Imagined Histories

AMERICAN HISTORIANS INTERPRET THE PAST

EDITED BY ANTHONY MOLHO AND GORDON S. WOOD

Imagined Histories

AMERICAN HISTORIANS INTERPRET THE PAST

EDITED BY ANTHONY MOLHO AND GORDON S. WOOD

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

• CONTENTS •

• CHAPTER 14 •

Between Whig Traditions and New Histories: American Historical Writing about Reformation and Early Modern Europe

PHILIP BENEDICT

IN ITS DEPICTION of professorial paladins of many nationalities jetting from conference to conference across oceans and time zones, David Lodge's academic novel *Small World* neatly captures one of the essential features of the contemporary world of scholarship—the dramatically increased pace of international scholarly cross-fertilization and migration. Perhaps no field of American historical writing has felt the effects of this more than the study of European history from 1500 to 1789. This period has been the focus of much of the most innovative work of the major European movements of "new history" in the past generations: the Annales school, the group of English historians around *Past and Present*, and the Italian microhistorians around *Quaderni Storici*. In the years since the second great expansion of the American historical profession began amid the postwar educational boom of the late fifties and sixties, the growth of support for international research, cheap transatlantic airfares, several consecutive decades of a strong dollar, and the multiplication of international conferences and exchanges all combined to increase commitment to archival research and to transform the ambitions and horizons of American scholars in this field. So many have produced archive-based monographs of a depth and sophistication comparable to those written in Europe that the prominent specialist in French history who advised his colleagues in 1958 that Americans could not compete in this domain and that they should concentrate instead on synthesizing European archival work graciously acknowledged in 1991 that he had been proved wrong.[1] Meanwhile, the relative wealth and openness of the American university system has drawn to the United States so many prominent European early modernists—Heiko Oberman, Lawrence Stone, Carlo Ginzburg, J. H. Elliott, Simon Schama, to name just a few—that it is hard even to know where to draw the boundaries of "American" scholarship.[2] A few native scholars have assumed a position among the most influential historians anywhere in the world. Many others are now interlocutors in international discussions on an equal standing with their counterparts in the various countries of Europe. The problems to which early modern historians working in the United States address themselves, as well as the methods they

employ, are as much those of the different European historiographic traditions with which they interact as those they share with domestic colleagues in other fields.

For all this increased internationalization of recruitment and perspectives, long-established curricular and organizational patterns nonetheless continue to lend a distinctive configuration to American research on this period of European history. Despite a growing tendency for all who work in this field to conceive of themselves as "early modernists," American specialists in the history of this era subdivide themselves into several distinct, if occasionally overlapping, communities of discourse. For those concerned with the European continent, teaching responsibilities divide specialists in the early part of the period from specialists in its later centuries, with the study of the Reformation defining the central focus of the initial period—a vestige of the long-standing emphasis within the American teaching curriculum on "Ren-Ref." By contrast, the period of continental European history from 1600 to 1789 has always lacked a clear identity or scholarly organizations similar to those which exist for the sixteenth century. English history from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries has meanwhile always constituted a field separate unto itself, one whose self-definition around the dubious dichotomization between Britain and Europe imparts to it an unusually high degree of insularity in its preoccupations with its particular debates and methods. Far smaller groups of early modernists also devote their attention to the history of science and—rare indeed—to Jewish history, each of which again is conventionally defined as constituting a separate field.

Despite the recent adoption of new methods and new problems under the influence of innovative historiographic currents both domestic and European, certain long-standing preoccupations still attract the attention of most people working on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Political history, broadly understood, retains pride of place. Intellectual history, especially the genealogy of secular rationalism, also remains an enduring concern. Continuity may also be observed in the fact that the advance of specialization and the sheer increase in the work devoted to the period has brought no perceptible alteration of the long-standing concentration on the history of just a few countries within Europe, especially England and France. The growth of aspirations to produce archivally based studies of a quality comparable to the best European research and the advance of topical and national specialization have led fewer American historians to attempt the interpretive syntheses on a European scale that David Pinkney considered the finest products of the previous generation. With some distance, however, it can be seen that most American research about this period continues to be related to certain grand themes that have long defined its significance in the minds of American historians. Supplemented by some new big stories introduced in the past generation, these themes continue to structure most classroom instruction about this period and to suggest many of the topics deemed worthy of research. In this respect, these fields contrast sharply with the current situation in Renaissance history, as described by Anthony Molho in chapter 13.

The Deep Structures

Thirty years ago, Leonard Krieger accurately highlighted two particularly important influences on the shape of American historical scholarship about Europe. The first was what he called the "predominance of the undergraduate teaching function" in American academic life. American history professors are responsible for teaching large chronological or thematic swatches of the European past. The experience of having to create, year after year, convincing, integrated accounts of this subject for previously uninitiated undergraduates draws them toward a relatively high level of generalization, attracts their attention to certain possible objects of study, and obscures others. The second influence was the understandable attraction the first American historians of this era had for those aspects of the European past that seemed either to anticipate elements of American history, culture, and political traditions, or to define the distinctive features of American history by revealing what it was not. John Lothrop Motley's brave little Holland fighting the first great war of independence and John William Draper's and Andrew Dickson White's centuries-old "warfare between science and religion" exemplify the former.[3] William H. Prescott's imperial Spain condemned to decline because of its intolerant Catholicism and tyrannical government and Henry Charles Lea's Catholic Church of the Inquisition, auricular confession, clerical celibacy, and other blendings of superstition and force illustrate the latter.

The great liberal historians of nineteenth-century Europe also shaped the connection that educated Americans established with the European past. The required surveys of postclassical history that were a standard part of the curriculum at many colleges by the middle of the nineteenth century assigned works such as Guizot's *History of Civilization* (a staple) and Hallam and Stubbs on English constitutional history.[4] Within this context, the vision that nineteenth-century liberal historiography presented of the Reformation as a central episode in the emancipation of the human mind commended this subject for particular attention. For the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the central tradition of Whig historiography stressed the juxtaposition of English and French constitutional developments.[5]

The conservative evolutionism of America's first generation of professional historians reinforced concern with such topics. As autonomous departments of history took shape between 1885 and 1910 and the first wave of professional expansion produced a varied menu of specialized courses, a substantial fraction—often more than half—of the menu was devoted to medieval and early modern Europe. Each college curriculum developed in its own manner, but the recurring staples of instruction for the period from 1300 through 1815 were those aspects of the European past considered to have either a clear genetic connection to American political and religious institutions and traditions, to illuminate by contrast the character of the American Revolution, or to be of larger significance in the great saga of gradual human emancipation: the Renaissance and Reformation, English

history, and the French Revolution. Continental European history from roughly 1600 until that point in the later eighteenth century when the courses on the French Revolution picked up their story was covered on a far more selective and aleatory basis. Certain courses made particularly clear the genetic connections that were seen between the elements of the early modern past that the curriculum emphasized and American history; this is seen most graphically in the course that Herbert Darling Foster taught at Dartmouth for many years: The Puritan State in Geneva, England, and Massachusetts Bay.[6]

The configuration of instruction about late medieval and early modern European history has changed only modestly since the early twentieth century. To be sure, as history departments grew, so did the number and range of courses about this period. Expansion was greatest between the late 1950s and 1970 and chiefly involved greater investment in the previously neglected seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Courses on the intellectual and the economic history of the era were also introduced early in the century in certain universities; the scientific revolution became a staple offering with the rise of the history of science; and recently many departments have begun to offer courses on women's history in this period. Still, in the absence of strong student demand or an evident national or political interest to be served by curricular expansion in this area, the initial heavy investment in the medieval and early modern European past has faded, as growth in course offerings about these centuries has lagged far behind that in American, more recent European, or non-Western history. Course offerings on the years 1600–1789 still diverge significantly from university to university, and for significant stretches of the postwar period, prestigious institutions were content to teach no courses at all on continental Europe between the Reformation and the onset of the French Revolution. Meanwhile, the pairing of the Renaissance and Reformation proved a hardy perennial, allowing instructors to ring a variety of changes on either the contrast between the secularizing, rationalist aspects of the Renaissance and the biblicism of the Reformation or the continuities between the humanist recovery of letters and the Protestant recovery of the gospel. Today the pairing carries less conviction for most specialists, and The Age of the Renaissance and The Age of the Reformation are most often taught as separate courses. But few who teach courses on the fifteenth or sixteenth century have dared to abandon the advertising power that these labels retain.

One result of these patterns was a long-standing tendency for early modernists in America to concentrate much of their attention on the history of the sixteenth century. The chronological distribution of articles in the most prestigious American and foreign journals shows that through the 1960s American scholars published more about the sixteenth century than about either of the subsequent two (see Table 1). This has now changed, but comparison with the situation in many European countries (e.g., France) might still suggest an unusually high level of concern with the sixteenth century.

The focus on the Renaissance and Reformation has also bred a covey of professional institutions, with their attendant scholarly journals: the American Society for Reformation Research (incorporated in 1947), the Renaissance Society of

TABLE 1
Chronological Focus of Articles Devoted to the Period 1500–1789 by American Scholars in Four Major Historical Journals, 1900–1990

	1900–10	*1930–40*	*1960–70*	*1980–90*
16th century	10 (40%)	18 (37%)	22 (40%)	21 (20%)
17th century	8 (32%)	17 (35%)	18 (33%)	32 (30%)
18th century	7 (28%)	14 (29%)	15 (27%)	53 (50%)

Note: Based on a survey of articles by scholars affiliated with North American universities appearing in *The American Historical Review* (*AHR*), *The Journal of Modern History* (*JMH*), *Annales* (*An.*), and *The Historical Journal* (*HJ*). Articles have been classified with reference to their chief century of focus. Those covering a sweep of several centuries have been omitted.

America (founded in 1954), and the Sixteenth Century Studies Council (established in 1972). No comparable institutions have developed for the seventeenth century or for early modern European history as a whole, while the Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (founded in 1969), although attracting the participation of some historians, is more strongly dominated by scholars of literature and art. Historians working on the later centuries find their chief professional peer groups in the many associations devoted to the history of individual European countries or topical specializations, such as the Society for French Historical Studies, the Council for British Studies, or the Social Science History Association.

REFORMATION HISTORY

The construction in America of the distinct field of Reformation history and its precocious institutionalization in the history curriculum did not result from just the prominence that nineteenth-century liberal historiography accorded the rise of Protestantism in its saga of the advance of liberty. The centrality of the period for the historical self-definition of so many Protestant churches also commended the subject to the attention of the Protestant-dominated academic culture of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. To this day, a powerful impetus attracting scholars to this subject remains the concern of Christian believers to explore the roots of their diverse traditions. Important work continues to be carried out not simply in the history departments of research universities but also within divinity schools, departments of religion, and small denominational colleges. The distinctive configuration of American religious life has consequently left a clear impress on this branch of American historiography. Its governing concerns and assumptions have changed substantially since the day when Protestantism's special contribution to the making of the modern world was axiomatic. The past generation has brought particularly dramatic transformations. Yet the field remains a point of encounter between agnostics and those attached to a specific religious vision or heritage. Considerable creative tension between different outlooks, methods, and foci of concern has resulted.

In the early years of the American historical profession, relations were strained between the more secular-minded Reformation historians and those who approached the subject with strong religious sensibilities. Thanks largely to the efforts of the energetic Philip Schaff (1819–93), the great pioneer of church history in America, ecclesiastical historians formed their own learned society in 1888, the American Society of Church History. The society decided in 1896 to merge with the American Historical Association, resolving that "Church history is only a part of general history." But ten years later its members reestablished the organization, for they felt marginalized within the AHA and had trouble getting their papers published in the larger association, whose officials feared that printing excessively narrow research about the history of Christian doctrine or institutions might violate the separation of church and state and endanger the association's government support.[7] In the meantime, an aggressively secular historiography, committed to rescuing the subject from what were perceived to be the blinkered perspectives of the church historians, developed among the ranks of the "New Historians." James Harvey Robinson proclaimed in 1903 that the field stood on the brink of a new understanding of the Reformation that would highlight its social, political, intellectual, economic, and institutional changes. His students investigated early Protestant social welfare policy and pioneered the application of Freudian analysis to Martin Luther's biography.[8] The substantial attention that the New Historians devoted to the history of science also gave them a heightened sense of the distance between the Reformation era and the contemporary world. It was in these circles and this generation that American historians assimilated for the first time the concept of the scientific revolution, with its identification of the critical turning point in European thought between the late sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries.[9] The synthetic *Age of the Reformation* (1920) by Robinson's leading student, Preserved Smith, set the Reformation amid a far broader range of economic, political, and intellectual contexts than comparable earlier works. The book was also notably devoid of pronouncements about the superiority of the Protestant nations over the Catholic and of statements about the importance of the Reformation in "the permanence and progress of civilization" such as those found fifty years earlier even in the work of George Park Fischer, one of the early ecclesiastical historians who most eagerly embraced the ideal of value-neutral scholarship.[10]

Between the 1930s and the 1960s, the tension that had previously characterized the relations between secular and church-minded historians largely dissipated. Broad currents within the historical profession attenuated the emphasis that the New Historians had accorded economic forces and enhanced appreciation for the autonomous force of ideas. The discovery of Luther's early lectures promoted within Protestant theological circles a vision of the young reformer as a great existential hero of faith, and this vision stimulated renewed appreciation of the potential relevance of Reformation thought for contemporary society. Until ongoing examination of the critical early texts led the majority of experts to shift in the 1960s and 1970s toward a later dating of Luther's critical "tower experience," this vision also pictured a reformer who had achieved his critical theolog-

ical insights before the press of events forced him reluctantly into opposition to Rome. All this lent powerful support to the view that the Reformation was in origin a theological revolution, incomprehensible without a good understanding of the history of Christian doctrine.[11]

Until the 1960s, American Reformation scholarship focused overwhelmingly on the Protestant side of the story. Most elite research universities remained tied to a liberal Protestant outlook well into the twentieth century, with few Catholics or Jews on the faculty until the postwar years. Catholic higher education was self-enclosed and parochial; the limited amount of historical scholarship carried out within its confines centered overwhelmingly on the Middle Ages, which were seen as the great age of Catholic faith and learning, or the Catholic contribution in American history. When John Dolan surveyed "Church History in England and America in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries" for the 1965 Catholic *Handbook of Church History*, the discussion of American research required less than a page and did not cite a single work on the era of the Counter-Reformation.[12]

Within the history of Protestantism, a broad variety of subjects attracted the attention of American scholars, a consequence of the exceptional range of Protestant denominations found on American soil. Schaff's work surveyed all the major churches to emerge from the magisterial Reformation and can be seen as the attempt of a pioneer Protestant ecumenicist to understand and appreciate the origins and points of difference between the many different creeds he encountered as an immigrant from Germany to America. Other historians of theology would follow the trail that Schaff had blazed from Germany to America, notably Wilhelm Pauck in 1925. Until the Nazi era, the continuing prestige of German theological learning also lured many American church historians to Germany for part of their education. In consequence, the center of gravity of American Reformation scholarship increasingly became the politics of the Reformation in Germany and the thought of Martin Luther—a situation reinforced after 1945 by the agreement of the American Society of Reformation Research to publish the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* jointly with the German Verein für Reformationsgeschichte. Yet a country with as strong a Calvinist heritage as the United States could hardly ignore the Reformed tradition. In the first part of the twentieth century, important studies were devoted to Zwingli and Zurich, to Calvin and Geneva, and to the French Wars of Religion.[13] In the generation of Perry Miller, William Haller, and M. M. Knappen, Americans distinguished themselves in the study of Old English as well as New England Puritanism.[14] Above all, the presence on American soil of many churches that traced their descent to the "left wing of the Reformation," as well as the constitutionally mandated separation of church from state that has led American scholars to view separatist groups positively as precursors in the struggle for religious liberty, produced unusual concern with the "radical Reformation."

As the most exacting critics, such as Pauck, have observed, it was only in this field of study that American researchers prior to the 1960s made truly substantial contributions to international Reformation scholarship. Several holders of the

most prominent chairs in ecclesiastical history during the interwar and immediate postwar decades devoted much of their original research to exploring the sectarians and dissenters of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, notably Yale's Roland Bainton and Harvard's George Huntston Williams.[15] But nobody was more influential than the Mennonite Harold S. Bender (1897–1964), whose efforts to accumulate the materials for, and to promote research about, Anabaptist history made Goshen College in Indiana an internationally reputed center for the study of the subject. In his major publications, Bender depicted Anabaptism as springing from a single source in Zurich, where a small band of people dared to carry the Reformation principle of *sola scriptura* to its full, logical, pacifist consequences, from which the magisterial reformers shrank back out of fear and calculation. It was a depiction that offered an inspiring, historically based sense of identity for America's Mennonites, who had just created the institutions of higher learning long characteristic of other Protestant denominations and were struggling to come to grips with the wider world of modern historical knowledge and Biblical scholarship that this implied. At the same time, Bender's work posed a sharp challenge to the historical self-understanding of the mainline Protestant confessions and a powerful stimulus for further research.[16] The expansion in knowledge about the radical Reformation promoted so energetically by Bender and others rescued the views of a wide range of groups and individuals formerly dismissed as fanatics by earlier church historiography. It also helped to reveal the full richness and variety of the reform programs generated amid the ferment of the early Reformation and drew attention to the political and social dynamics that promoted the institutionalization of certain visions of church reform and the marginalization of others. In so doing, it effected one of the central transformations of twentieth-century Reformation historiography.[17]

From the late 1960s onward, the field began to change dramatically. These years also saw one of the most internationally influential of all American historians emerge from within it: Natalie Zemon Davis.

Two central trends within historical scholarship in the past generation have been the expansion of historians' vision to encompass far more securely than previously the entire population of the place and period under study, and the shift within this expanded field of vision from an emphasis on the material conditions of life to an emphasis on culture. It does not seem entirely fortuitous that the scholar recognized as the most sophisticated and influential American trailblazer in the exploration of the culture of ordinary men and women should have emerged from Reformation history, where so much emphasis had already come to be placed on the need to respect the force and integrity of theological systems. But the personal intellectual trajectory that led Davis through the field was anything but ordinary. A secular Jew, she was drawn to the study of "Ren-Ref" as a student in the late 1940s at Smith College by an inspiring undergraduate teacher, Leona Gabel; by the still powerful belief that the origins of the modern world were to be found in the period; and by the intellectual excitement then being generated in the field by such figures as Hans Baron and Paul Kristeller.[18] Her engagement with radical politics and Marxism led her first to study the material-

ist philosophers of sixteenth-century Italy, then, for her Ph.D., the Protestant printing workers of sixteenth-century Lyon. To study the latter was to engage with the work of Henri Hauser, the great French pioneer of labor history whose 1899 interpretation of the early Protestant movement as the cause of journeymen alienated by the advance of capitalism and the closure of access to master status was still the most forceful social interpretation of the Reformation. Davis's archival research into the identity of Lyon's Protestants revealed that the guild masters and journeymen did not line up on opposite sides of the religious question, and indeed that no clear divisions of economic interest could predict who joined the Reformed Church and who remained Catholic. Her work did show, however, that such features of social experience as literacy, migration, and individual craft traditions and identities appeared to correlate with religious choice.

From 1952 to 1959, Davis was refused a passport by the State Department because of allegations of Communism against her and her husband, who was blacklisted and jailed for invoking the First Amendment before the House Un-American Activities Committee. During these years she had to set aside archival research in Europe in favor of reading about matters relevant to her subject in American rare book rooms. When her most important articles began to appear from the mid-1960s onward, they deployed an exceptional range of source materials, both archival and printed, in the service of a history that recognized the force of social groupings in shaping the experience and life choices of their members, but revealed the social order as a far more complex set of age, sex, and professional groupings than simple Marxist models of class analysis allowed. At the same time, her work insisted upon the no less significant power of religious symbols and ideologies in shaping collective behavior and rejected the attempt to reduce these to the expression of putatively deeper economic or social interests. In subsequent articles and books, Davis displayed an ever generous receptivity to new intellectual influences: successively, French folklore studies; English Marxist work on collective action; renascent women's history; the cultural anthropology of the seventies; Italian microhistory; and literary theory. With time, the socio-economic focus of her early work gave way to a sociocultural history in which the cultural element became ever more autonomous. But the varied intellectual influences that she absorbed were always brought into dialogue with extensive archival and library research carried out with great methodological imagination, giving her work a rootedness in the sources and a technical virtuosity that specialists could not fail to appreciate. By the later years of her career, her influence had come to be felt far beyond the confines of American Reformation scholarship. As of 1993, books of hers had been translated into nine languages. One of most successful recent American manifestos for a "new" history, Lynn Hunt's 1989 *New Cultural History*, invoked her as a patron saint alongside Clifford Geertz, Michel Foucault, and E. P. Thompson.[19]

Within American Reformation history, Davis's work of the 1960s and 1970s joined with a variety of imported influences to generate a move toward what quickly began to be labeled the social history of the Reformation. Bernd Moeller's *Imperial Cities and the Reformation* (1962; English translation 1972) pushed

historians to see the German Reformation as an "urban event." The simultaneous appearance in 1971 of Keith Thomas's *Religion and the Decline of Magic* and Jean Delumeau's *Catholicism between Luther and Voltaire* (English translation 1977) proved still more important. Each at once articulated a bold new interpretation of the course of religious change over a long Reformation era and illustrated new methods that could be used to recover the religious practice of ordinary believers—in Thomas's case, the wide reading through an anthropological lens of a range of printed sources and court records; in Delumeau's case, the methods of serial and quantitative history of the Annales school and the religious sociology of Gabriel Le Bras.[20] John Bossy's neo-Durkheimian work soon added still another, often stimulatingly contradictory, perspective of like ambition and subject matter.[21] Together, these works defined nothing less than a vast new research program for the field. In addition to recovering the theology of the reformers in all its original richness and accounting for the political history of the Reformation, Reformation history would now involve charting the long-term shifts in the character of parish-level religious practice throughout Europe from the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries.

Coming at a time when so many other currents within American historiography and life were also promoting "history from below," the social history of the Reformation proved hard to resist. Although many scholars, especially within divinity schools, held firm to older methods and preoccupations, such leading historians of theology as Heiko Oberman and Steven Ozment proclaimed themselves converts and altered the focus of their work. Students from thoroughly secular backgrounds perceived in the field the fascination of studying worldviews scarcely less alien to them than those of the Hopi or the Azande, but of undeniable centrality for European history. Their entry into the field altered the sociology of its recruitment and weakened the influence of filiopietistic and confessional impulses. Change was most dramatic in the study of the French Reformation, where Davis's work inspired a spate of other studies of early Protestantism and religious violence, and in the study of the Counter-Reformation, which suddenly became one of the most active areas of American scholarship. This latter subject attracted both non-Catholics inspired by Delumeau and Bossy to examine the impact of the Counter-Reformation on local religious life, and Catholics formed in the more cosmopolitan intellectual outlook of Catholic universities after 1960 and eager to reexamine their post-Tridentine heritage in the wake of Vatican II.[22]

Within the Germanocentric Protestant core of the field, anthropological sensitivities or the techniques of serial history advanced more slowly. Those in this area continued to orient themselves to the debates and preoccupations of German Reformation scholars, who largely ignored the methods of French religious history and shunned folklore studies because of the political associations they had assumed during the Nazi period. Processes of long-term religious change that historians working in the Franco-Anglo-American historiographic triangle described through quantitative appraisals of shifting tendencies or the exegesis of contrasting religious styles were consequently cast by American historians of the

German Reformation as questions of whether the Reformation was "good for women" or a "success or failure." The predictable debates that ensued rarely transcended the simple terms in which they were originally framed.[23]

American historians of the German Reformation nonetheless contributed important elements to the examination of the appeal and dynamics of the early evangelical movement. This has been perhaps the central focus and greatest achievement of the past generation of German Reformation scholarship. At the same time these historians have begun to engage with more recent German theses about the dynamics of "confessionalization."[24] Sixties-inflected fascination with popular movements and the dynamics of radicalism also combined with the tradition of study founded by Bender to make the historiography of Anabaptism a continuing locus of important discoveries. The last generation's work has made evident the confessional character of Bender's vision of the subject, set the different traditions of Anabaptism more firmly within the reform aspirations and millenarian dreams of the late middle ages and early evangelical movement, and laid bare the political dynamics that changed groups that originally aspired to transform all society into sects comprised of only those willing to undergo adult baptism.[25] At the same time, the impressive tradition of scholarship on late medieval theology and its connections with the Reformation that was gathering steam under the impetus of Heiko Oberman and his students in the 1960s has lost momentum.

Many Reformation specialists now stand in a very different personal relation to their subject than did their predecessors. Over the past thirty years, international Reformation scholarship has seen the advance of a widely shared, largely ecumenically inspired concern among historians of all denominations to study and appreciate traditions other than their own. Together with the discovery of many aspects of post-Reformation Catholic piety that promoted greater literacy, more systematic habits of self-discipline, and tighter codes of morality among the laity, this has led to an emphasis on the parallel consequences of the "two Reformations" and to the rejection of long-entrenched views that supposed a privileged link between Protestantism and modernity—a modest contribution of Reformation scholarship to the weakening salience of confessional difference in contemporary America. With the continuing advance of secularization and more than a generation of work in socioeconomic history built around the preindustrial/industrial dichotomy, most current Reformation scholars also now have an even stronger sense than did Preserved Smith and his peers that the age of the Reformation was less the origin of the modern world than a "world we have lost."[26] Yet the motives drawing historians to study the subject remain varied. Confessional agendas have not entirely disappeared, and certain historians continue to find in their subject matter values that they see as a possible source of continuing inspiration—witness Steven Ozment's sympathetic evocation of the loving patriarchalism that he finds in the writings about the family of the Protestant reformers, or the closing sentences of Elizabeth Gleason's recent biography of Gasparo Contarini: "Contarini can be a wonderful partner in a dialogue with modern interlocutors who care about questions of political and religious order, of liberty

and authority. His thought still invites them to meditate on unresolved issues and on thinkable alternatives to the course of events in church and state, then and now."[27]

Whether moved by a sense of the anthropological otherness of sixteenth-century Christianity or of its potential relevance for modern life and belief, most contemporary American historians of the Reformation nonetheless seem to share a confidence in the vitality of their field. "There is no field of historical study today that is more alive with change and fresh ideas that that of Reformation Europe," Ozment began his 1982 *Reformation Europe: A Guide to Research*.[28] A powerful and coherent new research program concerning the story of parish-level religious practice has recently expanded the agenda of questions and the repertoire of methods, while each year brings new monographs that help flesh out the emerging story. The recovery of the full complexity of the early evangelical movement and the concern to root out the many confessional agendas that once controlled so much Reformation historiography have led to major shifts in the interpretation of central elements in the established narrative of Protestantism's growth and institutionalization. If fewer contemporary Reformation historians see their subject as one of the birthpoints of modernity, most still see it as confidently as ever as one of the central transformations within preindustrial Europe, with broad implications not simply for the history of European ecclesiastical institutions, theology, and high politics but also for local religious life, literacy, family and gender relations, and social discipline. In this, the situation of Reformation history contrasts markedly with that of its erstwhile alter ego, Renaissance history. The Reformation, far more than the Renaissance, was a movement of ideas that swept up large elements of the European population and ushered in changes with broad implications for many aspects of religious, political, and social life. Reformation history could consequently absorb the historiographic movement of the past generation toward a more broadly inclusive history and retain the sense of connection with the narrative that initially gave the field its significance within the American history curriculum. Renaissance history could not.

The Rest of the Field

American scholarship about aspects of early modern European history other than the Reformation has always been characterized by far less thematic and institutional coherence. With some distance, however, it is possible to discern considerable continuity in the central preoccupations of American historians studying this era from the middle of the nineteenth century through the 1960s. The absorption of the new influences associated with the Annales school and the historians around *Past and Present* then expanded the scope of the field. The advance of research within long-established sectors modified the content of some of the older stories told about the period. Yet the majority of specialists continue to focus their research on the political and institutional history of England and

France. This continuity bespeaks the surprising durability of many old structures and assumptions.

The theme that long dominated American interest in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was that of the variegated evolution of European governmental forms and practices over this period, with the contrast between the gradual growth of constitutional government in England and the rise and fall of absolutism in France forming the heart of the story. For the better part of the century, whether approached with primary emphasis on the political and biographical dimension (as in the work of Conyers Read and John B. Wolf), on the institutional dimension (as in the work of Wallace Notestein), or on the dimension of political theory (as in the work of Charles McIlwain, William Farr Church, and Caroline Robbins), important American scholarship about these centuries centered around the rise of Parliament and the theorization of liberty in England and the rise and fall of absolutism in France.[29] Not only did this story provide a critical element in the genealogy of American politics and institutions; the many twentieth-century threats to the survival of representative government gave it continued topicality from the era of fascism's rise through the Cold War. The ideological polarization of World War II and the Cold War also bred a sense of kinship with the diplomatic and political intrigues of that earlier era of ideological polarization, the late sixteenth century, inspiring Garrett Mattingly's best-selling 1959 classic of narrative history, *The Armada*, and research by his students into the role of Geneva and Spain in destabilizing French domestic affairs.[30]

Another important current of American historiography about this period dedicated itself to intellectual history. White, Draper, and the Englishman W. E. H. Lecky first shaped certain of the themes that American historians of this subject would explore. James Harvey Robinson launched its fortunes within the curriculum with his course The Intellectual History of Western Europe at Columbia in 1904. From Lynn Thorndike's eight-volume *History of Magic and Experimental Science* (1923–58), Carl Becker's *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (1932), and A. O. Lovejoy's *The Great Chain of Being* (1936) through Richard Popkin's *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Descartes* (1963) and Peter Gay's *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation* (1967), a series of eminent early modernists attempted to trace the complex mixture of continuity and innovation that marked the history of early modern thought. With the development of the history of science (the History of Science Society was founded in 1924, but the great growth of the field came after World War II, as anxieties about the frightening power of modern technology and the need to bridge the gulf between C. P. Snow's "two cultures" fueled massive support), a substantial body of specialists in that field added their contribution to the story.[31]

Perhaps the most novel addition to the menu of scholarly concerns in the first part of the twentieth century was the rise of economic history. Although located uneasily between departments of economics and of history and slow to develop an autonomous professional society, the subject was widely taught by the first decades of the century, thanks largely to the influence of Harvard's well-connected Edwin Gay, professor of economic history from 1906 to 1936 with

time out for service as dean of the Business School, government war service, and the editorship of the *New York Post*. Entry into economics departments dominated by the ahistorical and theoretico-deductive predilections of the neoclassical school was gained largely by accepting a de facto division of labor. Premodern economic behavior was construed to differ fundamentally from modern in being shaped as much by values and institutions as by rational economic calculation. It was hence deemed suitable for inductive, historical investigation, while the contemporary economy was left to neoclassical modelbuilding. Gay was also concerned to promote the accumulation of long-term statistical series about such matters as prices and wages that might aid in the formulation of economic policy. Such concerns and assumptions attracted attention to the early modern centuries and inspired work centered on institutional structures, economic doctrines, and long-term movements of wages and prices, notably Abbott Payson Usher's still admired 1913 study of the French grain trade, Julius Klein's work on the Mesta, Earl J. Hamilton on American treasure and the price revolution, and Charles Woolsey Cole on French mercantilism.[32]

Some measure of the extent to which these long-standing patterns of interest have been modified in the past generation may be obtained from a quantitative breakdown of the articles about this period that American-based historians have published since the early part of the century in four leading professional journals. The exercise has its pitfalls, for the advance of specialization has bred a proliferation of journals devoted to geographic or topical subfields, with the result that even those journals that have sought to maintain a catholicity of subject matter and approach have become more narrowly typecast. In the past decades, American scholars have also published more in the most prestigious foreign journals, a mark of the growing internationalization of scholarship and the increased respect abroad for American research. To minimize the distortions introduced by these trends, four journals of a broad, relatively nonspecialized character, two American and two European, have been sampled at regular intervals: *The American Historical Review*, *The Journal of Modern History*, *Annales*, and *The Historical Journal*. The sample may still underestimate the expansion of the discipline into new subject areas.

Table 2, which presents the geographic foci of American production, shows how overwhelmingly early modern "European" history in the United States has always been, and remains to this day, the history of certain larger European nations, particularly England and France. Spain and the Netherlands captured the attention of Prescott and Motley in the nineteenth century, and from R. B. Merriman through Richard Kagan and Simon Schama, academic historians working in the United States have continued to write important books about these countries. Yet their histories have never received a level of attention commensurate to their evident importance in this period; when Kagan wished to begin his study of Spanish history in the late 1960s, he had to go to England for his doctoral training. Still more striking is the virtual absence of work on the smaller countries of Europe, despite the presence on American soil of so many immigrants from Scandinavia, Portugal, and eastern Europe. If anything, as table 2 shows, the

TABLE 2

Geographical Distribution of Articles by American Historians on European History, 1500–1789, in Four Major Historical Journals

	1900–10	*1930–40*				*1960–70*					*1980–90*				
	AHR	*AHR*	*JMH*	*An.*	*Total*	*AHR*	*JMH*	*An.*	*HJ*	*Total*	*AHR*	*JMH*	*An.*	*HJ*	*Total*
Britain	13 (46%)	11	19		30 (45%)	13	6		7	26 (43%)	5	9	3	31	48 (36%)
France	5 (18%)	4	10		14 (21%)	6	2	1	2	11 (18%)	10	16	13	3	42 (32%)
Germany & Austria	5 (18%)		3		3 (5%)		3			3 (5%)	2	8		1	11 (8%)
Spain			1	1	2 (3%)	1	1		2	4 (7%)	4	1	1		6 (5%)
Italy	2 (7%)	1	1		2 (3%)	2	1	1		4 (7%)		5			5 (4%)
The Netherlands			1		1 (2%)								1		1 (1%)
Belgium							1			1 (2%)			2		2 (2%)
Switzerland	1 (4%)														
Russia			1		1 (2%)	1	1			2 (3%)				1	1 (1%)
Scandinavia			2		2 (3%)										
Andorra			1		1 (2%)										
Armenia			1		1 (2%)										
Ottoman Empire		1			1 (2%)	1				1 (2%)					
Yugoslavia							1			1 (2%)					
"Central Europe"											1				1 (1%)
General European	2 (7%)	1	7		8 (12%)	4	2		1	7 (12%)	8	3	3		14 (12%)
Total	28	18	47	1	66	28	18	2	12	60	30	42	23	36	131

Note: See table 1 for journal titles.

concentration on a select subset of European nations has only grown in the past decades, even though the concomitant increase in the number of actively publishing specialists in the field might have been expected to spawn expansion into neglected geographic areas. The rather dramatic expansion that table 2 reveals in the volume of research devoted to French history in the past decade is probably explained by the particular attractiveness of French history during the period of peak prominence for the Annales school from the late 1960s into the early 1980s, as well as by the simple fact that French was for long the foreign language most studied in American high schools by students with intellectual aspirations. With native French research productivity waning over the same decades, due to a long dearth of new faculty positions and the redirection of energy by established historians toward satisfying the intense appetite for history of the larger French-reading public, by the 1980s a considerable amount of the most important archival investigation of French history was being written across the Atlantic.[33] If the percentage of work devoted to England declined in the same decade, English history has nonetheless succeeded remarkably in maintaining itself down to the present as a distinct specialization whose representation is still required within most major history departments. For no other country is the disproportion between the amount of work devoted to this subject and the country's demographic or power-political weight within early modern Europe more evident. These patterns reveal the continued and largely unthinking continuation of the Whig pairing of England and France as central to the story of early modern Europe, the tendency of specialists to replicate their specializations through their students, the reluctance of departments to hire candidates working outside the largest and most familiar national specializations, and the persistent conviction that the study of early modern England offers essential background for the study of early America.

As table 3 shows, important changes may be discerned in the questions and themes to which American historians of this restricted range of European countries have addressed themselves. Particularly noteworthy is the shift in recent years toward social and cultural history. Within the broad sphere of political and administrative history, the attention of American scholars has also moved away from the study of high politics and diplomacy toward the study of crowd and local politics and of political culture.

Much of the shift must be linked to the reception of the new historiographic currents represented by *Past and Present* and the *Annales*. Without slighting the work of such native pioneers as Franklin Ford or Robert Forster, it is probably fair to date the arrival in force of these influences to the years between 1963, when Lawrence Stone was hired at Princeton, and 1972, when Fernand Braudel's *The Mediterranean* appeared in English translation to broad acclaim. In this period, departments such as Princeton's and Michigan's established regular faculty exchanges with the Parisian Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes. The same historian who distanced himself condescendingly from recent *Annales* work in 1968 was translating essays from the journal by 1974.[34] The growing numbers of those drawn to French history in this period by the lure of a "history from below" with

TABLE 3

Topical Distribution of Articles by American Historians on European History, 1500–1789, in Four Major Historical Journals

	1900–10	*1930–40*				*1960–70*					*1980–90*				
	AHR	*AHR*	*JMH*	*An.*	*Total*	*AHR*	*JMH*	*An.*	*HJ*	*Total*	*AHR*	*JMH*	*An.*	*HJ*	*Total*
High politics, political biography	7 (30%)	3	11		14 (24%)	5	5		1	11 (20%)		3		3	6 (4%)
Institutions, administration, law	2 (9%)	3	4		7 (12%)	3	3		4	10 (18%)	2	15	1	8	26 (19%)
Intl. relations, diplomacy, military	3 (13%)	3	5		8 (14%)	1	2		1	4 (7%)		3		1	4 (3%)
Crowd and local politics											1	6	1	9	17 (12%)
Political thought, political culture	1 (4%)	1	6		7 (12%)	3			2	5 (9%)	2	6	4	10	22 (16%)
State and society						3	1			4 (7%)	2		2		4 (3%)
Church and religion	5 (22%)	1	2		3 (5%)		2		3	5 (9%)	4	2	1		7 (5%)
Intellectual hist., hist. of science		1	6		7 (12%)	3		1		4 (7%)	3	8	1	2	14 (10%)
Cultural hist.		1	1		2 (4%)						5	8	3	1	17 (12%)
Hist. of art, music, literature													2		2 (1%)
Economic hist., historical geography	2 (9%)	2	5	1	8 (14%)	3	2	1		6 (11%)	3	1	2		6 (4%)
Maritime empires	1 (4%)	1			1 (2%)	1				1 (2%)	1	1			2 (1%)
Social and demographic hist.						1	1			2 (4%)	5		6		11 (8%)
Hist. of technology			1		1 (2%)	2	1			3 (5%)					
Source criticism	2 (9%)														

Note: See table 1 for journal titles.

a particularly sophisticated Continental methodological flair were especially likely to produce works of social and cultural history themselves, and this has been the national specialization where such works have been the most abundant.[35] American scholars also played a vital role in introducing newer currents in social history to national historiographies whose own intellectual and political traditions largely sealed them off from such viewpoints, notably Germany and Spain.[36] In English history, by contrast, American scholars have been far less drawn to the newer areas of social or cultural history. Here the noteworthy trends have been the increasing tendency for leading positions in the United States to be filled with specialists imported from Britain's Thatcher-shocked universities, and perhaps a greater attachment of American-based historians of England to the traditional interpretation of that country's seventeenth-century political upheavals as landmarks in the struggle for constitutional rights. Whig traditions die hard here.

Of course, the reception of the new historiographic trends represented by *Past and Present* and the *Annales* did not occur in a vacuum. Contemporary concerns about problems of economic growth in underdeveloped societies, the hopes and fears about revolution both at home and abroad, the need felt both by many students with some experience of radical politics to understand why transformation proved harder to achieve than had initially been thought and by those who remained on the sidelines of campus activism to convince themselves of the futility of such efforts, and the powerful streak of romantic identification with the dispossessed—all facilitated the assimilation of a historiography focused on economic and demographic cycles in rural societies, the social origin of revolution and the motivation of crowd action, the lives of the poor, and society's deep, change-resistant structures. As always, the process of reception involved selective assimilation and creative appropriation. Steeped in the history of politics and reluctant to accept the full Braudelian vision of people trapped within economic and geographic structures beyond their control, many American social historians sought to avoid too sharp a divorce from *histoire événementielle*. The economic models derived from classical French political economy that informed so much *Annales* historiography appeared alien and were rarely absorbed. Lastly, a major pole of concern for American social historians would always be the crises, transformations, and catlike survival of aristocratic power throughout the early modern centuries. Indeed, J. H. Hexter highlighted the importance of studying the continuities and transformations of aristocratic power as early as 1950, and the study of the nobility became the first American bridgehead into social history, even before the larger arrival of *Annales* influences in the United States. The evident connection of this subject with the grand narratives of political development and state building, with their long-standing foregrounding of the presumed contest for power between crowns and aristocracies, accounts for the precocious interest in this topic.[37]

As new political concerns, notably feminism and identity politics, came to the fore later in the seventies and eighties, still other new subjects and new intellectual influences commanded increasing attention among all American historians.

Here, the study of early modern Europe may have been less affected than other specializations. Table 3 subsumes articles that deal primarily with women or gender roles under the broader methodological categories of social or cultural history, but a classification scheme that put articles on these topics in a separate category would also—unsurprisingly—reveal growth in recent years. The 5 percent figure that such articles would obtain in the 1980s probably falls short of the figures that might be obtained for many other time periods and parts of the world. The impulse to recover the experience of women has manifested itself among American early modernists as among American historians working in other fields, but the quest to discover the origins and persistence of patriarchy first directed the attention of women's historians less to these early modern centuries, which were marked by only modest changes in women's status and few organized struggles for women's rights, than to more distant or more recent eras.[38] Michel Foucault's dramatic rise to the top of the citation charts in the 1980s—he topped the *Social Sciences Citation Index* between 1985 and 1990, after placing third between 1980 and 1985 behind Clifford Geertz and Claude Levi-Strauss[39]—was also accompanied by increased influence in many corners of the historical profession. While several important recent books by historians that cut through this period, most notably Thomas Laqueur's *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (1990), show a strong Foucaultian influence, such tendencies again appear relatively muted among early modern historians. This might initially seem surprising, since so much of Foucault's earlier work focused heavily on this period, but that in fact probably explains much of this situation. The great surge of interest in Foucault's writings across the historical profession came with his power/knowledge essays (translated 1980), whose radical critique of disciplinary structures of knowledge meshed perfectly with feminist and multiculturalist politics of group assertion, and with his subsequent work on the history of sexuality, which energized the emerging field of gay and lesbian history. Well prior to that time, however, early modernists had been assaying his writings about the history of madness and the structures of Western thought and subjecting them to sharp empirical criticism. Also contributing to the relative weakness of Foucaultian influence in this field was the relative scarcity of interdisciplinary networks linking historians to literary scholars, New Historicist literary study having been Foucault's chief point of entry into the American academy.[40]

Table 3 reveals the recent shift toward social and cultural history, but it also suggests considerable continuity in the broadest thematic preoccupations of American early modernists. If a small but important subset of American early modernists always devoted themselves to economic history, the same continues to be true today. Reinvigorated by new methods for reconstructing local economies on a quantitative basis, their monographic research has focused primarily on the actual performance of individual industries, merchant communities, or regional economies, rather than on institutional structures or economic doctrines. But their contribution within the international community of economic historians to the past generation's enormous growth of detailed local knowledge about the preindustrial European economy has been far less important than the

broader models they have articulated to characterize the major changes in the structure of the European economy in what is now seen as the long, slow run-up to the technological breakthroughs of the late eighteenth century. Franklin Mendels's model of "proto-industrialization," Immanuel Wallerstein's "world systems," Robert Brenner's neo-Marxist interpretation of capitalist agriculture, and Jan de Vries's complex vision of multiple reorganizations within the internal structure of the European economy have largely set the terms of international debate and research about the long-term course of economic change over these centuries.[41] Here, American historians have continued to play the role that David Pinkney assigned them in 1958: generating broad synthetic interpretations based upon the combination of archival research and secondary reading.

In an age when the study of Latin continues to wane in America, the high level of skill in the classical languages required by the daunting erudition of so many sixteenth- and seventeenth-century thinkers has created severe barriers to entry to the field of early modern intellectual history. Nevertheless, another small but internationally respected band of holdouts has continued to cultivate this garden. Inspiration and reinforcements have often come from the ample ranks of the historians of science.[42] At the heart of most of this work, one can still see the long-standing preoccupation with tracing the elaboration across these centuries of various forms of critical rationalism—now done, however, in a far less celebratory mode, and with an intense concern to avoid anachronism. Some prominent historians of science have carried sociologizing programs to the point where the central ambition of their work has become to show that the triumph of central elements of the new science depended fundamentally on networks of power or cultural values—not simply, or even primarily, their superior explanatory power or evidentiary basis. Their work in turn has sparked withering criticism. The debates bursting out over these issues form part of the larger contemporary battles surrounding the cultural authority of science and show how significant the historical interpretation of this era remains for the larger assessment of Western thought.[43]

Above all, it remains the case that the majority of all research devoted by American historians to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries still concerns political and institutional history. True, fewer American scholars have recently felt the attractions of royal or ministerial biography, high politics, and international diplomacy. Instead, their attention has shifted toward exploring the links between politics and administration on the one hand, and society or culture on the other. The macrosociological tradition of Barrington Moore, Charles Tilly, and Perry Anderson, the work of Roland Mousnier and his pupils in France on the social origins and recruitment of Old Regime administrative corporations, and the no less influential studies by Hans Rosenberg and Francis Carsten of the interaction of princes, parliaments, and protobureaucracies within the Holy Roman Empire have all in their different ways directed much American attention to the actual workings of the different component parts of early modern government and administration, to the recruitment of their personnel, and to the broader relationship between state and society.[44] The reinvigoration of the his-

tory of political thought by the theoretical writings of Quentin Skinner and J. G. A. Pocock, as well as the broader linguistic turn within American historical writing, has stimulated considerable exploration of "political culture."[45] Meanwhile, the tradition of Ernst Kantorowicz's brilliant analyses of political ceremonial was maintained across two scholarly generations by Ralph Giesey and his pupils, who between 1960 and 1986 produced an important series of studies of the ritual practices of the French monarchy that constitute perhaps the most distinctive American school within this field.[46] In different ways, all these newer concerns can be seen as partaking of the larger rejection of the classical emphasis on the actions of political leaders in favor of the examination of deeper structures, recurring patterns of behavior and thought, and collective agency that are so much a part of broader trends within the past generation's historiography. The driving force behind this research has nonetheless remained that perduring concern of American historians of this era: the effort to lay bare the character and chronology of the movement toward either the loosening or the tightening of the restraints on autocratic power in the major states of western Europe.

Many particulars of the early modern political landscape now look different than they did a generation ago. The insights and analytical vocabulary of Marx, Weber, and Otto Hintze have become part of the working apparatus of American scholars. The theme of the growth of the state occupies ample room within the broad narrative of political development alongside the older stories of the rise and fall of different countries in the international arena and the evolution of their internal constitutional arrangements—evidence of increased appreciation that the sheer power of modern governments is one of the most basic phenomena of the contemporary world whose history demands illumination. Interpretations that emphasized the link between the growth of monarchy and the rise of the bourgeoisie have given way to an appreciation of the continuing influence of a transformed nobility, the importance of warfare in promoting institutional innovation, and the coexistence of bureaucratic and patrimonial forms of administration within early modern government. Above all, the now abundant evidence of the force of representative assemblies in many parts of Europe across the early modern period, of the limitations on the power of even so paradigmatic an "absolute monarch" as Louis XIV, and of the fact that the various currents of thought advocating mixed constitutions or republicanism in the "age of the democratic revolutions" were of many national pedigrees and often considerable antiquity has called into question the old Whig themes of the distinctiveness of English constitutional evolution and its exceptional importance for the larger study of European liberty.

These lessons have been obscured at times by the division of those who specialize in the history of early modern government and politics among so many national and chronological subspecialties. The tendency toward fragmentation has reached the point where even those concerned with adjacent centuries of the same national history can lose touch with one another. Many historians of eighteenth-century French political culture, for instance, currently organize their work around the breakdown of a political culture that they depict

as monolithically and self-consciously absolutist under Louis XIV, while their counterparts specializing in seventeenth-century French government emphasize the many compromises the Sun King was forced to make with powerful groups within the kingdom and the absence of any systematic absolutist project.[47] Together with the neglect of so many parts of the European political map, this advancing specialization has impeded the establishment of convincing continent-wide syntheses of the evolution of government and political thought over the course of this period. Those who have done the best job of seeing the forest for the trees have often been social scientists coming to the field from the outside, such as Nannerl Keohane and Brian M. Downing.[48] Downing has recently demonstrated that considerable order can be brought to the political and institutional history of Europe in this period by writing it around the theme of why certain regions were able to check more successfully than others the powerful tendencies toward autocracy created by the great growth in the size of the continent's armies. The collective history patronized by the new European Science Foundation on the origins of the modern state in Europe demonstrates that constructing a genuinely continentwide political and institutional history is very much the order of the day in a Europe caught between movements toward greater integration and toward resurgent regionalism and nationalism, but American historians had little role in or influence on this project.[49] It remains to be seen whether or not U.S. historians, to whom it once came naturally to think about European history as a whole, will be able to overcome current tendencies toward national specialization and capture more attention in continuing discussions of this topic.

With the exception of the well-structured area of Reformation history, the situation of those American early modernists investigating the era's political, constitutional, and administrative history—divided among themselves into congeries of specialists on different periods and countries, yet perhaps stumbling together toward a more coherent history of European state formation—is in many ways emblematic of the larger field of early modern European history in America. In the past generation, American Europeanists have largely renounced the function of offering in their writings broad, synthetic interpretations of European history, embracing instead an increasingly zealous commitment to detailed archival research in dialogue with the historians native to the countries about which they write. In tandem with the broader tendencies promoting the advance of specialization within modern academia, this has led to ever greater fragmentation around national and thematic subcommunities, each with its own local debates. Some American specialists may even feel that it has levitated them into a curious liminal space, midway between two or more national cultures. And yet, most American research still clusters around what have always been the great stories of this period: the economic developments that prepared the ground for Europe's escape from the constraints of a preindustrial economy; the elaboration of different modes of secular rationality and their complex relationships with the continued survival of organized religion; and the survival of traditions of representative government and a reign of law in the face of powerful impulses making for increased autocracy and state power. Work in the newer areas of social, cul-

tural, or women's history often clusters around other, sometimes much debated, grand narratives: the emergence of modern family arrangements, the advance of social discipline, and the reconfigurations of social and sexual hierarchies. For one powerful force continues to counteract the tendencies toward fragmentation and uprooting: the undergraduate teaching function. In the classroom, American historians of early modern Europe still need to generate broad narratives capable of illuminating the central developments of these centuries in a manner that captures the attention of successive generations of students. So long as their narratives can accommodate the swing toward a more socially inclusive, structural history of the sort that has become the common feature of all the most important new currents of history of the past generation—as the central narratives of the Reformation and early modern period have proven capable of doing—the classroom experience continues to nudge American research toward problems that in some way or another are suggested by these narratives, and that contribute to their further refinement.

Notes

This paper profited greatly from the discussions, formal and informal, at Providence and San Marino in connection with the conference entitled The State of Historical Writing in North America. Also helpful was a lively discussion at Harvard's Workshop in Early Modern British and European History. I would further like to thank Francisco Bethencourt, Diogo Curto, Jonathan Dewald, and Brad Gregory for their observations on earlier drafts of this essay, many of which I have incorporated into this version.

1. David H. Pinkney, "The Dilemma of the American Historian of Modern France," *French Historical Studies* 1 (1958): 11–25; "Time to Bury the Pinkney Thesis?" *French Historical Studies* 17 (1991): 219–23.

2. For the purposes of this paper, I shall define as American scholarship all work produced by individuals while holding positions at American universities, but I shall accord greater weight to those who received their higher education in the United States. Imperialistically but not, I believe, unjustifiably, I also include American-educated scholars teaching in Canadian universities.

3. Leonard Krieger, "European History in America," in John Higham et al., *History: The Development of Historical Studies in the United States* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965), pp. 235, 238–54.

4. *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Dartmouth College for the Academical Year 1850–51*, p. 24; *Catalogue of Dartmouth College 1857–1858*, p. 30; *Catalogue of Dartmouth College 1863–1864*, p. 30; *Register of the University of California 1870–1871*, p. 56; *Register of the University of California 1874–1875*, p. 46; *Catalogue of the Officers and Students in Yale College 1872–1873*, p. 53.

5. Successive lectures in the course that J. Lewis Diman taught at Brown University in 1880–81 took students from "The Italian Renaissance" and "The European State System" through "The Reformation"; "Civil Wars in France, Wars in the Netherlands and the Thirty Years War"; "The Rise of Monarchy in France," "Limited Monarchy in England," "The European Colonial System," "The Balance of Power," and "Modern Political Theories," before culminating with "The Constitutional History of the United States." Brown

University Archives, Student Lecture Notes, Ms 1M-2, lecture notes of Charles Evans Hughes on modern history 1880–81.

6. These observations about the growth of the history curriculum are based upon an examination of the course catalogues of five institutions: Brown, California, Chicago, Dartmouth, and Yale. I have also found useful Richard Hofstadter, "The Department of History," in R. Gordon Hoxie et al., *A History of the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University*, The Bicentennial History of Columbia University (New York, 1955), pp. 207–49. Beyond the rapid establishment of courses on the Renaissance and Reformation, English history, and the French Revolution, these reveal for the first decades of the twentieth century an occasional continentwide survey of the seventeenth and eighteenth century with a title such as "The Political and Military History of Europe from 1618 to 1763" or "Europe by Treaty from 1648 to 1789," as well as some nation-specific courses devoted to France, Spain (a curricular fixture at California from 1909–10 onward, but otherwise rare), and (surprisingly frequently) Prussia. The number of courses on the rise of Prussia testifies both to the important links between American and German historical scholarship in this period and to a broader fascination with the growth of a powerful new nation in the heart of Europe.

7. Henry Warner Bowden, *Church History in the Age of Science: Historiographical Patterns in the United States 1876–1918* (Chapel Hill, 1971), pp. 58–68, 239–45. That the assistant secretary at the Smithsonian who oversaw the operation of congressionally funded periodicals was Jewish furthered the disaffection of at least one prominent ecclesiastical historian, Samuel Macauley Jackson, who led the secession of the church historians. In submitting for publication the paper of one colleague, he added that if it were rejected (as it subsequently was) "it will be incumbent upon me to announce to my clerical friends whom I ask to write papers for the Association that their papers will not be published because a Jew says they must not be!"

8. James Harvey Robinson, "The Study of the Lutheran Revolt," *American Historical Review* 8 (1903): 205–16; Jacob Salwyn Schapiro, *Social Reform and the Reformation* (New York, 1909); Preserved Smith, "Luther's Early Development in the Light of Psychoanalysis," *American Journal of Psychology* 24 (1913): 360–77; Hartmut Lehmann, *Martin Luther in the American Imagination* (Munich: W. Fink, 1988), pp. 211n, 227; Henry Warner Bowden, *Church History in an Age of Uncertainty: Historiographical Patterns in the United States, 1906–1990* (Carbondale, Ill., 1991), p. 3.

9. I. Bernard Cohen, *Revolution in Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), pp. 391–96; H. Floris Cohen, *The Scientific Revolution: A Historiographical Inquiry* (Chicago, 1994).

10. Preserved Smith, *The Age of the Reformation* (New York, 1920); George Park Fischer, *The Reformation* (New York, 1873).

11. Higham, *History*, chap. 5; Sydney Ahlstrom, "Continental Influences on American Christian Thought since World War I," *Church History* 27 (1958): 256–72; James M. Stayer, "The Eclipse of Young Man Luther: An Outsider's Perspective on Luther Studies," *Canadian Journal of History* 19 (1984): 167–82.

12. The character and preoccupations of much Catholic historical writing in America can be inferred by surveying the early decades of the *Catholic Historical Review.* See also Hubert Jedin and John Dolan, eds., *Handbook of Church History* (New York, 1965); and, for the broader context, George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (Oxford, 1994); Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 69n, 172–74, 364–66; Philip Gleason, "American Catholic Higher Education, 1940–1990:

The Ideological Context," in George M. Marsden and Bradley J. Longfield, eds., *The Secularization of the Academy* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 234–58.

13. Samuel M. Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli* (New York, 1901); Williston Walker, *John Calvin, the Organizer of Reformed Protestantism* (New York, 1906); James Westfall Thompson, *The Wars of Religion in France 1559–1576* (Chicago, 1909).

14. William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1958); M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (Chicago, 1939).

15. Roland Bainton, *David Joris, Wiedertäufer und Kämpfer fur Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1937); idem, *Hunted Heretic: The Life and Death of Michael Servetus, 1511–1553* (Boston, 1953); George Huntston Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Philadelphia, 1962).

16. Bender's most important publications were "The Anabaptist Vision," *Church History* 13 (1944): 3–24; and *Conrad Grebel, 1498–1526: The Founder of the Swiss Brethren* (Goshen, 1950). For his life, work, and context: *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 38 (1964), "Harold S. Bender Memorial Number"; James C. Juhnke, *Vision, Doctrine, War: Mennonite Identity and Organization in America 1890–1930* (Scottdale, 1989), esp. pp. 277–82.

17. A. G. Dickens and John M. Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Oxford, 1985), chap. 9, "Rediscovered Dimensions: The Reformation Radicals."

18. Personal communication from Natalie Zemon Davis, March 10, 1995. Many valuable biographical details about Davis may also be found in MARHO, The Radical Historians Organization, *Visions of History* (New York, 1984), pp. 100–122; and now *A Life of Learning: Natalie Zemon Davis: Charles Homer Haskins Lecture for 1997*, American Council of Learned Societies Occasional Paper 39.

19. The evolution of Davis's interests can be followed most clearly through these works: "A Trade Union in Sixteenth-Century France," *Economic History Review* 19 (1966): 48–69; *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, 1975); "The Sacred and the Body Social in Sixteenth-Century Lyon," *Past & Present* 90 (1981): 40–70; *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983); *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford, 1987). Longer analyses and appreciations of the central themes of her work may be found in Barbara B. Diefendorf and Carla Hesse, "Introduction: Culture and Identity," in Diefendorf and Hesse, eds., *Culture and Identity in Early Modern Europe (1500–1800): Essays in Honor of Natalie Zemon Davis* (Ann Arbor, 1993), which includes a full bibliography of her publications; and Suzanne Desan, "Crowds, Community, and Ritual in the Work of E. P. Thompson and Natalie Davis," in Lynn Hunt, ed., *New Cultural History* (Berkeley, 1989).

20. Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (New York, 1971); Jean Delumeau, *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (Paris, 1971). Delumeau's work was translated into English, with an important foreword by John Bossy, in 1977.

21. John Bossy, "The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Europe," *Past & Present* 47 (1970): 51–70; "The Social History of Confession in the Age of the Reformation," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 25 (1975): 21–38; "Essai de sociographie de la messe, 1200–1700," *Annales: E.S.C.* 36 (1981): 44–70; *Christianity in the West 1400–1700* (Oxford, 1985).

22. For just some of the most important illustrations of these tendencies, see Philip Benedict, *Rouen during the Wars of Religion* (Cambridge, 1981); Philip T. Hoffman, *Church and Community in the Diocese of Lyon, 1500–1789* (New Haven, 1984); Ronald Po-Chia Hsia, *Society and Religion in Münster, 1535–1618* (New Haven, 1984); Barbara B. Diefendorf, *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth-Century Paris* (Oxford, 1991);

Marc R. Forster, *The Counter-Reformation in the Villages: Religion and Reformation in the Bishopric of Speyer, 1560–1720* (Ithaca, 1992); Sara T. Nalle, *God in La Mancha: Religious Reform and the People of Cuenca, 1500–1650* (Baltimore, 1992); Philip M. Soergel, *Wondrous in His Saints: Counter-Reformation Propaganda in Bavaria* (Berkeley, 1993); John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993); Elizabeth G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini: Venice, Rome and Reform* (Berkeley, 1993).

23. As historians working in this field are beginning to recognize. See Bruce Tolley, *Pastors and Parishioners in Würtemberg during the Late Reformation 1581–1621* (Stanford, 1995), p. 86; and the review of this book by Gerald Strauss, *American Historical Review* 101 (1996): 1231. For the contrast between the different patterns of analysis, cf. Natalie Z. Davis, "City Women and Religious Change," in Davis, *Society and Culture*, and Steven Ozment, *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983); Bernard Vogler, *Vie religieuse en pays rhénan dans la seconde moitié du XVIe siècle (1556–1619)* (Lille: Service de Reproduction des Thèses, 1974), and Gerald Strauss, "Success and Failure in the German Reformation," *Past & Present* 67 (1975): 30–63; James M. Kittelson, "Successes and Failures in the German Reformation: The Report from Strasbourg," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982): 153–75; Geoffrey Parker, "Success and Failure during the First Century of the Reformation," *Past & Present* 136 (1992): 43–82.

24. Steven Ozment, *The Reformation in the Cities* (New Haven, 1975); Paul A. Russell, *Lay Theology in the Reformation: Popular Pamphleteers in Southwest Germany, 1521–1525* (Cambridge, 1985); Carlos M. Eire, *War against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin* (Cambridge, 1986); Mark U. Edwards, Jr., *Printing, Propaganda and Martin Luther* (Berkeley, 1994); Ronald Po-Chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation* (London, 1989); Paula Sutter Fichtner, *Protestantism and Primogeniture in Early Modern Germany* (New Haven, 1989).

25. The reinterpretation of Anabaptism in the past generation has involved European and North American scholars alike. See in particular James M. Stayer, *Anabaptists and the Sword* (Lawrence, Kans., 1972); K. Deppermann, W. O. Packull, and Stayer, "From Monogenesis to Polygenesis: The Historical Discussion of Anabaptist Origins," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 49 (1975): 83–121; Hans-Jürgen Goertz, ed., *Umstrittenes Täufertum 1515–1975: Neue Forschungen* (Göttingen, 1975); Deppermann, *Melchior Hoffman* (Göttingen, 1979); Stayer, *The German Peasants' War and Anabaptist Community of Goods* (Montreal, 1991); Claus-P. Clasen, *Anabaptism: A Social History, 1525–1618* (Ithaca, 1972).

26. For a clear expression of this view, see Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, "Introduction: Renaissance and Reformation, Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Era," in *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* (Leiden, 1994), I, xiii–xvi.

27. Ozment, *When Fathers Ruled*; Elizabeth Gleason, *Contarini*, p. 301.

28. Steven Ozment, ed., *Reformation Europe: A Guide to Research* (St. Louis, 1982), p. 1.

29. Ample bibliographic indications may be found in Krieger, "European History in America."

30. Robert M. Kingdon, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555–1563* (Geneva, 1955); DeLamar Jensen, *Diplomacy and Dogmatism: Bernardino de Mendoza and the French Catholic League* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

31. On the development of the history of science, see Arnold Thackray, "History of Science," in Paul T. Durbin, ed., *A Guide to the Culture of Science, Technology and Medicine* (New York, 1980), pp. 12–19; Arnold Thackray and Robert K. Merton, "On Discipline Building: The Paradoxes of George Sarton," *Isis* 63 (1972): 473–95.

32. Usher, Klein, and Hamilton were all students of Gay's. Abbott Payson Usher, *The*

History of the Grain Trade in France, 1400–1710 (Cambridge, Mass., 1913); Julius Klein, *The Mesta: A Study in Spanish Economic History, 1273–1836* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920); Earl J. Hamilton, *American Treasure and the Price Revolution in Spain, 1501–1650* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934); Charles Woolsey Cole, *Colbert and a Century of French Mercantilism* (New York, 1939). For the development of economic history, see Arthur H. Cole, "Economic History in the United States: Formative Years of a Discipline," *Journal of Economic History* 28 (1968): 556–89; Steven A. Sass, *Entrepreneurial Historians and History: Leadership and Rationality in American Economic Historiography 1940–1960* (New York, 1982), chap. 1; *Dictionary of American Biography*, supplement four, 1946–50 (New York, 1974), s.v. "Edwin Francis Gay."

33. Jeremy D. Popkin, "'Made in U.S.A.': les historiens français d'outre-Atlantique et leur histoire," *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* 40 (1993): 317–18, provides a revealing discussion of the motivations that drew many Americans into French history in these years. For evidence of the shifting balance of research activity, see Roland Mousnier's review of Barbara B. Diefendorf, *Paris City Councillors in the Sixteenth Century*, in *Revue Historique* 271 (1984): 174; Pinkney, "Time to Bury the Pinkney Thesis?" 222–23.

34. Cf. Orest Ranum, *Paris in the Age of Absolutism: An Essay* (New York, 1968), pp. 297–98; Robert Forster and Orest Ranum, eds., *Biology of Man in History: Selections from the Annales Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* (Baltimore, 1975).

35. A small sampling of important recent American works on the social history of Old Regime France that indicates the range of topics examined: Robert Forster, *The House of Saulx-Tavanes: Versailles and Burgundy 1700–1830* (Baltimore, 1971); Kathryn Norberg, *Rich and Poor in Grenoble 1600–1814* (Berkeley, 1985); Steven Laurence Kaplan, *Provisioning Paris: Merchants and Millers in the Grain and Flour Trade during the Eighteenth Century* (Ithaca, 1984); Cissie Fairchilds, *Domestic Enemies: Servants and Their Masters in Old Regime France* (Baltimore, 1984); Robert Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York, 1984).

36. Witness the pioneering stature within the respective national historiographies of works such as David W. Sabean, *Power in the Blood: Popular Culture and Village Discourse in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge, 1984), and idem, *Property, Production and Family in Neckarhausen, 1700–1870* (Cambridge, 1990); Christopher R. Friedrichs, *Urban Society in an Age of War: Nördlingen, 1580–1720* (Princeton, 1979); Richard L. Kagan, *Students and Society in Early Modern Spain* (Baltimore, 1974), and idem, *Lawsuits and Litigants in Castile 1500–1700* (Chapel Hill, 1981); James S. Amelang, *Honored Citizens of Barcelona: Patrician Culture and Class Relations, 1490–1714* (Princeton, 1986).

37. J. H. Hexter, "The Education of the Aristocracy in the Renaissance," *Journal of Modern History* 22 (1950): 1–20, idem, "A New Framework for Social History," *Journal of Economic History* 15 (1955), and idem, "'Factors in Modern History,'" all collected in idem, *Reappraisals in History* (Evanston, 1961); Franklin L. Ford, *Robe and Sword: The Regrouping of the French Aristocracy after Louis XIV* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953); Robert Forster, *The Nobility of Toulouse in the Eighteenth Century: A Social and Economic Study* (Baltimore, 1960). The history of the early modern French nobility has subsequently been one of the subjects most extensively examined by American social historians of this period, most impressively by Jonathan Dewald, *The Formation of a Provincial Nobility: The Magistrates of the Parlement of Rouen 1499–1610* (Princeton, 1980); idem, *Pont-St-Pierre 1398–1789: Lordship, Community, and Capitalism in Early Modern France* (Berkeley, 1987); idem, *Aristocratic Experience and the Origins of Modern Culture: France, 1570–1715* (Berkeley, 1993).

38. Important books by American historians on women's history in this period include Carolyn C. Lougee, *Le Paradis des Femmes: Women, Salons, and Social Stratification in Seven-*

teenth-Century France (Princeton, 1976); Merry E. Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1993).

39. Mark A. Schneider, *Culture and Enchantment* (Chicago, 1993), p. 188n.

40. Prominent expressions of the reserved reception accorded Foucault by American early modern historians include H. C. Erik Midelfort, "Madness and Civilization in Early Modern Europe: A Reappraisal of Michel Foucault," in Barbara C. Malament, ed., *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J. H. Hexter* (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 247–66; George Huppert, "*Divinatio et eruditio:* Thoughts on Foucault," *History and Theory* 13 (1974): 191–207. On the broader issue of the reception of Foucault, see Schneider, *Culture and Enchantment*, p. 188; Allan Megill, "The Reception of Foucault by Historians," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987): 117–41; Jan Goldstein, ed., *Foucault and the Writing of History* (Oxford, 1994); and Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1988), esp. pp. 1–11, a central text.

41. Franklin Mendels, "Proto-industrialization: The First Phase of the Industrialization Process," *Journal of Economic History* 32 (1972): 241–61; Myron P. Gutmann, *Toward the Modern Economy: Early Industry in Europe, 1500–1800* (New York, 1988), pp. 245–46, for a listing of the most important titles within the vast literature spawned by Mendels's article; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System*, 4 vols. to date (New York, 1974–); Patrick O'Brien, "European Economic Development: The Contribution of the Periphery," *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 35 (1982): 1–18; Robert Brenner, "Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-industrial Europe," *Past & Present* 70 (1976): 30–74; T. H. Aston and C. H. E. Philpin, eds., *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-industrial Europe* (Cambridge, 1985); Jan de Vries, *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis, 1600–1750* (Cambridge, 1976); idem, *European Urbanization 1500–1800* (Cambridge, Mass., 1984); idem, "The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution," *Journal of Economic History* 54 (1994): 249–70.

42. For some important recent work in this field, Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1983–93); idem, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992); Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986); Margaret C. Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment* (London, 1981); idem, *Living the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1991); Alan C. Kors, *Atheism in France 1650–1729* (Princeton, 1990). The intense examination of actual scholarly and pedagogic practice that Grafton has used to revitalize the history of humanist education and classical scholarship derives from the history of the exact sciences via Grafton's Chicago teacher Noel Swerdlow. Jacob is a historian of science by training.

43. Steven Shapin and Simon Shaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump* (Princeton, 1985); Shapin, *A Social History of Truth* (Chicago, 1994); Mordechai Feingold, "Essay Review: When Facts Matter," *Isis* 87 (1996): 131–39; letters to the editor by Shapin and Feingold, ibid., 681–87; Mario Biagioli, *Galileo, Courtier: The Practice of Science in the Culture of Absolutism* (Chicago, 1993); Michael H. Shank, "Essay Review: Galileo's Day in Court," *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 25 (1994): 236–43; Biagioli, "Playing with the Evidence," *Early Science and Medicine* 1 (1996): 70–105; Shank, "How Shall We Practice History? The Case of Mario Biagioli's *Galileo, Courtier*," ibid., 106–50.

44. Particularly important studies of this sort include James A. Vann, *The Making of a State: Württemberg 1593–1793* (Ithaca, 1985); William Beik, *Absolutism and Society in Seventeenth-Century France: State Power and Provincial Aristocracy in Languedoc* (Cambridge, 1985); John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688–1783* (New York, 1989).

45. Important examples in different registers: J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Mo-*

ment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition (Princeton, 1975); Dale Van Kley, *The Damiens Affair and the Unraveling of the Ancien Regime, 1750–1770* (Princeton, 1984); Marc Raeff, *The Well Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional Change through Law in the Germanies and Russia, 1600–1800* (New Haven, 1983); Sarah Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres of Prerevolutionary France* (Berkeley, 1993).

46. Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Geneva, 1960); idem, *Céremonial et puissance souveraine: France, XVe-XVIIe siècles*, Cahier des Annales 41 (Paris, 1987); Sarah Hanley, *The Lit de Justice of the Kings of France* (Princeton, 1983); Richard A. Jackson, *Vive le Roi! A History of the French Coronation from Charles V to Charles X* (Chapel Hill, 1984); Lawrence M. Bryant, *The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony* (Geneva, 1986). This school has been especially warmly received in France since the mid-1980s, when François Furet initiated a move toward a more philosophical history of politics.

47. Cf. Daniel Gordon, *Citizens without Sovereignty: Equality and Sociability in French Thought, 1670–1789* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 3–5, 40; William Beik, "Louis XIV and the Cities," in James L. McClain, John M. Merriman, and Ugawa Kaoru, eds., *Edo and Paris: Urban Life and the State in the Early Modern Era* (Ithaca, 1994), pp. 68–85.

48. Nannerl Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Princeton, 1980); Brian M. Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton, 1993).

49. At the time this volume went to press, the following volumes of this project had appeared: Richard Bonney, ed., *Economic Systems and State Finance* (Oxford, 1995); Janet Coleman, ed., *The Individual in Political Theory and Practice* (Oxford, 1996); Wolfgang Reinhard, ed., *Power Elites and State Building* (Oxford, 1996); Peter Blickle, ed., *Resistance, Representation, and Community* (Oxford, 1997); Antonio Padoa-Schioppa, ed., *Legislation and Justice* (Oxford, 1997). The comparison between this project and the most important recent American undertaking of the sort, the volumes in the Rise of Modern Freedom series produced under the auspices of Washington University's Center for the History of Freedom, illustrates once again the continuing force of Whig traditions in America.