

Contents

<i>Author's Note</i>	ix
1 A History Essay is History	1
The practice of history is a craft	2
History is also an art	2
A history essay is history	3
2 A History Essay is Academic, is an Essay, is Literature	13
A history essay is academic writing	13
A history essay is an essay	16
A history essay is literature	19
3 The History Essay as a Process	22
History begins with a question ...	22
... and proceeds to an answer	23
Approaching the writing of an essay	25
Studying history as independent learning	31
4 Knowing your Sources	33
Types of source	33
Exploiting primary sources	36
Exploiting secondary and tertiary sources	37
The Internet	39
First and last things to read	41

5	Reading Critically	43
	Reading for information and reading for ideas	43
	The problem of authority	44
	Distinguishing between factual evidence and judgment or opinion	45
	Prejudice and bias	48
6	Explanation and Judgment	56
	What counts as explanation?	56
	Minimum reasonable assumptions	60
	Anachronistic standards of judgment	63
	Historical imagination	66
	Judgment and relativism	66
7	Noting What you Read	68
	Do not copy out verbatim from books	69
	When to write out quotations	69
	Common-sense guidelines	70
	Note-taking examples	71
8	Planning	75
	Deciding on essentials	75
	The cycle of argument	76
	The introduction	76
	The plan of attack	79
	Choosing the evidence to put in	82
	The logic of your argument	84
	The conclusion	85
9	Writing and Independent Thought	86
	Identifying plagiarism	89
	Avoiding plagiarism by offering independent thought	90
	Paraphrase in presenting factual evidence	90
	Good and bad use of what you read: a longer example	92

10	Drafting Your Essay	95
	Every sentence gives a signal	95
	Make sure that the logical structure is plain	97
	Avoiding tendentious language in your writing	97
	Quotations	98
	Writing the conclusion	100
	Matching words to ideas	101
11	Documenting Your Essay	105
	Citations	105
	Giving references	107
	'In-text' citation systems	108
	Footnotes	111
	What sort of documentation style suits history?	117
	Text in footnotes	118
	Good and bad footnoting	120
	Bibliography	120
	The importance of citation	122
12	Revision and Correction	123
	Some principles of revision	123
	Layout and presentation	124
	A check-list of revision points	126
	A proof-reading exercise	127
	Benefiting from conferring about corrections	129
	Common errors	130
13	Beyond the History Essay	132
	Document criticism	132
	Book reviews	135
	The literature review or critical historiographic essay	137
	Seminar introduction papers	138
	Reports	139
	Examination answers	139

14	The Importance of Good English Expression	143
	Accuracy of English expression	144
	Punctuation	144
	Italics	148
	Spelling	148
	Grammar	148
	Handling quotations	151
	Style	152
	<i>Notes</i>	156
	Appendix A Note on Historiography	158
	<i>References</i>	164
	<i>Glossary</i>	165
	<i>Index</i>	169

1 A History Essay is History

Now, what I want is, Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else.¹

I took the book list and the essay title, found the Radcliffe Camera [a library building at the University of Oxford at the time], began to read and perceived that I had been entirely misled for six years: history is fact only up to a point – more crucially, it is a matter of debate and conflicting evidence. It was like some kind of divine revelation: I went into the Camera a heathen and came out converted, but thought little of it, settling effortlessly into a new understanding, which is something that you can do at 18.²

History is, frankly, the most humane of subjects. The discipline of trying to understand the past and the character of change isn't narrowly vocational – it provides an intensive training in critical thinking and communication, a portfolio of skills and sensitivities that can be applied to any walk of life.³

The first of these quotations contains the famous words introducing Dickens' novel *Hard Times*, spoken by a man who believes that only facts matter. This belief is rejected by the novelist Penelope Lively in the second quotation; for her, history is fact only up to a point. Real history is 'debate and conflicting evidence'. That is the revelation which inspired her when she began her university study.

This does not mean that facts are unimportant. Historians love facts; they dedicate themselves to the pursuit of them; they go through every manner of hardship tracing facts across all terrains and in all weathers. The mistake they do not make is to suppose that facts are easily found, and, when found, perceived to be clear and certain, as if made of stone. On the contrary, historical facts are remarkably elusive and commonly retreat into the undergrowth, leaving only ambiguous traces which require skill to interpret. They are real, but the evidence by which they may come to be known can never be exhaustively ascertained; we can never completely know them.

It is in the experience of working on history essays that the student is brought most directly into a vivid and dynamic confrontation with 'debate and conflicting evidence'. This is why writing essays is so important; it fosters 'the training in critical thinking and communication' emphasized by Rees Davies.

► The practice of history is a craft

The intention of this book is to provide practical advice on the study and writing of history. This is an active process. It is not a matter simply of learning facts and writing them down. It is a matter of engaging with the process of debate and analysing the conflicting evidence. To engage in history is to manipulate ideas and interpretations, to test and analyse, to apply techniques, to acquire skill. You learn with your muscles, rather than with your eyes – that is, by doing, not just by seeing. You find out what history is by putting it into practice. It is a craft.

So the chief focus will be on active processes in which techniques are developed, primarily on the work that goes into an essay – reading for it, planning it, drafting it, revising it, and then benefiting from the experience so that you can do even better next time. It is a series of purposeful activities which can be learned by experience and careful practice, just as one learns a craft.

There is no substitute for experience, and the real learning process must take place in the courses of study along with which this book may be used. What is offered here is advice about the techniques which are to be applied and the reasons for them; the practical application, and the consequent learning experience, are up to you.

► History is also an art

These remarks may suggest that historical study follows a set of rules; but this needs to be qualified. Many practical skills are learned chiefly by applying sequences of mechanical operations, and success is a matter of following rules; but no set of rules can by itself guarantee success in historical study and writing. At every point, you must adapt the advice given here to practical experience. Initiative and imagination are essential qualities.

Anything in the following pages may sometimes be modified or even discarded by a teacher in the light of the needs of a particular course of study. The teacher reads his⁴ students' essays hoping to find in them evidence that their writers have a sensitive understanding of what they have read and an ability to respond critically, economically and elegantly to that understanding. The literal-minded observance of rules about essay-writing is an obstacle to the nurturing of these qualities. An essay is not a routine set of procedures like the prescribed standard tasks that must be performed by a pilot when he takes his craft into the air. It is supposed to show originality and independence: it is unique. It requires your own critical thought, responding sensitively to the nuances of the sources you have read, seeing connections between facts and ideas even when they are not explicitly spelled out, homing in on the essentials of a problem, sometimes coming up with a surprisingly new and interesting way of looking at it.

In the section below on History as one of the liberal arts or Humanities, it will be stressed that such study is of things that do not lend themselves to precise measurement. Thus, nothing that follows here is to be treated as a rule that will make it impossible to go wrong. Nevertheless, the sorts of guidelines that are offered in this book can have a useful part to play. It all depends upon how they are understood. They should function as a support, like a crutch that serves until a leg is strong, allowing an intuitive and independent sense of the requirements of the craft to develop in its own time.

If the only advice given to you were that you should cultivate originality and independent thought, you might be left wondering what to do about the nuts-and-bolts problems of writing essays. Why is it so difficult to decide where to start? How much factual information is required? When is a footnote needed and when is it not? How do you know when you have written enough? Such questions need answers. There is a place for guidelines or rules of thumb designed to help steer you through the problems of historical study.

So perhaps this is the right place to emphasize that all the paraphernalia of technical detail that appears on the pages below is not to be regarded as a set of iron rules. In a few years, you may have forgotten all the details, but still be able to write good history essays. The points made below are essentially suggestions, and the purpose of them is just to help you obtain a sense of the principles that guide the writing of a history essay. In the end, the crutches can be thrown away and you can step out, remembering just the essential fact that the essay is the place where you write what you think about the subject. By then, many of the technical details of the planning and writing will seem simply obvious, not a matter of applying rules.

► A history essay is history

Why should there need to be a manual for study and writing in history, as distinct from English literature or philosophy or any other branch of the humanities?²⁵ Study, after all, is study, and good methods that work for one subject ought to work for another.

This is true, and on one level it can well be said that what makes any essay good is the quality of the thought behind it, rather than its success in applying the rules of history or any other discipline. However, it often happens that techniques of essay-writing that seemed to earn high marks in one department attract constant criticisms in another.

So what is special and particular about History? This ought to be an easy question, but in fact historians all say different things about the essential nature of their own discipline. Historians, like any other human group, develop their own working culture with its assumptions that, simply because they are assumptions, do not have to be talked about and come to be taken unquestioningly for

granted. The newcomer to the group needs to find out what these assumptions are, and may be frustrated by the difficulty of obtaining fully satisfactory answers to practical questions ('How do I avoid plagiarism?' 'Do I have to give evidence for this statement?'). Historians, anxious to share with students their own intellectual delight in advanced new approaches, may overlook the students' problems with the basics, and hurry them on to the frontiers of research. Explaining rudiments that one learned many years ago may prove unexpectedly difficult.

It is one thing to carry out operations automatically and instinctively; it is another to analyse and explain those same operations. The famous verse about the centipede encapsulates this difficulty:

A centipede was happy quite,
Until a toad in fun
Said 'Pray which leg moves after which?'
And worked her mind to such a pitch,
She lay distracted in the ditch
Considering how to run.⁶

Defining history

So when historians try to explain what history is, they offer many different theories. There is a great deal of writing on the subject, including debates about whether history can hope to find 'truth', and many other more or less philosophical issues. These discussions are important, but they are not the same thing as the basic rudiments of the subject; they are advanced theoretical speculation.

What is it that history really does? For a start, here are some paragraphs all on the same topic – the nature of Machiavelli's political philosophy, which recommends to a ruler a devious and cynical approach to government. Quite conceivably, a historian might write any one of these passages, but just one of them is basically historical in treatment; the others could belong to other disciplines. None is supposed to be better than the others, or even good – they are designed to illustrate different approaches, not superior technique. Which is the most historical one, and what makes it historical?

1. Like the Indian political philosopher Kautilya centuries before, Machiavelli realized that neighbouring states are automatically potential enemies. As a principle of statecraft, this logically entails that the interest of the state's survival outweighs those of the individuals within it, and justifies whatever measures are necessary to secure that interest. Whether we like *The Prince* or not, we have to accept that Machiavelli's political philosophy is grounded in scientific observation.

2. The importance of childhood influences upon Machiavelli's thought is undeniable, but unfortunately the available information is inadequate to analyse properly the links between his own unique experiences and the values and purposes displayed by his adult thinking. What is more easily overlooked, though, is the effect of being held prisoner and tortured. Studies of the psychology of stress show how periods of trauma can subsequently determine deep-seated attitudes, even unacknowledged ones, which can permeate an individual's whole construction of reality. Machiavelli's views of politics were inevitably influenced by his experience of imprisonment at the hands of the Medici.
3. The propositions of Machiavelli enable us to recognize clearly certain ethical dilemmas. A consequentialist theory will hold that the value of an action is determined by what happens as a result of it; if a ruler's policies lead to the killing of innocent people but nevertheless bring a war to a rapid end, the total of harm done may then be less than if no such policy had been followed, and justify it. A categorical principle of action, on the other hand, will forbid certain actions such as the taking of innocent lives regardless of the hypothetical later consequences, and Machiavelli stands condemned. Other systems attend to what is in the mind of the perpetrator of a deed. Benevolent intentions, put into effect without culpable negligence or incompetence, can be adequate justification.
4. It is conceivable that, if France and Spain had been super-powers holding each other to ransom with nuclear weapons, conflict in Italy would have been tamed and contained by powerful kingdoms holding their small client states in check from the fear of mutual assured destruction, and Machiavelli would have lived in a more peaceful world governed by different rules of political behaviour. As it was, the small and prosperous states of northern Italy were natural prey for the armies of bigger kingdoms; the area was a cockpit of unprincipled competition, constantly disrupted by capricious outside interference. No local state could hope to work for a secure and principled system of international relations. This is the environment which shaped Machiavelli's perceptions.

What we need to recognize here is that the four different comments represent four different approaches to the study of Machiavelli, showing the methods and assumptions of four different academic disciplines. Just one of them places itself squarely within the domain of historical study.

The first one treats him as a contributor to the philosophy or science of politics, discussing his views within a range of theoretical ideas about international politics. Whether or not it is a good contribution, the paragraph places itself basically within the area of political science.

Paragraph (2), by contrast, focuses narrowly upon what went on inside Machiavelli. A historian might do this, but the paragraph appeals to psychological studies which relate severe stress to behaviour; it is thus basically psychology.

Paragraph (3) is on the other hand not about the way in which Machiavelli came to have his ideas (either by perceiving correctly the way things worked, or by having had certain experiences); it takes the ideas as given and considers whether they are good or bad. It thus identifies itself as moral philosophy.

We are left with paragraph (4), which accounts for Machiavelli's ideas by picking out what seems important in his historical environment. We can imagine a historian writing paragraph (1), applying broad theoretical ideas about political relations, but (4) shows the most clearly historical approach because it seeks to explain particular things (in this case, Machiavelli's ideas) within their own context. Historians start with the particular environment of the object of study. Essentially, they are concerned to understand the ways in which something reflects the influences of whatever is going on or has been going on in its own context, no matter how broad or narrow.

Thus, history begins with the questions about the particular – a book, an idea, a person, a series of events, anything identifiable through historical sources. The historian examines it in its context, in the environment in which it existed, and in pursuit of understanding may broaden the context to include anything at all that might be relevant.

Now, the pursuit of understanding by broadening the context may lead to various sorts of theories requiring attention to things happening in distant times and places. If our study of Machiavelli's life and times leads us to think that the experience of being tortured substantially affected his ideas, we may want to look at the effects of torture upon people even in very much later or earlier times, and we shall move into psychological theory. If our study leads us to think that Machiavelli's judgments about international politics are insights into what happens in real life generally, we may want to place these judgments in the context of political theory, with reference even to ancient Indian writers like Kautilya, or to modern states, and we shall move into political science.

Any sort of claim to have acquired understanding by reference to something in the context implies *some* sort of theory about the ways in which environments can influence things that happen in them, but some theories belong to established branches of study, such as psychology or political science, and historians sometimes explore them in order to advance their understanding of what they are studying. There are always dangers in entering a scholarly discipline in which one has not been formally trained, but some historians manage the transition very successfully.

None of this should, however, mask the fact that history starts from the close examination of particular objects of study, seeking understanding of them within their own contexts, and picking out whatever appears significant.

This lays the groundwork for the task of defining history. Let us quickly identify three stages:

Definition 1. History is the past.

This is true, but it is not immediately helpful, except in reminding us that there is an essential ambiguity in the word 'history'. What we are looking for in order to compare history with anthropology, music, linguistics and so forth is a definition of a type of study. Sometimes the word history refers to the past; sometimes it refers to the study of it.

Definition 2. History is the study of the past.

The problem with this is that, in a sense, almost any sort of study could be described in the same way. Anything whatsoever that happens becomes past as soon as it has happened. To utter words about some observed phenomenon is necessarily to speak of something in the past. Literature is past words. Observations of stars are observations of past events (often long past). Anthropologists may use the 'ethnographic present' tense in their writing, but for all that they are describing systems of thought and behaviour which are known only as having existed in the past and which are all too likely – it is a lively methodological problem in the discipline – to be changing now.

What we need must be something like this:

Definition 3. History is the study of the past through the critical appraisal of recorded words.

There is certainly an objection to this definition. Historians often study the past through the appraisal of things other than words, and research in wordless media includes some of the most interesting developments today. Historians have for some time been turning from their archives to the scrutiny of art and architecture, costumes and customs, rituals and recreations, diet and demography, indeed to the whole pattern of interaction between people and their physical environment, often with the most rewarding results. A historian of social history through cinema may turn from the recorded words of the talkies to the images of the silent film, obviously without thereby ceasing to be a historian.

However, the apprentice in any art or craft must start by learning about the techniques and principles which lie at the core of the subject; it is these which have in the past given shape and structure to the practice of the calling, and in which the learner must become proficient before he can hope to become a journeyman. The masters in the trade, meanwhile, may have developed techniques

which do not obey the rules of the core principles. These in the long run may change the essential nature of the calling; meanwhile, however, it is likely that the beginner who seeks to ground his ideas about his trade upon its most evolved forms will end in confusion. It is the old fallacy of seeking to run before you can walk. Therefore it is best to leave the exceptions on one side and attend to the core structures and principles. History is the quest for understanding of particular things, people or events in the past by close examination of their context, working from the evidence of recorded words (and whatever else can supplement them).

History and its neighbouring disciplines

History is distinguished as a discipline, then, by the fact that its evidence typically consists of recorded words. The evidence may be in any form: books, newspapers, diaries, archives, bills, bus tickets, film sound tracks, tape-recorded interviews, shorthand notes, inscriptions on stone or tortoise-shell, or any other form of recorded words. For the historian, the record is a *source* or document, and *documentation* is the identification of these sources as verifiable evidence.

What the historian appraises critically in his sources is what they say. That is, he is interested in the meaning of the words, rather than in, say, their handwriting, or the chemical composition of the fabric upon which they are recorded.

From the beginning of historical study, your main concern must be with the proper understanding of what is meant by the sources you read. Understanding them, you can then ask what light they can throw upon what was going on when they were written, and what light is thrown upon the sources and their meaning by your knowledge of what was going on at the time. This is what history is about.

Various other disciplines stand close beside history, and the experienced historian may sometimes or often wish to raid them for what they may yield. For the student, it may be better not to worry about these other disciplines – it is quite enough to focus upon the core techniques of history. However, you may have acquired knowledge of the techniques of other disciplines which, with guidance, you can use to augment the historical techniques.

Some of these neighbouring disciplines may be mentioned. When the words of the document are in a language not the historian's own, he must double as a *linguist*. Most of the history of the world is of places that did not have very much use for English. For the interpretation of terms in dead or literary languages, *philology* may be called for. The historian may use as evidence any written sources, including literature generally; thus they overlap with those of *literary criticism*, but for the historian they are used as evidence for different sorts of statements. *Archaeology* is the study of the past using any sort of physical object as

evidence, not just objects under the ground. *Epigraphy* is the study of inscriptions, which are typically on stone or metal. Statements about the past may also be based on the techniques of *palaography*, the study of the formation of characters and styles of writing at different periods in the past, by which for example a document may be roughly dated even if the date is not otherwise known. *Diplomatic* is the study of written documents which is addressed to their physical characteristics; chemical analysis of ink and paper may yield facts of interest to the historian about date, authenticity and provenance. *Social sciences* (such as *sociology*, *political science*, *psychology* and *economics*) often overlap in sources or subject-matter with history, but their methods are different. On this point there is more below.

Scholars in different disciplines often embrace each other's techniques; this lies behind many of the more interesting developments in contemporary research, but it can be risky. You may think, after reading about the results of research in some other discipline, that it is easy to apply their insights to your own historical problems, but then find that without a well-grounded intuitive grasp of the other discipline your application of it leads to confusion. Often it is better to leave such applications until one attains a much improved knowledge of the second discipline.

Social sciences, humanities, and fuzziness

Disciplines of scholarly study that are concerned with the study of people, culture and society can be divided into two classes: social sciences and humanities. (As noted above, the 'humanities' roughly correspond to liberal arts.) The allocations of particular disciplines to these classes are not always consistent. Sometimes history is regarded as a social science, sometimes not. How we regard it is quite important for our understanding of how it works.

Social sciences, as the name implies, are distinguished from physical sciences because they concern human society, but they are distinguished from the humanities because they seek to use scientific methods. This means that they ask questions which can be answered fairly precisely by measurement. Thus, the degree of poverty or ill-health in two different communities, or in one at two different times, might be compared by examining the statistics (assuming that good statistics are available) for income per annum per head, or for the incidence of certain diseases. Economics and sociology are core social science disciplines.

The humanities, on the other hand, are concerned with human culture, especially through the study of language and literature. Written documents and art forms are typical sources. Understanding is sought through the refinement of ideas about the meaning of what is studied rather than through measurement of it.

This way of distinguishing between them implies that they are identified by the types of questions, and the methods of answering them, that the two

divisions of study adopt, rather than by different disciplines. Conceivably, scholars in almost any liberal arts discipline might on some occasions seek answers to questions that lend themselves to precise measurement, and on others interest themselves in qualitative propositions using categories with fuzzy boundaries. ‘Were more people literate in the eighteenth than in the seventeenth century?’ is a question that can be answered by statistics, if they are available, though a great deal of inspired detective work may be needed to find the evidence. ‘Was the experience of being tortured a major influence upon Machiavelli’s thought?’ cannot be so answered. There is no obvious way of measuring all the different influences that might have been at play, or of deciding what would count as ‘major’.

History can concern itself with questions belonging to both social sciences and to the humanities. It cannot be decisively classified as of one type and not the other. However, it has deep roots in the humanities, and its core categories have fuzzy boundaries.

This is because history commonly seeks its explanations within contexts that cannot be precisely delimited. For example, anything at all within the experience of Italians (or others) during the lifetime of Machiavelli might turn out to be an influence upon his thought; the historian uses intuitive judgment based on human experience to decide what they might be, and seeks evidence wherever in the sources it might appear.

Even the most statistical-looking of enterprises may, for the historian, be permeated by fuzziness. Take the question ‘Was the living standard of industrial workers in the earlier nineteenth century rising or falling?’ In fact, clear statistics that might clearly measure the standard of living are not available. This is an obstacle to scientific economic research upon the question. Historians proceed differently, seeking such fragmentary evidence as they can find, using detective work, and the results are often debatable, depending a great deal upon judgment of what the evidence really shows. Thus, in a humanities research project, a lot of interpretation and opinion has to go into producing as an end result the material evidence, statistics, which for the economist must be the starting-point.

The importance of fuzziness cannot be over-emphasized. It does not mean lack of rigour. The reason why a historian cannot put a percentage value upon the importance of the experience of being tortured to Machiavelli’s thought is not that his method is sloppy; it lies in the nature of the question. Human experience fans out to fill the known world, and anything in human experience might influence what people think, write, or do. The historian can seldom be sure that *all* the evidence that might be relevant has in fact been collected. The rigour lies in the thoroughness of the detective work conducted, not in the precision of calculations made using facts already known.

Two practical consequences of this fuzziness need to be noticed. The first is that the historical argument in a piece of research, or a student essay, does not take the form of formal logical proof, moving through syllogisms to an unassailable conclusion. On the contrary, it may always be challenged on the basis of further evidence.

The second has to do with the presentation and format of the finished work. The methods of history require that the historian should carry on a dialogue with the sources, discussing the detective work that has gone into assessing them and identifying their value, as well as a dialogue with the problem to be solved with the help of the sources. These dialogues cannot always conveniently be carried on at once, and for clarity it is often necessary to separate the former sort of discussion in footnotes. This point is taken up below, in the chapter on documentation (see p. 119).

The wavelength of history

You may not realize at first, particularly if you are used to the requirements of other disciplines, how very *concrete* history is. It is true that you may find any number of theoretical statements in a historical work, and these may encourage the belief that history is like other disciplines that favour interpretative theory. There is a difference, though. However far the historian may move away from the concrete sources into abstract generalizations or theories, the documentary evidence is always exerting a pull on his mind, and, in the end, what gives authority to what he says is his ability to justify his conclusions by analysing convincingly the value of the specific sources upon which they depend.

Almost any statement about the past can be used in illustration. Here is one:

The Indian emperor Akbar set out to disprove the doctrine of the court religious teachers that human beings are given speech by a divine gift, not by learning.⁷

For most disciplines, this sentence would be taken as solid evidence, capable of being used as a building block in an argument. The student of religions would be interested in the theory of divine intervention in human affairs, the student of politics in the relationship between royal power and the authority of religious teachers, and so forth. But the historian automatically and instinctively turns, not to the theories – they come much later in his programme – but to the *evidence for the statement*. He asks: ‘How do we know this?’, and immediately, rolling up his shirtsleeves so to speak, burrows into the documentary evidence. Instead of taking the statement and using it as a building block for theory, he pulls it to pieces. ‘What documentary source tells us this about Akbar? Who wrote it? Why? For whom? What does it tell us about the author? Did he have any axe to grind?’

These are the historical questions which set the historian off on a quest that leads in the opposite direction to that taken by most other specialists. If it turns out that the document making this claim about Akbar is misleading or untrustworthy, the comparative religionists, political scientists and the rest might lose interest, but that is just where the historian feels that things are becoming interesting. *'Why is the document misleading? What do we learn about society and politics in the India of the time from the fact that the author is not to be trusted? If he was biased, what gave him that bias?'*

When you write history essays, you may make many generalizations and develop interest in theories, but they must always be anchored to an analysis of the actual hard evidence that is as detailed and specific as your time and your sources will allow.

Index

- Abbreviations, 116
Abu'l Fazl, 16th-cent. Indian minister
and author of *Akbarnama*, 133,
134, 159
Academic writing, 13–16
Agreement of verbs, 149
Akbar, 16th-cent. Indian ruler, 133–5
American revolution, 18
Annales, journal, and school of
history-writing, 160, 162
Apostrophes, 147
Archaeology, 8–9
Art, History as an, 2–3
Ashoka, ancient Indian ruler, 37
Authority, of sources, 44–5
- Balance, in historical writing, 54–5
Bemis, S.F., *The Hussey-Cumberland
Mission and American Independence*,
119
Bias, 49–50
Bibliographies, 120–1, 127
Bloch, Marc, author of *The Historian's
Craft*, 160
Book reviews, 135–7
Brackets, square, 147
Braudel, Fernand, author of *La
Méditerranée et le monde
méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe
II*, 160, 162
Brookhiser, R., *Founding Father,
Rediscovering George Washington*, 99
Buddha, the, 105–6
Buddhism, 37
Burckhardt, Jacob, author of
*Civilization of the Renaissance in
Italy*, 159
Burke, Edmund, 156
Butterfield, Herbert, author of *The
Whig Interpretation of History*, 161
Calhoun, John C., 71
Carr, E.H., author of *What is History?*,
161
Centipede rhyme, 4
Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.), 59
Chicago Manual of Style, 111–17
Christianity, 29
Persecuted, 84–5
Citation, see *Documents, Documentation*
Where c. is needed, 105–7
Clio, Muse of history, 158
Colloquialisms, 153
Colons, 146
Commas, 144–5
Computer tools, 123–4
Conclusions to essays, 24, 85, 100–1
Conspiracy theories, 59
Copying, 69
See also *Plagiarism*
Corrections, 129–30
Cotton cultivation, 71
Craft, History as a, 2
Craster, Mrs Edmund, 156 n.6
- Darwin, Charles, 57
Davies, Rees, 1
Dickens, C., *Hard Times*, 1, 156 n.3
Diplomatic, 9
Document criticism exercises, 132
Documents, documentation, 8, 105–22
'Dumb-house' experiment, 133–5
- Economic determinism, in historical
explanation, 58
Editing, see *Revision*
Elton, Sir Geoffrey R., author of
The Practice of History, 162
Endnotes, 107, 118–20
English expression, 143–55
Epigraphy, 9

- Errors, common, 130–1
- Essays
 Defined, 16–17
 E. length, 125
 E. titles, 124–5
 Planning e., 75–85, 126
- Evidence, 24, 82
 Factual e. and paraphrase, 90–2
- Evolution of species, 57
- Examination answers, 139–42
 ‘Closed-book’ e.a., 140–1
 ‘Open-book’ e.a., 140
- Explanation, in history, 56–60
- Febvre, Lucien, 160
- Feminism in history, 163
- Fitzgerald, C.P., *The Birth of Communist China*, 35
- Footnotes, 111–20
 Endnotes and f., 107, 118–20, 125
 Revision of f., 126
- Format of pages, 125, 126
- Foucault, Michel, 161
- Furtwangler, A., *American Silhouettes. Rhetorical identities of the founders*, 99
- Gibbon, Edward, 159
- Grammar, 127, 148
- Group identity in history, 60–4
- Guha, Ranajit, 163
- Hall, D.G.E., *A History of South-East Asia*, 38
- Heredity, see *Race*
- Herodotos/Herodotus, 158
- Historical explanation, 60–6
- Historical facts, 1
 H.f. contrasted to judgment or opinion, 45–6
- Historical imagination, 66
- Historical sources, 8
- Historiography, historiographical approaches, 81–2, 99
 Note on h., 158–63
- History essays
 As engineering, 23–4, 84, 100
 As a process, 22–32
 As literature, 19–21
- History
 As a discipline, 4–9
 Defined, 7
 Hobsbawm, E.J., 162
 Hofstadter, Richard, 162
 Hsuan-tsang, Buddhist pilgrim, 128
 Humanities, 9–11, 156 n.5
 Fuzziness in the h., 9–11
- Ibid.*, 120
- ‘In-text’ method of citation, 107
- Independent thought, 17–19, 86–94
 Ways of showing i.t., 88–9
 I.t. shown by example, 90–2
- Indian Mutiny, 28–31
- Indus Valley Civilization, 46–8
- Internet, its value for historical study, 39–41, 53–4
- Introductions to essays, 24, 76–9
- Italics, 148
- Jargon, 153
- Journals, learned, 41, 137
- Kautilya, ancient Indian writer, 4, 6
- Kuhn, Thomas S., author of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 153
- Ladurie, Emmanuel Le Roy, author of *The Peasants of Languedoc*, 160
- Library exploitation, 26–7, 32
- Literature reviews, 137–8
- Lively, Penelope, 156
- Longue durée*, the, historiographical concept, 161
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 159
- Machiavelli, N., *The Prince*, 4–7, 86–7
- Marx, Karl, 58
- Marxism, 162
- Medici, Florentine ruling family, 5
- M.L.A. documentation system, 108–10
- Mommsen, Theodor, author of *History of Rome*, 159, 162
- Moral philosophy, 6, 87
 M.p., history and, 66–7
- Multiple choice questions, 141

- Narrative, as approach to essay planning, 79–80
- Nash, Gary B., 17–18
- National character, in historical explanation, 57–8
- Niebuhr, Barthold Georg, 159
- 'Note-Bibliography' method of citation, 107, 108–11
- Notes, in historical study, 68–74
- Paradigms, in Kuhn's sense, 153
- Parallel grammatical construction, 150
- Paraphrase, 89–92
- Parentheses, 146
- Phillips, M., 157
- Philology, 8
- Plagiarism, 89–94
 - Paraphrase and p., 89–92
- Political science, 5
- Postmodernism in history, 161
- Prejudice, 48–50
- Pre-modern societies, contrasted with modern, 64–6
- Primary sources, 33–4
- Pronouns, 150–1
 - Gender of, ix
- Proof, in history, 56
- Proof-reading, 127–8
- Psychology, 6
- Punctuation, 127, 144–7
- Quotations, 69–70, 96, 98–100, 151–2
- Race, in historical explanation, 57–8
- Radcliffe Camera, library, 1
- Ranke, Leopold, 159, 161
- Reading, how to plan it, 41–2
 - Critical r., 43–8
- References, see *Citation, Documentation*
- Religion, in historical explanation, 57
- Renaissance, 157
- Report-writing, 16–17, 139
- Revision, 123–31
- Rg Veda*, Indian scripture, 120
- Scott, Joan Wallach, 161
- Secondary sources, 34
- Semi-colons, 146
- Seminar introduction papers, 138–9
- Short-answer questions, 140–1
- Sic*, 'thus', 151–2
- Signals, given by sentences, 95–7
- Slavery, in the U.S.A., 71, 83
- Social class, in historical explanation, 58
- Social Sciences, 9–10, 160
- Sources
 - Avoiding confusion of s., 101–4
 - Checking use of, 126
 - Difficulties of classification, 35–6
 - Exploiting historical s., 36–42, 102
 - Using as many as possible, 25–6
 - See also *Primary sources, Secondary sources, Tertiary sources*
- Spelling, 127, 148, 151
- Style in prose writing, 127, 152–5
- Subaltern Studies, journal, and school of history writing, 163
- Subheadings, in prose layout, 154
- Tendentious language, 50–4, 97–8
- Tense, of verbs, 7, 127, 149–50
- Tertiary sources, 35
- Textbooks, 38
- 'That' and 'which', ix
- Thematic approach to essay planning, 80–1
- Thistlethwaite, F., *The Great Experiment, An Introduction to the History of the American People*, 71–4, 83
- Thucydides, 159
- Tokugawa Shogunate, 61
- Transitions and signposts, 97
- Trumbull, John, American artist, 99–100
- Turabian, Kate, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 112, 119
- Venkat, Kalavai, author of an Internet review, 157
- Verbs, 7, 127, 147–9
 - Main v., 148–9
 - See also *Tense of verbs, Agreement of verbs*

Verifiability, 15, 105
Vocabulary, 127

Washington, George, 99
Weber, Max, 57
Whitney's cotton gin, 71
Wilberforce, William, 74

Winks, Robin, *The Historian as
Detective*, 156

Xavier, Jerome, Jesuit missionary, 135

Zeldin, Theodore, 157 n.2 [Ch. 6], 163,
164