

HOW TO GET ON TOP OF THE STATE OF THE PROFESSIONAL ART IN EARLY MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

© 2011 by Constantin Fasolt. All rights reserved

What follows is an annotated list of readings that came to my mind as I was trying to figure out what would be best for a beginning graduate student in early modern European history to read in order to get a good sense of what the profession is currently thinking. It starts with a section on the history and theory of historical writing in general. Then it turns to main themes in early modern history. It concludes with a few references to medieval history.

THE CURRENT STATE OF THE HISTORICAL DISCIPLINE IN GENERAL

In this section I will give you information about books and articles that you ought to read in order to make yourself familiar with the ideas, concepts, and approaches that go into the vocabulary of all professionally literate historians today.

If you have never read an overview of the history of the discipline of history as a whole, from antiquity to the present, it would definitely help you to do so. For that purpose there are two books I would recommend:

Robin George Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, ed. Thomas Malcolm Knox (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946). This is famous as a philosophy of history, but as it happens, it begins with an extremely interesting and illuminating review of the whole history of historical writing, with a special stress on the importance of Christianity, and a very good account of the significance of the turn to "scientific" history in the nineteenth century.

Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval and Modern*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007). This is an old stand-by, somewhat updated. Old-fashioned, but not bad for a first approach to a history of the whole field.

For books that describe the development of historical writing and the historical profession since the nineteenth century, I would recommend that you read four different books, written from four different perspectives, each with its distinct advantages and disadvantages. Taken in conjunction, they'll give you a pretty good grasp of where we are at today:

Georg G. Iggers, *New Directions in European Historiography*, Revised ed. (Middletown, Ct.: Wesleyan U. Press, 1984). This is a short and concise treatment of some of the most basic developments, with special attention to the *Annales* and to Germany. When I read it, I was impressed by the clarity with which Iggers laid out the central issues. He is an interesting historian—a German Jew who fled with his wife just before Kristallnacht, landed in the States, and worked as a committed civil rights activists in the 1950s. He became a leading member of the NAACP in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Georg G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1997). I haven't read this, but I would trust it to be a good follow-up to the first

volume. It obviously goes over some of the same ground, but it is written more like a survey (rather than a collection of essays) and it has the distinct virtue of bringing the story up to the "linguistic turn" of the recent past.

Michael Bentley, *Modern Historiography: An Introduction* (London - New York: Routledge, 1999). This is an outstanding and up-to-date birds-eye view of the development of modern historiography since the Enlightenment. It's written from a British point of view and its intellectual orientation is more contemporary than that of Iggers. It was originally published as the introduction to the *Companion to Historiography* edited by Bentley, on which see below.

Geoffrey Barraclough, *Main Trends in History*, ed. Michael Burns (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1991). This is more dated and a bit dry, but it is very thorough, detailed, and reliable up to the 1960s. Michael Burns added a chapter to update the book for 1991, but that chapter isn't much more than a list of names and titles. Barraclough's book is probably not the best thing to read first, because it's pretty relentless. But I do recommend it highly to be read at some point. It will give you a lot of coverage, especially for anyone with a mind for detail. Barraclough was a great medieval historian who developed a very serious interest in world history. R. I. Moore, who succeeded him as a medievalist with a very serious interest in world history, thinks very highly of him.

I also recommend that you read:

Fritz Stern, ed., *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present* (New York: Meridian Books, 1960). This is a uniquely successful collection of excerpts from the writings of some of the most famous historians in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. I know of no better short-cut to getting a firsthand impression of the differences between, say, Ranke, Engels, Fustel de Coulanges, Lord Acton, Mommsen, Trevelyan, and so on. It was written at a good moment, before all the changes that began to cast more radical doubt on history in the 1960s. From Fritz Stern's prose you'll get the kind of commonsensical down-to-earth solid historical perspective that was common until then, and is now very difficult to maintain without seeming naïve.

What follows next are four essay collections that deal with changes in historical thinking that have occurred in the last generation or so. You may not want to read them until you are more familiar with the lay of the land, but each of them is informative in its own way, in part because they will introduce you to work by some of the leading historians around today, in part because they approach the subject from complementary perspectives:

Quentin Skinner, ed., *The Return of Grand Theory in the Human Sciences* (Cambridge - New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985). This is a good collection of essays on a series of major figures in twentieth-century social and historical thought of whose work and significance you have to be aware if you want to be professionally literate, even if you have no intention at all of following their lead, or will ever draw directly on their writings—people like Hans Georg Gadamer, Thomas Kuhn, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and

Jürgen Habermas. The essays also happen to be written by people who are no slouches themselves, like Quentin Skinner, Stuart Clark, and Anthony Giddens.

- Peter Burke, *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, 2nd ed. (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001). This volume is more directly focused on history. It contains overviews of a number of subfields in history that have attracted much attention, like microhistory (by Giovanni Levi himself, one of microhistory's greatest practitioners), oral history, history of political thought, history of events, history of the body, and so on. What makes it particularly attractive for early modernists is that its editor is himself an outstanding cultural historian with special expertise in early modern history. It was originally published in the early 1990s and does therefore not address the "linguistic turn" as directly as the following two collections.
- Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Avery Hunt, eds., *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). This collection of essays arose out of conferences at Berkeley where some of the leading practitioners of social and cultural history presented their work. Like *Studies on the History of Society and Culture*, the series in which it was published, it focuses on the task of doing justice to social and cultural history without ignoring the challenge posed to both by the "linguistic turn." The contributors include Bill Sewell, Richard Biernacki, Caroline Bynum, Jerrold Seigel, and Hayden White, among others.
- Gabrielle M. Spiegel, ed., *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn* (New York: Routledge, 2005). This collection casts its net a little more widely than the one by Bonnell and Hunt, and does so more systematically, too. It is divided into three parts, dealing respectively with discourse versus social history, self and agency, and experience and practice. The authors include such social science luminaries as Pierre Bourdieu, Anthony Giddens, Michel de Certeau, Marshall Sahlins, and Gareth Stedman Jones, along with historians like William Sewell, Geoff Eley, and Joan Scott. Except for the pieces by Bourdieu and Giddens, the essays were published in the 1990s and 2000s. Overall, this collection gives a good feel for the fundamental conceptual issues at stake in contemporary historical study.

If you haven't done so already, you should also read a few deservedly famous essays:

- Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 3-53. This was the article in which Skinner announced his deep dissatisfaction with the "great books" approach to the history of political thought and laid out the fundamental philosophical and methodological reasons that have since then been institutionalized in "The Cambridge School" and the "Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought." It was a brilliant piece of rhetoric and argument, and it's still crucial reading for anyone who is interested in doing any kind of intellectual history today.
- Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," and "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight," in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, by Clifford Geertz, (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 3-30, 412-

53. Geertz has been extremely influential in establishing the study of culture as a proper field for historical inquiry. There can't be many other essays as influential and widely-cited as these two. You need to know about them.

Lawrence Stone, "The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History," *Past and Present* 85 (1979): 3-24. This was the first blast of the great trumpet that signaled the coming of a fundamental break with the dominance that social and economic history had enjoyed in the 1960s and 1970s. It's important not merely for its substance (which is excellent on the issues surrounding the conventional criticism of "narrative" history), but also because it's a great illustration of the way in which an outstanding historian can smell a change that's in the air from quite a distance and use his intuition to shape the future of the field.

Joan Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category for Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 1053-75. This was the article that distinguished "women's history" from "gender history" and thus finally established gender history as a significant historical field in its own right. It's one of the great examples of what the linguistic turn (or the "cultural turn") was all about.

John E. Toews, "Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience," *American Historical Review* 92 (1987): 879-907. Toews' attitude is intellectually conservative. I don't quite like it. But this article was a very prominent attempt to lay out the basic issues involved in the emergence of cultural history, and it has served as a reference point ever since. It is very useful for that reason.

Obviously the list of influential essays you could read is a whole lot longer than this. But these pieces have to be on any such list, and that's why I have put them here.

HISTORIOGRAPHICAL TOOLS OF GENERAL SIGNIFICANCE, ALSO USEFUL FOR MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN HISTORY

Allan Megill, *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide to Practice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007). This is the best account of the fundamental problems one encounters in trying to turn historical evidence into a good historical account of which I am aware. It also happens to contain a good bit of information about the current state of historical thinking more broadly speaking, including especially a terrific last chapter on the "Annales" school.

Michael Bentley, ed., *Companion to Historiography* (London - New York: Routledge, 1997). This is a very large collection of succinct overviews of twentieth-century developments in a great number of different historical fields that will be useful to you. One of the major sections is specifically devoted to early modern history. It includes an overview of early modern history by G.E. Aylmer (very good British historian), and essays on the concept of early modern history, recent work in early modern intellectual history, the history of science, and a few others. Lots of bibliographical references and a relatively recent date of publication make this a very useful point of entry to the field.

Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001). This is an overview of basic questions and

basic tools of research. Because Howell is a medievalist and Prevenier a medievalist who specializes in so-called "auxiliary sciences" of history such as diplomatics and paleography, it tends to privilege books and sources interesting to medievalists. It also contains a concise section on "the new interpretive approaches" to history. It's a little didactic, but still a very helpful treatment of the main kinds of tools of research of which historians ought to be aware.

- R. C. van Caenegem, *Guide to the Sources of Medieval History* (Amsterdam - New York: North-Holland Pub. Co., 1978). If you don't know this book, you should take a look, even if you're not a medieval historian. It's one of the best books I know from which to learn about the significance of the differences between different genres of sources, because each genre communicates different kinds of information about the past. The typologies of various types of sources that have been published by Brépols in recent decades have largely superseded this account of sources of medieval history, not to mention that new sources of which van Caenegem didn't know very much keep becoming available. But even so, his overview is a solid and remarkably comprehensive introduction to the kinds of sources we have for medieval history.

BOOKS ESSENTIAL FOR GETTING A GOOD GRASP ON THE CURRENT STATE OF SCHOLARSHIP IN EARLY MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

On early modern Europe in general, I recommend five books:

Eugene F. Rice and Anthony Grafton, *The Foundations of Early Modern Europe, 1460-1559*, 2nd ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1994). This is the most succinct and readable introduction to the history of early modern Europe written in English during the last half century. It was originally published in 1970, but was updated by Grafton. Its main virtue is the clarity with which it focuses on major themes in early modern history.

H. G. Koenigsberger, G. L. Mosse, and G. Q. Bowler, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1989). This is an outstanding complement to Rice and Grafton. Its scope is more comprehensive and it covers a lot of territory more thoroughly. One of its outstanding features is the way in which Koenigsberger managed to integrate social, economic, and political history into a single survey. In my view it's still the best general survey of early modern Europe available.

Richard Bonney, *The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991). This is the best general survey of the political and diplomatic history of early modern Europe. Its main defect is that its relentless focus on the dynastic details of European politics swamps whatever else it has to say about religion, society, and economy. But if you can plough your way through it, you will find it very much worth your while.

Theodore K. Rabb, *The Struggle for Stability in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975). This is so widely used that you may have read it before—but if you haven't, you must. I know of no other book like it. It's

short, and it gives a more coherent picture of early modern European history as a whole than anything else I've read. It also gives a wonderful introduction to much of the most important scholarly literature, taking off from the great debate about the "general crisis" of the seventeenth century crisis that was started by Hugh Trevor-Roper, considered in detail in Trevor Aston, ed., *Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660* (London: Doubleday Anchor, 1965), and is still demanding attention, as in Jonathan Dewald, Geoffrey Parker, Michael Marmé, et al., "AHR Forum: The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century Revisited," *American Historical Review* 113 (2008): 1029-99.

Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, eds., *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, 2 vols. (Leiden - New York - Köln: E. J. Brill, 1994-95). This is now getting a little long in the tooth, but in my judgment it is still the single most effective introduction to the "state of the art" in historical scholarship on the period from 1400-1600. It's divided into many chapters, each of which deals with a particular topic, a particular area of historical life, a particular period, particular region, and so on. All conclude with a short bibliography that lists the most important secondary literature available in 1995. Taken in conjunction, these chapters cover a lot of ground. If you can master the knowledge amassed in these two volumes, you'll have a pretty good lock on early modern European historiography up to 1995. There is only one major problem: these volumes are heavily oriented towards the Germanies and the Protestant Reformation.

On the Renaissance I recommend:

John Jeffries Martin, ed., *The Renaissance World* (New York - London: Routledge, 2007). This is a very handsome volume of which I know mainly because I contributed an essay. It offers an excellent and comprehensive introduction to the state of the art in Renaissance studies.

John Monfasani, "The Renaissance as the Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages," *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo* 108 (2006): 165-85. This was published a little out of the way, but it's a terrific piece on what one can responsibly say about "the Renaissance" nowadays.

Zachary Schiffman, ed., *Humanism and the Renaissance* (Boston - New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2002). This is a very well done collection of different perspectives on the Renaissance from Burckhardt to the present, edited by an historian who is a good friend of mine and who teaches in Chicago.

On the fundamental disagreement between Paul Oskar Kristeller and Hans Baron about the nature and significance of Humanism, I would look at the following:

Paul Oskar Kristeller, "The Humanist Movement," in *Renaissance Thought, 1: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains*, by Paul Oskar Kristeller, (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 3-23

- Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*, 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966)
- Paul Oskar Kristeller and Margaret L. King, "Iter Kristellerianum: The European Journey (1905-1939)," *Renaissance Quarterly* 47 (1994): 907-29
- James Hankins, "The Baron Thesis after 40 Years," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995): 309-38
- Ronald Witt, John M. Najemy, Craig Kallendorf, et al., "AHR Forum: Hans Baron's Renaissance Humanism," *American Historical Review* 101 (1996): 107-44
- Charles G. Nauert, "Humanism as Method: Roots of Conflict with the Scholastics," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29 (1998): 427-38
- James Hankins, ed., *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Christopher S. Celenza, *The Lost Italian Renaissance: Humanists, Historians, and Latin's Legacy* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004)

On the Reformation, I recommend the following:

- John W. O'Malley, *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000). This is by far the best introduction to the current state of Catholic thinking about early modern European history that I am aware of. It also happens to contain a succinct review of some of the most important developments in Protestant historiography about the Reformation. I recommend it highly, both as a good and informative read, and as a model of what such a book should look like. I know you'll be tempted to skirt it because it seems to be limited to "Catholicism." So it is, but you'll be surprised to see how clearly the study of "Catholicism" reflects the most important developments in historical writing in the twentieth century.
- Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). This still is the best single survey of the Reformation with a European scope. Its main virtue is that it deals thoroughly and comprehensively with the intellectual aspects of the Reformation while paying equal attention to the significance of social and cultural history. It also has an interesting thesis about a short-lived alliance between intellectuals and ordinary people Cameron treats as crucial for the success the Reformation. Its main weakness is its underlying tendency to take a Protestant point of view.
- Steven E. Ozment, ed., *Reformation Europe: A Guide to Research* (St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1982). This may also not look promising, but it contains terrific historiographical essays by a number of outstanding historians, with references to the secondary literature that were up-to-date in 1982. It deals with all sorts of subjects (social history, art, humanism, Luther, popular religion, etc.) and it will give you as concise an introduction to the state of the art in 1982 as any volume I know. There are updated versions of this volume that have been published more recently, but they are not as good as this one. They merely add more recent information.

J. W. O'Malley, ed., *Catholicism in Early Modern History: A Guide to Research* (St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1988). This is a Catholic sequel to the Protestant original edited by Ozment. Unfortunately it's not nearly as incisive and informative. A useful reference to have, but I much prefer O'Malley's own book on *Trent and All That*.

Anne Jacobson Schutte, Susan C. Karant-Nunn, and Heinz Schilling, eds., *Reformationsforschung in Europa und Nordamerika: Eine historiographische Bilanz anlässlich des 100. Bandes des Archivs für Reformationsgeschichte. Reformation Research in Europe and North America: A Historical Assessment. Vol. 100 of the Archive for Reformation History* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2009). This is a systematic and comprehensive collection of essays designed to give an overview of what historians of the Reformation have done and what has preoccupied them in all areas of European history. It has a lot of geographical coverage and has the great virtue of being very recent.

I would add a few articles about the Reformation that are useful because they are all informative, but differ from each other deeply in style and approach, namely:

Tom Scott, "The Reformation between Deconstruction and Reconstruction: Reflections on Recent Writings on the German Reformation," *German History* 26 (2008): 406-22

Susan C. Karant-Nunn, "Changing One's Mind: Transformations in Reformation History from a Germanist's Perspective," *Renaissance Quarterly* 58 (2005): 1101-27

Mack P. Holt, "The Social History of the Reformation: Recent Trends and Future Agendas," *Journal of Social History* 37 (2003): 133-44

Not to forget: Constantin Fasolt, "Hegel's Ghost: Europe, the Reformation, and the Middle Ages," *Viator* 39 (2008): 345-86

What follows are a few more randomly selected volumes that are devoted to particularly important historians or particularly significant subjects in early modern history other than the traditional Renaissance and Reformation.

Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970). This is a book that every historian has to read. It did more to break the back of the belief in the possibility of a "scientific" kind of history than any other book, in part because of its philosophical clarity, in part because it consisted of such excellent detailed historical investigations into the question how historical change actually does occur in the area of scientific knowledge. There is obviously a huge body of related literature on this book in particular, and on early modern science in general. Kuhn is no longer setting the norm. Now, one has to read Steven Shapin, Bruno Latour, and Adrian Johns, among others. For a recent review of what's been happening in the history of early modern science, you can go to Pamela Smith, "Science on the Move: Recent Trends in the History of Early Modern Science," *Renaissance Quarterly* 72 (2009): 345-75.

Peter N. Miller, ed., *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007). This is the best place to begin in order to understand why Arnaldo Momigliano was as important as he in fact was, and where Anthony Grafton is coming from. Grafton dominates the early modern field today as perhaps no other historian in the United States. Take a look!

Carlo Ginzburg, *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*, trans. John and Anne Tedeschi (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992). Not really an introduction to the state of the profession, but Ginzburg is such an outstanding historian that reading this book will give you good access to at least some basic disputed issues, as well as to a lot of historical work by the historians with whom Ginzburg stands in conversation (Momigliano being one of them).

James Tully, ed., *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988). A wonderful collection focused on one of the most important intellectual historians to have written about early modern European history in the second half of the twentieth century. Skinner's own most important essays up to 1988 are included in this book. They are influential and very interesting to read if you want to do any kind of intellectual history.

Kathleen Davis, *Periodization and Sovereignty: How Ideas of Feudalism and Secularization Govern the Politics of Time* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008). This is not an easy read, but it's a short book, and it's packed with information about the "invention" of the Middle Ages by early modern jurists and it includes a pointed critique of contemporary historians like J. G. A. Pocock, Quentin Skinner, and Donald Kelley, whose names must become familiar to you.

SPECIFICALLY MEDIEVAL

If you want to know what I think about medieval historiography, the best thing you can do is to follow the footnotes in "Hegel's Ghost: Europe, the Reformation, and the Middle Ages," *Viator* 39 (2008): 345-86. There's not much I can say above and beyond what I said there.

For the perspectives of other historians I would recommend that you first look at the sections in Bentley's *Companion to Historiography* that are devoted to medieval history (like Janet Nelson on family, gender, and sexuality, Timothy Reuter on the nobility, Peter Biller on popular religion, and so on).

In addition you'll find the following to give you quick access to some of the most interesting issues in medieval historiography today:

Norman F. Cantor, *Inventing the Middle Ages: The Lives, Works, and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century* (New York: W. Morrow, 1991). This is catty and quite unreliable. But it's also a great read for anyone who wants to know about the history of medieval historiography in the twentieth century. You must not trust it, but you must read it.

Robert E. Lerner, "'Meritorious Academic Service': Kantorowicz and Frankfurt," in *Ernst Kantorowicz: Erträge der Doppeltagung Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt*, ed. Robert Louis Benson and Johannes Fried (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1997), 14-32. Lerner was furious at Cantor's badmouthing of Kantorowicz and Percy Ernst Schramm. Here you'll find some of the reasons why. It would be an interesting task to track down all of the pieces written by medievalists and others responding to Cantor. There must have been a lot.

Edward Peters, "More Trouble With Henry: The Historiography of Medieval Germany in the Angliterate World, 1888-1995," *Central European History* 28 (1995): 47-72. This is focused specifically on the Germanies, but it's really a great read, extremely informative, and a pretty pointed corrective to Cantor. Peters has been around so long that he has a very well-informed perspective, and he is not shy about saying what he believes to be the case. I loved reading it.

John Van Engen, ed., *The Past and Future of Medieval Studies* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), and William D. Paden, ed., *The Future of the Middle Ages: Medieval Literature in the 1990s* (Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 1994). These are two volumes of collected essays that came out at exactly the same time. Taken in conjunction, they give a pretty good feel for what medievalists were thinking around 1990.

John Van Engen, "The Christian Middle Ages as an Historiographical Problem," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 519-52. This is now quite dated, but it's still a great reference point, in part because Van Engen is such a thorough and level-headed historian, in part because it includes a remarkably thorough and reliable review of a great deal of secondary literature and a pointed rejoinder to Jean Delumeau's famous claim that the medieval people whom we generally consider to have been Christians weren't "real" Christians, but only thinly disguised pagans.

Paul Freedman and Gabrielle Spiegel, "Medievalisms Old and New: The Rediscovery of Alterity in North American Medieval Studies," *American Historical Review* 103 (1998): 677-704. This is an unusually intelligent and provocative analysis of the current state of medieval historiography.

In addition, it seems to me that anyone who wants to be able to talk intelligently about medieval history must read the following two books:

Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, trans. L. A. Manyon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). There is pretty much unanimous agreement that this is the best book written about medieval Europe in the twentieth century, and possibly the best of all books of history. It is the gold standard of the kind of history that was favored by the *Annales* and there is nothing else quite like it, never mind that it may have been superseded in many details.

Otto Brunner, *Land and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria*, trans. with an introduction by Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992). As far as I am concerned, this is a must-read book for anyone with a serious interest in medieval history, especially if they are working on central Europe. Brunner has been much maligned for his affiliation with the National Socialists. But there is no doubt that he was one of the most influential and important German historians of the twentieth century, and that he provoked a fundamental rethinking of medieval history that has a lot in common with the work of the *Annales* historians. If it had not been for Hitler, Brunner would probably now occupy a place of much greater honor in twentieth-century historiography, as the closest thing to a German equivalent of Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre that Germany ever produced. The introduction by Kaminsky and Van Horn Melton does a good job of doing justice to Brunner, pointing out the problems while being fair to his accomplishment.

The following pieces will help you to navigate your way through the polemics surrounding Brunner:

James Van Horn Melton, "From Folk History to Structural History: Otto Brunner (1898-1982) and the Radical Conservative Roots of German Social History," in *Paths of Continuity: Central European Historiography from the 1930s to the 1950s*, ed. Hartmut Lehmann and James Van Horn Melton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 263-92. This is a very informative study that expands on the introduction to *Land and Lordship* and is critical without being censorious.

Peter Miller, "Nazis and Neo-Stoics: Otto Brunner and Gerhard Oestreich," *Past and Present* 176 (2002): 145-86. This is the same Peter Miller who edited the volume on Momigliano and Antiquarianism. I like him a lot, and this piece shows how good he is at making a compelling case. I think this is more of a hatchet job on Brunner and Oestreich than a fair assessment. But it's important for collecting the evidence for the case against Brunner.

Bryce Lyon, "Henri Pirenne and the Origins of *Annales* History," *Annals of Scholarship* 1 (1980): 69-84. This is a short, but incisive article that shows very clearly how much the intellectual energy of the first *Annales* historians owed to Karl Lamprecht and other German historians, as mediated by Henri Pirenne.