

***THE TRENDS IN
HISTORIOGRAPHY***

I SEMESTER

CORE COURSE

BA HISTORY

(CUCBCSS - 2014 Admission)



UNIVERS 761 F CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

Core Course

BA HISTORY

I Semester

THE TRENDS IN HISTORIOGRAPHY

<i>Prepared by:</i>	<i>Module I and II</i>	<i>Sri.Prabhakaran Vattolipurakkal, M A;M.Ed;M.Sc (Psychology), Assistant Professor, Department of History, Government College Malappuram.</i>
	<i>Module III</i>	<i>Sri.Rajan Vattolipurakkal, M A;M.Phil), Associate Professor &Head Department of History, Government College Malappuram.</i>
	<i>Module IV</i>	<i>Sri.Udayakumar P, M A, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Government College Malappuram.</i>
<i>Scrutinized by:</i>		<i>Sri. Ashraf Koyilothan Kandiyil, Chairman, Board of Studies in History (UG), Govt. College Mokeri.</i>

Layout: Computer Section, SDE

©
Reserved

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
MODULE 1	5
MODULE II	8
MODULE III	20
MODULE IV	23

MODULE 1

Evolution of History as a Discipline

History is the result of the interplay of man with his environment and with his fellow men. History has its origin from a Greek word *istoria* which means inquiry, research or exploration from the bygone days. The German word *Geschichte* also contributes to the discipline which means the parestis and meaningful exploration of the past. It was in late 19th century that historians developed a philosophical approach to the subject. During this juncture both the documentation and evaluation of the events become important. Thus a scientific approach started in 19th century. As a result a new deviation emerged in the path of history which is called historiography.

Historiography

The term historiography simply means the science of writing history or the art of the documentation of history. It is also called the history of history or the theory of history. Some scholars define it as the science of history. It includes the evolution of the ideas and techniques associated with the writing of history, and the changing attitudes towards the nature of history itself.

For the careful reconstruction of history some preconditions are there. The residues and records are the first one which carry lots of information. Critical methods should be followed to analyze the source material and a scientific approach is needed. Not only that, a historical sense should be inculcated by the interpreter.

Quasi History

The term quasi history denotes to explain the classical or pre-classical compositions. Quasi means half and it is evident that we are conferred with numerous classics which carry half history. We cannot rely the information from classics as such, but there are tints of reality in it. So quasi history means half history and while dealing with the sources quasi historical in nature one should be very careful to evaluate and interpret the events and incidents.

Herodotus(484-430 BC)

Herodotus the father of history was lived in 5th Century BC. He was born in an exalted family in Halicarnassus about 484 BC. He loved to travel for distant places which moulded his historical sense. He wrote the Greeco-Persian war of 6th and 5th century BC. Even though he depicts about the history of Persian rulers, and the rise and fall of Madian Empire. It was Cicero who called Herodotus the father of history. He travelled a long to have an access to the sources. It was Herodotus who freed history from logography.

There are many criticisms for the history of Herodotus. It was over filled with the idiomatic literature which stood in the way to understand things properly. He did not approach the sources with a critical thinking. Despite of all these criticisms the works done by Herodotus is noteworthy.

Thucydides (460-396 BC)

Thucydides was another great Greek historian who was the contemporary of Herodotus. When the Peloponnesian war broke out, he kept the record of it from the day to day. But before completing the whole work, the History of Peloponnesian War, he died. His style was different. He concentrated on the cause and effect relationship of every incidents and that is why he is known as the father of scientific history. He is also known as the first economic historian in the world as he tried to analyze the influence of economic conditions in the history of Athens.

Medieval Historiography

The Medieval Historiography is moulded by the dogmas of Christianity. It was nothing to do with the Greco-Roman traditions. We cannot see any rapport with this classical tradition. The medieval historiography was not based on rational thinking. It is also called the Church historiography.

St. Augustine (354-430 AD)

St. Augustine was the greatest of the Church historians. He was a multi facet personality like poet, philosopher, theologian and a political thinker. He is the author of the quasi-historical work 'The City of God', which is having 22 volumes. St. Augustine tells that the world is ruled by two forces namely God and Devil. Almost always we can see the conflict of such forces everywhere in the world. Ultimately God will win over the devil or the evil force. God makes everything beautiful in his world and human being just imitates it. So this world is nothing but the city of God.

Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406 AD)

Ibn Khaldun is the greatest Arab historian. He is considered as the exponent of the scientific approach in history. His most important work book is 'The Universal History' (7 Volumes). But he is famous with the preface of the work which is known as 'Muqquadama'. To Ibn Khaldun history is not the records of all the phenomena but the description of the social bondage and that bondage can be psychological or external. He always stood for the cyclical theory of history. He argues that the disintegration of any empire is a natural process just as the rise and ruin of any organism.

According to Ibn Khaldun each society has a definite time. The society proceeds through two definite phases i.e., rural and urban. When a metamorphosis happens to a society from rural to urban, its innate vigour fades. The greatest contribution of Ibn Khaldun is that he compared the Science of History with the Science of Culture.

Vico (1668-1744 AD)

Giambattista Vico is one of the greatest modern historians, hails from Italy. His book is known as 'The New Science'. He interprets history as a new science. When natural science indulges the external affairs of man, social science depicts the internal affairs. A historian uses a

tool much different from that of a natural scientist. He also supports the cyclical theory of history. He divides this process in to certain phases namely bestial stage, Age of Gods and Age of Heroes. The fourth phase is the Age of Man which denotes the struggle between the patricians and plebeians. The beginning of democratic age is with the victory of the plebeians over the patricians. Then the cyclical process ends with a decay of the existing society.

Auguste Comte (1795-1857AD)

Comte was a French philosopher stood against the Church domination in every affair. Basically he was a humanist. He propagated historical objectivity through two important works namely 'The Course of Positive Philosophy', and 'The System of Positive Policy'. He called history a social physics. He believed that it is only through history that one can understand the society. He freed history from the domination of theology and metaphysics.

Ranke (1795-1885AD)

Leopold von Ranke is considered as the first modern historian. He introduced a method of criticism (both internal and external) in historiography and that paved the way for a new era in historiography based on the criticism of sources. Ranke brought a professional touch in history. Objectivity is an inevitable part of history. His first historical work is known as 'Histories of Roman and Teutonic People'.

Ranke conducted serious researches in history of Europe. He says that the duty of every historian is to approach the events and sources with an objective mind. The following are the famous works of Ranke: 'History of Popes', 'History of Reformation in Germany', 'History of France', 'History of England', and 'History of Prussia'. Ranke tells that God has His own part in history. The contribution of Ranke and his followers are known as the Berlin Revolution in history.

MODULE II

NEW TRENDS IN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Karl Marx

Karl Marx (5 May 1818 – 14 March 1883) was a German philosopher, economist, social scientist, sociologist, historian, journalist, and revolutionary socialist. Marx's work in economics laid the basis for much of the current understanding of labour and its relation to capital, and subsequent economic thought. He is one of the founders of sociology and social science. He published numerous books during his lifetime, the most notable being *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) and *Das Kapital* (1867–1894).

Born into a wealthy middle-class family in Trier in the Prussian Rhineland, Marx studied at the University of Bonn and the University of Berlin where he became interested in the philosophical ideas of the Young Hegelians. After his studies he wrote for a radical newspaper in Cologne and began to work out the theory of the materialist conception of history. He moved to Paris in 1843, where he began writing for other radical newspapers and met Friedrich Engels, who would become his lifelong friend and collaborator. In 1849 he was exiled and moved to London together with his wife and children, where he continued writing and formulating his theories about social and economic activity. He also campaigned for socialism and became a significant figure in the International Workingmen's Association.

Historical materialism

Historical materialism is a methodological approach to the study of society, economics, and history first articulated by Karl Marx (1818–1883) as the materialist conception of history. It is a theory of socioeconomic development according to which changes in material conditions (technology and productive capacity) are the primary influence on how society and the economy are organised.

Historical materialism looks for the causes of developments and changes in human society in the means by which humans collectively produce the necessities of life. Social classes and the relationship between them, along with the political structures and ways of thinking in society, are founded on and reflect contemporary economic activity.

Historical materialism started from a fundamental underlying reality of human existence: that in order for human beings to survive and continue existence from generation to generation, it is necessary for them to produce and reproduce the material requirements of life. Marx then extended this premise by asserting the importance of the fact that, in order to carry out production and exchange, people have to enter into very definite social relations, most fundamentally "production relations".

Arnold J. Toynbee

Toynbee (born in London on 14 April 1889) was the son of Harry Valpy Toynbee (1861–1941), secretary of the Charity Organization Society, and his wife Sarah Edith Marshall (1859–1939); his sister Jocelyn Toynbee was an archaeologist and art historian. Toynbee was the grandson of Joseph Toynbee, nephew of the 19th-century economist Arnold Toynbee (1852–1883) and descendant of prominent British intellectuals for several generations. He was educated at Winchester College, Balliol College, Oxford (classics, 1911), and studied briefly at the British School at Athens, an experience that influenced the genesis of his philosophy about the decline of civilizations. In 1912 he became a tutor and fellow in ancient history at Balliol College, and in 1915 he began working for the intelligence department of the British Foreign Office. After serving as a delegate to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 he was appointed professor of Byzantine and modern Greek studies at the University of London. From 1921 to 1922 he was the Manchester Guardian correspondent during the Greco-Turkish War, an experience that resulted in the publication of *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*. In 1925 he became research professor of international history at the London School of Economics and director of studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London.

On Civilizations

A Study of History is the 12-volume history book by British historian Arnold J. Toynbee, finished in 1961, in which the author traces the development and decay of nineteen world civilizations in the historical record. Toynbee applies his model to each of these civilizations, detailing the stages through which they all pass: genesis, growth, time of troubles, universal state, and disintegration.

The nineteen major civilizations, as Toynbee sees them, are: Egyptian, Andean, Sinic, Minoan, Sumerian, Mayan, Indic, Hittite, Hellenic, Western, Orthodox Christian (Russia), Far Eastern, Orthodox Christian (main body), Persian, Arabic, Hindu, Mexican, Yucatec, and Babylonian. There are four 'abortive civilizations' (Abortive Far Western Christian, Abortive Far Eastern Christian, Abortive Scandinavian, Abortive Syriac) and five 'arrested civilizations' (Polynesian, Eskimo, Nomadic, Ottoman, Spartan).

Toynbee argues that civilizations are born out of more primitive societies, not as the result of racial or environmental factors, but as a response to *challenges*, such as hard country, new ground, blows and pressures from other civilizations, and penalization. He argues that for civilizations to be born, the challenge must be a golden mean; that excessive challenge will crush the civilization, and too little challenge will cause it to stagnate. He argues that civilizations continue to grow only when they meet one challenge only to be met by another. He argues that civilizations develop in different ways due to their different environments and different approaches to the challenges they face.

Toynbee does not see the breakdown of civilizations as caused by loss of control over the physical environment, by loss of control over the human environment, or by attacks from outside.

Rather, it comes from the deterioration of the "Creative Minority", which eventually ceases to be creative and degenerates into merely a "Dominant Minority" - which forces the majority to obey without meriting obedience. He argues that creative minorities deteriorate due to a worship of their "former self", by which they become prideful and fail adequately to address the next challenge they face.

J.B. Bury

J.B. Bury, in full John Bagnell Bury (born Oct. 16, 1861, County [Monaghan](#), Ire.—died June 1, 1927, [Rome, Italy](#)), British classical scholar and historian. The range of Bury's scholarship was remarkable: he wrote about Greek, Roman, and Byzantine history; classical philology and literature; and the theory and [philosophy of history](#). His works are considered to be among the finest illustrations of the revival of Byzantine studies.

Highly trained in classics and philology, Bury began developing an interest in history in the 1880s. By 1890 he had published *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*, and two years later he completed another work, *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*, simultaneously serving as editor on the scholarly journal *Kottabos*. Bury regarded history as a methodological science, though involving factors sufficiently fortuitous to discourage inference of general laws or of didactic guidance. His scepticism, however, was limited; in general, he represented the Victorian generation and its ultimate faith in the growth of reason and its capacity to elucidate the European past and make intelligible the present. His *History of Freedom of Thought* probably best expresses his conception of history as the record of man's rational struggles and progress. In addition to providing high standards of scholarly excellence, he was one of the first English historians to participate in the revival of Byzantine studies, including philosophy, art, culture, and architecture, as valid representations of a civilization's history.

The Idea of Progress

We may believe in the doctrine of Progress or we may not, but in either case it is a matter of interest to examine the origins and trace the history of what is now, even should it ultimately prove to be no more than an *idolum saeculi*, the animating and controlling idea of western civilisation. For the earthly Progress of humanity is the general test to which social aims and theories are submitted as a matter of course. The phrase CIVILISATION AND PROGRESS has become stereotyped, and illustrates how we have come to judge a civilisation good or bad according as it is or is not progressive. The ideals of liberty and democracy, which have their own ancient and independent justifications, have sought a new strength by attaching themselves to Progress. The conjunctions of "liberty and progress," "democracy and progress," meet us at every turn. Socialism, at an early stage of its modern development, sought the same aid. The friends of Mars, who cannot bear the prospect of perpetual peace, maintain that war is an indispensable instrument of Progress. It is in the name of Progress that the doctrinaires who established the present reign of terror in Russia profess to act. All this shows the prevalent feeling that a social or political theory or programme is hardly tenable if it cannot claim that it harmonises with this controlling idea.

In the Middle Ages Europeans followed a different guiding star. The idea of a life beyond the grave was in control, and the great things of this life were conducted with reference to the next.

When men's deepest feelings reacted more steadily and powerfully to the idea of saving their souls than to any other, harmony with this idea was the test by which the opportuneness of social theories and institutions was judged. Monasticism, for instance, thrived under its aegis, while liberty of conscience had no chance. With a new idea in control, this has been reversed. Religious freedom has thrived under the aegis of Progress; monasticism can make no appeal to it.

For the hope of an ultimate happy state on this planet to be enjoyed by future generations—or of some state, at least, that may relatively be considered happy—has replaced, as a social power, the hope of felicity in another world. Belief in personal immortality is still very widely entertained, but may we not fairly say that it has ceased to be a central and guiding idea of collective life, a criterion by which social values are measured? Many people do not believe in it; many more regard it as so uncertain that they could not reasonably permit it to affect their lives or opinions. Those who believe in it are doubtless the majority, but belief has many degrees; and one can hardly be wrong in saying that, as a general rule, this belief does not possess the imaginations of those who hold it, that their emotions react to it feebly, that it is felt to be remote and unreal, and has comparatively seldom a more direct influence on conduct than the abstract arguments to be found in treatises on morals.

Under the control of the idea of Progress the ethical code recognised in the Western world has been reformed in modern times by a new principle of far-reaching importance which has emanated from that idea. When Isocrates formulated the rule of life, "Do unto others," he probably did not mean to include among "others" slaves or savages. The Stoics and the Christians extended its application to the whole of living humanity. But in late years the rule has received a vastly greater extension by the inclusion of the unborn generations of the future. This principle of duty to posterity is a direct corollary of the idea of Progress. In the recent war that idea, involving the moral obligation of making sacrifices for the sake of future ages, was constantly appealed to; just as in the Crusades, the most characteristic wars of our medieval ancestors, the idea of human destinies then in the ascendant lured thousands to hardship and death.

The present attempt to trace the genesis and growth of the idea in broad outline is a purely historical inquiry, and any discussion of the great issue which is involved lies outside its modest scope. Occasional criticisms on particular forms which the creed of Progress assumed, or on arguments which were used to support it, are not intended as a judgment on its general validity. I may, however, make two observations here. The doubts which Mr. Balfour expressed nearly thirty years ago, in an Address delivered at Glasgow, have not, so far as I know, been answered. And it is probable that many people, to whom six years ago the notion of a sudden decline or break-up of our western civilisation, as a result not of cosmic forces but of its own development, would have appeared almost fantastic, will feel much less confident to-day, notwithstanding the fact that the leading nations of the world have instituted a league of peoples for the prevention of war, the measure to which so many high priests of Progress have looked forward as meaning a long stride forward on the road to Utopia.

The preponderance of France's part in developing the idea is an outstanding feature of its history. France, who, like ancient Greece, has always been a nursing-mother of ideas, bears the principal responsibility for its growth; and if it is French thought that will persistently claim our

attention, this is not due to an arbitrary preference on my part or to neglect of speculation in other countries.

ANNALES SCHOOL.

The systematic scientific and ordered historical writing is begun only in 19th century. This new historians tried to free history from the status of amusing tales and fables. By the first half of the 20th century the historians started new researches and they tried to assert the autonomous states of history as a separate discipline and made new areas for history by mutual relations with history and other disciplines.

In the beginning of 20th C a discussion on the question of changing the existing method of historical writing was started in France. As a part of this discussion the French GOVT established an institute. It was known as Ecole Normale Superiure, it was a center of the sociological studies and a number of sociologist and historians became the member of the institute. As a part of the activates of this institute the anal schools of historical writing was started in 1929 with the publication of the journal '*Anales de historie economic et sociate*' generally known as *Annales*. Marc Bloch and Lucian febvre had take as the initiative attempt for the formation of these school. The purpose of the journal annals was departure from the political history and to the economic and social history. In course of time the annals school of historical writing is known as 'New History'. History of totality, Global history etc.

FEATURES OF ANNALS SCHOOL

- 1 -Instead of the traditional political history they gave more important to the aspect related with the Human life.
- 2 -National history was replaced by continental and global history
- 3 -Instead of narrating events they gave more important to the analysis of structures
- 4 -The history of common people came in to the forefront of the historical writing.
- 5 -Documentary evidences were supplemented by visual oral tradition folk literature place names etc

MARC BLOCH

He is the first editor of annals schools from 1929 – 1944.He was a French and considered as one of the most important historian of 20th century. He was participated in 2nd world war with France and short dead by the firing squad of Hitler's Gestapo in 1944.His important works are Feudal society, The Royal Touch, French rural history, The historians crafts. He criticized the periodization in history and argued that the historians should give importance to the problems than events. He also wanted comparative method in the study of history.

LUCIAN FEBVRE

He was the 2nd editor of annals schools on 1944 to 1956.he initiated the studies of historical geography, history of relation the roll of contingency in history, and intellectual history. He also conducted studies on Martin Luther King and Rabelais

FERNAND BRUDEL

He was editor of annals from 1956 1968.His important works are Capitalism and material life. The Mediterranean and Mediterranean world in the period of Philip 2nd, on history. His idea like Geo history and long duree are very much influenced in the present day historical writing. Instead of the history of the victors He writes the history of majority. He also explain the impotents of time concept in historical writing and differentiated it as geographical time, social and economic time and individual time.

E.H.CARR AND CAUSATIVE HISTORY.

Edward Hallet Carr was a liberal and later left wing Marxist historian ,one of the most distinguished modern historian. He was best known for his 14 volume history of soviet union ,A HISTORY OF SOVIET RUSSIA, What Is History ,a seminal work ,which *he laid out historiographical principles rejected conventional traditional historical methods and practices.* In 1961 ,he delivered the G.M.Trevelyan lectures at the University of Cambridge that became the basis of this book. He rejected the empirical view of the historians work being an accretion of facts that he or she has at their disposal as non senses. Carr claimed ; the belief in a hard core of historical facts existing objectively and independently of the interpretation of the historian is a preposterous fallacy ,but one which it is very hard to eradicate.

The word cause ordinarily means the connection or correlation between two or more phenomena. The law of causation postulates that every imaginable thing has to be brought into existence by another and anterior force. An extended proposition of the law is that the same causes produce the same results. A causal relation can be established between two or more simultaneously varying phenomena. This is true of historical events also. Causation is a concept of fundamental importance in history writing. To Polybius ,the study of history would become instructive and fruitful only when the statement of an occurrence ,however interesting it might be ,was accompanied by a statement of its cause. He himself would lay bare the chain of causes and effects so that history become a lantern of understanding help up to the present and the future. The concept of causation figured prominently in enlightenment historiography considerations on the causes of the greatness of the Romans and of their rise and decline started that it was not fortune but moral or physical causes which governed the rise ,the maintenance and the overthrow of monarchies .

Carr enumerates three characteristics of the phenomenon of the causation or historical explanation or historical interpretation ;(1)the first is the *plurality or multiplicity of causes.*.No historical event proper occurs as a result of just one cause. For such an event as the French Revolution the historian assigns a complex economic,political,ideological and personnel causes, both long-term and short term. The second is the *hierarchy of causes:* the multiplicity of causes necessarily leads the historian to establish some hierarchy causes and their relation to one another, to decide one another ,to decide which cause ,or category of causes ,should be regarded as the ultimate cause, the cause of all causes. The causes which the historian invokes are the both the interpretation of his theme and test of his quality. This invocation of causes may vary with particular historians and with change in time. Gibbon attributed the decline

and fall of the Roman Empire to the triumph of barbarism and Christianity. Every historical argument, observes Carr, revolves round the priority of causes. The third characteristic that he enumerates of the historians approach to the problem of causal explanation is *the dual process of multiplication and simplification*: he shows that with the development of new genres of history- economic, social, cultural---the historian is compelled, on the one hand, to accumulate more and more answers to the questions Why? And, on the other, to simplify his multiplicity of his answers by subordinating one answer to another, and to introduce some order and unity into chaos and of happenings. History Carr observes, advances through this dual and apparently contradictory process of multiplication and simplification.

Carr's dictum that *the study of history is a study of causes* and the historian is known by the causes which he invokes. Bring out the importance causation in history. the concept in essence is one of seeking rational explanation of historical events. The historian must not only describe, but explain, he must tell not only the what but also the why of things..He must assign causes to events or conditions.

The logic of explanation in science, says Patrick Gardiner, takes the form of relating one event to another event or a set of events which cause or condition it. An event is explained when it is brought under a generalization or a law. Thus the explanation of a given event consists in (a) stating a universal law or set of laws and (b) stating the existence of a set of initial conditions. Logically and metaphysically, it may be argued that cause and effect are not separate but a continuing provenance in history with beginning and end difficult to determine. While such objections may have little relevance to history, there are historical events, movements and processes which do not fit into cause and effect moulds. The difficulties with the classical view of causality begin when it is asked at what point the dividing line is drawn between the cause and the effect. since both cause and effect are processes and so divisible into parts, one may ask which part is the cause. It is basic to law the causation that the cause never occurs after the effect.

Carr divided facts into two categories facts of the pasts, that is historical information that historians deem unimportant, and historical facts, information that the historians have decided is important. He contended that historians quite arbitrarily determine which of the facts of the past to turn into historical facts according to their own bias and agendas. He stated that ; study the before you begin to study the facts. The facts are really not at all like fish on the fish mongers slab. They are like fish swimming about in a vast and sometimes in accessible ocean ; and what the historian catches will depend partly on chance, but mainly on what part of the ocean he chooses to fish in and what tackle he chooses to use—these two factors being, of course, determined by the kind of fish he wants to catch..by and large, the historian will get the kind of facts he wants. History means interpretation. Carr argued that Ranke's famous dictum show what actually happened was wrong because it presumed that the facts influenced what the historian wrote, rather than the historian choosing what facts of the past, he or she indented to turn into historical facts. He also argued that the study of the facts may lead the historian to change his or her views. In this way he interprets that history was an unending dialogue between the past and present. he claimed that when examining causation in history, historians should seek to find rational causes of historical

occurrences that is causes that can be generalised across time to explain other occurrences in other times and places. For him, historical accidents cannot be generalized, and thus not worth the historians time. As an example of his attack on the role of accidents in history ,he mocked the hypothesis of *Cleopatra's Nose* .

According to him ,historical works that serve to broaden society's understanding of the past via generalizations are more right and socially acceptable than works that do not. and he emphatically contended that history was a social science ,not an art. He argued that history should be considered a social science because historians like scientists seek generalizations that helped broaden the understandings ones subject.

Subaltern Studies

The Subaltern Studies Group (SSG) or Subaltern Studies Collective is a group of South Asian scholars interested in the postcolonial and post-imperial societies with a particular focus on those of South Asia while also covering the developing world in general sense. The term **Subaltern Studies** is sometimes also applied more broadly to others who share many of their views. Their anti-essentialist approach^[1] is one of history from below, focused more on what happens among the masses at the base levels of society than among the elite.

The term "subaltern" in this context is an allusion to the work of Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937). It refers to any person or group of inferior rank and station, whether because of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or religion.

The SSG arose in the 1980s, influenced by the scholarship of Eric Stokes and Ranajit Guha, to attempt to formulate a new narrative of the history of India and South Asia. This narrative strategy most clearly inspired by the writings of Gramsci was explicated in the writings of their "mentor" Ranajit Guha, most clearly in his "manifesto" in Subaltern Studies I and also in his classic monograph *The Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency*. Although they are, in a sense, on the left, they are very critical of the traditional Marxist narrative of Indian history, in which semi-feudal India was colonized by the British, became politicized, and earned its independence. In particular, they are critical of the focus of this narrative on the political consciousness of elites, who in turn inspire the masses to resistance and rebellion against the British.

Ranajit Guha

Ranajit Guha was a historian from India who was greatly influential in the Subaltern Studies group, and was the editor of several of the group's early anthologies. He migrated from India to the UK in 1959, and currently lives in Vienna, Austria.His *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency* in Colonial India is widely considered to be a classic. Aside from this, his founding statement in the first volume of Subaltern Studies set the agenda for the Subaltern Studies group, defining the "subaltern" as "the demographic difference between the total Indian population and all those whom we have described as the 'elite'."

Books

- *A rule of property for Bengal : an essay on the idea of permanent settlement*, Paris [etc.] : Mouton & Co., 1963, New edition: Duke University Press, [ISBN 0-8223-1761-3](#)
- *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1983, New edition: Duke Univ Press, 1999, [ISBN 0-8223-2348-6](#) - a classic of Subaltern Studies
- Guha, Ranajit, "[History at the Limit of World-History](#)" (Italian Academy Lectures), Columbia University Press 2002
- *An Indian Historiography of India: A Nineteenth Century Agenda & Its Implications*. Calcutta: K.P. Bagchi & Company. 1988.
- *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*, Harvard University Press, 1998
- *The Small Voice of History*, Permanent Black, 2009

POST MODERNISM

Post modernism is an intellectual movement emerged in America and Europe in the post world war period. Jean Francois Lyotard, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Roland Barthes, Jacques Lacan, Keith Jenkins etc. They are the impotent upholders of post modernism. The post modernism questioned the existing isms science technology etc. and rejected the period before post modernism. It is commonly accepted that modernity began in the late of 18th centuries and ended around the 2nd world war and with the fall of industrial capitalism after this post modernism.

So called post modernism was developed in America. Which is called in different names in different states. During the 1950s Bernard Rosenberg called it as *Mass culture*. John Gallbraith called as *Affluent society*. He was an economist. Daniel Bell called as *post industrial society*. Wright Mills called as *post modern period*. Following these during 1970s and 1980s the concept of post modernism was developed in France

POST MODERN CONDITION

It was in 1970s, His book *post modern condition of Leothal*. In early life he was a trade unionist. Then he worked as a left wing journalist in Algeria. And finally he became a member of the far left group an extreme left group in Paris, and later he became a post modernist.

Julia Kristeva is another post modernist historian. He during 1960s he was a follower of Maoist group in Paris. It was during 1960s he became an admirer of American liberalism.

The post modernists attack history on different grounds. They argue that the assumption of the historians are drawn from the evidences which are based on personal interest, and from the same set of evidences they made several descriptions. They also argued that the interpretation of the past are influenced by the cultural prejudices and personal interests, the cultural bias leads the historians to misleading descriptions of the past. Thus so called sources are also used, if only they have interested by historians. The post modernism also destructed the traditional frame work of history by reconstructing the traditional actors like individual and group.

The post modernist also against the meta narratives like the rise and growth of Capitalism, The period of Enlightenment, Marxism and gave more importance to the little narratives like ethnic minorities local communities traditional believes. According to Barthes the historians description of the past only represent a number of concepts about the past and not the past itself. According to Jenkins the past and history float free from each other and they are ages and miles apart and there is no ultimate knowledge of historical truth.

Keith Jenkins is a British historiographer and post modernist .He believes that any historian's output should be seen as a story. A work of history is as much about the historian's own world view and ideological positions as it is about past events. This means that different historians will inevitably ascribe different meaning to the same historical events.

In his principal books on the philosophy of history, in particular *Rethinking History* (1991), *On 'What is History?'* (1995), *Why History?* (1999), *Refiguring History*, (2003) and *At the Limits of History* (2009), he, displays a remarkable constancy of approach, involving a thoroughly sceptical/postmodern critique of the subject, designed to reveal its ineffectiveness as a vehicle for the discovery of 'truth' about the past, or indeed any knowledge of the past. Not that Jenkins's conclusions regarding the implications of the supposed ineffectiveness of history have remained unchanged throughout. On the contrary, as he explains in the introduction to *At the Limits of History*, in the late 1970s, when he first became acquainted with the postmodern critique of history, he chose merely to distance himself from those historians who ignored or challenged it. Later, for a while, he argued the case for a 'postmodern' history that might replace conventional academic history (with which he was mainly concerned). But finally, in the late 1990s, he came to the conclusion that we should let 'history [and ethics] go' . Henceforth, we should simply wave goodbye to history, and look forward to a future unburdened and unspoilt by the historicised/historical past. (History here stands for histories: in Jenkins's opinion there is no such thing as mere 'history'. Postmodern/postmodernism refers to the influential currents of critical thinking generated by a group of mainly continental anti-foundational thinkers in the second half of the 20th century).

Not surprisingly, Jenkins's increasingly powerful assault on conventional history provoked many strong reactions. The outcome was an at times furious and prolonged debate, in which there were numerous accusations of insane individualism, solipsism, fantasy-mongering, left-wing posturing and hectoring authoritarianism – a debate which no self-respecting historian could easily ignore; though it has to be said that many did.

In *Rethinking History* (1991), a remarkable bestseller, much translated, Jenkins argues compellingly that the conventional view of academic history – that it enjoys the benefits of a uniquely effective epistemology and methodology which enables it to discover from historical facts, properly established, some sort of historical truth, a truth, moreover that can be conveyed to a willing audience by way of historical narrative – is fundamentally flawed. Even the most perfunctory understanding of conventional historical method, properly analysed in a postmodern way, will show that the historian, no matter how well trained he might be, can never really know the past, as the gap between the past and history is an ontological one, one that in the very nature of things cannot be bridged. Nor is it possible for the historian to attain to some kind of

methodological objectivity, free from prejudice and bias. No amount of skill or expertise will make that possible. Conventional history, despite all its extraordinary pretensions, is basically just a contested discourse, an embattled terrain, on which people, classes and groups construct essentially autobiographical interpretations of an imagined past to suit themselves. Any contemporary consensus can only be arrived at when one dominant voice or set of voices silences others, either by means of overt power or covert incorporation. History, in short, in Jenkins's view, is not an epistemology but an aesthetic literary genre, incapable of making claims about the truth. Debates about history are debates about meaning, and meaning is no more entailed by facts than values are by discourse.

In *On 'What is History?'* (1995), he compares and contrasts the thoughts and opinions regarding history of Carr and Geoffrey Elton with those of Richard Rorty and Hayden White. This he does in order to expand and elaborate the arguments regarding the fallibility of history outlined in *Rethinking History*. Thus, according to him, history remains what it has in fact always been, namely a narrative prose discourse, of which, as White famously remarked, the content is 'as much imagined/ invented as found'. In order to appear plausible any such discourse must normally look simultaneously towards the once real events and situations of the past and towards narrative-type myths common in all social formations. Moreover, history cannot recover that past, but only such evidence of a past as remains in accessible traces. These traces are then transformed into written histories by means of a series of theoretically and methodologically disparate procedures; which historiography may then be made subject to a series of uses, logically infinite, but in practice for the most part the product of social power. Histories, that is to say, are invariably fabricated, without any real foundations beyond the textual. Far from being 'objective', as claimed by the conventional historian, they are invariably subjective – i.e. positioned, constructed in someone's interest.

In *Why History?* (1999), on the other hand, he analyses the inadequacies of history by way of a series of case studies of Jacques Derrida, Jean Baudrillard, Jean-François Lyotard, Richard Evans, Hayden White etc. In this way he once again shows, as he puts it in the introduction to *Why History?*, that certain postmodern ways of thinking almost certainly signal 'the end of history'. At the same time, in particular in the chapter on Derrida, Jenkins explains how, by way of the 'undecidability of the decision', postmodern thinking also leads to the end of all traditional (rule-based) ethical systems. This is because for a decision to be ethical it must first pass through a moment of radical 'undecidability'. Otherwise the ethical choice made will be merely formulaic, one intended to obey the rules of a previously worked out system or code. Postmodern thinking will, therefore, lead inevitably to the end of all rule-based ethical systems, in much the same way that it lead to the end of history.

In *Refiguring History* (2003), described by Hayden White as a 'small masterpiece', Jenkins attempts, somewhat paradoxically it must be said, to breath new life into history by refiguring it as a discourse that gratefully accepts and elaborates the inevitable failure of all historical representation. This he does by trying to promote in history the endless openness advocated by Derrida and other postmodern philosophers. Endless openness, logically unavoidable, he argues, will allow for new, disrespectful, contentious radical readings and re readings, writings and rewritings to be produced. As for the new histories thus produced, they will be useful, even

emancipatory, contributing as they almost certainly will to a radical, 'disobedient', counter-hegemonic politics, of the sort that Jenkins, apparently depressed by the failure of the Modernist experiment known as the 'Enlightenment Project', deems most desirable. Such, it seems, is the ultimate purpose of *Refiguring History*.

In *At the Limits of History* (2009), a collection of essays on the theory and practice of history written in the period 1994–2008, he covers a wide range of subjects ranging from time to Marxism, the ethical responsibility of the historian and the works of Hayden White and Sande Cohen. Yet it is evident throughout that his main interest lies in the exposure of (what he sees as) the inherent inadequacies of conventional history, as essays on 'Why bother with history?' 'Postmodernity, the end of history and Frank Ankersmit', and 'The End of the Affair; on the irretrievable breakdown of history and ethics' show.

MODULE III

CONCEPTUALISING HISTORY

As a dynamic and scientific discipline, History has and has been incorporating new trends, innovative analyses and new concepts in its fold for a comprehensive understanding of human life. The Post War period witnessed the emergence of new trends and concepts like Gender History, History of sexuality, Food History, History of Clinic, History of childhood and so forth into main stream History. All these fields, with all their limitations, have made their presence felt in historical studies and have brought down History in to the lives of common folk. These studies in turn have become the theoretical frame works for the upliftment of the hitherto marginalised and for the redefinition of conventional terms and new concepts.

Examine the significance of Gender History and Gerda Lerner in Historical studies

Gender History or better Gender Studies is a sub branch of History, and looks at history and hence human life from the perspectives of Gender. Gender is a concept that can be used in many ways. Gender, a social and cultural construct, can simply refer to studying the relationship between men and women. In other words, gender refers to the way by which men and women are socially conditioned to their respective roles not only in the family but in the society as well.

To Joan Scott, the American historian on France, gender was a key category of historical analysis and that is vital to study how femininity and masculinity were culturally constructed in relation to each other in different societies.

Gender History had passed through different phases to make its present form. The first stage in the development of Gender History was Women history, where historians focused on the study of famous women, although without interrelating the lives of women with the social fabric in which lived. This phase was also characterized by the entry of larger number of women into the historical profession. The next stage began with the Feminist movements, particularly with the second wave of Western Feminism. But these trends studied women not as a historical category, but women as a monolithic category, just opposite to their counterparts. This understanding of women as binary opposite to men undermined women's role in the making of history .

Thus, it was left to Gender historians to make an indepth study of the society in which women lived, so as to bring forth their marginalized nature and non documentation in the main stream history. It stated without any doubt that the understanding of human life, for that matter, the understanding of history cannot gain perfection without paying attention to the lives of women and men as such. It also clearly demonstrated that the study of gender roles in a given society has to be given emphasis for the actual understanding of the marginalization women. Gender History focuses on the study of systematic differentiation of womanhood and manhood. Finally, Gender History tries to relate women not only with the society in which they live, but also with men, who determine and consciously create the ethos and spine of society.

Gerda Lerner (1920-2013) was an American historian, novelist, script writer and public activist , with special emphasis on women movements. She was a Professor Emeritus of History at the University of Wisconsin and acted as a visiting Professor at Duke University. Lerner was one of the founding members of the National Organisation for Women and worked as the President of the Organisation of American Historians.

Lerner's major work, 'Black Women in White America' is acclaimed as one of the best sellers and most read books in History. Published in 1972, this book deals with the 350 years of the slavery of Black women in the Americas and its lasting impacts on the history of the US. It can be considered as a documentary history of the varied levels of the lives of the Black Women in the US.

Her other prominent books are, 'The female Experience', 'Why History Matters' and 'Women and History'.

Lerner can also be considered as one of the pioneers in the study of the history of women. She started the First Women's History course in the world at the New School for Social research as early as in 1963. Through her many articles and books, she made Gender history as a specific field of study. Moreover, she is also one of the first to apply feminist approach in the study of History.

As a true representative of Gender Studies, Lerner made an indepth study of the educational deprivations of women, their isolation from many of the customs and traditions of their respective societies, the compositions of women as expressive outlets etc. As an activist of women movements, she used history to change the definition of culture, where men have not only made culture, but determined culture, from the perspective of women.

Bring out the Contribution of Michael Foucault with regard to the history of Sexuality to Historical studies

Michael Foucault (1926 -1984) was a French philosopher, historian, Literary Critic and a social theorist. He made radical changes in the study of History by his innovative ideas on power, its working ,and the relation between power and knowledge. A representative of Post structuralism, Foucault revolutionized historical studies with his theory of 'archeology of knowledge'. This theory dismissed the importance of individual thinkers or individual motives . It emphasized the inescapable mind sets that characterize different periods in history.

Foucault's another unit of analysis was 'discourse'. To him, discourse is a way of thinking. It is to be understood as a system of possibility for knowledge. The exclusive function of discourse is to serve as a transparent representation of things and ideas standing outside it.

But his outstanding contribution to historiography is his study of sexuality. In his work, 'History of Sexuality' published in three volumes, in 1976, he made an exhaustive study of sexuality in Western World. He rejected the much accepted idea that Western society suppressed sexuality from 17th to mid 20th centuries. Foucault, instead, argued that there was much interest and proliferation of the discourse on sex. This proliferation, to him was due to the development of dominant bourgeois class in Europe. This new class of people encouraged study on sexuality. Sex became a topic of debate in different areas of society. He argued that society's approach to sexuality finally determine population growth. This concept of Foucault is centered around the notion that the identities of the people are increasingly tied to their sexuality.

The book, 'History of Sexuality' is one of the finest historic analytical enterprises. This work, divided into three volumes; the first volume is titled as "The Will to Knowledge", the Second as "Use of Pleasure" and the Third is captioned as "The Cave of the Self"

As a social theorist, Foucault had authored many influential and provocative works: They are

'Madness and Civilisation (Published in 1961)

'The Birth of Clinic' (1963)

'The Order of Things' (1966)

'The Archaeology of Knowledge' (1969)

'Discipline and Punishment' (1975)

WRITE A NOTE ON FELIPE FERNANDEZ- ARMESTO AND HIS 'A HISTORY OF FOOD'

FELIPE FERNANDEZ- ARMESTO is a British historian, who is famous in history for his path breaking studies on the history of food in the world. He is the first academic historian to make a detailed study on the history of food and society.

His magnum opus, 'NEAR A THOUSAND TABLES: A HISTORY OF FOOD' published in 2001, stands as the best read, an exclusive and most influential work on the history of food and its effect on changing the attitude of the people.

Armesto traces the history of food through eight revolutionary stages. He identified "Origin of Cooking" as the first stage, which was the first revolution; while the second stage in the evolution was "The Meaning of Eating", that was characterized by 'Food as Rite and Magic' or the Ritualisation of Eating. "Breeding to Eat" was the third Stage, where herding revolution had taken place along with the change from 'Collecting' Food to Producing It. The Fourth phase was "The Edible Earth" in which the main speciality was 'Managing Plant life for Food'. "Food and Rank" was the fifth stage, where, 'Inequality and the rise of Haute Cuisine' was the main stay. He identifies the sixth stage as "The Edible Horizon", in which 'Food and Long Range Exchange of Culture' was the main mark. In the Seventh stage, which branded as "Challenging Evolution", 'Food and Ecological Evolution' was the characteristic. The final stage was known as "Feeding the Giants" where, 'Food Industrialisation of the 19th and 20th centuries' was the prime feature.

Armesto considers food as a universal and fundamental to human life. To him 'food is what matters most to most people for most of the time.' As already stated, he makes an in-depth study and vividly portrays how food had changed the attitude of human beings through centuries. His findings are that 'You are what you Eat' and that a man of average life time approximately spends Ten Years at dining table.

His exclusive study on food makes him a unique figure among historians of the 21st Century, for, his is the first detailed, authentic and exhaustive study not only on the history of food, but on the different food habits of the world.

MODULE IV

Historical consciousness in pre- colonial India

It has long been maintained that ancient Indians lacked historical consciousness and therefore did not produce any historical works. This statement put forward either from the perspective of modern historical understanding or comparisons with the historical consciousness of ancient Greek or Chinese, that was based upon the belief that the chronology dealing with short period of the is the eye of history and the ancient Indians were not used to chronology of short period of time. It is a fact that ancient Indians did not consider history as an enquiry into the past with the logical purpose of explaining its causes and consequences. But, if history is defined as philosophy in motion, we had our own historical consciousness. The concept of time for Indians cycle and not linear. Recent researches have shown that we had our own historical consciousness which is visible in genealogies and chronicles, where time reckoning was recorded in generations, regnal years and eras. They were not strict historical works but it included historical information.

ITHIHASA -PURARANA TRADITION.

The best example of the ancient Indian historical writing is the itihasa -purana tradition. They were scattered in the pre Gupta period which were compiled, modified and enlarged in the Gupta and post Gupta period. Every society has a concept of its own past but this concept may vary from society to society and from time to time.

The term used in Sanskrit literature for history was itihasa, with a literary meaning of *thus it was, so it has been or it happened here*. An extended form of itihasa included legends and accounts of the past events. It means past events accompanied by or arranged in the form of stories. The puranas might have been derived from one original purana text or a genus of literature with tales, songs and lore come down through the ages. The literary purana is old. They were prepared and transmitted orally and made into written records at a later period.

The itihasa and puranas were often composed originally by priest poets attached to various tribes. They were composed in literary form by the sutras or bards and magadhs or the chroniclers. The earliest surviving written evidences relating to the itihasa purana tradition dates to the rise of Guptas.

There are two itihisas in India Mahabharata and Ramayana. Mahabharata was written by Vyasa, the Malayalam translator of Mahabharata was Kodungallur Kunjikuttan Thampuran. Mahabharata deals with the states affairs from 10th BC to AD 4th C. In early period it included 8800 slokas or verses, at that time it was known as Jaya Samhita, Jaya means Victory. In later period it increased up to 24000, known as Bharata; now it included more than one lakh of slokas and called as Mahabharata. It deals the Kaurava and Pandava conflict belong to the later Vedic period. It also helped to understand the political institutions and ideas, political life of that period also.

Ramayana.

It contains the political affairs belong to the 5th C BC. Ramayana was written by Valmiki. In early period it contains 6000 slokas and later it increased up to 12000 and now it composed with 24000 slokas. It also deals with the migration of Aryans to south India and described a kingless state and an ideal state. It provides an idealised version of the ancient political institutions.

The puranas consider the subjects like nature of creation, the relationship between men and gods, the maintenance of social institutions, genealogies of rulers and heroes, legends relating to the Krishna avathara of Vishnu and eventual destruction of the world at the end of kaliyuga. It also give informations about the ancient Indian dynasties, the geographical divisions, the names of rivers, mountains, towns and political institutions etc.

The three main constituents of the itihasa purana tradition are genealogy, mythology and historical narrative or vamsavali charitha.

There are 18 puranas; in which Matsya Purana, Vayupurana, Vishnu Purana and Bhavishya Purana are important puranas. Vishnu Purana contains the informations about Mौरya dynastic history and Vayupurana includes the Gupta dynastic history and the Matsya Purana contains the informations about the Andhra kings (Satavahanas).

Geneology.

The genealogical records as mentioned in the Vishnu Purana begins with the great flood which occurred in the beginning, from which only Manu and his family along with seven sages survived. After the flood Manu returned to Jambu Dweep. Of his many children the tenth one was a hermaphrodite who gives birth to two royal lineages. From the female half comes the Lunar family and from the male the solar. Almost all the ruling families of ancient India are said to belong either to the lunar or solar family, the Chandra vamsa or the Sooryavamsa. Ikshvaku, the son of Manu belong to suryavamsa and Ila, the daughter of Manu belong to Chandravamsa. Slight variation in the story is seen in some other Purana that of Matsya Purana. The Ramayana focuses on the Surya vamsa lineage and the Mahabharata on the Chandra vamsa lineage. The genealogies of three major dynasties, Kauravas of Hasthinapura, Ikshvaku of Ayodhya and Brahadhradhas of Magadha are given in the text.

Mythology.

Myth is generally considered as a proto type of history. It is the narration of the selected aspects of the past for the purpose of the preservation. Myth is often composed of a tale associated with the religious ceremony. The Purushasuktha of the Rigveda is an example for the myth providing social sanction for caste. According to the Purushasuktha the four varnas are said to have sprung from the body of the god Prajapati. Brahmanas comes from the mouth of Prajapati, Kshatriyas from arms, Vaisyas from thighs and Sudra from the feet. It symbolises the ritual status of the four varnas as well as their status.

Historical Narratives or Vamsavali charitha.

It contains the core of historical explanation. In ancient period time span reckoned with some important events noted with calendar. The Indian concept of time was cyclic. The puranas viewed it as the mahayuga or the great cycle. The mahayuga was divided into four parts, the kritayuga, Treta yuga, Dwapara yuga and Kali yuga. At the end of the mahayuga comes total destruction. The Kaliyuga was the smallest time span of four lakh thirty two thousand years. According to the modern calculation the kaliyuga began in 3102 BC. The virtues are in the descending order, from the krita yuga the kaliyuga. Finally it turns out to be the evil age and it leads to total destruction. After that a new cycle begins afresh.

Historicity of the puranas.

We cannot accept the writings of the itihasa purana tradition as historical material in the modern understanding of the term history. But historical facts are included in these writings. In early period, it was used for historical writings for legitimizing and holding of the powers by rulers. Itihasa purana tradition was not seriously concerned with the political history, instead it gives much importance to the tradition of lineage in the society. The itihasa purana tradition give details of many kings who had ruled the Madhyadesha almost up to the beginning of the gupta period. It gives the details about the ancient Indian geography and important places. It tries to discuss the causes and effects of events as occasionally. The epics mention the change of kingdoms into monarchies. Thus it marks the transformation of ancient Indian political system from the lineages to the evolution of states, focusing on the dynastic power in northern india.

The itihasa purana gave instructions about dharma or Morals, Artha or Wealth, Kama or Desire and Moksha or Salvation as the four ultimate ends of human life. Dharma was seen in the historical context as the socio religious ordering of the society. Karma was concerned with the actions in the life of an individual which condition his next birth. It can be argued that the continuity between the past and present was maintained in this tradition. We can also argue that in the scenario of the historical writing of the modern period, the itihasa purana tradition acquire more importance than before. So we can conclude that the itihasa purana tradition gave the information about the customs and manners, methods of warfare, art of government, trade, commerce, farming, philosophy, genealogy of kings and cultural aspects of india.

Historical biographies or charitas and Vamsacharitas.

It is a new branch of historical writing emerged in the 7th C AD. It was a continuation of the earlier itihasa purana tradition. Historical biographies were prepared as a consequence to the formation of the small regional kingdoms and the growth of power of the regional kings and rulers. The court poets who had enjoyed the royal patronage emerged as the central figures of historical writings. They gave preference to dramatic analogies than to historical veracity. All these biographies were prepared to emphasise the values of chivalry, heroism and loyalty.

The important feature and purpose of the writing of historical biographies were eulogistic. Because all the authors were seeking royal patronage. The works generally focussed on particular person on single dynasty. The historicity of these biographies are questioned mainly because of their literary ornamentation. So the irrelevant facts came as the dominant factor in this writing. So we can say that all these biographies contain the materials for history. But they are not true historical works.

The important historical biographies of ancient India were the Harshacharita of Bana, the Vikramanga Devacharita of Bilhana, Prithviraja Vijaya of Jayanga and Mushakavamsa Kavya of Athulya.

Harishacharita

Bana wrote Harshacharita in the 7th C AD. It is considered as the most important historical biography of ancient India. It is a eulogy written about the achievements of the king Harshavardhana. Bana did not record the series of events as they happened. And also did not deal with the entire life of Harsha. It contains only the first few months of Harsha's rule. It is a combination of historical and fictional stories and shows how Harsha had attained his fortunes.

The central theme of the work is the invasion on the kingdom of Harsha by the combined forces of his enemies. Harsha marched with his army to drive out the enemies from his kingdom. He defeated them and rescued his sister Rajyasree from the captivity of the enemies. Bana provides no details of the war and concludes the narrative with the meeting of Harsha and his sister. Another purpose of Bana was to point out that Harsha had legitimately succeeded to the empire.

Mushakavamsa.

Mushakavamsa Kavya written by Atula in the 11th c AD. It is considered as the first historical chronicle of Kerala. This work deals with the dynastic history of the rulers of the Kolathu Nadu, the Northern part of Kerala. The work focuses on his patron Srikanta, the contemporary ruler of Kolathu Nadu. It also included the chronology of the kings of the Mushaka dynasty from its founder Ramaghata to Srikanta. In this work Atula had mixed up historical facts with legends. He has tried to relate the genealogical origin of his king Parasurama and the Yadavakula. Mushakavamsa Kavya written in Sanskrit language.

Now we can conclude that in early periods all the historical biographies were related with legends. The literary ornamentation often pushed back historical fact. The authors praised their patron in order to please them. Sometimes they were characterised as the incarnation of god. So only with the corroborative evidences we can verify the veracity of historical information of these works.

Rajatarangini of Kalhana.

Ancient India produced several historical biographies and genealogies. But all these were embraced in literary forms. Rajatarangini is only the exceptional one. It is the dynastic history or the dynastic chronicle produced in Kashmir by Kalhana in 12th C AD. It is the chronicle on the kings of

Kashmir. It is considered as first historical work produced in India. Even from the early period the people of Kashmir maintain a tradition of historical writing. Because they maintained a close relation with Chinese Islamic people from the early period, there was also a seat of Buddhist culture and Sanskrit learning. Buddhism displayed a strong historical sense in Kashmir.

Kalhana was the son of Kanpaka, who was the minister of King Harsha in Kashmir. But Harsha was deposed and killed by Loharas, the contemporary rulers of Kashmir in the time of Kalhana. Later Kanpaka did not take up service under the new rulers.

Kalhana was a Brahmin and because of his father's early position he had interest in history. He studied different chronicles on Kashmir and the local puranas.

The writing of *Rajatarangini* was completed by him in around 1148 AD. The introductory verses of *Rajatarangini* give a list of sources for its writing. He consulted 11 chronicles which were written before him. *Nilamata Purana* – a local work which included certain historical tradition, the works of *Suvrata* – which contains the summary of earlier chronicles, *Kshemendra's* chronicle on Kashmir, coins, decrees, inscriptions and verbal traditions were also used by Kalhana for the writing. Besides all these sources he used personal knowledge and current accounts and applied his own sense of criticism and judgement. The style of the writing is simple narrating.

The text *Rajatarangini* consists of eight books and 8000 verses. It is translated and edited into several languages. Aruel Stein translated it into English language. The work is divided into three parts, the first part includes the first three books, generally based on tradition. It describes the legendary kings. The second part includes the next three books covering the Karkota and Utpala dynasties, based upon the existing chronicles. The third part consists of the last two books which deal with the contemporary Lohara dynasty, which were written on the basis of eye witness account, personal knowledge and prasadies of earlier kings etc.

Kalhana did not consider himself as an historian, but as a poet or Kavi. According to him "only a poet can bring the past with the eye of his mind, by divine intuition. He states that the purpose of the work is to establish true places and time of kings and to inform the reader about the events of the ancient days without considering the different tradition. He believed that while studying history of earlier reigns, the wise man might foresee the fortunes and misfortunes of future kings.

Kalhana had a deep feeling of regional patriotism, that is he had written that the rulers of Kashmir had conquered the whole India in ancient days. His ideal king is strong and he should be benevolent towards his subjects and sympathetic towards their wishes. He also wants the bureaucracy should not get more influence in government. He was against petty feudal chiefs and because they had brought political anarchy in the kingdom.

In these works Kalhana gives details of the career and achievements of each king of Kashmir in chronological order. He also explained about the foundation of Kashmir by Prajapati Kasyapa, who had raised it from the great lake. He mentioned that in the year 653 of Kaliyuga the first king of Kashmir came into power. In *Rajatarangini* Kalhana also gives the minute details of the contemporary ruler Jayasimha. He believed in the theory of Karma. He states that good kings arise through the merits of people and the oppressive kings inevitably suffer the same. He was also believed in fate. He states that fate leads the kings even against their will.

Now we can conclude with the sentence that Kalhana was the first historian in India, who had understood the value of historical sources and necessity of their critical examination. During his period the historical approach of Kalhana was unknown to the other parts of the country. But his approach was adopted and continued in other parts in the later period.

ZIA UD DIN BARANI.

He was considered as the most important historical chronicler of the sultanate period. He was born in 1286 AD in a Sayyid family of Kaithal. He had his education at Delhi and later he rose to high position in the court of Alauddin Khalji and served as an advisor to Muhammad bin Tughlaq for about 17 years. He passed away at the age 73,

It is believed that Barani wrote 10 books but some of them are not traced. *Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi* and *Fatwa-i-Jahandari* are the famous works of Barani. For these works he gathered information from his associates like Amir Khusru. His stay at Delhi and his own experience as a court official also enabled him to write these works.

The *Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi* includes the reign of Balban, Kaiyubad, Jalaluddin Khalji, Alauddin Khalji, Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq, Muhammad bin Tughlaq, and the first 6 years of Firoz Tughlaq. In this work he followed a lenient attitude towards the Sultan except Muhammad bin Tughlaq. In this work he discusses the administrative reforms, revenue policy, land revenue and the agrarian and the economic conditions of the sultanate state. He also discusses the market control of Alauddin Khalji and severely criticises the transfer of capital and currency reforms of Muhammad bin Tughlaq.

Barani considers Firoz Tughlaq as the personification of an ideal monarch. His aim was to propagate his philosophy of history through his works. He also wanted to educate the sultans to exercise his powers in the right way. According to Barani, history is an indispensable study for a good life in this world. And history opens us the wisdom of the past and opens the lives of great men. He further believed that the duty of a historian is to teach the lessons of history and the records of the truth with fear and favour. He treated history as an academic subject.

Like all other medieval historians he was also an elitist historian. He was against the subaltern historical writing and emphasised that the historian should write the history on rulers, nobles and other upper class people. He also emphasises that history should not be about the base of the society. Like the ancient Roman historian, he also had adopted the method of putting his ideas into the mouth of some historical personalities.

Fatwa-i-Jahandari was his another important work. It deals with the creation of the world, teachings of the prophets, ideals of government and principles of administration like the rights and duties of rulers, special privileges of nobles, crime and punishment, organizations of the army and maintenance of law and order. The language of the work is Persian but Hindustani words occur frequently. His style of presentation is simple and lucid, but the preface is ornamental. His subjects of writing included the rulers, court, nobles, scholars, saints, astronomers, and also the features of daily life like mode of dress, food, habit and drink etc. He was also a didactic historian in the sense that he believed that history has a significant purpose to serve to guide humanity on the right way.

So his works are producing the assistance to us understanding the social and economic life of people. so we can conclude that, despite the prejudices and narrow views, his position as a historian of medieval India is generally accepted.

ABUL FAZAL.

He was a court historian of Mughal India under the reign of Akbar the Great. He was considered as the most important historian not only of the Mughal period but of the entire medieval India. He was born in 1551 as the son of Sheikh Mubarak at Agra. After having his education he became a teacher. He was introduced to Akbar by his brother Faizi, the poet. Then he rose into a high position in the court and became the principal minister of Akbar. He also worked as a statesman, military commander, diplomat during the reign of Akbar. However, he was assassinated in 1602 at the instigation of Prince Salim (Jahangir).

At the royal orders of Akbar, he wrote Akbarnama. For this writing he used official records, eye witness accounts, interviews with officials, nobles and provincial rulers. At the result of 7 years work he completed the book in his 42 years and submitted to Akbar in 1597.

Akbarnama has three parts. The first part deals with political history of Babur and Humayun and the background of the birth of Akbar. Second part includes the details of Akbar's reign up to 1602. And the third part known as AIN-I-AKBARI, and consists of the details of the administration including the central and provincial administration, population, trade, and commerce, industry, revenue system, social customs, and Hindu culture etc.

Abul Fazal also translated Gita from Sanskrit to Persian and he wrote a preface to Persian translation of Mahabharata. According to him history is the chronological order of events. He considered Akbar as the personification of all virtues in the world. No other court historians of the medieval India can claim the degree of adoration shown by him to his master. In many places in this work he exaggerates the virtues of Akbar and minimises his vices. He deliberately wrote the book in a very complex style because it was written for not the common people, but only for the enlightened monarchs. Akbarnama became reference book for the modern historians because it contains the authentic information about the reign of Akbar.

MUHAMMED QASIM FERISHTA.

The historiography of the Mughal period will be incomplete if Tarikh-i-Ferishta is left out. Muhammed Qasim Ferishta was the author of this book. He was hailed from Deccan. In the beginning he joined the service of the Sultan Nizam Shah of Ahmadnagar. And later he joined in the service of Ibrahim Adil Shah of Bijapur. When Adil Shah asked him to write a comprehensive history of India, he had written the work, Tarikh-i-Ferishta in two volumes.

In this work he narrated the events without making any didactic statements and showing favour to anybody. It contains the history of North India from the invasion of Muhammed Ghazni to Akbar, the history of Kashmir to Malabar and the history of the Gujarat to Bengal. This work he also records the history of North India prior to the invasion of Ghazni. But it was prepared on the basis of hearsay. So they are not acceptable.

In short the mughal historians had no philosophy of history. they could not improve the techniques and methods of historical writings. they recorded the events only for the placing of their masters. they could not provide their own interpretation to the evidences which collected by them.

ROMILA THAPAR'S VIEW ON HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN EARLY INDIA.

Romila Thapar, student of Basham and was professor in the centre for historical studies, Jawaharlal Nehru university, New Delhi from 1970 to 1991. Thapar is a very competent and authentic on ancient Indian, society, history and culture in the contemporary. She has published many number of articles and books on various aspects of ancient Indian history. She has to her credit several important works on ancient Indian history., like *Asoka and the Decline of the Mouryas* (1960), *Past and Prejudice* (1975), *Ancient Indian Social History: Some Interpretations* (1978), *History of India Vol. I* (1983), *Lineage to State* (1984), *Mouryas Revisited, Time as a Metaphor*, *Cultural Pasts*, article, *Was there Historical Writing in Ancient India?* In C. Talbot (Ed) *Knowing India* (2011)

Ancient Indian Social History is a collection of essays on various aspects of the ancient Indian history. She examines the role of Dana and Dakshina in the redistribution of resources, the ideal renunciation as creating a counter culture and explains royal origin myths as legitimising process. her interpretations have contributed to better understanding of the complex relationship between ideological development and material conditions in the social life. She uses the recent anthropological and sociological concepts to examine the transition of the early Indian society from tribal to political status. She examines the concept of empire in the Mouryan context and identifies it as a centralised bureaucratic empire.

The colonial and imperialist historians and scholars deliberately defined early Indian civilizations as *A-HISTORICAL*. The argument from colonial historians denying history in early India was to become axiomatic to the imperialistic view of Indian past and is still held by some historians. The colonial scholars described the Indian past as oriental despotism arguing that it was a static that registered no change and therefore it had no use for recording the past. Change is a nodal point in history. When new identities can emerge and the past can be reconstituted. there was no change and so no need to record the past. this view was used to legitimise the requirements colonial policy. The colonial view point was generally accepted by the early modern historians of India also.

Thapar questioned the notions of a *A-HISTORICAL* and lack of historical consciousness of early Indians. she stated that the claim often stated that early Indians lacked historical consciousness distract others how to recognise historical sense of societies whose past is recorded in ways very different from European conventions. though there may not have been a conventional form of historical writing in early India, there are nevertheless many texts that reflect the consciousness of early India. The historical consciousness of early Indian society was embedded in the diverse body of classical literature. Mentioning various texts, she stated that early Indian history was far from static. While in the early period of Indian history there may not be historical writing in a conventional form that is familiar to us from the European tradition, there are nevertheless many texts of different kind that reflect historical consciousness. Some of these came to be reformulated even those times, as historical traditions.

PATHS THROUGH THE PAST BEFORE US—HISTORICAL TRADITIONS OF EARLY NORTH INDIA, which deals with the search for historical tradition. Thapar gives the details of the early Indian historical writing and towards historical traditions. The embedded tradition, the fragmented narratives from the Vedas---the *Mahabharatha and Ramayana*. The emerging historical tradition, genealogies in the making of a historical tradition, vamsacharithas, history as literature—Visakhadatta. Alternative histories—brahmanical and Buddhist traditions---monks as historians, monastic chronicles Buddhist biographies .The historical tradition was externalised --historical biographies --- Harsha and Ramacharita, biography as histories., chamba vamsavali and the prabatha *chinthamani*. The Indian historical tradition embedded with sacred literature and the genres that emerged in order to record the tradition independent of other literary forms. Historical consciousness was the belief in the past. She analyses the issues of perspective ---specific and varying images of their past and text., ritual , political ,secular/bardic,budhist/jainalinks with the political process.kanvas ,bhragus, anginas as, sutas etc. were included in different texts. Magadhas and vratyas also.

Gana/sanga and rajya—changes-from legitimising the lineage based society to class system..Ramakatha,dasarata jataka etc...vedic and non-vedic texts or literatures unveils the historical traditions of India in differently and also explains about important regional kingdoms too. The suta magaths,gadhas,narasamsis, akhyanas and dana stutis all in a way reflect the life and society of early India. These entire corpuses represent the historical consciousness of early India. But the methodological defects and collection of the sources are also verified in differently.

&&&&&