

## 26. ANALYSIS OF SOURCES

*The main aim of historical research is to apply the method of reflective thinking to social problems, still unsolved, by means of discovery of past trends of event, fact or attitude.*

*- F.L. Whitney.*

### 26.1 HISTORICAL METHOD

#### 26.1.1 What is Historical Method?

The past has a great role to play in all societies. In a country like India the past is often the key to the present for the simple reason that institutions are a growth and not a series of disjointed events. The longest the history, the greatest is the influence of the past. The past has a causal relation to the present. A proper understanding of historical events, eventful changes and the causes for these changes requires the researcher to take resort to historical method. Historical method is "the induction of principles through research into the past".<sup>1</sup> Its aim is to apply reflective thinking to solve historical problems. It is directed towards the uniqueness of past facts.

#### 26.1.2 Application of Historical Method

The historical method has to be applied and its application has to be useful and correct. It therefore demands many things of the researcher. *To start with*, a great deal of historical orientation is necessary. *Secondly*, it requires historical insight to realize and bring out the causal relations between events. *Thirdly*, the researcher who delves deep into the past and applies the historical method should be able to work out accurately how, when and why the events occurred, the conditions leading upto the event as well as the conditions growing out of it. *Fourthly*, this method demands experience in assembling data and in relating them to the influencing conditions and in assessing their significance in the particular context. *Fifthly*, the application of the historical method demands the use of both an analytical and synthetic view of the facts.

*Sixthly*, it is essential to make use of this method as much in discovering facts as in interpreting them. Every researcher should of course be objective, but the emphasis on objectivity becomes all the more necessary while using the historical method.<sup>2</sup> *Seventhly*, the data collected

should be adequate, reliable and relevant. *Eighthly*, the research scholar must be thoroughly familiar with the general field of his topic. *Ninthly*, the researcher must be fully aware of the difficulties in understanding and interpreting the historical events as well as the sources he may be able to mobilize. *Tenthly*, a great deal of imagination is necessary in using the historical method since a past event cannot be built with no other source than imagination.

## 26.2 CRITICISM

### 26.2.1 Heuristics or External Criticism

#### 1. Stages in Historical Method

There are *four stages* in the historical method, viz., 1) Heuristics or External criticism; 2) Hermeneutics or internal criticism; 3) Synthesis; and 4) Exposition. Selection of a suitable topic, preparation of a bibliography and the development of an outline are the preliminary operations of historical research. The remaining phases are Analytical, Synthetic and concluding operations. Analytical operation is divided into external criticism and internal criticism.

#### 2. Historical Criticism

Historical research is based on documents. Documents are "reports of events consisting of impressions made on some human brain by past events and consciously or deliberately recorded for the purpose of transmitting information".<sup>3</sup> The documents should not be accepted at the face value. They need to be evaluated. Their genuineness or authenticity should be established. Then only the researcher can place each bit of information found in the document in its proper perspective and draw conclusions. The evaluation of documents is therefore known as the '*historical criticism*'. The aim of historical criticism is to find out whether a given document or idea is acceptable as authentic or not. In other words, the purpose of historic criticism is to eliminate errors and to know the truth. And this is done through external and internal criticism.

#### 3. What is External Criticism?

##### Meaning of External Criticism

The term '*heuristics*' is derived from the Greek word '*heuriskein*', which means '*to find*'. That is to find out the authenticity of the document and the veracity of the information found in it. Heuristics is a technique to detect, trace and locate historical evidences. As a technique it is "an art rather than a science".<sup>4</sup> It has no general rules. It knows few short cuts. "It is, almost entirely, deftness in the handling of specialized guide-books, a

strong memory for bibliographical detail, severe self-discipline in the making, classifying and preserving of notes"'. No text book of heuristic exists! However, heuristic art can be acquired by practice.

### Preparatory Study

Heuristics is also called *External Criticism* or Lower Criticism. It is a preparatory study of documentary evidence. External criticism is "the search for material and the preliminary study of that material to know a few essentials of it".<sup>6</sup> Material traces of the past can be found in museums, archives, libraries or private collections. Unless the researcher has a solid and broad foundation of *accepted history* he will have to encounter insurmountable difficulty in locating the original documents. Accepted history gives the clue or cue for locating the sources. Proceeding from accepted history of his own special subject of research will save the scholar a lot of heuristic labour. For instance, a hint found in a biography may provide clues about the places and perhaps even the collection of documents and where the manuscripts are being preserved.

### Ascertaining Authenticity

As soon as the documentary trace is found it has to be judged. The researcher will have to decide whether the trace is suitable or not for his research. He must look at every trace or pack of traces and satisfy himself whether it is a good trace, and more important, whether it is an historical trace. Once the trace is detected it must be subjected to severe scrutiny. The authenticity of the trace should be ascertained because the only alternative to authenticity is forgery or fake. Objects might be forged for the purpose of selling them to amateur archaeologists, to be sold for gain, with a desire to deceive; and to provide a missing link in a sequence of events the researcher had imaginatively reconstructed. Positively heuristics makes sure that the trace detected is genuine, not spurious. Negatively, it ascertains that the trace is not a fake or forgery.<sup>7</sup>

### Tested Techniques

Research workers have over a period of time elaborated techniques of recognition of historical documents. The *triple techniques* of external criticism are:

- 1) the touchstone of accepted history.
- 2) the knowledge of the difficulty of faking and
- 3) the conformation provided by other objects of admitted authenticity. Now-a-days these techniques have become so precise that they are reckoned among the sciences. These techniques may not lead the

researcher to absolute or formal certainty, but it will definitely lead to what Ranier calls "an empirical satisfactoriness".<sup>8</sup>

To sum up, heuristics external criticism refers to the examination of source material about its authenticity. It *precedes* evaluation of its worth. At this stage, the research detects traces of past events, examines them and criticizes them. He judges them from the point of view of their *authenticity* and then he asks whether they are what they purport to be. That is, the trace is looked at from the outside and its value as a material object is judged. In short the authenticity of any historical material involves 1) determination of the time when it was written, 2) of the date and place where it originated; and 3) the determination of its authorship.<sup>9</sup>

### Functions of External Criticism

The *functions* of external criticism are many. The establishment of the authorship of the document; the determination of the place of the document; and the fixation of the time of the document are ofcourse the *primary* functions of external criticism. It establishes the authenticity of the record and helps to detect forgery. In the case of lithic and copper plate records Paleology can help detecting forgery. For example, "The Mercara Copper Plates that gave the clue to the Ganga dynasty of Karnataka were all found to be spurious"<sup>10</sup>

Similarly, if a coin struck in the reign of William and Mary of England were to read 'by the grace of God King and Queen of Great Briton, France and England', the coin is obviously a faked one, for Louis XIV was the king of France at that time"<sup>11</sup>

Of late *textual criticism* has become part of heuristics. Textual criticism involves application of certain principles and techniques in order to find out the authenticity of the text. It must be remembered that external criticism is a means to an end not an end by itself. "It is a temporary necessity and not a permanent feature of historical writing"<sup>12</sup>

## 26.2.2 Hermeneutics or Internal Criticism

### 1. Meaning of Internal Criticism

Hermeneutics is internal interpretative criticism. It is also called Higher Criticism. It is a science of interpretation. If heuristic deals with the external aspects of a document, hermeneutics deals with the internal aspects of the document. In other words, internal criticism is concerned with the authenticity of the *content* of the document. It seeks to ascertain whether the content is true or not. Its purpose is to establish the *trustworthiness* or otherwise of the contents of the document.

## 2. Application of Internal Criticism

Each trace contains a message. Once the trace is detected the researcher will raise the question whether he can trust the message which the detected trace appears to be carrying. Internal criticism can be applied only where the research workers are dealing with writing, whether in documents or in inscriptions, in monuments, coins, medals or seals. In internal criticism documents are looked at from the inside with the purpose of finding out whether the message it carries is genuine. It is not a separate operation. It takes place each time a researcher comes across a bundle of traces that forms a document.

## 3. Scrutiny of Statements

Since a researcher depends entirely upon the records for his information he has to ascertain the authenticity of the content of the documents. For the records might contain both true and false statements. Such statements have to be carefully tested and scrutinized before they are used. Some of the documents might be written with inadequate knowledge or with motivation or prejudice. The court historians might have written with a view to praise their patrons. Similarly, the foreign travelers might have been guided by rumours or hearsay. Rulers, administrators and military commanders would have been influenced by a particular standpoint in their writing. Hence the *personal elements* which might have entered into the account must be enquired into. Internal criticism helps the researcher in the process of finding out errors or fallacies of good faith or of accuracy.

Internal criticism is used to detect and determine whether the document contains errors or lies as the external criticism is confined to defect and determine whether the document is the trace of a forgery or not. Internal criticism is individual in its method. The authenticity of the textual content has to be ascertained and assessed on its own merit. It is done by the process of trial and error, the use of accepted history, the application of acquired experience and skill, and the techniques of physical science.

## 4. Two Types of Errors

### Errors of Good Faith

There are two types errors of fallacies, viz., Errors of Good Faith and Errors of Accuracy. If the error is deliberate and intentional, it is the question of good faith of the author. It may be due to several reasons.

- 1) The author may commit this fallacy when he writes to gain practical advantage for himself. The court chroniclers like Barani, Abul Fazl who wrote the history of their periods suffer from this defect.
- 2) The author might be the victim of circumstances. Social obligations, religious practices or political pressures would have obliged the author to write contrary to his personal convictions.
- 3) Personal preferences, prejudices and predilections towards events or persons might have influenced the author to deviate from truth. For instance, patriotic historian praises the virtues of his country as the biographer extols his hero.
- 4) The author when impelled by vanity-private or collective-becomes partial or partisan. Zealot historians attribute to his group or race, or religion or community or country a high and honoured place in the world.
- 5) Error of faith creeps in when the author intentionally writes to please the public.
- 6) The author distorts facts when he embellishes his writing with rhetorical distortions. In short, errors of good faith are committed when the author is not sincere, honest and faithful to his trade.<sup>13</sup>

### Errors of Accuracy

Similarly, *errors of accuracy* occur when the source of information is defective. The researchers may be sincere, honest and faithful but the information he gets may be wrong or defective due to reasons beyond his control. He may pass on the information in good faith without knowing that it is not true. Errors of accuracy are committed because 1) the author depends on reports furnished to him by others. 2) he writes under fear, force or illusion. 3) he is habitually incapable of observing things correctly.<sup>14</sup> 4) he is motivated by prejudices. 5) he is affected by external influences and conditions, time and place; and 6) he does not possess necessary experience and expertise to understand the facts in proper perspective. Errors of accuracy are committed because the historian is not the observer of events and has to necessarily depend on second hand accounts.<sup>15</sup>

### 5. The Critical Approach

The critical approach guards the researcher against the errors of good faith and of accuracy. The content of the document is critically analyzed. Each trace is closely studied and scrutinized. The document is divided into its constituent parts; the different traces contained in it are separated, analyzed and interpreted. Each trace is separately analyzed and

tested. In short, traces are tested in the crucible of criticism in order to know the nature of historical facts and to test their authenticity.

## 6. Kinds of Internal Criticism

### Positive Criticism

There are *two kinds* of internal criticism, viz., 1) Positive criticism and 2) Negative criticism. *Positive Criticism* refers to the analysis of the content. Its purposes are to know what the author really means by making a particular statement. Its task is to get at the literal and real meaning of the author's statements. In order to know the literal meaning of the document it is essential to know the language of the document. Familiarity of the language, linguistic usage, manner of writing and style, changes in expression etc. are necessary to understand the literal meaning of the text. Similarly, the real meaning submerged or concealed in the mire of words and phrases, simile and symbolism, allusion and analogy, hoax and hyperbole, must be discerned. The real meaning must be sifted from the hidden meaning, as grain from chaf.<sup>6</sup> In short, internal criticism is intended to extract the real meaning of the content of the document from the welter of words.

### Negative Criticism

*Negative criticism* is concerned with the process of eliminating statements which are patently false, fabricated or forged. Erroneous statements are discounted. Every statement and idea is doubted and scrutinized. No document is taken for granted or believed to be true. It must be kept in mind that no scientific truth is established by testimony nor criticism should be leveled en-bloc.

Presence of few inaccuracies or misstatements or exaggerated accounts do not invalidate the entire work. It is possible that a single statement is a mixture of true and false ideas, accurate and inaccurate narration. Thus, negative criticism inquires not only the good faith of the author but also the accuracy of the statement he makes. Both positive and negative criticism help the researcher to detect and remove errors of good faith and errors of accuracy and arrive at the historical facts. External and internal criticism is of crucial importance in historical research. In fact "it is a pivot on which the whole methodology revolves".<sup>17</sup>

## 7. Checklist for Internal Criticism

Beginners often get lost in the maze of verbiage of discussion of internal criticism. The evidence may be in the form of a sentence, a paragraph or more. It is important to decide on the proper unit of the evidence. The following checklist of questions will be useful to confirm the veracity of a piece of evidence:

- 1 Is the real meaning of the statement different from its literal meaning?
- 2 Is the author fully competent to observe the thing he reports?
- 3 How did the author report? What was his ability to do so?
- 4 What was the intention of the author in reporting?
- 5 Do his statements seem inherently improbable?
- 6 Is the information easier to observe?
- 7 Are there inner contradictions in the document?
- 8 Are your own biases and prejudices distorting your view of the document?
- 9 Do the statements tally with the references cited?
- 10 Does the statement leave you confident of your knowledge of that detail so that no corroboration is required?

### REFERENCES

1. Pauline Young, *Scientific Social Surveys and Research*, New York, 1960, p.207.
2. For instance Karl Marx's economic interpretation of history is no doubt brilliant but is not objective. Similarly, the attempt to interpret South Indian Rebellion of 1800, the Vellore Mutiny of 1806 and the Indian Mutiny of 1857 as the First War of Indian Independence is an instance of misusing the historical method.
3. Carter V.Good, *Essentials of Educational Research*, New York, 1966, p.156.
4. G.J.Renier, *History: Its Purpose and Method*, Boston, 1950, p.106.
5. *Ibid.*,
6. B.Sheik Ali, *History: Its Theory and Method*, reprint, 1991, p.116.
7. Letters can be compared from the point of view of handwriting, style, spelling, and other characteristic features. Similarly, coins can be compared in terms of shape, weight, workmanship etc.
8. G.J.Renier, *op.cit.*, p.110.
9. Allen Johnson, *Historian and Historical Evidence*, New York, 1926, p.50.
10. B.Sheik Ali, *op.cit.*, p.112.
11. G.J.Renier, *op.cit.*,
12. B.Sheik Ali, *op.cit.*, p.114.
13. *Ibid.*, pp.128-131.
14. This habitual incapacity is known as 'Froude's Disease'. Froude is one who would never report any event correctly.
15. B.Sheik Ali, *op.cit.*, pp.131 - 133.
16. Hunting for allegorical meaning everywhere in the text is called 'hyper-hermeneutics'.
17. B.Sheik Ali, *op.cit.*, p.117.



## 27. OBJECTIVITY IN HISTORICAL WRITING

*History is neither written nor made without love or hate.*  
- Theodor Mommsen,

### 27.1 MEANING OF OBJECTIVITY

To be objective means not influenced by personal feelings or opinions. Objectivity is the state of being objective. Objectivity in historical writing refers to "dispassionate, disinterested and scientific treatment of all events".<sup>1</sup> It means unbiased and fair writing. A thesis is a critical analysis of a problem. It should not consist of the reporting of personal experience or opinion of the research scholar. Scholarly writing is an impartial, unbiased and unvarnished presentation of the problem "using a tone of scientific impersonality".<sup>2</sup>

Ranke, the Father of Scientific History, analyzed the historical sources critically, followed the principle of unbiased research and sought to write his historical accounts with 'tranquil objectivity'. His dictum that "To judge history has been attributed the function to judge the past..." still holds good. Being a judge of men and events the historian should handle historical facts, events and developments with utmost impartiality. Hence, the writing of the research scholar must be true, unbiased and scientific.

### 27.2 IMPORTANCE OF OBJECTIVITY

Objectivity in historical writing is of critical importance. It is the essence of historical narration. The credibility of the historical thesis depends on objective presentation. History will degenerate into fiction in the absence of objectivity. Critical study of history is not possible without objectivity. Objective history is rational history. The need for objectivity in historical writing is self-evident:<sup>3</sup>

1. Impartiality is the soul and spice of historical writing. Real history is possible only when it is written objectively. It is a matter of intellectual honesty and moral standards.
- 2) History is in pursuit of truth. It should reveal the truth of the past. It must be divorced from the passions and prejudices of the present. It must employ systematic methods for the attainment of objectivity. Objectivity ensures accuracy, authenticity and acceptability.

- 3) History is selective in nature. As historical data are varied the historian is obliged to select facts for the purpose of narration, interpretation and formulation of conclusions. So he must be cautious and careful in handling historical material. He must be as objective as possible. Objectivity alone will save the historian and his writing from subjectivity syndrome.

### 27.3 SUBJECTIVITY

Subjectivity is antithesis to objectivity. *It exists in the mind of the historian* and not produced by things outside the mind. It refers to the preconceived ideas, feelings, opinions, notions etc. of the historian. "Subjectivity and bias are not synonymous".<sup>4</sup> *Bias* refers to historian's predisposition. It refers to the feeling that strongly favours one side in an analysis of a historical problem or one item in a group or series of facts or events. Bias is the breeding ground of subjectivity. Bias and subjectivity are like the Siamese Twins.

*Subjectivity* seems to be inescapable and is inbuilt in the art of writing history. The greatest historians from Thucydides to Toynbee are subjective. Bana's *Harsha Charita*, St. Augustines *the City of God*, Abul Fazl's *Akbar Nama*, Voltaire's *Louis XIV*, Gibbon's *Decline and fall of the Roman Empire*, J.S. Mill's *History of British India*, Grote's pro-Athenian stance, Mitford's pro-Spartan attitude, Mommsen's anti-democratic sentiments, Ranke's religious and philosophical leanings, Lingard's vindication of James II, a Catholic prince, Macaulay's favoured treatment of William III and glorification of the Revolution of 1688, Josiah strong's sense of racial complex in favour of Anglo Saxons, Hegel's selective approach, Marx's materialistic interpretation of history, V.D. Savarkar's motivated First War of Independence, K.P. Jeyaswal's Hindu Polity, K. Rajayyan's *The South Indian Rebellion: The First War of Independence (1800 – 1801)* and a host of illustrious historians and their works are vitiated by the virus of subjectivity.

### 27.4 BARRIERS TO OBJECTIVITY

Objectivity in historical writing is a laudable objective and an idyllic ideal. But it is honoured more in breach than its observance. Even historians who preach and proclaim the virtues of objectivity fall a willing victim to subjectivity! The wish for objectivity is strong but the will to achieve it is weak. There are several difficulties in accomplishing objectivity. The following are some of the significant barriers to objectivity:

### **27.4.1 The Nature of Historical Events**

All the historical events are not well preserved. The evidences might have been destroyed. Those who recorded the events might not have observed them well. Even if they had observed the events well, they might have omitted certain information. So, the nature of historical events and the nature of the observation distort objectivity in history.

### **27.4.2 The Selection of Historical Events**

The historian is confronted with a plethora of historical themes. It is humanly impossible to record all that had happened in the past. Even a research scholar is at a loss to select a suitable topic for his research. History has unlimited scope for research. When the researcher is faced with several problems or themes he has to necessarily select a subject for writing. Subjective element surreptitiously enters into the selection of a subject for research.

### **27.4.3 The Personality of the Author**

Basically the historian is a human being with all his likings and dislikings; prides and prejudices; commitments and considerations. Each historian may have his point of view. Ideological considerations, political commitment, group prejudice, national fervour, patriotic zeal and partisan attitude distort historian's vision.<sup>5</sup>

### **27.4.4 Mixture of Narration and Explanation**

The historian's task is to narrate events of the past as they had happened objectively. But pure-narration of events is self-contradictory. Non-narrative elements become mixed up with the narrative. Any and every narrative implies explanation, a reference to causes, motives, effects and results. This mixture of non-narrative and narrative elements makes subjective interpretation of history inevitable.

### **27.4.5 Historical Assumptions**

The assumptions made by the historian are responsible for bias and subjectivity in historical writing. For example, Toynbee assumes that the Eastern Society failed because the throne dominated the Church and the western Christian society failed because the church tried to dominate the throne! Similarly, Gibbon concludes: "In the revolution of ten centuries not a single discovery was made to exalt the dignity or promote the happiness of mankind. Not a single idea has been added to the speculative systems of antiquity. Not a single composition of history, philosophy, or literature has been saved from oblivion by the intrinsic

beauties of style or sentiment, of original fancy, or even of successful imitation"! Yet, St. Sophia still stands, an everlasting wonder. The society that built it had an astonishing vitality. It survived the fall of the 'Eternal City' by a thousand years!<sup>6</sup>

#### 27.4.6 Poetic Interest in History

The practical value of a knowledge of history is commonly exaggerated. Men do not appear to learn readily from the mistakes of their ancestors. Historians themselves are seldom known for this wisdom. Practical men distrust 'mere history'. Interest in history is more poetic than practical or scientific. This poetic interest in history acts as a barrier of objectivity. In the words of Mommsen "History is neither written nor made without love or hate". The historian is inevitably an artist of a kind as he composes his narrative, selecting, shaping and colouring. The greatest historians, from Herodotus to Toynbee, have generally been distinguished for their imaginative reach and grasp, not necessarily the soundness of their conclusions.

#### 27.4.7 Error of Understanding

The historian can commit errors of understanding. Poor understanding may be due to want of sufficient sources, lack of interest or love for the age in which the historian lives. Take for instance Thucydides, the Father of Scientific History. Thucydides, the most objective of the ancient historians, began his history of the Peloponnesian war by stating that nothing of great importance had happened before his time! In his ignorance of all that lay before his age he could not relate the unique glory of Athens.

#### 27.4.8 History is what the Historian Makes

No objective history is possible because the historian has to collect, select and make history. Historical facts are like alloy; they must be purified and used. Objectivity is lost in the process of 'purifying' the facts. The historian re-enacts in thought what has gone on in the minds of his *dramatis personae*. The reader in his turn must re-enact what goes on in the mind of the historian. Objectivity is the first casualty in the process of double re-enactment! "Study the historian before you begin to study the facts", says E.H.Carr.<sup>7</sup>

G.M.Trevelyan's 'finest and maturest work' *England under Queen Anne*, is the Whig interpretation of history. St. Augustine looked at history from the point of view of the early Christians; Tillamont from that of a 17<sup>th</sup> century Frenchman; Gibbon from that of an 18<sup>th</sup> century Englishman:

Mommsen from that of a 19<sup>th</sup> century German; and Toynbee from that of a 20<sup>th</sup> century Britishers!

#### **27.4.9 Commitment to a Cause**

The historian must be non-committal and uncommitted. He should not commit himself to a cause nor should he show what he thinks about it. He should not bound or pledge to a particular policy, course of action, individual or group values. An attempt to explain the meaning of an issue or to defend a cause will be a barrier of objectivity. History, if used as propaganda to further one's socio-political-religious cause, is dangerous. History is not a branch of propaganda. Exaggerating the virtues of one's own country and denigrating those of others is 'inverted subjectivism'.<sup>8</sup>

#### **27.4.10 Perverted History**

Perversion or distortion is the worst enemy of objectivity. Ignorance, fear and motivation are the factors that contribute to the writing of perverted history. Ignorance due to in-accessibility to the source material and inability to study the relevant data, fear of authority, and the desire to advance vested interests pollute objectivity in history writing. "The Court historians of the past and the mercenary historians of the present have reduced history into an instrument".<sup>9</sup>

### **27.5 PREREQUISITES FOR OBJECTIVITY**

Polybius, who treated the Romans and the Carthaginians alike, underlined the necessity of avoiding likes and dislikes while writing history. A historian is a judge, not an advocate. Like a scientist he must observe everything with utmost impartiality. "The most diligent research can prove or disprove only facts but never opinions".<sup>10</sup> Some of the *prerequisites* for objectivity in historical writing are:

- 1) The historian should leave no stone unturned in gathering the information from all possible sources.
- 2) He should possess a critical spirit for a rigorous scientific analysis of sources.
- 3) He should have a historical sense and perspective to see a character, event or trend in its real setting.
- 4) He should consciously keep his urge or itch for subjectivity under strict control. His conclusions must be supported by sufficient data and his generalizations must be based upon balanced approach.<sup>11</sup>

- 5) He must be resilient enough to adjust his views intune with his findings instead of his feeling; and
- 6) He must present his findings in their historical perspective and in a sober style without sacrificing veracity for gaining effect.<sup>12</sup> Objective history may be will-o'-the-wisp but the will of the historian to be objective should be strong.

### REFERENCES

1. B.Sheik Ali, *History: Its Theory and Method*, reprint, Madras 1991, p.61.
2. J.Anderson, B.H. Durston and Millicent Poole, *Thesis and Assignment Writing*, reprint, New Delhi, 1991, p.6.
3. R.J.Shafer, *A Guide to Historical Method*, Third Printing, Illinois, 1971, pp.148-153.
4. S.Kadhirvel, *Research Methodology-History*, Madras, 1985, p.124.
5. B.Sheik Ali, *op.cit.*, pp.61-62.
6. Herbert J.Muller, *The Uses of the Past: Profiles of Former Societies*, New York, 1952, pp.13-14.
7. E.H.Carr, *What is History?* Reprint, London, 1982, p.23.
8. N.Subramanian, *Historiography*, Madurai, 1973, p.99.
9. K.Rajayyan, *op.cit.*, p.226.
10. N.Subramanian, *op.cit.*, p.102.
11. Confining oneself to facts and nothing but facts is Ranke with a vengeance. Absolutely unbiased or objective history is just a will-o'-the-wisp. It is not desirable either. As J.B.Bury says "... whoever writes completely free from bias will produce colourless and dull book". Quoted, *Ibid.*, p.98.
12. K.Rajayyan, *op.cit.*, pp.227-228.