towards problematically capacious surveys of different object types, which tend to preserve disciplinary divisions, yield scattered results, and foster programmatic agendas. Instead, they might be conducive to developing a microhistorical equilibrium that balances close analysis of source materials across multiple, interconnected contexts against the holistic study of discrete object classes, which furnish a microcosmic lens through which to inflect broader questions that range across periods, places, and modes of history.⁵⁷ The hope is to develop adaptable methodological models. Thus while focusing on the movements of things and persons with special attention to interconnecting, in my case, the Italian peninsula and the Baltic littoral, my hope is that research results will encourage extra-European perspectives to de-Westernize the discourse and further connect isolated regional histories—keeping in

55) *Connected Central European Worlds 1500-1700*, <https://research.kent.ac.uk/emcentraleu/>

56) For an overview of some of these challenges, see John-Paul A. Ghobrial, ed., ‘Global History and Microhistory,’ special issue of *Past & Present*, 242:14, 2019.

57) For studies along these methodological lines, though not focused on the region in question here, see Leah R. Clark, *Collecting Art in the Italian Renaissance Court: Objects and Exchanges*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018; Anna Grasskamp, *Objects in Frames: Displaying Foreign Collectibles in Early Modern China and Europe*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 2019.

mind that attending to central and eastern Europe itself constitutes an effort to de-Westernize (another point to address in the next questions).⁵⁸

[O. PEVNY] The study of central and eastern Europe certainly has a contribution to make to the global turn in Art History. To begin with, it offers the opportunity of mitigating the emphasis of global studies from maritime empires to polities experiencing processes of ‘internal globalization’. Moreover, it speaks to the ambiguity of the concept of ‘Europe’. It draws attention to fluctuating borders, to the diversity and movements of people, to the emergence and adaptation of groups identities, and to the struggle for democratic representation of minoritarian groups. In the case of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional polity co-governed by the nobility, the lay and ecclesiastical lords, and an elected monarch, equal rights and privileges were extended to all members of the noble estate, religious toleration was guaranteed to the nobility and free persons, and broad autonomy offered to the regions. Yet, not everyone was equal. For one, serfs were under the jurisdiction of their masters, and Polonization and the spread of Catholicism encroached on the traditions, languages, and faiths of minoritarian ethnic and religious groups. Such groups not only exhibited a continuous and fluid reconstitution of their identity in response to changing imperatives, but sought to impact the social, legal, and political parameters of the Commonwealth’s governance. The gains and shortcoming experienced by the Commonwealth and its multi-ethnic and multi-confessional population certainly offer lessons on global citizenship that resonate with contemporary anxieties arising between cultures and nations, as well as nations and supra-national bodies (such as the EU). Moreover, the visual culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and especially that of Ruthenian lands, remains largely understudied. The gathering of empirical evidence (both photographic and archival documentation) and the creation of databases of visual culture that would make these visual sources part of the broader art historical discourse certainly has good prospects as a long-term international grant project. Such work would undoubtedly raise the profile of early modern visual culture of central and eastern Europe, which at present is overshadowed by the looming and often unproblematized categories of ‘European art’ and ‘Russian art’.

I cannot see a better way forward than to continue diligently investigating central and eastern Europe, while engaging in current approaches and methodologies that can offer new perspectives on the material we study. Understanding the early modern cultural landscapes of central and eastern Europe can deepen our understanding of the commonalities and tensions underlying current processes of globalization, most notably the political conservatism of Poland and Hungary, Ukraine’s turn towards Europe, and Russia’s revanchist violation of Ukraine’s sovereignty in 2014 and 2022. The parameters of the global turn in our research need to be broad enough to engage scholars of different global regions and specific enough to maintain local relevance. I can think of many possible topics of research that are commensurate with the global turn when it comes to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, for example: hybrid sites of meaning and multicultural landscapes, graphic landscapes of multilingual society, local rites and ecclesiastical universalism, confessionalization, architecture of

58) See e.g. the recent co-authored study: Ruth Sargent Noyes et al., ‘“Baltic Catacombs.” Translating *Corpisaniti* Catacomb Relic Sculptures between Rome, Polish Livonia, and the Lithuanian Grand Duchy circa 1750-1800,’ *Open Research Europe*, 1: 18, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.13259.1> (last accessed 15 June 2021).

multi-confessionalism, ethnic and religious violence, multicultural urban coexistence, republican values and local traditions, cultural homogenization and heterogenization, internal migration and quasi-colonialism, diaspora communities, myths of origin, national and regional identities, memory and identity, information management, intellectual currents, educational trends, ideologies of patriotism, and the politics of representation.

[R. RADWAY] I agree. Thanks in large part to the imperial archives that cover the region, it is uniquely well documented, preserving evidence of how objects were created, used, and moved across time. These archives require a scholar to have paleographic training and the learning curve is steep, but the results can be remarkable. Using such sources allows us to play with local and regional entanglements to weave new narratives about objects, their owners, and their makers in a global early modern world. I could imagine a fascinating article about a German-speaking Jewish merchant in Ottoman Buda (Budapest) who lived in a Renaissance house designed by Florentine architects and used blue-and-white Chinese porcelain to serve a meal during a visit from a Bohemian nobleman on his way to Constantinople with his large retinue of Netherlandish, Tyrolian, and Silesian courtiers. This would tell an important story about the place of the local in the global and the centrality of this region in uniting these worlds on a day-to-day basis. The sources for such narratives are all extant but they are difficult to pull together, and the leap required to weave such a narrative – to unite disparate traces to tell a clean narrative – may require us to investigate how other regions in global art history piece together documentation and found objects.⁵⁹ Of course, we don't need Chinese porcelain to be global. Or do we?

We also have a contribution to art history as a discipline that goes beyond just the early modern period. Central and eastern European art challenges the term 'hybridity', still a dominant concept in much recent scholarship. Hybridity suggests that two discrete and authentic things (styles, objects, people) meet and blend into something new. To treat something as a hybrid is to imply that original pure forms could and did exist.⁶⁰ The art of this region offers a series of ideal case-studies to highlight this fiction. Notions of stylistic purity were the product of the nineteenth and twentieth-century art historians whose political aims have recently become the subject of study.⁶¹ The stories told by objects themselves involve complicated processes of appropriation, adoption, and blending of elements over centuries.

59) Tünde F. Komori, 'Prestige Object or Coffee Cup? Problems of Identifying and Dating Chinese Porcelain Unearthed in Buda,' *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU*, 23, 2017, 108–22.

60) Carolyn Dean and D. Leibsohn, 'Hybridity and Its Discontents: Considering Visual Culture in Colonial Spanish America,' *Colonial Latin American Review*, 12, 2003, 5–35.

61) Suzanne Marchand, 'The View from the Land: Austrian Art Historians and the Interpretation of Croatian Art,' in Alina Alexandra Payne, ed., *Dalmatia and the Mediterranean: Portable Archeology and the Poetics of Influence*, Leiden: Brill, 2013, 19–58; Matthew Rampley, *Vienna School of Art History: Empire and the Politics of Scholarship, 1847-1918*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013.

QUESTION 3:

What are some of the potential challenges of engaging in global historical approaches to central and eastern European Art?

[O. PEVNY] The investigation of questions that cut across national boundaries has the benefit of being able to mitigate the dominance of themes underlining national distinctiveness that continue to overshadow scholarship on early modern central and eastern European culture. In terms of teaching, providing a broader global perspective on cultural development in central and eastern Europe can only work to help students appreciate the relevance and importance of the material they are studying. I am concerned, however, that such coverage might subject central and eastern European visual culture to an imported evaluative framework. Rather than provide an opportunity for students to focus on imperatives and developments key to the region, it could result in an emphasis on exceptional cases of cultural production that reflect concurrent global priorities, which nonetheless had restricted resonance in central and eastern Europe. In the case of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth much is left to do in terms of addressing internal differences of ethnicity, religion, language, and culture. The Commonwealth was divided not just into Crown of the Polish Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but into numerous historical regions (such as Ruthenia, Prussia, and Livonia), as well as into voievodships, starostwa, and cities, each with their own issues and concerns. In 1795 with the final partition, the various corners of the Commonwealth became parts of distinct modern entities, and the Commonwealth's inheritance often has been interpreted in the context of these later political developments. Within the Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union, the Commonwealth inheritance of Ruthenian lands remained largely unexplored; it is currently a quickly growing field of study in central and eastern Europe. Nevertheless, empirical data must still be gathered before broader interpretive work of visual sources is undertaken.

[S. IVANIČ] I think we have as much right to lay claim to 'the global' as others, but it would be wise to heed two warnings. First, it is appealing to write a history of exotic and sparkly things belonging to the wealthy inhabitants of these regions. But – as a scathing review of Lisa Jardine's *Worldly Goods* by Lauro Martines pointed out – about 97% of the population did not have the means to engage in the consumption of fabulous Renaissance exotica.⁶² Was this really a global world for them? Beverly Lemire has recently shown how global connections did permeate all levels of society in early modern Europe, but we must still be wary about the history we are doing.⁶³ Is it just a history of the wealthy in society, and is it just urban? Second, we must note Dan Hicks' recent challenge to the academic terms used in global histories that gloss over violent events; 'cultural biography' and 'entanglement' sound conveniently positive for the victors who often end up writing histories.⁶⁴ What did the experience of globalization

62) Lauro Martines 'Review: The Renaissance and the Birth of Consumer Society Reviewed Works: Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy: 1300-1600 by Richard A. Goldthwaite; *Worldly Goods: A New History of the Renaissance* by Lisa Jardine,' *Renaissance Quarterly*, 51: 1, 1998, 193–203.

63) Beverly Lemire, *Global Trade and the Transformation of Consumer Cultures. The Material World Remade, c. 1500-1820*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

64) Dan Hicks, *The Brutish Museums: The Benin Bronzes, Colonial Violence and Cultural Restitution*, London: Pluto Press, 2020, esp. 25–28.

mean for people on all sides? What about conflict and violence? If we talk of mixing and giving, what about of taking and erasure? Does Hicks' warning apply outside of colonial contexts and even within Europe? Transferred to a non-colonial or intra-colonial space, how does this work? Central and eastern Europe was certainly not a tension-free area. Laura Lisy-Wagner has written about the Habani, German-speaking Anabaptists living in Moravia who were expelled in the 1620s and settled in Upper Hungary (today Slovakia).⁶⁵ Habaner ceramics fused Islamic designs with Italian maiolica into a vernacular style lauded for its unique qualities. Yet is there also a story to tell of persecution? These were resilient communities producing beautiful artwork, but they did so in the face of adversity.

[R. S. NOYES] I agree, this global history rooted in violence is already basically there. The etymology of the word for slave (schiavo) in Italian is central to the Pac-Medici case study. Schiavo also gives you Slav, so there is an intrinsic association between violence and a certain imagined and vaguely-defined area of Europe. This issue speaks to what I call the 'triple-threat' of the absence, destruction, and/or dispersal of the archive when it comes to researching our field—a research challenge but also another area where we can contribute to the global turn in Art History. To cite but one example from my own recent work on the Paces, the centuries-long history of violent conflict in Lithuania means that little remains of the family's impressive collection of rare relics of the Florentine saint Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi (with whom they claimed common parentage), gifted from Medici grand dukes within lavish reliquary containers manufactured in the same Medicean Galleria that turned Baltic amber into medicinal remedies. Relevant archival materials for studying the Paces were dispersed between Italy, Poland, Lithuania, and Latvia, with relevant artworks, objects, and monuments in Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine, Latvia, Russia, Italy, and Poland, and many more documents and collections lost or destroyed, all predominantly due to violent conflicts and geopolitical realignments of the twentieth century.

Thus a portion (sometimes sizeable) of the visual, architectural and material cultural archives and histories of central and eastern Europe currently exists beyond the visible or the intelligible, and what does survive presents challenges of access and interpretation (more on the latter in response to the next question). This triple-threat represents an issue similarly faced by specialists researching the pre-Columbian Americas, plantation economies (to name but a few), colonial contexts, and more broadly speaking 'contact zones', to use Mary Louise Pratt's term, by which she means 'social spaces where cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths.'⁶⁶ This evinces common methodological ground wherein we might make some contributions—and of course draw much benefit for our own particular field of inquiry. I also often find myself consulting different textual and two-dimensional media (e.g. drawings or photographs) to reconstruct now-lost monuments, objects and artworks, and their respective spatial environments. Recourse to Pac-Medici correspondence and Medici inventories in the state archive in Florence, for instance, discloses the existence of not only the

65) Laura Lisy-Wagner, *Islam, Christianity, and the Making of Czech Identity, 1453–1683*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

66) Mary Louise Pratt, 'Arts of the Contact Zone,' *Profession*, 1991, 33–40, and *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, New York: Routledge, 1992.

gift of the ‘Turkish’ slave and amber from the Paces, but also live polar bears, Turkish stallions and Samogitian ponies, as well as reciprocal gifts from Cosimo including medicines from the grand-ducal *Galleria*, Neapolitan horses, and parmesan cheese. Such methods and approaches can shed glancing light on broader issues taken up increasingly in recent scholarship taking up the question of the history of collecting and display, as well as the ephemeral arts, both burgeoning areas in early modern art history.

[R. RADWAY] The potential roadblocks are manifold, including a dearth of new research, unprocessed and unpublished excavation materials laying in boxes, a limited number of internationally recognizable artefacts to work from (elsewhere called ‘masterpieces’), and a complicated twenty-first century political landscape. We have a lot of groundwork ahead of us. Also, to underscore Suzanna’s point, we need to remain cautious with our focus on the jet-setting elites of history whose cosmopolitanism mirrors our own twenty-first-century globalized reality.

The very idea of global art history has faced criticism recently. What does ‘global’ mean in the early modern period anyway? Is it about materials? Methodology? Politics? Parity? Equal representation? Are we just speaking about pre-national, transregional comparative studies? A recent panel at the annual meeting of the Renaissance Society of America asked these very questions. The discussion revolved around the idea that the global turn was a tool to empower art from underrepresented geographies, allowing it to enter the conversation on more equal footing. It was suggested that soon we might not need to justify the study of ‘other’ geographies by calling it global and will be able to just simply study them for their own sake. We cannot afford to ignore the global turn, however. Nor would we accurately represent the objects and materials we study if we fail to examine their global contexts. But we also need to strike a delicate balance attuned to the political and social contexts we study.

QUESTION 4:

A wide array of approaches could be employed to explore the region’s past, including entangled history (Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann); cultural transfer (Michel Espagne and Michael Werner); connected histories (Sanjay Subramanyam); *Transfergeschichte* (Matthias Middell); history of globalisation (Sebastian Conrad); circulations (Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann). Do any of these do justice to central and eastern Europe’s historical complexities? What specific methods do you find useful in your work

[T. GRUSIECKI] Global art history as it is practised today has been devised mostly with Western European empires and their colonies in mind. Central and eastern Europeanists must be mindful of this methodological framework and work towards its expansion. We will only come across as relevant to a wider community of early modernists if we dare to ask new questions that emerge from the specific contexts of central and eastern European transcultural experiences; otherwise, we risk appearing a peripheral offshoot of Western European story of global encounters. What is relevant about the region is not that methods could be applied to study its history, but rather that its underexplored archives and collections can lead to the development of new methods of analysis, especially as new art objects and cultural forms are brought to the fore.

It is then particularly embarrassing that (at least to my knowledge) only three methodological interventions came from the study of our region, ‘horizontal art histories’, ‘close others’ (both terms coined by Piotr Piotrowski), and ‘epistemic privilege’ (Beáta Hock’s term), all of which were applied to the study of modern art.⁶⁷ A ‘horizontal art history’ is an approach that is polyphonic, multidimensional, and free of geographical hierarchies; ‘close other’ describes an intermediate epistemic position between attributed difference and acknowledged resemblance; and ‘epistemic privilege’ is an inversion of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s idea of ‘epistemic violence’, which implies that scholars of central and eastern Europe are by definition more ‘global’ in their approach to art history than most Western Europeanists because—as opposed to the latter—they need to acquire a working knowledge of traditions and cultures other than their own in order to participate in art-historical discourse. The analytical strength of these terms owes much to their embeddedness in local concerns and lived experiences, in a similar way that concepts such as ‘hybridity’, ‘transculturation’, and ‘provincializing Europe’ were originally specific to the contexts of Latin America and India, even though they are now part of mainstream Art History’s analytical language. Some of these terms, like ‘hybridity’ are highly contested. Notably, Homi Bhabha’s notion of hybridity as an empowering tool is different from Carolyn Dean and Dana Leibsohn’s who see it as a model of cultural transmission that reifies cultural differences.⁶⁸ While I favour Dean and Leibsohn’s approach in my own work, I do not find it fitting to take their side here, but rather to point out that the reason why different scholars find either the former or the latter definition convincing is because they both arose from a specific local context and are thus not simply theoretical in nature but highly applicable in real life.

[S. IVANIČ] I prefer to call what I do ‘connected history’, as proposed by Sanjay Subrahmanyam, because investigating regional links are as important to the story as the global.⁶⁹ The connected and entangled nature of life for early modern men and women is made plain when studying inventories from seventeenth-century Prague. Place names from far and wide crop up attesting to the migration of a large number of residents for marriage, trade or the avoidance of persecution, such as Kúndrat Šteffanaúr, a court clockmaker from the Swiss Confederation who moved to Prague to work for the Holy Roman Emperor, Rudolf II, married a Czech woman named Lidmila, and continued to work for Catholic noble clients in Prague until his death in 1635.⁷⁰ Numerous languages and variant spellings in the inventories attest to linguistic fluidity and the lack of linguistic barriers. And the objects that burghers owned – like a coconut shell cup or coral beads – attest to the vast trade networks of the early modern world. The experience of the archive quickly disavows the scholar of notions of nation or even of the existence of distinctive cultures.

67) Piotr Piotrowski, ‘On the Spatial Turn, or Horizontal Art History,’ *Umění*, 56, 2008, 378–83; Piotr Piotrowski, ‘East European Art Peripheries Facing Post-Colonial Theory,’ *nonsite.org*, 12, 12 August 2014, <https://nonsite.org/article/east-european-art-peripheries-facing-post-colonial-theory>; Beáta Hock, ‘Introduction,’ in Beáta Hock and Anu Allas, eds, *Globalizing East European Art Histories: Past and Present*, New York: Routledge, 2018, 1–22.

68) Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*; Dean and Leibsohn, ‘Hybridity.’

69) Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Explorations in Connected History: From the Tagus to the Ganges*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Connected History: Essays and Arguments*, New York: Verso, 2022.

70) Ivanič, *Cosmos*, 131–52.

[R. RADWAY] I have a tattered copy of Homi Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* on my shelf that I often turn to for inspiration. While my approach to it has evolved over time, I am deeply motivated by the notion that in-between spaces carry 'the burden of the meaning of culture'.⁷¹ It is our job to discover this meaning and relay it in powerful ways. I am a fan of using a combination of entangled history and circulations, but I do not find them specific enough. What is so fascinating about central and eastern Europe is that globalizing elements go much deeper, from the palaces of nobility down to the disposable prints for sale by the hawker who passes through a rural village once every fortnight. A focus on entangled histories alone runs the risk of following around a group of well-documented elites. In current art-historical writing, circulations generally occur in centre-periphery relationships and rely on notions of 'influence'. In my view, neither methodology considers the full range of options available for patrons and artists to choose from. It is imperative to think about the motivating factors behind appropriation, transformation, reactions, distortions, modifications, emulations, resistance, subversion, parody, simplification, exaggeration, etc. We are often looking at layered histories in which multiple historical traditions overlap, existing simultaneously in the visual toolboxes of artists and artisans.

[R. S. NOYES] I find a productive approach to be that of proceeding according to practices and principles that draw together aspects of global microhistory, object- and material-centric inquiry, and *histoire croisée* or *Verflechtungsgeschichte* (entangled history).⁷² I think it is worth recalling in regard to the latter that since places like Prussia, Lithuania, and Livonia entered Western conceptual geography and historical consciousness in the course of papal-mandated Baltic medieval crusades, the region was thereafter largely perceived by the West through a colonial and neocolonial lens.⁷³ As Larry Wolff notes in his classic study, eighteenth-century discourse analogized Poland-Lithuania and Russia to the 'barbaric' climes of Africa and the Americas, theorizing racial and ethnic parallels between the inhabitants of these spheres.⁷⁴ Scholarship have shown this discourse can be traced back through the preceding centuries.⁷⁵ Thus there are historical bases for marshalling the postcolonial associations of *histoire croisée* to bring to bear on our material.

Entangled history, coupled with a focus on 'following the object' (or material) as it moves across and between specific contexts, couples an attention to mutual processes of exchange with that to the various forms and modes of agency of all involved (including human and non-human actors) in these exchange processes.⁷⁶ This multi-faceted research, I think, can

71) Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 56.

72) Leah R. Clark, 'Framing Transcultural Objects: New Approaches to Collecting in the Early Modern World,' *Oxford Art Journal*, 43, 2020, 476–9.

73) Domenico Caccamo, 'Le Indie d'Europa: Polonia, Ucraina, Russia nella letteratura di viaggio e di esplorazione,' *Roma, Venezia e l'Europa Centro-Orientale: Ricerche sulla prima età moderna*, Milan: Franco Angeli, 2010, 352–64; Stefan Donecker, 'Est Vera India Septemtrio: Re-imagining the Baltic in the Age of Discovery,' in Linda Kaljundi and Tuomas Lehtonen, eds, *Re-forming Texts, Music, and Church Art in the Early Modern North*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016, 393–419.

74) Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe*.

75) See, for example, Dolly Jørgensen and Virginia Langum, eds, *Visions of North in Premodern Europe*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2018.

76) Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press,

be more conducive to overcoming outdated interpretive scaffolds traditionally used to describe a one-sided or over-simplified account of, for example, Western European expansion. As a scholar who first trained as an Italianist engaged with issues of centre-periphery, who then came progressively to address and incorporate in my scholarship objects, artworks, agents, and histories from the present-day Baltic region in conversation with Italian realms, I also shy away from de-coupling early modern central and eastern Europe and its arts from Western European counterparts. Rather, I would tend to tether East and West by means of transregional, microhistorical case studies that retrace the diverse trajectories and entanglements—spatial, temporal, symbolic, discursive, etc.—of particular objects and materials, such as fur and amber, as intercultural actants and frames, thresholds and/or barriers that variously mediated and essentially shaped and structured meaning making and socio-cultural relations and perceptions.⁷⁷ One could also undertake these approaches with specific motifs or forms, for example.

[R. BORN] New impulses might be provided not only by considerations on the social and cultural life of things and Bruno Latour's Actor-Network-Theory (ANT), but also by the concept of 'object itineraries', first discussed by anthropologists and archaeologists.⁷⁸ This approach, developed in distinction to the biologically influenced approach of 'object biographies', proves to be particularly suitable for the analysis of the 'flows' of people, objects, and ideas. These aspects formed an important part of the agenda of the Transottomanica Priority Programme funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG), focusing on the moment of movement and dynamics between Eastern Europe, the Ottoman Empire, the Middle East, and Central Asia.⁷⁹ Some of the recently published reconstructions of 'object itineraries' from an art historical perspective include case studies on Persia, the Ottoman Empire, and Poland-Lithuania.⁸⁰

2005. See also Latour, 'The Berlin key or how to do words with things,' in *Matter, Materiality, and Modern Culture*, ed. Paul Graves-Brown, New York: Routledge, 2000, 10–21, especially 19. For a recent paradigmatic case study connecting Italy to the wider world see Leah R. Clark, 'Objets croisés: Albarelli as Vessels of Mediation Within and Beyond the Spezieria,' *Études Épistémè*, 36, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.4000/episteme.6292>. For the Baltic milieu see Kodres, et. al, *Indifferent Things?; Mänd and Tamm, Making Livonia*.

77) See Rūstis Kamuntavičius and Ruth Sargent Noyes, 'Lugano lake artists in the northernmost heart of eighteenth-century Catholic baroque art,' *Review of Institute of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*, 1, 2021, 25–44. See also Sargent Noyes, 'Count Michał Jan Borch as Patron and Collector: Art between Italy and the Inflanty Voivodeship in the Age of Partition,' *Baltic Journal of Art History*, 21, 2021, 9–70; 'Translatio reliquiae and translatio imperii between Italy and North-eastern Europe in the Age of Partition (c. 1750–1800): the Case of the Plater in Polish Livonia,' in Anna Ancâne, ed., *The Migration of Artists and Architects in Central and Northern Europe 1560–1900*, Riga: Art Academy of Latvia, forthcoming; Sargent Noyes and Rūstis Kamuntavičius, '(Re)moving Relics and Migrating Architecture between Italy and Polish Livonia in the Long Counter-Reformation: the Case of the Paracca,' in Sarah Lynch, ed., *Interpreting Italians Abroad: The Migration of Ticinese Architects across Europe in the Early Modern Era*, Milan: Officina Libraria, forthcoming.

78) Arjun Appadurai, 'Introduction. Commodities and Politics of Value,' in Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things. Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, 3–63; Latour, *Reassembling the Social*; Hans Peter Hahn and Hadas Weiss, 'Biographies, travels and itineraries of things,' in Hans Peter Hahn and Hadas Weiss, eds, *Mobility, Meaning and the Transformations of Things: Shifting Contexts of Material Culture Through Time and Space*, Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2013, 1–14, here 7–10; Rosemary A. Joyce and Susan D. Gillespie, 'Making Things out of Objects that Move,' in Rosemary A. Joyce and Susan D. Gillespie, eds, *Things in Motion. Object Itineraries in Anthropological Practice*, Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research, 2015, 3–20.

79) <https://www.transottomanica.de/> (accessed 15 June 2022). See Arkadiusz Christoph Blaszczyk, Robert Born and Florian Riedler 'Introduction. Movable Objects,' in Blaszczyk, Born and Riedler, eds, *Transottoman Matters. Objects Moving through Time, Space, and Meaning*, Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2021, 9–26.

80) Daniela Bleichmar and Meredith Martin, eds, *Objects in Motion in the Early Modern World*, Oxford: Wiley, 2015; Sussan Babaie and Melanie Gibson, eds, *The Mercantile Effect. Art and Exchange in the Islamicate World during the 17th*

Special mention should also be made of the concept of ‘portability’ proposed by Alina Payne, whose focus is on mobility and its consequences. Unlike the ‘object itineraries’, this approach also considers material and cultural transformations of objects as they moved from one place to another. Former Ottoman tributary states in East-Central Europe, Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia, together with the bordering regions, were the focus of the seminar ‘From Riverbed to Seashore. Art on the Move in Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean in the Early Modern Period’, which was held in 2014-2015 as part of the Getty Foundation’s ‘Connecting Art Histories’ initiative. Here, riverways were particularly appreciated as links between geographic regions and cultures, as well as vehicles for people, things, and ideas.⁸¹

As for Larry Wolff’s *Inventing Eastern Europe*, it must be pointed out that the book has been criticized for the omission of voices from the region. Derogatory ideas about this part of the world predate the eighteenth century and are also to be found in non-Western European sources, albeit without the use of the phrase ‘Eastern Europe’. Even during the Enlightenment, the East-West division emphasized by Wolff is mentioned rather sporadically in textual documents, calling to question his influential theory of ‘demi-Orientalism’.⁸²

[O. PEVNY] All methods offer their own insights; the material under investigation should determine the appropriateness of both methodology and terminology. In my research, the global turn offers the potential of looking at central and eastern Europe from new perspectives and of asking questions that focus on ethnic, religious, and social minoritarian groups. In the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, works of visual culture produced by these groups attest to the on-going processes of cultural revisioning that marked their search for recognition, representation, and alliances.

[T. GRUSIECKI] An ideal scholar of Poland-Lithuania would need to read Polish, German, Low German, Latin, Hebrew, Lithuanian, Latvian, Old Slavonic, Ruthenian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian to conduct research in the archives and have full access to the secondary literature on the art and culture of this vast polity. I doubt it is physically possible for a single scholar to achieve proficiency in all these languages. This complex linguistic landscape does point, however, to the problem of untranslatability of much of the scholarship that exists on Polish-Lithuanian art, not in the sense of impossibility to translate it but rather never being able to stop translating the scholarship produced in the many different (modern) national contexts of Poland-Lithuania’s successor states, let alone producing a mutually acceptable scholarly synthesis.⁸³ What on the surface might appear as a disadvantage may become an epistemic privilege, though, by turning Poland-Lithuania into a model of dialogic scholarship that stresses different kinds of

and 18th Centuries, London: Gingko Library, 2017; Elisabeth A. Fraser, ed., *The Mobility of People and Things in the Early Modern Mediterranean. The Art of Travel*, New York-London: Routledge, 2019.

81) Alina Payne, ‘The Portability of Art: Prolegomena to Art and Architecture on the Move,’ in Diana Sorensen, ed., *Territories & Trajectories: Cultures in Circulation*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2018, 91–109.

82) See Alex Drace-Francis, ‘A Provincial Imperialist and a Curious Account of Wallachia: Ignaz von Born,’ *European History Quarterly*, 36: 1, 2006, 61–89, here 61–2; Csaba Dupcsik, ‘Postcolonial Studies and the Inventing of Eastern Europe,’ *East Central Europe*, 26, 1999, 1–14; Ezequiel Adamovsky, ‘Euro-Orientalism and the Making of the Concept of Eastern Europe in France, 1810–1880,’ *Journal of Modern History* 77: 3, 2005, 591–628, here 592–5.

83) For the concept of untranslatability, see Alessandra Russo, *The Untranslatable Image: A Mestizo History of the Arts in New Spain*, trans. Susan Emanuel, Joe R. and Teresa Lozano Long, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2014.

historical experience and the need to mediate its meaning in a modern context. New forms of scholarly activity may better suit this approach than the conventional single-author publication model; this includes co-authored pieces, collaborative research projects, and published roundtables, to name just a few.

[R. BORN] Language competence is indeed one of the greatest challenges when dealing with art in East-Central or South-Eastern Europe. From my experience teaching in Germany, it is mostly students who have a family connection to this region and thus have the appropriate language skills, as well as students from the region itself, who drive research in the field of art history of central and eastern Europe. Regarding research on global art history, I have found that even regionally produced studies published in languages with a wide circulation (German, Italian, French) are often not taken up, especially in monographs published in the United States and Great Britain.

[S. IVANIČ] Three particularly notable scholars in the Anglophone world have mastered the many languages needed to do wide-ranging histories of the Habsburgs and East-Central Europe: Robert J. W. Evans, Thomas DaCosta Kaufman, and Paul Crossley. In the context of today's pressures of tenure, publication, administration, and teaching, coupled with lack of funding for skills acquisition, we can hardly expect young scholars to achieve the same vast skill sets. To work rigorously across the many physical, intellectual, and linguistic borders that our research requires, we – as a group – need to bring together teams of individuals in research projects and networks to cover a range of skills and learn from each other with support. To improve the field, we also need to engage more readily with those in heritage, museums, and collections. This is an exciting moment for historians of central and eastern Europe when networks are becoming easier to form through online platforms and – a generation on from the fall of the Iron Curtain – there is a new energy among scholars keen to work together. We are at an exciting juncture for this broadening out and refreshing of scholarship.

[R. RADWAY] We are expected to be superhuman. Digital tools and collaboration are our saving graces. For secondary literature, machine learning and translation software have come incredibly far, and it might be time to start normalizing its cautious use for tangential languages in a person's subfield. It can be incredibly useful for identifying important work that appears in surprising places. If we signal to students that these linguistic hurdles can be overcome without dedicating thirty years to language acquisition first, it might encourage more of them to take up early modern topics in the region. We might also want to maintain a running list of 'low-lying fruit' or low-linguistic-investment topics for students to engage with that could draw them in.

[R. S. NOYES] While to be an art historian also makes one something of a de facto polymath, I think, I tend to agree that those focused on central and eastern Europe face a particularly kaleidoscopic linguistic ecosystem. That the Pac archives I mentioned above, for instance, are scattered throughout multiple countries today is mirrored to an extent by the fact that the relevant documents are in Polish, Latin, and Italian, reflecting the reality that the region's

multilingualism itself has a long history.⁸⁴ I think the beginnings of an answer to the challenge of not only undertaking our own current research but also training future generations of scholars might be found in separate but interrelated currents particular to Euro-American cultural and socio-political dynamics that are presently evolving in real time. These have to do with the incremental EU integration, already ongoing for about two decades, of East-Central and Western Europe (with the latter I'd include Scandinavia-Nordics). Especially since the fall of the Soviet Union (though also before) and the regaining of, for example, Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian independence more than three decades ago, art historians and cultural theorists in each of the Baltic countries have grappled with delineating the contours of their respective national histories of art, architecture and material culture, and publishing on these subjects in their respective languages.⁸⁵ Such projects are vital, while also unavoidably engendering some degree of insularism.⁸⁶ Part of my scholarly strategy these days is collaboration with scholars from historically under-represented territories. The idea is to join forces as we internationalize decades of important work in local art-historical traditions previously carried out within isolated nationalist parameters imposed by totalitarian regimes. Dissemination of this scholarship in Anglophone journals and volumes brings the opportunity to embed and incorporate it within broader transregional and methodological frameworks.

Thanks to growing initiatives on the national, regional, and international level to further integrate Europe, there are increasing resources and impetus to support collaboration with central and eastern European scholars. I have prepared research grant applications in cooperation with a team of specialists from the Baltics, combining diverse linguistic expertise to form a kind of conglomerate 'superscholar'. I have also started co-authoring articles with researchers who may have complimentary linguistic toolkits and/or access to source materials in the field. An example of this is as an ongoing project involving research on a specific genre of relic-sculptures manufactured in eighteenth-century Rome and exported to today's Belarus, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland, for which I recently coordinated a team of PhDs and postdocs from these countries in writing a joint article.⁸⁷ The question of generational change points to another important aspect, which is the emergence of rising generations of students and future scholars from central and eastern European countries who may already have a grounding in

84) See, for example, Catherine Gibson, 'The Polish Livonian Legacy in Latgale: Slavic Ethnolects at the Confluence of the Baltic and Slavic Dialectal Continua,' in Tomasz Kamusella, Motoki Nomachi, and Catherine Gibson, eds, *The Palgrave Handbook of Slavic Languages, Identities and Borders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, 57–80.

85) See essays in Katrin Kivimaa, ed., 'The Geographies of Art History in the Baltic Region,' Special Issue of *Kunsteadauslikke Uurimusi / Studies on Art and Architecture*, 19: 3-4, 2010.

86) There are, however, important exceptions: in Lithuania, for example, with its strong tradition of Roman Catholicism, there is a bi-directional vein of scholarship investigating historical connections with Italy, e.g. Riccardo Casimiro Lewanski, ed., *La via dell'Ambra. Dal Baltico All'Alma Mater. Atti Del Convegno Italico-Baltico*, Bologna: Università degli Studi, 1994; Aušra Baniulytė, 'Italai XVI–XVII a. Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kasdieniame gyvenime,' in Auksuolė Čepaitienė, ed., *Lietuvos etnologija / Lithuanian Ethnology*, Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History, 2005, 75–96; Piero Bugiani, 'From Innocent III to Today—Italian Interest in the Baltic,' *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 38: 2, 2007, 255–62; Aušra Baniulytė, 'Italian Intrigue in the Baltics: Myth, Faith, and Politics in the Age of the Baroque,' *Journal of Early Modern History*, 16, 2012, 23–52; Daiva Mitrulevičiūtė, ed, *Lietuva-Italija: šimtmečių ryšiai*, Vilnius: Išleido Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2016; Giovanni Matteo Guidetti, 'Firenze e Lituania. Un rapporto antico, un legame ritrovato,' in *Firenze tra Rinascimento e Barocco. Dalle Collezioni d'Arte della Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Firenze e di Banca CR Firenze SpA*, Vilnius: Fondazione CR Firenze, 2018, <https://www.fondazionecrfirenze.it/la-collezione-di-fondazione-cr-firenze-in-mostra-a-vilnius/> (accessed 31 August 2021).

87) Ruth Sargent Noyes et al., "Baltic catacombs."

several languages, together with a mastery of English that earlier generations could not attain. I think we might be looking eastward in recruiting both present collaborators and future scholars.

[O. PEVNY] Art history is an interdisciplinary field that requires competency in several languages, and the multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, multi-confessional and multi-cultural communities that formed central and eastern Europe further contribute to the lingual diversity required to competently investigate the visual culture of this part of the world. While mastery of all the necessary skills can be off-putting for young scholars beginning in the field and for faculty members burdened by teaching and administrative duties, these concerns can be addressed in various ways. Collaborative research, the creation of reading groups, funding for language training and/or the translation of sources, and development of translation technologies, number among the ways such difficulties can be addressed. This said, I believe there is an immediate need in our field to publish engaging English language survey texts as well as anthologies of translated primary sources that can be used for the teaching of introductory university courses in the visual culture of central and eastern Europe. The availability of such resources would allow students to develop an interest in the field before having to confront the demanding list of recommended foreign languages. Another way of addressing the language barriers is to create courses that combine components of Art History and Area Studies and that offer classes introducing a given language in conjunction with art history lectures – in other words, move to a model of team-taught courses that are cross-disciplinary. To make these courses interesting to future generation of students, they must engage with current theories and methodologies, as well as cover topics of current interests (for example, gender studies and ecology). Immersion in the cultural context of central and eastern Europe also is a good way to nurture the curiosity of students and encourage their further study of the region. Year-abroad programmes or short-term study visits to relevant countries or regions for the on-site study of monuments of visual culture or of language should be encouraged.

[S. IVANIČ] I agree with Olenka's point about labelling the region. The issue of fluidity and nuance is so important to understanding the vast area which we are dealing with, but – on the other hand – the complexity of this issue can be problematic for communicating with broader audiences. One does not want to be labelled merely as a regional historian. Is it perhaps wiser for us to avoid geographical categories altogether and just become, for example, historians of religion, society or art?

[R. RADWAY] Exactly. How do you sell yourself? I often find it easier to just say I work on early modern Europe because it is true. The centre of my early modern Europe is Vienna, Prague, Buda, and Constantinople. We do not need to qualify Europe any more than a person studying French, English, or Italian Renaissance needs to qualify their use of the term 'Europe'. Maybe this obfuscates my focus on eastern and central Europe. You cannot grow a field if you do not name it. But perhaps my approach is a subversive way of expanding the field, by teaching and writing about it unselfconsciously.

Natural borders are extremely important for defining regions and connecting them across political borders. I think it is equally important to examine historical political borders as they were at the time an object was created. National historiography and national approaches to these topics have often obscured the historical reality of the imperial borderlands that crisscrossed the region. Sometimes it is impossible to use accurate political terms for the period that the objects were created because an editor has flagged it with ‘nobody knows what that means’. I am in favour of owning empire, even where it does not necessarily exist on a real political and legal level because I see it in the way that it functions in the archival documentation of patronage networks, in the way that objects are created. I am willing to reference the Holy Roman Empire or a Habsburg empire with a lowercase ‘e’, because the collection of territories ruled by the Habsburgs was not a real ‘empire’ in the legal sense. One can argue similarly with Transylvania and the Ottoman Empire. In embracing the explanatory power of empire and imperial formations, we can enter different and more broad historiographical debates.

[R. S. NOYES] I like to call what you are describing ‘aspirational empire’. How might we reconsider the supposed primacy of Italy in the history of art, for instance, in relation to the self-fashioning of cosmopolitan patrons and collectors like the Paces, who discursively harnessed the idea of Italy not as fixed entity but malleable concept that could be arbitrated, legitimated, and transformed to stake a strategic position as a north-easternmost Roman Catholic stronghold? These kinds of transregional microhistories productively problematize conventional understandings of cultural dynamics between ostensibly far-flung regions of Europe specifically, and perceived centres and their purported peripheries more generally. The Medici-Pac exchange should be mapped against the decline of the Medicean Grand Duchy, as Tuscany was increasingly outpaced on the global stage, and against the broader reliance of Florence and its rulers over the *longue durée* upon the Baltic as an important source of artistic, political, economic, and cultural capital.⁸⁸

That there is a whole subfield of apologetic scholarship which researches and contextualizes how and why the Grand Duchy of Tuscany under the Medici failed to become more than an aspirational global empire underscores the strong scholarly tradition of writing about such ‘failed’ imperial ambitions in the West, something still largely lacking for the region under discussion here.⁸⁹ In the case of the Pac family, they clearly were trying to project a notional intercultural Italo-Lithuanian empire that resonated with the neologism *Litalinia* eliding the toponyms *Lituania* (Lithuania) and *Italia* (Italy), a term coined by the first papal nuncio to Poland-Lithuania Zaccaria Ferreri (1479-1524), who proposed that the Grand Duchy be called *Litaliania* rather than *Lituania*, as the name ultimately derived from *l'Italia*, and the Lithuanian nobility descended directly from Italian parentage.⁹⁰ They constructed parallel genealogical

88) For these questions see the forthcoming essay: Ruth Sargent Noyes, ‘“To see at least in an image the semblance of a Friend...” Representing the family of Pacowie (Pacai) between baroque Tuscany and Lithuania,’ Special Issue of *Kauno istorijos metraštis*, 2022, forthcoming.

89) See, for example, Lia Markey, *Imagining the Americas in Medici Florence*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016.

90) Zaccaria Ferreri, *Vita Beati Casimiri Confessoris: ex serenissimis Poloni[a]e regibus & magnis ... Zacharia Ferrerio Vicentino pontifice Gardien[se]: in Polonia[m] & Lituania[m]*, [Cracow: Iohannes Haller], 1521, n.p. On Ferreri see Eckehart Stöve, ‘FERRERI, Zaccaria,’ in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 46, 1996, [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/zaccaria-ferreri_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/zaccaria-ferreri_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed 30 August 2021). For Ferreri’s theorizing on connections between

myths of Roman and Florentine origins, on one hand cultivating ethnogenesis mythologizing the Lithuanian aristocracy's Roman origins in the Po river valley of Etruria (also the invented *locus* of Medicean power), and holding that during the reign of Nero the patrician Palemon and five hundred Roman nobles fled north, eventually settling in the Baltic.⁹¹ The Paces also grounded a specific *Litalinian* pedigree linking their family to the Pazzi, the powerful Tuscan bankers and erstwhile Medici rivals, claiming that after the Pazzi's exile from Florence in the wake of a failed anti-Medici coup in 1478, some banished members settled in Lithuania—a claim reinforced by the onomastic coincidence of the family names *Pac* (pronounced 'Pats') and *Pazzi* (pronounced 'Pats-tsi').⁹² The Paces' Italianization was so successful that seventeenth-century papal and Medicean court propaganda vaunted the Paces as the 'Pazzi in Lithuania,' positioning the family as north-easternmost guardians of the Roman Church and even successors to antique Roman *imperium*.⁹³

QUESTION 6:

Does the field of early modern central and eastern European art history exist both within and outside the region? How can we ensure its continuing growth on an institutional level?

[O. PEVNY] The field exists outside of central and eastern Europe, but the main research hubs are located within the nation states of this region. Perhaps this is how it should be. Nevertheless, the underrepresentation of central and eastern European studies in Western European, British, and North American institutions is noteworthy, especially in the aftermath of the fall of the Iron Curtain and of the Soviet Union. At the University of Cambridge, Slavonic culture is studied with the Slavonic section of the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics. In addition to offering papers (courses) on Russian language, literature and culture, the Slavonic section offers an introductory paper on Polish history, culture and language, and a parallel paper on Ukrainian history, culture, and language. There is another paper that covers Ukrainian film and one on Early Rus' culture. The teaching of these papers is made possible by special endowments. A programme of public events that brings to Cambridge specialists in Polish and Ukrainian Studies enriches the paper offerings. The equal weight ascribed to Polish, Ukrainian and Russian papers in the pursuit of the undergraduate degree in Slavonic Studies ensures enrolment in the Ukrainian and Polish papers; the popularity of the papers is boosted by good teaching and extensive public programming. Political revolutions in Ukraine, the rise of conservatism in Poland, and the imperial ambitions of the Putin regime also pop-

Italy and Lithuania, see Pietro U. Dini, *Prelude to Baltic Linguistics: Earliest Theories about Baltic Languages (16th century)*, Leiden: Brill, 2014, 164-66.

91) On Pac self-fashioning see Anna Sylwia Czyż, *Fundacje artystyczne rodziny Paców. Stefana, Krzysztofa Zygmunta i Mikołaja Stefana: 'Lillium bonae spei at antiquitate consecrarum'*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UKSW, 2016.

92) For these genealogies see Aušra Baniulytė, 'Pacai ar Pazzi? Nauja Palemono legendos versija LDK raštijoje,' in Aušra Jurgutienė and Sigita Narbutas, eds, *Istorijos Rašymo Horizontai, Senoji Lietuvos literatūra 18*, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2005, 140-66. See also Joanna Orzeł, 'From imagination to political reality? The Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a successor of Rome in the early modern historiography (15th-18th centuries),' *Open Political Science*, 1, 2019, 170-81.

93) Aušra Baniulytė, 'The Pazzi Family in Lithuania: Myth and Politics in the European Court Society of the Early Modern Age,' *Medium aevum quotidianum*, 58, 2009, 41-57.

ularize the Ukrainian and Polish papers. In the future, I think it will be private endowments as well as funding and resources made available by institutions of relevant nation states or supra-national unions that will make the study of central and eastern Europe possible in Western European and North American institutions. The popularity of such programmes will be contingent upon their ability to re-envision narratives of local history in step with changing global concerns.

[R. RADWAY] As someone trained in North America, first as an art historian and then as a historian, I would say a stand-alone field did not exist in the 2000s and 2010s when I was a student. There were just a handful of departments training Ph.D. students in early modern central and eastern European art. While coursework in these places often included Eastern Europe, few Ph.D. students had any interest or the necessary linguistic skills to pursue projects and eventually careers that covered the region broadly. This may partly have to do with the tendency towards increased specialization and, curiously, an increased focus on global art history in those same departments. Regrettably, art history in general seems to be shrinking everywhere. Still, I think in order to expand the field and place it firmly on the map, we need to publish in prominent venues where we are forced to speak to broad audiences beyond our subfield. This will require us to downplay the linguistic peculiarities of the region. Something as simple as using fewer complicated proper names in foreign languages both in teaching and in writing can make what we do more accessible. I also think we need to take more leadership roles in learned societies and journal editorial boards. By taking a seat at the table we increase our visibility and take part in decision-making processes.

[T. GRUSIECKI] In North America, I don't see early modern central and eastern European art as a separate field. Tenured and tenure-track scholars who study the region are few and far between, and fewer still work at research-intensive universities where they could train graduate students who would continue building the field. In North America, I don't think our issue is the survival of the field; here the issue is the non-existence of the field and the lack of impetus to organise, collaborate, and support each other. US-based learned societies are either dominated by modernists (SHERA and HGSCEA), Germanists (HGSCEA), Russianists (SHERA), or political and literary historians (ESSA), reflecting the low numbers of the early modernists among art historians who work on the region.⁹⁴ I don't think establishing another society or a journal is an answer to this conundrum, but we certainly need to stay motivated to continue having stimulating conversations among ourselves, both formal and informal, written and spoken. Ultimately, the goal is to increase the quantity and status of scholarship on the region, to have more junior scholars serve in faculty positions, and to convince others that our scholarship matters beyond the narrow constricts of area studies.

[S. IVANIČ] One way to ensure its growth as a field is to engage with the now sizeable populations of central and eastern Europeans in Western Europe and North America. In 2019, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) recorded that there were approximately 1.9 million 'Central

94) Society of Historians of Eastern European, Eurasian, and Russian Art and Architecture (SHERA), <http://shera-art.org>; Historians of German, Scandinavian, and Central European Art (HGSCEA), <http://hgscea.org>; Early Slavic Studies Association (ESSA), <https://earlyslavicstudies.org>.

Europeans', broadly defined, living in the UK (ONS Population of the UK by country of birth and nationality). In the USA, 36% of European immigrants living in the country in 2016 came from Central European regions (migrationpolicy.org), equating to 1.7 million people. Yet despite large numbers of Central European immigrants to the UK after 2004, central and eastern European history is under-represented in the school curriculum. A generation of students with roots in Central Europe find that the focus on Tudors and Stuarts in early modern history does not speak to them. As these students approach university age, it is our job to introduce them to histories that are engaging and to show them the great potential for studying central and eastern Europe. There is a wealth of untapped knowledge here in their underused language skills and local understanding.

Finally, we have an important social and political responsibility. National histories are still central to modern politics of central and eastern Europe. However, to understand its longer history is to understand its place – geographical and historical – in a far more fluid world before the emergence of the nineteenth-century nation-state. Taking a global approach can help make sense of its connectedness and its geographical role in human history. The ability of ordinary people to live everyday lives that crossed borders and were linked by things other than nation – religion, family, trade, and professions – and to migrate and learn new languages, to fit in or not, was (and is) vast. By telling these stories and remaking the history of central and eastern Europe as one of connectedness, we can play a role in broadening an understanding of identity; and to show how migration and cultural effervescence are a part of central and eastern Europe's history and ancestry.

[R. BORN] The situation in Germany is different. (West) Berlin professors trained students in central and eastern European topics, including – prior to 1989 – Hellmut Lorenz (b. 1942) at the Freie Universität, and – from 1990 – Robert Suckale (1943-2020) at the Technische Universität. Both were connected with colleagues from the region, including informal associations such as the 'Arbeitskreis deutscher und polnischer Kunsthistoriker und Denkmalpflege' (Working Group of German and Polish Art Historians and Monuments Preservationists), which was founded in 1988.

In the eastern part of the city, Hubert Faensen (1928-2019), an expert on the Balkans and the Caucasus, taught at the Humboldt University from 1982 to 1992 on various topics of Eastern Christian and Old Russian art. In 1995, the Chair of Eastern European Art History was established at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Its first holder, Adam S. Labuda (b. 1946) focused his teaching and research on medieval and early modern art, the role of art in the processes of nation-building, and the history of the discipline in East-Central Europe. These research areas were maintained in 2009–2013 by the interim chairholders Milena Bartlová, Katarzyna Murawska-Muthesius, Piotr Piotrowski (1952-2015), and Robert Born, while being thematically expanded to include the art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Murawska-Muthesius and Piotrowski), as well as Byzantium, the Ottoman Empire, and South-eastern Europe (Born). Michaela Marek augmented this spectrum as the new chair from 2013 until her untimely passing in 2018 with new areas of focus, such as urban planning, art and architecture in the Soviet Union, and art historiography between 1945 and 1989.⁹⁵ An

95) <http://www.kunstgeschichte.hu-berlin.de/institut/lehrstuehle/lehrstuhl-fuer-kunstgeschichte-osteuropas/>

‘International Forum for Doctoral Candidates in East European Art History,’ has been held annually under her aegis since 2014. Many of the issues tackled by Marek were pursued between 2018 and 2020 by Katja Bernhardt who continued the ‘International Forum’. It would be desirable that for the sake of institutional continuity the chair at Humboldt University be reappointed.

Research institutes focused on East-Central and South-Eastern Europe also offer critical infrastructure. These are the Northeast Institute (IKGN e. V.) in Lüneburg, which is affiliated with the University of Hamburg; the Leibniz Institute for East and Southeast European Studies (IOS) in Regensburg; the Herder Institute for Historical Research on East Central Europe – Institute of the Leibniz Association in Marburg; the German Historical Institute (DHI) in Warsaw; and the Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO) in Leipzig. The GWZO has been supporting research on the art and culture in the area between the Baltic and the Adriatic and the Black Sea from Late Antiquity to the present since 1995, resulting in several monographs, anthologies, and exhibition catalogues. An additional platform for the presentation of new research in the field is the *Handbuch zur Kunstgeschichte Ostmitteleuropas* (Handbook on the History of Art in East-Central Europe). In nine volumes, it aims to present the development of the region’s art from Late Antiquity to the present.⁹⁶

[S. IVANIČ] The AHRC project, *Connected Central European Worlds, 1500–1700* maintains a continually updated list of research centres, institutions, and learned societies dedicated to the advancement of knowledge about early modern central and eastern European art and culture.⁹⁷ This allows for a snapshot of the field as it is today.

[R. S. NOYES] I find the theoretical and methodological approaches sketched out here to be productive for several reasons. First, they help to foreclose on the (unintentional) marginalization, isolation, and exoticizing of central and eastern European art that can sometimes result from focusing solely on the subject as an insular field, without reference to its broader horizons and multifarious connections with the wider world.⁹⁸ Grand Duke Cosimo III’s ermine robe, for example, only reveals its resonances when framed against the centuries-long Baltic fur trade, historical European fashions, and discourse associated with the prophylactic and fertility-giving powers of the mustelids from which it was made.⁹⁹ This in turn unfolds a reading of the portrait that attributes to the work otherwise lacking complexity and agency. Second, they appeal to a broader (and predominantly Anglophone) audience of art historians and scholars of early modern historical studies who will likely be familiar with, say, the Houses of Medici and Habsburg-Lorraine specifically, and Italian arts more generally, and thus permit the opening of new interpretive horizons for a wider swath of scholars, who might

96) <https://www.leibniz-gwzo.de/de/forschung/wissenstransfer-und-vernetzung/wissen-teilen/publizieren/handbuch-kunst>

97) <https://research.kent.ac.uk/emcentraleu/resources/>

98) Along these lines see Tomasz Grusiecki, ‘Going Global? An Attempt to Challenge the Peripheral Position of Early Modern Polish–Lithuanian Painting in the Historiography of Art,’ *The Polish Review*, 57, 2012, 3–26; Beáta Hock and Anu Allas, eds, *Globalizing East European Art Histories: Past and Present*, New York: Routledge, 2018.

99) Tawny Sherrill, ‘Fleas, Furs, and Fashions: Zibellini as Luxury Accessories of the Renaissance,’ in Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker, eds, *Medieval Clothing and Textiles*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006, 2, 121–50.

see in a new light both the relevance of central and eastern European art histories and the contingency of certain conventional art-historical teleologies.

I think central and eastern Europe's perceived peripherality is and will be gradually changing. Certain entrenched 'lanes' change more slowly—the traditional separation within many art history departments, for example, of faculty working on early modern Southern or Western Europe (usually Italy), Northern Europe (typically Germany/Netherlands), and the Iberian world (which might include Spain proper as well as its colonies). In American academe, the progressive streamlining and de-westernizing of the humanities has accelerated since the post-2008 cuts to departments' budgets. Many universities have conducted searches for 'early modernists' (without stipulations of conventional geographic divisions) or 'global early modernists' who can explicitly engage with transregional questions. While this reflects the broader depopulating of art history faculty (thus necessitating new hires with an ever-wider range of expertise), such a trend could mean more opportunities for faculty working on some of these topics. From the European perspective, the scholarly capacity to set central and eastern European art into conversation with the rest of Europe and the wider world might prove strategically fruitful. I think there is a particular currency now, in the sense that the EU wants to tell a certain story of an interconnected and globalized Europe to itself about itself for a range of social, political, ideological, and economic reasons, and this directly impacts what kinds of research gets funding. Thus, I think now is a potentially propitious moment for scholarship that undertakes to globalize central and eastern Europe, at least within the European intellectual context.

[T. GRUSIECKI] Returning to the main question 'what can historians of the region's art do to secure its inclusion in the global narratives', it seems that we need to tackle three interconnected issues as we attempt to insert central and eastern Europe into the discipline's mainstream accounts: (1) the lack of institutional scaffold for the study of the region in North America and Western Europe, and therefore fewer students to take up the mantle when we retire; (2) the dearth of publications available in major research languages, particularly in English; and (3) the methodological untranslatability of much research produced on the region, leading to its invisibility in the Anglo-American academe. The solution to this multifaceted issue thus must be multidirectional in scope. Rather than working on a single fix, we will do better if we simultaneously (1) make our research more marketable so that we can attract and train a new generation of students who will get jobs, ensuring the field's survival; (2) collaborate with other scholars, both in and outside the region with the aim of expanding readership for our work; and (3) work towards a larger methodological commensurability of scholarly work on the region, particularly that produced in central and eastern Europe itself.

Getting any faculty position in early modern art history these days resembles the chances of winning at roulette, but this underscores still more our professional duty to build critical mass for central and eastern European art so that other art historians take the region seriously. Of utmost importance is the expansion of our readership beyond the field. In this pursuit, we need to find better opportunities to connect with other scholars of the region, including those who reside in central and eastern Europe. Most importantly, we need to think how to link our research to present-day concerns, such as migration, cultural heterogeneity, climate change, populism, nationalism, economic globalisation (and soon possibly de-globalisation), to ask new questions and offer new perspectives on the wider field of early modern Art History. This

is not an easy task, but the future of our field is at stake. The point of this forum was precisely to trigger a conversation, to bring attention to the cause, to rally other scholars of the region, and to show them that there is a community out there. We can only hope that our colleagues elsewhere pick up this conversation where we left it off.

Postscript in a time of war

Taking place in summer 2021, this discussion reflected thoughts in a time of pandemic, when the interconnections in life and culture had been sorely missing for a year and a half. That phase had made the historical importance of the interconnected nature of cultures more clear than ever. Relating these ideas onto a region whose histories had been carved up by national interests in the modern period seemed like a necessary corrective. Yet, Russia's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 reveals that our wish to 'globalize', connect, and trace the transcultural links in this region must be done cautiously. It cannot be allowed to gloss over what is local and specific. Russia's invasion of Ukraine, based in large part on claims to its history—as a 'brother', rightful inheritor and protector of these lands—reveals a long and insidious campaign to erase Ukrainian history, heritage, and identity. This kind of action has happened many times in these so-called 'bloodlands' between 'the East' and 'the West'.¹⁰⁰ The erasure of national sovereignty in the name of 'brotherhood' leads to genocide. Voices from Ukraine have long called for a decolonized view of its history, free of a Russian imperial lens, a sentiment powerfully expressed in Olenka Pevny's inaugural lecture for a 2022 series on Ukrainian history and heritage, and Olesya Khromeychuk's recent address to the BASEES conference.¹⁰¹ How can a decolonized view of the region, then, sit alongside wishes to understand the deep links across it? These are not mutually exclusive approaches. Ukrainians do not want to write Russia out of their histories, but to be once again free to write histories that are based on primary sources and scholarly research, and that can celebrate the generative potential of partnerships, crossings and encounters in an area continually in contact with peoples and cultures to the south, north, east and west; to correct the numerous volumes of histories that are ideologically motivated, invent monuments where they are not there, or falsely consign Kyivan Rus' to the roots of Russia alone. What happens in Ukraine is a warning to us all. Now is a fresh opportunity, when the world is watching, to write and re-write histories of central and eastern Europe that acknowledge links, convergences, and transcultural dialogues without laying claim to them: to write a decolonized but transcultural history that finds beauty and richness in complexity and shuns the binaries.

100) Timothy Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin*, New York: Basic Books, 2010.

101) Olenka Z. Pevny (University of Cambridge), 'Lacunae of Art History and Kyiv's Visual Culture,' Inaugural Lecture 22 April 2022, Dumbarton Oaks, <https://www.doaks.org/research/byzantine/scholarly-activities/kyivan-rus-to-modern-ukraine-home>; and Olesya Khromeychuk (Ukrainian Institute London), 'Where is Ukraine on the mental map of the academic community?' Keynote Lecture, British Association of Slavonic and East European Studies (BASEES) Conference, 8 April 2022, <https://youtu.be/CJthJb1tK0Y>.



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as images or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.