

## HISTORIOGRAPHY

The term historiography refers to a body of historical work on various topics. It also refers to the art and the science of writing history. Historiography may be defined as “The history of history”. Historiography is usually defined and studied by topic, examples being the “Historiography of the French Revolution,” the “Historiography of the Spanish Inquisition,” or the “Historiography of Ancient India”. Historiography also encompasses specific approaches and tools employed for the study of history. The direction of research in the field of historiography has broadened and changed over time, starting from traditional view of history as a mere narrative of events to Marxist historiography and post-modern schools of historiography. In recent decades, there has been an interest in formulating newer approaches, particularly in areas such as cultural studies, and the field is set for a major revitalization with a plethora of new approaches and techniques.

Furay and Salevouris (1988) define historiography as "the study of the way history has been and is written —the history of historical writing... When you study 'historiography' you do not study the events of the past directly, but the changing interpretations of those events in the works of individual historians."

### **Definition of history**

Some of the earliest definitions of history were given by the Greeks and the Romans. Let us now proceed to examine some definitions of history given since ancient times. According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, history had to contain the quintessence of human experience which provided universal values for civilization. Aristotle defined history as “The manifestation of human nature, intentions and motives over the millennia which differed in degree and not in their basic nature.” According to Henry Johnson, “History is at a broad level, a summary of everything that has ever happened”. According to Thomas Carlyle, “History is nothing but the biography of great men, and is a record of human accomplishment”. According to Lord Acton, “history is a story of the unfolding march to freedom”. This idea was accepted by Turgot and Condorcet as well. According to A.L. Rowse, “history is a record of the life of men in their geographical and physical environment”. According to Seignbos, “History is a science of reasoning.” According to Ernest Bernheim, “History is a science that

investigates and presents in their context of psycho-physical causality the facts determined by space and time of the evolution of men in their individual as well as typical and collective activity as human beings.” According to Rousseau, “History is the art of choosing from the many lies, one which most closely resembles the truth.” According to Benedetto Croce, “All history is one supreme spirit which is indivisible, but has four different aspects—art, ethics, logic and economics—which emerge from the basic unity of the spirit.” According to John Findlay, “History is any sequence of events traced in their relations.” According to Professor Maitland, “History is what people have done and said, above all what they have thought.” According to G.J Renier, “History is the story of men living in societies, in which group activity, collective response to creative thoughts and sociability and will to serve society and act in the greater interests of common good, is of paramount importance.” According to G.R. Elton, “History is concerned with all those human beings, sayings, thoughts, deeds and sufferings which have occurred in the past and have left present deposits and it deals with them from the point of view of constant change.” According to Belgian Historian Henri Pirenne, “History is the story of men living in societies and their deeds.” Like Hegel and others, who insisted on the role of great men in history, Thomas Carlyle argued that history was the biography of a few central individuals, heroes, arguing “The history of the world is nothing but the biography of great men.” According to John J. Anderson, “History is a narration of the events which have happened among mankind, including an account of the rise and fall of nations, as well as of other great changes which have affected the political and social condition of the human race.”

### **Ancient historiography**

In ancient times, the first history was written by Ephorus (4th century BC) who was a disciple of Isocrates. This work has been lost, but its influence can be seen in the works of his son Demophilus, Polybius (203–120 BC) and Diodorus (1st century BC) who gave comprehensive accounts of their worlds. Herodotus is considered by many to be the father of historiography. It is believed he largely drew his inspiration from Hecataeus of Miletus. He is noted for his fast-paced style of writing, ability to engage readers, and his first-hand accounts of events. Poets like Homer and Hesiod also wrote poems with historical content. Thucydides also contributed greatly to historiography. Although he was not as famous as Herodotus, he was known for his thoroughness of approach, his deep analysis of

events and his accuracy and his ability to construct and derive general principles from an analysis of historical data. Posidonius and Polybius were other Greek historians. Greek Historiography is known for its rational and meticulous approach. Fabius Pictor was the first Roman historian, who laid the foundation for Roman historiography. Cato the Censor was the greatest of early Roman historians, who rose from a very humble background to become one of the greatest Historians of all times. Livy, Cornelius Tacitus and Antipater were other great historians of Rome. Roman historiography borrowed heavily from the Greeks, but was less analytical in approach and often lacked in rigour and depth. Medieval, Enlightenment and Post-Enlightenment Historiography Arab Historiography predates Islam, but was revitalized after the advent of Islam and made an attempt to reconcile Greek method and Church historiography. Historiography made steady progress during this era and Islamic scholars introduced new techniques such as Isnad. Great Islamic scholars were Ibn Khaldun, Waqidi and Al-Madaini. Church historiography also made great progress during this era, and brought new philosophical interpretations to history. Noted church historiographers were St. Augustine and Salvian. Enlightenment historiography lasted from the 1600's to the 1800's reflected the vast changes brought about in that era and was characterized by pragmatism and economic emancipation through historiography. Bolingbroke, Bentham, Macaulay, Voltaire, Montesquieu and Mill belonged to this school. Towards the end of this era, there was a renewed interest of histories of countries such as India owing to colonialism and expansionism of European powers. However, such scholarship was not entirely free from racism and colonial prejudices. Noted English Historians of this era included Edward Gibbon and Thomas Carlyle. Later English historians included Henry Thomas Buckle and Arnold Toynbee.

### **German school**

The German school of historiography has left a profound impact on the modern world. Hegel was one of the German philosophers of this age. His concept of dialectics, which also meant discussion, was an idea where a reconciliation between thesis and anti-thesis led to synthesis. This idea influenced Karl Marx greatly and one of the key tenets of Marxism and Marxist historiography, though in greatly modified form. Ranke was another great German historiographer who played a major role in bringing a scientific method to historiography, and

contributed greatly to philosophy as well. Karl Marx was a great thinker and philosopher, and also one of the most controversial men in history. While he may have had a large number of detractors, both in his time, and after, few will deny that he was one of the most influential men ever, and that his ideas had a profound effect in shaping the course of history. He embraced Hegel's dialectics, but with a twist. For Marx, most problems could be explained in material or economic terms, and this concept is known as Historical Materialism. According to Marx, non-material aspects of human existence such as art, literature and philosophy were merely determined by economic factors of conditions. Marx's ideas on history were followed by many parts in the world, including in many countries which did not consider themselves to be communist or socialist. Marxist historians who do not subscribe to mainstream Marxist philosophy call themselves 'marxist' (starting with an 'm' in lower case), while those who do call themselves 'Marxist' (starting with an 'M' in upper case). Marxist historiography has made contributions to the history of the working class, oppressed nationalities, and the methodology of history from below. Few would deny that Marx was highly criticised both in his life time and after, both for his ideas on economics and history, and criticisms of his philosophy and historical methods have been many.

### **Modern trends in historiography**

Major changes have occurred in the field of historiography since the time of Karl Marx, and the field is still constantly evolving and changing to encompass newer vistas and horizons. We now discuss some of the major changes that have taken place in the field of historiography since the field of Karl Marx. In recent times, history has been seen as more of a science than an art. An emphasis has been made on its inter-relationship with Geography, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Archaeology, Anthropology, Philology and other sciences. It has also been used as a tool to draw lessons from the past, analyse events scientifically and to predict future events. Scholars such as Prof E.H. Carr, Vico, Collingwood, Comte, Spengler and J.B. Bury have also supported the view that history is a science. The Annales School has been influential in setting the agenda for historiography in many countries, and has helped incorporate social scientific methods into history, with an emphasis on social themes over political themes, and an amalgam with Marxist thought. New trends in historiography also include Cliometrics,

Comparative history Cultural history, Cultural history, history of art, history of literature, subaltern history or history from below etc

### **Nationalist historiography in India**

The Indian Nationalist School of historiography arose from the desire to set right alleged biases and prejudices in Colonial historiography particularly in the works of English scholars such as James Mill<sup>9</sup> who were hostile to India. It also arose from the desire to search for a national identity and displace the colonial mind set. One of the progenitors of this school was Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. The Indian nationalist school of historiography, on the other hand, was accused of being over-reactionary, and as a result of its innumerable flaws which also included methodological ones, had never made much headway in forging a broad consensus among a wide range of scholars. In addition, R.C. Majumdar and other Nationalist historians were often accused of Hindu nationalism and communalism. They were also accused of trying to glorify India's past and lacking objectivity, consistency of method and rigour. It was also accused of being casteist, and lacking a subaltern perspective. However, nationalist historiography has greatly contributed to the study of India's cultural history. It has also contributed to the study of regional cultures.

### **Hindutva interpretations of history**

At the very outset, few will deny that Hindutva approaches cannot hold up to rigorous scholarly scrutiny, and most would not qualify as bona fide approaches at all, being largely driven by ideological constraints such as the Hindutva desire to maintain that 'Aryans' were natives of India or to prove that the Vedic culture was older than the IVC, and is known for its casuistry and sophistry. Among their more publicized and hackneyed strategies is a criticism of a long-abandoned theory known as the 'Aryan Invasion theory' with a view to replace them with ideology-driven constructs such as the 'Vedic Indus theory', 'Indigenous Aryan theory', or in some cases even the 'Out of India theory'. Although many colonial constructs are still in use well into the twenty-first century, Hindutva approaches, unlike those of the Indian nationalist school, may not be just reactionary or ill-conceived; they may, in certain cases, be even full of dubious and convoluted logic and paralogisms used to push a certain point of view even if it has little mainstream

or intellectual backing. Hindutva approaches can also be identified through their polemical constructs and their minatory posturing, and Hindutva forces had nearly managed to wrest control of key institutions in India in the early 2000's. The author has discussed Hindutva strategies in great detail in his paper 'The Aryan problem' published by the ICFAI University press. Any twenty-first century approaches to historiography will need to take into account the importance of countering such ideologically-driven approaches and interpretations of history.

1112 Post-colonialist historiography in India Post-colonial historiography emerged as a reaction towards the colonial world-view and sought to emphasize a multi-polar world as opposed to a euro-centric standpoint, and rescue objectivity from the debilitating effects of colonialism. However, this school has been criticized for its lack of historical method and its association with nationalist movements in some countries. The leading postcolonial theorists are Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, Homi Bhabha, and Leela Gandhi.

### **Subaltern historiography in India**

Subaltern historiography emerged in India in the 1980's as a distinct discipline of study. Vivek Chibber and Vinay Lal have been key proponents of Subaltern studies. The key tenet of Subaltern history is to look at history from the point of view of the elites and the downtrodden. Vivek Chibber has also been associated with the 'New left' which is trying to make Marxist historiography more relevant for the times.

Post-modernist Historiography in India Post-modernist historiography is still in a nascent stage in India. Post-modernism emphasizes a greater or enhanced role of a historian towards society by emphasizing a humanistic outlook. It also encourages a search for new topics for analysis, and encourages a sceptical outlook. Post-modernist historiography has been criticized for its vagueness of approach, and its inability to offer tangible leanings to other disciplines of study. Notable critics of post-modernism have included Alan Sokal, and most Marxist scholars.

Marxist historiography in India Marxist historiography is a by-product of Marxist economic and political thought which had a great impact in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Marxist historiography is based on certain core principles such as Historical materialism, Dialectical Materialism and Teleological determinism. Marxist historians both in India and elsewhere have made contributions to

subaltern studies and the history of the oppressed. Marxist historians have also greatly contributed to the containment of Hindutva and ideology-driven approaches. D.D.Kosambi was one of the first great Marxist historians of India. Given the profound impact Marxist historiography has had over the years, both in India and elsewhere, it be necessary to discuss some of the drawbacks attributed to Marxist historiography by other mainstream researchers. Some of the common drawbacks of Marxist historiography are presented.

## Herodotus

*Hēródotos*, [Attic Greek](#) pronunciation: [[hɛː.ró.do.tos](#)]; c. 484 – c. 425 BC) was an [ancient Greek](#) historian who was born in [Halicarnassus](#) in the [Persian Empire](#) (modern-day [Bodrum](#), [Turkey](#)). He is known for having written the book [The Histories](#) ([Greek](#): Ἱστορίαι *Historíai*), a detailed record of his "inquiry" ([ἱστορία](#) *historía*) on the origins of the [Greco-Persian Wars](#). He is widely considered to have been the first writer to have treated historical subjects using a method of systematic investigation—specifically, by collecting his materials and then critically arranging them into an [historiographic](#) narrative. On account of this, he is often referred to as "[The Father of History](#)," a title first conferred on him by the first-century BC [Roman](#) orator [Cicero](#).<sup>[1]</sup>

Despite Herodotus's historical significance, little is known about his personal life. His *Histories* primarily deals with the lives of [Croesus](#), [Cyrus](#), [Cambyses](#), [Smerdis](#), [Darius](#), and [Xerxes](#) and the battles of [Marathon](#), [Thermopylae](#), [Artemisium](#), [Salamis](#), [Plataea](#), and [Mycale](#); however, his many cultural, [ethnographical](#), geographical, [historiographical](#), and other digressions form a defining and essential part of the *Histories* and contain a wealth of information. Herodotus has been criticized for the fact that his book includes many obvious legends and fanciful accounts. Many authors, starting with the late fifth-century BC historian [Thucydides](#), have accused him of making up stories for entertainment. However, Herodotus states that he is merely reporting what he has seen and been told, on several occasions saying that he does not himself believe the story that he reports. A sizable portion of the information he provides has since been confirmed by historians and archaeologists.

His record of the achievements of others was an achievement in itself, though the extent of it has been debated. Herodotus's place in history and his significance may be understood according to the traditions within which he worked. His work is the earliest Greek prose to have survived intact. However, [Dionysius of Halicarnassus](#),

a literary critic of [Augustan Rome](#), listed seven predecessors of Herodotus, describing their works as simple, unadorned accounts of their own and other cities and people, Greek or foreign, including popular legends, sometimes melodramatic and naïve, often charming – all traits that can be found in the work of Herodotus himself.<sup>[3]</sup>

Modern historians regard the chronology as uncertain, but according to the ancient account, these predecessors included [Dionysius of Miletus](#), Charon of Lampsacus, [Hellanicus of Lesbos](#), [Xanthus of Lydia](#) and, the best attested of them all, [Hecataeus of Miletus](#). Of these, only fragments of Hecataeus's works survived, and the authenticity of these is debatable,<sup>[4]</sup> but they provide a glimpse into the kind of tradition within which Herodotus wrote his own *Histories*.

## **Banabhatta**

**Naresh**, the chief of the Vardhan dynasty of Baan [Thaneshwar](#), was the chief court poet of Harsh. This scholar was a writer and poet of seventh century Sanskrit prose. Banabhatta has composed Harshacharit, Kadambari and **Parvati Parinay**. He has two major texts, which are composed in Sanskrit language: **Harshacharitam** and Kadambari. **Harshacharitam** was the life-character of King Harshavardhan and Kadambari was the first novel in the world.

Kadambari composed by Banabhatta. It is the best novel in Sanskrit literature. Banabhatta was the court scholar of Harsh, the ruler of the [Vardhan dynasty](#). From the study of Kadambari, we get the knowledge of the social and religious life of the time.

**Thomas Aquinas**, Italian **San Tommaso d’Aquino**, also called **Aquinas**, byname **Doctor Angelicus (Latin: “Angelic Doctor”)**, (born 1224/25, Roccasecca, near Aquino, Terra di Lavoro, Kingdom of Sicily [Italy]—died March 7, 1274, Fossanova, near Terracina, Latium, Papal States; canonized July 18, 1323; feast day January 28, formerly March 7), Italian Dominican theologian, the foremost [medieval Scholastic](#). He developed his own conclusions from [Aristotelian premises](#), notably in the [metaphysics](#) of personality, creation, and [Providence](#). As a [theologian](#), he was responsible in his two masterpieces, the [Summa theologiae](#) and the [Summa contra gentiles](#), for the classical systematization of Latin [theology](#), and, as a poet, he wrote some of the most gravely beautiful eucharistic [hymns](#) in the church’s [liturgy](#). His doctrinal system and the explanations and developments made by his followers are known as [Thomism](#). Although many modern [Roman Catholic](#) theologians do not find St. Thomas altogether [congenial](#), he is

nevertheless recognized by the [Roman Catholic Church](#) as its foremost Western philosopher and theologian.

Thomas was born to parents who were in possession of a modest [feudal domain](#) on a boundary constantly disputed by the emperor and the [pope](#). His father was of [Lombard](#) origin; his mother was of the later invading [Norman](#) heritage. His people were distinguished in the service of Emperor [Frederick II](#) during the civil strife in southern [Italy](#) between the papal and imperial forces. Thomas was placed in the [monastery](#) of Monte Cassino near his home as an oblate (i.e., offered as a prospective monk) when he was still a young boy; his family doubtless hoped that he would someday become [abbot](#) to their advantage. In 1239, after nine years in this sanctuary of spiritual and cultural life, young Thomas was forced to return to his family when the emperor expelled the [monks](#) because they were too obedient to the pope. He was then sent to the [University of Naples](#), recently founded by the emperor, where he first encountered the scientific and philosophical works that were being translated from [Greek](#) and [Arabic](#). In this setting Thomas decided to join the Friars Preachers, or [Dominicans](#), a new religious order founded 30 years earlier, which departed from the traditional paternalistic form of government for monks to the more democratic form of the mendicant [friars](#) (i.e., religious orders whose corporate as well as personal poverty made it necessary for them to beg alms) and from the monastic life of [prayer](#) and manual labour to a more active life of preaching and teaching. By this move he took a liberating step beyond the feudal world into which he was born and the monastic spirituality in which he was reared. A dramatic episode marked the full significance of his decision. His parents had him abducted on the road to Paris, where his shrewd superiors had immediately assigned him so that he would be out of the reach of his family but also so that he could pursue his studies in the most prestigious and turbulent university of the time.

## **Alberuni**

Alberuni was born at Khiva in 973 A.D. and he was two years younger than Mahmud of Ghazni. His original name was Abu Rehan Muhammad bin- Ahmed. He came to India in the war-train of Mahmud and lived here for many years. He was a great philosopher, mathematician and historian.

Attracted by Indian culture, he learnt Sanskrit and studied several books concerning Hindu philosophy and culture. His curious mind and master eyes did not spare even the Puranas and the Bhagwat-Gita. He travelled far and wide and wrote a masterly account of India in his book Tahqiq-i-Hind.

This also known as Kitābul Hind (1017-31 A.D). In addition to it, Alberuni is also credited to have translated many Sanskrit works into Persian and Arabic. Talking of Hindu in general, Alberuni complains of their complacency and ignorance of the outside world. He even finds faults with them for their want of sympathy and communication with other peoples whom they call mlechchas.

Observing the consuming arrogance of Hindus he notes, ‘The Hindus believe that there is no country but theirs, no nation like theirs, no kings like theirs, no religion like theirs, and no science like theirs. If they travelled and mixed with other nations, they would soon change their mind, ‘he adds, ‘for their ancestors were not as narrow-minded as the present generations.’

According to him, India was divided into a number of kingdoms such as Kashmir, Sindh, Malwa and Kannauj. He talks of various kinds of castes and distinctions in the society. Another point of society is that early marriage was common and women who lost their husbands were condemned to perpetual widowhood. Parents arranged marriages for their children and no gifts were settled, though the husband made a gift to his wife which became her stridhana.

A further comment of Alberuni is also worth-noting. He observes that the Hindus did ‘not desire that a thing which has once been polluted should be purified and thus recovered’. Thus, the above portrayal clearly shows that all was not well with India. Society as the least compact. Caste tensions were prevalent. There was no sense of cause; the disintegrating tendencies were already serious.

The disorganized people of the country finally surrendered themselves to foreign invaders. Alberuni was able to observe the condition of India very minutely. He wrote what he saw here.

## **Voltaire**

François-Marie d’Arouet (1694–1778), better known by his pen name Voltaire, was a French writer and public activist who played a singular role in defining the eighteenth-century movement called the Enlightenment. At the center of his work was a new conception of philosophy and the philosopher that in several crucial respects influenced the modern concept of each. Yet in other ways Voltaire was not a philosopher at all in the modern sense of the term. He wrote as many plays, stories, and poems as patently philosophical tracts, and he in fact directed many of his critical writings against the philosophical pretensions of recognized philosophers such as Leibniz, Malebranche, and Descartes. He was, however, a vigorous defender of a conception of natural science that served in his mind as the

antidote to vain and fruitless philosophical investigation. In clarifying this new distinction between science and philosophy, and especially in fighting vigorously for it in public campaigns directed against the perceived enemies of fanaticism and superstition, Voltaire pointed modern philosophy down several paths that it subsequently followed.

To capture Voltaire's unconventional place in the history of philosophy, this article will be structured in a particular way. First, a full account of Voltaire's life is offered, not merely as background context for his philosophical work, but as an argument about the way that his particular career produced his particular contributions to European philosophy. Second, a survey of Voltaire's philosophical views is offered so as to attach the legacy of what Voltaire did with the intellectual viewpoints that his activities reinforced.

### Leopold Von Ranke

There is a story about Leopold von Ranke, the 19th-century German historian regarded as the father of modern "professional" history writing - that at the age of 91 he lay down on his pine bed and gently chided his amanuensis, Theodor Wiedemann, for having fallen asleep at his pen the night before. Ranke had been trying to finish dictating the eighth volume of his sweeping "Universal History," which he had begun writing at the age of 82. But the eyes would not stay open and the "Universal History" would never be finished.

"If your strength had only held out last night," the mummy-like Ranke told poor Wiedemann, "we could have finished our work; it's spread out before me in panorama; but it is too late; I am weary." And the great Ranke soon died, taking his panorama with him into what he once imagined would be the great archives of heaven.

This happened in 1886, and because of the roundness of that anniversary -and also because Ranke's private library of more than 20,000 volumes ended up at Syracuse University - an international conference of scholars gathered here recently to talk about Ranke's place in the history of history. History as Science

Some participants in the conference insisted, as people do at such events, that Ranke's spirit and beneficent influence were still very much alive. His name did not ring the great bells rung by Marx, Nietzsche, Freud and other thinkers and writers in German over the last century or so; and indeed Ranke is "a name normally unknown in this world," one elderly German-born scholar confessed.

**James Mill** (1773–1836) was a Scots-born political philosopher, historian, psychologist, educational theorist, economist, and legal, political and penal reformer. Well-known and highly regarded in his day, he is now all but forgotten. Mill's reputation now rests mainly on two biographical facts. The first is that his first-born son was John Stuart Mill, who became even more eminent than his father. The second is that the elder Mill was the collaborator and ally of Jeremy Bentham, whose subsequent reputation also eclipsed the elder Mill's. Our aim here is to try, insofar as possible, to remove Mill from these two large shadows and to reconsider him as a formidable thinker in his own right.

Mill's range of interests was remarkably wide, extending from education and psychology in his two-volume *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind* (1829a), to political economy (he persuaded his friend David Ricardo to write on that subject, as Mill himself did in his *Elements of Political Economy*, 1821), to penology and prison reform, to the law and history, and, not least, to political philosophy. On these and other subjects he wrote five books and more than a thousand essays and reviews. It is with Mill the political philosopher and educational theorist that the present article is principally concerned.

### **Vincent Arthur Smith**

- Ancient Tamil [literature](#) and the [Greek](#) and [Roman](#) authors prove that in the first two centuries of the Christian era the ports on the Coromandel or Cholamandal coast enjoyed the benefits of active commerce with both [East](#) and [West](#). The Chola fleets.....uncrossed the Indian ocean to the islands of the Malaya Archipelago.
  - Early History of India - By Vincent Smith p. 415
- 'In the 7th century of the Christian era,' Vincent Smith wrote, 'the Nalanda establishment undoubtedly was the most important and splendid of its kind in India, or, in fact, the world. It was the principal centre of Buddhist learning, and was crowded with students from every quarter. It was truly a great university...'
  - Vincent Smith, quoted in [Shourie, Arun](#) (2014). Eminent historians: Their technology, their line, their fraud. Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India : HarperCollins Publishers.
- The [university](#) was the centre of Mahayana learning, of course – so much so that, reviewing its significance, Vincent Smith observed, 'A detailed history of Nalanda would be a history of Mahayanist Buddhism, from the time of

Nagarjuna in the 2nd cent A.D. (?), or possibly even from an earlier date, until the Muhammadan conquest of Bihar in A.D. 1197 – a period well over a millennium. All the most noted doctors of the Mahayana seem to have studied at Nalanda...’

- Vincent Smith, quoted in [Shourie, Arun](#) (2014). Eminent historians: Their technology, their line, their fraud. Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India : HarperCollins Publishers.
- Summarizing the evidence relating to the slaughter of the Buddhist Monks perpetrated by the Musalman General in the course of his invasion of Bihar in 1197 AD, Mr. Vincent Smith says, "The Musalman General, who had already made his name a terror by repeated plundering expeditions in Bihar, seized the capital by a daring stroke... Great quantities of plunder were obtained, and the slaughter of the 'shaven headed Brahmans', that is to say the Buddhist monks, was so thoroughly completed, that when the victor sought for someone capable of explaining the contents of the books in the libraries of the monasteries, not a living man could be found who was able to read them. 'It was discovered,' we are told, 'that the whole of that fortress and city was a college, and in the Hindi tongue they call a college Bihar.' "Such was the slaughter of the Buddhist priesthood perpetrated by the Islamic invaders. The axe was struck at the very root. For by killing the Buddhist priesthood, Islam killed Buddhism. This was the greatest disaster that befell the religion of the Buddha in India...
  - quoted from [B. R. Ambedkar](#), "The decline and fall of Buddhism," *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*, Vol. III, Government of Maharashtra. 1987, p. 232-233, quoting Vincent Smith
- Muhammad ibn Tughlaq “led forth his army to ravage Hindostan. He laid the country waste from Kanauj to Dalmau [on the Ganges, in the Rai Baréli District, Oudh], and every person that fell into his hands he slew. Many of the inhabitants fled and took refuge in the jungles, but the Sultan had the jungles surrounded, and every individual that was captured was killed.”
  - Vincent Arthur Smith, *The Oxford History of India: From the Earliest Times to the End of 1911* (Clarendon Press, 1920), 241-2. as quoted in [Spencer, Robert](#) (2018). *The history of Jihad: From Muhammad to ISIS*.

**K.A. Nilakanta Sastri**

Kallidaikurichi Aiyah Nilakanta Sastri (August 12, 1892 – June 15, 1975) was an Indian historian and Dravidologist who is generally regarded as the greatest and most prolific among professional historians of South India

Nilakanta Sastri was born in a poor Brahmin family in Kallidaikurichi near Tirunelveli, on August 12, 1892.[2] He completed his FA in M.D.T Hindu College, Tirunelveli and his college education in Madras Christian College.[3][4] Sastri obtained his MA by coming first in the Madras Presidency. He joined the Hindu College as lecturer in 1913 where he taught till 1918.[5][6] He served as Professor of History, Banaras Hindu University from 1918 to 1920.[5] After that he became the Principal of the (then) newly started Arts College of Annamalai University.[7] In 1929, he was employed as Professor of History at National College, Trichy. The same year, he succeeded Sakkottai Krishnaswamy Aiyangar[8] as the Professor of History and Archaeology at the Madras University,[1] a post he held till 1946.[3] He was the Professor of Indology (Currently renamed as Department of History and Archaeology) at the University of Mysore from 1952 to 1955.[1][3][5] He was appointed as the ex-officio Director of Archaeology for the Mysore State in 1954. He was also the President of the All-India Oriental Conference in the early 1950s.[9] From 1957 to 1972, he served with the UNESCO's Institute of Traditional Cultures of South East Asia, as the Director of the institute.[1][3] In 1957, he was awarded the Padma Bhushan, India's third highest civilian honour. In the summer of 1959, he was a visiting professor at the University of Chicago where he delivered a series of lectures on South Indian History .[5] Nilakanta Sastri died in 1975.[1]

Eminent Historian Professor R.S. Sharma writes of him as: "K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, the great historian from South India, was not a revivalist. His "History of South India" is a very dependable book." [10] Tamil historian A R Venkatachalapathy views him as "arguably the most distinguished historian of twentieth-century Tamil Nadu".

In 1915, a Bengali historian Jadunath Sarkar, wrote an essay Confessions of a History Teacher in the Modern Review regretting the lack of acclaimed historical works in vernacular languages and stressed that efforts should be made to write history books and teach history in vernacular languages.[11] Nilakanta Sastri, who was then a young teacher in Thirunelveli, wrote a letter to the newspaper opposing Sarkar's suggestion by saying that "English serves me better as a medium of expression than Tamil - I mean in handling historical subjects. Perhaps the vernacular is not so well off in this part of the country as it should be".[11] Sastri's comments evoked sharp criticism from the nationalist poet Subramanya

Bharathi.[11][12] According to Venkatachalapathy, Sastri's Tamil proficiency was not good and he relied on Tamil scholar S. Vaiyapuri Pillai for understanding Tamil literary works. Thus he was not able to analyze the changing meaning of words over time. Venkatachalapathy says, the professional historiography in Tamil Nadu practiced during K. A. Nilakanta Sastri's period there was rarely any interrogation of sources (except in terms of authenticity and chronology).

## **K. K. Pillay**

**Kolappa Kanakasabhapathy Pillay** (3 April 1905 – 26 September 1981) was an Indian historian who headed the Department of Indian history at the [University of Madras](#) from 1954 to 1966.<sup>[1]</sup> He also served as a President of the [Indian History Congress](#) and as the founder-President of the [South Indian History Congress](#).<sup>[2]</sup>

Pillay was born on 3 April 1905 to Kolappa Pillay and Parvathi, a Tamil-speaking couple in the village of [Aloor](#) in the [Kalkulam taluk](#) in the [Southern division](#) of [Travancore](#) state (presently in [Kanyakumari district](#) of [Tamil Nadu](#)). He was educated at the English High School at [Kottar](#) and the [Scott Christian College](#) in [Nagercoil](#). After graduating, Pillay worked as a lecturer in [Government College, Kumbakonam](#). Later, he joined the faculty of the [Presidency College, Madras](#) as Professor before moving to the [University of Madras](#).

In 1948, Pillay obtained a doctorate from the [University of Oxford](#) for his thesis on "Local Self-Government in Madras Presidency, 1850-1919". He also won a D. Litt. in 1953 for his paper "The Suchindram Temple". Pillay headed the Department of Indian History and Archaeology at the University of Madras from 1954 to 1959 and the Department of Indian History from 1959 to 1966. In 1966, Pillay was made head of the newly created Department of Social Sciences and Area Studies, a position he held till 1971. In 1972, Pillay succeeded [K. A. Nilakanta Sastri](#) as the Director of [UNESCO's](#) Institute of Traditional Cultures of South East Asia. Under his stewardship, the institute conducted two conferences one in 1977 and 1978. Pillay died on 26 September 1981 at the age of 76.

## **Approaches to history**

**Edward Palmer Thompson** (3 February 1924 – 28 August 1993) was a British historian, writer, socialist and peace campaigner. He is probably best known today

for his historical work on the British radical movements in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, in particular [The Making of the English Working Class](#) (1963).<sup>[1]</sup>

Thompson published biographies of [William Morris](#) (1955) and (posthumously) [William Blake](#) (1993) and was a prolific journalist and essayist. He published the novel *The Sykaos Papers* and a collection of poetry.

His work is considered by some to have been among the most important contributions to [labour history](#) and [social history](#) in the latter twentieth-century, with a global impact, including on scholarship in Asia and Africa.<sup>[2]</sup> In a 2011 poll by *History Today* magazine, he was named the second most important historian of the previous 60 years, behind only [Fernand Braudel](#).<sup>[3]</sup>

Thompson was one of the principal intellectuals of the [Communist Party of Great Britain](#). Although he left the party in 1956 over the [Soviet invasion](#) of Hungary, he nevertheless remained a "historian in the [Marxist](#) tradition", calling for a rebellion against [Stalinism](#) as a prerequisite for the restoration of communists' "confidence in our own revolutionary perspectives".<sup>[4]</sup>

Thompson played a key role in the first [New Left](#) in Britain in the late 1950s. He was a vociferous left-wing socialist critic of the Labour governments of 1964–70 and 1974–79, and an early and constant supporter of the [Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament](#), becoming during the 1980s the leading intellectual light of the movement against nuclear weapons in Europe.<sup>[5]</sup>

## Indian Marxist

**Damodar Dharmananda Kosambi** (31 July 1907 – 29 June 1966) was an [Indian mathematician](#), [statistician](#), [philologist](#), [historian](#) and [polymath](#) who contributed to genetics by introducing *Kosambi map function*.<sup>[1]</sup> He is well known for his work in [numismatics](#) and for compiling critical editions of ancient Sanskrit texts. His father, [Dharmananda Damodar Kosambi](#), had studied ancient Indian texts with a particular emphasis on Buddhism and its literature in the Pali language. Damodar Kosambi emulated him by developing a keen interest in his country's ancient history. Kosambi was also a [Marxist](#) historian specialising in ancient India who employed the [historical materialist](#) approach in his work.<sup>[2]</sup> He is particularly known for his classic work [An Introduction to the Study of Indian History](#).

He is described as "the patriarch of the Marxist school of Indian historiography".<sup>[2]</sup> Kosambi was critical of the policies of then prime minister [Jawaharlal Nehru](#), which, according to him, promoted capitalism in the guise of [democratic socialism](#).

He was an enthusiast of the [Chinese revolution](#) and its ideals, and, in addition, a leading activist in the World Peace Movement.

The new economic history originated in 1958 with *The Economics of Slavery in the Antebellum South* by American economists [Alfred H. Conrad](#) and [John R. Meyer](#). The book would cause a firestorm of controversy with its claim, based on statistical data, that slavery would not have ended in the absence of the U.S. Civil War, as the practice was economically efficient and highly profitable for slaves owners.<sup>[4][7]</sup>

## **Cliometrics**

The term *cliometrics*—which from [Clio](#), who was the [muse](#) of history—was originally coined by [mathematical economist Stanley Reiter](#) in 1960.<sup>[8]</sup> Cliometrics became better known when [Douglass North](#) and William Parker became the editors of the *Journal of Economic History* in 1960. The Cliometrics Meetings also began to be held around this time at [Purdue University](#) and are still held annually in different locations.

North, a professor at Washington University in St. Louis, would go on to win the [Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences](#) in October 1993 along with [Robert William Fogel](#), himself often described as the father of modern econometric history and Neo-historicals.<sup>[9][10]</sup> The two were honoured "for having renewed research in economic history;" the Academy noted that "they were pioneers in the branch of economic history that has been called the 'new economic history,' or cliometrics."<sup>[9]</sup> Fogel and North received the prize for turning the theoretical and statistical tools of modern economics on the historical past: on subjects ranging from slavery and railroads to ocean shipping and property rights. North was heralded as a pioneer in the "new" institutional history. In the Nobel announcement,<sup>[9][11]</sup> specific mention was made of a 1968 paper on ocean shipping, in which North showed that organizational changes played a greater role in increasing productivity than did technological change.<sup>[12]</sup> Fogel is especially noted for using careful empirical work to overturn [conventional wisdom](#).

**Sir Lewis Bernstein Namier**, original name **Ludwik Bernstein Niemirowski**, (born June 27, 1888, Wola Okrzejska, near Warsaw, Pol., Russian Empire—died Aug. 19, 1960, [London](#), Eng.), British historian, who was most noted for his work on 18th- and 19th-century [Europe](#). Namier immigrated to [England](#) in 1906 and studied at Balliol College, Oxford. He took British nationality and legally adopted an Anglicized name before [World War I](#), in which he served first in the army and

then in the Foreign Office, where he remained until 1920. Namier failed to get a teaching post at Oxford, went into business, and later devoted his time to research.

The appearance of Namier's *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III* in 1929 revolutionized 18th-century historiography and remains his most considerable work. By intensive research over a brief period, he aimed to show why men entered politics, and he rejected the simple classification of Whig and Tory in favour of personal, family, or regional interests. He was professor of modern [history](#) (1931–53) at the [Victoria University of Manchester](#) and produced various books of essays and two important works: *1848: The Revolution of the Intellectuals* (1946) and *Diplomatic Prelude, 1938–39* (1948). Of an official *History of Parliament*, begun under his editorship, part I, *The House of Commons, 1745–90*, in three volumes, appeared in 1964.

**Structuralism**– Strauss pioneered a branch of anthropology called cultural anthropology. According to this, a culture, which can be viewed as a society, can be better understood in terms of relations within the structure. In this case, i.e., society. Therefore, one should look at the elements making this society to understand it. Some of these elements could be viewed in light with reference to the contours of kinships, patterns in mythology, art, etc.

**Claude Lévi-Strauss** ([/klo:d 'levi 'straʊs/](#);<sup>[2]</sup> French: [\[klod levi stʁos\]](#); 28 November 1908 – 30 October 2009)<sup>[3][4][5]</sup> was a French [anthropologist](#) and [ethnologist](#), born in Belgium to French-Jewish parents living in Brussels, whose work was key in the development of the theory of [structuralism](#) and [structural anthropology](#).<sup>[6]</sup> He held the chair of Social Anthropology at the [Collège de France](#) between 1959 and 1982, was elected a member of the [Académie française](#) in 1973 and was a member of the [School for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences](#) in Paris. He received numerous honors from universities and institutions throughout the world and has been called, alongside [James George Frazer](#) and [Franz Boas](#),<sup>[7]</sup> the "father of modern anthropology".<sup>[8]</sup>

Lévi-Strauss argued that the "savage" mind had the same structures as the "civilized" mind and that human characteristics are the same everywhere.<sup>[9][10]</sup> These observations culminated in his famous book *Tristes Tropiques* that established his position as one of the central figures in the structuralist school of thought. As well as [sociology](#), his ideas reached into many fields in the [humanities](#), including [philosophy](#). Structuralism has been defined as "the search for the underlying patterns of thought in all forms of human activity."<sup>[4]</sup>

Ranajit Guha and Subaltern Studies Today I'm going to talk about the Indian historian Ranajit Guha and the historiographical project associated with him, Subaltern Studies. This took the form of twelve edited volumes of historical scholarship, mainly on the history of colonial India, which were published between 1982 and 2005, the first six volumes being edited by Guha and the remaining volumes by other scholars associated with the project, many of whom he had mentored or influenced. This proved to be one of the more influential currents in historical thought in the last quarter of the twentieth century, and extremely responsive to changes in the prevailing intellectual climate. Initially associated with the 'history from below' current you've heard about in earlier lectures, it also borrowed and developed insights from structuralism, post-structuralism, and most of all post-colonial theory. Edward Said famously endorsed the project; the postcolonial theorist Gayatri Spivak entered into a significant dialogue with it, which many seen as having heralded a wholesale shift towards post-colonial theory in the arsenal of Subaltern Studies. The project can also be seen as a sustained dialogue, at times acrimonious, with the powerful and influential Marxist legacy in South Asian historical scholarship. Many of its leading historians established their reputations in a broadly Marxist scholarly milieu, and the project itself always claimed to be in some sense an internal critique of both Left scholarship and politics. So there are clearly immense political as well as intellectual issues tied up with the development and influence of Subaltern Studies

To begin with, a few comments on Ranajit Guha and his times. Guha was born in 1923, to a family of prosperous landowners in East Bengal. He moved to Calcutta for his university education, and became caught up in the heavily left-wing student milieu of the 1940s, during the last years of British rule. In 1947, upon the attainment of Independence, Guha was sent as a student representative to Europe by the Communist Party of India. He travelled widely in Europe and the Middle East, and also took the Trans-Siberian railway to China shortly after the Communist revolution there. He returned to India in 1953, and taught there till 1959. Between 1959 and 1980 he worked in England, first at the University of Manchester and then at the University of Sussex. It was at Sussex, in the 1970s, that he and a group of his students and like-minded associates would begin to have discussions about radical history that would eventually feed into the Subaltern Studies project

## **Historian Work**

How history should be written has been the subject of ardent discussions ever since history has been written. The complaint that the method is not what it should be is

a millennial one; it was loud in Greek and Roman times and has been renewed since, sometimes with acerbity, in most of the civilized nations.

The chief reason is not that the problem is so difficult, but that, as history deals with individuals, families, and nations, it excites passions, and passions do not facilitate the solution of problems.

But for passion, the question would appear simple enough to open-minded people. To remember what is history is indeed to solve the problem.

History is not simply an art, nor simply a science; as the accompanying papers well show, it participates in the nature of both. In the hunt for facts and the ascertaining of truth, the historian must be as conscientious as the scientist. In the presentation he must be an artist, a true one, not one of those who favor vain embellishments and are not, therefore, true artists (*vilis miretur vulgus*), but of those who bring you as near as possible to the realities, showing them as they are, in their glory or their misery, simply putting between the reader and the facts a transparent, crystal-like glass, not a colored one.

Art is selection. Historians must select; they can not write history life-size; among thousands of facts they have to choose those especially important or especially characteristic. "An inconspicuous action," says Plutarch, "a word, a joke, will oftentimes better reveal a character than the bloodiest fights or the most important battles and sieges." A heavy responsibility rests with historians; they must have prepared themselves by thought, method, study, observation, and hard work, to judge well.

And this responsibility is now all their own. They have no longer the excuse of censorship. They have not to apprehend the interference of a James I, reproving a Raleigh for his too severe judgments on Spain, or of a Napoleon rebuking even long-dead Tacitus for having been too hard on emperors. They can freely speak their minds; they are all-powerful. But this boon carries with it terrible dangers. Limitless power is begotten of tyrants. Only well-tempered souls can resist the lure: the whole course of history is an evidence thereof. Has it never happened even in our days that some newspapers acted as tyrants, all-powerful, unchecked, practically irresponsible?

The honest man, the honest historian, will check himself and be his own censor, or, in other words, will take for his censors and guiding lights Learning, Truth, Justice.

Here's **one strategy for developing a research topic** once you have a broad topic in mind:

- **Background research** will help you develop your topic and hone or change it in more appropriate ways. **Knowing more about your topic's background can only help you develop a more effective topic, and therefore, research paper.**
- **Brainstorm concepts.** Once you think of a broad topic that interests you, try to brainstorm all of the words or concepts you can that might be related to that topic (and write them down!). For example, if your topic is "polar bears," you might think of the following words and topics in association: ice, cubs, pollution, hunting, diet, climate change, and environmental icon.
- **Develop a research question.** Once you have come up with a broad topic and done some background research, you may want to develop a research question, or a question you're going to answer in your paper by doing more, in-depth research.
- **What's your general approach to the topic?** Think about some general approaches that may help you further develop your topic: use a historical angle by focusing on a particular time period; a geographical angle, focusing on a particular part of the world; or a sociological angle, focusing on a particular group of people.
- **Start doing some exploratory, in-depth research.** As you do more in-depth research, like looking for scholarly articles, books, and other sources to include in your paper, you can and probably will modify or refine your topic based on what you find.
- **Research is a dynamic process.** Don't be afraid to discover new things and modify or refine your topic.

The topic development process will help you to develop your **thesis**, which is essentially your proposed answer to your research question. You will then be ready to use the sources you've found, and find more sources in order to support that thesis, or to answer your research question.

Here's an example of how the topic development process above can lead you to a thesis:

## **Literature Review**

A literature review is a study – or, more accurately, a survey – involving scholarly material, with the aim to discuss published information about a specific topic or

research question. Therefore, to write a literature review, it is compulsory that you are a real expert in the object of study. The results and findings will be published and made available to the public, namely scientists working in the same area of research.

## **How to Write a Literature Review**

First of all, don't forget that writing a literature review is a great responsibility. It's a document that is expected to be highly reliable, especially concerning its sources and findings. You have to feel intellectually comfortable in the area of study and highly proficient in the target language; misconceptions and errors do not have a place in a document as important as a literature review. In fact, you might want to consider text editing services, like those offered at Elsevier, to make sure your literature is following the highest standards of text quality. You want to make sure your literature review is memorable by its novelty and quality rather than language errors.

Writing a literature review requires expertise but also organization. We cannot teach you about your topic of research, but we can provide a few steps to guide you through conducting a literature review:

### **Primary Data Collection Methods**

Primary data is collected from the first-hand experience and is not used in the past. The data gathered by primary data collection methods are specific to the research's motive and highly accurate.

Primary data collection methods can be divided into two categories: quantitative methods and qualitative methods.

### **Secondary Data Collection Methods**

Secondary data is the data that has been used in the past. The researcher can obtain data from the sources, both internal and external, to the organization.

## **Internal and External Criticism**

Foot notes

When using either type of footnote, insert a number formatted in superscript following any punctuation mark apart from a dash (—). A footnote callout should

precede the dash. A footnote callout should only be placed inside of a set of parentheses if it directly pertains to the material inside. There should not be a space before a footnote callout, and a footnote callout should never occur in a heading. For example:

Caxton's printing of the *Morte Darthur*—dated 1485<sup>1</sup>—changes several aspects of the Pentecostal Oath.<sup>2</sup> (The Winchester Manuscript's version of the Oath will be discussed later in this chapter.<sup>3</sup>)

When using the footnote function in a word-processing program like Microsoft Word, place all footnotes at the bottom of the page on which they appear. Footnotes may also appear on their own page after the References page in your document. Center and bold the word "Footnotes" at the top of the page. Indent one tab (or five spaces) on the first line of each footnote. Put a space between the footnote number and the footnote itself. Then, follow normal paragraph spacing rules. Double space throughout.

## **Bibliography**

A bibliography is a list of all of the sources you have used (whether referenced or not) in the process of researching your work. In general, a bibliography should include:

- the authors' names
- the titles of the works
- the names and locations of the companies that published your copies of the sources
- the dates your copies were published
- the page numbers of your sources (if they are part of multi-source volumes)

The word appendix comes from the Latin "*appendere*," meaning "hang upon." An appendix is a collection of supplementary materials, usually appearing at the end of a [report](#), academic paper, [proposal](#) (such as a bid or a grant), or book. It typically includes data and supporting documents the writer has used to develop the written work.

## **Examples of Supporting Materials**

### **Appendix – Documentation**

Not every report, proposal, or book requires an appendix. Including one, however, allows a writer to point to additional information that may be relevant to readers but would be out of place in the main body of the text. An appendix can give the reader more depth regarding the topic, supply resources for further reading or contact lists, or provide documentation to make the case for a grant or bid proposal. That said, an appendix should *not* be treated as an opportunity for [padding](#).

Appendix information may include tables, figures, charts, letters, memos, detailed technical specs, maps, drawings, diagrams, photos, or other materials. In the case of research papers, supporting materials may include surveys, questionnaires, or schematics and the like that were used to produce the results included in the paper.

### **Formatting an Appendix**

The way in which you format your appendix depends on the style guide you have chosen to follow for your work. In general, each item referred to in your text (table, figure, chart, or other information) should be included as its own appendix. However, if there are many data sets under one grouping, keep them together in their appendix and label each piece appropriately.

If you have more than one appendix, label the appendices "Appendix A," "Appendix B," and so forth, so that you can easily cite them in the body of the report, and start each on a separate page. For the ease of the readers, put your appendices in the order that you refer to them in the paper and don't forget to note them in the table of contents—if your work has one.

Research papers, including academic and medical studies, usually follow [APA style guidelines](#) for the formatting of appendices. They can also follow the Chicago Manual of Style. For each of these styles, format the appendix as follows.

