HISTORY 705: COLLOQUIUM IN EUROPEAN HISTORY BEFORE 1800

Course Information:
History 705-01, Fall 2023 (CRN: 80496). Time: Wednesdays 5:30-8:20 PM. Room: 2210 MHRA

Instructor Information:
Email: rebarton@uncg.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays 9:00-10:00, Wednesdays 3:30-4:30, and by appointment

Description:
This course comprises the first half of the Graduate Colloquium in European History. Our imagined task is a huge, even impossible one: we are supposed to make sense of the historiography produced by historians concerning the 1500 years (or so) leading up to the French Revolution. Obviously we cannot do justice to every period and/or every topic, and our approach must inevitably be somewhat fragmentary. Each week is thus devoted to a ‘large theme’ in European history (crusade, saints, lordship, reformation, renaissance, etc.), with an emphasis on subjects which have proven to be of recent scholarly interest. For each of these themes, we will examine a main historiographical reading, typically a fairly recent book by an important modern historian, alongside one or two
shorter readings designed to provide context. Whenever possible I have tried to arrange the reasons to show either a debate/dispute or at least a set of alternate approaches to the same theme.

Our goals will be several. First, we are interested in identifying the theme or problem for the week. We will then wish to identify and evaluate the arguments of the main readings insofar as they pertain to that topic. Finally, we will also – when appropriate – consider how the readings reflect broader historiographical trends and methods.

As a graduate reading seminar, you will be tasked to read a lot of pages each week. You must be concerned first and foremost with identifying the author’s stated (or unstated) purpose and/or agenda in writing. Close behind this will fall the argument of the author’s work. As our task will be to evaluate the success of this argument, you need to try to avoid getting bogged down in the minutiae of the details offered by each author. Of course it’s important to pay attention to some of the evidence, both for its inherent interest and for its contribution(s) to the argument, but we cannot hope to become expert in the local historiographies of such a vast field. So, on the whole, you should pay close attention to the argument, the evidence offered to support that argument, and the assumptions around which the argument (and the choice of evidence) is based. In essence, you will be learning to “gut” or “fillet” a book for its ‘meat’ or significance. This may sound inelegant, and it is, but learning to do so is an important skill to develop during your graduate education. You should thus practice reading rapidly (but carefully), skimming the details but keeping your eyes open for the argument, holes in reasoning, blatant (or not-so-blatant) assumptions, and so on.

**Required Books**
The following are all available at the UNCG Bookstore. You may also be able to find copies elsewhere for a cheaper price. All but 3 of the items are held by UNCG as e-books, with unlimited user access. I’ve placed all the books that UNCG holds in hard copy on reserve; you can check them out for 2 hours at a time (with overnight privileges too) at the Circulation Desk.

Other Required Readings:
Although the assigned books comprise the major reading for the semester, we will also complement them with short excerpts from other books and articles by authors who have written on the same subject. Typically these other readings will be found in pdf form on Canvas; sometimes you will need to acquire them yourselves through UNCG’s library.

Student Learning Outcomes
A student who successfully completes this course will be able to:
1. Critically evaluate important works of modern scholarship both orally and in writing
2. Conduct evidence-based discussions of scholarship in a professional, collegial manner
3. Locate, assess, and communicate reviews and other subjective analyses of the assigned readings
4. Identify and analyze a range of methodological approaches to historical writing

Teaching Methods and Course Requirements
A. Teaching Methods:
The course is taught as a seminar in which all participants critically analyze joint readings. The instructor takes a semi-socratic approach, suggesting (when needed) topics and questions for discussion, and filling in historiographical background when necessary. The point of discussion is to assess the arguments of the assigned readings, particularly with an eye towards their contribution to debates on signal themes of medieval and early modern historiography. Students will make regular presentations on cognate matters of historiographical concern, and will help to lead discussion.

B. Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Percentage of Course Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Participation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Analytical Essays</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Project</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Oral Presentation: (15%) (Student Learning Outcomes 1, 3)
Each week one of you will open our discussion with a brief (10 minute) presentation that accomplishes the following three tasks:
1. Offer your (informed) opinion about what you found the argument of the main book to be, whether or not you found it to be persuasive, and why or why not you found it persuasive.

2. Offer a mini-biography of the author (as much as can be gleaned), paying special attention to the author’s historiographical alignments.

3. Explain the scholarly reception of the main work for the week (as evidenced by reviews).

4. Suggest three lines of inquiry to be pursued in the subsequent discussion.

Along with your presentation you should distribute a 1-page handout with whatever relevant points about the book, author, and/or historiographical ‘problem du jour’ that you wish to share with us (some biographical details, potentially relevant quotations, your questions, etc.).

The actual oral part of the presentation should **not** feature you reading your handout. Summarize your points succinctly and clearly, and do so in a confident, professional way (eye-contact, spontaneous speech [i.e., not reading notes], etc).

2. **General Participation** (20%) (Student Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 6)

As a graduate seminar, the course demands participation from all students. I recognize that much of the material may be unfamiliar to some of you; despite this reasonable point, I still expect students to take an active and frequent part in the discussion. If you find that you are not saying almost anything (one interjection per meeting, say), you are likely to receive a C for this part of the course grade. Grades in the A and B range are only awarded to students who speak regularly and participate in discussion by considering and responding to the comments of others (professor and students). I am less concerned with *what* you say than in seeing you make a decent effort to orally analyze the reading and offer some sort of reasoned explanation for your analysis. (Okay, I *am* also interested in *what* you say, but still ....)

3. **Analytical Essays**: (40% total, 10% each) (Student Learning Outcomes: 1, 6)

Students must complete four (4) short analytical essays. Each should be 3-5 pages long (1000-1500 words), typed, with 1” margins, and with appropriate citations. The first essay is due on September 13; you can write a response to either the week 2, the week 3, or the week 4 readings (choose 1). The second essay is due on October 11; it must concern one of the topics up to and including 4 October. The final two essays are due whenever you like. Note: some students like to turn in papers quickly at the start of the semester (one year a student had written all 4 by week 7). I’m okay with this, with the caveat that you should probably wait to get feedback on your first essay before writing another. But if you like to get them out of the way, it is permissible to write all four before, say 11 October. The date of 11 October is merely a minimum; I want to have received at least 2 essays by this point. Of course, other people like to pick and choose which essays they write based either on the subject matter or their own schedule, or the prompts I’ve written. That is perfectly fine. Bottom line: please choose your own due-dates, provided I get one essay by 13 September and a second by 11 October.

You also have choice in what you choose to write about for a given topic. While I have written a couple of essay prompts for each book/topic, you are also **ALWAYS** welcome to take the ‘Open Option’. In the Open Option, you answer an analytical question of your own devising (in case you want to write about something other than the prompt[s] I have written). For the Open Option, you should identify a problem, issue, or major point of significance raised by the reading and discuss it,
using evidence from the readings to support your position. I don’t want to see a summary. What I do want to see is you making an argument about the reading, and supporting it with evidence. That argument can come in several forms: you can support, modify or reject the author’s argument; you might explain the significance of the main work to the historiography of the main theme; you might take sides in a debate; or you might devise an argument of your own (yay!).

4. Final Essay/Project (25%)
Again, I am going to give you a choice for your final project in the course. You can EITHER write a 2000-2500-word essay (~7-8-pages) historiographical essay on the subject of one of the topics we have already read for the semester (you’ll need to locate, read, and incorporate 2-4 other works on this topic as well), OR you can prepare a syllabus for an upper-level undergraduate course on a topic of their choosing from pre-Modern European history. The syllabus project will require that you produce a 500-word justificatory introduction to the course, a list of required readings, a weekly schedule of topics, and an annotated bibliography you have consulted (or might consult) in preparation to teaching said course. I'll distribute a handout with more information during the semester. Note I am more than happy (excited, even!) to consult you concerning your topic, whether historiographical essay or course syllabus, and to brainstorm with you about ideas and bibliography.

The “Legal” stuff:
1. All students should be familiar (or make themselves familiar) with the UNCG Academic Integrity Policy: http://academicintegrity.uncg.edu/complete/
2. All work should be your own. Plagiarism is intolerable all the time, but there is absolutely no excuse for it at the graduate level.
3. Attendance is critical in this course. If you miss more than 1 class without explanation, I will take some sort of disciplinary measures.
4. All course materials must be completed to receive a grade. I am giving you substantial leeway in scheduling your own due-dates. Don’t make me mad by piling them all up at the end of the semester!

Schedule of Classes and Readings

NOTE: I have listed the readings for each week in a particular order. I strongly suggest that you read them in the order listed (starting with 1, etc.). This is largely a matter of historiography; that is, the earlier readings typically offer a viewpoint being challenged by the ‘main’ book for that week.

Week 1
August 16: Course Introduction
Readings:
1. How to Gut a Book
2. How to Gut a Book, alt.

Week 2
August 23: the Early Middle Ages – Charlemagne in History and Legend
Readings:
3. Canvas: Paul Dutton, “Preface” and “Charlemagne’s Mustache”, in Dutton, Charlemagne’s Mustache and Other Cultural Clusters of a Dark Age (Palgrave, 2004), xiii-xvi and 3-42 and 201-209.

Issues: what makes or made Charlemagne ‘Great’ (the name Charlemagne means ‘Charles the Great’)? When and how was his greatness established? How did medieval people of the 12th and 13th centuries remember him? What does Charlemagne’s case tell us about the uses to which history is put, and the ways in which historical memory are deployed?

Week 3
August 30: Ecology and Culture: Medieval Approaches to Animals
Readings:
1. Jamie Kreiner, Legions of Pigs, entire

Issues:

Week 4
September 6: Motivations for Crusading
Readings:
2. Jay Rubenstein, Nebuchadnezzar’s Dream

Issues: motives of first crusaders, material, spiritual, apocalyptic, other

Week 5 [First Analytical Essay Due]
September 13: Lords, States and Power
Readings:

Issues: what is power?; lordship vs. government; definition of 'state'; stateless society; anarchy; violence as a social ill.

**Week 6**
September 20: Writing and Literacy
Readings:

Issues: what is literacy?; who was literate (and when) in the MA?; literacy vs. orality; types of written ‘texts’; link between writing and power

**Week 7**
September 27: Peasant Communities: Two Views
Readings:

**Week 8**
October 4: Religion and Gender in the Later Middle Ages
Readings:

Issues: TBA

**Week 9** [A second analytical essay must be turned in by this date]
October 11: Renaissance Identities and Sexualities
Readings


### Week 10

October 18: Approaches to Martin Luther

Readings:


Issues: what is impt about Luther? Printing and reformation; ideas vs culture; social history vs intellectual vs theological history of the reformation; Luther as ‘pop star’; how revolutionary was the reformation?

### Week 11

October 25: Queenship in the Sixteenth Century

Readings:


Issues: TBA

### Week 12

November 1: Peasant Life, Gender and Agency in the 16th Century

Readings:

1. Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre*
4. Film: *Return of Martin Guerre* [clips to be shown in class]

Issues: TBA

### Week 13

November 8: Slavery and Culture in the Early-Modern Mediterranean

Readings
1. Gillian Weiss, *Captives and Corsairs*

**Week 14**
November 15: Absolutism

Readings

**Week 15**
November 22: No Class: Thanksgiving Holiday

**Week 16**
November 30: Writing, Culture and Revolution in the Ancien Regime

Readings:

**Final Project Due:** Tuesday, December 7, by noon in my office

---

**Some Guidelines for Critical Reading and Writing**

Learning how to read, analyze, and write about historical literature in a critical way is the main objective of this course. Keep the following in mind as you read and write about the books and articles this semester:

a. Check the date and place of publication (don’t be fooled by reprints or later editions). How are these important to an understanding of the book? Consider a book on medieval Germany written by an Englishman in 1943.

b. Read the author’s introduction or preface and/or acknowledgments. Whom else does he/she know, or with whom and with what types of historical writing does he/she choose to associate his/her work? To whom is he/she indebted? Whom does he/she consider as an opponent? Does the author state his/her purpose in writing the book? No author is an island, and very few are truly original; most authors are indebted either personally to someone else or methodologically to a school or approach.
c. Pay careful attention to the author’s use of sources. To ascertain this, you will need to be aware of his/her footnotes and/or bibliography, even if you do not read every single reference (indeed, you probably shouldn’t read every reference). How does the selection and use of sources inform the author’s historical interpretation? Does the author use a single source [a treatise, a chronicle, an inquest]? A single category of sources [parish records, letters, memoirs, legal sources, etc.]? Many different types of sources? Does he/she make use of literary sources? Statistical sources? Police records? Are all sources equally reliable? Would use of another kind of source altered his/her conclusions?

d. Does the author make clear what is (are) his/her thesis (or theses) in the book or article? That is to say, can you discern if an argument is being made? Or, is the book pure narrative? [be careful, for even narratives can have agendas and/or theses] If there is no apparent argument, is this a problem? If there is an argument, does it fit into some larger historiographical debate? Or, does it fit into or alongside some major historical or ideological theory?

e. Does the author bring to his/her analysis a particular method or approach? In some weeks, you may well read works on the same subject from diametrically opposing methodological perspectives. While the tendency may be to believe that one is “right” and the other “wrong”, we will find that it is more useful to simply try to uncover, analyze, and criticize the methods being used, and to express an opinion about which method seems to offer a better, or more important, understanding of the topic in question.

f. To what sort of audience is the book or article addressed? Other scholars? A general readership? Students? How do considerations of audience affect an author’s selection and use of sources?

g. Is the work in question a monograph, based primarily on original research? Or is it a synthesis that integrates new material with older ideas? Or some combination of the two?