

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

History Seminar 73601 & 73602
Autumn 2011 and Winter 2012
(History Colloquium 53001, by consent)
TuTh 1:30-2:50
JRL 139

Constantin Fasolt
Office: HMW 602
Office hour: Wednesdays, 3:30-5:00
Office phone: 702 7935
icon@uchicago.edu

SEMINAR

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION IN GERMANY FROM RANKE TO THE PRESENT

SYLLABUS

The Reformation used to be regarded as an event of world historical significance. It was said to mark the beginning of modern history. It received a great deal of attention from philosophers, social thinkers, and historians. Hegel viewed it as the first manifestation of true freedom in the history of the world. Ranke thought it revealed the struggle of the German nation for unity. Marx and Engels took it as a preview of the proletarian revolution. And Weber thought it gave rise to the spirit of capitalism that distinguished Western civilization from the rest of the world.

Such views no longer carry nearly the same conviction they once had. They have been modified and submerged by a vastly increased body of detailed historical scholarship. Confessionally rooted categories of understanding that used to dominate interpretations of the Reformation have lost most of their appeal and are constantly being side-stepped by professional historians. Yet the old convictions have by no means been replaced, and they are no less effective for operating in a concealed and implicit manner. The Reformation continues to give rise to disagreements among historians that are closely aligned with confessional differences, and it continues to play a crucial role in historians' understanding of Europe's transition to modernity, even if that role is now something of an embarrassment that it seems better to disguise as "early modern history" than call by its familiar name.

The development of historical knowledge about the Reformation over the last two centuries thus reveals a great deal about historians' understanding of modernity, about the changes they have been forced to make to their accounts of European history since the nineteenth century, and about the difficulties with which they continue to struggle. It amounts to something of an object lesson in the challenges historians face in their attempts to render an account of European history that is neither restricted to confessional or Eurocentric horizons nor founded on untenable assumptions about progress and the meaning of history.

This two-quarter seminar is designed to take advantage of that object lesson. It will introduce graduate students to the professional study of European history and put them in a position to conduct original research in the history of the Reformation. The point is not to canvas the most recent scholarship, although to some extent we will do just that. The point is rather to establish criteria with which to judge the quality of the most recent scholarship by learning to distinguish what is old from what is new, fundamental questions from ancillary matters, and innovative work from recycled ideas.

Our first task will be to examine a succession of leading accounts of the Reformation from the days of Hegel to the most recent scholarship. We shall begin with classic interpretations developed in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century (Hegel, Ranke, Marx, Engels, Troeltsch, Weber, Febvre, Elias). Next, we are going to look at a few paradigmatic pieces of scholarships on the medieval church, both in order to establish a contrast to Reformation scholarship and to furnish some relief from its relentlessly Protestant tone. Thereafter we are going to turn to questions debated in the professional literature since the 1960s by historians such as Heiko Oberman, Bernd Moeller, Thomas Brady, Wolfgang Reinhard and others.

Second, we are going to read some of Luther's writings in English translation, not in order to focus on Lutheran teaching, but in order to highlight the contrast between reading a few particularly pertinent primary sources dating from the Reformation and reading their interpretation in the scholarly literature. That contrast alone will be sufficient to cast a bright light on the nature of historical knowledge and its ability to determine the extent to which the Reformation can and cannot be said to have marked a fundamental break in European history.

Third, the first quarter of this seminar will provide those of you who are first-year or second-year PhD students of History with the setting in which you will develop a research topic for the seminar paper you will be expected to submit at the end of the Winter quarter. In order to write a good seminar paper, you will need to start thinking about a topic as soon as possible, identify leads in the sources and the secondary literature, pursue those leads in the library, and report regularly to the seminar (orally as well as in writing) on your on-going research.

In order for me to be able to assist and supervise you at every stage of this process, you are required to keep in close contact with me and to meet the deadlines for the submission of drafts and research proposals. That will be the most effective way for you to develop a topic that will not only be of interest to you, but also clearly delimited, meaningfully related to the current state of the scholarship, and above all else manageable in the time allowed and with the resources available.

The second quarter of the seminar is meant to give you the opportunity to turn the research you started in the first quarter into a seminar essay that will satisfy the standards of professional historical scholarship. We will continue to meet on an ad-hoc basis in order to discuss the progress of your research and writing.

Students who wish to take only the first quarter of this course as a free-standing graduate colloquium (HIST 53001) must obtain the consent of the instructor.

Requirements

In order to make sure that you are familiar with the general principles of formulating a good topic for research and carrying the process of research and writing to a successful conclusion you are **required** to read Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, *The Craft of Research*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008). Because this book deals with general principles, I am not going to deal with it in any detail in class. But I will expect you to follow the advice it gives you.

If you are taking this course as a **two-quarter seminar**, you will be asked to:

- Complete the assigned readings
- Write a brief (1-2 pages) statement on the readings for a given week and post it on Chalk by 12 noon on Monday of that week
- Read the statements posted by all other students before class meets on Tuesday
- Participate in discussions and answer questions about the readings and the statements about the readings
- Consult with me in and out of class about an appropriate topic of research for your seminar paper
- Draft a paper proposal and post it on Chalk by 12 noon on Monday of fifth week
- Read the draft proposals posted by the other students
- Meet at a separately scheduled time in sixth week in order to receive feedback on your draft proposal and give feedback to everybody else
- Revise your draft of the paper proposal and post it on Chalk by 12 noon on Monday of ninth week
- Read the revised draft proposals posted by the other students
- Prepare an outline of your seminar paper and post it on Chalk by 12 noon on Monday of the first week in the winter quarter
- Read the outlines posted by everybody else
- Meet as scheduled by arrangement in the winter quarter to report on the progress of your research and writing, receive feedback on your work, and give feedback to everybody else
- Write a first draft of your seminar paper and post it on Chalk by 12 noon on Monday of fourth week in the winter quarter
- Read everyone's first draft of their seminar paper and give your feedback in class
- Revise the draft of your seminar paper and post the revised draft on Chalk by 12 noon on Monday of eighth week in the winter quarter
- Submit the final version of your seminar paper to the History Department by the deadline set by the Department

The most important requirement for the first quarter is the formulation and submission of a research paper proposal. This, and the paper you will go on to research and write, will determine your success in this seminar.

In order to make sure that you get started early, I have set the deadline for a first draft in fifth week. I do not expect a finished product at this point. The purpose of scheduling the draft so early is to give you an opportunity to try out your ideas and to leave you with sufficient time to modify your proposal in the course of your research. Modifications are a natural by-product of research. You may even have to change course completely and start on an altogether different subject. But if you keep in touch with me, I will do my best to steer you in a direction designed to avoid such an outcome.

I do expect a first draft that will identify, however roughly, the subject on which you plan to do your research, place that subject in an appropriate intellectual context, and offer a preliminary list of primary and secondary literature to be considered in your research. Describe the subject of your research and state the reasons why you have focused on it, what is already known about it, and what you intend to find out about it. You must include both a brief review of the existing secondary literature as far as you understand it at this point, and a basic bibliography divided into primary and secondary sources.

I will schedule a special meeting in sixth week at which we are going to discuss each proposal and make suggestions for changes.

If you want to take the first quarter of this course as a graduate colloquium without taking the second quarter, you need to obtain my consent. If you take the colloquium for **letter credit**, you will be expected to do the same work as students taking the full two-quarter seminar, except that at the end of the quarter you will write a paper of anywhere from 10-20 pages (instead of a full-length seminar paper). Your paper will be due by 12 noon on Monday of twelfth week. If you only want **R credit**, you will be expected to do the same work as students taking the full seminar, but will not write a paper.

Deadlines

- Your short statement on the readings assigned for the week is due by 12 noon on Monday of each week, starting Monday of 2nd week
- The draft of your paper proposal is due by 12 noon on Monday of 5th week
- Discussion of paper proposals will take place at a special meeting in 6th week
- The revised draft of your paper proposal is due by 12 noon on Monday of 9th week
- The paper of students taking only the first quarter, for letter credit, is due by 12 noon on Monday of 12th week
- The outline of your seminar paper is due by 12 noon on Monday of 1st week in the winter quarter
- The first draft of your seminar paper is due by 12 noon on Monday of 4th week in the winter quarter
- The revised draft of your seminar paper is due by 12 noon on Monday of 8th week in the winter quarter
- The final version of your seminar paper is due in the office of the Department of History by the deadline set by the Department

Readings

The readings for the first quarter are chosen to give you something of an overview, not to go into depth. They include some old chestnuts that everybody invokes, but hardly anybody reads. They include some primary literature. They include a number of relatively recent scholarly articles. They include some great classics. They include surveys of the historiography, bibliographies, handbooks, guides to further research, and so on. They deal with theology, with society, and with politics. They employ the perspectives of narrative historians and of structuralists, of historians interested in events and historians interested in the so-called *longue durée*. None of them are meant to give you more than a sampling. All of them have been chosen for the clarity with which they represent the most important kinds of approaches that have been taken to the study of the Reformation.

There is a lot I have left out. Most obvious among the omissions are the history of women and gender, the history of Jews, the Radical Reformation, Calvinism, the Reformation in England, and the Counter-Reformation. These omissions reflect my desire to combine a long chronological perspective with a clear topical focus. They should not deter you from exploring other subjects in your own research.

I am not unrealistic enough to believe that you will be able to read everything with equal attention. I will therefore point you to what I regard as the most telling sections. If you read those, you've read no more than the minimum. Do skim the rest. Always pay special attention to the table of contents (because it's both a summary of the whole book and an indication of its structure); to prefaces, introductions, and conclusions (because that's where writers tend to make their most revealing statements); and to footnotes and bibliographies (because that's where you learn whom writers like and trust, and whom they don't believe). Use the same procedure, suitably adapted, for articles. Take notes and come to class prepared to discuss the readings and the statements written by your peers.

In case you'd like to deepen your reading, I have prepared a guide to further readings and a brief overview of some elementary tools of research. I will give you hard copies of both.

If you would like to get an overview of the Reformation, I would recommend the following (the asterisk * here and on the schedule of required readings below means that I have asked the Seminary Coop to keep these books available for purchase):

- *Cameron, Euan. *The European Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991. BR305.2.C350 1991: in my judgment still the best general textbook of the Reformation in English available today. It does an unusually good job of treating both the new knowledge produced by social historians and the old knowledge of Reformation theology even-handedly and integrating both into an interpretive context covering all of Europe.
- *Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002. BX9415 .B47 2002: the best general history of Calvinism, and a unique scholarly accomplishment.
- *O'Malley, John W. *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000. BR430 .O45 2000: a miraculously brief and lucid treatment of the state of the historiography in

the study of early modern church history. It's obviously focused on Catholicism, but it is quite thorough in its coverage of the so-called confessionalization paradigm, and it bears lessons that historians of the Protestant Reformation would do well to heed better.

Ozment, Steven E., ed. *Reformation Europe: A Guide to Research*. St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1982. BR305.2.R34 +RR4: This is now almost thirty years old. But the contributions in it were written by some of the historians of the Reformation who did the most to reanimate Reformation historiography in the United States in the 1970s. It therefore continues to be one of the best introductions to the historiography of the Reformation and the major changes in it since World War II.

Schutte, Anne Jacobson, 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. BR300.A67 vol. 100: An attempt at a comprehensive overview of the current state of knowledge in Reformation research for all of Europe, organized mostly by countries, but also by topics (e.g., gender, theology since World War II). Some of the essays are outstanding, some more perfunctory. The main advantages of this volume are that it is recent, that it covers all of Europe, and that it is equipped with many bibliographical references. That makes it as good a starting point for exploring Reformation research as any.

Weekly written statements

In order to lay a good foundation for discussions in class, I expect you to prepare a brief written statement—no longer than two pages, double-spaced—on the readings for each week. In that statement, I want you to answer the following question in the most straightforward language you are able to muster: "What was your honest reaction to the claims made in these readings?"

By "your honest reaction" I mean just that: your honest reaction to the claims made in the readings. I mean your *hunches*. Learn to trust your hunches. Don't start criticizing them before you even know what they *are*. Do not try to get ahead of yourself. I want you to think about your genuine reaction to the readings and to put the result of your thinking into straightforward writing. I do not want you to formulate the thoughts you wish you had had, or the thoughts you tried to have, and especially not the thoughts you believe a good scholar ought to have had. The thoughts that you wished to have, tried to have, or ought to have had may be extremely compelling. But they have a crucial drawback: you did not actually have them. They are fictions. As historians, you must deal in facts. And the fact is that you are a beginner in graduate school. A beginner does not have a whole lot more than native intelligence and hunches to go on. That is the reason why there is such a thing as graduate school. Treat your condition with the respect it deserves: write down as clearly as you can the thoughts you actually had.

At the most basic level your reaction may consist of mere approval or disapproval ("I like it" - "I don't like it"). That is too basic, even for a beginner. Your reaction should include reasons for your approval or disapproval ("I like it, because I learned X" - "I don't like it because it pays no attention to Y"). At the most advanced level it will place the reading into a historiographical context ("It strikes me as important, because it improves on Schilling's account of confessionalization"). Don't aim for the most advanced level. In fact, don't aim for scholarship at all. Aim at treating the reading with the most attention you can muster, and then articulate your thoughts about it in your own words.

If you are curious about the reason why I am asking you to write statements that are likely to be personal and opinionated, here it is: the pursuit of objectivity in historical scholarship has been carried to such lengths that it often extinguishes the ability of historians to formulate judgments. I don't mean moral judgments. I mean the ability to say "this is that" without adding so many qualifications that nobody can tell *what* "this" is supposed to be. The ability to say "this is that"—as in "the Council of Trent was an authoritative gathering of the entire Catholic Church" or "Norbert Elias's *Civilizing Process* is a classic illustration of the quandary faced by sociologists who try to take history seriously"—is an essential precondition of scholarship. Without that ability, there is nothing to debate, nothing to criticize, and nothing to measure against the standards of objectivity. Hence it is necessary to train the intellectual muscles that make it possible for you to say "this is that" *even if you have nothing more than a hunch to go by*. You will need to exercise those muscles throughout your career. The purpose of the statement is to make you aware of what it means to use them. That's also the reason why the statement must be no longer than 2 pages. The shorter the statement, the more you are forced to exercise your judgment of what matters.

Don't worry about your "subjectivity" before you've even had a chance to figure out what you think. First figure out what you actually think and learn to put that into writing. What you actually think—your hunches, as they arise from the specific historical circumstances of your previous training and the context in which you currently find yourself—is the only foundation for successful research you have. There is no substitute for that. You are not in graduate school because you are an expert. You are in graduate school because you are a beginner who wants to become an expert. There will be plenty of time for you to revise your hunches in the light of what you will keep learning until you are able to turn them into historical knowledge of professional quality. But if you ignore your hunches, you will never know what you really want to say.

The paper proposal

At the most general level, a good paper proposal will have three main features.

1. It will pose a research problem that is interesting, first and foremost to yourself, but also to others, especially to other historians in the field.
2. The problem will not have been solved before, and will perhaps not even have been posed before.
3. The problem will be possible to solve with the means you have at your disposal.

Let me elaborate on each of these main features. First, you really need to be interested in whatever question you propose to research, or whatever problem you propose to solve. Don't make the mistake of choosing a problem only because it is safe. That's choosing the road to mediocrity. You will get bored, your energy will flag, and the result will be lifeless or incomplete. Finding an interesting question is especially important for a major project, such as a dissertation or a book, which may keep you preoccupied for several years. But on a smaller scale it is equally true of a seminar paper.

At the same time the problem you identify should not merely be your private hobby. It should be of interest to other people, and especially to other historians in the field. These are the people who make up the profession, whose company you are preparing to join, and whose judgment of your work will have a huge impact on your career for as long as you keep working.

That leads directly to the second main feature. In order to be interesting, the question you raise must promise to change what we already know. Put differently, it must fit into the current state of knowledge and reflect the current problematic. For that reason all good research problems have the same elementary structure (read more about it in Booth, Williams, and Colomb, *The Craft of Research*). That is, they propose to remove our ignorance of something specific in order to reduce our ignorance of something broader, deeper, or more fundamental. They are based on a significant relationship between *two different but related areas of ignorance*: "I propose to figure out x in order to cast light on y." - "I propose to study Protestant wills from the second half of the sixteenth century preserved in the archives of Nuremberg in order to test James Kittelson's hypothesis that the Reformation did succeed in changing the beliefs and practices of ordinary people."

You may very well have questions in which you are interested for their own sake. But such questions do not figure into an existing body of scholarly knowledge. If you cannot tell how they fit into existing scholarship, you will not be able to answer the most important question about your research. That question is: "So what? Why should I care about your research? Why does it matter?" If you merely have a question you'd like to answer because you are interested in it, you will only be able to say: "Because I would like to know more about x." That's not a good answer. A good answer will name a *second, more basic question* as a *justification* for the research you are doing: "Because then we will have a better chance to explain why prices rose in the sixteenth century." - "Because that will help us to clarify the relationship between early modern historical thought and natural philosophy."

The best kind of question is one that has never occurred to anyone before, but that fits directly into an issue in which everyone is interested. For example, everyone studying the history of the Reformation is interested in understanding what brought it about. But until Bernd Moeller wrote his famous article on imperial cities, nobody had ever realized how important it was that the Reformation spread most rapidly in the imperial cities in the southwest of the Holy Roman Empire. Moeller was the first to ask: "Why did the Reformation spread so rapidly in the cities in the southwest of the Holy Roman Empire?" His answer changed Reformation historiography.

Put differently, in order to formulate an interesting question, it is not enough merely to be curious. Your curiosity must be informed. You need to know what other historians have

already figured out, and you need to know what they would like to know more about. Ask yourself: "What is it that historians do not know about the Reformation, but would dearly like to know?" Then ask yourself: "What can I find out that will give them some of what they want?" If you don't ask such questions, you run the risk of posing a problem that has long since been solved or one that interests no one—and it is difficult to say which of the alternatives is worse.

Third, the most interesting problem imaginable is a waste of time unless it can be solved. Whether or not it can be solved depends on two factors: the materials available to you and your ability to master those materials in the available time. It might be interesting to know what went through the mind of Jan Hus as he was being burned at the Council of Constance. But we'll never know, because he could not write it down. It would be interesting to know what caused the Reformation. But it's not possible for one person to figure that out in a two-quarter seminar. It would be interesting to know how the manuscripts of Bartolus' commentaries on Roman law differ from the published edition, but unless you know Latin paleography, and know where the manuscripts are, and have time to read them, you won't be able to answer that question.

Lack of material that is both accessible and manageable is one of the most common pitfalls in which students get trapped when they forget that an interesting problem is not to be confused with a solvable problem. One of your main priorities should therefore be to formulate a problem that is not merely interesting, but also possible to solve. Cover the ground. Make sure you know what materials there are with which you could answer your question, make sure that you can get your hands on them, and make sure that you have what it takes to read them in terms of time and skill.

You might consider going all the way to the opposite extreme: don't start with an interesting question, and figure out afterwards whether it's possible to answer with the materials available. Start with the material that's available and figure out if it's possible to ask an interesting question about it. That's possible, but it's not guaranteed to work. The biggest danger here is not that you won't be able to answer the question you have posed, but that both the question and the answer will be trivial.

So there's a tradeoff to be made. If you start with an interesting question, you run the risk of winding up with gaping holes in your argument because you cannot find the material you would need to answer the question. In that case, you'll have to backtrack, ask a new question or reformulate your old question, and look for different material. If you start with the available material, you run the risk of winding up with a boring paper, because you could not think of an interesting question. In that case you won't be forced to backtrack, because you have something you can turn into a seminar paper. But you'll be disappointed that it doesn't amount to anything exciting. The ideal lies somewhere between these two equally unpleasant opposites.

These general considerations translate directly into the requirements for your paper proposal. Your paper proposal must include:

- A title

- A general description of the topic in which you are interested
- The particular question(s) that you would like to answer through your research
- An explanation of the reasons why this is the question you would like to answer
- An account of what you intend to do in order to find the answer
- A tentative formulation of the answer you hope to find
- An account of what other historians have already contributed to answering the question you have posed
- An explanation of the difference the results of your research will make to what we already know about the past
- A list of the primary sources and the secondary literature by means of which you intend to answer the question you have posed

Your paper proposal must address each of these points, though not necessarily in this order. The length at which you will be able to address them, and the confidence with which you can do so, will naturally depend on how much you already know. Don't let that worry you—and especially don't let it discourage you from tackling an ambitious project. Writing a seminar paper is a process that needs to go through a series of stages. If you are engaged in original research, you start by definition without knowing where you will wind up. If you knew where you will wind up, you would not need to do the research in the first place. The reason you need to do the research is precisely in order to find out where you will wind up. You won't know where that is until after you have done the research. Not knowing where you will wind up is obviously a source of anxiety, and the anxiety may be great. But it is also completely normal. Indeed, it is more than normal. It is necessary. It is the coin in which you pay for the originality of your research.

What matters, therefore, is not that you start fully confident of being on the right track, but that you start with a balanced mix of excitement, confidence, anxiety, and trepidation. It may well out that you are not on the right track. You may run into a dead end and have to turn back. You may have to try a different tack. You will doubtless gather a great deal of material that you will never be able to use, because it is boring, besides the point, or otherwise recalcitrant. Do not regard any of that as a failure. So far from being a failure, that is precisely what must happen in order for you to make real progress. You cannot tell a dead end from a promising road forward until you have actually gone there. Sometimes the fear of running into a dead end can keep researchers from exploring what will turn out to have been a tremendous missed opportunity, just as soon as some intrepid soul decides to give it a try. What makes the difference between a gifted researcher and an ordinary one is not the confidence they have in the hypothesis with which they start out, but the courage and the ingenuity with which they try to nail it down until they are forced to change course.

Don't try to cut any corners. So long as you focus on meeting the requirements for the proposal that I have listed above, you will do well. These requirements, simple as they may seem, frame the substance of research. They can be refined in many ways. But none of them can be left out. If you treat each of them as thoroughly as you can, and keep thinking about them in a sustained and methodical way, your initial, tentative, preliminary paper proposal will gradually turn into a long and substantial piece of original research of which you can be proud.

Books for purchase and on reserve

I have asked Regenstein Library to keep the readings on reserve or, if possible, on e-reserve. I have also asked the Seminary Co-op to order copies of the most important readings that are still in print. These are identified with an asterisk (*) on the schedule of readings and assignments below. Books that are out of print may also be available at Powell's on 57th Street (a used-books store with a large selection of historical books) or from Amazon and AbeBooks (www.abebooks.com; "Abe" stands for "Advanced Book Exchange"). Amazon and AbeBooks have millions of used books from rare and used book dealers all over the world in their databases, and sometimes the prices are surprisingly reasonable.

Schedule of readings and assignments

First week, Tuesday: Introduction to the seminar

No readings

Part One: Classics

First week, Thursday: Hegel and Marx—two paradigms

*Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Philosophy of History*. Trans. J. Sibree. New York: Dover, 1956. D16.8.H48.

xi-xvi: "Charles Hegel's Preface" and "Contents"

341-6: "The German World – The Principle of Spiritual Freedom"

412-27: "The Reformation"

427-38: "The Influence of the Reformation on Political Development"

438-57: "The Eclaircissement and Revolution"

*Tucker, Robert C., ed. *The Marx-Engels Reader*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1978.

3-6: Karl Marx, "Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*"

53-65: Karl Marx, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*: Introduction"

761-765: Friedrich Engels, "Letter to Joseph Bloch"

G. R. Elton, "Introduction: The Age of the Reformation," in *The Reformation, 1520-1559*, ed. G. R. Elton (Cambridge, 1958), 1-22. D209.N53 v.2

Bainton, Roland H. "Interpretations of the Reformation." *American Historical Review* 66 (1960): 74-84. E171.A52 RR3

Consider this: Broadly speaking, Hegel distinguishes between spirit and matter, and he believes that true liberty consists of uniting the two. How did he believe the Reformation helped to advance that goal? And how did it differ from the Enlightenment and the French Revolution? How, in turn, does Marx differ from Hegel? What does Elton in 1958 regard as well established knowledge about the Reformation? What does Bainton in 1960 regard as major challenges to ongoing historical scholarship?

Second week, Tuesday: Ranke—idealism and nationalism (objectivity I)

Ranke, Leopold von. *History of the Reformation in Germany*. Trans. Sarah Austin.

London: Routledge, 1905. BR305.R2

vii-xiv: "Author's Preface" and "Contents"

111-245: "Book II: Early History of Luther and of Charles V, 1517-1521"

Consider this: Ranke claims to write the history of the Reformation, and not to be engaged in philosophy. Yet his work seems to echo the ideas of Hegel. How does it do so?

Second week, Thursday: Engels—materialism and class structure (objectivity II)

*Engels, Friedrich. *The Peasant War in Germany*. Trans. David Riasanov. New York: International Publishers, 1926. DD182 .E5713 1956
vii-xiv: Preface

Section I [Germany circa 1500]

Section II [Luther versus Muenzer]

Section IV [Class divisions in the Reformation]

Section VII [Effects and Nature of the Peasants' War]

Note: This translation was published many times in different paginations. In order to avoid confusion, I've left out the pagination and given merely the numbers of the sections on which you should concentrate.

[Compare with Marx on England: Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Trans. Ben Fowkes. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Vol. 1, pp. 873-940: "Part Eight: So-Called Primitive Accumulation"]

Consider this: Marx and Engels claimed to turn Hegel right side up. Engels' account of the Reformation is a good illustration of what that means. How does Engels turn Hegel "right side up," and how does his account of the Reformation differ from Ranke's?

Third week, Tuesday: The search for a new paradigm I—Weber and sociology

*Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Scribner, 1958. BR115.E3W42 1976

13-31: "Author's Introduction"

35-46: "Religious Affiliation and Social Stratification"

47-78: "The Spirit of Capitalism"

79-92: "Luther's Conception of the Calling: Task of the Investigation"

155-83: "Asceticism and the Spirit of Capitalism"

Trevor-Roper, Hugh R. "Religion, the Reformation and Social Change." In: Hugh R. Trevor-Roper, ed. *The European Witch-Craze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and Other Essays*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), pp. 1-45.

D231.T81.

Consider this: Weber may be described as a German idealist who took the Marxist challenge to idealism seriously without surrendering claims to the superiority of European Civilization—and in the process laid the foundations for a hugely influential form of sociology. How does his account of the Reformation differ from those given by Ranke and Engels? And why does Trevor-Roper object?

Third week, Thursday: The search for a new paradigm II—Troeltsch versus Holl

*Troeltsch, Ernst. *Protestantism and Progress: A Historical Study of the Relation of Protestantism to the Modern World*. Trans. W. Montgomery. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 1999. BX4817.T84

v-ix: "Preface"

1-8: "Introduction"

- 9-42: "The Meaning of 'The Modern World'"
 43-57: "The Meaning of 'Protestantism'"
 57-88: "Protestantism and the Modern World: Points of Contrast"
 171-207: "Protestantism and Modern Religious Feeling"

Holl, Karl. *The Cultural Significance of the Reformation*. Trans. Karl and Barbara Hertz and John H. Lichtblau. New York: Meridian Books, 1959. BR307.H7
 23-41: "Religion and Secular Life"

Consider this: Troeltsch was convinced that it was impossible to understand the Reformation without the help of sociology. Holl begged to differ. What's the nature of the disagreement? Moreover, Troeltsch had strong views about the difference between "old" and "new" Protestantism. What are those Protestantisms and what's the difference?

Fourth week, Tuesday: The search for a new paradigm III—Lucien Febvre

Febvre, Lucien. "The Origins of the French Reformation: A Badly-Put Question?"
 In *A New Kind of History and Other Essays*, by Lucien Febvre, ed. Peter Burke,
 trans. K. Folca, 44-107. New York: Harper & Row, 1973. DC36.9.F28

*Febvre, Lucien. *The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century: The Religion of Rabelais*.
 Trans. Beatrice Gottlieb. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.
 PQ1697.R4F311
 vii-ix: "Contents"

- 1-8: "General Introduction"
 335-53: "Religion's Domination of Life"
 455-64: "Conclusion: A Century that Wanted to Believe"

Consider this: Lucien Febvre is known as one of the two founders of the *Annales* (the other was Marc Bloch), a French historical journal after which the most influential school of historical thought in the twentieth century has been named. How does Febvre's approach differ from what you have read so far?

Fourth week, Thursday: The search for a new paradigm IV—Norbert Elias

- *Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell,
 1994. CB83.E4130 1994
 xi-xvii: "Preface" [dated September 1936]
 42-178: "Part Two [of *The History of Manners*]: Civilization as a Specific
 Transformation of Human Behavior" (no need to read all of this with
 equal attention; you'll get the picture pretty soon)
 181-215: "Introduction to the 1968 Edition"
 265-269: "Survey of Courtly Society"
 269-272: "A Prospective Glance at the Sociogenesis of Absolutism"
 345-355: "On the Monopoly Mechanism"
 443-456: "The Social Constraint towards Self-Constraint"
 492-498: "Shame and Repugnance"
 513-524: "Conclusion"

Note: there are several different editions of this book, with varying paginations, depending on whether the two parts of the *Civilizing Process*, i.e., *The History of Manners* and *State Formation and Civilization*, are combined in a single volume or not, and paginated separately or consecutively. The pagination used above is taken from the consecutively paginated edition published in one volume in

1994. You're free to use any edition you can lay your hands on, but make sure you read the passages I've assigned.

Consider this: Norbert Elias believed that the "individual"—the *homo clausus* of modern times—is neither more rational than human beings in earlier times, nor a kind of human essence, but simply a way for human beings to behave under the circumstances of a particular (modern) kind of society in which they are exposed to very particular constraints. He also believed that there is a certain logic to the way these constraints arose over time. What are those constraints, and what is the logic?

Part Two: Catholics and the Medieval Church

Fifth week, Tuesday: The Medieval Church—Bartlett and Tellenbach

*Bartlett, Robert. *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950-1350*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993. D200.B270 1993
1-3: "Introduction"

5-23: "The Expansion of Latin Christendom"

243-268: "The Roman Church and the Christian People"

269-291: "The Europeanization of Europe"

Tellenbach, Gerd. *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Controversy*. Trans. Ralph F. Bennett. London: Basil Blackwell & Mott, 1959. BX1790.T4313x 1991

1-37: "Fundamental Principles"

38-60: "The Medieval Conception of the Hierarchy"

126-161: "Libertas Ecclesiae: The Struggle for Right Order in the Christian World"

162-168: "Conclusion"

Fifth week, Thursday: "Corruption" of the church—Barraclough, Haller, Bossy

Practice your German: Haller, Johannes. *Papsttum und Kirchenreform: Vier Kapitel zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Mittelalters*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1903. BX955.H2
v-x: "Vorwort"

Barraclough, Geoffrey. *Papal Provisions: Aspects of Church History, Constitutional, Legal, and Administrative in the Later Middle Ages*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1935.

BX1955.B3

vii-xvi: Preface and Table of Contents

1-18: Chapters 1-2 (skim chapter 3)

50-98: Chapters 4-7

120-136: Chapter 10

153-177: Chapter 12

Bossy, John. "The Mass as a Social Institution, 1200-1700." *Past & Present* 100 (1983): 29-61. D1.P3

Sixth week, TBD: Discussion of paper proposals

Seminar students will meet at a mutually agreeable time outside of class in order to discuss the first draft of their paper proposals and consider recommendations for changes.

Sixth week, Tuesday: The catholic foundations of democracy

- Brian Tierney, "Medieval Canon Law and Western Constitutionalism," *Catholic Historical Review* 52 (1966): 1-17. BX1404.C3
- Tierney, Brian. "Hierarchy, Consent, and the 'Western Tradition'." *Political Theory* 15 (1987): 646-52. JA1.P763
- Francis Oakley, "Legitimation by Consent: The Question of the Medieval Roots," *Viator* 14 (1983): 303-35. CB351.A1V62

Part Three: Contemporary Reformation Scholarship

Sixth week, Thursday: The urban Reformation—Bernd Moeller

- Moeller, Bernd. *Imperial Cities and the Reformation*. Trans. H. C. Erik Midelfort and Mark U. Edwards, Jr. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972. BR307.M69
- 3-16: "Problems of Reformation Research"
- 19-38: "The German Humanists and the Beginnings of the Reformation"
- 41-115: "Imperial Cities and the Reformation"
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr. "In Search of the Godly City: The Domestication of Religion in the German Urban Reformation." In *The German People and the Reformation*, ed. Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, 14-31. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988. BR309.G370 1988

Seventh week, Tuesday: Origins of the Reformation—Oberman and Moeller

- *Oberman, Heiko A. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963. BT26.O2
- 1-7: "Introduction"
- 423-28: "Postscript: The Catholicity of Nominalism"
- Oberman, Heiko A. "The Shape of Late Medieval Thought: The Birthpangs of the Modern Era." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 64 (1973): 13-33. BR300.A67
- Moeller, Bernd. "Piety in Germany Around 1500." In *The Reformation in Medieval Perspective*, ed. Steven E. Ozment, 50-75. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971. BR309.O9
- Oakley, Francis. "Religious and Ecclesiastical Life on the Eve of the Reformation." In *Reformation Europe: A Guide to Research*, ed. S. Ozment, 5-32. St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1982. BR305.2.R34 RR4

Seventh week, Thursday: Social History and Religion—Brady, Blicke, Scribner

- Brady, Thomas A., Jr. *Ruling Class, Regime, and Reformation at Strasbourg, 1520-1555*. Leiden: Brill, 1978. HN438.S87B70
- 3-19: "The 'Sacral Corporation' and the Urban Reformation in Germany"
- 291-95: "Conclusions"
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr. "'The Social History of the Reformation' between 'Romantic Idealism' and 'Sociologism': A Reply." In *Stadtbürgertum und Adel in der Reformation: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Reformation in England und Deutschland*, ed. Wolfgang Mommsen, Peter Alter, and R. Scribner, 40-3. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1979. D231.S750 [This is a reply to Bernd Moeller, "Stadt und Buch: Bemerkungen zur Struktur der reformatorischen Bewegung in

Deutschland," in the same volume, pp. 25-39. If you can read German, take a look.]

Blickle, Peter. *The Revolution of 1525: The German Peasants' War from a New Perspective*. Trans. Erik Midelfort and Thomas Brady. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1982. DD182.B6130

3-17: "Introduction: Interpretations, Problems, and New Perspectives"

187-93: "Conclusion: The Revolution of the Common Man"

Scribner, Robert W. "The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the 'Disenchantment of the World'." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 23 (1993): 475-94. CB3.J76 RR2

Eighth week, Tuesday: Success and Failure—Strauss, Kittelson, Parker

Strauss, Gerald. "Success and Failure in the German Reformation." *Past & Present* 67 (1975): 30-63. D1.P3

Kittelson, James M. "Successes and Failures in the German Reformation: The Report from Strasbourg." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982): 153-74. BR300.A67

Parker, Geoffrey. "Success and Failure During the First Century of the Reformation." *Past & Present* 136 (1992): 43-82. D1.P3

Eighth week, Thursday: Confessionalization—Oestreich, Reinhard, and Schilling

Oestreich, Gerhard. *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*. Ed. Brigitta Oestreich and H. G. Koenigsberger. Trans. David McLintock. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982. JN3249.O33130 1982

258-73: "The Structure of the Absolute State"

Reinhard, Wolfgang. "Pressures towards Confessionalization? Prolegomena to a Theory of the Confessional Age." In *The German Reformation: The Essential Readings*, ed. C. Scott Dixon, 169-92. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999. BR305.2 .G45 1999

Schilling, Heinz. "The Reformation and the Rise of the Early Modern State." In *Luther and the Modern State in Germany*, ed. James D. Tracy, 21-30. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Publishers, 1986. BR333.5.P6L870 1986

*O'Malley, John W. *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000. BR430 .O45 2000
92-117: "France, Germany, and Beyond"

Ninth week, Tuesday: The state of the art

Fasolt, Constantin. "Hegel's Ghost: Europe, the Reformation, and the Middle Ages." *Viator* 39 (2008): 345-86. CB351.A1V62

Karant-Nunn, Susan C. "Changing One's Mind: Transformations in Reformation History from a Germanist's Perspective." *Renaissance Quarterly* 58 (2005): 1101-27. CB361.R4 RR3

Scott, Tom. "The Reformation between Deconstruction and Reconstruction: Reflections on Recent Writings on the German Reformation." *German History* 26 (2008): 406-422. DD1.G32

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, Mary Laven, and Eamon Duffy. "Recent Trends in the Study of Christianity in Sixteenth-Century Europe." *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006): 697-731.

- *Cameron, Euan. *The European Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
BR305.2.C350 1991
vii-x: "Preface"
1-6: "Introduction"
9-19: "The Religion of the People of Europe"
417-22: "Conclusion"
- Brady, Thomas A., 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. ICU: D203.H360 1994 RR3
vol. 1, pp. xiii-xxiv: "Introduction: Renaissance, Reformation, Late Middle Ages, and Early Modern Era"
vol. 2, pp. xv-xxiii: "Introduction: the Unsettling Settlements"
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr. *The Politics of the Reformation in Germany: Jacob Sturm (1489-1553) of Strasbourg*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1997. BR350.S78B72 1996
1-5: "Introduction"
249-50: "Epilogue"
- Elton, G. R., ed. *The Reformation, 1520-1559*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. D208.N40 1990 v.2 RR3
vii-x: "Introduction to the 2nd Edition"
- Lindberg, Carter, ed. *The Reformation Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. BT27 .R38 2002
1-15: "Introduction"

Part Four: Luther's Writings

Tenth week, Tuesday: Luther I—Theology

- *Luther, Martin. *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*. Ed. J. Dillenberger. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1961. BR331.E5D6
3-12: "Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings"
42-85: "The Freedom of a Christian"
249-359: "The Pagan Servitude of the Church"
489-500: "Ninety-Five Theses"

Tenth week, Thursday: Luther II—Politics

- *Luther, Martin. *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*. Ed. J. Dillenberger. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1961. BR331.E5D6
363-402: "Secular Authority: To What Extent It Should be Obeyed."
403-485: "Appeal to the Ruling Class of German Nationality"
- *Luther, Martin, and the Peasants. "The Twelve Articles of the Peasants" and "Admonition to Peace." In *The Renaissance*, ed. Eric Cochrane and Julius Kirshner, 334-57. University of Chicago Readings in Western Civilization, vol. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. CB245.U640 1986