



## CHAPTER 2

Monographic and Macro Histories:  
Confronting Paradigms*Diego Olstein*

The teaching of world history at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem resulted from a profound institutional innovation: the founding of the School of History. The aim of the School of History is to provide a framework for all historians and students dispersed among the history departments (History, History of the Jewish People, and Art History) and the regional-studies departments (Islamic and Middle East Studies, African Studies, East Asian Studies, Russian and Slavic Studies, American Studies, Spanish and Latin American Studies, and Indian, Iranian and Armenian Studies). This inclusiveness is possible for two reasons. First, these fields share the basic principles of the historical discipline and, second, the School of History emphasizes the transcendence of the regional boundaries toward an all-encompassing unit of analysis—the world. This new organizational mode has affected the program of study in the above-mentioned departments and diverse academic activities at several levels: the teaching of a core-course curriculum and seminars, inter-departmental collaboration, international meetings, university-community relations, and world-history research.

One significant achievement of the School of History is an introductory course on world history given to students from all the above-mentioned departments. Two models inform the introductory courses on world history—a narrative-synthetic model and an analytical model. The narrative-synthetic course consists of an introductory survey structured according to five main principles: four fundamental types of societies (nomadic,

agricultural, maritime, and industrial); two major transformations in economies (the agricultural and industrial revolutions); two major intellectual transformations (the axial age and the scientific revolution); two fundamental types of political regimes (the command system and the market system); and four scales of spatial integration (multiple regional systems, the Indian-basin system, the Atlantic-basin system, and globalization).

In the analytical course, the units of teaching are thematically arranged. The course provides a cross-section of world history by dividing the field of study according to key issues: environment, time and space, demography, economics, social structures, political regimes, warfare and conquest, cultural contacts, and cosmologies.

The introductory course on world history is not the only result of inter-departmental collaboration. Also an inter-departmental advanced seminar on monographic and macro histories resulted from this collaboration. This chapter presents the highlights of the seminar in two senses. Explicitly, this chapter summarizes the main contents and conclusions of the seminar. The contents and conclusions concern the different conceptual paths of macro history—world history, world-system approach, civilizational analysis, historical sociology, and comparative history—and the specific relationship between those paths and the monographic history written by area-studies experts.<sup>1</sup> Implicitly, beyond the specific contents, the chapter presents a model of world-history teaching for advanced students. The teaching model consists of two basic components: a) the gathering of scholars from different macro-historical disciplines and several area studies, and b) the arrangement of the seminar discussions along a unifying organizing principle.

### **Macro History and Area Studies: Confronting Paradigms**

The interdisciplinary seminar departed from a large-scale mapping of the historical discipline, which makes a clear-cut distinction between two realms of historical writing: monographic and macro-historical. The emergence of history as an academic field is closely related to the consolidation of the modern nation-state. For this reason, and as a result of institutional and ideological constraints, historians have generally adopted the nation-state (and the political entities preceding it) as the basic unit of analysis, making the study of history a monographic enterprise. The subsequent emergence

of regional-area studies was shaped by a similar conception, although non-nation-state criteria (language, religion, and culture, for example) defined the unit of analysis. Moreover, the monographic conception has persisted almost untouched in the research and writing of history in all the historiographical approaches that have evolved since the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Economic, social, cliometric, intellectual, cultural, gender-based, and post-colonial branches of historical knowledge essentially assumed that the nation-state, or another enclosed unit, was the undisputed unit of analysis. However, a wide range of historical fields directly challenges the perennial unit of analysis by transcending the nation-states or other borders: world history, comparative history, civilization analysis, world systems, and historical sociology. For these macro-historical approaches, the crossing of boundaries is indispensable for the process of historical inquiry, given that it adopts a new unit of analysis: the world, or a significant part of it, rather than the nation-state, its preceding political entities, or another kind of enclosed unit. Relying on this major contrast between monographic histories (in which area studies are included) and macro histories, the first part of the seminar was dedicated to an analysis of the variety of macro histories. Once the macro-historical realm was mapped out, we examined the ways in which macro histories and monographic area studies potentially and actually communicate.

### **The Range of Macro Histories: The Substantial-Analytical Rift**

Crossing of national boundaries being the major shared feature of macro histories, the way in which each macro-history transcends these boundaries defines the main differences between them. National boundaries can be transcended either analytically or substantially. Comparative history transcends the boundaries analytically by studying the shared and different features of a particular phenomenon, process, or institution in two or more units enclosed by national boundaries. This procedure derives from the basic aim of comparative history—making contrasts between units. World history is different. Given that its main purpose is to connect units, world history transcends the boundaries substantially by focusing on phenomena—the impact, contacts, links, integration, diffusion, and migration from one unit to another—that transcend national boundaries. Also, world-historical units of analysis are usually larger than those of comparative history and

include—in addition to nation-states or regions—continents, ocean basins, hemispheres, and the entire world. Similarly, analysis based on civilizations deals with large units of analysis, indeed the whole world. Once again, this is the result of the concrete transcending of borders, with civilization-based traits being a cross-national-borders phenomenon. However, on the other hand, the definition of civilizations is obtained by contrasting these huge compartmentalized units. Therefore, the transcendence of these new and larger boundaries is analytical in the same way as comparative history. A particular interest in encounters and conflicts between civilizations brings civilizational analysis closer to world history, which, as a result of its analytical and contrastive features, is otherwise much more closely related to comparative history.

Another field akin to comparative history is historical sociology. To begin with, the transcendence of national boundaries is analytical and its aim is contrastive. Its singularity, however, results from its profound aspiration for generalization, which is lacking in comparative history. By means of contrasting the enclosed units, it targets the necessary and sufficient conditions of a particular phenomenon, such as the rise of the modern state, modernization, and dictatorship. The world-system approach, which focuses on cross-border phenomena, such as capital accumulation, world division of labor, and struggle for political hegemony, transcends the national boundaries substantially. Therefore, as in the case of world history, the prevailing unit of analysis is the world as a whole.

Crossing the borders analytically to make a contrast, or crossing them substantially for the sake of linking, is, therefore, the major divide within the macro-histories realm. Moreover, a concomitant series of assumptions follow, reinforcing and emphasizing this primary divide. These assumptions relate to the space and time dimensions and the formulation of causal relations. The macro histories that transcend the national borders analytically—comparative history, civilization analysis, and historical sociology—assume that the units under comparison are self-enclosed. Given that the space dimension is composed of enclosed units of analysis, the historian is able to select for comparison different units from the entire time span. In this sense, a diachronic definition of time dimension is privileged. In addition, a further assumption might be drawn from the primacy of a diachronic definition of time, whereby each singular unit follows its own periodization

and evolves along its own specific path. With each unit being enclosed and transiting its own historical path, the causation of processes is endogenous. In contrast, a substantial crossing of borders brings about an integrated rather than a compartmentalized world. Defining space as the globe as whole, the actions/processes taking place at a single point/period in time all across the world—real time—are of greater importance. Therefore, a synchronic view of time prevails. This view might lead to a single periodization that rules the entire globe. Although the causation of processes proceeds within the integrated whole, from the compartmentalized perspective, causation is exogenous.

**Table 1. Classifying the Wide Range of Macro Histories:  
The Substantial-Analytical Rift**

<i>DEFINING FEATURES</i>	MACRO HISTORIES	
	<b>World History</b>	<b>Comparative History</b>
	<b>World-system Approach</b> <b>Civilization Analysis</b>	<b>Historical Sociology</b> <b>Civilization Analysis</b>
<i>Way of Transcending National Boundaries</i>	Substantially	Analytically
<i>Space Dimension: The Basic Units of Analysis</i>	The World as Ultimate Unit of Analysis	Several Enclosed Units (Nation-state/Civilization)
<i>Time Dimension</i>	Synchronic	Diachronic
<i>Causality Attribution</i>	Exogenous	Endogenous

The above oversimplified scheme was designed to map the differences within macro histories. Nevertheless, the parsimony of this scheme should not hide the considerable variance of historiography that exists within each macro-historical enterprise. To begin with the analytical border crossers, *comparative history* contains a wide variety of research designs to pursue different aims: explanation of uniqueness, formulation of generalizations, and depiction of varieties within a pattern. Each of these designs is related to a particular method of comparison: crucial agreement/difference, deductive or parallel comparison, and concomitant variation in correspondence. The framework of *civilizational analysis* can be divided into four sections by dealing with two crucial antinomies. The first is the antinomy of material

(geographic, economic) versus ideal (structures of consciousness, imaginary signification) variables as primary criteria for the definition of civilizations. The second is the antinomy of the same general divide between macro histories: a comparative study of civilization patterns and their historical trajectories versus the decisive role of interaction and inter-civilization encounters. Because of this internal fracture, civilization analysis belongs to either the analytical or substantial border crossers.

*Historical sociology* encompasses two major agendas, each stressing one of the components of its name. The first strategy is initially historical and only afterwards sociological. It identifies recurrent structures and sequences across time and space to depict patterns. Another aim is to inform human choices in the present and future while dealing with historical problems persisting into the present. The second approach operates from the opposite direction, by applying sociological conclusions derived from the study of contemporary societies to the past.

In the realm of the substantial border crossers, several sub-categories may be depicted. The rich harvest of *world-history* studies of the last fifteen years may be classified according to their object of study. The resulting typology entails four categories: the history of time units, space units, variables (economics, ecology, demography, gender, culture, and politics), and processes (evolution, contacts, and diffusion). Conversely, each of these categories includes studies using different scales, ranging from the widest to the narrowest (for example, time units, from millennia to one year; space units, from the entire planet to a single village; and variables, from world economy to a specific commodity).<sup>2</sup> Finally, the main division within the *world-system approach* is chronology and its underlying assumptions. Is the world system five hundred or five thousand years old (with several possibilities in between)? The answer to this question determines the geographical scope of the system as well as its defining features.

Having said this, we should not push these differences, significant as they might be, too far.<sup>3</sup> Even before the emergence of world history as a distinctive historical perspective, Hodgson had already noted its problematic relationship with comparative history. In an article dedicated to the conditions of historical comparison, he stressed the importance of the relationship in which each compared unit was involved with its region (for example, although both Vikings and Polynesians engaged in exploration, the former

were part of a wider configuration—the Oikoumene—while the latter were isolated).<sup>4</sup> This preliminary suggestion has become a key in the attempts made in recent years to adjust the analytical and substantial procedures. McMichael has provided a second key by defining the “incorporated comparison.” Instead of juxtaposing several units, this type of historical comparison adopts connected and mutually conditioning processes as its subject of comparison.<sup>5</sup> In recent years, several works of comparative world history containing one of these two orientations have evolved. Pomeranz applies the first principle, in his book *The Great Divergence*, in which he selects for comparison parts of his units—Europe, China, Japan, and India—which are similarly positioned within their worlds. From the global perspective, he is able to make comparisons between two parts of the whole and observe how their position and function within it shapes their nature.<sup>6</sup> The recent historical research on globalization resembles the second path of combination. In this case, the same worldwide process is compared at two chronological stages: the last part of the twentieth century and the second half of the nineteenth century, or “today’s globalization” and the “first great globalization” of 1850–1914.<sup>7</sup>

In brief, as a result of its own historicity, modern historiography emerged and developed as a monographic enterprise. Nevertheless, several globalizing conditions inspired a number of macro-historical enterprises ready to cross the traditional borders challenging the unquestioned nation-state unit of analysis. Crossing these borders analytically or substantially implied opposing assumptions: enclosed versus integrated space, diachronic versus synchronic time, and endogenous versus exogenous causation. Despite this clear divide, by concentrating on the functional relationship of the enclosed units in comparison to the world as a whole, or by comparing a world process at different historical stages, we could profit from the combination of the procedures transcending the boundaries both analytically and substantially. Moreover, beyond the internal dialogue among macro histories, the deepest challenge lays in combining the meticulous depth of monographic history with the widest breadth of macro history. In our seminar, this challenge was applied to the history of Asia.

### **Macro Histories and Area Studies: Six Paths for Enrichment and Debate**

The second part of the seminar confronted macro histories with area studies. The discussions were arranged according to the regional criterion embedded both in area studies and civilizational analysis. The following is an exposition, also arranged by regions, of the existing ways of communication between monographic histories and macro histories, and some suggestions for future attempts to connect the two.

*Ancient Mesopotamia: an impressive feedback cycle.* The main division within the *world-system approach* is based on chronology. The earliest stage proposed for the emergence of the world system coincides with the appearance of civilization in Mesopotamia. In this region, it is claimed, the complex and hierarchical societies that emerged were integrated by using networks in which important, two-way, ordinary interaction linked peoples, creating a world system. As such, the space was arranged along a scheme of strong core polities and weaker and dependent peripheral societies, with semi-peripheral societies in the middle. Moreover, being a world system, its time-span evolved in cyclical patterns: urban and empire growth and decline and expansion and contraction of trade networks influenced by climate change. The first two cycles discussed are Uruk expansion and the Akkadian Empire. Uruk expansion was accomplished, as described in the seminar, by founding colonies and colonial enclaves within existing towns across a vast region to gain access to desired goods and to control trade routes. The Akkadian Empire is considered the first instance of a core-wide empire resulting from the conquest of a number of older core-states.

Back to the world system chronological divide, for those that define the world system as a modern phenomenon exclusively, neither the Uruk nor the Akkadian Empire fit the world-system definition. Either because of their incapability to project military power far from its borders or because they lacked elaborated capitalistic mechanisms for facilitating unequal exchange, both the Uruk and the Akkadian Empire were unable to extract resources from distant peripheral areas. However, the most interesting contact lies not within the world-system approach. By contrasting paradigms, we find an impressive feedback cycle between the world-system approach and monographic research. Unsurprisingly, the first stage of this dialogue is the extensive reliance of world-system literature on Ancient Mesopotamia on monographic research in this area.<sup>8</sup> The second stage results from the previous

stage: a fruitful synthesis of large quantities of very specific focused articles that provide a comprehensive overview.<sup>9</sup> The third stage of the dialogue, the truly surprising one, turns the feedback full circle. Monographic research is inspired by, referred to, and even manifested in the analytical framework of the world-system approach.<sup>10</sup>

*Muslim Middle East: two roads to macro histories.* The formation and consolidation of Islam took place through a series of border-crossing processes: military conquest, language diffusion, religious conversion, pilgrimage, long-distance trade, and agricultural and technological transfers. These types of processes are the very subjects with which world history deals. Therefore, both Middle East studies and world history have shared a common ground from the outset. Moreover, as these foundational processes unfolded, they created a “Muslim Commonwealth,” a “Muslim World System.” In this sense, a new road of communication is opened, this time between Middle East studies and the world-system approach. Here, the world-system conceptual framework can contribute in articulating monographic research so that it provides a comprehensive view of the Muslim Middle East.

This foundational stage of Islam was followed by manifold interactions between the Muslim Middle East and its multiple neighboring societies—Europe, Africa, India, and China, but first and foremost with the peoples from the Steppes of Central Asia. These are subjects for world history at its best. To put it briefly, we see from a list of major subjects in Muslim Middle East studies that this field is open to macro histories through an internal road, dealing also with its foundational processes and its resulting outcome, and an external road for the subsequent interregional contacts.

*Central Asia: a marvelous case of correspondence.* By definition, world history is a macro-historical enterprise that transcends boundaries substantially. The history of Central Asia is that of nomadic societies whose existence was structurally conditioned to cross borders. To a large extent, therefore, Central Asia’s history is world history. This has been the case from the period of the Hsiung-Nu expansion to the Timurid states, and through the Turkish Qaganates and the Mongol Empire. All these developments involved a pattern of conquest by pastoral nomadic confederations of tribes. However, the Mongol expansion and empire epitomized this trend by their synthesis of two different traditions – the Steppes empires based in the Mandate of Heaven ideology and the

Manchurian peoples that maintained nomadic rule over large agricultural societies, and by invigorating these traditions with innovations such as military-unit organization, transfer of populations, direct taxation, and a riding post service.

This initial correspondence between world history and Central Asia, both of which are based on transcending boundaries, contains a confluence of interests that seals their close affinity. Among the aims of world history are inclusion of “peoples without history,” visualization of new perspectives, and a new balance between the world’s regions. The concern for “peoples without history” by world historians is part of their interest in pastoral nomadic societies. One of the new perspectives developed by world historians that challenge the linear succession of “hunter-gatherer/farmer/industrial societies” is the long-lasting interactions between sedentary and nomadic societies. A new balance of regional attention, in which Central Asia is better positioned, takes shape. As a result, these three features bring world history very close to the perspective of Central Asia studies. Simultaneously, Central Asia studies, being a region on the move and dependent on its surrounding neighbors, are a receptive field for the insights provided by world history.

*India: instructive contrast.* The crucial contrast that emerged from the confrontation of world history and area studies regarding the history of India is geographic. Simply stated, to world historians, India means northern India. By contrast, area studies, which seek to capture pristine India, target the southern part of the subcontinent. These preferences are understandable given the biases derived from each perspective. With world history being a substantial border-crossing field of study, it is natural to stress the intermittent contacts, conquests, and migrations that have dotted Indian history and arose, or were consolidated, in the north. Thus, world-history books depict the history of India as a succession of migrations and conquests from the time of the Aryans’ invasion to the time of the Indian Empire. Monographic research, on the other hand, aims at the local, the idiosyncratic, and the unique, so it focuses on South India because of its detachment from the recurrent foreign intrusions. Contrary to the imperial history of northern India, which roughly synchronized with successive empires elsewhere in Asia, monographic history, through the experience of the southern part of the subcontinent, provides a singular characterization of Indian political history. Distant from the imperial history of the north,

the outstanding feature of southern political history is the weakness of the state that resulted from the rift between the power of the king and the authority of the Brahmins. Moreover, the realm of power underwent a process of “de-ontologization,” i.e., the power sphere became irrelevant in crucial existential matters. Rather, the spiritual realm, which the Brahmins control, is most important. However, despite the geographical split between world and monographic histories at this point, an interesting intersection appears when addressing state formation in the south. For instance, Stein’s model on the consolidation of the Vijayanagara kingdom (from 1340 to its crisis in the late sixteenth century) as a prototype of the future regimes in the south closely recalls the widely-known model of absolutist/gunpowder empires. Here as elsewhere, military innovations created a financial need that was provided by a shift in agriculture toward cash crops, monetization of the economy, and urbanization.<sup>11</sup> The contrast here between macro and monographic histories is enlightening in two ways. First, by pursuing different objectives—border crossing or enclosure—macro histories and monographic histories can complement each other. Second, no matter how idiosyncratic a case appears to be, it is helpful to be acquainted with the general patterns reconstructed by macro histories that might rest underneath uniqueness.

*China: reconciling comparative and systemic views.* Monographic histories on China rely heavily on comparative crucial difference, with two central phenomena at play: success and stagnation. Success is reflected by enduring political and cultural continuity, stagnation by economic decay. Success is explained by the stability provided by the special gentry-bureaucracy relationship, Confucianism, imperial restraint, and moral economy. Stagnation, too, is explained by stability, in this case technological stability. Its result, the “high-level equilibrium trap,” enabled quantitative growth that subsequently resulted in a qualitative standstill. Diminishing returns and Malthusian dynamics have fostered economic decay since the late eighteenth century. Europe, with its fragmented political history and economic growth, is the implicit unit in making this comparison, from which China’s uniqueness emerged.

Surprisingly, however, stressing uniqueness to the limit creates an affinity with macro histories. China’s uniqueness relies on its precocious political, cultural, and economic integration. Moreover, its achievements took place in

a huge area. This intersection—large-scale political, cultural, and economic integration—provides a basis for considering Chinese history as a world-system history. Similarly, these features compel the inclusion of Chinese history in the conceptual framework of globalization. Therefore, an explicit comparative approach should be designed in trying to understand China's strengths and failures. Doing so would overcome the distinction between analytical and substantial macro histories in the twofold way discussed above. On the one hand, we could compare China as a particular world system to another world system, as Chase-Dunn has done for ten different types of world systems. Similarly, the globalization taking place in China could be viewed in the framework of comparative globalization. On the other hand, "incorporated comparisons," which take into account the relationship of each unit with its region and the mutually-conditioning processes in which all of the units are immersed, might be applied as well. Indeed, recent studies, such as the work of Kenneth Pomeranz, have moved in this direction.

*Japan: linked by a concept.* Diffusion, an important concept shared by Japanese-area studies and world history, fruitfully linked the two disciplines. Through long diffusion processes, Japan was presented first as a variant of China and then as a variant of the West. In both cases, its geographical location enabled Japan to impede the influx of foreign influence. For centuries, Japan relied on Chinese inputs for the development of its economy and culture. Rice cultivation, irrigation systems, metalwork, production of textiles (including silk and dyeing), and patterns of urbanization are fundamental economic elements that Japan inherited from China. In the cultural sphere, the Japanese adopted Chinese as its learned language. Not only did this result in the adoption of the Japanese writing system, it also enabled the Japanese to acquire the sciences (astronomy, medicine, and mathematics), historiography, social and political philosophy (Confucianism), and jurisprudence that developed in China. Also, Buddhism entered Japan via China, as did forms of religious art (temples, sculptures, and paintings). In all these cases, however, the Japanese carried out a deliberate selection and adaptation process.

During the sixteenth century, a new avenue of diffusion became available for Japan. The Portuguese Jesuit mission converted a half million Japanese (out of a population of twenty-five million) to Christianity. The mission's success was a Pyrrhic victory: Japan expelled the Jesuits and closed the

country to outside influence in 1636, except for the Dutch colony that was allowed to remain as a trading post. Here, too, the language was first learned by scholars commissioned by the Shogun. Books from Holland followed and with them came western science (astronomy, medicine, and mathematics). Ultimately, as we know, the overwhelming Western influence arrived much later, after 1853. Since then, the Western model has informed Japan's economy and culture: industrialization and urbanization, a constitution and a parliament. In daily life, too, Western influence has replaced Chinese influence. This is evident in the clothes, hairstyles, calendar, gastronomy, and the like. Conversely, by switching to the Western source of influence, Japan entered the regional and world scene while initiating its own imperialist design and stamping a major imprint on world history.

### **Conclusions**

A clear-cut typology of macro histories emerged from the first part of the seminar: substantial or analytical border-crossing fields. The second part of the seminar generated two primary ways of communication, with different intensity, between Asian studies and macro histories. On the one hand, there is a mode of viable links, which stimulates feedback, congruence, and correspondence. On the other hand, a contrastive mode stressing uniqueness communicates more hesitantly. These two modes of communication between area studies and macro histories seem to be related to both the conspicuous historical features of each area investigated and to the defining assumptions of each macro-historical field. In this way, areas characterized as spaces in movement, such as the Middle East and Central Asia, favored the substantial border-crossing type of macro-history. Conversely, China's history, which is primarily conceived as internal history, is more prone to the analytical border-crossing type of macro histories. In between lay the cases of India and Japan. India's northern part is characterized by intermittent movements that bring it close to world history, while its more closed southern part bears an affinity with analytic macro histories. In Japan studies, predominant interest lies in internal history, making it closer to analytical macro histories, while recognition of the importance of external diffusion in the development of this inner history brings the analysis closer to substantial macro histories.

**Table 2. All Together Now: Area Studies and Macro Histories**

<b>Area-studies Perspectives</b>	Inner History	Spaces on the Move
<b>Macro Histories</b>	Analytical	Substantial
<b>Communication Mode</b>	Contrastive	Correspondent
<b>Cases</b>	China	Middle East, Central Asia
	South India	North India
	Japan	Japan

Whatever the mode of communication, the confrontation of area studies and macro histories was highly encouraging and instructive. Firstly, on the content side, mapping the realm of macro histories enhanced the search for ways of collaboration between them. Moreover the seminar, in response to its primary aim, corroborated that historical research should proceed at both monographic and macro levels simultaneously. Finally, regarding the teaching model, this first seminar was arranged according to the regional criterion embedded both in area studies and civilizational analysis. However, an entire series of “confrontation seminars” of this type can be developed by arranging each of them pursuant to the criteria of another macro-historical field. Given that world history is the organizing key, area-studies experts from areas engaged in a particular trans-boundaries phenomenon will be engaged, along with macro-historians, in a “multilateral” approach. The adoption of a world-system perspective will help integrate regional processes into a coherent whole. Comparisons grounded in sound scholarship could be the outcome of a comparative “confrontation seminar,” and several patterns could be tracked globally in an historical-sociological seminar. These “confrontation seminars,” therefore, offer a fruitful and wide teaching framework. Moreover, by eroding the old monographic categories and by fostering new networks of scholarly interaction, they might inspire macro-historical research as well.

## Notes

1. For a complete account on the teaching of world history teaching at The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, see D. Olstein, "World History: An Integrative Model," *World History Bulletin*, 20, 2 (2004): 4–6. The list of contributors to the seminar includes S. N. Eisenstadt (Civilization Analysis), Y. Harari (World History), D. Olstein (World System, Comparative History, and Historical Sociology), N. Wasserman (Ancient Mesopotamia), A. David (Ancient Egypt), R. Amitai (Medieval Islam), E. Ginio (Ottoman Empire), M. Biran (Central Asia in the Middle Ages), R. Sela (Early Modern Central Asia), D. Shulman (India), Y. Pines (China), and B. Shillony (Japan).
2. For a typology of world history writing, see D. Olstein, "La nueva historia mundial en sus variedades," *Actas del III Congreso Internacional Historia a Debate* (Santiago de Compostela: Historia a Debate Editorial, 2006).
3. D. Olstein, "Comparative History and World History: Contrasts and Contacts," in I. Shagrir, R. Ellenblum, and J. Riley-Smith, eds., *In Laudem Hierosolymitani: Studies in Crusades and Medieval Culture in Honour of Benjamin Z. Kedar* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006).
4. M. Hodgson, "Conditions of Historical Comparison among Ages and Regions," in E. Burke, ed., *Rethinking World History: Essays on Europe, Islam, and World History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 267–277.
5. P. McMichael, "Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method," *American Sociological Review* 55 (1990): 385–397.
6. K. Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).
7. D. Olstein, "The Multiple Origins of Globalization: Examining Conceptual Issues," *Contemporanea* 3 (2006).
8. For examples of monographic research that informs world-system analysis, see R. Adams and N. Hans, *The Uruk Countryside* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972); and J. S. Cooper, "Sumerian and Akkadian in Sumer and Akkad," in G. Buccellati, ed., "Approaches to the Study of the Ancient Near East: A Volume of Studies Offered to Ignace J. Gelb," *Orientalia* 42 (1973): 239–246.
9. For examples of world-system overviews on Ancient Mesopotamia, see M. Allen, "The Mechanisms of Underdevelopment: An Ancient Mesopotamian Example," *Review* 15 (1992): 453–476; and C. Cioffi-Revilla, "War and politics in ancient Mesopotamia, 2900–539 BC: Measurement and Comparative Analysis," *LORANOW Project* (Boulder: University of Colorado, 1995).
10. For examples of monographic research inspired by, referred to, and manifested in the analytic framework of the world system approach, see G. Algaze, *The Uruk World System: The Dynamics of Expansion of Early Mesopotamian Civilization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); and G. Stein, *Rethinking World Systems: Diasporas, Colonies, and Interaction in Uruk Mesopotamia* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1999).
11. B. Stein, *The New Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I.2. *Vijayanagara* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).