Statehood and governance, their transformation and diversification, are yet again highly discussed topics in German historical research. For a long time, early modern state building was considered a genuinely European characteristic of this era. Whereas the concept of state building from above has often been criticized and thus the general conception of Early Modern statehood has changed thoroughly in recent years, the main focus of this discussion throughout has been mostly limited to Europe. However, stately structures and governance did not exist solely in Europe. In the Early Modern era and especially before the mid-18th century, Europeans were confronted with highly developed and efficient state systems in Asia. In India, the Mughal Empire was established in the 16th century, South Indian kingdoms possessed elaborate governmental structures; the Safawid dynasty ruled in Persia; and while the Ottoman Empire may to some extent have become less threatening after the battle of Lepanto, it was still an important actor in the Mediterranean world; not to mention China or Japan, who resisted intensified cultural contact for a long time. But they, too, served as a role model in several European theories of the state.

Moreover, the early modern period was a time of intensified contact between Europe and Asia. Cultural contact is always accompanied by cultural flows (Appadurai). This suggests that transcultural encounters were essential, or at least important, for the transformation and diversification of governmental structures and practices both in Europe and Asia. Statehood and governance were clearly high on the agenda in both world regions as problems of improving not only the efficiency of administrative structures, but also the legal and fiscal penetration of the ruled territory became increasingly important. And processes of transfer take place in areas where the need for action or even structural shortcomings is perceived. Nevertheless, state structures in non-European regions are only rarely integrated into European model-building and concepts of statehood. Furthermore, this selective perception is also widespread among area studies which often argue against the master narrative of the Modern European state without noticing that many different models and explanations were developed concerning early modern European history. The division of labour and expertise between history and area studies certainly has to be renegotiated, as recent discussions about global history have clearly shown. However, it seems even more important right now to exchange methods and concepts concerning comparative and entangled history. Therefore, this workshop will discuss concepts and methodology for comparative and entangled history using the examples of Asian and European statehood. It will encompass three focal points.

1. The main focus will address the methods and theories necessary to create a transcultural perspective. Various concepts have emerged not only from different disciplines, but also from different regional and historiographical traditions in both Asia and Europe (connected history, entanglement, transfer, comparison, *histoire croisée*, and global history). How can these
varying concepts be applied successfully and can they be combined to help us reach a deeper understanding of transcultural interaction, perception and transfer?

2. Distinct explanations and descriptions of the phenomenon “statehood” have also developed in each regional discipline, explanations which often do not take each other into account even when they all concern the early modern era. This workshop will therefore question if and how, for example, a new cultural history of the political history (Stollberg-Rilinger) is compatible and stimulative for the ritual sovereignty of the segmentary South Asian state (B. Stein), or if the concepts of state building ‘from below’ (Holenstein) can bring new understanding of the “little kingdoms” (Dirks).

3. However, the workshop shall not tackle solely theoretical and conceptual questions. It is important that they be combined with concrete research. Thus they should be tested using examples of state structures in Europe, Asia and the Middle East. With which problems were they confronted and how did they react? Which elements were essential to the stabilization, expansion or changing of rulership? How did contemporaries themselves reflect on their system, its functioning and its legitimacy?

Program

Monday, 26th October
14.00-14.30 Antje Flüchter (Heidelberg) **Introduction: State Building as Entangled History**

The Early Modern State: Concepts and Theories
Chair: Monica Juneja (Heidelberg)
14.30-15.30 Peer Vries (Wien):  
*State building in Eastern Asia and Western Europe*

15.30-16.30 Stefan Brakensiek (Essen)  
*New Perspectives on State Building and the Implementation of Rulership in Early Modern Monarchies*

16.30-17.00 Coffee break

17.00-18.00 Farhat Hasan (Delhi)  
*Re-assessing the Historiography of State Formation in India*

Evening Lecture
19.00-20.00 Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger (Münster)  
*State and political history in a culturalist perspective*

20.30 Dinner

Dienstag, 27th October
8.00-12.45 II. Models
Chair: Thomas Simon (Wien)
8.00-8.30 Michael Stolleis (Frankfurt/Main):  
*Einführung*

8.30-9.15 Thomas Simon (Wien)  
*Konzepte normativer Durchdringung des Staates im deutsch-chinesischen Vergleich*
9.15-10.00 Reinhard Blänkner (Frankfurt/Oder)
Provincializing the „Early Modern State“. Überlegungen über Staatenformierung im globalen Kontext der frühen Neuzeit.

10.00-10.30 Coffee break

10.30-11.15 Susan Richter (Heidelberg)
Fremdes Vorbild und Gegenentwurf – Konstrukte staatlicher Erfolgsmodelle in der europäischen Staatstheorie

11.15-12.00 Nicolas Schillinger (Heidelberg)
Statistik als staatliches Instrument – Der Transfer einer europäischen Regierungstechnologie nach China im frühen 20. Jahrhundert

12.00-12.45 Guido Mühlemann (Zürich)
Die Rezeption europäischer Staatsvorstellungen in China seit dem Ersten Opiumkrieg (1839-1842)

12.45-14.30 Lunch Break

III. Concepts for Transcultural Studies
Chair: Jörg Gengnagel (Heidelberg)
14.30-15.30 Angelika Epple (Bielefeld):
Who speaks? New Global History and (old) historiographical problems

15.30-16.30 Ulrike Lindner (München/Bielefeld)
Entangled histories. Comparison and transnational/transcolonial approaches in the history of colonialism

16.30-17.00 Coffee break

17.00-18.00 Sven Trakulhun (Zürich)
Comparing Conceptions of Absolute Rule: the Figure of the ‘Monarch’ in Siam and Europe, 16-18 c.

18.00-19.00 Susanna Burghartz (Basel)
Sampling identities between survival and superiority. Travel accounts into New Worlds about 1600

Mittwoch, 28th October

IV. State and state building as Entangled History – case studies
8.00-12.00
Barend Noordam (Heidelberg): Processes of Transfer in the Military Field. Europe and the Post-Nomadic States of Mughal India and Manchu China

Peter Trummer (Heidelberg): Theories on civil-military relations and military professionalization at the turn from the 18th to the 19th century

Gauri Parasher (Heidelberg): Indo-French relations during the Early Modern Period. Cultural Asymmetries in the Fields of Politics and Government

Sebastian Meurer (Heidelberg): At the junction of local and global conceptions of government: Fort William (Calcutta) in the 18th Century
Dorothee Linnemann (Münster): Strategies of Eye-Witnessing: Visual Ceremonial Descriptions and Conflicting Concepts of Governance in European-Ottoman Court Relations in the 17th and 18th Century

12.00-13.00 Lunch Break

V. Court and Diplomacy
13.00-14.00 Corinne Léfevre (Paris): Mughal India/Muslim Asia/Europe: Circulation of Political Ideas and Instruments in Early Modern Times

14.00-15.00 Jan-Peter Hartung (London): The Islamization of the Tiger – On Strategies of Legitimization of Tipu Sultan

15.00-15.30 Coffee Break

15.30-16.30 Christian Wieland (Freiburg), The Consequences of Early Modern Diplomacy: Entanglement, Discrimination, and Mutual Ignorance

16.30 -17.30 Concluding discussion
Chair: Thomas Maissen (Heidelberg)