

ASSIGNMENT No. 1

Q.1 Discuss the status of History as a social science in the context of E. H. Carr's debate in What is History?

The concept of history plays a fundamental role in human thought. It invokes notions of human agency, change, the role of material circumstances in human affairs, and the putative meaning of historical events. It raises the possibility of "learning from history." And it suggests the possibility of better understanding ourselves in the present, by understanding the forces, choices, and circumstances that brought us to our current situation. It is therefore unsurprising that philosophers have sometimes turned their attention to efforts to examine history itself and the nature of historical knowledge. These reflections can be grouped together into a body of work called "philosophy of history." This work is heterogeneous, comprising analyses and arguments of idealists, positivists, logicians, theologians, and others, and moving back and forth over the divides between European and Anglo-American philosophy, and between hermeneutics and positivism.

Given the plurality of voices within the "philosophy of history," it is impossible to give one definition of the field that suits all these approaches. In fact, it is misleading to imagine that we refer to a single philosophical tradition when we invoke the phrase, "philosophy of history," because the strands of research characterized here rarely engage in dialogue with each other. Still, we can usefully think of philosophers' writings about history as clustering around several large questions, involving metaphysics, hermeneutics, epistemology, and historicism:

(1) What does history consist of—individual actions, social structures, periods and regions, civilizations, large causal processes, divine intervention? (2) Does history as a whole have meaning, structure, or direction, beyond the individual events and actions that make it up? (3) What is involved in our knowing, representing, and explaining history? (4) To what extent is human history constitutive of the human present. First, historians are interested in providing conceptualizations and factual descriptions of events and circumstances in the past. This effort is an answer to questions like these: "What happened? What was it like? What were some of the circumstances and happenings that took place during this period in the past?" Sometimes this means simply reconstructing a complicated story from scattered historical sources—for example, in constructing a narrative of the Spanish Civil War or attempting to sort out the series of events that culminated in the Detroit race riot / uprising of 1967. But sometimes it means engaging in substantial conceptual work in order to arrive at a vocabulary in terms of which to characterize "what happened." Concerning the disorders of 1967 in Detroit: was this a riot or an uprising? How did participants and contemporaries think about it?

Second, historians often want to answer "why" questions: "Why did this event occur? What were the conditions and forces that brought it about?" This body of questions invites the historian to provide an explanation of the event or pattern he or she describes: the rise of fascism in Spain, the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the great global financial crisis of 2008. And providing an explanation requires, most basically, an account of the causal mechanisms, background circumstances, and human choices that brought the outcome about. We explain an

Course: Historical Research Methods (5676)

Semester: Autumn, 2021

historical outcome when we identify the social causes, forces, and actions that brought it about, or made it more likely.

Third, and related to the previous point, historians are sometimes interested in answering a “how” question: “How did this outcome come to pass? What were the processes through which the outcome occurred?” How did the Prussian Army succeed in defeating the superior French Army in 1870? How did Truman manage to defeat Dewey in the 1948 US election? Here the pragmatic interest of the historian's account derives from the antecedent unlikelihood of the event in question: how was this outcome possible? This too is an explanation; but it is an answer to a “how possible” question rather than a “why necessary” question.

Fourth, often historians are interested in piecing together the human meanings and intentions that underlie a given complex series of historical actions. They want to help the reader make sense of the historical events and actions, in terms of the thoughts, motives, and states of mind of the participants. For example: Why did Napoleon III carelessly provoke Prussia into war in 1870? Why has the Burmese junta dictatorship been so intransigent in its treatment of democracy activist Aung San Suu Kyi? Why did northern cities in the United States develop such profound patterns of racial segregation after World War II? Answers to questions like these require interpretation of actions, meanings, and intentions—of individual actors and of cultures that characterize whole populations. This aspect of historical thinking is “hermeneutic,” interpretive, and ethnographic.

And, of course, the historian faces an even more basic intellectual task: that of discovering and making sense of the archival information that exists about a given event or time in the past. Historical data do not speak for themselves; archives are incomplete, ambiguous, contradictory, and confusing. The historian needs to interpret individual pieces of evidence; and he or she needs to be able to somehow fit the mass of evidence into a coherent and truthful story. So complex events like the Spanish Civil War present the historian with an ocean of historical traces in repositories and archives all over the world; these collections sometimes reflect specific efforts at concealment by the powerful (for example, Franco's efforts to conceal all evidence of mass killings of Republicans after the end of fighting); and the historian's task is to find ways of using this body of evidence to discern some of the truth about the past.

In short, historians conceptualize, describe, contextualize, explain, and interpret events and circumstances of the past. They sketch out ways of representing the complex activities and events of the past; they explain and interpret significant outcomes; and they base their findings on evidence in the present that bears upon facts about the past. Their accounts need to be grounded on the evidence of the available historical record; and their explanations and interpretations require that the historian arrive at hypotheses about social causes and cultural meanings. Historians can turn to the best available theories in the social and behavioral sciences to arrive at theories about causal mechanisms and human behavior; so historical statements depend ultimately upon factual inquiry and theoretical reasoning. Ultimately, the historian's task is to shed light on the what, why, and how of the past, based on inferences from the evidence of the present.

Two preliminary issues are relevant to almost all discussions of history and the philosophy of history. These are issues having to do with the constitution of history and the levels at which we choose to characterize historical events and processes. The first issue concerns the relationship between actors and causes in history: is history a sequence of causal relations, or is it the outcome of an interlocking series of human actions? The second issue concerns the question of scale of historical processes in space and time: how should historians seek to reconcile micro-, meso-, and macro-perspectives on history? Both issues can be illustrated in the history of France. Should we imagine that twentieth-century France is the end result of a number of major causes in its past—the collapse of the Roman order in the territory, the military successes of Charlemagne, the occurrence of the French Revolution, and defeat in the Franco-Prussian War? Or should we acknowledge that France at any point in time was the object of action and contest among individuals, groups, and organizations, and that the interplay of strategic actors is a more fertile way of thinking about French history than the idea of a series of causal events? Scale is equally controversial. Should we think of France as a single comprehensive region, or as the agglomeration of separate regions and cultures with their own historical dynamics (Alsace, Brittany, Burgundy)? Further, is it useful to consider the long expanse of human activity in the territory of what is now France, or are historians better advised to focus their attention on shorter periods of time? The following two sections will briefly consider these issues.

An important problem for the philosophy of history is how to conceptualize “history” itself. Is history largely of interest because of the objective causal relations that exist among historical events and structures like the absolutist state or the Roman Empire? Or is history an agglomeration of the actions and mental frameworks of myriad individuals, high and low?

Historians often pose questions like these: “What were some of the causes of the fall of Rome?”, “what were the causes of the rise of fascism?”, or “what were the causes of the Industrial Revolution?”. But what if the reality of history is significantly different from what is implied by this approach? What if the causes of some very large and significant historical events are themselves small, granular, gradual, and cumulative? What if there is no satisfyingly simple and high-level answer to the question, why did Rome fall? What if, instead, the best we can do in some of these cases is to identify a swarm of independent, small-scale processes and contingencies that eventually produced the large outcome of interest?

More radically, it is worth considering whether this way of thinking about history as a series of causes and effects is even remotely suited to its subject matter. What if we think that the language of static causes does not work particularly well in the context of history? What if we take seriously the idea that history is the result of the actions and thoughts of vast numbers of actors, so history is a flow of action and knowledge rather than a sequence of causes and effects? What if we believe that there is an overwhelming amount of contingency and path dependency in history? Do these alternative conceptions of history suggest that we need to ask different questions about large historical changes?

Here is an alternative way of thinking of history: we might focus on history as a set of social conditions and processes that constrain and propel actions, rather than as a discrete set of causes and effects. We might couch historical explanations in terms of how individual actors (low and high) acted in the context of these conditions; and we might interpret the large outcomes as no more than the aggregation of these countless actors and their actions. Such an approach would help to inoculate us against the error of reification of historical structures, periods, or forces, in favor of a more disaggregated conception of multiple actors and shifting conditions of action.

This orientation brings along with it the importance of analyzing closely the social and natural environment in which actors frame their choices. Our account of the flow of human action eventuating in historical change unavoidably needs to take into account the institutional and situational environment in which these actions take place. Part of the topography of a period of historical change is the ensemble of institutions that exist more or less stably in the period: property relations, political institutions, family structures, and educational practices, religious and moral values. So historical explanations need to be sophisticated in their treatment of institutions and practices. This approach gives a basis for judging that such-and-so circumstance “caused” a given historical change; but it also provides an understanding of the way in which this kind of historical cause is embodied and conveyed—through the actions and thoughts of individuals in response to given natural and social circumstances.

Social circumstances can be both inhibiting and enabling; they constitute the environment within which individuals plan and act. It is an important circumstance that a given period in time possesses a fund of scientific and technical knowledge, a set of social relationships of power, and a level of material productivity. It is also an important circumstance that knowledge is limited; that coercion exists; and that resources for action are limited. Within these opportunities and limitations, individuals, from leaders to ordinary people, make out their lives and ambitions through action.

What all of this suggests is an alternative way of thinking about history that has a different structure from the idea of history as a stream of causes and effects, structures and events. This approach might be called “actor-centered history”: we explain an epoch when we have an account of what people thought and believed; what they wanted; and what social and environmental conditions framed their choices. It is a view of history that gives close attention to states of knowledge, ideology, and agency, as well as institutions, organizations, and structures, and that gives less priority to the framework of cause and effect.

Q.2 Discuss the relationship of History and Economics indicating the points of convergence and divergence between both sciences.

There are numerous trends and tools in the world of economics and finance. Some of them describe opposing forces, such as divergence and convergence. Divergence generally means two things are moving apart while convergence implies that two forces are moving together. In the world of economics, finance, and trading, divergence and convergence are terms used to describe the directional relationship of two trends, prices, or

indicators. But as the general definitions imply, these two terms refer to how these relationships move. Divergence indicates that two trends move further away from each other while convergence indicates how they move closer together.

- Divergence occurs when the price of an asset and an indicator move away from each other.
- Convergence happens when the price of an asset and an indicator move toward each other.
- Divergence can be either positive or negative.
- Convergence occurs because an efficient market won't allow something to trade for two prices at the same time
- Technical traders are more interested in divergence as a signal to trade while the absence of convergence is an opportunity for arbitrage.

When the value of an asset, indicator, or index moves, the related asset, indicator, or index moves in the other direction. This is what is referred to as divergence. Divergence warns that the current price trend may be weakening, and in some cases may lead to the price changing direction.

Divergence can be either positive or negative. For example, positive divergence occurs when a stock is nearing a low but its indicators start to rally. This would be a sign of trend reversal, potentially opening up an entry opportunity for the trader. On the other hand, negative divergence happens when prices go higher while the indicator signals a new low.¹

When divergence does occur, it does not mean the price will reverse or that a reversal will occur soon. In fact, divergence can last a long time, so acting on it alone could mean substantial losses if the price does not react as expected. Traders generally don't exclusively rely on divergence in their trading activities. That's because it doesn't provide timely trade signals on its own.

The term convergence is the opposite of divergence. It is used to describe the phenomenon of the futures price and the cash price of the underlying commodity moving closer together over time. In most cases, traders refer to convergence as a way to describe the price action of a futures contract.²

Theoretically, convergence happens because an efficient market won't allow something to trade for two prices at the same time. The actual market value of a futures contract is lower than the contract price at issue because traders have to factor in the time value of the security. As the expiration date on the contract approaches, the premium on the time value shrinks, and the two prices converge.

If the prices did not converge, traders would take advantage of the price difference to make a quick profit. This would continue until prices converged. When prices don't converge, there is an opportunity for arbitrage. Arbitrage is when an asset is bought and sold at the same time, in different markets, to take advantage of a temporary price difference. This situation takes advantage of inefficiencies in the market.

Technical traders are much more concerned with divergence than convergence, largely because convergence is assumed to occur in a normal market. Many technical indicators commonly use divergence as tools,

primarily oscillators. They map out bands (both high and low ones) that occur between two extreme values. They then build trend indicators that flow within those boundaries.³

Divergence is a phenomenon that is commonly interpreted to mean that a trend is weak or potentially unsustainable. Traders who employ technical analysis as part of their trading strategies use divergence to read the underlying momentum of an asset.

Convergence occurs when the price of an asset, indicator, or index moves in the same direction as a related asset, indicator, or index in technical analysis. For example, there is convergence when the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) shows gains at the same time that its accumulation/distribution line is increasing.

Q.3 Examine the significance of Autobiographies in historical research indicating their merits and demerits.

Historical recording of past events forms the basis of future and present day lives. History not only reveals the progress of a subject, but also the events, actions and influences of such past.

Historians analyze events and use evidence and other justifiable reasons to explain the influences of the past. History plays an important role in the social, cultural, political and other societal developments. History is at the heart of any subject and acts as a symbol of posterity and justifications of values held and belief systems.

The recording of historical events based on evidence however faces the issues of truth in terms of criticisms as to whether it represents an objective interpretation of the evidence provided. Records such as bibliographies are crucial for historians in their evaluation of characters, beliefs, values, interpretation of events and explanations for actions taken. Most historians agree that memoirs are at the heart of history recording and interpretation.

However, some philosophers argue that the use of memoirs to record past events creates subjectivity and questions the fairness and truth of such historical recording. Therefore, the merits and pitfalls of using memoirs to record past events are worth evaluating to establish an objective stand.

Memoir or biography as evidence for past events

This essay shall entail evaluating the merits and pitfalls of using memoirs in recording past events. The essay shall include the role that such memoirs play in history recording as well as the factors that influence their reliance and use as evidence in history recording.

The role of memoirs or biographies in history

Memoirs are basically personal recordings of the individual events and happenings that act as a trace of the life of such an individual. While people write memoirs for different personal reasons under different motivations, they still record the events of their life and other issues influencing them.

The role of memoirs in history recording is worth evaluating since it is from this role that their use can be justified or not based on personal interpretations. Memoirs have subsequently been used in recording of past accounts as Fowale points out.^[1] Memoirs express the truth in history due to the fact that they are primary sources of evidence and as such the fairness expected of history.^[2] The interpretation of historical events does

not only rely on other recordings but memoirs play the role of such interpretation with the provision of a flow of events and the time coverage of such events.

History recording requires the explaining of human actions taken. Such human actions however include the evaluation of the beliefs, desires, principles held, values and opinions. These human actions are best interpreted using memoirs as they record the feelings, events and actions taken which represent the individual values, beliefs, opinions and desires.

Factors that influence the use of bibliographies in the recording of past events

The use of memoirs in recording of past events by historians is based on their judgments that such records would reveal their intended interpretation.

Evaluation of such factors is thus important in the essay since it lays the foundation of the importance and the reasons why such memoirs are used. The interpretation of historical events requires the reliance on such evidence as is linked to the events under discussion. Memoirs are classified as primary sources of historical evidence since they represent the actual event interpretation of the writer.

Further, they are classified into different types which permeate history recording.^[3] The use of memoirs in history also stems from the advantage they have of reliability since most other sources of evidence are faced with issues of actual event description and loss of memory in event account.^[4] Memoirs are of use where there are limited sources of evidence to account for past events and provide the different perspectives of history events.^[5] The factors of using memoirs also are represented in the posterity they offer to history recording.^[6]

Merits of using memoirs in recording of history

The use of memoirs in history recording is based on justified reasons which form the merits of such memoirs. The merits of using memoirs in history recording of past events incorporate the value they play in different fields of use of such history. The fact that memoirs are primary sources of evidence increases the validity of history sources since such recordings are not based on any secondary interpretations of information.

Memoirs also are necessary in history recording especially where there are limited sources of evidence hence can be used to record such events while they provide historical data from different perspectives and based on different events which increases the value and content of history.

Further, memoirs provide interpretation of actions and events while they provide the necessary chronological of events as described with the records of the times and dates.^[7] Additionally, memoirs increase the reality of events recorded with the use of feelings. They increase the fields of application of historical research such as political, philosophical, language, social, economic and cultural interpretations increasing the use of historical data.^[8]

The use of memoirs in recording of historical events has been criticized from different perspectives. Firstly, memoirs are individualized and as such reliance on them would provide a biased view point especially where varying perspectives of different memoirs are used. Memoirs also are just recordings of such events as the

writer deems necessary.^[9] This means that some aspects written are just a mere expression of opinions which cannot be effectively applied for a group context.

While memoirs are not just used by historians, they elicit different interpretations from different users which are based on their own perceptions and other factors influencing their perceptions. This creates a conflict as to the interpretation to base on and contradicts the truth basis of history.^[10] While memoirs are useful in the interpretation of past events, sometimes they do not represent rational explanations of actions which limit their application.

Historians have been criticized of trying to establish the causes of actions which are limited by memoirs due to the individual differences. Further, history based on emotions is not stable enough to stand the test of time. This is because memoirs are based on expression of the feelings of an individual which are influenced by different factors.^[11] Memoirs are also prone to modifications by the individual writer especially based on changes of opinions due to more knowledge on the subject which cannot be clearly identified from them thus limiting their use.

Annotated Bibliography

Fowale in this article provides an account of his support of the fact that biographies play a very important role in history. While he acknowledges that biographies provide the basis of historical accounts, he points out that much historical writing derives its sense of richness from biographies.

He examines the different characteristics and types of biographies as the individual, research based, critical and standard ones which influence the depth of their application and relevance to history writing. Fowale further identifies that most biographies serve as accounts of the legacy of an individual and are used for the purposes of posterity.

He observes that biographies not only provide accounts of an individual life but also permeate to the events, actions and the happenings of historical importance to the person. In the overall account, Fowale reveals his opinion that biographies are at the heart of history and influence the nature and purposes played by such history.

Q.4 ‘No documents no history’. Elaborate the statement.

The concept of history plays a fundamental role in human thought. It invokes notions of human agency, change, the role of material circumstances in human affairs, and the putative meaning of historical events. It raises the possibility of “learning from history.” And it suggests the possibility of better understanding ourselves in the present, by understanding the forces, choices, and circumstances that brought us to our current situation. It is therefore unsurprising that philosophers have sometimes turned their attention to efforts to examine history itself and the nature of historical knowledge. These reflections can be grouped together into a body of work called “philosophy of history.” This work is heterogeneous, comprising analyses and arguments of idealists, positivists, logicians, theologians, and others, and moving back and forth over the divides between European and Anglo-American philosophy, and between hermeneutics and positivism.

Course: Historical Research Methods (5676)

Semester: Autumn, 2021

Given the plurality of voices within the “philosophy of history,” it is impossible to give one definition of the field that suits all these approaches. In fact, it is misleading to imagine that we refer to a single philosophical tradition when we invoke the phrase, “philosophy of history,” because the strands of research characterized here rarely engage in dialogue with each other. Still, we can usefully think of philosophers' writings about history as clustering around several large questions, involving metaphysics, hermeneutics, epistemology, and historicism:

(1) What does history consist of—individual actions, social structures, periods and regions, civilizations, large causal processes, divine intervention? (2) Does history as a whole have meaning, structure, or direction, beyond the individual events and actions that make it up? (3) What is involved in our knowing, representing, and explaining history? (4) To what extent is human history constitutive of the human present. First, historians are interested in providing conceptualizations and factual descriptions of events and circumstances in the past. This effort is an answer to questions like these: “What happened? What was it like? What were some of the circumstances and happenings that took place during this period in the past?” Sometimes this means simply reconstructing a complicated story from scattered historical sources—for example, in constructing a narrative of the Spanish Civil War or attempting to sort out the series of events that culminated in the Detroit race riot / uprising of 1967. But sometimes it means engaging in substantial conceptual work in order to arrive at a vocabulary in terms of which to characterize “what happened.” Concerning the disorders of 1967 in Detroit: was this a riot or an uprising? How did participants and contemporaries think about it?

Second, historians often want to answer “why” questions: “Why did this event occur? What were the conditions and forces that brought it about?” This body of questions invites the historian to provide an explanation of the event or pattern he or she describes: the rise of fascism in Spain, the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the great global financial crisis of 2008. And providing an explanation requires, most basically, an account of the causal mechanisms, background circumstances, and human choices that brought the outcome about. We explain an historical outcome when we identify the social causes, forces, and actions that brought it about, or made it more likely.

Third, and related to the previous point, historians are sometimes interested in answering a “how” question: “How did this outcome come to pass? What were the processes through which the outcome occurred?” How did the Prussian Army succeed in defeating the superior French Army in 1870? How did Truman manage to defeat Dewey in the 1948 US election? Here the pragmatic interest of the historian's account derives from the antecedent unlikelihood of the event in question: how was this outcome possible? This too is an explanation; but it is an answer to a “how possible” question rather than a “why necessary” question.

Fourth, often historians are interested in piecing together the human meanings and intentions that underlie a given complex series of historical actions. They want to help the reader make sense of the historical events and actions, in terms of the thoughts, motives, and states of mind of the participants. For example: Why did Napoleon III carelessly provoke Prussia into war in 1870? Why has the Burmese junta dictatorship been so intransigent in its treatment of democracy activist Aung San Suu Kyi? Why did northern cities in the United

Course: Historical Research Methods (5676)

Semester: Autumn, 2021

States develop such profound patterns of racial segregation after World War II? Answers to questions like these require interpretation of actions, meanings, and intentions—of individual actors and of cultures that characterize whole populations. This aspect of historical thinking is “hermeneutic,” interpretive, and ethnographic.

And, of course, the historian faces an even more basic intellectual task: that of discovering and making sense of the archival information that exists about a given event or time in the past. Historical data do not speak for themselves; archives are incomplete, ambiguous, contradictory, and confusing. The historian needs to interpret individual pieces of evidence; and he or she needs to be able to somehow fit the mass of evidence into a coherent and truthful story. So complex events like the Spanish Civil War present the historian with an ocean of historical traces in repositories and archives all over the world; these collections sometimes reflect specific efforts at concealment by the powerful (for example, Franco's efforts to conceal all evidence of mass killings of Republicans after the end of fighting); and the historian's task is to find ways of using this body of evidence to discern some of the truth about the past.

In short, historians conceptualize, describe, contextualize, explain, and interpret events and circumstances of the past. They sketch out ways of representing the complex activities and events of the past; they explain and interpret significant outcomes; and they base their findings on evidence in the present that bears upon facts about the past. Their accounts need to be grounded on the evidence of the available historical record; and their explanations and interpretations require that the historian arrive at hypotheses about social causes and cultural meanings. Historians can turn to the best available theories in the social and behavioral sciences to arrive at theories about causal mechanisms and human behavior; so historical statements depend ultimately upon factual inquiry and theoretical reasoning. Ultimately, the historian's task is to shed light on the what, why, and how of the past, based on inferences from the evidence of the present.

Two preliminary issues are relevant to almost all discussions of history and the philosophy of history. These are issues having to do with the constitution of history and the levels at which we choose to characterize historical events and processes. The first issue concerns the relationship between actors and causes in history: is history a sequence of causal relations, or is it the outcome of an interlocking series of human actions? The second issue concerns the question of scale of historical processes in space and time: how should historians seek to reconcile micro-, meso-, and macro-perspectives on history? Both issues can be illustrated in the history of France. Should we imagine that twentieth-century France is the end result of a number of major causes in its past—the collapse of the Roman order in the territory, the military successes of Charlemagne, the occurrence of the French Revolution, and defeat in the Franco-Prussian War? Or should we acknowledge that France at any point in time was the object of action and contest among individuals, groups, and organizations, and that the interplay of strategic actors is a more fertile way of thinking about French history than the idea of a series of causal events? Scale is equally controversial. Should we think of France as a single comprehensive region, or as the agglomeration of separate regions and cultures with their own historical dynamics (Alsace, Brittany, Burgundy)? Further, is it useful to consider the long expanse of human activity in the territory of what is now

France, or are historians better advised to focus their attention on shorter periods of time? The following two sections will briefly consider these issues.

An important problem for the philosophy of history is how to conceptualize “history” itself. Is history largely of interest because of the objective causal relations that exist among historical events and structures like the absolutist state or the Roman Empire? Or is history an agglomeration of the actions and mental frameworks of myriad individuals, high and low?

Historians often pose questions like these: “What were some of the causes of the fall of Rome?”, “what were the causes of the rise of fascism?”, or “what were the causes of the Industrial Revolution?”. But what if the reality of history is significantly different from what is implied by this approach? What if the causes of some very large and significant historical events are themselves small, granular, gradual, and cumulative? What if there is no satisfyingly simple and high-level answer to the question, why did Rome fall? What if, instead, the best we can do in some of these cases is to identify a swarm of independent, small-scale processes and contingencies that eventually produced the large outcome of interest?

More radically, it is worth considering whether this way of thinking about history as a series of causes and effects is even remotely suited to its subject matter. What if we think that the language of static causes does not work particularly well in the context of history? What if we take seriously the idea that history is the result of the actions and thoughts of vast numbers of actors, so history is a flow of action and knowledge rather than a sequence of causes and effects? What if we believe that there is an overwhelming amount of contingency and path dependency in history? Do these alternative conceptions of history suggest that we need to ask different questions about large historical changes?

Here is an alternative way of thinking of history: we might focus on history as a set of social conditions and processes that constrain and propel actions, rather than as a discrete set of causes and effects. We might couch historical explanations in terms of how individual actors (low and high) acted in the context of these conditions; and we might interpret the large outcomes as no more than the aggregation of these countless actors and their actions. Such an approach would help to inoculate us against the error of reification of historical structures, periods, or forces, in favor of a more disaggregated conception of multiple actors and shifting conditions of action.

This orientation brings along with it the importance of analyzing closely the social and natural environment in which actors frame their choices. Our account of the flow of human action eventuating in historical change unavoidably needs to take into account the institutional and situational environment in which these actions take place. Part of the topography of a period of historical change is the ensemble of institutions that exist more or less stably in the period: property relations, political institutions, family structures, and educational practices, religious and moral values. So historical explanations need to be sophisticated in their treatment of institutions and practices. This approach gives a basis for judging that such-and-so circumstance “caused” a given historical change; but it also provides an understanding of the way in which this kind of historical cause is embodied and

conveyed—through the actions and thoughts of individuals in response to given natural and social circumstances.

Social circumstances can be both inhibiting and enabling; they constitute the environment within which individuals plan and act. It is an important circumstance that a given period in time possesses a fund of scientific and technical knowledge, a set of social relationships of power, and a level of material productivity. It is also an important circumstance that knowledge is limited; that coercion exists; and that resources for action are limited. Within these opportunities and limitations, individuals, from leaders to ordinary people, make out their lives and ambitions through action.

What all of this suggests is an alternative way of thinking about history that has a different structure from the idea of history as a stream of causes and effects, structures and events. This approach might be called “actor-centered history”: we explain an epoch when we have an account of what people thought and believed; what they wanted; and what social and environmental conditions framed their choices. It is a view of history that gives close attention to states of knowledge, ideology, and agency, as well as institutions, organizations, and structures, and that gives less priority to the framework of cause and effect.

Q.5 Define Epigraphy? How does Epigraphy help a historian in his research?

The study of written records engraved on hard and durable material is known as epigraphy. Epigraphy is a primary source for historians which help them in understanding, interpreting and analyzing the recorded past. Epigraphy is considered as one of the authentic sources of the past.

Ancient writings had their own meaning at their respective cultural and historical eras. Therefore, to learn about the past, it is essential to learn what exactly these writings mean. The process of determining, studying and analyzing such ancient graphemes is called epigraphy. Specialists in this field (and the people who are dedicated to the research of these ancient writings) are called epigraphers. In order to conduct a full-scale study of historical documents, epigraphers reconstruct the texts, translate the words and run a dating test to identify the time in which the inscription might have been written. It is also important to note that epigraphy is a branch of archaeology.

History Of Epigraphy

Epigraphy has been practiced for quite some time. Different cultures around the globe have been doing it in their ways to serve their needs. At first, Latin documents were the subject of intense study by European epigraphers who included Georg Fabricius. The largest collection of Latin writings called the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, were the product of the work done by Memmosen together with fellow scholars who did extensive research on them. Despite the interruptions of the Prussian wars at that time, the documents were published in Berlin since 1863. Greek writings were published too in Berlin during the time of 1827-1877 under the title, Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. Other series of publications that have been comprehensively studied and published by epigraphers include Roman, Egyptian and Persian writings among others.

Forms Of Epigraphy

Historical materials come in different forms that require epigraphers to use different methods to handle and analyze them. Such materials can either be writings on stone tablets, marble surfaces, and wood. The methods employed have to respond to the unique challenges that each element brings, for example, limestone does not have a smooth surface hence analyzing inscriptions written on it hard. Clay inscriptions, however, are easier to decrypt since they were made when the clay was still soft and later hardened by fire in furnaces. Tools like the chisel were often used to make writings on wood, stone and metal surfaces. A hammer was also during chiseling, primarily when working on hard surfaces like rocks. The amount of work that went into the making of these historical archives shows how professional they were done.

Purpose Of Epigraphy

The rulers used inscriptions extensively in the ancient times to record their edicts and decrees for their subjects. In ancient Greece, they were placed at the Acropolis where any Greek citizen would read about the important decrees made by the people. Information about the expenditure of the government was also put there. In Greek temples, inscriptions were used to record financial matters like the payment of loans, gifts, and properties sold or bought by religious leaders. Rituals were also recorded for the sole purpose of guiding worshippers on the correct procedure of conducting them. Thus, epigraphy helps to reveal all this ancient knowledge stored in the form of writing over a period of centuries.