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Introducing the module

This is a core module counting for one 30-CAT unit in Finals. It is compulsory for all single-honours History students, optional for joint degree and other advanced students. As a core module it complements teaching in specialised History modules, by providing a broad context for understanding developments in the discipline of history during the modern period. It asks students to consider what form of thinking and writing (what kind of human endeavour) ‘history’ is, and to relate the historiographical developments discussed during the course, to the works of history they study on Advanced Option and Special Subject modules.

*Historiography* is also intended to develop students’ abilities in study, research, and oral and written communication, through a programme of seminars, lectures and essay work.

Context

*Historiography* has been designed to complement the learning which students will have done so far in their work in the Department, both in core and optional modules. For all students taking it, *Historiography* provides an overview of ‘doing History’ from the later eighteenth-century onwards, the ideas that have underpinned historical research and writing, and of recent theories of history (many of them drawn from other disciplines), as they have been used by historians. It provides students with an opportunity to think reflexively about the nature of the historical enterprise. You are encouraged to link your studies in *Historiography* with your other third-year modules.

Syllabus

The syllabus has two major themes. There is a broad historical sweep encompassing the eighteenth-century origins of modern history, the founders of academic history, including Ranke, Marx, and Weber, and historians of the Frankfurt and *Annales* Schools. Then the course focuses on recent and contemporary developments in theories and practices of history from the 1960s to the present. The setting for European/Western developments in historical thinking is conceived of as global. The starting point is the later eighteenth-century because that was a period of more intensified encounters between historiographical traditions from different parts of the world.

Teaching and Learning

The module runs in Terms 1, and 2, and two weeks in Term 3. Teaching is through 20 x 1-hour lectures (9 in Term 1, 9 in Term 2, and 2 in Term 3). They are all taught on Tuesdays at 10-11 am in the L 4 (Science Concourse). There are 20 x 90 mins seminars, attached to the weekly lectures. Seminar groups will normally consist of 12-16 students and will all take place on Tuesday afternoon. Times and venues will be arranged before the beginning of term and first lecture; they will be found on the History Department Third Year Notice Board, and on the *Historiography* webpage. There are individual tutorials to discuss feedback on three written assignments (non-assessed essays) over the course of the year. Tutors may allow students to substitute mock exam answers for the third and final essay.

Lectures and Seminars

Seminars follow the lectures and are always connected to them. Lecturers on this module aim to provide both an introduction to the topic in hand, and a series of propositions about it. The perspectives of the lecture and the reading assigned by your tutor make up the material discussed in the seminar. You are expected to read in advance the basic texts set for that week.
Seminar Preparation
In this Handbook each seminar is described in terms of reading **Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources** which, with the guidance of your seminar tutor, you should complete as preparation for the seminar. It is important that you always read the set text reading for the week, as familiarity with these texts forms one of the criteria in the awarding of marks in the summer examination. For each seminar there is a list of **Questions** to guide your reading and note-taking (some of these may also be adapted as short-essay titles; an extended list of possible titles will be also found at the end of this Handbook). Your seminar tutor may also assign additional or alternative readings from the **Background Seminar Reading** lists. **Additional readings** are listed under different headings to provide you with Bibliographies for essay-writing. Sometimes, these **additional** or **further readings** and the questions they raise may be the focus of your seminar group’s discussion. The summer examination paper is composed by the course team that conducts the lectures and seminars, bearing in mind the experience of each seminar group, as well as the lecture series.

**Reading**

**General Surveys**
- Claus, Peter and John Marriott, *History: An Introduction to Theory, Method and Practice* (2012)
- Green, Anna and Kathleen Troup (eds), *The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-century History and Theory* (1999). This is particularly useful for the way it introduces a theoretical and methodological vocabulary for studying twentieth-century historiography.
- Hughes-Warrington, Marnie, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History* (2008). Provides short essays on fifty mainly European and US historians, historiographers, and thinkers who have had an impact on history-writing.


• Stunkel, Kenneth R., *Fifty Key Works of History and Historiography* (2011). Provides short introductions to key writings of fifty historians and thinkers who have had an impact on history-writing, from all over the world.


**Books to Buy?**

We suggest you buy books for highly practical reasons, as the university library cannot (under copyright legislation) digitalise more than one chapter or one-fifth (whichever is the shortest) of a book.  Many of the books on the ‘General Survey’ list are appropriate in this respect.  Most focus on broad historiographical trends rather than the particular historians and theorists that provide the focus for this particular module.  Such figures will however be covered in these books in more or less depth in passing (use the content-list and index). You will get your money’s worth out of purchasing books such as Troup and Green’s *Houses of History*, Hughes-Warrington’s *Fifty Key Thinkers in History* (2000), Bentley’s *Modern Historiography* (1999), Claus and Marriot's *History: An Introduction to Theory, Method and Practice* (2012), and, for a more global spread, Iggers and Wang, *A Global History of Modern Historiography* (2008).

**Terminology**


**Keeping Up with Developments in Historiography**

Get into the habit of running the names of historians through the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography on-line* (for British and former-Commonwealth historians only). Other national dictionaries of biography can often be located by simply searching the internet with the name of the historian you are interested in. Make it a habit to regularly check the Bibliography of British and Irish History to discover recent publications on the topics of historiography and history-writing. As with *Historical Abstracts* and the *MLA Index* (Modern Languages Association of America) this is a good way of discovering how much recent attention the historian you are interested in has received.

An important internet source is the Institute of Historical Research’s (IHR) website ‘Making History’. Find it at: [http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/](http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/) It is dedicated to the
history of the study and practice of history in Britain over the last hundred years or so, following the emergence of the professional discipline in the late nineteenth century. It contains cross-referenced entries for interviews with historians, journal articles, projects and debates. Its statistical pages allow you to analyse the profession as a historical enterprise within society. Also become familiar with ‘Making History’s’ host site, the IHR, at http://www.history.ac.uk/. Here you can watch the IHR’s attempt to move out from the Anglocentric focus of ‘Making History’, and globalise historiography.

It is often said that historians leave thinking about history to the philosophers. The module team profoundly disagrees with this proposition! But if you want to see what philosophers of history are saying about history and historians, make it a habit to check (and browse the back issues of) History and Theory (available ONLINE and in hard copy in the Library).

Otherwise, there is the bookshop, Library, SLC, connection to journals on-line (Blackwell-Synergie, Project-Muse, JSTOR …), digitalised course extracts …

Many of the basic texts studied in seminars are available in both the bookshop and the Library. Many of the key book-sections and articles listed below will also be found in the Photocopy Collection: always check there if you cannot find the journal on the shelf. The back issues of most journals are available ONLINE. Type the journal title into the Library catalogue search box, searching ‘Journals’. You will be taken to all electronic portals for the journal in question.

When a book extract has been scanned and is available online it is listed at: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/services/library/electronicresources/extracts/hi/hi323 Every Historiography extract that can be legally digitalised, has been digitalised. You should check this list regularly, as new extracts may be added throughout the year.

You can read seventeenth- and eighteenth-century (English-language) histories in their original form in Early English Books On-line and Eighteenth-Century Collections On-line (Library pages -> Resources -> Electronic Resources -> Books.) When a text is available in this easily-accessed form it is indicated in this Handbook by EEBO or ECCO. Literature On-line (LION) will give you access to full text versions of ‘English literature’, including histories. The Making of the Modern World (MMW) is a data-base of social and economic texts from the fifteenth- to the nineteenth-century. Much history-writing has ended up here. Access it, as above, via the Library pages

Assessment
All students submit three non-assessed essays of about 2000 words each during Terms 1 and 2. The Questions in each seminar section can be reformulated as essay topics; there is also a full list of Essay Titles at the end of this Handbook. You are encouraged to negotiate essay titles with your seminar tutor; the final title must have been approved by him or her. Your seminar tutor may agree to your substituting a mock exam question or questions for the third and final essay. Seminar tutors will establish deadlines for their tutees, and assignments should be handed to him or her.

Formal assessment is by a three-hour examination. You will answer three questions, at least one from Section A of the paper, dealing with the particular historians/historical thinkers/historical writing studied, and at least one question from Section B which contains general questions about the nature, practice – and history - of History.

Please note the following:
• The examination rubric changed in 2008-9. You are no longer required to answer two questions from Section A, which was the case between 2003 and 2008.
• The paper is longer than it was in the past. There are as a rule about 15 questions in Section A (starting with four for Venice Stream Students) and about 10 questions in Section B.
• Bear in mind that syllabus changes in recent years mean that some examination questions on past papers (in particular those on Robert Darnton, Keith Thomas, and Natalie Zemon Davis) are no longer relevant to your revision.
• In the assessment of answers to Section B questions, examiners will give particular credit to those candidates who draw (where appropriate) on historiographical discussion in other modules they have studied. You are also expected to answer Section B questions in a comparative manner, and not answer them merely in relationship to one of the figures that come up in Section A.
• Venice Stream students follow an adapted version of the module, and the initial four questions on the exam paper will relate to texts not studied by Modern Stream students.

Aims, Objectives, and Expected Learning Outcomes
By the end of the module it is intended that students will have:
• developed their ability to assess critically historical analysis and argument, past and present
• gained an understanding of the development of the academic study of history throughout the world since the later eighteenth century
• gained an awareness of recent and contemporary debates in the theory and practice of historical writing
• gained insight into current methodologies, theories, and concepts, currently in use within the historical discipline
• gained insight into how historical arguments have been and are made
• become aware of historiographical traditions outside the West
• had the opportunity to think reflexively about the nature of the historical enterprise within society
**Lecture and Seminar Programme**

The one-hour lectures all take place on Tuesdays at 10-11am in L4 (Science Concourse). The panel round up session (term 3, week 3) and the revision lecture (term 3, week 4) will also take place in L4. The seminars will be on Tuesday afternoon, right after the weekly lecture - times to be arranged with individual seminar tutors.

**Lecturers:** DA= David Anderson; AS=Aditya Sakar; CS=Claudia Stein; CW=Charles Walton; DH=David Hardiman; HC=Howard Chiang; LS=Laura Schwartz; RS=Rosa Salzberg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Tue</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1. Introductory lecture to the module</td>
<td>1. Introductory seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tue</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2. The idea of history</td>
<td>2. The idea of history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tue</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>3. The eighteenth-century historical enterprise</td>
<td>3. Eighteenth-century origins of modern history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tue</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>4. Historiographical encounters in early colonial India</td>
<td>4. Indian historiography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Tue</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>5. Ranke and idea of empiricist history</td>
<td>5. Ranke and ‘Rankean’ history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research and reading week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Tue</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>6. Karl Marx: history and theory</td>
<td>6. Marx and theories of history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tue</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>7. Max Weber: history and sociology</td>
<td>7. Weber and his method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Tue</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>8. Walter Benjamin &amp; the Frankfurt school</td>
<td>8. Benjamin and the Frankfurt school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Tue</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>10. Edward Thompson: experience, commitment and culture</td>
<td>10. Thompson: history from below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Tue</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>12. Michel Foucault: power and knowledge</td>
<td>12. Michel Foucault: power and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research and reading week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Tue</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>15. Walkowitz: from sex to gender (from society to culture)</td>
<td>15. Walkowitz: men, women, and the writing of history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Tue</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>16. History and the postmodern turn</td>
<td>16. Postmodernism: a serious ‘challenge to history’?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Tue</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>17. Provincialising history: on Chinese historiography</td>
<td>17. Provincialising and Reinventing China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Tue</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>18. The historical enterprise within society: theory and method</td>
<td>18. Answering Part B exam questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 3</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Tue*</td>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>19. Round up panel session (two hours)</td>
<td>19. Revision seminar I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Tue**</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>20. Revision lecture</td>
<td>20. Revision seminar II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Term 3 week 3: round up panel session held Tuesday 6 May, 2014 at 10-12am in L4 (Science Concourse)
** Term 3, week 4: lecture held on Tuesday 13 May, 2014 at 10-11 in L4 (Science Concourse).
Seminar 1: Introductory Seminar

This seminar offers the opportunity of a first exploration of the field of history writing. It engages with questions and issues raised in the Introductory lecture and in the assigned readings, a short and provocative piece by the historian Richard J. Evans, first published in the London Review of Books in 2011. While engaging with a highly political issue at the time (and now) – the history curriculum at schools – Evan’s also discusses issues that will be central themes throughout the entire module. What is academic history? What is it for? Is it ‘objective’ or ideology? Is it political? Where is the boundary between academic history-writing and other cultural activities that deal with the past such as novel-writing or journalism?

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources

Questions for seminar:
1. Is history-writing an ‘objective’ activity?
2. What is academic history for?
3. Is there a difference between journalism and academic history?
4. What is a historical ‘fact’ and what is historical ‘fiction’?

Background Seminar Reading:
(see Seminar 2)
Seminar 2: The Idea of History

If ‘Historiography’ involves the study of historical writing and historical thinking as they have developed through time, then a working definition of ‘History’ will surely be useful for our own enterprise over the next two terms. The focus of this introductory seminar is some of the ways in which the question ‘what is History?’ has been posed, and some of the answers that have been provided by historians and other scholars. ‘History’ here is conceived of as a practice or an activity rather than as in its everyday meaning – as ‘the past’. We consider the book that asked the question for the Anglophone, twentieth-century world: E. H. Carr’s What Is History? R.G. Collingwood provides an explanation of what makes the enterprise of history-writing distinctive.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources

Background Seminar Reading:
Evans, R., In Defence of History (London, 1997), 75-102
History in Focus Website http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Whatishistory/
Hughes-Warrington, M., Fifty Key Thinkers on History (London, 2008), xi-xxi
Jenkins, K., Re-thinking History (London, 1991), 5-26
Jenkins, K., Refiguring History: New Thoughts on an Old Discipline (London, 2003), 59-70
Stedman Jones, G., ‘From Historical Sociology to Theoretical History’, British Journal of Sociology, 27:3 (1976), 295-305

Questions for Seminar:
1. This module bears the title ‘historiography’. What do you think is meant by this, and what are we expected to learn about? Some other universities have course with titles such as ‘methods and approaches in history’, ‘a history of history’ etc.; and it is often taught in year one, and is thus more basic. In what way is what we are doing here different from that sort of approach, and what is the advantage of doing it in the final year? What is the difference between the Part A and Part B questions in the examination that you will sit in term three?
2. What are the main features of history as a field of study?
3. How does history differ from other fields of study? For example: philosophy, theology, the natural sciences, the social science (sociology, political science, geography, anthropology), or from other humanities such as literature.
4. Why do you study history? What do you hope to get from it? What should you get from it? Do you consider yourself a ‘historian’ at the moment, while you are studying history at university? How much does your essay-writing resemble the process of writing history described by E.H. Carr, What is History? 22-4?

Further Reading:
Burke, P., *History and Social Theory* (Cambridge, 1992)
Jenkins, K., On ‘What is History?’ From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White (London, 1995)
Tosh, J., *Historians on History: An Anthology* (Harlow, 2000)
Seminar 3: Eighteenth-Century Origins of Modern History
(After lecture on ‘The Eighteenth-century Historical Enterprise’)

In A Global History of Modern Historiography, Iggers and Wang say that they begin their account in the eighteenth century, because ‘at that point the various traditions of historical thinking which until then… existed… apart from each other began to interact’. What was it that interacted? Two lectures have prepared us for answering that question. This week we shall pay attention to the ways in which history operated in the social and imaginative world of Britain in the late eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. We are thus beginning the discussion that will continue throughout this module of ‘the historiographical enterprise within society’ (or ‘societies’).

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:
Hume, D., Hume’s History of England, abridged, from the Invasion of Julius Caesar, to the Revolution in 1688. For the use of schools and young gentlemen. By George Buist, V.D.M [electronic resource] (Edinburgh, 1793), 1-8  ECCO.

Background Seminar Reading:
Hughes Warrington, M., Fifty Key Thinkers on History (London, 2000), entries for Edward Gibbon, Georg Hegel, Giambattista Vico
Kelley, D. R., Versions of History from Antiquity to the Enlightenment (New Haven CT, 1991), 439-496

Questions for Seminar:
1. What did ‘history’ mean in eighteenth century Europe?
2. What were the main features of the new form of history-writing that emerge at the time of the Enlightenment?
3. What is meant by ‘philosophic history’? What were its strengths and weaknesses?
4. Can we place this new form of history-writing in the context of any particular social, political or economic developments at that time?

Further Reading on History-writing in the (long) Western Eighteenth Century (see also readings on ‘Enlightenment Historiography’ in the Historiography Venice Stream Handbook, which is available on the historiography website):
Cook, A., 'The Gradual Emergence of History Writing as a Separate Genre', Clio, 15:2 (1986), 171-89
Perkins, P., ‘“Too Classical for a Female Pen”? Late Eighteenth-Century Women Reading and Writing Classical History’, Clio [Fort Wayne, IN], 33:3 (2004), 241-64
Phillips, M. S., Society and Sentiment. Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820 (Princeton NJ, 2000), 3-78
Smith, B. G., Gender and the Practice of History (Harvard MA, 1998), 14-36
Seminar 4: Historiographical Encounters in Early Colonial India
(After lecture on ‘Historiographical Encounters in Early Colonial India’)

India was conquered by the British East India Company in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries - the very moment that the new discipline of history was emerging in Europe. Informed by this new understanding of how to go about studying the past, the British adopted a highly critical view of the existing ways in which the Indian people regarded their past. As in any sophisticated civilisation, the Indian people recounted and wrote about their past in a complex and different ways. These are examined in the lecture. The new methods that the British provided were in time adopted by Indians, and then within the space of hardly more than half a century began to be turned against the colonial rulers, as new nationalist histories of India were produced as a key element in the project of defining an Indian ‘nation’ that Indians demanded should be free from British rule.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:
Anon., ‘A View of the History of India, from the earliest Ages, to the Year 1603 of the Christian Æra’, Ch. 1 of The Asiatic Annual Register; or, A View of the History of Hindustan, and of the politics, commerce, and literature of Asia [electronic resource] (London, 1800) ECCO

Background Seminar Reading:

Questions for Seminar:
1. What did ‘history’ mean in precolonial India? Think of some ways that Indians might justify their understandings of the past.
2. How did the British set about constructing a new history of India? What was their agenda in doing so?
3. Did British and Indian historiography interact in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries? If so, in what ways?
4. How did Indians respond to British-history writing in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries? How did their histories differ from colonial histories, and with what intent?

Further Reading on Indian Historiography:
Bayly, C. A., Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780-1870 (Cambridge 1996)
Guha, R., History at the Limits of World History (New Delhi & New York, 2002)
Inden, R., Imagining India (Oxford, 2000)
Prakash, G., ‘Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Indian Historiography is Good to Think’, Colonialism and Culture (Ann Arbor MI, 1992), 353-89
Viswanathan, G., Masks of Conquest: Literary Studies and British Rule in India (New York, 1989)

Writing History in a Global Space?
Seminar 5: Ranke and Rankean History
(After lecture on ‘Ranke and the Idea of Empiricist History’)

The seminar has a dual focus, considering both Ranke’s relationship to his predecessors and some of the ways in which he was made into ‘the father of modern empirical history’ after his death. The further reading lists demonstrate several other approaches to Ranke, which your seminar group may choose to explore. These topics could also be explored in a short essay.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:

Reading these digitalised extracts gives you access to Ranke’s variety of writing on: the distinction between history and philosophy, on history and politics, on ‘The Great Powers, his idea of the ‘holy hieroglyph’ and his critique of Guicciardini. The Theory and Practice of History volume also includes the Prefaces to the major works. These could not be digitalised for copyright reasons. The volume is on reserve in SLC. You can also read the Preface to the six volumes of Ranke’s History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth Century here:
http://socserv2.socsci.mcmaster.ca/~econ/ugcm/3ll3/ranke/

Background Seminar Reading:
Bann, S., Romanticism and the Rise of History (New York, 1995), 3-29
Braw, J. D., ‘Vision as Revision: Ranke and the Beginning of Modern History’,
History and Theory, 46:4 (2007), 45-60
Burke, P., ‘Ranke the Reactionary’, in G. G. Igers & J. M. Powell (eds), Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline (Syracuse, 1990), 36-44
Fritzsche, P. Stranded in the Present (Cambridge MASS, 2004), ch. 2.
Green, A. & Troup, K. (eds), The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-century History and Theory (Manchester, 1999), 1-11 (‘The Empiricists’)
Hughes-Warrington, M., Fifty Key Thinkers in History (London, 2000), 256-263
Igers, G. and Wang, Q. E., A Global History of Modern Historiography (Harlow, 2008), 69-82
(On how Ranke influenced American historians.)
Smith, B., The Gender of History. Men, Women and Historical Practice (Cambridge MASS, 1998), ch.4
Questions for Seminar:
1. What was ‘philosophical’ history, and why did Ranke reject it?
2. Taking the case of Ranke, how important is a historian’s background to understanding his/her work?
3. Assess the view that ‘for Ranke the writing of history was an act of worship’. How did his religious beliefs relate to his history-writing?
4. What did ‘historism’ mean in the case of Ranke, and how significant was it to his historical practice?

Further Reading on Ranke, his Work, and his Legacies:
Kelley, D. R. (ed.), *Versions of History from Antiquity to the Enlightenment* (New Haven, 1991)

On Ranke’s Relationship to his Predecessors:
Kelley, D. R., *Faces of History: Historical Enquiry from Herodotus to Herder* (New Haven, 1998), chs.9-10

On Ranke’s Relationship to Sir Walter Scott’s History-writing:
Curthoys, A. & Docker, J., *Is History Fiction?* (Sydney, 2005), ch. 3
Scott, W., ‘Advertisement’ [Preface] to *The Antiquary* (in the Waverley Novels), (Edinburgh 1815) LION
Scott, W., *Quentin Durward* (Edinburgh, 1823) Library & LION
Southgate, B., *History meets Fiction* (Harlow, 2009), 53-59
On the notion/practice of 'objectivity':

Historism:
Friedrich N., *On the Use and Abuse of History* (1874)
Meineke, F., *Historism* (1972)
Iggers, G., *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (Middletown, Ct., 1983), chapter on German historism.

Chapters or articles (and three book-length studies) of different aspects of Ranke’s work:
Grafton, A., 'The Footnote from de Thou to Ranke', *History and Theory* 33 (1994), 53-76
Iggers, G. G., 'The Image of Ranke in American and German Historical Thought’, *History and Theory* 2 (1962), 17-40
Stuchtey, Benedikt, 'German Historical Writing', in Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca, and Attila Pók (eds), The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume 4: 1800-1945 (Oxford, 2011)
Vierhaus, R., 'Historiography Between Science and Art', in G. G. Iggers & J. M. Powell (eds), Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline (Syracuse, 1990), 61-69
White, H., ‘Ranke: Historical Realism as Comedy’, in White, Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe (Baltimore, 1973), ch.4
Seminar 6: Marx and Theories of History
(After lecture on ‘Karl Marx: History and Theory’)

We will continue to explore the idea of the historian writing about his/her own times in the guise of the past. This is a particularly interesting question in relation to The Eighteenth Brumaire: Marx wrote in the middle of what would only later be labelled ‘a historical event’ (Louis Bonaparte’s 1852 coup).

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:

All works by Marx can be found (in addition to the scanned extracts above) in the Moscow Foreign Languages editions of Marx's collected or selected works. Alternatively you can use the extracts provided in the SLC Photocopy Collection. There are multiple copies of two abbreviated versions of ‘The Eighteenth Brumaire’ here: one from McLellan, the other (rather longer) from the Moscow Selected works. The SLC photocopies of Section 1 of The Communist Manifesto are labelled 'Bourgeois & Proletarians'. All these items are available at many websites.

Background Seminar Reading:
Hughes-Warrington, M., Fifty Key Thinkers on History (London, 2000), 215-224

Questions for Seminar:
1. In what particular ways was Marx’s historical method distinctive? How did he differ from (a) Ranke and (b) positivist history?
2. How did Marx understand the relationship between philosophy and social action? How did this differ from Hegel?
3. How successful is The Eighteenth Brumaire in explaining away the failure of the vision expressed in The Communist Manifesto?
4. Why was Marx so influential in the hundred or so years after his death in 1883, and are Marx’s writings of any relevance to us today?

Further reading on Eighteenth Brumaire:
Myers, J. C., ‘From Stage-ist Theories to a Theory of the Stage: The Concept of Ideology in Marx’s Eighteenth Brumaire’, Strategies, 16:1 (2003), 13-21

Marx: Origins and Influences:
Aron, R., Main Currents in Sociological Thought, Vol. 1, Montesquieu, Comte, Marx, Tocqueville, the Sociologists and the Revolutions of 1848 (London, 1968)
Shaw, W. H., ‘“The Handmill Gives You the Feudal Lord”: Marx’s Technological Determinism’, History and Theory 18 (1979), 155-76
Seminar 7: Weber and his Method
(After lecture on ‘Max Weber: History and Sociology’)

The seminar will explore the case of a profoundly influential (and much disputed) historical thesis produced by a scholar who ‘wasn’t a historian’, paying particular attention to Weber’s ‘historical method’. Historiography themes will be kept in mind: although Jack Goody does not mention Weber in his Theft of History, he is one of the scholars implicated in Goody’s charge that ‘capitalism’ and ‘individualism’ have been conceived of as uniquely Western developments, and thus ‘stolen’ from the history of the rest of the world.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:
Weber, M, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (ed. A. Giddens, London, 1992), Introduction and pp.1-50, 102-125. (This is a very short book, despite appearances: more than half of it consists of the copious notes Weber produced when he turned it from two articles into a book. It is recommended that you read it all.)

Green, A., & Troup, K. (eds), The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-century History and Theory (Manchester, 1999), 110-120 (‘Historical Sociology’)
Kasler, D., Max Weber: An Introduction to His Life and Work (Cambridge, 1988), 174-84
Tawney, R. H., Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (London, 1926). For a critique by a later historian. A particularly relevant footnote has been scanned.

Questions for Seminar:

1. Is Weber’s Protestant Ethic primarily an attack on materialist explanations of historical change?
2. Is Weber’s theory on the causes of capitalism convincing?
3. Is Weber Eurocentric?
4. How have subsequent historians viewed The Protestant Ethic?

More Specialised Studies: Weber and the Sociologists:
Davis, W. M., ““Anti-critical Last Word on The Spirit of Capitalism” by Max Weber’, American Journal of Sociology 83:5 (March 1978), 105-1131
McIntosh, D., ‘The Objective Bases of Max Weber’s Ideal Types’, History & Theory, 16 (1977), 265-279
Mommsen, W. J. & Osterhammel, J. (eds), Max Weber and his Contemporaries (London, 1987), intro. & ch.2
Parkin, F., Max Weber (Chichester, 1982)

More Specialised Studies: Weber and the Historians:
Hughes, H. S., Consciousness and Society: The Reorientation of European Social Thought, 1890-1930 (London, 1959), chs 6 & 8


**Weber and (Some of) His Sources:**


Bunyan, J., *The Pilgrim’s Progress from This World to That Which Is to Come* (1678). (Available in multiple forms; find seventeenth- and eighteenth-century editions in EEBO and ECCO; full text available in LION)


Milton, J., *Paradise Lost* (1667) Available in multiple forms; find seventeenth- and eighteenth-century editions in EEBO and ECCO; full text available in LION
Seminar 8: Walter Benjamin and the Frankfurt School
(After lecture on Benjamin and the Frankfurt School)

The seminar will look at the Frankfurt School and the way its theorists used Marx’s
history and philosophy of history to analyse and explain the rise of mass culture and
new mass social and political forms in the early twentieth century. It will focus in
particular on Walter Benjamin’s ‘Thesis on the Concept of History’.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:
Benjamin, Walter, ‘Theses On the Concept of History’ in Walter Benjamin, Illuminations
(1970), pp. 245-55. Full text available online at:
http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/benjamin/1940/history.htm
Beiner, Ronald, ‘Walter Benjamin's Philosophy of History’, Political Theory, 12:3, August
1984, pp. 423-34.
Löwy, Michael, 'Introduction' to Fire Alarm: Reading Walter Benjamin’s ‘On the Concept of
History’ (London 2005) (pp. 1-16) available through extracts.

Background Seminar Reading:
Eley, G., ‘Marxist Historiography’, in S. Berger, H. Feldner and K. Passmore (eds), Writing
History: Theory and Practice (London, 2003), 63-82
Green, A., & Troup, K. (eds), The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-century
History and Theory (Manchester, 1999), 33-43, 44-58 (‘Marxist Historians’)
Research, 1923-1950 (Boston, 1973)
Lukács, Georg, ‘What is Orthodox Marxism’, in History and Class Consciousness. Studies in
Marxist Dialectics (London, 1971)
http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/work/history/orthodox.htm
Schwartz, Vanessa, ‘Walter Benjamin for Historians,’ The American Historical Review 106: 5
(December 2001): 1721-1743 This article focuses on Benjamin’s Arcades Project rather than
the ‘Theses on the Concept of History’.

Questions for Seminar:
1. How did Frankfurt School scholars develop or deviate from ‘orthodox Marxism’?
2. What is the relationship between structure and agency in Walter Benjamin’s ‘Thesis
on the Concept of History’?
3. What sort of history did Benjamin want to remember, and how and why was it
important for him? What sorts of history-writing did he reject?
4. How does Benjamin view ‘redemption’? Is this rooted in Judaic mysticism, or is there a more
materialist dimension to it?

Further Reading on the Frankfurt School:
Adorno, T. and M. Horkheimer. ‘The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception’,
in Dialectic of Enlightenment (New York, 1972)
Benjamin, W., Illuminations (London 1970). See in particular ‘The Work of Art in the Age of
Mechanical Reproduction’, 211-44
Benjamin, W., One-Way Street (London 1979)


Cohen, M., Profane Illumination: Walter Benjamin and the Paris of Surreal Revolution (Berkeley, 1993)

Eagleton, T., Walter Benjamin: or, Towards a Revolutionary Criticism (London, 1981)


Frisby, D., Fragments of Modernity: Theories of Modernity in the Work of Simmel, Kracauer and Benjamin (Cambridge, 1986)


Kracauer, Siegfried, History: The Last Thing before the Last (1969)


Jay, M., Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas (Berkeley, 1984)


Simmel, G., Simmel on Culture, Selected Writings, eds. D. Frisby and M. Featherstone (London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi, 1997)

Simmel, G., Selections from On Individuality and Social Forms, Selected Writings, ed. D. N. Levine (Chicago, 1971)


Bertrand Taite, Peter Buse, and Scott McCracken, Benjamin's Arcades: An Unguided Tour (Manchester 2006)


Marxists and Marxisms:


Althusser, L. For Marx/Pour Marx, orig. pub 1965 (London, 1990)


Anderson, P., Considerations on Western Marxism (London, 1976)

Boggs, C., The Two Revolutions. Antonio Gramsci and the Dilemmas of Western Marxism (Boston MA, 1984)

Derrida, J., Spectres of Marx. The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and
Elster, J., An Introduction to Karl Marx (Cambridge, 1986)
Giddens, A., Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber (Cambridge, 1971)
Gramsci, A., ‘Our Marx’ (1918), Pre-Prison Writings, ed. R. Bellamy (Cambridge, 1994), 54-58
Jay, M., ‘Further Considerations on Anderson’s Considerations on Western Marxism’, Telos, 32 (Summer 1977): 167-67
Judt, T., Past Imperfect: French Intellectuals (Berkeley, 1992)
McLennan, G., Marxism, Pluralism and Beyond: Classic Debates and New Directions (Cambridge, 1989), esp. Chs. 3 & 4
Miller, R.W., Analyzing Marx: Morality, Power and History (Princeton, 1984)
Parkin, F., Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique (London, 1979)
Perkins, S., Marxism and the Proletariat: A Lukacsian Perspective (London, 1993)
Piccone, P., ‘From Tragedy to Farce: The Return of Critical Theory,’ New German Critique, 7 (Winter 1976)
Poster, M., Existential Marxism in postwar France: From Sartre to Althusser (Princeton, 1975)
Poulantzas, N., Political Power and Social Classes (London, 1973)
Rigby, S., Marxism and History: A Critical Introduction (Manchester, 1987)
Seminar 9: Les Annales: From Bloch to Braudel and Beyond
(After lecture on ‘Les Annales: interdisciplinary histories and ideas of space and time’)

The seminar will consider the development of this influential ‘school’ of historical thought, in France and in the wider world. We can explore in some detail the interaction of historical, anthropological, and sociological paradigms in determining a new way of analysing the past. The way in which these ‘other’ disciplines in the human and social sciences have shaped modern history will be a preoccupation of the Historiography module from now on. So too will be the Annalist historians’ conception of time. Are the ideas of histoire totale, la longue durée, and histoire événementielle at work in other historians’ work you have studied?

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:
Evans, R. J., ‘Cite Ourselves!’, London Review of Books, 31:23 (Dec 2009), 12-14 http://www.lrb.co.uk/v31/n23/richard-j-evans/cite-ourselves

Background Seminar Reading:
Bentley, M., Modern Historiography: An Introduction (London, 1999), 103-115
Green, A., & Troup, K. (eds), The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-century History and Theory (Manchester, 1999), 87-97 (‘The Annales’)
Hughes-Warrington, M., Fifty Key Thinkers on History (London, 2000), ‘Marc Bloch’, ‘Fernand Braudel’

Questions for Seminar:
1. What were Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre against, and what were they for?
2. Is total or holistic history possible or desirable?
3. How do you understand Braudel’s division of time into that of (1) structure – long time (longue durée), (2) conjuncture – medium-term units of decades, and (3) event – short term (histoire événementielle)? What are the advantages and disadvantages of a focus on the longue durée?
4. Why did E. Le Roy Ladurie turn from structuralist history to the history of mentalities, and how useful – if at all – is the study of mentalities for understanding social movements and periods of revolutionary change?
1. General reading on Les Annaリスト:
Carrard, P., *Poetics of the New History: French Historical Discourse from Braudel to Chartier* (Baltimore, 1992)
Iggers, G. G., *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: from Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Middletown, CT, 1997), ch.5

2. Reading for Marc Bloch & Lucien Febvre:
3. Reading for Fernand Braudel:

4. Readings for other Annales historians:
Le Roy Ladurie, E., *The Peasants of Languedoc* (Urbana IL, 1974)
Seminar 10: Thompson: History from Below  
(After lecture on ‘Edward Thompson: Commitment and Culture’)

The historian E. P. Thompson’s work and influence can be considered under many headings: ‘E. P. Thompson and the New Social History … and the cultural turn in historical studies … and anthropology … and Marxism … and labour and people’s history … ’ (and many more). We have chosen to begin discussion of his work and its legacy with the idea of ‘history from below’ because this will allow us to revise the idea of ‘history from above’ (as practised for example, by von Ranke) and to anticipate the emergence of Subaltern Studies in the later twentieth century. With the argument that Thompson was above all ‘a historian of the Cold War era’, we can also revisit the proposition that all historical writing is as much about the cultural and political circumstances it emerges from, as it is about its ostensible subject matter.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:

Background Seminar Reading:

Questions for Seminar:
1. What, in your opinion, were E.P Thompson’s key ideas? How original was he?
2. What, in your opinion, were the main failures and omissions from his history?
3. Did Thompson’s political work make him a better historian?
4. Drawing on what you have studied in your other History modules, discuss whether or not there is still ‘a Thompsonian legacy’? Do you find his ideas useful in your understanding of history?

1. Some Key Works by E. P. Thompson:
Thompson, E. P., Warwick University Ltd. Industry, Management and the Universities (Harmondsworth, 1970)
Thompson, E. P., Writing by Candlelight (London, 1980)

2. Readings on E.P. Thompson:
Hamilton, S., The Crisis of Theory: EP Thompson, the New Left and Postwar British Politics (Manchester 2011)
Iggers, G. G., Historiography in the Twentieth Century: from Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge (Middletown CT, 1997), ch.7
Randall, A., & Charlesworth, A. (eds), Moral Economy and Popular Protest: Crowds, Conflict and Authority (Basingstoke, 2000)
Wrightson, K., English Society, 1580-1680 (London, 2003), 9-16 (Introduction)
3. Some Post-Thompsonian Approaches to the History of Class:
Chakrabarty, D., Rethinking Working-class History. Bengal, 1890-1940 (Princeton NJ, 2000)
Wahrman, D., Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c.1750-1840 (Cambridge, 1995)
Walter, J., Understanding Popular Violence in the English Revolution: The Colchester Plunderers (Cambridge, 1999), ch.7 (esp. 260-84)

4. British Marxism and Communist Historians
Dworkin, D., Cultural Marxism in Postwar Britain: History, the New Left and the Origin of Cultural Studies (Durham NC, 1997)
Hobsbawm, E. J., ‘Where are British Historians Going?’, Marxist Quarterly, 2 (1955), 14-26
Lee, R. E., The Life and Times of Cultural Studies (Durham SC, 2003), 11-34
Long, P., Only in the Common People: The Aesthetics of Class in Post-War Britain (Newcastle, 2008)

5. Women and the Making of Class
(Cambridge, 1990), 78-102; also available in Hall, C., White, Male and Middle Class (Cambridge, 1992)
Kessler-Harris, A., Gendering Labor History (Urbana IL & Chicago, 2007)
Steedman, C., Master and Servant. Love and Labour in the English Industrial Age (Cambridge 2007)

6. The Historian’s Times
Lashmar, P., & Oliver, J., Britain’s Secret Propaganda War 1948-1977 (Stroud, 1998)
Long, P., Only in the Common People. The Aesthetics of Class in Post-War Britain (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2008)
Rowbotham, S., Segal, L., & Wainwright, H., Beyond the Fragments. Feminism and the Making of Socialism (London, 1979)
Saunders, F. S., Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War (London, 1999)
Scott-Smith, G. & Krabbendam, H. (eds), The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe (London, 2005)
Thompson, E. P., Beyond the Cold War (London, 1982)
Seminar 11: Ginzburg: the Uses of Case-study
(After lecture on ‘Ginzburg: Micro-history and the Anthropologists’)

What is micro-history? What kind of methods and perspectives does it involve? Is a micro-history like The Cheese and the Worms a case-study, or ‘just a story’? How do historians using its methods relate their ‘case’ to wider contexts? Do they even try to do that? Is the micro-historian’s approach comparable to that of the anthropologist, working on and representing ‘other’ cultures?

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:

Background Seminar Reading:
Green, A., & Troup, K. (eds), The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-century History and Theory (Manchester, 1999), 172-81 (‘Anthropology and Ethnohistory’)

Questions for Seminar:
1. Why did microhistory come to the fore in the 1970s and 1980s? Was this good for the discipline of history?
2. How do you situate microhistory? Is it essentially local history? Is it really an anthropology of the past? Or, is it more like a work of literature? What is the role of the strong narrative structure of The Cheese and the Worms?
3. Is this essentially a history of mentalities? Is Menocchio really representative of the popular mind of his day?
4. How does microhistory relate to macrohistory? Is it wrong to seek to generalise on the basis of one microhistorical study? Should we even try? Or, should we just celebrate the ‘fragment’?

1. Other Works by Carlo Ginzburg:
Ginzburg, C., *Myths, Emblems, Clues* (London, 1990), 60-76

2. Discussions of Ginzburg’s Work:
Del Col, A., ‘Introduction’, in A. Del Col (ed.), *Domenico Scandella, Known as Mennochio: His Trials Before the Inquisition* (1583-1599), xi-xii
3. History and Anthropology:
Burke, P., *History and Social Theory* (Cambridge, 1992), esp. chs.1 & 4
Walters, R. G., ‘Signs of the Times: Clifford Geertz and Historians’, *Social Research*, 47 (1980), 537-556

4. On Microhistory
Gray, M., ‘Micro-history as Universal History’, *Central European History* 34:3 (2001), 419-31
Iggers, G. G., *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: from Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Middletown CT, 1997), ch.9
Magnusson, S. G., ‘Social History as “Sites of Memory”? The Institutionalisation of History: Micro-history and the Grand Narrative’, *Journal of Social History* 39:3 (2006), 891-913
Muir, E., & Ruggiero, G. (eds), *Sex and Gender in Historical Perspective: Selections from Quaderni Storici* (Baltimore, 1990)

5. On the ‘New Cultural History’ (again):
Burke, P. (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Cambridge, 1991)
Burke, P., *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cambridge, 1997)
LaCapra, D. & Kaplan, S. L. (eds), *Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives* (Ithaca, 1982)
Licht, W., ‘Cultural History/Social History: A Review Essay’, *Historical Methods* 25 (1992), 37-41
Seminar 12: Michel Foucault: Power and Knowledge  
(After lecture on ‘Michel Foucault; Power and Knowledge’)

The French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-1984) has been hugely influential in shaping an understanding of power that no longer centred on actors or underlying structures. Instead he proposed the idea of ‘power is everywhere’, diffused and embodied in discourse, knowledge and ‘regimes of truth’. The lecture and seminar introduces us to Foucault’s ‘revolutionary’ ideas, concepts, methods, which have deeply influenced history-writing over the last three decades.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:

Background Seminar Reading:
Hughes-Warrington, M., *Fifty Key Thinkers on History* (London, 2008), 107-16
Stunkel, K., *Fifty Key Works of History and Historiography* (Abingdon, 2011), 263-267

Questions for Seminar:
1. How, according to Foucault, did disciplinary regimes differ in feudal and bourgeois societies? Besides regimes of punishment, what other types of institutions may historians apply his ideas to?
2. How useful to historians is the Foucauldian insight that ‘knowledge is power’?
3. What value did twentieth-century feminism find in Foucault’s work?
4. Why was ‘the body’ such an important theme in Foucault’s work?

1. Works by Foucault (incl. posthumous publications):


Foucault, M., Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-77, ed. C. Gordon (Brighton, 1980)

Foucault, M., The Foucault Reader, ed. P. Rabinow (Harmondsworth, 1984)

Foucault, M., Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-84 ed. L. Kritzman (London, 1988)

Foucault, M., Foucault Live (Interviews 1966-84), ed. S. Lotringer (New York, 1989)


2. Works on Foucault, and Discussions of His Work:

Bernauer, J. & Rasmussen, D. (eds), The Final Foucault (Cambridge MA, 1988)


Burke, P. (ed.), Critical Essays on Michel Foucault (Aldershot, 1992)


Diamond, I., & Quinby, L. (eds), Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance (Boston, 1988)

Fine, R., 'Struggles against Discipline: The Theory and Politics of Michel Foucault', Capital and Class, 9 (1979), 75-96


Poster, M., Foucault, Marxism and History: Modes of Production, Modes of Information (Cambridge, 1984)

Rousseau, G. S., 'Whose Enlightenment? Not Man’s. The Case of Michel Foucault', Eighteenth-Century Studies, 6:2 (1972), 238-56


Strozier, R. M., Foucault, Subjectivity, and Identity. Historical Constructions of Subject and Self (Detroit, 2002)


3. The Subject of Michel Foucault


Dreyfus, H. L. & Rabinow, P. (eds), Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics (Chicago, 1982), esp. 208-226
Miller, J., *The Passion of Michel Foucault* (New York, 1999)

4. Foucault and the Feminists
Seminar 13: The Idea of Orientalism

(After lecture on ‘Edward Said: Orientalism’)

One way of looking at literary scholar Edward Said’s most resonant work is as a history of ideas. Orientalism proposes that the nineteenth-century Western conceptions of ‘the Orient’ had long-lasting social and political effects. Certainly, in the late twentieth century, Said’s proposals were used to illuminate Foucault’s thesis about the ‘power/knowledge couplet’; in 1995 Said himself agreed that ‘no more glaring parallel exists between power and knowledge … than in the case of Orientalism. Much of the information and knowledge about Islam and the Orient that was used by the colonial powers to justify their colonialism derived from Orientalist scholarship’.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:

Background Seminar Reading:
Claus, P., and J. Marriott, History: An Introduction to Theory, Method and Practice (Harlow, 2012), 98-102
Green, A., & Troup, K. (eds), The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory (Manchester, 1999), 277-87 (‘Postcolonialism’)
Stunkel, K., Fifty Key Works of History and Historiography (Abingdon, 2011), 256-262.

Questions for Seminar:
1. Is the opposition between ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ in Said’s work a helpful model for historical analysis?
2. Does Said overemphasise the power of colonial knowledge, as against military might, in maintaining colonial rule?
3. Did Said adequately acknowledge (1) the differences ways in which European expansion was experienced by various Asian peoples, and (2) the diverse reactions of Europeans to the East?
4. Has Said’s work had any real impact on American culture and its foreign policy?

1. On ‘Orientalism’:
Bhaba, H., The Location of Culture (London, 1994)
Heehs, P., ‘Shades of Orientalism: Paradoxes and Problems in Indian Historiography’, History & Theory 42 (2003), 169-95
Inden, R., Imagining India (Oxford, 1990)
Sardar, Z., *Orientalism* (Buckingham, 1999)
Spanos, W.V., *The Legacy of Edward Said* (Urbana-Champaign IL, 2009)

2. **On Hegemony and Alterity (the ‘Other’, ‘Otherness’)**
   

3. **The Reception of Edward Said: From Early Reviews of Orientalism to the Present**
   
Seminar 14: Ranajit Guha and Subaltern Studies
(After lecture on ‘Ranjait Guha and Subaltern Studies’)

Emerging from the study of Indian history, *Subaltern Studies* established its own distinctive methodology that deployed Gramsci’s notion of ‘the subaltern’ (meaning all those who are subordinated) to include other oppressed groups besides the working classes, notably the peasantry and indigenous peoples, within their political analysis. The domain of politics was seen to be divided into an elite and subaltern sphere, with the two interacting but maintaining their own integrity. Mechanical and economistic Marxism was rejected, with culture and religion being seen as crucial to any understanding of the subaltern. The project was subjected to harsh criticism by Indian nationalists, mainstream Indian Marxists and many British historians, but embraced with enthusiasm by the New Left, dissident Indian Marxists, and numerous historians outside Britain – particularly in the USA and Latin America. (Note: the 12 volumes of *Subaltern Studies* are kept in the library as a journal in Social Science Periodicals section).

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources
Ranajit Guha, ‘The Prose of Counter-Insurgency’, in Ranajit Guha (ed.), *Subaltern Studies II* (New Delhi 1983), 1-42. Examines how historical narratives were constructed by colonial officials, in the process building an account of popular insurrection that accorded with the ideological needs of the colonial state in India.

Background Seminar Reading:
Guha, R., ‘The Small Voice of History’, in Shahid Amin and Dipesh Chakrabarty (eds.), *Subaltern Studies IX* (New Delhi, 1996), 1-12. Guha examines the histories that are ignored in what he calls ‘statist’ history, which, in his words, ‘authorises the dominant values of the state to determine the criteria of the historic’.

Questions for Seminar:
1. To what extent was *Subaltern Studies* merely a new form of ‘history from below’? What – if anything – was original about it?
2. Is there too much focus in *Subaltern Studies* on insurgency and protest, at the expense of an analysis of the everyday life of the subaltern?
3. To what extent is it possible to hear the voice of the subaltern?
4. Examine the strategies that historians might adopt in writing subaltern histories.
**Works by Ranajit Guha**

Guha, R., *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India* (New Delhi 1983)

Guha, R., ‘Chandra’s Death’, in *Subaltern Studies V* (New Delhi 1987), 135-65

Guha, R., *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India* (Cambridge Mass., 1997), Ch. 3


Guha, R., *An Indian Historiography of India: A Nineteenth-century Agenda and its Implications* (Calcutta, 1988)

Guha, R., *History at the Limits of World-History* (New Delhi 2003)


**Commentaries on Subaltern Studies**

Chakrabarty, D., ‘Invitation to a Dialogue’, *Subaltern Studies IV* (New Delhi, 1985), 364-376


Prakash, P., ‘Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 32:2, April 1990


Seminar 15: Walkowitz: Men, Women and the Writing of History
(After lecture on ‘Walkowitz: From Sex to Gender (from Society to Culture)’)

Some of the introductory readings for the first seminar in this Handbook will be useful here as we consider Judith Walkowitz as an example of a historian taking many of the ‘turns’ available at the end of the twentieth-century. Following the trajectory of her research and writing between 1980 and 1992 alerts us to many other historians who moved from women’s history to gender history, from social history to cultural history … in the same period.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:

Background Seminar Reading:
Editorial Collective, ‘Why Gender and History?’, Gender and History, 1:1 (1989), 1-12
Green, A., & Troup, K. (eds), The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-century History and Theory (Manchester, 1999), 253-62 (‘Gender and History’)

Questions for Seminar:
1. What was the impact of post-1960s feminism on the practice of social history?
3. What was ‘the linguistic turn’? Did Walkowitz take this turn?
4. How and why did the shift to ‘gender’ studies occur? What are the implications for the historian’s work of the view that gender identities are inherently unstable?

On Gender History:
Bailey, J., 'Is the Rise of Gender History "hiding" Women from History Once Again?’, History in Focus, 8 (2005). http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Gender/articles.html
Berg, M., A Woman in History: Eileen Power, 1889-1940 (Cambridge, 1996)

2. Sexuality, Class and Power:

3. Gender, Place, and Modernity:
Bailey, P., ‘Parasexuality and Glamour: The Victorian Barmaid as Cultural Prototype’, *Gender and History* 2 (1990), 148-72
de Grazia, V. (ed.), *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective* (Berkeley, 1996)
Seminar 16: Postmodernism: A Serious Challenge to History?
(After lecture on ‘History and the Postmodern Turn’)

Over a decade into the new century, it is sometimes difficult to see what fired the fierce arguments about postmodernism and history – or in Kenneth Winschutte’s hyperbolic charge of 1996: The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists are Murdering our Past (see below). To get a measure of the argument, read Richard Evans and his critics (and supporters) on the Making History website. Then (to go back to the beginning of the module) consider what the ‘History’ being challenged or defended actually is (or was). One thing we must all surely have learned by now, is that ‘History’ is not one, but many; and that Historiography is an account of those multiple ways of representing the past.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources:
Evans, R. J., ‘In Defence of History: Reply to Critics (Version 4)’. IHR ONLINE: Making History http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Whatishistory/evans.html

Background Seminar Reading:
Green, A., & Troup, K. (eds), The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory (Manchester, 1999), 297-307 (‘The Challenge of Poststructuralism and Postmodernism’)
Hughes-Warrington, M, Fifty Key Thinkers on History (Abingdon, 2008), Ch. on Hayden White, 388-95
Lyotard, Jean-François, The Postmodern Condition: a Report on Knowledge (Manchester 1984)
Stunkel, K, Fifty Key Works of History and Historiography (Abingdon, 2011), Ch. 49 is an extract from Hayden White, Metahistory, 272-76.

Questions for Seminar:
1. Is it true that we can never grasp the material reality of the past, only read texts from the past that create their own reality-effect?
2. Does postmodernism, with its insistence that texts have no fixed meaning and its attack on the Western rationalist tradition, help such things as Holocaust denial, as Richard Evans argues?
3. Jean-François Lyotard has defined postmodernism as the refusal to accept metanarratives on their own terms. All that we have are various stories that are told by people about themselves. Claims to universal truths are oppressive, totalising and must be resisted. What is a ‘metanarrative’? What does Lyotard’s argument imply for the discipline of history?
4. Is the humanist belief that people create their own history through their own willed action now unsustainable?

1. General


Ermarto, E. *Ethics and Method, History and Theory*, Theme Issue 43 (December 2004), 61-83


Joyce, P., ‘The End of Social History?: A Brief Reply to Eley and Nield’, *Social History*, 21 (1996), 96-98

Joyce, P., ‘The End of Social History?: The Imaginary Discontents of Social History: A Note of Response to Mayfield and Thorne and Lawrence and Taylor’, *Social History*, 18 (1993), 81-85


3. General on Postmodernism and Post-modernity:

4. Historians engage in battle (Critiques of a ‘Postmodern History’):
Mayfield, D., & Thorne, S., ‘Social History and its Discontents: Gareth Stedman Jones and the Politics of Language’, *Social History* 17 (1992), 165-82
Mayfield, D., & Thorne, S., ‘Reply to “The Poverty of Protest” and “The Imaginary Discontents”’, *Social History* 18 (1993), 219-33
Windschuttle, K., *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists are Murdering our Past* (New York, 1996)

5. Other (Older) Linguistic Turns
Seminar 17: Provincialising and Reinventing China
(After lecture on Provincialising History: on Chinese Historiography)

To ‘provincialise’ Western historiography would involve many historians standing and looking from elsewhere, from somewhere outside the central historical discourse of the West. It would be to make the societies that were formerly the object of Western historians’ study, their own Subject. Is this what Edward Said’s Orientalism paved the way for, in the 1970s? And whether the answer to that question if ‘yes’, or ‘no’, is it desirable for a Western historian to do this? Is it possible to stand outside your own historical circumstances in writing the history of ‘somewhere else’? The historiography of China is examined as a case study.

Texts/Documents/Arguments/Sources
Chakrabarty, D., Provincialising Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference (Princeton NJ, 2000), 3-23

Background Seminar Reading:
Dietze, C., ‘Forum: Provincializing Europe I: Towards a History on Equal Terms …’, History and Theory, 47 (2008), 69-84
Melman, B., Women’s Orients: English Women and the Middle East, 1718-1918: Sexuality, Religion, Work (Basingstoke, 1983)
Turner, B. S., Orientalism, Postmodernism and Globalisation (London, 1994)

Questions for Seminar:
1. Chakrabarty argues that the West is the subject of post-Enlightenment history. What does he mean by this?
2. Can a Westerner write a postcolonial history of a people who were once colonised? Is this a form of cultural theft? It is argued by some subjugated and oppressed people, e.g. Native Americans, that historians working in elite institutions (e.g. universities) build their careers by writing their histories, which merely perpetuates colonialism. Is this argument justified?
3. How has Chinese (or Indian, or African, or Latin American) history-writing in the twentieth century related to European (and mainstream North American) history-writing? Examine one region of the non-Europeans and North American world.
4. Given that many people all over the world continue to explain historical causation in terms of religion and the supernatural, how should a secular historian deal with such beliefs? Should they be seen merely as a form of false consciousness?

‘Other’ Historiographies? Or, China at the Centre of Chinese Historical Thinking?
Huaiyin Li, Reinventing Modern China: Imagination and Authenticity in Chinese Historical Writing (University of Hawaii Press, 2013).
Rüsen, J., (ed.) Western Historical Thinking: an Intercultural Debate (New York, 2002)
http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/reith2008/
Seminar 18: Answering Part B exam questions
(Following lecture on ‘The Historical Enterprise within Society: Theory and Method’)

This seminar is designed to focus your attention on Part B questions of the examination paper. Some of the main categories of question that come up in one form or another are listed below. You should look also at past Historiography examination papers to get a feel for the way such questions are posed. You are advised to come to the seminar having thought about and prepared something to say about at least two of these questions. It is a good idea for the seminar tutor to allocate topics in the previous week, so that they can all be covered.

There is no reading-list as such for this seminar, though hints are given in some of the categories set out below. Many of these sorts of questions are discussed in passing in the general surveys listed at the start of the handbook.

Some broad areas:
(These are not definitive – for other possible themes see the list of Part B questions at the end of the handbook.)

- The building blocks of history. What constitutes historical ‘evidence’? Do you agree with Carr’s definition of a historical ‘fact’? (see What is History, Ch.1). How have other historians treated their evidence? (e.g. look at Ranajit Guha, ‘the Prose of Counter-Insurgency’.)
- The place of history within the world of scholarly enquiry. Is History a ‘science’? How does R.G. Collingwood understand this question in Ch.1 of The Idea of History and E.H. Carr in Ch. 3 of What is History? What connotations does ‘science’ have in English? Does this differ from the German understanding, and is the difference important? (See discussion of Ranke’s use of the term here.) Is history – rather – an art, or a branch of literature?
- Historical time. How does our choice of periodization and focus on particular themes relate to notions of historical time?
- Relationship between history and society. How do we situate history as a discipline? What is the social function of the historian? How should history be taught? Is a ‘historian’ necessarily a professional person? Or, can others be ‘historians’? Role of TV history etc.? How have historians related to their society and times? Do we have any expectations of historians in this respect?
- Some major approaches and their impact. These include the Enlightenment, Marxism, Gender Studies, Postcolonialism, and Postmodernism. How exactly has each of these impacted on the way we write history?
Essay/written assignment titles:
(Seminar questions may also be adapted for short essays. You are expected to do at least one Part-B style question as a non-assessed essay during the course of the year.)

Part A-style questions
1. What was the impact of the Enlightenment on History-writing in Europe?
2. Would James Mill have written a better history of India if he had known Indian languages?
3. Describe historical thinking in colonial era India.
4. Assess the significance of style in Ranke’s historical writing.
5. If Ranke ‘rejected Sir Walter Scott’, what was he rejecting?
6. Was Leopold von Ranke a Romantic?
8. Describe Igers’ and Wang’s ‘history of Leopold von Ranke in the world’. Account for any deficiencies in their argument.
9. What did Karl Marx mean when he asserted that ‘the social revolution of the nineteenth century can only create its poetry from the future, not from the past’? (Eighteenth Brumaire, Section 1).
10. How was The Eighteenth Brumaire revisited on its 150th birthday?
11. ‘Where Hegel started with philosophy, Marx started with people’s experiences’. Discuss.
12. ‘Simplicity supplies the key to the secret of the unchangeableness of Asiatic societies’ (Marx, Capital, Vol.1, xiv, s. 4). How typical was Marx’s historiography of India?
13. Discuss the ‘Marxism’ of any twentieth-century historian or theorist of history [state the person clearly in the title].
14. Why is Walter Benjamin’s ‘On the Concept of History’ still regarded as an important text?
15. Can Walter Benjamin’s understanding of History be described as Marxist?
16. What is a historical fact?
17. What is class consciousness?
18. Why are there so many literary texts in Max Weber’s The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism?
19. Is history a social science?
20. How did Weber approach the problem of causation in history?
21. Do all historians proceed by constructing ideal-types?
22. ‘Only in the West does science exist at a stage of development which we today recognise as valid’ (Max Weber). Discuss.
23. ‘The science of men in time’ is how Marc Bloch described the practice of history. What did he mean?
24. ‘With their examination of mentalité the Annalist historians furnished the historical profession with a new mode of reconstructing the past’. Discuss.
25. ‘It is undeniable that a science [like the historical science] will always seem to us somehow incomplete if it cannot, sooner or later, in one way or another, aid us to live better’. (Bloch, Historian’s Craft) Discuss Bloch’s view of the historical enterprise within society.
26. There are many English-language educational and media websites devoted to the work of Annales historians. Make a selection of them, and give an account of the ways in which a twentieth-century ‘historical school’ is presented to twenty-first century reading publics.
27. *The Making of the English Working Class* has come to be seen as the single most influential work of English history of the post-war period (John Rule, DNB entry for E. P. Thompson). Why?

28. Drawing on the resources of advanced options and special subjects, discuss whether or not there is still ‘a Thompsonian legacy’ in historical studies.

29. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of micro-history.

30. Discuss any historical case-study you have read. Is the case-study approach the same as the micro-historical approach?

31. What was cultural about ‘the New Cultural History’?

32. What was new and disturbing about the theory of Power outlined in Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish*?

33. Why did Foucault find such a warm reception among (some) feminist historians and social scientists?

34. ‘A challenge to the conventional Western interpretation of the non-Western world’. Is this an adequate description of the impact of Said’s work on historical scholarship?

35. Describe ‘the reception of Edward Said’ by historians and others.

36. What – if anything – was original about *Subaltern Studies*?

37. To what extent is it possible to hear the voice of the subaltern?

38. What have been the defining characteristics to Chinese (or any other non-Western society’s) historical thinking?

39. ‘It is now men (and masculinity) that are truly hidden from history’. Discuss.

40. Discuss the view that Judy Walkowitz’s *City of Dreadful Delight* is ‘about stories, not about history’.

**Part B-style questions**

(note: you should answer such questions comparatively, not focusing on just one historian or thinker.)

1. Why study historiography?
2. What is a ‘historian’?
3. Is history a ‘science’?
4. History is closer to literature than to science.” Discuss.
5. Is History primarily about the past or the present?
6. What are the implications of E. H. Carr's claim that ‘only the future can provide the key to the interpretation of the past’?
7. Is total or holistic history possible or desirable?
8. Describe and discuss the historical enterprise of any one society, past or present, that you have studied during your degree course.
9. What counts as a historical source?
10. Is there any difference between a historical ‘fact’ and historical ‘evidence’?
11. ‘The idea of what is considered “valid historical evidence” has changed considerably over the past two centuries.’ Discuss.
12. ‘The science of men in time’ is how Marc Bloch characterised history. What did he mean? Introduce other historians’ conceptions of time in answering this question.
13. ‘The writing of history tells us more about the historian than about the past.’ Do you agree?
14. ‘“Time” has no agreed meaning for historians.’ Discuss.
15. ‘History from below invariably romanticises popular culture.’ Discuss.
16. Is history, as it is written, inevitably relativistic?
17. Is it true, as George Orwell claimed, that those with power in the present control the past?
18. Has history ended, as Francis Fukuyama claimed?
19. Can the writing of history be politically neutral?
20. Does political history have a future?
21. How and why has cultural history become so important?
22. ‘Modern history can only be conceived in relationship to the nation state’. Discuss.
23. ‘Since the early nineteenth century, historians have been engaged in a continuing debate with the heritage of the Enlightenment.’ Discuss.
24. How should history be taught in schools?
25. Why should governments fund historical research?
26. What is the value of popular history? (You may answer this in terms of television history, film or drama.)
27. Why has family history become so popular in modern Britain?
28. Why was Marxist theory central to twentieth-century historical scholarship?
29. Has the historical writing influenced by Marx been good history?
30. ‘Postcolonialism forces us to re-evaluate the whole history of Britain in modern times.’ Discuss.
31. How important has the history of the non-Western world been to the shaping of Western historiography?
32. How can global history meaningfully be studied?
33. Are postmodernist views of history plausible?
34. Was postmodernism a serious ‘challenge to history’ in the late twentieth century?
35. Has the linguistic turn produced good history writing?

Seminar 19: Revision Seminar I

Following the Panel Session. There is no required reading for the panel discussion/seminar. The seminar will focus on specific themes students wish to revise and re-discuss.

Seminar 20: Revision Seminar II

Following the Revision lecture. The lecture will pick up themes and questions, asked during the Panel discussion. No new readings are required for the seminar but it is strongly suggested that students come prepared with their own questions regarding the material read during the course of the module.