Author/s:
Whitehouse, John Alexander

Title:
History Teaching as Conversation

Date:
2019

Persistent Link:
https://hdl.handle.net/11343/235519

History Teaching as Conversation

John Alexander Whitehouse
BA(Hons), MA, DipEd, MEdSt, FACE

ORCID iD: 0000-0002-8920-1321

Submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements
of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
September 2019
School of Historical and Philosophical Studies
The University of Melbourne

Abstract

The thesis uses Greek and Roman historiography to discuss the learning and teaching of history. It offers a synthesis of two leading approaches to historical thinking to present a combined model. The components of this model form part of the syntax that teachers and students can use to speak about the past. Although it is rare for research in education to evoke historians from classical antiquity, Greek and Roman historians address persistent issues for history teaching and teacher education.

Drawing on the work of Herodotus and Thucydides, the study underscores the importance of using questions and sources to create opportunities for students to engage in historical thinking. The research adapts a model of the epistemic authority of teachers to capture conversation in the history classroom. In this approach, the source acts as a sign for the past or aspects of historical inquiry. The study explores syntactic elements of history such as causation, significance and change. In each instance, works by classical historians are used as the foundation of discussion. The research also addresses two different, but related concepts: historical narrative and interpretations.

The research argues for the teaching of historical method in schools. It advocates a social construction approach in which history teachers and students explore source material, build interpretations and exchange representations to promote understanding.

Declaration

This thesis only comprises original work towards the Doctor of Philosophy except where indicated in the preface.

Due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used.

The thesis is fewer than 100,000 words in length, exclusive of tables, maps, bibliographies and appendices.

John A. Whitehouse.

Preface

This thesis includes material that appears in the following publications:

Whitehouse, John A. ‘The Role of Questions and Sources in Promoting Historical Thinking’. In Historical Thinking *for History Teachers: A New Approach to Engaging Students and Developing Historical Consciousness*, edited by Tim Allender, Anna Clark, and Robert Parkes, 60-71. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2019.

Whitehouse, John A. ‘Critical Analysis of Sources in History: Developing Historical Thinking’. *Education and Society* 36, no. 2 (2018): 5-14.

Whitehouse, John A. ‘Blue-Water Cruising on the High Seas of Time: What Does the Review of the Australian Curriculum mean for Senior Ancient History?’. *Curriculum Perspectives* 35 no. 1 (2015): 61-63.

Whitehouse, John A. ‘Historical Thinking and Narrative in a Global Culture’. In *Nation-Building and History Education in a Global Culture*, edited by Joseph Zajda, 15-27. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2015.

Whitehouse, John A. ‘Historical Thinking: A Framework for Learning and Teaching History’. *Educational Practice and Theory* 37, no. 2 (2015): 51-58.

Whitehouse, John A. ‘Beyond *Time, Continuity and Change*: Reasoning, Imagination and the Future of History’. *Curriculum Perspectives* 31, no. 3 (2011): 84-88.

Whitehouse, John A. ‘Historical Inquiry: Herodotus, Thucydides and the Classroom’. *Agora* 44, no. 4 (2009): 4-8.

Whitehouse, John. A (2008). ‘Teaching the Historians’. *Agora* 43, no. 2 (2008): 4-8.

Acknowledgements

There are many people to whom I wish to express my sincere gratitude. No student could wish for better supervisors than Professor Emeritus Ronald Ridley, Dr Rod Fawns and Dr Christine Redman. I have benefitted from the vast expertise of Professor Ridley in history generally, and the ancient world in particular. I am extremely grateful for the immense expertise of Dr Rod Fawns in education. Dr Christine Redman joined the project before her retirement and made an invaluable contribution with her advice on the material in the introduction. I sincerely thank them for their guidance, patience and kindness.

I thank the many friends and colleagues who have accompanied me on this journey: Ian Coffey, Dr Jeana Kriewaldt, Jeff Kinsman, Jan Hayes, Associate Professor Joseph Zajda, Associate Professor Deborah Henderson and Dr Robert Guyver. I am very grateful to my predecessor as Lecturer in History, May Leckey. Like many members of staff at the Melbourne Graduate School of Education (MGSE), I benefited from wisdom of Associate Professor Ros Hurworth (dec.). I also wish to acknowledge the kind support of my current supervisor, Associate Professor Neryl Jeanneret. I am grateful for the support of many other colleagues in the MGSE and the Faculty of Arts.

As a teacher and an academic, I have taught thousands of students. I thank them for their love of learning.

As a recipient of an Australian Postgraduate Award (APA) scholarship, I wish to express my gratitude to the Australian Government and the University of Melbourne.

It would have been impossible undertake this thesis without the love and support of my parents, both of whom passed away in quick succession before the completion of the PhD.

Four little girls will now be able to spend more time with their father. I thank Ciara, Alannah, Clare and Sarah. I look forward to more stories, movies and Lego building.

Most importantly, I thank my loving and supportive wife Barbara.

I dedicate this thesis to her.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

What does research reveal about learning and teaching history?[1]

> 'To know nothing of what happened before you were born is to remain forever a child'. (*Orator* 34.120)

Cicero observes that children do not see beyond the confines of their world. The study of the past presents a wider frame of reference. History is frequently - and rightly - defended as a subject that prepares students to become informed and active citizens. This addresses the well-being of the state in the future, but the subject also meets the needs of the present. History challenges students to look beyond themselves and their world. Historical inquiry necessitates the consideration of the perspectives of others. This can be difficult as the beliefs, values and attitudes at work in the past may differ markedly from those of today. Historical inquiry offers students the opportunity to grow. The study of the past does not take place by itself. Teachers interact with students to make learning possible. The present research explores history teaching as a form of conversation. Its draws on classical history to discuss the syntax and morphology of this social exchange. The research is intended to inform the practice of history teachers and curriculum specialists.

The conversation that is history teaching includes syntactic concepts that are foundational to historical inquiry. This chapter surveys recent pedagogical research on these ideas. It synthesises two approaches to construct a combined model of historical reasoning. This consists of eight elements: *ask historical questions*, *establish historical significance*, *use sources as evidence*, *identify continuity and change*, *analyse cause and consequence*, *explore historical perspectives*, *examine ethical dimensions of history*, and *construct historical arguments*. Following this overview of research literature, the chapter turns to issues of method, and the concludes with an outline of the structure of the thesis.

[1] A version of this chapter was published as John A. Whitehouse, 'Historical Thinking: A Framework for Learning and Teaching History', *Educational Practice and Theory* 37, no. 2 (2015): 51-58. This article drew on research commissioned by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (Australia) to set out the approach to historical thinking in the senior history curriculum. See also John A. Whitehouse, 'Blue-Water Cruising on the High Seas of Time: What Does the Review of the Australian Curriculum mean for Senior Ancient History?'. *Curriculum Perspectives* 35 no. 1 (2015): 61-63.

The present research draws on the distinction drawn by Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby between *substantive* and *procedural* knowledge in history.[2] *Substantive knowledge* deals with individuals, groups, events, practices, ideas and movements in a specific period. It is propositional in character. *Procedural knowledge* concerns the construction of meaning in the discipline. This domain encompasses issues of method such as the use of sources, identification of causal relationships, and the establishment of historical significance. Peter Seixas holds that procedural concepts such as these can be regarded as persistent issues in the study of the past.[3] Bruce VanSledright describes procedural concepts as 'knowledge-in-use'.[4] The substantive and procedural realms are interdependent and should not be taught in isolation from each other. Together, they evoke a curriculum in which students actively engage in historical inquiry.

Under the direction of Peter Seixas, The Historical Thinking Project has developed an influential model of historical thinking. It consists of six elements: (1) *establish historical significance*, (2) *use primary source evidence*, (3) *identify continuity and change*, (4) *analyse cause and consequence*, (5) *take historical perspectives*, and (6) *understand the ethical dimension of historical interpretations*.[5] Stéphane Lévesque offers a detailed clarification of key procedural concepts related to this model.[6] In the Netherlands, Jannet Van Drie and Carla Van Boxtel also present a model of historical reasoning: (1) *asking historical questions*, (2) *using sources*, (3) *contextualisation*, (4) *argumentation*, (5) *using substantive concepts*, and (6) *using meta-concepts*.[7] It is important to note that the two models are not mutually exclusive. Both embrace a vision of the classroom in which the

[2] Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby, 'Progression in Historical Understanding Among Students Ages 7-14' in *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, ed. Peter Stearns, Peter Seixas, and Sam Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 199-222.
[3] Peter Seixas, 'Conceptualizing the Growth of Historical Understanding' in *The Handbook of Education and Human Development: New Models of Learning, Teaching, and Schooling*, ed. David Olson and Nancy Torrance (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 765-83; see also Peter Seixas, 'Historical Consciousness: A Scheme of Progress in Knowledge for a Post-Progressive Age' in *Narrative, Identity and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 141-62.
[4] Bruce VanSledright, 'Thinking Historically', *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 41, no. 3 (2009): 433-438.
[5] Historical Thinking Project, 'Historical Thinking Concepts', accessed September 12, 2019, http://historicalthinking.ca/historical-thinking-concepts. For recent discussion, see Peter Seixas, 'A Model of Historical Thinking', *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 49, no. 6 (2017): 593-605.
[6] Stéphane Lévesque, *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the Twenty-First Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 3-8.
[7] Jannet Van Drie and Carla Van Boxtel, 'Historical Reasoning: Towards a Framework for Analyzing Students' Reasoning About the Past', *Educational Psychology Review* 20, no. 2 (2008): 87-110.

learner is actively engaged with primary source material. Traces of the past, rather than the textbook, take primacy.

There is much to commend in each model. Both approaches insist on the foundational role of primary sources in learning and teaching history. Van Drie and Van Boxtel highlight the importance of asking questions about the past. This affirms the centrality of inquiry and serves to invest agency in the student. These researchers include argument as a separate component of their model. There is value in this approach. A case can be made for contextualisation as a separate component. In terms of developing a practical model for use in the classroom, contextualisation may be dealt with as part of the use of sources and the exploration of historical perspectives. Teaching can proceed from this point. A key strength of the model of historical reasoning offered by the Historical Thinking Project is its specificity. Jannet van Drie and Carla van Boxtel underscore the importance of metaconcepts (procedural concepts), but Seixas and the Historical Thinking Project name them. Such specificity is vital to learning and teaching. To represent the processes of the discipline for pedagogy, it is helpful to add *Ask Historical Questions* and *Construct Historical Arguments* to the six-point model of the Historical Thinking Project. We will now consider the eight components of this combined approach.

Asking Historical Questions

Questions set historical inquiry in motion. Students develop lines of historical reasoning in response to questions. Furthermore, the propensity to pose questions about the past and sources reflects historical understanding.[8] This leads Van Drie and Van Boxtel to include this capacity in their model of historical reasoning. Although they identify four kinds of questions: *descriptive*, *causal*, *comparative* and *evaluative*, there is no reason that causation should displace other procedural concepts. For example, students might pose questions about significance, or continuity and change. In fact, the key questions that drive a unit of work often make use of procedural concepts.[9] Evaluative questions

[8] Sam Wineburg, 'Reading Abraham Lincoln: An Expert/Expert Study in the Interpretation of Historical Texts', *Cognitive Science 22*, no. 3 (1998): 319-346; Carla van Boxtel and Jannet Van Drie, 'Historical Reasoning: A Comparison of How Experts and Novices Contextualise Historical Sources', *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research* 4, no. 2 (2004): 89-97.

[9] Christine Counsell, 'Historical Knowledge and Historical Skills: The Distracting Dichotomy' in *Issues in History Teaching*, ed. James Arthur and Robert Phillips (London: Routledge, 2000), 54-71.

represent a variation of the first three types; there is research to demonstrate that such questions are particularly effective at promoting depth of historical understanding.[10] Furthermore, students need to refine their own questions to enhance their capacity to investigate the past.

Use Sources as Evidence

The use of primary sources as evidence is foundational to historical thinking. Historians use sources to draw inferences about the past. VanSledright offers an accessible model of source analysis that consists of four elements: *identification*, *attribution*, *judging perspective*, and *reliability assessment.*[11] *Identification* requires students to classify the source according to its form. *Attribution* requires the student to identify the author or creator of the source. These two cognitive acts provide the foundation for the exploration of perspective and determination of reliability. This approach to the analysis of sources builds on the research of Sam Wineburg.[12] Wineburg's work underpins the approach to source analysis advocated by the award-winning on-line teaching aid 'Historical Thinking Matters': *sourcing*, *contextualising*, *close reading* and *corroborating*.[13] Historical inquiry links questions, sources and context.[14] The selection of source material shapes the experience of learning and teaching. Frederick Drake and Sarah Drake Brown offer an

[10] Jannet van Drie, Carla van Boxtel, and Jos van der Linden, 'Historical Reasoning in a Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Environment' in *Collaborative Learning, Reasoning and Technology*, ed. Angela M. O'Donnell, Cindy E. Hmelo-Silver, and Gijsbert Erkens (Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 2006): 265-296.

[11] Bruce VanSledright, "What Does It Mean to Think Historically … and How Do You Teach It?" *Social Education* 68, no. 3 (2004): 230-233.

[12] Samuel S. Wineburg, 'On the Reading of Historical Texts: Notes on the Breach Between School and Academy', *American Educational Research Journal* 28, no. 3 (1991): 495-519; Sam Wineburg, 'Historical Problem Solving: A Study of the Cognitive Processes used in the Evaluation of Documentary and Pictorial Evidence', *Journal of Educational Psychology* 83, no. 1 (1991): 73-87; Samuel S. Wineburg, 'Reading Abraham Lincoln: An Expert/Expert Study in the Interpretation of Historical Texts', *Cognitive Science* 22, no. 3 (1998): 319-346; Sam Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001); See also Abby Reisman, 'Reading Like a Historian: A Document-Based History Curriculum Intervention in Urban High Schools', *Cognition and Instruction* 30 (2012): 86–112.

[13] 'Historical Thinking Matters', accessed September 12, 2019, http://historicalthinkingmatters.org/.

[14] Seixas, 'Historical Thinking', 599: 'The problem of primary source evidence is larger than the question, 'How do I interpret sources which are sitting in front of me?' That question assumes that sources simply appear before me to be analysed (as well they might in a history classroom), so it misses two other key elements: first, the questions or lines of inquiry, whose answers might be provided or enriched by these sources; and second, what I already know about the context of the sources. These three elements, the text, the context, and the questions that drive the inquiry, interact dynamically (both for the historian and in the well-designed history classroom), and it is their dynamic interaction that sets up the problematic tension for primary source evidence'.

approach to learning and teaching history based on different orders of sources.[15] The first-order source is pivotal to the unit. Second-order sources may confirm aspects of this source or call them into question. Third-order sources result from student inquiry. This strategy is valuable because it foregrounds the foundational nature of sources to curriculum and pedagogy in history.

Establish Historical Significance

Historical inquiry necessitates the selection of subject matter. What should we remember about the past? Historical writing preserves aspects of the past on the historical record. In this way, history constitutes a form of public memory. These shared memories enable the discipline to serve a magisterial function. Establishing historical significance can present various difficulties to students.[16] Significance is always ascribed – it is a judgment, an interpretation. The reasons supporting this judgment may include the way in which the event, individual, group, idea, movement or development was perceived at the time, the profundity of its impact, the number of people it affected, its duration and its relevance to the present.[17] Counsell uses five criteria: *remarkable*, *remembered*, *resonant*, *resulting in change* and *revealing*.[18] Peck and Seixas advocate the final two elements in this set as useful places to start.[19] Each of the above sets of criteria is designed to assist students to explain the importance of aspects of the past. They are intended to move students beyond narrow judgments based on limited criteria. These involve matters of personal relevance, contemporary lessons, or symbolic significance.[20] Judgments of historical significance underpin the lines of inquiry that historians, teachers and students choose to follow.

---

[15] Frederick D. Drake and Sarah Drake Brown, 'A Systematic Approach to Improve Students' Historical Thinking', *The History Teacher* 36, no. 4 (2003): 465-489.

[16] Peter Seixas, 'Students' Understanding of Historical Significance', *Theory and Research in Social Education* 22, no. 3 (1994): 281-304; Peter Seixas, "Mapping the Terrain of Historical Significance," *Social Education* 61, no. 1 (1997): 22-27.

[17] Geoffrey Partington, *The Idea of an Historical Education* (Windsor, England: NFER Publishing); Robert Phillips, 'Historical Significance – the Forgotten Key Element?' *Teaching History 106* (2002): 14-19; Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 39-61.

[18] Christine Counsell, 'Looking Through a Josephine-Butler-Shaped Window: Focusing Pupils' Thinking on Historical Significance', *Teaching History* 114 (2004): 30-36.

[19] Carla Peck and Peter Seixas, 'Benchmarks of Historical Thinking: First Steps', *Canadian Journal of Education* 31, no. 4 (2008): 1015-1038.

[20] Stéphane Lévesque, 'Teaching Second-Order Concepts in Canadian History: The Importance of 'Historical Significance', *Canadian Social Studies* 39, no. 2 (2005), accessed September 12, 2019, https://canadian-social-studies-journal.educ.ualberta.ca/content/articles-2000-2010#ARLevesque_second-order_concepts221; Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 56-60.

Identify Continuity and Change

The Historical Thinking Project notes that students often fail to perceive the multifaceted nature of change. Students must understand that changes can take place in one aspect of the past whilst conditions remain unaltered in other areas. The disruption of prevailing conditions provides the foundations of historical narrative. Historians use turning points to mark continuity and change. Continuity and change may be evaluated by using the concepts of progress and decline, but any such judgment is shaped by the beliefs, values and attitudes of the specific time and place in which it was constructed, and also by the individual purposes of the historian.[21]

Analyse Cause and Consequence

The exploration of causes is central to teaching and learning history. Historical inquiry involves identification of causal relationships. There are many kinds of causes in history, including *necessary* and *sufficient*, *short-term* and *long-term*, *immediate* and *underlying*, *direct* and *indirect*. Such causes may pertain to various aspects of the past such as society, politics and economics. Historians use causal relationships to construct coherent representations of the past. Historical narrative, the dominant mode of historical explanation, relies on causes to function. It is important to note that causation and explanation are not synonymous, despite their close relationship. Causes are at work irrespective of their identification by the historian; explanations are built in the present.[22]

---

[21] Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby, 'Progression in Historical Understanding Among Students Ages 7-14', in *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History*, 199-222; Peter Lee and Denis Shemilt, 'Is Any Explanation Better than None? Over-determined Narratives, Senseless Agencies and One-way Streets in Students' Learning about Cause and Consequence', *Teaching History*, 137 (2009): 42-49; Christine Counsell, 'What Do We Want Students to Do with Historical Change and Continuity?' in *Debates in History Teaching*, ed. Ian Davies (London: Routledge, 2011), 109-123; Christine Counsell, 'Historical Change and Continuity: How History Teachers are Advancing the Field' in *Debates in History Teaching*, 2nd ed., ed. Ian Davies (London: Routledge, 2017), 109-123. For very recent research, see Lightning Jay and Abby Reisman, 'Teaching Change and Continuity with Historical Analogies', *Social Studies Research and Practice* 14, no. 1 (2019): 98-104.

[22] Michael Stanford, *A Companion to the Study of History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 194-204. Peter Lee, Alaric Dickinson, and Rosalyn Ashby, 'Children's Ideas about Historical Explanation', in *Raising the Standards in History Education*, vol. 3, ed. Alaric Dickinson, Peter Gordon and Peter Lee (London: Woburn Press, 2001), 97-115; Arthur Chapman, 'Camels, Diamonds and Counterfactuals: A Model for Teaching Causal Reasoning' *Teaching History*, 112 (2003): 46-53; James Woodcock, 'Does the Linguistic Release the Conceptual? Helping Year 10 to Improve their Causal Reasoning', Teaching History *119* (2005): 5–14; James Wookcock, 'Causal Explanation', in Ian Davies, *Debates in History Teaching*, 124-136; Gerhard L. Stoel, Jannet P. van Drie, Carla A. M. van Boxtel, 'Teaching Towards Historical Expertise: Developing a Pedagogy for Fostering Causal Reasoning in History', *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 47 (2015): 49-76.

Explore Historical Perspectives

Historical inquiry involves a paradox. In one sense, the past is gone. Yet, the past also infuses the present. To understand the past, one must explore how historical actors understood their world, but the mindsets of the past may radically differ from those of the present. Nevertheless, we do share a common humanity with those who have gone before us. This means that historians must engage with historical perspectives presented in a range of primary sources to construct an empathic explanation of the past. Even though there is much research on the subject, historical empathy is a contested and multifaceted concept which is often misunderstood.[23] It is best to speak in terms of the *exploration* of different perspectives. Here, contextualisation is essential; Van Boxtel and Van Drie highlight the importance of linking a source (or an aspect of the past) to key concepts and landmarks in time.[24] Furthermore, Lévesque presents a helpful reflection on historical empathy in which he explores the interrelationship of *contextualisation*, *imagination* and *moral judgment*.[25]

Examine Ethical Dimensions of History

History is a form of collective memory. This means that it is deeply concerned with values. What aspects of the past should we remember? What claim does the past have on

[23] Denis Shemilt, 'Beauty and the Philosopher: Empathy in History and Classroom' in *Learning History*, ed. Alaric K. Dickinson, Peter J. Lee and Paul J. Rogers (London: Heinemann, 1984), 39-84; cf. Peter J. Lee and Denis Shemilt, 'The Concept that Dares not Speak Its Name: Should Empathy Come out of the Closet?', *Teaching History* 143 (2011): 39-49. On historical empathy as product, see Rosalyn Ashby and Peter Lee, 'Children's Concepts of Empathy and Understanding in History' in *The History Curriculum for Teachers*, edited by Christopher Portal (London: Falmer, 1987), 62-88. On historical empathy as process, see Stuart J. Foster and Elizabeth A. Yeager, 'The Role of Empathy in the Development of Historical Understanding', *International Journal of Social Education* 13, no. 1 (1998): 1-7; Stuart J. Foster, 'Using Historical Empathy to Excite Students about the Study of History: Can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain?' *The Social Studies* 90, no 1 (1999): 18-24; Bruce VanSledright, 'From Empathetic Regard to Self-Understanding: Im/Positionality, Empathy, and Historical Contextualizations', in *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*, ed. Ozro L. Davis, Jr, Elizabeth Yeager and Stuart Foster (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001), 51-68; Stuart Foster, 'Historical Empathy in Theory and Practice: Some Final Thoughts' in *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*,167-182; For recent work, see Jason Endacott, 'Reconsidering Affective Engagement in Historical Empathy', *Theory & Research in Social Education* 38, no. 1 (2010): 6-49; Jason Endacott and Sarah Brooks 'An Updated Theoretical and Practical Model for Promoting Historical Empathy', *Social Studies Research and Practice* 8, no 1 (2013): 41-57; For a key reappraisal, see Tyson Retz, 'A Moderate Hermeneutical Approach to Empathy in History Education', *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 47, 3 (2015): 214-226. On empathy, history, philosophy of history, and pedagogy, see Tyson Retz, *Empathy and History: Historical Understanding in Re-enactment, Hermeneutics and Education* (New York: Berghahn, 2018).

[24] Carla Van Boxtel and Jannet Van Drie, '"That's in the Time of the Romans!" Knowledge and Strategies Students use to Contextualize Historical Images and Documents', *Cognition and Instruction* 30, no. 2 (2012): 133-145.

[25] Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 140-169.

the present? Such questions have special resonance for Australia in terms of the on-going process of Reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. Much of the subject matter of history evokes moral responses.[26] Having said this, the actions of people in the past were frequently based on values which we do not share. This aspect of historical inquiry is entwined with the consideration of historical perspectives. Again, we are confronted with a paradox. Historical inquiry is undermined by the anachronistic imposition of our own values on the past, yet we are moral beings and the study of history should deepen students' understanding of what it means to be human. Historians attempt to refrain from judging people in the past, but historical interpretations may carry moral implications.[27] The very fact that we teach history to school students is an ethical choice. How we remember the past informs the present and shapes the future.

Construct historical arguments

If students are to reason historically, then they need to be able to construct arguments about the past based on evidence.[28] Evidence is derived from source material. Nevertheless, two historians may interpret the same source in quite different ways. Sources are not all equal in value; historians must determine the relative strengths and weaknesses of the material that they use to support statements about the past. All sorts of gaps may exist in sources. This means that inference plays a key part in historical inquiry. One must also address counter-arguments.[29] Clearly, the construction of an argument about the past is a challenging task. In the junior years of secondary school, description and explanation dominate, but many young students are capable of building arguments.[30] Lessons can proceed from questions about the past and move through the exploration of sources to the construction of an argument.

---

[26] Keith C. Barton and Linda S. Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good* (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2004), 187-188; Jannet Van Drie and Carla Van Boxtel, 'Historical Reasoning', 97: 'Because historical accounts are based upon various kinds of sources that often contain partial and contradictory information and because historical interpretations are not definite, assertions and claims about the past must be supported by rational arguments, which, in turn, should be based upon well-evaluated evidence'.

[27] Historical Thinking Project, 'Historical Thinking Concepts', accessed September 12, 2019, http://historicalthinking.ca/historical-thinking-concepts.

[28] Barton and Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good*, 187-188.

[29] Kathryn T. Spoehr and Luther W. Spoehr, 'Learning to Think Historically', *Educational Psychologist* 29, no. 2 (1994): 71-77; Van Drie and Van Boxtel, 'Historical Reasoning', 97-99.

[30] Nancy L. Stein and Christopher A. Miller, 'The Development of Memory and Reasoning Skills in Argumentative Contexts: Evaluating, Explaining, and Generating Evidence' in *Advances in Instructional Psychology*, vol. 4, ed. Robert Glaser (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1993), 285-335.

The Combined Model

The work of the Historical Thinking Project has made a profound contribution to the learning and teaching of history. Research on historical reasoning by Van Drie and Van Boxtel offers an alternative model that is also invaluable to teachers. The present research combines these approaches to establish a framework for the development of curriculum. This synthesis fuses key strengths of the work from the Netherlands, namely its emphasis on questions and argument, with the meta-conceptual specificity of the research by Seixas. The result is a combined model that is of use to curriculum designers, teachers and students. As a starting point, components of the model can be used to create skills objectives. Procedural concepts may be paired with associated verbs. These can be arranged in increasing levels of cognitive demand. For example, students might *describe* change initially and *analyse* it later in their studies.[31] The aim is for students to use procedural concepts to achieve a deeper understanding of the past.

Outline of Study

The present study is an argument for teaching historical method in schools. It addresses four of the procedural concepts identified by the Historical Thinking project: use sources as evidence (questions and sources), causation, significance and continuity and change. Furthermore, it investigates the related concepts of historical narrative and interpretations. The remaining procedural concepts identified by the researchers on historical thinking represent fertile ground for future research. The discipline of history is interpretative by nature. Consequently, there is no separate chapter on historical argument. Inferences about any aspect of the past are understood to be subject to debate. A valid historical argument is one that is supported by evidence. Importantly, not all arguments about the past are equally convincing.

In terms of method, this study examines historical writing. The amount of discussion in the philosophy of history that does not rest on close reading of historiography is striking. The present study explores foundational works of history. It rejects the mistaken idea that

[31] Bloom's Revised Taxonomy is a helpful means of capturing increasing levels of cognitive challenge; see Lorin W. Anderson, and David R. Krathwohl, eds. *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (New York: Longman, 2001).

an impassable barrier exists between historians in antiquity and the modern world. That is not to suggest that changes have not occurred, but to argue that Greek and Roman texts facilitate reflection on essential concepts for history from its inception as a form of critical inquiry. Greek and Roman historians have shaped history as a literary genre in the West. Classical historians are introduced in the chapter in which their work appears. Citations make use of the conventions of ancient history and classics (book and chapter numbers).

Although the scope of this study is confined to historiography in the Greco-Roman world, Chinese historiography presents invaluable opportunities for future research.[32]

Chapter Overview

Chapter 2: Questions and Sources

How do we know about the past? This chapter uses Herodotus and Thucydides to explore the place of questions and sources in history. Ancient Greek historians confront the basic question of historical method, so too must teachers and students in the modern world. The use of sources as evidence is foundational to the construction of knowledge in history. The chapter offers a model of source analysis and draws on epistemic research to present a model of conversation. It explains the use of sources as pedagogical objects through the social semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce.

Chapter 3: Causation in History

In his discussion of causation, Edward Carr invokes Herodotus and Thucydides.[33] The former is used to highlight the centrality of causation to historical inquiry. Criticism of the latter is offered in support of the suggestion that ancient historiography fails to address causation adequately. In fact, Thucydides took a keen interest in causes. The distinction between short and long-term causes is central to his work. The chapter argues that teachers can use historiography to enhance students' understanding of causation. The discussion adds to the model of conversation from the previous chapter.

[32] As a starting point on China, see On-cho Ng and Q. Edward Wang, *Mirroring the Past: The Writing and Use of History in Imperial China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005).
[33] Edward H. Carr, *What is History*? 2nd ed. (London: Penguin, 1987), 87.

Chapter 4: Historical Significance

Historical inquiry preserves selected aspects of the past for the historical record. Selection of content is subject to many rival claims. Thucydides hopes that his work will be of use (*Thuc.* 1.22.4). From this viewpoint, an education in history should address contemporary circumstances. In a globalised world, it is insufficient to restrict schooling to the history of a single nation. Having said that, citizens of any democracy need historical knowledge. This chapter examines the work of Joseph Schwab and Charles Sanders Peirce on inquiry and applies their insights to history education.

Chapter 5: Change

Thucydides offers a powerful example of change in his account of the ill-fated Sicilian expedition. The disruption of prevailing conditions provides the foundations of historical narrative. Historians use turning points to mark continuity and change. Livy offers an outstanding example of this in this account of the downfall of the monarchy and the birth of the republic. Continuity and change may be evaluated by using the concepts of progress and decline, but any such judgment is shaped by the beliefs, values and attitudes of the specific time and place in which it was constructed, and by the individual purposes of the historian. The chapter concludes with an exploration of the role of curriculum specialist in promoting planning and professional learning around these areas.

Chapter 6: Historical Narrative

Narrative is the central mode of historical explanation. This chapter opens with analysis of the use of narrative by Tacitus in his *Annales*. In this part of his work, Tacitus presents a powerful reflection on history through his narrative account of the trial of a historian. Building on this, the study explores the multifaceted role of narrative in the classroom. It presents a five-part model for the role of narrative in teaching and learning: *involvement and engagement*, *mode of explanation*, *context for historical inquiry*, a *form of source*, and an *outcome of historical inquiry*.

Chapter 7: Historical Interpretations

Reading the works of classical historians reveals that continuities and discontinuities exist between historical accounts. Furthermore, the context in which historians writes

influences their treatment of the past. These complexities also are evident in the writing of modern historians. The pedagogical reasoning and action of the teacher must take account of such factors. Building from a careful exploration of primary sources, a teaching and learning sequence can then address interpretations of that subject by experts in the discipline. On the other hand, analysis of primary source material might be framed around an exchange between historians. The research takes up a key model of planning to support the use of historical interpretations in the classroom.

2. Questions and Sources

How do we know about the past?[1]

> Herodotus of Halicarnassus here displays his inquiry, so that human achievements may not become forgotten in time, and great and marvellous deeds – some displayed by Greeks, some by barbarians – may not be without their glory; and especially to show why the two peoples fought with each other. (1.1.1)[2]

Thus begins the writing of history. Critical historical thought first finds written form in the inquiries of Herodotus. He investigated the past through discussion with his informants, venturing to distant lands to gather tales of his world.[3] The historian is a guardian of memory: the deeds of Greek and non-Greek alike will endure through his text. Herodotus strives to ensure that quality of the writing matches the renown of the subject matter. Great deeds require elevated words. Anne Curthoys and John Docker suggest that this creates a tension in the discipline from its foundation.[4] On one hand, history is a rigorous process of inquiry: the historian must interrogate sources and assess evidence. On the other hand, the historian is engaged in a literary endeavour; the writing must capture the imagination of its audience, present and future. Cicero called Herodotus the Father of History (*De Legibus* 1.5.1). We should not, however, let this obscure the legacy of Thucydides. The modern discipline is heir to his rigorous treatment of sources and insistence on the use of source material to construct an argument about the past. The

[1] This chapter includes material that appeared in the following publications: John A. Whitehouse, 'Historical Inquiry: Herodotus, Thucydides and the Classroom', *Agora* 44, no. 4 (2009) 4-8; John A. Whitehouse, 'Critical Analysis of Sources in History: Developing Historical Thinking', *Education and Society* 36, no. 2 (2018): 5-14; John A. Whitehouse, 'The Role of Questions and Sources in Promoting Historical Thinking', in *Historical Thinking for History Teachers: A New Approach to Engaging Students and Developing Historical Consciousness,* ed. Tim Allender, Anna Clark, and Robert Parkes (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2019), 60-71.

[2] Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt, revised John Marincola (London: Penguin, 2003), 3. All subsequent references are to this edition.

[3] The idea of the historian as traveller is an enduring one. For his first foreign assignment, journalist Ryszard Kapuscinski was given a copy of Herodotus by his editor. It remained with him through many travels; see Ryszard Kapuscinski, *Travels with Herodotus*, trans. Klara Glowczewska (New York: A. A. Knopf, 2008).

[4] Ann Curthoys and John Docker, *Is History Fiction?* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2006), 36: 'Herodotus and Thucydides established the curious doubleness of history: history as a sustained inquiry into the past; history as literary, engaged in narrative, history as drama, engaged in the creation of scenes, characters and speeches'.

foundational position of Herodotus and Thucydides makes that their works invaluable to historiography. How did the two founders of history understand historical inquiry? What are the implications for our work as teachers today?

Herodotus, Thucydides and History

Few details have survived about the life of Herodotus. The first line of his work names his birthplace as Halicarnassus. This town was founded as a Greek colony but had fallen under Persian domination. The date of his birth is uncertain, but it was probably before the Persian Wars (Dion. Hal. *Thuc*. 5). It appears that he was forced into exile due to political turmoil in his home.[5] His journeys in the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea gave rise to the first work of history. The historical inquiry that he presents is a response to a key question: what caused the conflict between Persia and Greece?[6] Herodotus searches for answers in legend and the recent past. Indeed, the text includes many personal and reported narratives on an extensive range of historical and ethnographic subjects.[7] He does not present a sustained reflection on his research, but instead refers to historical method at various points of the text.[8] The discussion of Egyptian history and geography in Book 2 contains one such statement:

> Up to this point I have confined what I have written to the results of my own direct observation and research, and the views I have formed from them; but from now on the basis of my story will be the accounts given to me by the Egyptians themselves

[5] T. James Luce, *The Greek Historians* (London: Routledge, 1997), 18-19. The main ancient source for the life of Herodotus is his work. The *Suda*, a 10th century Byzantine encyclopaedia, may offer further glimpses.
[6] Luce, *The Greek Historians*, 15; See also Henry Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland: American Philological Association, 1966); John Gould, *Herodotus* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1989); Donald Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989).
[7] Rosalind Thomas, 'The Intellectual Milieu of Herodotus', in *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 71: 'it is his manner of explicitly commenting on his sources, on his method, his emphasis on autopsy or eyewitness accounts, and indeed his very presence in the narrative as an active inquirer and commentator, which reveal his relation to very recent and contemporary intellectual trends; these are elements which are new, which Thucydides had to answer in his own way, and which are all too easily taken for granted as part of the Herodotean persona'.
[8] John Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 8: 'Herodotus seems to assume that the question, "How do you know?", is constantly on his audience's mind. His solution was to place himself, if not front and centre, then in a constant and direct relationship with his material, ensuring that he, the narrator, was recognised as the medium, the authority, through which the deeds became known and celebrated'.

> – though here, too, I shall put in one or two things which I have seen with my own eyes. (2.99.1)[9]

Herodotus conceives of his task as one of inquiry: he conducts observation and presents this to his audience. In Book 7, Herodotus states that he will draw on Egyptian sources. These sources are included in the text. He adds thoughts but does not process the material in a way that subsumes the source material in a seamless representation of the past. The figure of the historian is ever-present, but he refrains from judging the veracity of every account that he receives. Nineteenth century scholars dismissed Herodotus for including the fabulous in his work. Such criticism misses the point: Herodotus presents what his sources tell, but not what he necessarily accepts. Take, for example, a key statement from Herodotus after he recounts two versions of the Argive response to the Persian invasion:

> So the Argives were not the worst offenders. My business is to record what people say, but I am by no means bound to believe it – and that may be taken to apply to this book as a whole. There is yet another story about the Argives: it was they, according to some, who invited the Persians to invade Greece, because their war with Sparta was going badly and they felt that anything would be better than their present plight. (7.152.3)

Herodotean history is a voyage of discovery. He does not attempt to persuade, but instead shares tales from his journey. History as the presentation and deference of an argument about the past will come later. Herodotus does not see it as his role to include judgments about the veracity of the information contained within his sources; the audience is free to draw its own conclusions:

> For my own part, I cannot positively state that Xerxes either did, or did not, send the messenger to Argos; nor can I guarantee the story of the Argives going to Susa

[9] The Loeb edition refers to the discernment of the historian and the existence of documentary evidence; see Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, trans. Alfred D. Godley, Loeb Classical Library 117 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), 385: 'Thus far all I have said is the outcome of my own sight and judgment and inquiry. Henceforth I will record Egyptian chronicles, according to that which I have heard, adding thereto somewhat of what I myself have seen.' This is Godley's revision of his 1920 Loeb translation.

> and asking Artaxerxes about their relationship with Persia. I will express no opinion on this matter other than that of the Argives themselves. (7.152.1)

The collection of sources is privileged over their evaluation. This method differs from the use of sources as evidence to support an argument: an approach to the investigation of the past which Thucydides will develop. Despite differences between this form of writing and the work of the modern researcher, the seeds of historical inquiry are sown by Herodotus of Halicarnassus. The historian poses a question about the past that sets inquiry in motion. Historical investigation necessitates engagement with sources. The historian constructs an account of the past based on this material. We learn much from Herodotus, but his great successor Thucydides also shapes the nature of modern historical inquiry.

Although Herodotus is lauded as the Father of History, he is also condemned as the Father of Lies due to the inclusion of incredible tales in his history.[10] In antiquity, Thucydides was revered as the greatest historian (Dion. Hal. *On Thuc.* 2). Born into the aristocracy of Athens, Thucydides witnessed the expansion of Athenian power after the Persian Wars. He claims to have begun writing about the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BC) – the great struggle between Athens and Sparta – at the outbreak of hostilities (1.1.1). Thucydides survived the plague that broke out in 430 BC (2.48). Elected as *stratêgos* (general) in 424 BC, he was sent to Thrace (1.104) where his family held rights to gold mines (4.105). Sparta attacked nearby Amphipolis. Under the leadership of Thucydides, an Athenian force tried and failed to counter the Spartans (4.102-106). In punishment, Thucydides was exiled. Banishment enabled him to examine the Peloponnesian view of the war (5.26.5).[11] He returned to Athens after the end of hostilities and died soon after.[12]

---

[10] Cicero refers to Herodotus as the 'Father of History' (*On the Laws* 1.5). Elsewhere, Cicero denounces him for invention (*De Divinatione* 2.56.11). Plutarch condemns Herodotus as a liar in 'On the Malignity of Herodotus'. On the reputation of Herodotus, see James A. S. Evans, 'Father of History or Father of Lies: The Reputation of Herodotus', *The Classical Journal* 64, no. 1 (1968): 11-17; Félix Racine, 'Herodotus' Reputation in Latin Literature from Cicero to the 12th Century' in *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. Jessica Priestley and Vasiliki Zali (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 193-212.

[11] Herodotus and Thucydides both experienced exile. The greatest twentieth century historian of ancient Rome sagely observed that 'exile may be the making of an historian'; see Ronald Syme, 'Thucydides', in *Roman Papers*, vol. 6, ed. Anthony R. Birley (Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1991), 72-87; cf. John Dillery, 'Exile: The Making of the Greek Historian', in *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. Jan Felix Gaertner (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 51-70.

[12] Simon Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London: Duckworth, 1987), 151-2.

In the opening of his masterpiece, Thucydides presents a digression on historical inquiry. Its purpose is to establish the authority of the writer and hence the veracity of the text. As part of this, he reflects on the place of speeches in his work:

> With reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said. (1.22.1)[13]

This statement is evidence for the twin character of history as discussed by Curthoys and Docker. Thucydides creates a representation of the past (history as literature). In the next breath, he declares that his work is a model of accuracy (history as rational inquiry). The claims of literature and rational inquiry are at odds in this part of the text. This tension leads Thucydides to underscore the rigor of his work in the subsequent line:

> And with reference to the narrative of events, far from permitting myself to derive it from the first source that came to hand, I did not even trust my own impressions, but it rests partly on what I saw myself, partly on what others saw for me, the accuracy of the report being always tried by the most severe and detailed tests possible. (1.22.2)

[13] Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, trans. Richard Crawley (London: J. M. Dent, 1910), 14-15. Subsequent references are to this edition; cf. Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume I: Books 1-2*, trans. Charles F. Smith, Loeb Classical Library 108 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928), 39: 'As to the speeches that were made by different men, either when they were about to begin the war or when they were already engaged therein, it has been difficult to recall with strict accuracy, the words actually spoken, both for me as regards that which I myself heard, and for those whom from various other sources have brought me reports. Therefore, the speeches are given in the language in which, as it seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion, though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said'. The scholarship on speeches in Thucydides is vast; see Geoffrey E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London: Duckworth, 1972), 7-16; P. D. Rokeah, 'Speeches in Thucydides: Factual Reporting or Creative Writing?', *Athenaeum* 60 (1982): 386-401; John Wilson, 'What does Thucydides Claim for his Speeches?', *Phoenix* 36 (1982): 95-103; Thomas F. Garrity, 'Thucydides 1.22.1: Content and Form in the Speeches', *American Journal of Philology* 119 (1998): 361-384; John Marincola, *Greek Historians* (Cambridge: Classical Association, 2001), 77-85.

The depiction of the past depends not on careless chance or speculation, but painstaking investigation. The same standard of rigour is applied to incidents in which the historian participated, as to reported material. In contrast to Herodotus, Thucydides uses the verb *syngraphein* ('to write up') to describe his work. History becomes a technical treatise. In this approach to historical study, evidence is used to support a point of view. The authority of Homeric epic was ensured by the invocation of the Muse, but in the mortal realm of history, the authority of the text depends upon the efforts of the historian.

Thucydides strives to win the confidence of his audience by demonstrating the exacting nature of the inquiry. W. R. Connor describes this section of the work as an *epideixis*: a rhetorical strategy designed to display excellence.[14] Thucydides accepts the Trojan War as an historical event, but applies rational inquiry to the heroic age; he argues that it is the power of Agamemnon, not the oaths of Helen's suitors, that causes the Greek fleet to set sail for Troy (1.8.9). He also argues that the protracted nature of the Trojan War is due to the limited size of the Greek force, a result of restricted supplies (1.11.1). Having explored this war, Thucydides claims that he aspires to the highest standards of accuracy:

> On the whole, however, the conclusions I have drawn from the proofs quoted may, I believe, safely be relied on. Assuredly they will not be disturbed either by the lays of a poet displaying the exaggeration of his craft, or by the compositions of the chroniclers that are attractive at truth's expense; the subjects they treat of being out of the reach of evidence, and time having robbed most of them of historical value by enthroning them in the region of legend. Turning from these, we can rest satisfied with having proceeded upon the clearest data, and having arrived at conclusions as exact as can be expected in matters of such antiquity. To come to this war: despite the known disposition of the actors in a struggle to overrate its importance, and when it is over to return to their admiration of earlier events, yet an examination of the facts will show that it was much greater than the wars which preceded it. (1.21.1)

[14] W. Robert Connor, *Thucydides* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 29: 'By the end of the Archaeology we recognize that it is in fact an *epideixis*, a rhetorical display piece, and not a conventional one, but an exhibition of a new technique of analysis and a fully appropriate proemium to the rest of the work, emphasizing in good rhetorical fashion the greatness of the subject matter'.

Thucydides warns that similar caution must be exercised when exploring contemporary history, in his case the war between Athens and Sparta:

> My conclusions have cost me some labour from the want of coincidence between accounts of the same occurrences by different eye-witnesses, arising sometimes from imperfect memory, sometimes from undue partiality for one side or the other. (1.22.3)

Here, the historian demonstrates his understanding of the problematic nature of his source material. Thucydides understands his task as the construction of a unified account of the past. He does not identify sources in his writing, but instead presents his interpretation of the subject matter.[15] Herodotus offers sources and stories; Thucydides favours authority and argument. Curthoys and Docker construct a case for the dual nature of the discipline around the disjuncture between the approaches to historical inquiry adopted by Herodotus and Thucydides. There is, however, another position that warrants discussion. Drawing too sharp a division between Herodotus and Thucydides risks ignoring common ground between the writers. John Marincola notes that Herodotus constantly grapples with the question, 'How do you know?'[16] Thucydides must also confront this issue. Both writers combine the literary and the investigative in their respective responses to the foundational question of historical method. Marincola argues that Herodotus responds by portraying himself in such a way that the audience perceives him as the medium through which primary sources are known and presented. Thucydides endeavours to win the confidence of his audience from the outset with a sustained reflection on method. In both cases the historian depicts his work. This necessitates engagement with the two aspects of history. The representation of historical inquiry is a feature of historical literature. History is a form of literature. History is a form of inquiry. Nevertheless, these facets of the discipline are not mutually exclusive and shape the writing of history across time.

---

[15] Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, 9: 'The narrative homogeneity of Thucydides is meant to inspire confidence; he does not, like Herodotus, want the emphasis to be on his tracking down of sources, but on the finished product: the reader is to be concerned not with the process of research, but rather with the result'. See also Virginia J. Hunter, *Past and Process in Thucydides and Herodotus* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).

[16] Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, 8.

Herodotus and Thucydides are challenged by the same question: how do we find out about the past? This question speaks to us today. The implications of this for the learning and teaching of history are profound. Questions of method are central to history as a discipline. *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum: History* – a foundational document for the Australian national curriculum – defines historical inquiry as follows:

> Historical inquiry is the process of developing knowledge and understanding in history by asking questions about the past, and applying skills associated with analysing, interpreting and evaluating sources of evidence to develop informed and defensible answers.[17]

From the beginnings of history as a form of critical inquiry, the interaction of questions and sources has resulted in historical knowledge. Likewise, the processes of inquiry at work in disciplines should shape the curriculum.[18] As the above definition states, historical investigation engages with source material. This means that the inclusion of sources in the curriculum is vital. Bruce VanSledright suggests that engagement with primary sources may constitute the *sine qua non* of historical thinking.[19] Sam Wineburg argues that this form of reasoning is not a natural but must instead be taught.[20]

---

[17] This document offers a useful discussion of historical investigation; see National Curriculum Board, *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum: History* (May 2009), accessed September 12, 2019, http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Australian_Curriculum_-_History.pdf, 2.6: 'Historical inquiry involves the retrieval, comprehension and interpretation of sources, and judgment, guided by principles that are intrinsic to the discipline. It yields knowledge that is based on the available evidence, but remains open to further debate and future reinterpretation. It develops in students the ability to recognise varying interpretations of history and to determine the difference between fact, opinion and bias'.

[18] Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1960). For a key discussion of inquiry, see John Dewey, *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1938), 104-5: 'Inquiry is the controlled or directed transformation of an indeterminate situation into one that is so determinate in its constituent distinctions and relations as to convert the elements of the original situation into a unified whole.'

[19] Bruce VanSledright, 'What Does it Mean to Think Historically … and How Do You Teach It?' *Social Education*, *68*, 230-3.

[20] Sam Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001); cf. Jon A. Levisohn, 'Historical Thinking--and Its Alleged Unnaturalness', *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 49, no. 6 (2017): 618-630.

Historical knowledge rests on the use of sources to respond to questions about the past. If history is a language – a way to speak about the past – then this is a fundamental element of its syntax. The pedagogical challenge is to teach students this language. This is not an easy task as historical knowledge seems unproblematic to the uninitiated.[21] Nevertheless, key research by Wineburg, VanSledright, Seixas, van Drie and van Boxtel highlights the importance of using historical method in the secondary school curriculum to foster depth of understanding. Their models represent invaluable planning tools for teachers to foster disciplinary thinking in history. This means that methodological concerns that confronted Herodotus and Thucydides continue to challenge students today:

> For I suppose if Lacedaemon were to become desolate, and the temples and the foundations of the public buildings were left, that as time went on there would be a strong disposition with posterity to refuse to accept her fame as a true exponent of her power. And yet they occupy two-fifths of Peloponnese and lead the whole, not to speak of their numerous allies without. Still, as the city is neither built in a compact form nor adorned with magnificent temples and public edifices, but composed of villages after the old fashion of Hellas, there would be an impression of inadequacy. Whereas, if Athens were to suffer the same misfortune, I suppose that any inference from the appearance presented to the eye would make her power to have been twice as great as it is. (1.10.2)

In his opening book, Thucydides muses on the difficulties of constructing meaning about the past. As we, his readers down the generations, look to the beginnings of critical history writing, we encounter Thucydides reflecting on the relationship between evidence and knowledge. His abovementioned example of historical reasoning is a constructive extract to use with students, particularly given that introductions to historiography are often taught in Year 7 in units on ancient Greece. What would historians in the future make of our society if only the buildings remained? How do we know about the past? This is the fundamental question of historical method.

[21] Denis Shemilt, *History 13 - 16 Evaluation Study* (Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall, 1980).

The British curriculum theorist Michael Young argues that 'powerful knowledge' offers students fresh capacities for understanding and action.[22] It generates potential for change. Such knowledge is not acquired during everyday life but is instead learned in educational institutions. Powerful knowledge is specialized in that it exhibits distinctive syntactic and semantic features. In a democratic society, such knowledge is the learning entitlement of every student. The discipline of history includes a great deal of powerful knowledge. For example, the notion of evidence presents a profound challenge to 'fake news', 'post-truth politics' and spin. The critical mindset fostered by an education in history need not always be trained on the past. How can we teach students to evaluate sources for use as evidence in support of an argument? There is no more powerful knowledge that history can provide.

Teaching and Learning: Using Sources as Evidence

Herodotus and Thucydides use sources to make inferences about the past. This process is at the heart of historical method in the modern world. Our understanding of the past is based on the traces of the past which have washed up on the shores of the present. Such fragments do not form a complete picture; nor can they speak for themselves. The remains of the past are many and varied. Lévesque offers a helpful distinction between records and relics.[23] Records are documents such as letters, diaries, oral testimony and legislation. Relics are objects such as coins, vases, buildings or some other item of material culture. For a remnant of the past to become a source it must be brought to bear on a historical inquiry. Having said this, a record or relic must be evaluated before it can be used to support inferences about the past. The ability to assess sources for use as evidence is foundational to historical reasoning. There is a strong tradition of research from the United States that explores how students read sources.[24] Foundational research by Sam

[22] Michael Young, *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From Social Constructivism to Social Realism in the Sociology of Education* (London: Routledge, 2008); Michael Young, 'Powerful Knowledge as a Curriculum Principle' in *Knowledge and the Future School: Curriculum and Social Justice* ed. Michael Young, David Lambert, Carolyn Roberts, and Martin Roberts (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 65-88.

[23] Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 116. For Johnson, *records* capture events for posterity (or fulfil practical ends) and *remains* are any traces of human activity: Allen Johnson, *The Historian and Historical Evidence* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1926). Such language is insensitive to issues of human remains and related rights violations (see *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, Article 12).

[24] Elizabeth A. Yeager and O. L. Davis, Jr., 'Classroom Teachers' Thinking About Historical Texts: An Exploratory Study', *Theory and Research in Social Education* 24, no. 2 (1996): 146-66; Keith C. Barton, "'I Just Kinda Know": Elementary Students' Ideas about Historical Evidence', *Theory and Research in Social Education* 25, no. 4 (1997): 407-30; Keith C. Barton, 'Primary Children's Understanding of the Role of Evidence: Comparisons between the United States and Northern Ireland', *International Journal of*

Wineburg finds that historians see source material differently to the uninitiated.[25] Beginners believe that sources are unproblematic repositories of information. From this mindset, meaning seems to be unaffected by matters of form, authorship, purpose, context or subtext. In contrast, historians know their importance. The starting point for historical research may be a question or the archive.[26] Nevertheless, historical thought depends on the use of sources to answer questions about the past. History teachers use both questions and sources. Interaction between the two facilitates discussion about the past.

Class discussion serves various pedagogical purposes which Joseph Schwab distinguishes as *stimulatory*, *exemplary* and *exploratory*.[27] Each of these kinds of conversation includes questions that further the pedagogical aims of the teacher. Stimulatory discussion fosters the predisposition to engage with the past. *What were the wonders of the ancient world? How close did the world come to destruction during the Cuban Missile Crisis?* Such questions set an instructional sequence in motion. Exemplary discussion offers students models to support learning about historical inquiry. For example, teachers guide students through the analysis of a record or relic. The questions that teachers ask act as models for students. *What are the strengths of the source? What are its limitations?* Exploratory questions promote learning through the investigation of historical inquiry itself. *What is the nature of causation in history? What do historians mean by change?* Exploratory discussion involves investigation of historical inquiry. Knowledge of historical inquiry is expressed when students synthesize understanding from more than one source.

Historical Learning, Teaching and Research 1, no. 2 (2001): 21-30; Bruce A. VanSledright, 'Fifth-Graders Investigating History in the Classroom: Results from a Researcher-Practitioner Design Experiment', *Elementary School Journal* (November 2002): 131-60; Bruce VanSledright, *In Search of America's Past: Learning to Read History in Elementary Schools* (New York, Teachers College Press, 2002).

[25] Samuel S. Wineburg, 'On the Reading of Historical Texts: Notes on the Breach Between School and Academy', *American Educational Research Journal* 28, no. 3 (1991): 495-519; Samuel S. Wineburg, 'Reading Abraham Lincoln: An Expert/Expert Study in the Interpretation of Historical Texts', *Cognitive Science* 22, no. 3 (1998): 319-346; see also, Samuel S. Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts*. Wineburg uses present participles in presenting heuristics to highlight their active nature. The current research adopts a similar approach; the best way for history students to learn source analysis is to actively engage in it.

[26] John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, 5th ed. (Harlow: Pearson, 2010), 120-1.

[27] Joseph Schwab, 'Eros and Education: A Discussion of One Aspect of Discussion' in *Science, Curriculum, and Liberal Education: Selected Essays*, ed. Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 105-132.

Asking historical questions is an element of the model of historical reasoning developed by Carla van Drie and Jannet van Boxtel.[28] They discuss four types of questions that arise in historical inquiry: *descriptive*, *causal*, *comparative* and *evaluative*. Descriptive questions pertain to the realm of historical fact: *What was the Industrial Revolution?* Such questions support acquisition of foundational knowledge. *Causal questions* explore links between events: *Why did the Industrial Revolution occur?* Comparative questions require consideration of similarities and differences: *How was life changed by the Industrial Revolution? Evaluative* questions require reflective assessment: *To what extent is the notion of Industrial Revolution a useful way to describe changes in Britain and then elsewhere between the mid-eighteenth and the mid-nineteenth centuries?* Such questions tend to elicit more nuanced responses than the other types.[29] All four question types are invaluable to the pedagogical repertoire of the history teacher. They help students to move from what can be achieved without assistance to what can be done with support.[30]

For Lee Shulman, pedagogical content knowledge is a distinctive form of understanding possessed by teachers.[31] It concerns ways in which the teacher renders the subject knowable to students. If questions and sources are foundational to historical thinking, then they must occupy a central place in the pedagogical reasoning of the history teacher. The model of pedagogical reasoning and action formulated by Shulman is a useful way to conceptualise planning for learning and teaching.[32] The first stage of the model is

[28] Jannet Van Drie and Carla Van Boxtel, 'Historical Reasoning: Towards a Framework for Analyzing Students' Reasoning About the Past', *Educational Psychology Review* 20, no. 2 (2008): 90-92.
[29] Jannet van Drie, Carla van Boxtel, and Jos van der Linden, 'Historical Reasoning in a Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Environment', in *Collaborative Learning, Reasoning and Technology*, ed. Angela M. O'Donnell, Cindy E. Hmelo-Silver, and Gijsbert Erkens (Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 2006): 265-296.
[30] Lev Vygotsky, *Thought and Language*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1962).
[31] Lee Shulman, 'Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching', *Educational Researcher* 15 no. 2 (1986), 9: 'Within the category of pedagogical content knowledge I include, for the most regularly taught topics in one's subject area, the most useful forms of representation of those ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations – in a word, the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others'.
[32] Lee S. Shulman, 'Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform', *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 1 (1987): 1-22; cf. Hugh T. Sockett, 'Has Shulman Got the Strategy Right?' *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 2 (1987): 208-219; cf. Lee S. Shulman, 'Sounding an Alarm: A Reply to Sockett', *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 4 (1987): 473-482. Sockett offers three key objections to Shulman. First, that Shulman privileges content over context. Second, that he adopts dispassionate language that reduces teaching to a series of techniques bereft of moral purpose. Third, Sockett holds that Shulman fails to capture the relationship between reason and teaching. Shulman dismisses the first point by noting

comprehension. The teacher must grasp educational purposes and content knowledge. In history, this includes the epistemological significance of sources in history as a form of inquiry. The teacher must also have a strong command of educational purposes. What is it that students should learn about the past? The second step is *transformation*. This consists of four sub-stages: *preparation*, *representation*, *selection* and *adaptation* (of specific pedagogical sources for classroom use). The history teacher formulates searching questions and locates appropriate sources. These questions and sources must be relevant to the substantive content. By foregrounding the centrality of sources and questions, the teacher represents the subject as a form of inquiry. Furthermore, teachers must select activities that assist students to read the source and use it to discuss the past. For the best outcomes, the teacher must adapt material and approaches to the needs of the students. The third stage of the model is *instruction* (or staging): interaction between teacher and students facilitates learning. *Evaluation* refers to assessment of the student learning at all levels of cognitive demand and the work of the teacher. This enables *reflection* on evidence. Reflection gives rise to *new comprehension* of content, pedagogy, students and self. A strong grasp of how to use sources is indispensable to the pedagogical reasoning and action of the history teacher. It is also essential knowledge for students.

Identification: Establishing the Five W's

The first stage in the analysis of any source is identification of its basic nature. Here, the 'Seven Circumstances' of classical antiquity offer a valuable guide. Traditionally, these have been ascribed to Hermagoras of Temnos whom Isidore of Seville lauds as one of the founders of rhetoric.[33] Hermagoras argues that deliberative rhetoric – the use of language to persuade an audience to take or reject a course of action – deals with the *thesis* (an abstract question) and the *hypothesis* (a question about a particular issue). The *hypothesis*

---

that the knowledge base of teachers enables adaptation to context. On the second objection, he counters that teaching is a multifaceted endeavour that does not demand one type of language. Shulman concludes that judgement is at the heart of teaching.

[33] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies*, 2.2.1. A key teacher of rhetoric during the Hellenistic period, Hermagoras of Temnos developed a system to classify the principal and subordinate issues of a matter. His writings are only known to us through Cicero, Quintilian and Hermogenes. See George Alexander Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 303-21; Ray Nadeau, 'Classical Systems of *Stases* in Greek: Hermagoras to Hermogenes', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 2 (1959): 51-71; Beth S. Bennett, 'Hermagoras of Temnos', in *Classical Rhetorics and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources*, ed. Michelle Ballif and Michael G. Moran (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005), 187-193.

is defined by seven circumstances.[34] The works of Hermagoras no longer survive, but Augustine lists the circumstances as *quis, quid, quando, ubi, cur, quem ad modum*, and *quibus adminiculis* (*De rhetorica* 7.2-3). These may be translated as *who, what, when, where, why, in what manner*, and *by what means*. Hermagoras was not the first scholar to examine such issues. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle discusses the circumstances in which an action is located. Translations of the key passage vary, but Christopher Rowe renders it as follows: 'there is the matter of who is acting, what he is doing, in relation to what or affecting what, sometimes also with what (as for example with a tool), what the action is for (e.g. saving someone), and how it is done (e.g. gently or vigorously)' (1111a3-6).[35] Five circumstances are presented here. Using another translation, Michael Sloan argues that all seven are included in the passage.[36] It is safe to say that the basis of the approach is Aristotelian. We may merge two elements – *in what manner* and *by what means* – into *how* and address this later. Source analysis proceeds from recognition of form. The result is a five-part approach: *what, who, when, where* and *why*.

These questions from the ancient world serve a preliminary function by establishing the foundation on which a case is built.[37] Historical inquiry is an attempt to build an argument about the past. A persuasive argument in history requires the support of evidence drawn from sources. Hermagoras uses his questions to examine the circumstances surrounding a specific issue. In the case of historical inquiry, the issue is the extent to which the source may be used as evidence. This is a clear feature of the work of Herodotus and Thucydides. The first step is identification as form shapes meaning: *What is the source?* The range of forms that a primary source might take is immense. An editorial in a newspaper is a public

[34] Cicero differed from Hermagoras. For Cicero, the *thesis* was the realm of philosophy; the *hypothesis* was the concern of rhetoric (*de Inventione* 1.8). The topic was addressed by Boethius and informed the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) on confession; see D. W. Robinson, Jr., 'A Note on the Classical Origin of the "Circumstances" in the Medieval Confessional', *Studies in Philology* 43, no. 1 (1946): 6-14.

[35] Christopher Rowe, trans., and Sarah Broadie, comm., *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 125. The Loeb translation is as follows: 'Perhaps then it will be as well to specify the nature and number of these circumstances. They are (1) the agent, (2) the act, (3) the thing that is affected by or is the sphere of the act; and sometimes also (4) the instrument, for instance, a tool with which the act is done, (5) the effect, for instance, saving a man's life, and (6) the manner, for instance, gently or violently', see Aristotle, trans. H. Rackham *Nicomachean Ethics* (London: Heinemann, 1926), 125.

[36] Michael C. Sloan, 'Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics as the Original Locus for the *Septem Circumstantiae*', *Classical Philology* 105 (2010): 236-51.

[37] Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 67. In modern scholarship, external criticism aims to determine the authenticity of a source. Internal criticism explores its content.

text that presents the opinion of the editor on an issue. A private text such as a diary presents personal experience. Herodotus and Thucydides note the importance of oral testimony. Modern historians may use letters, diaries, novels (and other literary works such as poetry or plays). Official records such as the transcripts of trials, inquests, parliamentary proceedings and legislation all constitute different forms of source that the historian might use. Material culture may be used as sources: tools, coins, weapons and armour, clothing and other everyday items, or works of art such as mosaics, sculpture and painting. The second step is attribution: *Who made the source?* Relics and records are created by human beings. Historical inquiry must take account of individuals and groups because sources are produced by humans. This means that time and place are relevant: *When was the source made? Where was it made?* Answers to these questions elicit factual answers, but the fifth question may invite more interpretation: *Why was the source made?* Purpose is relevant. History explore human purposes or agency in ways that other subjects do not. Whilst we cannot read the minds of historical actors, we can infer their intent.[38] These questions establish the groundwork of source analysis. Herodotus and Thucydides faced these questions. They are invaluable preliminaries to the conversation that follows. The next step is to examine the content of the source.

Content Analysis: Reading Closely

It is necessary to examine a source carefully to ascertain its contents.[39] Take, for example, the speech that Winston Churchill delivered at Fulton, Missouri, on March 5, 1946. In February, the Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin had proclaimed that war was the inescapable consequence of capitalism. In response, Churchill sought to secure support for a 'fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples' to counter the threat of Communism.[40]

[38] On intention, action and inference, see Robin G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 302-315, cf. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York, Seabury Press, 1975). For further discussion, see Chinatsu Kobayashi and Mathieu Marion 'Gadamer and Collingwood on Temporal Distance and Understanding', *History and Theory* 50, no .4 (2011): 81–103; Alun Munslow, *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*. 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2000), 151-153; Mark Bevir and Frank Ankersmit, 'Exchanging Ideas', *Rethinking History: The Journal of Theory and Practice* 4, no. 3 (2000): 351-372; Frank R. Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983); Mark Bevir, *The Logic of the History of Ideas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[39] The contemporary discipline explores a wider range of sources than was traditionally the case, so we may speak in terms of reading (written word), listening (oral testimony) and viewing (material culture).

[40] Walter LaFeber, *America, Russia and the Cold War*, 7th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1993), 38-39.

Although it was titled ‘The Sinews of Peace’, it is known today as the ‘Iron Curtain Speech’:

> From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in many cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow.

This is a powerful piece of rhetoric. The dominant metaphor is that of the ‘iron curtain’: unyielding, opaque and oppressive. Churchill names eight capital cities that lie shrouded behind the pall. There is a relentless quality to the list. Those cities and their nations are subject to Russian influence. Freedom is under threat. Churchill emphasises that Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Romania and Bulgaria now face the spectre of domination by Stalin’s Russia. The speech is a rhetorical tour-de-force, building on its dominant metaphor to the consequences of the division of Europe. The ‘famous’ capitals of ‘ancient’ states now fall within a ‘Soviet sphere’. The lines that marked the position of Allied forces at the end of World War 2 are now the boundaries of a new conflict between East and West. Close analysis of the text enables the reader to infer how the former and future British Prime Minister understood the situation: the USSR was a threat, it sought power over sovereign states and already held much of Europe in its thrall. Indeed, the exploration of perspectives an important aspect of source analysis.[41] Discussion could turn to the subtext of concern for the place of Britain in the post-war world.

Context Analysis: Making Links

Content analysis is necessary to interpret source material, but it does not suffice. If our goal is to understand the past, we must link the source to the context in which it was produced. An expert in history recognizes that context influences meaning. The novice

[41] Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 140-169.

does not necessarily share this insight. Historians know that immediate circumstances are important, but so too are prevailing social, political and economic conditions. Exploration of individual agency forms part of the initial stage of source analysis: *Why was the source produced?* Students can build links between the source, the actions and the intentions of its creator. To build context beyond issues of immediate circumstance, Van Boxtel and Van Drie hold that students require historical knowledge arranged around landmarks in time and key concepts.[42] Temporal markers may be events of long or short duration (such as the Cold War or the Cuban Missile Crisis). Key concepts may refer to the political, economic, cultural and ideological features of the society. Their research offers a clear message: key concepts and landmarks in time must be understood for students to contextualize sources effectively.

Take, for example, the use of the label the 'Roaring Twenties' to characterise the 1920s. This decade is often remembered as a period in which the attitudes and behaviour of the young were at odds with those of older generations. Modernity was valued. Victorian and Edwardian norms were cast aside. In the United States, it has been described as a time of forgetting – turning from the suffering of the Great War to the possibilities offered by prosperity (not that prosperity was evenly shared or economic growth sustained). Mass production fed materialism: disposable income was spent on consumer products such as the radio and the motorcar. Spectators were amazed as flight records were set and broken. It was also the era of prohibition. The criminal behaviour that resulted has become legend. The values, anxieties and preoccupations of the era are reflected in its fashion, music and art. Students must grasp these concepts to understand a source such as *The Great Gatsby*. The narrative is told from the perspective of Nick Caraway, who has recently moved to New York from the mid-West. He is invited to the opulent mansion of Jay Gatsby. There, he experiences pure hedonism:

> I believe that on the first night I went to Gatsby's house I was one of the few guests who had actually been invited. People were not invited – they went there.

[42] Carla van Boxtel and Jannet van Drie. '"That's in the time of the Romans!" Knowledge and Strategies Students use to Contextualize Historical Images and Documents', *Cognition and Instruction* 30, no. 2 (2012): 113-145.

> They got into automobiles which bore them out to Long Island, and somehow they ended up at Gatsby's door. Once there they were introduced by somebody who knew Gatsby, and after that they conducted themselves according to the rules of behaviour associated with an amusement park. Sometimes they came and went without having met Gatsby at all, came for the party with a simplicity of heart that was its own ticket of admission.[43]

The extract captures the hedonism associated with the era. Gatsby throws extravagant parties on a regular basis. The propriety and restraint of previous generations is tossed aside. Few of the guests receive a formal invitation. Most have not even met their host. Revellers arrive in motor cars: the iconic consumer item of the era. The car epitomised speed, freedom and change. Having abandoned convention, the revellers embrace the fast life. Fitzgerald writes of 'a simplicity of heart' amongst the guests, but their behaviour is nothing short of riotous. For some, this may be a consequence of the need to forget the Great War (Nick and Gatsby are veterans). The extract reflects the anxieties of a society that has turned from the past but faces an uncertain future. Later, the novel underscores the destructive consequences of individualism and materialism.

The 'Jazz Age' is not the only way to remember the period: wealth and opportunity were not shared by all. Most Indigenous Australians experienced little of this prosperity. Many of the jobs offered to women in wartime evaporated with peace. Furthermore, the 1920s was a period of significant industrial discontent. Thousands of returned servicemen lived with wounds that would never heal. Soldier Settlement Schemes proved largely disastrous with large numbers of veterans and their families abandoning the inappropriate blocks of land that they had been allocated. These aspects of the past challenge positive depictions of the Jazz Age. To place a source such as *The Great Gatsby* in context it is necessary to grasp events, developments and ideas that highlight the multi-layered nature of the 1920s. In terms of sequence, contextualisation can only occur when the student has acquired this knowledge. Planning for teaching and learning must take this into account.

[43] F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby* (London: Penguin, 1990), 43.

Evaluation: Judging Value

Having identified the nature of the source, its content and context, it is necessary to make an overall judgement about its value as evidence. What are the strengths of the source? What are its weaknesses? How might it be used as evidence? Herodotus affirms the need to gather sources, but Thucydides underscores the necessity of judgment. The preceding stages of source analysis have implications determination of how a source might be used as evidence. For example, a private letter home by an English migrant to Australia in the 1920s may not address to the experiences of migrants from other times and places. In fact, the experience of one person may not be representative of others from the same period. Take, for example, two of the accounts of life the Great Depression presented in *Weevils in the Flour* – a landmark work of oral history in Australia. In the first source, Jack recalls that he and his wife had no money and were without food for their six-month-old baby. Accompanied by a friend, Jack took to the street with his violin. Others were busking along Parramatta Road. Eventually, the pair found a space and performed:

> No one put anything in the box until, all of a sudden, a little kid got a ha'penny from her father, and two young girls come along and put in threepence each. I thought, 'How terrible this is, taking ha'pennies off kids.' My mate got demoralised and he put the box down at my feet and stood on the corner. I was still on 'Play, Fiddle, Play'. I couldn't get off it. I said, 'How much is in that box? He said, 'Elvenpence ha'penny.' A small tin of Lactogen was one and six! I had only a few minutes to go until nine o'clock and my knees were still shaking. A young fellow come out of a barber's shop. He'd just had a shave and a haircut. He looked at me, put his hand in his pocket and dropped two bob in the box. I stopped playing, got on the train, paid my tuppence fare, and I got out to Newton Bridge as the chemist was about to close. I said, 'A small tin of Lactogen, please,' and, of course, he was only too pleased to sell me something. So I come home, the big hero with a tin of Lactogen, and some change! And after we'd fed the baby we had some ourselves.[44]

[44] Wendy Lowenstein, *Weevils in the Flour: An Oral Record of the 1930s Depression in Australia* (South Yarra, Melbourne: Hyland House, 1978), 23. This book is a powerful example of how the form of source material (oral testimony) can exert a profound effect on the representation of the past – and challenge the discipline by including voices that might not otherwise be heard.

This is a heart-rending narrative of poverty. The street is lined with victims of the Great Depression. Children are the first to give money to the desperate father. Eventually, Jack raises the funds, races to the pharmacist, and buy the infant milk formula. The parents have no food apart from the Lactogen, so after caring for the baby they feed themselves. The source is *authentic*, *relevant*, *reliable*, *credible* and *consistent*. It is *sufficient* to infer that life could be a terrible struggle during the Depression. A student might conclude that life was shockingly difficult for everyone. Eva Robinson – a high school teacher – offers a different perspective:

> Our private poverty had practically terminated when the depression came. We were beginning to earn and, being of lower middle class extraction, we didn't associate closely with workers or know exactly what happened to them. A great number of non-working class people had little knowledge of what poverty existed except where it touched themselves. For example, if my brother hadn't been a journalist I wouldn't have known that there were people living in Victoria Park, Brisbane, in broken-down tanks and so forth. The enormous ignorance of people about the unemployed was quite significant. Even in this dreadful depression, many people didn't know.[45]

The first source is not *representative* of everyone; Eva had largely escaped poverty by the onset of the Depression. Further research would show that the sacrifices of the Depression were not evenly shared. This small example points to the importance of corroboration to historical inquiry. Corroboration enables the historian to test statements about the past. Wineburg holds that it is a distinctive heuristic used by historians.[46] Corroboration forms an important part of source evaluation. Such thinking challenges students: it occupies the highest level of the cognitive domain in the original version of the taxonomy of objectives developed by Benjamin Bloom.[47]

---

[45] Lowenstein, *Weevils in the Flour*, 166.

[46] Samuel S. Wineburg, 'Historical Problem Solving: A Study of the Cognitive Processes used in the Evaluation of Documentary and Pictorial Evidence', *Journal of Educational Psychology* 83, no. 1 (1991): 77: 'Stated as a heuristic, corroboration could be formulated as "Whenever possible, check important details against each other before accepting them as plausible or likely.",

[47] Benjamin S. Bloom, ed., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (New York: David McKay, 1956). See also Lorin W. Anderson, and David R. Krathwohl, eds. *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (New York: Longman, 2001).

Sources, Classroom Conversation and Social Constructivism

Herodotus and Thucydides foreground the importance of sources to historical inquiry. Sources are key elements of conversations about the past between teachers and students that enable learning to occur. Social constructivism explores ways in which individuals interact to create meaning. Within this paradigm, the task of the sociologist of knowledge is to investigate the process through which this occurs.[48] For social psychologists, the individual is understood through interaction with others. The use of language is the focus of such study. Nevertheless, Rom Harré notes that analysis of discourse is insufficient: one must attend to the 'local moral order': the system of 'rights, duties and obligations' which underpin social episodes.[49] From this perspective, any pedagogical interaction is a conversation. The moral order of the classroom involves privileges and responsibilities.[50] Teachers and students interact in this context.

Douglas Roberts offers three models of pedagogical interaction.[51] Each consists of three elements: student, teacher and domain. It is the relationships between the components that differ. His research is constructivist as it acknowledges the agency of the learner. Rather than entering the classroom as a *tabula rasa*, the student holds beliefs, values and attitudes and plays an active role in learning. Teaching is not simply a process of the transmission of information. The teacher is the next element in each model. The pedagogical decisions made by the teacher influence the learning of the student: the teacher selects subject matter and strategies that shape the learning experience. For Roberts, what the teacher says and does matters. Domain refers to the subject-matter in question. The relationship between these elements defines three pedagogical styles. In outlining these styles, Roberts justifies the epistemic (knowledge) authority of the teacher.

---

[48] Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 13.
[49] Rom Harré and Luk van Langenhove, 'The Dynamics of Social Episodes', in *Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts of Intentional Action*, ed. Rom Harré and Luk van Langenhove (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 1-13.
[50] On the local development of the moral order in the classroom (as opposed to emphasis on the imposition of external orders through regulatory talk), see Peter Freebody and Jill Freiberg, 'Public and Pedagogic Morality: The Local Orders of Instructional and Regulatory Talk in Classrooms', in *Local Educational Order: Ethnomethodological Studies of Knowledge in Action*, ed. Stephen K. Hester and David Francis (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000), 141-162.
[51] Douglas A. Roberts, 'Epistemic Authority for Teacher Knowledge: The Potential Role of Teacher Communities – A Response to Robert Orton', *Curriculum Inquiry* 26, no. 4 (1996): 417 – 431; cf. Robert E. Orton, 'How Can Teacher Beliefs About Student Learning Be Justified?' *Curriculum Inquiry* 26, no. 2 (1996): 133-146.

The first model offered by Roberts is triadic (the 'Trialogue' style). It involves interaction between teacher and domain, teacher and student, and student and domain. In terms of student and the domain, the model acknowledges prior knowledge held by the student (a key constructivist insight). Both the teacher and the student observe the discipline. Both the teacher and the student offer representations/explanations to the other. The difference is that the representations/explanations offered by the teacher are justified knowledge of the field. The pedagogical imperative is for the teacher to explain differences between representations/explanations offered by the student and justified knowledge. This requires a conversation about the nature of justification itself. In the case of history, the teacher and student might use a source to draw an inference about the past (in such an instance it stands for an aspect of the domain). The student constructs an interpretation (drawing on prior knowledge). The teacher also builds an interpretation (using syntactic and semantic knowledge of history). The student shares his or her interpretation. The student is entitled to this view on ethical and pedagogical grounds. It may not, however, find justification in the discipline. The teacher offers an interpretation based on historical knowledge and discusses the differences between the two representations/explanations. This means that the construction of meaning in history is the focus of conversation.[52]

There are alternatives to this triadic conversation. The second style that Roberts explores is the 'imposition' style. In this approach, the student interacts directly with the teacher, not the domain. Direct engagement with the domain is the role of the teacher. Students can ask questions and receive explanations, but it is not the role of the students to drive inquiry. Roberts notes that much teaching occurs in this way. This style assumes that students will discern why the domain subject matter is more effective than preconceptions that they hold. If this is the case, then direct instruction can be powerful. For example, previous instruction might have explored the divisive debates in Australia concerning conscription and the Great War. Building on this, the teacher might offer students a range of primary sources to examine. These sources would capture a range of experiences but

[52] Roberts notes that this style is analogous to the 'Rule Model' (as opposed to the 'Impression' or 'Insight' orientations of teaching): see Israel Scheffler, 'Philosophical Models of Teaching', *Harvard Educational Review* 35, no. 2 (1965): 131-143. Scheffler associates this approach with Immanuel Kant because of his emphasis on reason and autonomy. Having said this, reason is one of the most extensively discussed topics in philosophy. The linguistic turn in twentieth century could lead us to replace Kant with Wittgenstein. If this were the case, then the language of historical inquiry would shift to the foreground.

would be read from a shared understanding of the period. This style has similarities to the 'Insight Model' discussed by Israel Scheffler. In this approach, the work of the teacher *prompts* understanding. Scheffler associates this orientation with Plato and St. Augustine.

The third style that Roberts presents is 'abandonment'. The difference between this style and the first approach lies in the interaction between teacher and student: the teacher does not offer explanations which others have constructed knowledge in the domain. Instead, students are left to their own devices. For example, students of ancient history might be asked to develop an argument about the causes of the Peloponnesian War. After exploring source material, a student might argue that Sparta was concerned about the growth of Athenian power and so went to war. This is a valid interpretation. In fact, it is the view taken by the ancient historian Thucydides. In this pedagogical style, however, the teacher does not address this with the student. The teacher may neglect to note that some modern scholars take other views. Thus, valuable opportunities for learning are lost. Nevertheless, Roberts argues that it is important to address this due to its prevalence in schools.

This might also be said for the third orientation that Scheffler describes: the 'Impression Model'. He associates this with John Locke. Locke holds that the mind may be understood as a blank slate. Learning result from external input that is conveyed through the senses (experience) or refection (internal processes of the mind).[53] Although one strength of this approach is its emphasis on experience, its weakness resides in the failure to acknowledge the agency of the student (or to take advantage of prior learning). Furthermore, it does not address social dimensions of learning as explored by scholars including John Dewey, Lev Vygotsky, Jean Piaget and Albert Bandura. Although direct instruction is an invaluable strategy in the repertoire of the teacher; a pedagogical orientation that abandons students to their impressions (misconceptions) of content is clearly inadequate.

[53] Scheffler quotes John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (Chapter 1, Sec. 2): 'Let us then suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper, void of all characters, without any ideas: — How comes it to be furnished? Whence comes it by that vast store which the busy and boundless fancy of man has painted on it with an almost endless variety? Whence has it all the materials of reason and knowledge? To this I answer, in one word, from EXPERIENCE. In that all our knowledge is founded; and from that it ultimately derives itself. Our observation employed either, about external sensible objects, or about the internal operations of our minds perceived and reflected on by ourselves, is that which supplies our understandings with all the materials of thinking. These two are the fountains of knowledge, from whence all the ideas we have, or can naturally have, do spring'. The subsequent sections of Locke's essay discuss experience and reflection.

Roberts presents these three styles as part of a broader argument concerning the epistemic authority of the teacher. Roberts draws on research by Hugh Munby and Tom Russell that explores the 'authority of experience'.[54] This is knowledge about teaching that is acquired through teaching. It is validated through interaction with other teachers. Having said this, any process of validation must draw on the discipline. Roberts offers the triadic model to support this discussion. Any source that a history teacher uses to represent an aspect of the past may be judged against selections made by other teachers. The same is true of any questions, exchanges or learning activities that are associated with the presentation of the source in the classroom. The discipline of history is an indispensable element in any such validation (as the semantic and syntactic aspects of the discipline must inform pedagogy). The claims of discipline and pedagogy intersect in the selection of the source. The teacher acts on the authority of experience (as well as other forms of authority).

Source as Sign

Representation of a domain is an element of each of the models offered by Roberts. There are many ways in which a history teacher might represent content, but the selection of sources is pivotal. Importantly, history teachers select sources to serve pedagogical ends. This means that the choices that teachers make may vary from those of the historians. For example, many works of medieval history do not refer to the Bayeux Tapestry. In contrast, the teacher might make extensive use of the tapestry because it captures the imagination, its visual nature makes it more accessible than many alternative sources, and it offers the teacher the opportunity to make links to related substantive content (such as the Norman Invasion, kingship, and warfare). A triadic model of conversation in the history classroom might consist of teacher, student and source. In such a model, the selection of the source is crucial because it sends discussion in a specific direction. For a lesson on the Seven Years War, for example, the choice of source might direct conversation towards one of its many theatres: Europe, North America, South America, the Caribbean, India or Africa.

[54] Hugh Munby and Tom Russell, 'The Authority of Experience in Learning to Teach: Messages form a Physics Methods Class', *Journal of Teacher Education* 45, no. 2 (1994): 86-95. See Donald Schön; *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books, 1983); Hugh Munby, Tom Russell, and Alice K. Martin, 'Teachers' Knowledge and How it Develops' in *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, ed. Virginia Richardson (Washington: American Educational Research Association: 2001): 877–904; Tom Russell and Andrea K. Martin, 'Reflective Practice: Epistemological Perspectives on Learning from Experience in Teacher Education' in *Reflective Theory and Practice in Teacher Education*, ed. Robyn Brandenburg et al. (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2017): 27-47.

Other paths are not taken (at least, at that point). The source is a pedagogical instrument that points to an aspect of the past (or to historical inquiry itself).

Recognition of the value of the source as a sign enables us to draw on semiotics to discuss its pedagogical value. Semiotics offers two main models of the sign. For Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, a sign consists of two elements: the *signifier* and *signified*.[55] The *signifier* is best understood as the form of sign (although Saussure explored sound patterns of linguistic signs).[56] The *signified* is the meaning to which the signifier refers. The two are inseparable, but their relationship is arbitrary. Scholars linked to a two-part model of signs include Augustine, the Scholastics, Hobbes and Locke.[57] Teachers can readily use such a model. Students might investigate an Athenian coin. The image of the owl is the signifier. Athena and Athens are signified. The two-part model may be used to generate questions that invite students to analyse the source: *What do you see on the coin? What is the meaning of the image?* There is, however, a more comprehensive approach.

Whilst Saussure was formulating his dyadic approach, American philosopher, scientist and mathematician Charles Sanders Peirce was establishing a triadic model. In contrast to the linguistic focus of Saussure, Peirce holds that the material world is filled with signs. For Peirce, a sign consists of its form (the *representamen*), the *interpretant* (the sense that is made of the sign) and an *object* (that to which the sign refers).[58] In the abovementioned example, the *representamen* is the owl. The *interpretant* is idea that the owl stands for Athens and Athens. The *object* is Athena and Athens. Comparison of the models reveals that *signifier* and the *representamen* are similar. Peirce notes that the *interpretant* is itself a sign; Saussure makes no such claim for the *signified*. Furthermore, the two-part model

[55] Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. Roy Harris (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013). For discussion of this foundational work, see Jonathan D. Culler, *Saussure* (Glasgow: Fontana, 1976); Roy Harris, *Reading Saussure: A Critical Commentary on the Cours de Linguistique Générale* (London: Duckworth, 1987); John E. Joseph, *Saussure* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
[56] Daniel Chandler, *Semiotics: The Basics*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2007), 14.
[57] Winfried Nöth, *Handbook of Semiotics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 88.
[58] Charles S. Peirce, 'On Signs' MS [R] 798, 2.228: 'A sign, or *representamen*, is something which stands to somebody for something in some respect or capacity. It addresses somebody, that is, creates in the mind of that person an equivalent sign, or perhaps a more developed sign. That sign which it creates I call the *interpretant* of the first sign. The sign stands for something, its *object*. It stands for that object, not in all respects, but in reference to a sort of idea, which I have sometimes called the *ground* of the representamen'. 'Sign', in *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition,* eds. Mats Bergman and Sami Paavola, accessed September 12, 2019. http://www.commens.org/dictionary/term/sign

does not refer to anything beyond itself, whereas the triadic model includes the *object*. This is the 'semiotic object', not the 'real object' since Peirce holds that the limitations of the mind mean that we cannot absolutely know any object. In his discussion of triadic models, Nöth uses different language, replacing *representamen* with *sign vehicle* (form), *interpretant* with *sense* and *object* with *referant*. He observes that a range of scholars are associated with such an approach: Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Boethius, Francis Bacon, Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz.[59] The triadic model is preferable to the dyadic approach because it acknowledges meaning that is construed by the student.

One of the many classifications offered by Peirce is the division of signs into three categories: *icon*, *index* and *symbol*.[60] An icon resembles that for which it stands. An index does not physically resemble that for which it stands, but some sensory feature offers a connection that is not arbitrary. The relationship between a symbol and that for which is stands is based on convention. All signs fall into one or more of these three categories. In the case of source material in history, a statute belongs to the category of icon. Film or audio recordings falls into the second category (index). Since language is symbolic, documents occupy the third category. All three types of signs can form elements of conversations about the past. They enable teachers and students to point to aspects of the domain. They also enable reflection on the nature of historical inquiry.

Conclusion

How do we know about the past? Herodotus and Thucydides confront the basic question of historical method, so too must teachers and students in the modern world. The use of sources as evidence is foundational to the construction of knowledge in history. Research by Wineburg reveals that the difference between novice reader of a source and an expert is not merely a difference of degree, but a difference of kind. To the novice, the source is an unproblematic receptacle of information. Meaning is presented whole and pure in the source. In contrast, historians understand that meaning is shaped by form, perspective and

[59] Winfried Nöth, *Handbook of Semiotics*, 89-90.
[60] Charles S. Peirce, 'On A New List of Categories' in *The Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition*, vol. 2, Peirce Edition Project (Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 1984), 49-59.

context. Teachers can assist students to think historically by providing them with a model of source analysis. For a trace of the past to become a source it must be drawn into inquiry. The first step in any process of evaluation is to identify the form of the source. Only then can analysis turn to other aspects of external criticism: attribution, dating and location. It is at this point that students can consider issues of purpose. Having laid this foundation, students can turn to matters of content (what the source says/shows). Contextualisation is the next step: the student links the source to the world in which it was produced. Finally, the student assesses its strengths and limitations. It is only at this point that the source can be used as evidence in support of an argument about the past. This insight is fundamental to historical thought.

Herodotus and Thucydides insist on the importance of sources to historical inquiry. Both historians use sources to respond to questions about the past. Discipline-based pedagogy in history builds on these foundations. Teachers use questions and sources to speak about the past. Students are presented with sources in the classroom so that they can do likewise. Questions and sources interact with other points of the grammar of history: significance, continuity and change, cause and consequence, narrative and interpretations. Subsequent chapters explore these pivotal relationships. In each case, classical historiography is used to offer a discussion of the syntactic concept. Furthermore, each chapter addresses its role in conversations about the past. Importantly, the purpose of such conversation is not the creation of new knowledge (this is the task of the discipline). The aim of the teacher is to promote learning

3. Causation in History

How do we explain the relationships between events?

In his discussion of causation in history, E. H. Carr makes the following observation:

> Herodotus, the father of history, defined his purpose in the opening of his work: to preserve a memory of the deeds of the Greeks and the barbarians, 'and in particular, beyond everything else, to give the cause of their fighting one another'. He found few disciples in the ancient world: even Thucydides has been accused of having no clear conception of causation.[1]

Carr invokes Herodotus and Thucydides. The former is used to highlight the centrality of causation to the exploration of the past. Criticism of the latter is offered in support of the suggestion that ancient historiography fails to address causation adequately. Carr cites F. M. Cornford as his authority for this reading of Thucydides.[2] The position adopted by Cornford was a reaction against nineteenth century scholars who regarded Thucydides as a positivist: a thinker whose knowledge was the product of experience and observation. Although Cornford emphasises the influence of tragedy on Thucydides (and the literary nature of his work), aspects of fifth-century Greek thought such as philosophy and medicine are also evident.[3] In fact, Thucydides took a keen interest in causation. It is difficult to overstate the importance of causation to the discipline. For Carr, 'The study of history is a study of causes'.[4] As Thucydides offers an extended reflection on historical method, his work is a useful place to begin our discussion of the concept.

---

[1] Edward H. Carr, *What is History*? 2nd ed. (London: Penguin, 1987), 87.

[2] Francis Macdonald Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London: Edward Arnold, 1907), x: 'Thucydides never understood the origin of the war because his mind was filled with preconceptions which shaped the events he witnessed into a certain form; and this form chanced to be such that it snapped the causal links between incidents in the connexion of which the secret lies'. For Cornford, the key influence on Thucydides was poetry. Consequently, Thucydidean history offers a tragic vision of human nature. On implications for form, Cornford prefigures elements of the work of Hayden White. Such a reading does not sit well with the idea of Thucydides as a founding figure of the realist view of International Relations; see David Bedford and Thorn Workman, 'The Tragic Reading of the Thucydidean Tragedy', *Review of International Studies* 27, no. 1 (2001): 51-67.

[3] Simon Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London: Duckworth, 1987), 110-35; Jonathan J. Price, *Thucydides and Internal War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 14-22.

[4] Carr, *What is History*?, 87.

Thucydides on the Causes of the Peloponnesian War

The Persian Empire mounted its first attempt to invade Greece in 490 BC. The invasion failed, but Persia launched a second campaign a decade later. Sparta – the pre-eminent power in Greece – was chosen to lead the Hellenic resistance. Standing at the head of an alliance of oligarchic states, Sparta was the dominant power in Greece. Indeed, Sparta led the Greeks to victory at the Battle of Plataea (479 BC). Acclaim for the successful defence of Greece did not belong to Sparta alone, however, as the democratic city-state of Athens used its impressive navy to humble the invaders at Salamis and Mycale. With the Greek mainland saved, Sparta did not seek to continue the fight against the Persians. In contrast, Athens wanted to keep fighting to free the Greeks of Ionia that remained under Persian control. Consequently, Athens formed the Delian League (478 BC) – an alliance to defend against any further Persian attacks and to liberate cities that had been founded as Greek colonies on the eastern shores of the Aegean. Tribute paid by member states of the league enabled Athens to expand its already formidable fleet. The Delian League soon became an Athenian empire. A key event is the transfer of the treasury from the island of Delos to Athens (454 BC). The balance of power in the Greek world had shifted.[5]

In 464 BC, an earthquake rocked Sparta. The Helot (subject) population took advantage of the resultant upheaval to revolt. Sparta invoked the support of her allies to deal with the threat. In response, Athens dispatched 4,000 Hoplites under the command of Cimon. Thucydides writes that the Spartans rebuffed the Athenians, sending them home because they might seek to bring about political change in Sparta (1.101). Rebuffed, the Athenians broke off their alliance with Sparta and established an accord with Argos (an adversary of the Spartans). The rivalry between Athens and allies of Sparta erupted into war (with limited Spartan involvement). During this conflict, Athens used tribute from the Delian League to fund the war effort. The war ended in Thirty Years' Peace (446 BC). The terms of this peace formalised the division of the Greek world. Sparta and Athens swore to

[5] On the Persian wars, see Nicholas G. L. Hammond, 'The Expedition of Datis and Artaphernes' in *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 4: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525–479 BC*, 2nd ed., ed. John Boardman, Nicholas G. L. Hammond, David M. Lewis and Martin Ostwald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 491-517; Nicholas G. L. Hammond, 'The Expedition of Xerxes' in Boardman et al., *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 4*, 2nd ed., 518-591. On Greece after 479 BC, see John K. Davies, 'Greece after the Persian Wars', in *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 5: The Fifth Century BC*, 2nd ed, ed. David M. Lewis, John Boardman, John K. Davies and Martin Ostwald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 15-33.

refrain from interfering with the allies of the other. Spartan allies were forbidden from defecting to Athens; Athenian allies could not defect to Sparta. Neutral states were free to join either block. Disputes were to be submitted to arbitration. The stage was set for the next phase of the conflict.

The Dispute at Corcyra

Thucydides presents a careful treatment of the origins of the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BC).[6] He presents the crisis at Corcyra (modern Corfu) as a prelude to the war. After years of tension, the democratic faction in Epidamnus expelled aristocrats from the city. These aristocrats formed an alliance with Illyrian tribes and tried to wrest control from the democrats. As Epidamnus had been founded by Corcyra, the democrats turned to the mother city for support. Corcyra refused the request. The Epidamnians then sought assistance from Corinth. The desperation of the Epidamnians was such that they offered to become a colony of Corinth in return for support. This had the potential to escalate the conflict; although Corcyra was founded by Corinth, relations between the two city-states were strained. Eager to humiliate Corcyra, Corinth provided the military assistance. The result was the Battle of Leucimne (435 BC) in which the Corinthians were defeated by the Corcyraeans. That was not the end of the matter, however, as Corinth assembled a new fleet to humble upstart Corcyra. Alarmed, Corcyra sought assistance from Athens. This placed the Athenians in a difficult position. Such an alliance risked drawing Athens into a war with Corinth (and Sparta), but the possibility of Corinth taking the fleet of Corcyra for her own was disturbing to the Athenians.

Thucydides presents the key part of the speech by a Corcyraean envoy to the Athenians as follows:

[6] Scholarship on Thucydides and the causes of the war is extensive; see Anthony Andrewes, 'Thucydides on the Causes of the War', *Classical Quarterly* 53 (1959): 223-39; Peter J. Rhodes, 'Thucydides and the Causes of the Peloponnesian War', *Hermes* 115 (1987): 154-65; John S. Richardson, 'Thucydides 1.23.6 and the Debate about the Peloponnesian War' in *Owls to Athens: Essays in Classical Studies Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, ed. Elizabeth M. Craik (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990): 155-61; Simon Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 62-66; Donald Kagan, *Thucydides: The Reinvention of History* (London: Viking, 2009).

Now there are many reasons why in the event of your compliance you will congratulate yourselves on this request having been made to you. First, because your assistance will be rendered to a power which, herself inoffensive, is a victim to the injustice of others. Secondly, because all that we most value is at stake in the present contest, and your welcome of us under these circumstances will be a proof of goodwill which will ever keep alive the gratitude you will lay up in our hearts. Thirdly, yourselves excepted, we are the greatest naval power in Hellas. Moreover, can you conceive a stroke of good fortune more rare in itself, or more disheartening to your enemies, than that the power whose adhesion you would have valued above much material and moral strength should present herself self-invited, should deliver herself into your hands without danger and without expense, and should lastly put you in the way of gaining a high character in the eyes of the world, the gratitude of those whom you shall assist, and a great accession of strength for yourselves? You may search all history without finding many instances of a people gaining all these advantages at once, or many instances of a power that comes in quest of assistance being in a position to give to the people whose alliance she solicits as much safety and honour as she will receive. But it will be urged that it is only in the case of a war that we shall be found useful. To this we answer that if any of you imagine that that war is far off, he is grievously mistaken, and is blind to the fact that Lacedaemon (Sparta) regards you with jealousy and desires war, and that Corinth is powerful there--the same, remember, that is your enemy, and is even now trying to subdue us as a preliminary to attacking you. And this she does to prevent our becoming united by a common enmity, and her having us both on her hands, and also to ensure getting the start of you in one of two ways, either by crippling our power or by making its strength her own. Now it is our policy to be beforehand with her--that is, for Corcyra to make an offer of alliance and for you to accept it; in fact, we ought to form plans against her instead of waiting to defeat the plans she forms against us. (1.33)[7]

[7] The Loeb translation stresses the fear that the growth of Athenian power caused in Sparta; see Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume I: Books 1-2*, trans. Charles F. Smith, Loeb Classical Library 108 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919), 61: 'Now as to the war which would give us occasion to be of service, if anyone of you thinks it will not occur he errs in judgment, and fails to perceive

This speech exemplifies the understanding of the origins of the Peloponnesian War held by Thucydides. The initial points deal with justice and gratitude. These are preliminaries for an appeal to self-interest; Athenian support will keep Corcyraean naval might out of Corinthian hands. It is at this point that the speech turns to Thucydides' view of the cause of the war. The envoy underscores the inevitability of conflict between Athens and Sparta (the Lacedaemonians). This is due to the fear that the growth of Athenian power has fostered in her rival. The envoy states that this fear drives the movement towards war.[8] The crisis at Corcyra constitutes a contributing cause, but it is not the underlying cause of the war that is to come. By noting the friendship between Corinth and Sparta, the envoy attempts to persuade the Assembly that support for Corcyra is in the interests of Athens. Corinth and Sparta plan to bolster their strength at the expense of their adversaries. The fall of Corcyra will lead to the demise of Athens.

Following this speech, the Athenians hear from a representative of the Corinthians. The Corinthian envoy argues that war is not inevitable, but Athenian support for Corcyra would make an enemy of Corinth (1.42). After receiving the entreaties of both sides, the democratic Athenians must determine their preferred course of action. Thucydides writes:

> When the Athenians had heard both out, two assemblies were held. In the first there was a manifest disposition to listen to the representations of Corinth; in the second, public feeling had changed and an alliance with Corcyra was decided on, with certain reservations. It was to be a defensive, not an offensive alliance. It did not involve a breach of the treaty with Peloponnese: Athens could not be required to join Corcyra in any attack upon Corinth. But each of the contracting parties had a right to the other's assistance against invasion, whether of his own territory or that of an ally. For it began now to be felt that the coming of the Peloponnesian war was only a question of time, and no one was willing to see a naval power of such magnitude as Corcyra sacrificed to Corinth; though if they could let them

---

that the Lacedaemonians, through fear of you, are eager for war, and that the Corinthians, who have great influence with them and are enemies of yours, are making a beginning with us now with a view to a subsequent attack upon you, in order that we may not be led by our common hatred to take our stand together against them, and that they may not fail, before we unite, to attain their two objects—to harm us and to strengthen themselves. It is our business, on the other hand, to get the start of them—we offering and you accepting the alliance—and to forestall their schemes rather than to counteract them'.

[8] Hornblower, *Commentary*, 78.

> weaken each other by mutual conflict, it would be no bad preparation for the struggle which Athens might one day have to wage with Corinth and the other naval powers. At the same time the island seemed to lie conveniently on the coasting passage to Italy and Sicily. (1.44)[9]

Thucydides writes that the feeling amongst the Athenians is that war is inevitable. This provides the context for Athenian decision-making. With war on the horizon, Athens does not wish to risk the loss of the Corcyraean fleet. Consequently, the Athenians establish a defensive alliance with Corcyra and ten ships are sent to protect the Corcyraeans. The force is bound by strict rules of engagement because the Athenians do not wish to violate the Thirty Years' Peace (1.45.3). The result is the Battle of Sybota (433 BC). Following the engagement, both the Corinthians and Corcyraeans claim victory. Thucydides notes that the battle provided 'the first cause of the war that Corinth had against the Athenians' because 'they had fought against them with the Corcyraeans in time of treaty' (1.55.2). For Thucydides, the dispute at Corcyra represents a *pretext* that Corinth can use to justify war with Athens.[10] It does not explain why the war occurred.

Dispute at Potidaea

Thucydides offers a further short-term or contributing cause of the Peloponnesian War: a dispute concerning Potidaea. Potidaea was a colony of Corinth, but paid tribute to Athens as a member of the Delian League. Having earned the enmity of Corinth, Athens becomes concerned about a possible revolt in Potidaea (1.54). Following the battle off Corcyra, the Athenians demand that the Potidaeans dismantle fortifications, offer hostages, and expel Corinthian ambassadors. At the same time, Perdiccas, King of Macedon, was seeking to inflame revolt in the area because the Athenians had sided with his rivals. Subsequently,

[9] This section of the text also foreshadows the role of Corcyra in support of the ill-fated Sicilian Expedition, see W. Robert Connor, *Thucydides* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 35-6: 'Thucydides then adds a further point, also adduced by the Corcyraeans in their speech: "At the same time the island seemed to then well suited for a naval expedition to Sicily. Such a consideration is fully appropriate in the diplomatic climate of the pre-war years for we know that Athens at this time was concerned with western Greece. But from a post-war perspective the words take on an added force. Inevitably, they bring to mind Corcyra's later role as the marshalling point for the great expedition that passed along the Italian coast to Sicily and ultimately to defeat at Syracuse'; cf. Henry D. Westlake, 'Athenian Aims in Sicily,' *Historia* 9 (1960): 393. For the dispute at Corcyra, see Donald Kagan, *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), 222-250.

[10] Clifford Orwin, *The Humanity of Thucydides* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

the Potidaeans send representatives to Athens and Sparta. Discussion with the Athenians achieves nothing to further Potidaean interests. Dialogue with the Spartans results in the promise of support. Consequently, Potidaea and some other cities in Thrace revolt against Athens (1.58). Previously, Athens had sent ships to the area for operations in Macedonia. Arriving in Thrace, they discover the rebellion (1.59). It is impossible to attack Perdiccas and the rebels, so the Athenians decide to support their allies in Macedon. To support the revolt, Corinth sends 2,000 volunteers and mercenaries (1.60). Meanwhile, the Athenians come to terms with Perdiccas and then move against the rebels. At the Battle of Potidaea (432 BC) the Athenians and their Macedonian allies fight Potidaeans and Peloponnesians. Subsequent siege operations continue into the Peloponnesian War.

Thucydides describes the dispute at Potidaea as another reason for the outbreak of war (1.56.1). The narrative that the historian offers rests on causal relationships: the dispute in Corcyra causes problems in Potidaea. The Athenian demands cause the Potidaeans to seek the support of the Spartans and a diplomatic solution with the Athenians. Athenian policy causes Perdiccas to fuel discontent in Thrace. The possibility of Spartan assistance causes the Potidaeans (and other cities) to throw off the Athenians. Corinthian enmity for Athens causes them to send an expedition to Thrace. The pursuit of self-interest causes the Athenians to strike deals with the Macedonian factions and to move against Potidaea. Without causes, historical narrative collapses. Having said this, Thucydides distinguishes between different types of causes. The Potidaean affair, like the Corcyraean dispute, does not represent the true cause of the war. We would describe these as short-term or trigger causes. Yet, for Thucydides, the disputes at Potidaea and Corcyra do not explain why the Peloponnesian War took place.

The Megarian Decree

Thucydides does not present the Megarian decree (433/2 BC) as the principal cause of the Peloponnesian War. Many of his contemporaries would not have shared this view, instead viewing it as the cause of the conflict.[11] The decree was a series of sanctions that

[11] See Chapter 4 for Andocides on the decree. Aristophanes refers to it in *Acharnians* (ll. 524-39).

restricted Megarian trade with Athens and her empire.[12] Megarian ships could not enter any harbour within the Athenian Empire. Megarians were also banned from trading in the Athenian marketplace. The results for Megara were disastrous. The ostensible reasons for the decree were that the Megarians had infringed upon sacred lands, cultivated land that did not belong to them and were giving refuge to runaway slaves (1.139.2). These were pretexts. The real reason is that Megara had supported Corinth in its conflict with Corcyra. Thucydides presents a speech by Pericles, the Athenian leader, as follows:

> Now it was clear before that Lacedaemon entertained designs against us; it is still more clear now. The treaty provides that we shall mutually submit our differences to legal settlement, and that we shall meanwhile each keep what we have. Yet the Lacedaemonians never yet made us any such offer, never yet would accept from us any such offer; on the contrary, they wish complaints to be settled by war instead of by negotiation; and in the end we find them here dropping the tone of expostulation and adopting that of command. They order us to raise the siege of Potidaea, to let Aegina be independent, to revoke the Megara decree; and they conclude with an ultimatum warning us to leave the Hellenes independent. I hope that you will none of you think that we shall be going to war for a trifle if we refuse to revoke the Megara decree, which appears in front of their complaints, and the revocation of which is to save us from war, or let any feeling of self-reproach linger in your minds, as if you went to war for slight cause. Why, this trifle contains the whole seal and trial of your resolution. If you give way, you will instantly have to meet some greater demand, as having been frightened into

[12] For a detailed discussion see, Brian R. MacDonald, 'The Megarian Decree', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 32, no. 4 (1983): 385-410; cf. Geoffrey E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London: Duckworth, 1972), 225-289. MacDonald views the decree as a political stratagem. Ste. Croix highlights the religious character of the conflict (Megara had permitted cattle to graze on sacred lands). Most historians take the former view, see Raphael Sealey, 'The Causes of the Peloponnesian War', *Classical Philology* 70 (1975): 103-105; Charles Fornara, 'Plutarch and the Megarian Decree', *Yale Classical Studies* 24 (1975): 213-228; Terry E. Wick, 'Thucydides and the Megarian Decree', *L'Antiquité Classique* 46 (1977): 91-99. A high degree of uncertainty still surrounds the sanctions, see Alfred French 'The Megarian Decree', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 25, no. 2 (1976), 249: 'What we do know is that Athens misused her imperial position to spite a neighbour with whom she was feuding: in view of the developing climate of fear, the unfortunate consequences may have turned out to be disproportionate to any expected gain'.

> obedience in the first instance; while a firm refusal will make them clearly understand that they must treat you more as equals. (1.40.2-6)

Pericles emphasises that Sparta and her allies have been conspiring against Athens for an extended period. Spartan machinations are motivated by alarm at the growing power of Athens. If so, this supports the case that the Peloponnesian War cannot be adequately explained by any short-term cause. Pericles notes that the Thirty Years' Peace provides for arbitration of disputes; the Peloponnesians have not availed themselves of the opportunity to negotiate. Instead, Pericles states that Sparta and her allies prefer war. Now, the Spartans order the Athenians to comply with their demands. Revocation of the Megarian Decree would constitute an unacceptable concession. It would be tantamount to handing Athenian independence (and power) to Sparta. The passage ends by returning to the theme of fear: the Athenians must not allow fear to drive them into submission. The Athenian refusal to rescind the decree reflects a commitment to maintenance of their power. It is the growth of this power that has been regarded with alarm in Sparta. For Thucydides, the Megarian decree, the Spartan demand for its retraction, and the Athenian refusal are products of the strained relationship between the leading powers of the Greek world. The narrative that Thucydides presents offers them as the final steps to war. Thucydides is interested in what set Greece on that path in the first place. For Thucydides, the decree does not explain the conflict. He looks beyond short-term triggers for a deeper explanation.

'The Truest Explanation'

The complex way in which Thucydides argues that the Peloponnesian War was caused by Spartan fear of Athenian power demonstrates the inadequacy of any suggestion that he lacked an understanding of causation. Interestingly, Thucydides does not argue that his work is a study of causes; the task that he sets himself is to write a history of the war. Events are linked by causal relationships, but explanation and causation are not the same. Thucydides investigates the past. To do so, he seeks out sources. Once assessed, sources may be used as evidence to support inferences about the past. Some of these inferences address causal relationships. Furthermore, it is necessary to distinguish between different

kinds of causes. Having done this, Thucydides is then able to use causation in a historical interpretation:

> All this came upon them with the late war, which was begun by the Athenians and Peloponnesians by the dissolution of the thirty year's truce made after the conquest of Euboea. To the question why they broke the treaty, I answer by placing first an account of their grounds of complaint and points of difference, that no one may ever have to ask the immediate cause which plunged the Hellenes into a war of such magnitude. The real cause I consider to be the one which was formally most kept out of sight. The growth of the power of Athens and the alarm which this inspired in Lacedaemon, made war inevitable. Still it is well to give the grounds alleged by either side which led to the dissolution of the treaty and the breaking out of the war. (1.23.5-6)[13]

Thucydides marks the beginning of hostilities with the end of the Thirty Years' Peace. As Arnold Gomme notes, Thucydides does not argue that the events at Epidamnus, Corcyra, and Potidea are irrelevant.[14] He does not assert that the Megarian Decree played no part in the road to war. These immediate causes are explored in the chapters that follow. Taken together, they fail to offer a full complete explanation. Instead, Thucydides holds that one must look to Spartan fear of the growth of Athenian power for the underlying cause of the war. Thucydides attempts to persuade the reader of his case through his narrative. He

[13] The Loeb edition again underscores Spartan fear of the increasing power of Athens. This translation speaks of the 'truest explanation' rather than of 'real' and 'immediate' causes; see Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, 43: 'And the war began when the Athenians and Peloponnesians broke the thirty years' truce, concluded between them after the capture of Euboea. The reasons why they broke it and the grounds of their quarrel I have first set forth, that no one may ever have to inquire for what cause the Hellenes became involved in so great a war. The truest explanation, although it has been the least often advanced, I believe to have been the growth of the Athenians to greatness, which brought fear to the Lacedaemonians and forced them to war. But the reasons publicly alleged on either side which led them to break the truce and involved them in the war were as follows'. For support of Thucydides view of the cause of the war, see Simon Hornblower, *The Greek World*, 479-323 (London: Routledge, 1991), 88-93; *Commentary*, 65, cf. De Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. De Ste Croix. argues that Sparta and her allies (particularly Corinth) were responsible for the war.

[14] Gomme, *Commentary*, 154: 'We must at the same time bear in mind, not only that in ordinary parlance is the same word, cause, used for different things, but that the 'immediate occasions;, 'even 'the complaints and quarrels' are also among the true causes of a war; they are not to be dismissed as mere symptoms. If Athens had decided not to interfere in the war between Corinth and Kerkyra (Corcyra), Spartan fears might not have been sufficiently provoked to lead into war (that is, Perikles' judgment might have been wrong); for another thing, these quarrels helped the war-spirit on both sides; and weaken the influence of an Archidamos (Archidamus)'.

addresses the immediate causes discussed above and then turns to a key Spartan assembly in 432 BC.[15] Any Spartan allies that had a grievance with Athens were invited to speak (1.67.3). The Megarians asserted that the ban on trade with the Athenian empire was a violation of the peace (1.67.4). Last to speak, the Corinthians reproached Sparta for inaction (1.68-1.71). Corinthian volunteers and paid troops were defending Potidea from the Athenians. King Archidamus II called for restraint (1.80-85), but the majority decided that the treaty had been broken and that war should be declared (1.87).

Thucydides follows this account with the *Pentecontaetia* (1.89-117) – an excursus on the fifty years between the end of the second Persian at the Battle of Platea (479 BC) and the Peloponnesian War.[16] The purpose of this section of the history is to support Thucydides' contention about the true cause of the war.[17] Thucydides notes that Athens had established a mighty fleet to confront Persia, but Spartan allies found this navy disturbing (1.90.1). The Spartans asked the Athenians to refrain from rebuilding their walls, but the Athenians engaged in some deception and fortified both the city and the Piraeus (1.90-93). Athens displaces Sparta as the leader of campaigns against Persia at sea (1.95). The Athenians collect tribute from their allies, providing a financial basis of empire (1.96).[18] Thucydides observes that the Athenians first provided leadership to autonomous states against Persia, but their 'supremacy grew' due to actions against the Persians, the Peloponnesians, and 'allies in revolt' (1.97.1). Naxos attempts to leave the alliance but is forced to return after enduring an Athenian siege (1.98.4). Thucydides records the earthquake and Helot revolt (1.101.2). Sparta calls for assistance, but the Athenians are sent home due to fear that the democrats might seek to effect political change (1.102.3). Thucydides notes that this leads the end of the alliance (1.102.4). Later, Athens resettles rebel Helots at Naupactus, a strategic point on the Gulf of Corinth (1.103.3). Megara abandons Sparta for alliance with

[15] It is probable that the Spartan ephors (magistrates who shared power with the two kings) favoured war and called the assembly to secure a majority; see Kagan. *Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*, 286-287.
[16] Hunter R. Rawlings III, 'Thucydides on the Purpose of the Delian League', *Phoenix* 31 (1977): 1-8; Philip A. Stadter, 'The Form and Content of Thucydides' Pentecontaetia (1.89-117)', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 34, no. 1 (1993): 35-72; Tim Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 225-248; Lisa Kallet, 'The Pentecontaetia' in *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, ed. Ryan Balot, Sarah Forsdyke and Edith Foster (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 63-80.
[17] The *Pentecontaetia* is not a general history of the period. It explores the growth of Athenian power during the period in question. Thucydides includes events that would have caused alarm in Sparta; see Hornblower, *Commentary*, 133.
[18] Lisa Kallet, 'The Pentecontaetia', 67-68.

Athens (1.103.4). This meant that Athens and Corinth were at war.[19] The First Peloponnesian War (460-445 BC) is a modern name for a conflict that largely played out between Athens and the Delian League against and Spartan allies (with a minor role for Sparta herself).[20] Thucydides dismisses this as a precursor to the war that he explores. He draws together his argument as follows:

> All these actions of the Hellenes against each other and the barbarian occurred in the fifty years' interval between the retreat of Xerxes and the beginning of the present war. During this interval the Athenians succeeded in placing their empire on a firmer basis and advanced their own home power to a very great height. The Lacedaemonians (Spartans), though fully aware of it, opposed it only for a little while, but remained inactive during most of the period, being of old slow to go to war except under the pressure of necessity, and in the present instance being hampered by wars at home; until the growth of the Athenian power could be no longer ignored, and their own confederacy became the object of its encroachments. They then felt that they could endure it no longer, but that the time had come for them to throw themselves heart and soul upon the hostile power, and break it, if they could, by commencing the present war. (1.118.2)

A Debate Across Time

Donald Kagan is the pre-eminent historian of Peloponnesian War in modern times. His four-volume treatment of the conflict is a landmark in scholarship on the topic.[21] It affords excellent pedagogical possibilities to which we will return. Kagan honours Thucydides –

[19] De Ste. Croix, *Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, 213.

[20] On the First Peloponnesian War, see de Ste. Croix, *Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, 180-200; A. J. Holladay, 'Sparta's Role in the First Peloponnesian War', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97 (1977): 54-63; David M. Lewis, 'The Origins of the First Peloponnesian War', *Classical Contributions: Studies in Honour of Malcolm Francis MacGregor*, ed. Gordon S. Shrimpton and David J. McCargar (Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1981), 71-78; John B. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 BC* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984); A. J. Holladay, 'Sparta and the First Peloponnesian War', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105 (1985): 161-162; Hornblower, *Commentary*, 161.

[21] Donald Kagan, *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*, *The Archidamian War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974); *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1981)*; The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987). See also the single volume work that draws on this research, Donald Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War* (New York: Viking Press, 2003).

indeed, he wrote another book to his work – but rejects the ancient historian's argument about the causes of the war:

> It was Thucydides who invented the distinction between the underlying, remote causes of the war and the immediate causes. In his history of the Peloponnesian War he considered the immediate causes, which in fact went back almost five years before the actual commencement of hostilities, to be far less important than the more remote causes that arose from the growth of the Athenian Empire almost fifty years before the start of the war. Thucydides' view that the war was the inevitable consequence of the growth of that empire, its insatiable demand for expansion, and the fear it must inspire in the Spartans has won acceptance. Our investigation has led to conclude that this judgment is mistaken. We have argued that Athenian power did not grow between 445 and 435, that the that the imperial appetite of the Athenians was not insatiable and gave good evidence of being satisfied, that the Spartans as a state seem not to have been unduly afraid of the Athenians, at least until the crisis had developed very far, that there was good reason to think that the two great powers and their allies could live side by side in peace indefinitely, and thus that it was not the underlying causes but the immediate causes that produced the war.[22]

This discussion bridges classical antiquity and the modern world. Kagan highlights the contribution of Thucydides to historiography: the pivotal distinction between underlying and immediate causes – and the relevance of this insight to the Peloponnesian War. Kagan observes that the judgment of Thucydides has won acceptance by modern scholars such as Eduard Meyer, Karl Beloch and Gaetano De Sanctis. Rather than facing an impassable gulf, the conclusions of past and present coincide. Having said this, the argument taken by Kagan is the reverse of the interpretation adopted interpretation offered by Thucydides. Whereas Thucydides (and his modern followers) see the long-term cause as central and short-term causes as peripheral, Kagan views the immediate causes as pivotal and the underlying cause as marginal. The relevance of ancient scholarship to the modern discipline could not be clearer. E. H. Carr famously described history as 'an unending

[22] Kagan, *Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*, 345.

dialogue between the present and the past'.[23] The extract between Thucydides and Kagan presents history as an ongoing dialogue between historians about the past.

Herodotus and Causation

Thucydides has bequeathed many legacies to the modern world. Perhaps the most precious of these is the distinction between short- and long-term causes. Nevertheless, Thucydides was not the first historian to use causes to explain the past. Instead, we must turn to Herodotus. Henry Immerwahr discerns three kinds of causes in Herodotean history: *immediate, permanently operative* and *metaphysical*.[24] Immediate causes are the emotions, predispositions and intentions of human beings. Permanently operative causes in the basic nature of things, such as the drive to expand empire. Metaphysical causes lie beyond the mortal realm. In the opening of his work, Herodotus explains that he seeks to explain why the Persians and Greeks went to war. True to a Hellenic world that venerated Homeric epic, Herodotus notes the abduction of women. He writes that Persian scholars assert that the Phoenicians were to blame (1.2). The Phoenicians were great traders who travelled to numerous Mediterranean ports. During one visit Argos, Io, daughter of the king attended the fair. The Phoenicians abducted her, along with several other women. In retribution, a group of Greeks kidnapped a princess from a Phoenician port. Later, Greeks committed similar crime in Colchis. At this point, Herodotus links abduction of women to the subject matter of Homeric epic: 'The accounts go on to say that some forty or fifty years afterwards Paris, the son of Priam, was inspired by these stories to steal a wife for himself out of Greece, being confident that he would not have to pay for the venture any more than the Greeks had done. And that was how he came to carry off Helen' (1.3.1). Paris did not expect Greece to mount a military expedition to rescue her. In this way, the Trojan War marked the beginning of the enmity between east and west (1.4). It is not surprising that Herodotus turns to epic, given its prominence in the cultural life of Greece.

[23] Carr, *What is History?*, 30.

[24] Henry R. Immerwahr, 'Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 87 (1956): 241-280; Jacqueline de Romilly, 'La vengeance comme explication dans I'oeuvre d'Hérodote', *Revue des Études Grecques Année* 84 (1971): 314-337. See also Raphael Sealey, 'Thucydides, Herodotus and the Causes of War', *Classical Quarterly*, n. s. 7 (1957), 1-12; A. E. Wardman, 'Herodotus on the Cause of the Greco-Persian Wars: (Herodotus, I, 5)', *The American Journal of Philology* 82, no. 2 (1961): 133-150; Henry R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland, NJ: American Philological Association, 1966); Virginia J. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982).

In terms of historical explanation, one abduction follows the next until warfare erupts. In short, the narrative consists of a chain of events. These events are held together by causal links. Nevertheless, Herodotus seems unconvinced. At this point in the narrative he turns from such tales:

> ‘So much for what Persians and Phoenicians say; and I have no intention of passing judgement on its truth or falsity. I prefer to rely on my own knowledge, and to point out who it was in actual fact that first injured the Greeks; then I will proceed with my history, telling the story as I go along of small cities of men no less than of great. For most of those which were great once are small today; and those which used to be small were great in my own time. Knowing, therefore, that human prosperity never abides long in the same place, I shall pay attention to both alike’. (1.5.3)

This is an important shift. Herodotus recounts material gleaned from his informants but neither endorses nor refutes it. At this point, he turns to his own knowledge and the recent past. Herodotus observes that Croesus, King of Lydia, endeavoured to expand his domain (a permanently operative cause of Herodotean history) by subjugating cities that had been founded by Greeks on the eastern shores of the Aegean Sea: ‘He was the first foreigner so far as we know to come into direct contact with the Greeks, both in the way of conquest and alliance, forcing tribute from Ionians, Aeolians, and Asiatic Dorians, and forming a pact of friendship with the Lacedaemonians’ (1.6.2). Eventually, Croesus went too far (a Herodotean theme) and attacked Persian territory. Herodotus writes that he was motivated by an oracle that he would defeat a great empire. It transpired that the domain that Croesus destroyed was his own. Cyrus defeated Croesus and incorporated Lydia into the Persian Empire. This meant that Greek cities were now under Persian rule. Later, this would lead to the Ionic Revolt (499-493 BC) in which some of these cities rebelled against Persia.

Unlike Thucydides, Herodotus does not subsume his sources into a single argument about the past.[25] Nor does he distinguish between short- and long-term causes. Nevertheless,

[25] I am indebted to Professor Emeritus Ronald T. Ridley for sharing his research on Herodotus and causation which will appear in *The Birth of History*. He observes that Thucydides is almost always given credit for

there is a degree of dissatisfaction evident in tales of abduction as an explanation of the conflict between east and west. The search for a satisfactory explanation takes Herodotus into the recent past. The understanding of causation is linear: Lydia takes Ionic cities, Persia takes Lydia, and conflict between Greeks and Persians is the result. Herodotus does not present an unambiguous statement that the origins of the Persian Wars may be found in the actions of Croesus. In the final analysis, Herodotus presents the audience with two sets of causes. He links the first with Phoenicians and Persians. The second addresses the experience of the Greeks. Herodotus has much more to say about the past: the work embraces folklore, ethnography and geography. He will only present an account of the Persian Wars in Book 5. Nevertheless, the question that sets the inquiry in motion demands a causal response. Herodotus offers different kinds of explanations to this question at the start of his work. In each case, they are cast in the form of narrative. Causal relationships hold these stories about the past together.

The Legacy of Herodotus and Thucydides

The intellectual legacy of ancient historiography is profound. As a minimum, John Tosh suggests that 'some distinction needs to be made between background causes and direct causes: the former operate over the long term and place the event in question on the agenda of history, so to speak; the latter put the outcome into effect, often in a distinctive shape that no one could have foreseen'.[26] Historical inquiry involves identification of causal relationships. In his discussion of causation in history, British philosopher William Walsh observes that the concept is intrinsic to historical explanation: 'To put the matter at its plainest, it is felt that historians ought to be able to say what brought things about as well as what in fact occurred, and yet there is evidently far more disagreement among historians in diagnosing causes than in delineating the precise course of events'.[27] For E. H. Carr, the selection and arrangement of causes is central to historical interpretation'.[28]

---

distinguishing between the immediate cause (*profasis*) and the underlying cause (the real *aitia)*. Herodotus presents the immediate cause of war with Persia as the Ionian Revolt (and Athenian involvement). This is the start of terrible evil (5.97). Herodotus presents the actual cause of the conflict as Persian expansionism: 1.153, 190 (Cyrus), 3.17 (Cambyses), 3.134, 4.118, 6.94 (Darius), 7.8, 138 (Xerxes).

[26] John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History* 5th ed. (Harlowe, England: Pearson, 2010), 153.

[27] William H. Walsh, 'Historical Causation', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society,* n. s., 63 (1962 - 1963), 217.

[28] Carr, *What is History?,* 103: 'The relation of the historian to his causes has the same dual and reciprocal character as the relation of the historian to his facts. The causes determine his interpretation of the historical

It is important to draw a distinction between causation and explanation, despite their close relationship.[29] Causes are relationships between aspects of the past (such as events, processes and conditions).[30] A relationship may be said to be causal if an aspect of the past results in (or contributes to) a consequent event, process or condition. In contrast, explanations are constructed by historians. Historians use relationships and then use them to describe, explain, argue, and narrate. The use of the term in historical writing has diminished in recent times.[31] Having said this, causation remains indispensable to historical narrative.

For the philosopher Robin Collingwood, understanding the past necessitates repeating the thoughts of historical actors:

> When a scientist asks 'Why did that piece of litmus paper turn pink?' he means 'On what kinds of occasions do pieces of litmus paper turn pink?' When an historian asks 'Why did Brutus stab Caesar?' he means 'What did Brutus think, which made him decide to stab Caesar?" The cause of the event, for him, means the thought in the mind of the person by whose agency the event came about: and this is not something other than the event, it is the inside of the event itself.
>
> The processes of nature can therefore be properly described as sequences of mere events, but those of history cannot. They are not processes of mere events, but processes of actions, which have an inner side, consisting of processes of thought;

process, and his interpretation determines his selection and marshalling of the causes. The hierarchy of causes, the relative significance of one cause or set of causes or of another, is the essence of interpretation'.

[29] Michael Stanford, *A Companion to the Study of History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 193. The distinction that Stanford draws between causation and explanation draws on the philosopher Donald Davidson; see Peter F. Stawson, 'Causation and Explanation' in *Essays on Davidson: Actions and Events*, ed. Bruce Vermazen and Merrill B. Hintikka (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 115-135.

[30] Harry Ritter, 'Causation' in *Dictionary of Concepts in History* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 31-38. See also, Raymond Martin, 'Causes, Conditions, and Causal Importance', *History and Theory* 21, no. 1 (1982): 53-74.

[31] Roy Bin Wong, 'Causation' in *A Concise Companion to History*, ed. Ulinka Rublack (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011), 37: 'The limitations of materialism as an approach to historical studies have diminished the faith and interest of historians in causation more generally. The complexity of historical change further renders difficult efforts at locating causes; the more we learn about the past the more varied and complex our histories become. And finally, historians have in the past quarter-century reaffirmed their engagement with topics not formulated in a way to consider causation'.

> and what the historian is looking for in these processes of thought. All history is the history of thought.[32]

The reader is presented with a comparison of science and history. The scientist seeks to comprehend a physical event. The historian, on the other hand, endeavours to understand the interior of an event. Collingwood holds that the interior is to be found in the thought of historical actors. To grasp the past, the thoughts of historical actors must be re-enacted in the mind of the historian. From this perspective, causes exist as the thoughts of people in the past. For a cause to be identified, it must be repeated in the mind of the historian (and subjected to critical analysis). This the doctrine of re-enactment has been the subject of extensive criticism.[33] There is a distinction between inferring intentions and repeating the thoughts of historical actors. Having said this, Collingwood is right to underscore the importance of intentionality in historical writing. When an historian explains the death of Caesar, for example, that response is based on presuppositions that are taken as given. It is helpful to turn to the work of Patrick Gardiner here. Gardiner holds that the language of causation enables the historian to manage aspects of the past:

> For common sense, the cause of an event is frequently conceived of as being a kind of handle, an instrument for achieving, or helping to achieve, an end that we desire. We say that striking a match causes it to light: but, of course, this is not the *only* condition of the match's catching fire. The match must not be damp or a dummy, the sand-paper must not be worn out, the match must not be struck with a certain minimum degree of force, and so forth.[34]

When historians mention causes, or causal factors, or origins it is understood that they are privileging a certain aspect or aspects of the past over others. Although the events of the

---

[32] Robin G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 214-215. On Collingwood and history in schools, see Marnie Hughes-Warrington, *'How Good an Historian Shall I Be?': R. G. Collingwood, The Historical Imagination and Education* (Exeter: Imprint, 2003).

[33] For example, see William H. Walsh, 'R. G. Collingwood's Philosophy of History', *Philosophy* 22, no. 82 (1947): 154-118, Patrick L. Gardiner, 'The "Objects" of Historical Knowledge' *Philosophy* 27 (1952), 211-220; Margit Hurup Nielsen, 'Re-enactment and Reconstruction in Collingwood's Philosophy of History', *History and Theory* 20, no 1 (1981): 1-31; William H. Dray, *History as Re-Enactment: R. G. Collingwood's Idea of History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

[34] Patrick Gardiner, *The Nature of Historical Explanation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952), 11.

Ides of March required the births of the protagonists, for example, the historian does not need to mention these events. All sorts of other aspects of the past need not be invoked because they do add nothing of significance to the explanation. Benedetto Croce observes that causes serve as the 'cement' that binds historical explanations together.[35] If this is so, then the mortar is as important as the bricks to the outcome. The reader needs to critically examine historical narrative for the presence of causal relationships. This is not an easy task. Michael Scriven notes that causes are often hidden by other terms.[36] When historians use terms such as 'because', for example, causal relationships are invoked. Philosophers distinguish between necessary and sufficient conditions. The distinction holds for causes in history. A cause is sufficient if the consequence invariably results. A necessary cause is required for the consequence to occur. Alun Munslow uses the death of Lincoln as an example. Lincoln opposed slavery. This position drew the ire of some Americans. Lincoln intended to visit the theatre, he and his wife were present at Forde's Theatre, John Wilkes Booth was present. Booth had the intention to kill and the means to act (his pistol).[37] The historian arranges these necessary and sufficient causes to explain the event.

Teaching and Learning: Causation

How do school students understand historical causation? The research of Denis Shemilt is foundational. In his evaluation of the UK Schools History Project, Shemilt notes that the concept of causation often enters discussion about the past in a surreptitious manner; numerous terms used in class suggest causation ('because', 'since', 'hence', for example). Furthermore, any historical narrative consists of a series of events which are linked by causal relationships. Although teachers may treat causation 'as an abstract statement of relation between two events or states of affairs', Shemilt observes that school students do not necessarily share this understanding: 'Many highly intelligent adolescents treat the

[35] Benedetto Croce, *History, Its Theory and Practice*, trans. Douglas Ainslie (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1921), 80.
[36] Michael Scriven, 'Causes, Connections and Conditions in History' in *Philosophical Analysis and History*, ed. W. H. Dray (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 238-264.
[37] Alun Munslow, *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies* 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2006), 39: 'A cause is sufficient, therefore, if the effect always follows that cause (being shot at point blank range is sufficient to kill you). Sufficient cause is usually distinguished from necessary cause. A cause is necessary if its effect would otherwise have been absent (the assassin had not been in the theatre). Most historical explanations thus depend on sorting out what are necessary and what are sufficient causes, and what hierarchy exists among what may turn out to be chains of causes'.

word ‘cause’ as through it refers to the not to the connection between events, but to the properties of one of those events. For them the word ‘cause’ denotes something akin to ‘*strength*’ or ‘*potency*’; an historical cause is seen as something with the power to *make something else happen*’.[38] Graphic representations of the causal links between events can help students to grasp the relational nature of the idea. Having said this, history teachers frequently encounter other misconceptions associated with the topic.

Building on work by Arthur Chapman and Peter Lee, Alison Kitson and Chris Husbands and Susan Steward identify six misunderstandings about causation that hamper learning in history.[39] The first of these is *presentism*: the imposition of the mindset of the present on the past. This leads students to misunderstand motives for the behaviour of historical actors (or renders their actions unintelligible). The next misunderstanding is *voluntarism*: the belief that historical events occurred simply because historical actors wanted them to. This leads students to regard events as the product of individual or collective decision-making without addressing other causes. *Mechanical causality* limits students to a linear conception of causal processes: change is understood as a series of individual causes and consequences. The fourth misunderstanding leads students to attribute equal importance to all the causal relationships involved. Historical inquiry depends on the ability to weigh causes against each other. The fifth misunderstanding is *monocausality*: the inability to recognise more than one cause. The sixth misconception is *determinism/inevitability*: the view that events could not have unfolded in any other way.

The epistemological beliefs held by students are pivotal to understanding causation. Liliana Maggioni, Bruce VanSledright and Patricia Alexander distinguish between *objectivist*, *subjectivist* and *criterialist* beliefs about the nature of knowledge in history.[40]

---

[38] Denis Shemilt, *History 13 – 16 Evaluation Study* (Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall, 1980), 30-32.

[39] Alison Kitson and Chris Husbands with Susan Steward, *Teaching and Learning History 11-18: Understanding the Past* (McGraw Hill: Open University Press, 2011), 73-74. See also Peter J. Lee ‘Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History’ in *How Students Learn: History, Mathematics and Science in the Classroom*, ed. M. Suzanne Donovan, and John D. Bransford (Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 2005), 31-77.

[40] Liliana Maggioni, Bruce VanSledright and Patricia A. Alexander, ‘Walking on the Borders: A Measure of Epistemic Cognition in History’, *Journal of Experimental Education* 77 (2009): 187-214. This research builds on Patricia M. King and Karen S. Kitchener, ‘The Reflective Judgment Model: Twenty Years of Research on Epistemic Cognition’ in *Personal Epistemology: The Psychology of Beliefs about Knowledge and Knowing*, ed. Barbara K. Hofer and Paul R. Pintrich (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002), 37-61; Deanna

The objectivist fails to grasp the role of interpretation in history (e. g. the belief that the historian has direct and unproblematic access to the past). In contrast, the subjectivist gives too much importance to the knower (e. g. the belief that all interpretations are valid). Criterialist thinkers employ disciplinary heuristics and insights to construct an understanding of the past. Such students understand that the past does not speak for itself. They know that a range of explanations are possible in history, but that not all such views are well-founded. Gerhard Stoel, Jannet van Drie and Carla van Boxtel apply these distinctions to the concept of causation.[41] Their research endorses the importance of explicit teaching of causation as a procedural concept. There is a key role for the teacher in explaining the idea of causation so that students can use to concept to strengthen their understanding of the past.

History Teaching and Conversation

The previous chapter examined models of epistemic authority for teacher knowledge of designed by Doug Roberts.[42] Each model consists of three elements: teacher, student and domain. In the preferred 'social construction' model, the teacher observes the domain

Kuhn and Michael Weinstock, 'What is Epistemological Thinking and Why Does it Matter?' in *Personal Epistemology: The Psychology of Beliefs about Knowledge and Knowing*, ed. Barbara K. Hofer and Paul R. Pintrich (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002), 121-144; Peter Lee and Denis Shemilt, 'A Scaffold, not a Cage: Progression and Progression Models in History', *Teaching History, 113* (2003): 13–24. See also, Liliana Maggioni, Bruce VanSledright and Patricia A. Alexander, 'At a Crossroads? The Development of Epistemological Beliefs and Historical Thinking', *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 2 (2004): 169-197.

[41] Gerhard L. Stoel, Jannet P. van Drie and Carla A. van Boxtel, 'The Effects of Explicit Teaching of Strategies, Second-order Concepts, and Epistemological Underpinnings on Students' Ability to Reason Causally in History', *Journal of Educational Psychology* 109, no. 3 (2017): 321-337. See also, Gerhard L. Stoel, Jannet P. van Drie, Carla A. M. van Boxtel, 'Teaching Towards Historical Expertise: Developing a Pedagogy for Fostering Causal Reasoning in History', *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 47 (2015): 49-76. For early work in the area, see Chris Sansom, 'Concepts, Skills and Content: A Developmental Approach to the History Syllabus' in *The History Curriculum for Teachers*, ed. Christopher Portal (London: Falmer Press, 1987): 116-141. In Stage 1, the learner regards the idea as unproblematic: stories about the past consist of events that unfold in a straightforward manner. In Stage 2, students recognize that certain events are related, but causality is viewed as a matter of inevitable succession. In Stage 3, the student believes that causes act as mutually exclusive forces; some causes may be more important than others. In Stage 4 causes interact like a net. Chris Husbands draws on Tim Lomas to offer a fifth stage in which the student recognises a relationship between causes and the judgment of the historian; see Chris Husbands, *What is History Teaching? Language, Ideas and Meaning in Learning about the Past* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996), 36; Tim Lomas, *Teaching and Assessing Historical Understanding* (London: Historical Association, 1990).

[42] Douglas A. Roberts, 'Epistemic Authority for Teacher Knowledge: The Potential Role of Teacher Communities – A Response to Robert Orton', *Curriculum Inquiry* 26, no. 4 (1996): 417-431. Roberts builds on Israel Scheffler, 'Philosophical Models of Teaching', *Harvard Educational Review* 35, no. 2 (1965): 131-143.

(history) and constructs representations of it. The student does the same. The interaction between teacher and student is pivotal to learning. As Roberts argues, a significant aspect of this exchange is exploration of reasoning.[43] In the case of history, a student might read a source on food shortages in Paris in 1789 and conclude that the French Revolution was the result of hunger. It is not incorrect to suggest that crop failures caused shortages and price increases. This represents one causal factor for the emergence of the revolutionary crisis. Having said that, many causal factors were at work. These include Enlightenment thought, the financial crisis due to French involvement in Seven Years War (1756–1763) and the American Revolutionary War (1775-1783), the rise of the bourgeoisie, American independence, social inequalities and under the Ancien Régime, and decisions by Louis XVI. The teacher would engage with the historical reasoning of the student but also point out that further causes were at work (i.e. offer historical knowledge).

Teachers understand that when they explain something to one student, many pairs of ears listen. Conversation is not confined to a tutor and student. As teachers, we usually address the class or small groups of students. The 'social construction' model can be adapted to capture the complexities of this conversation. To do so, we must add a fourth component to the model: *other students*. The aim is to encompass small groups and the whole class. This is not a criticism of Roberts as his research is well-suited to defending the epistemic authority of the teacher. The intention here is to adapt his model to discuss the nature of conversation in the history classroom. For example, the teaching and learning sequence may have started with an analysis of a source dealing with food shortages and the Ancien Régime. Although it is commendable for any student to read such a source and infer that scarcity of food may have resulted in political instability, it would be incorrect to conclude that this was the sole cause of the French Revolution. Production of a complete historical explanation requires the student to address the various causes sketched above. The teacher would make this clear to any student who offered this view during class discussion. This

[43] Roberts, 'Epistemic Authority for Teacher Knowledge', 422: 'A significant part of the communication between student and teacher, then, would have to do with what it means to treat the two constructions as constructions. This would include reasons why the student's representation and/or explanation differs from what has been justified as knowledge (if indeed it does, but it almost certainly will), and therefore it would have to include communication about justification itself. If the communication is done well, the student can develop his or her own "constructs" freely, but he or she would also have to take into account what it means - at an appropriate level of understanding - to justify these constructions if they are to be called *knowledge*'.

response would impact on the learning of the rest of the class. Using further pedagogical instruments (sources), the teacher would create opportunities for students to identify other causes at work in the developing crisis. Students might read such sources in small groups, working collaboratively to build a more thorough explanation of the crisis.

A class that is investigating the causes of the Cold War might use historical interpretations in a similar way. There are three prevailing schools of thought in the historical research: orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist.[44] The orthodox view blames the Soviet Union for the Cold War. Revisionist historians assign responsibility to the United States. Post-revisionist historians take a middle course between these positions. Having introduced the topic, the teacher might assign an extract from a different historian to each base group. Each extract would represent a different school of interpretation. Working in base groups, students would establish an understanding of their allocated text. Students would then be reassigned to teams consisting of a representative of each of the base groups. Each student would then explain the extract that was explored in the base group. At the conclusion of this stage, students would have encountered all three schools of thought. Each table group might then consider which explanation is best supported by events such as the conferences in Yalta and Potsdam, the Soviet occupation of eastern Europe, the Iron Curtain speech, the Berlin Airlift, the Truman Doctrine, and the Marshall Plan.

Exchanges between students can build into whole class discussion. Whether responding to individuals, small groups, or the class, teachers need to provide feedback to students. The Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) taxonomy developed by John Biggs and Kevin Collis can be a useful way to evaluate causal explanations offered by

[44] For the orthodox view of the Cold War, see Thomas A. Bailey, *America Faces Russia*: *Russian-American Relations from Early Times to Our Day* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1950); Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr, 'Origins of the Cold War', *Foreign Affairs* 46, no. 1 (1967): 22-52. For revisionist accounts, see William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (Cleveland, OH: World Publishing, 1959); Walter LaFeber, *America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1992* 10th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006); cf. Douglas J. Macdonald, 'Communist Bloc Expansion in the Early Cold War: Challenging Realism, Refuting Revisionism', *International Security* 20, no. 3 (Winter 1995–1996): 152-188. For a post-revisionist view, see John Lewis Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941–1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972). With the demise of the Soviet Union, archives in communist nations became available for research. Based on the availability of new sources, Gaddis assigned far greater responsibility to Stalin; see *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

students.[45] The authors distinguish between *pre-structural*, *unistructural*, *multistructural*, *relational* and *extended abstract responses*. Pre-structural responses fail to not satisfy the demands of the task. Unistructural responses consist of a single element. Multistructural responses consist of a series of separate elements. Relational responses address the links between these elements. Extended abstract responses include the elements of a relational response but generalise this material into a new context. The taxonomy can be applied to the command of syntactic concepts in history such as significance, causation and change. The aim is to identify the point of learning need.

In the case of the causes of the First World War, a pre-structural answer would not identify any causes. A unistructural response would identify a single cause, such as imperialism. A multistructural explanation could include causes such as imperialism, nationalism, alliances and militarism. A relational response might address each of the aforementioned causal factors, and link them to the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the 'Blank Cheque' (German support for Austria-Hungary against Serbia), Russian mobilisation, the Schlieffen Plan, and German mobilisation. An extended abstract response would address the causes and links in the relational response but might connect these to historiography on the topic. Such an accomplishment requires the teacher to approach history as *the study of the past*. Furthermore, students must have been introduced to the historiography on the causes of the war to demonstrate this learning outcome.[46]

[45] John B. Biggs and Kevin F. Collis, *Evaluating the Quality of Learning: The SOLO Taxonomy (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome)*(New York: Academic Press, 1982).

[46] The debate surrounding the causes of the Great War is one of the key controversies in history. The Treaty of Versailles included the war guilt clause (Article 231) that blamed Germany. For a revisionist stance, see Sydney B. Fay, *The Origins of the World War* (New York: Macmillan, 1930). Fay favours collective blame over sole German responsibility. For German expansionism as the cause of the Great War (anti-revisionist), see Fritz Fischer, *Griff nach der Weltmacht: die Kriegszielpolitik des kaiserlichen Deutschland 1914/1918* (Dusseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1962). English translation: *Germany and the Origins of the First World War* (London, Chatto & Windus 1967); *War of Illusions* (London: Chatto & Windus 1975). For a post-Fischer consensus apportioning the weight of blame on Germany, see Annika Mombauer, *The Origins of the First World War: Controversies and Consensus* (Harlow, England: Longman, 2002). On Russian culpability, see Sean McMeekin, *The Russian Origins of the First World War* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011). On collective responsibility, see Christopher Clark, *The Sleepwalkers – How Europe went to War in 1914* (London: Allen Lane, 2012), 561: 'There is no smoking gun in this story; or, rather, there is one in the hands of every major character. Viewed in this light, the outbreak of war was a tragedy, not a crime.'. I am indebted to Dr Steven Welch for his insightful discussion of this complex topic with my students.

The epistemic beliefs of the history teacher influence educational outcomes.[47] In the case of the 'social construction' model advocated by Roberts, the teacher makes observations and representations of the domain and shares these with students. Such constructions must constitute historical knowledge. Having said that, history is an interpretative discipline. The extant evidence may support more than one valid explanation. It can be a powerful learning experience for teachers point to these, or to highlight that a range of interpretative positions exist. In short, the teacher offers historical knowledge. The same is not true of all observations and representations built by students, but it is the case for some of them. In a constructivist classroom, the teacher must engage in informal summative assessment through dialogue with individual students, small groups and the whole class. Students can also hold conversations in small groups in which they compare explanations that they have constructed.

Research by Jannet van Drie and Piet-Hein van de Ven suggests that there is considerable value in providing students with the opportunity to engage in such conversations before they attempt written tasks.[48] This reflects the social nature of learning. An essay about the causes of the Peloponnesian War will benefit from a discussion of the positions adopted by Thucydides and Kagan, for example. Such discussion offers the chance to highlight substantive or syntactic concepts and to underscore areas of debate within the discipline. Van Drie and van de Ven also observe that disciplinary discourse to carry into

[47] Bruce A. VanSledright and Margarita Limón, 'Learning and Teaching Social Studies: A Review of Cognitive Research in History and Geography' in *Handbook of Educational Psychology*, ed. Patricia A. Alexander and Philip H. Winne (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 2006), 545-570; Kaya Yilmaz, 'Social Studies Teachers' Conceptions of History: Calling on Historiography', *The Journal of Educational Research* 101, no. 3 (2008): 158-176; Chris Husbands, 'What Do History Teachers (Need to) Know? A Framework for Understanding and Developing Practice', in *Debates in History Teaching*, ed. Ian Davies (London: Routledge, 2011), 84-95; Bruce VanSledright and Liliana Maggioni, 'Preparing Teachers to Teach Historical Thinking?: An Interplay Between Professional Development Programs and School-Systems' Cultures' in *Handbook of Research on Professional Development for Quality Teaching and Learning*, ed. Teresa Petty, Amy J. Good and S. Michael Putman (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2016), 252-280. Mallihai M. Tambyah, 'Teaching for 'Historical Understanding: What Knowledge(s) do Teachers Need to Teach History?', *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 42, no. 5 (2017): 35-50.

[48] Jannet van Drie and Piet-Hein van de Ven, 'Moving Ideas: An Exploration of Students' use of Dialogue for Writing in History', *Language and Education* 31, no. 6 (2017): 538: 'classroom interaction prior to writing can be beneficial to stimulate students' disciplinary thinking in several ways. It seems to aid students in the process of generating ideas, and they use these ideas in the subsequent writing task by reproducing or transforming them—meaning that thinking does not stop after the discussion'. See also, Jannet van Drie, Carla van Boxtel, and Martine Braaksma, 'Writing to Engage Students in Historical Reasoning' in *Writing as Learning Activity*, ed. Perry Klein, Pietro Boscolo, Lori Kirkpatrick, and Carmen Gelati (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2014), 94-119.

writing. The writing that students produce on causes (and other aspects of the past) can also fuel conversation. For example, students could share plans of their aforementioned essays in small groups. The task of the other students would be to offer additional supporting points or a counter argument.[49] Considerable research supports the effectiveness of co-operative learning.[50] This offers a strong foundation for including other students as a fourth element of the 'social construction' model when it is applied to discussion in the classroom.

Conclusion

The concept of causation is indispensable to historical explanation. It is too important for teachers to ignore. Thucydides presents a celebrated treatment of the distinction between immediate and underlying causes. The debate between Thucydides and Kagan illustrates the centrality of the concept to historical writing. Herodotus and Thucydides demonstrate that different causal relationships operate in the past. Causes vary in kind, importance and duration. Teachers offer causal explanations in response to *why* questions. Research on historical thinking challenges teachers to provide opportunities for students to engage in causal reasoning. Consequently, the language of the discipline must enter conversation in the classroom. The role of the teacher is central to such discussion. The knowledge base of the teacher shapes the feedback that students receive. Constructivist research literature underscores the social nature of learning. Interaction between the domain (history), the teacher, the individual student and the class (or groups) enables learning to occur. Such conversation must address important aspects of the past, so it is to the concept of historical significance that we now turn.

---

[49] Steven Zemelman, Harvey Daniels, and Arthur Hyde, *Best Practice: New Standards for Teaching and Learning in America's Schools* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1998).

[50] Robert E. Slavin, *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995); Michael S. Meloth and Paul D. Deering, 'The Role of the Teacher in Promoting Cognitive Processing During Collaborative Learning', in *Cognitive Perspectives on Peer Learning*, ed. Angela O'Donnell and Alison King (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1999), 235-255; David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson, 'Learning Together and Alone: Overview and Meta-analysis', *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 22, no. 1 (2002): 95-105; Robyn M. Gillies, *Cooperative Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice* (Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications, 2007); David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson, 'An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning', *Educational Researcher*, 38 (2009): 365-379; Robyn M. Gillies, 'Cooperative learning: Developments in Research', *International Journal of Educational Psychology* 3, no. 2 (2014): 125–140; 'Co-operative Learning: Review of Research and Practice', *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 41, no. 3 (2016): 39-54; 'Dialogic Interactions in the Cooperative Classroom', *International Journal of Educational Research* 76 (2016): 178-189.

4. Historical Significance

What aspects of the past are important?[1]

What history should we teach? The intended curriculum sets directions for teaching and learning, but it often conceals the reasoning that underpins it. The selection of substantive content is subject to a host of rival claims. For many conservative commentators, it is the task of the teacher to tell the national story.[2] This is the prevailing approach in many parts of the world. This mindset that is often adopted by politicians.[3] In contrast, advocates of a disciplinary approach underscore the centrality of inquiry, interpretation and argument. Postmodernist thought embraces multiple narratives. John Tosh observes that historical inquiry proceeds from questions or the archive.[4] Whose questions? Which archive? In the absence of laws governing the selection of substantive content in history, it is still possible to offer some directions. Thucydides writes that the utility of his work lies in congruence between past and present (1.22). From this perspective, an education in history should address the needs of the present.

In an increasingly globalised world, it is insufficient to restrict an education in history to the past of a single nation. This is a clear imperative of the present. Having said that, to fail to address the national history is to disinherit students. Informed citizens of pluralist democracies need to know how their nation came to exist in its current state, but they also need to see beyond its borders. Another claim is made by the discipline itself. History has

[1] This chapter includes material that appeared in the following publications: John A. Whitehouse, 'Beyond *Time*, *Continuity and Change*: Reasoning, Imagination and the Future of History', *Curriculum Perspectives* 31, no. 3 (2011): 84-88; and John A. Whitehouse, 'Blue-Water Cruising on the High Seas of Time: What Does the Review of the Australian Curriculum mean for Senior Ancient History?', *Curriculum Perspectives* 35 no. 1 (2015): 61-63.

[2] In the context of Australia, see Anna Clark, 'What Do They Teach Our Children?' In *The History Wars*, Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark (Melbourne: University of Melbourne Press, 2003), 171-190; Anna Clark, 'Politicians Using History' *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 56, no. 1 (2010): 120-131; 'Teaching the Nation's Story: Comparing Public Debates and Classroom Perspectives on History Education in Australia and Canada', *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 41, no. 6 (2009): 745-762; Robert Guyver, 'Reflections on the History Wars', *Agora* 46, no. 2, (2011): 4-12; 'History Teaching, Pedagogy, Curriculum and Politics: Dialogues and Debates in Regional, National, Transnational, International and Supranational Settings', *International Journal of Historical Learning Teaching and Research*, 11, no.2 (2013): 3-10.

[3] Bridget Martin, 'Debating History in the Australian Curriculum: A Clash of Paradigms?' *Agora* 51, no. 1 (2016): 4-12.

[4] John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, 5th ed. (Harlow, England: Pearson, 2010), 120-1.

a history; the foundations of the discipline are in the classical world. It is important for students to understand the origins of subject. The study of ancient history enables students to investigate changes that occurred over much greater spans of time than modern history allows.[5] The explanatory value of many modern topics is also compelling. For example, how can one understand the modern world without some knowledge of the Industrial Revolution? Decisions about what to teach have ethical consequences. In countries such as Australia, the curriculum needs to address the dispossession of Indigenous peoples. Public memory also makes its claim not to forget the sacrifices made in war. Amidst such a vast range of claims, how might Thucydides assist teachers to approach historical significance?

Thucydides, the Peloponnesian War and Historical Significance

> Then we went to war again on account of Megara, and allowed Attica to be laid waste; but the many privations which we suffered led us to make peace once more, this time through Nicias, the son of Niceratus. As you are all aware, I imagine, this peace enabled us to deposit seven thousand talents of coined silver on the Acropolis and to acquire over three hundred ships: an annual tribute of more than twelve hundred talents was coming in: we controlled the Chersonese, Naxos, and over two-thirds of Euboea: while to mention our other settlements abroad individually would be tedious. But in spite of all these advantages we went to war with Sparta afresh … (*Andoc*. 3.8-9).[6]

Andocides, an Athenian aristocrat, offers the commonplace understanding of the conflict between Athens and Sparta. He notes that the two greatest powers of Hellas fought over Aegina (3.6). This war ended with the Thirty Years' Peace (446 BC). This period was one of prosperity for the Athens. He claims that it enabled the city to amass considerable reserves of wealth, increase its naval power, complete the southern section of its Long Walls and bolster her numbers of cavalry and archers (3.7). Andocides states that the

[5] Fernand Braudel. *A History of Civilizations*, trans. Richard Mayne (New York: Penguin, 1995), 35.
[6] Andocides, 'On the Peace with Sparta', in *Minor Attic Orators, Volume 1: Antiphon. Andocides.*, trans. Kenneth J. Maidment, Loeb Classical Library 308 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941), 505-7. Andocides (c.440-c.390 BC) was accused of defacing statues of Hermes on the night before the departure of the disastrous Sicilian expedition. This desecration seems to have been the work of an oligarchic faction.

Megarian Decree – which barred traders from Megara from Athenian ports – caused the next war (431 BC). He notes that the Peace of Nicias brought this to an end (421 BC) and lists benefits derived from the cessation of hostilities to support his contention that 'peace has never yet caused the fall of the Athenian democracy' (3.10). He refers to more than one war and assumes that his audience views the struggle between Athens and Sparta in this way. The Peloponnesian War (431 to 404 BC) is not presented as a single event.[7]

This is not the view adopted by Thucydides. For him, the Archidamian War (431 to 421 BC), the tense period following the Peace of Nicias and the resumption of war between Athens and Sparta (the Ionian War) constitute three parts of one event: the Peloponnesian War. William H. Walsh uses the term 'colligation' to explain the way in which historians investigate the past: 'the procedure of explaining an event by tracing its intrinsic relations to other events by locating it in its historical context'.[8] Colligatory concepts include terms such as *medieval*, *renaissance*, and *enlightenment*, for example. Thucydides traces links between events; he concludes that his subject is one war of twenty-seven years' duration. He states that he commenced writing soon after it broke out (1.1.1), but there is extensive debate on how it was composed.[9] Having recounted the first decade of the war, he then pauses. This is a pivotal point as Thucydides must link events together:

> After the treaty and the alliance between the Lacedaemonians and Athenians, concluded after the ten years' war, in the ephorate of Pleistolas at Lacedaemon, and the archonship of Alcaeus at Athens, the states which had accepted them were at peace; but the Corinthians and some of the cities in Peloponnese trying to

[7] The speech may represent an aristocratic attempt to undermine democracy in Athens; see Anna Missiou, *The Subversive Oratory of Andokides: Politics, Ideology and Decision-Making in Democratic Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); cf. Jonas Grethlein, *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 136-9.
[8] William H. Walsh, *Philosophy of History: An Introduction* (1960), 59.
[9] George B. Grundy, *Thucydides and the History of His Age*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1948), 401: 'Every one must admit that Thucydides' work, 'in the form in which we now have it,' dates in composition from after the end of the war. But the question in relation to the first half of his history is whether 'the form in which we now have it' is the original form, and whether there was not an earlier form composed long before the war came to a close - in fact in the years succeeding the Peace of Nikias', quoted in Virginia Hunter, 'The Composition of Thucydides' History: A New Answer to the Problem', *Historia* 26 (1977), 269-94. Hunter builds on Grundy to argue that Thucydides added 5.26 to an earlier version of his work. See also Nicholas G. L. Hammond, 'The Composition of Thucydides' History', *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1940): 146-152; Henry D. Westlake, 'The Two Second Prefaces of Thucydides', *Phoenix* 26, no. 1 (1972): 12-17; W. Robert Connor, *Thucydides* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 143.

> disturb the settlement, a fresh agitation was instantly commenced by the allies against Lacedaemon. Further, the Lacedaemonians, as time went on, became suspected by the Athenians through their not performing some of the provisions in the treaty; and though for six years and ten months they abstained from invasion of each other's territory, yet abroad an unstable armistice did not prevent either party doing the other the most effectual injury, until they were finally obliged to break the treaty made after the ten years' war and to have recourse to open hostilities. (5.25)

Thucydides offers an account of the period following the conclusion of the Archidamian War. A treaty has been established between the Spartans and the Athenians. Thucydides uses twin temporal markers – one Spartan and one Greek – to place the apparent cessation of hostilities in time. This reflects the character of the historical inquiry in that Thucydides explores the war from the perspective of both leading belligerents. In the next breath, however, we learn that the Corinthians and other members of the Peloponnesian League are dissatisfied with peace and seek to disrupt it. Despite the fact neither invades the territory of the other, hostilities between Sparta and Athens persist. The great powers of the Hellenic world continue to undermine each other's interests. The result is that open conflict erupts again. This chapter is pivotal because it allows Thucydides to assert the unity of his subject matter. This is a definitive judgment of historical significance that has defined how centuries of scholars have perceived the conflict. Thucydides drives the point home in his subsequent chapter:

> The history of this period has been also written by the same Thucydides, an Athenian, in the chronological order of events by summers and winters, to the time when the Lacedaemonians and their allies put an end to the Athenian empire and took the Long Walls and Piraeus. The war had then lasted for twenty-seven years in all. Only a mistaken judgment can object to including the interval of treaty in the war. Looked at by the light of facts it cannot, it will be found, be rationally considered a state of peace, where neither party either gave or got back all that they had agreed, apart from the violations of it which occurred on both sides in the Mantinean and Epidaurian wars and other instances, and the fact that the allies

> in the direction of Thrace were in as open hostility as ever, while the Boeotians had only a truce renewed every ten days. So that the first ten years' war, the treacherous armistice that followed it, and the subsequent war will, calculating by the seasons, be found to make up the number of years which I have mentioned, with the difference of a few days, and to afford an instance of faith in oracles being for once justified by the event. I certainly all along remember from the beginning to the end of the war its being commonly declared that it would last thrice nine years. I lived through the whole of it, being of an age to comprehend events, and giving my attention to them in order to know the exact truth about them. It was also my fate to be an exile from my country for twenty years after my command at Amphipolis; and being present with both parties, and more especially with the Peloponnesians by reason of my exile, I had leisure to observe affairs somewhat particularly. I will accordingly now relate the differences that arose after the ten years' war, the breach of the treaty, and the hostilities that followed. (5.26)

This chapter, and the preceding one, have come to be known to modern scholars as the Second Preface. It has been argued that Thucydides did not intend to include both chapters in the final version of his work; perhaps illness or death prevented him from bringing this section of his work to its final form.[10] Chapter 25 looks back at the treaty and events that followed in its wake. Thucydides opens Chapter 26 with his name. This evokes the first line of the work. He then turns to his subject matter: he will describe the struggle between the two greatest powers of Greece down to the downfall of Athens. The chapters perform complementary functions. Thucydides argues that he is dealing with one great twenty-seven-year conflict, not separate wars. Connor suggests that the inclusion of this preface is a literary technique designed to highlight that the war is not coming to an end.[11] If this

[10] Westlake, 'The Two Second Prefaces of Thucydides', 16: 'Either chapter 25 or chapter 26 would be acceptable as an appropriate preface to the continuation of the History from the point at which the account of the ten years' war ended, but not both side by side. A writer so methodical as Thucydides can scarcely have intended to allow a preface to x to remain in juxtaposition to a preface to x + y. There can hardly be any doubt that, if he had revised this part of his work, he would have taken steps to produce a single unified preface from the substance of the two chapters. What he seems to have done soon after the end of the war is to have adopted the temporary expedient of adding to his text an extra leaf containing chapter 26.15 This makeshift has survived because he was evidently prevented by death or incapacity from carrying out the revision which he must have intended'.

[11] Connor, *Thucydides*, 143: 'We know that some of Thucydides' contemporaries saw not a single twenty-seven-year war, but a series of shorter conflicts. The "Second Preface" rejects the notion that the Peace of

is so, then substance and structure combine in a judgement of historical significance. For Thucydides, it is a single great conflict that shakes the Hellenic world to its foundations. Its duration exceeded the ten long years of the Trojan War. The magnitude of its impact on the Greek world was worse than the Persian Wars. It is now seen as one war because of how Thucydides traced links between elements of the past. The ascription of historical significance is therefore inextricably linked to matters of perspective.

The Plague

Athens stood at the head of a mighty naval empire. Metaphorically, Athens was an island: a pair of long walls connected city and harbour. Faced with Spartan forces, the population of Athens and the nearby countryside had drawn within the walls. The need for supplies could be met by sea. Athens had turned the Delian League into her own maritime empire. With the protection of the fleet, the Athenians could wait out a siege. In an era before the invention of the trebuchet and other such siege equipment, such tactics were compelling. In times of war, however, it is impossible to foresee how events will unfold. In the second year of fighting, a terrible plague swept through Athens. The scholarship on Thucydides' account of the disaster is immense.[12] This is how his account begins:

> In the first days of summer the Lacedaemonians and their allies, with two-thirds of their forces as before, invaded Attica, under the command of Archidamus, son of Zeuxidamus, King of Lacedaemon, and sat down and laid waste the country.

Nicias introduced a true cessation of hostilities. In Thucydides' treatment of this "peace," far from being the end of the war, marked a new phase in the conflict. Hence Thucydides made use of the literary form, the preface, that most dramatically reflected the substance of his argument. A preface destroys any illusion that a war is about to come to a conclusion, just as the allusion to the oracles which asserted that the war would last thrice nine years (5.26.4) affirms the length and unit of the whole war'.

[12] Charles N. Cochrane, *Thucydides and the Science of History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929); Denys L. Page, 'Thucydides' Description of the Great Plague at Athens', *Classical Quarterly* 3, no. 3/4 (1953): 97-119; Adam M. Parry, 'The Language of Thucydides' Description of the Plague', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 16 (1969): 106-18; A. J. Holladay and J. C. F. Poole, 'Thucydides and the Plague of Athens', *Classical Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (1979): 282-300; Elizabeth M. Alford, 'Thucydides and the Plague at Athens', *Written Communication* 5, no. 2 (1988): 131-53; Thomas E. Morgan, 'Plague or Poetry? Thucydides on the Epidemic at Athens', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124 (1994): 197-209; Paul Dermot, 'The Causes of the Athenian Plague and Thucydides', in *Thucydides between History and Literature*, ed. Antonis Tsakmakis and Melina Tamiolaki (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 73–87; Rosalind T. Thomas, 'Thucydides' Intellectual Milieu and the Plague' in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. Antonios Rengakos and Antonis Tsakmakis (Leiden: Brill, 2006): 87–108; Robin Mitchell-Boyask, *Plague and the Athenian Imagination: Drama, History, and the Cult of Asclepius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Lisa Kallet, 'Thucydides, Apollo, Plague and the War', *American Journal of Philology* 134, no. 3 (2013): 355-382.

> Not many days after their arrival in Attica the plague first began to show itself among the Athenians. It was said that it had broken out in many places previously in the neighbourhood of Lemnos and elsewhere; but a pestilence of such extent and mortality was nowhere remembered. Neither were the physicians at first of any service, ignorant as they were of the proper way to treat it, but they died themselves the most thickly, as they visited the sick most often; nor did any human art succeed any better. Supplications in the temples, divinations, and so forth were found equally futile, till the overwhelming nature of the disaster at last put a stop to them altogether. (2.47.2-4)

The extract opens with the Spartans causing ruin in Attica. A second threat soon faces the people of Athens: plague. The tactic of withdrawing the population of Attica within the walls of the city furnishes protection from the Spartans but renders Athens vulnerable to plague. Thucydides writes that pestilence of this magnitude without precedent. It appears that the population of Athens may have fallen by about one third.[13] Physicians are unable to treat the disease. Athenians seek assistance from the gods but abandon these efforts as the epidemic takes hold of the city. Bodies are abandoned in piles, strewn in sacred places, or thrown on the pyres of strangers:

> An aggravation of the existing calamity was the influx from the country into the city, and this was especially felt by the new arrivals. As there were no houses to receive them, they had to be lodged at the hot season of the year in stifling cabins, where the mortality raged without restraint. The bodies of dying men lay one upon another, and half-dead creatures reeled about the streets and gathered round all the fountains in their longing for water. The sacred places also in which they had quartered themselves were full of corpses of persons that had died there, just as

[13] The foundational treatment of the population of Athens is Arnold W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1933). Thucydides describes the impact of the plague as immense but does not offer a figure for the total losses. In his description of Athenian operations against Chalcidians in the region of Thrace and the on-going siege of Potidea (2.58), Thucydides states that 1,050 of the 4,000 hoplites died (although note all from plague). In Book 3, Thucydides writes that 4,400 hoplites, 300 cavalry and countless others perished due to the plague (3.87.3). In Book 2, he states that Athens began the war with some 13,000 hoplites (2.13.8). See also Mogens H. Hansen, 'Athenian Population Losses 431-403 BC and the Number of Athenian Citizens in 431 BC' in *Three Studies in Athenian Demography* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters, 1988), 14-28.

> they were; for as the disaster passed all bounds, men, not knowing what was to become of them, became utterly careless of everything, whether sacred or profane. All the burial rites before in use were entirely upset, and they buried the bodies as best they could. Many from want of the proper appliances, through so many of their friends having died already, had recourse to the most shameless sepultures: sometimes getting the start of those who had raised a pile, they threw their own dead body upon the stranger's pyre and ignited it; sometimes they tossed the corpse which they were carrying on the top of another that was burning, and so went off. (2.52)

The plague ravaged Athens for a period of two years (430 and 429 BC) and returned in the winter of 427/6 BC for another year. Thucydides observes that 'nothing distressed the Athenians and reduced their power more than this' (3.87.2).[14] He was infected but survived (2.48). Sadly, many of the people of Attica were not as fortunate. The Athenians turned on Pericles, their leader. Accused of embezzlement, he was forced to step down from his role as strategôs to defend himself. Donald Kagan holds that this charge may have been the result of collusion between extremist factions; one group sought a more aggressive approach to the war and the second wanted peace at any cost.[15] The removal of Pericles was in the interests of both groups. He was found guilty and fined, but soon re-elected as strategôs (2.65). Although the Athenians had tried to make peace with Sparta (2.59) such thoughts were abandoned after the fine was imposed on Pericles (2.65). He lived for two more years before he died from the plague. Thucydides clearly admired his leadership:

> For as long as he was at the head of the state during the peace, he pursued a moderate and conservative policy; and in his time its greatness was at its height. When the war broke out, here also he seems to have rightly gauged the power of his country. He outlived its commencement two years and six months, and the correctness of his previsions respecting it became better known by his death. He

[14] The subsequent sentence (3.87.3) refers to man-power, rather than other aspects of military capacity; see Arnold Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 388.
[15] Donald Kagan, *Thucydides: The Reinvention of History* (London: Viking, 2009): 83.

> told them to wait quietly, to pay attention to their marine, to attempt no new conquests, and to expose the city to no hazards during the war, and doing this, promised them a favourable result. What they did was the very contrary, allowing private ambitions and private interests, in matters apparently quite foreign to the war, to lead them into projects unjust both to themselves and to their allies--projects whose success would only conduce to the honour and advantage of private persons, and whose failure entailed certain disaster on the country in the war. The causes of this are not far to seek. Pericles indeed, by his rank, ability, and known integrity, was enabled to exercise an independent control over the multitude--in short, to lead them instead of being led by them; for as he never sought power by improper means, he was never compelled to flatter them, but, on the contrary, enjoyed so high an estimation that he could afford to anger them by contradiction. (2.65.4-8)

For Thucydides, the death of Pericles was a turning point in the history of Athens.[16] Pericles possessed the 'rank, ability and known integrity' to lead the Athenians; rather than merely following prevailing opinion, he was so highly regarded that he could oppose the view of the majority (2.65.8). In contrast, the successors of Pericles allowed personal ambition to prevail over the common good. As a result of the plague, Athens loses its greatest leader, and lesser figures take the stage. These men struggle for power and allow the state to be led by the crowd (2.65.10). Thucydides stresses a causal relationship between this poor leadership and the outcome of the war (2.65.7). The worst mistake is the ruinous Sicilian Expedition (2.65.11): a violation of Periclean policy which warned against the expansion of the empire during the war (2.65.7). Thucydides observes that the

[16] See Donald Kagan, *The Archidamian War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), 117-119. Connor highlights the importance of structural considerations here. Pericles delivers the Funeral Oration over the fallen (2.34-46), the Great Plague sweeps through Athens (2.51-54), and then Thucydides presents Pericles' last speech (2.60-64). The Funeral Oration highlights civic unity and resolve. After the plague, division and self-interest dominate. In this way, the effect of the sequence is ironic. It demonstrates that humans cannot anticipate all ends; see Connor, *Thucydides*, 63-75. Gomme, *Commentary*: 161: 'There can be no doubt that Thucydides was conscious of the deep contrast between the sunlit description of Athens in the Funeral Speech and the realism of Pericles' last speech, which he is soon to give; as he was of the effect produced by the Mytilenean debate being followed by the speeches at the trial of the Plataians, and of the presage in the Melian war of the disaster at Syracuse. This does not prove that the speeches did not take place, an in the order in which he gives them'; cf. Francis Macdonald Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London: Edward Arnold, 1907).

resources available to Athens due to the leadership of Pericles are such that the Athenians can fight on after the disaster in Sicily:

> Yet after losing most of their fleet besides other forces in Sicily, and with faction already dominant in the city, they could still for three years make head against their original adversaries, joined not only by the Sicilians, but also by their own allies nearly all in revolt, and at last by the King's son, Cyrus, who furnished the funds for the Peloponnesian navy. Nor did they finally succumb till they fell the victims of their own intestine disorders. So superfluously abundant were the resources from which the genius of Pericles foresaw an easy triumph in the war over the unaided forces of the Peloponnesians. (2.65.10-13)

What does Thucydides' narrative of the plague reveal about historical significance? This question goes to the function of history. In his opening sentence, Herodotus states that the goal of his work is to 'preserve from decay the remembrance of what men have done' (*praef.*). We need look no further for the starting point of our reflection: history is a form of public memory. It prevents aspects of the past from being forgotten. Thucydides holds that the great plague is worthy of remembrance and so commits it to the historical record. On what grounds does he make this determination? To begin with, no account of the war would be complete without it. The plague is the unintended result of events that proceeded it (bringing the population of the countryside within the walls). Furthermore, subsequent developments are affected by it. For Thucydides, the loss of Pericles is the precondition for dubious leadership to flourish. Historical inquiry must account for processes of change (see Chapter 4). The plague is a profound change in prevailing conditions. The magnitude of its impact is unprecedented. It supports the claim that Thucydides makes in his preface that the Peloponnesian War was the worst upheaval in the history of Greece (1.1.2).

Thucydides argues that the plague is significant for another reason. After describing the callous treatment of corpses, he addresses this consequence of the epidemic:

> Nor was this the only form of lawless extravagance which owed its origin to the plague. Men now coolly ventured on what they had formerly done in a corner, and

> not just as they pleased, seeing the rapid transitions produced by persons in prosperity suddenly dying and those who before had nothing succeeding to their property. So they resolved to spend quickly and enjoy themselves, regarding their lives and riches as alike things of a day. Perseverance in what men called honour was popular with none, it was so uncertain whether they would be spared to attain the object; but it was settled that present enjoyment, and all that contributed to it, was both honourable and useful. Fear of gods or law of man there was none to restrain them. As for the first, they judged it to be just the same whether they worshipped them or not, as they saw all alike perishing; and for the last, no one expected to live to be brought to trial for his offences, but each felt that a far severer sentence had been already passed upon them all and hung ever over their heads, and before this fell it was only reasonable to enjoy life a little. (2.53)

For Thucydides, the plague offers an important insight about humans and society. When the rules that govern human behaviour start to disintegrate, individualism overwhelms the common good. Actions that were previously concealed are now performed in plain sight. As part of this process, traditional values are inverted.[17] Society is not a permanent aspect of existence. It can collapse as a result of choices that humans make. In this way, the significance of the content transcends the events of the narrative. Thucydides pursue this theme in his treatment of the crisis at Corcyra.

The Revolution at Corcyra

In his account of the civil strife at Corcyra (427 BC), Thucydides pursues this concern.[18] Corcyra was an ally of Athens. Corinth, a powerful member of the Peloponnesian League, released Corcyraean prisoners whom they had taken in naval engagements Epidamnus. These men were tasked with winning Corcyra over to the side of Corinth (3.70). Although

[17] This theme is not confined to Thucydides. For example, Euripides' *Medea* underscores the tenuous nature of civilisation. The playwright explores the inversion of binaries throughout the play; see Euripides, *Medea and Other Plays*, trans. Philip Vellacott (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963); 29: 'Streams of the sacred rivers flow uphill; / Tradition, order, all things are reversed' [ll.410-414].

[18] On the *stasis* at Corcyra, see I. A. F. Bruce, 'The Corcyraean Civil War of 427 B.C.', *Phoenix* 25, no. 2 (1971): 108-117; Alexander Fuks, 'Thucydides and the Stasis at Corcyra' *American Journal of Philology* 92, no. 2 (1971): 48-55; Marc Cogan, 'Mytilene, Plataea, and Corcyra: Ideology and Policy in Thucydides', *Phoenix* 35 (1981): 1-21; Connor, *Thucydides*, 95-105; Mary F. Williams, *Ethics in Thucydides: The Ancient Simplicity* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1998); Jonathan J. Price, *Thucydides and Internal War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

the returned prisoners were unable to dissolve the alliance between Corcyra and Athens, they charged Peithias, leader of the commons and a member of the pro-Athenian faction, with enslaving the city to Athens. Peithias stood trial and was acquitted. He retaliated by accusing his five richest enemies of sacrilege. These were found guilty and a hefty penalty was imposed. The former prisoners then killed Peithias and sixty others. Subsequently, more violence broke out (3.71-74). The commoners were assisted by slaves; the oligarchs enlisted the support of mercenaries. The result was defeat for the oligarchs. The Athenian strategôs Nicostratus then intervened with a force of twelve ships and 500 men (3.75). Nicostratus proposed a settlement which included a defensive and offensive alliance between Corcyra and Athens. The Corcyraeans then requested that five Athenian vessels remain in Corcyra to dissuade the oligarchs from any treachery. The Corcyraeans offered to replace the Athenian ships with their own. When Nicostratus agreed, the commoners tried to make oligarchs serve on the ships. When they refused, the commoners used this as proof of their duplicity. This would have cost the oligarchs their lives had Nicostratus not intervened. Eventually, over four hundred members of the oligarchic faction were transferred to a nearby island. Four or five days later, Peloponnesian ships arrived (3.76). The Corcyraean force was ill-disciplined and ineffective (3.76-77). The Athenians used tactics that enabled the Corcyraeans to escape (3.78). The Peloponnesians refrained from attacking the city and instead pillaged the nearby countryside (3.79). When they learned of the approach of a superior Athenian force they withdrew (3.80). The Corcyraeans saw that their foes were departing. Abandoning all restraint, they engage in massacre:

> The Peloponnesians accordingly at once set off in haste by night for home, coasting along shore; and hauling their ships across the Isthmus of Leucas, in order not to be seen doubling it, so departed. The Corcyraeans, made aware of the approach of the Athenian fleet and of the departure of the enemy, brought the Messenians from outside the walls into the town, and ordered the fleet which they had manned to sail round into the Hyllaic harbour; and while it was so doing, slew such of their enemies as they laid hands on, dispatching afterwards, as they landed them, those whom they had persuaded to go on board the ships. Next they went to the sanctuary of Hera and persuaded about fifty men to take their trial, and condemned them all to death. The mass of the suppliants who had refused to do

> so, on seeing what was taking place, slew each other there in the consecrated ground; while some hanged themselves upon the trees, and others destroyed themselves as they were severally able. During seven days that Eurymedon stayed with his sixty ships, the Corcyraeans were engaged in butchering those of their fellow citizens whom they regarded as their enemies: and although the crime imputed was that of attempting to put down the democracy, some were slain also for private hatred, others by their debtors because of the moneys owed to them. Death thus raged in every shape; and, as usually happens at such times, there was no length to which violence did not go; sons were killed by their fathers, and suppliants dragged from the altar or slain upon it; while some were even walled up in the temple of Dionysus and died there. (3.81)

The violence is shocking. The Corcyraeans commoners kill their enemies whom they had instructed to board the ships. Fifty men are condemned to death. Many members of the oligarchic faction take their own lives. The chaos also serves as a pretext for Corcyraeans to settle private feuds. The natural order is disrupted as fathers slay their sons. The sanctity of temples is violated. Thucydides states that the turmoil at Corcyra was only one of the first revolutions to take place as 'the whole Hellenic world was convulsed' (3.82.1). In one city state after the next democratic and oligarchic factions fought against each other. This would have been difficult in peacetime, but factionalism thrives in war due to the involvement of the great powers. To this, Thucydides adds that propensity for barbarism is part of human nature.[19] The end result is chaos:

> The sufferings which revolution entailed upon the cities were many and terrible, such as have occurred and always will occur, as long as the nature of mankind remains the same; though in a severer or milder form, and varying in their symptoms, according to the variety of the particular cases. In peace and prosperity, states and individuals have better sentiments, because they do not find themselves suddenly confronted with imperious necessities; but war takes away the easy

[19] Connor, *Thucydides*, 250: 'Thucydides' history is perhaps unique among historical writings in its uncompromising demonstration of how deeply the sufferings of war are rooted in human nature and its simultaneous insistence that they are mistakes that ought to be avoided. The work provides no resolution to this tension'.

> supply of daily wants, and so proves a rough master, that brings most men's characters to a level with their fortunes. (3.82.2)

War is a violent teacher. It also teaches violence.[20] The upheaval of revolution spreads like plague (3.82.3). Thucydides holds that the symptoms of such turmoil vary but its cause is human nature. Human passions always struggle against law (3.84.2). When war removes the restraints imposed by law and disaster is the result. The very fabric of society unravels, and the result is frightening. Language facilitates social interaction. As society is engulfed in turmoil, language itself is distorted. The conventional meaning of words shifts as values are subverted:

> Words had to change their ordinary meaning and to take that which was now given them. Reckless audacity came to be considered the courage of a loyal ally; prudent hesitation, specious cowardice; moderation was held to be a cloak for unmanliness; ability to see all sides of a question, inaptness to act on any. Frantic violence became the attribute of manliness; cautious plotting, a justifiable means of self-defence. (3.82.4)[21]

Historical inquiry proceeds from judgments of historical significance. The perception of the historian is vital. Thucydides demonstrates that presentation of a series of changes in the in the past as a single event results from a judgment of historical significance (i.e. the recognition of a series of changes as a linked set). It is necessary to defend such a position. The account of the plague offers further insights about historical significance. Thucydides commits the event to the public record due to the magnitude of its impact. Furthermore, the plague is the result of change (bringing the entire population of the area within the city walls). It also results in change: the death of countless Athenians, including Pericles. The loss of the Athenian leader is a precondition for the abandonment of his conservative

[20] Gomme translates the difficult language of Thucydides as ‘teacher of violence’ and ‘violent taskmaster’; see *Commentary*, vol. 2, 373 & 384.

[21] The Loeb translation highlights human agency; see Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume II: Books 3-4*, trans. Charles F. Smith, Loeb Classical Library 109 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), 145: ‘The ordinary acceptation of words in their relation to things was changed as men thought fit. Reckless audacity came to be regarded as courageous loyalty to party, prudent hesitation as specious cowardice, moderation as a cloak for unmanly weakness, and to be clever in everything was to do naught in anything’.

approach to the war. In short, Thucydides account of the war would be incomplete without it. The plague offers insights about human beings and society. Thucydides pursues these in his account of the crisis at Corcyra. The war fuels factionalism and enables constraints on behaviour to be cast aside. The result is violent change that consumes the Greek world. As the medium of social exchange, language itself is disrupted. Society is more tenuous than we would like to believe.

Teaching and Learning: Historical Significance

The selection of substantive content by the teacher speaks to judgments of historical significance. There are many kinds of history. Surely an education in history should reach beyond the narrow confines of national boundaries to engage with a range of them. There is no compelling argument for the study of a single theme, region or period over others.[22] Having said that, one of the advantages of ancient history is that it allows the student to investigate changes that take place over hundreds or thousands of years – historical inquiry that Fernand Braudel describes as 'blue-water cruising on the high seas of time'.[23] Ancient history offers much that is strange to students today. 'The past is a foreign country. They do things differently there'. The words of L. P. Hartley resonate in the ears of the teacher of ancient history because there can be vast differences between the perspectives and practices of people in antiquity and those of the present. It is easy to worship at the shrine of contemporary relevance, but the different and strange also captures the imagination of students. Greece and Rome represent significant parts of ancient history. The Greco-Roman world shaped the history of the West and has impacted on the world. History as a form of critical inquiry was born in the Hellenic world. Beginning with Herodotus, and fostered by Thucydides, history became a key part of the intellectual life of Greece and Rome. Any treatment of historical inquiry should address its foundations.

History prepares students to participate in civic life in their own nation state: this is a view that is at home in Greek and Roman thought. It follows that an education in history should

[22] On the application of this view to the education of undergraduate students, see Geoffrey R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (London: Collins, 1967), 188.
[23] Braudel, *A History of Civilizations*, 35.

include the opportunity for students to study the past of their own country. The subject is frequently – and rightly – defended in terms of its necessity in the formation of critical citizens. In *Politics,* Aristotle observes that the relationship between education and the state was one of mutual necessity. In the democracies of the twenty-first century, voters must hold elected representatives to account. Furthermore, history performs a magisterial function: it is subject to appeals by contenting groups. In fact, the substantive content of the curriculum is often the subject of public debate; the way in which we understand the past, informs the present and offers preferred directions for the future. Thus, history is the most political of subjects. Having said this, effective history teaching emphasises how to think, not what to think. It empowers students to critically evaluate historical narratives that serve narrow ideological ends.

The pedagogical reasoning of the teacher includes judgments of historical significance. How can we offer students opportunities to engage in this kind of thinking? Cicero writes that 'To know nothing of what happened before you were born is to remain forever a child' (*Orator* 34.120). Children do not see beyond the confines of their world. Research shows that students often base judgments of historical significance on a narrow range of criteria.[24] Personal interest, contemporary lessons or symbolic significance dominate this type of reasoning.[25] One student of the Battle of Britain might suggest that the topic is significant because it is fascinating. Another student might believe there are lessons that we can learn from it, such as the danger of appeasement. A third student might build on this position to state that the Battle of Britain is a compelling chapter in the national story that everyone in the United Kingdom should know. None of these answers is necessarily wrong, but each statement rests on a lone criterion. It is part of the task of history teachers

[24] Peter Seixas, 'Historical Understanding among Adolescents in a Multicultural Setting', *Curriculum Inquiry* 23, no. 3 (1993): 301-327; 'Students' Understanding of Historical Significance', *Theory and Research in Social Education* 22, no. 3 (1994): 281-304; Keith Barton and Linda Levstik, '"It Wasn't a Good Part of History": National Identity and Students' Explanations of Historical Significance', *Teachers College Record* 99, no. 3 (1998): 478-513; Peter Seixas, 'Mapping the Terrain of Historical Significance', *Social Education* 61, no. 1 (1997): 22-27; Linda Levstik, 'Articulating the Silences: Teachers' and Adolescents' Conceptions of Historical Significance', in *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, ed. Peter Stearns, Peter Seixas and Sam Wineburg (London: New York University Press, 2000), 284-305; Stéphane Lévesque, 'Teaching Second-Order Concepts in Canadian History: The Importance of 'Historical Significance,', *Canadian Social Studies* 39, no. 2 (2005), https://sites.educ.ualberta.ca/css/Css_39_2/ARLevesque_second-order_concepts.htm.

[25] Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 56-60.

to help students to construct more sophisticated arguments. Historians do not agree on set of standards that they use to measure historical significance. Instead, history education researchers have developed various sets of criteria to provide students with a wider frame of reference.

Geoffrey Partington presents five criteria that students may use to support the ascription of historical significance.[26] This approach has been adopted up by scholars such as Robert Phillips and Stephane Lévesque.[27] The first criterion – *importance* – addresses the way in which historical actors viewed the event (or other aspect of the past). The second criterion – *profundity* – asks students to reflect on the degree of impact on people at the time. The next criterion – *quantity* – considers the number of people who were involved. The fourth criterion – *duration* – addresses the span of time over which the event occurred. The final criterion is *relevance*. This invites us to consider any analogies between past and present. To what extent does the aspect of the past have a bearing on the contemporary world? It is important to keep in mind that history offers no set formula for the application of these criteria.

In the United Kingdom, Christine Counsell offers a similar list: *remarkable, remembered, resonant, resulting in change* and *revealing.*[28] *Remarkable* corresponds to *importance* in the list offered by Partington. *Remembered* encourages students to think about the way in which the aspect of the past has been captured in historical consciousness over time. The third criterion corresponds to relevance in the Partington model. Peck and Seixas advocate the final two elements in this set as useful places to start.[29] *Resulting in change* requires students to consider the consequences of the aspect of the past in question. This may involve matters of *profundity, quantity* and/or *duration* from the Partington model. The last criterion in the – *revealing* – addresses the extent to which the aspect of the past casts light on the period in question. As with Partington's work, the purpose of these criteria is

[26] Geoffrey Partington, *The Idea of an Historical Education* (Windsor, England: NFER, 1980), 112-116; 'What History Should We Teach?' *Oxford Review of Education* 6, no. 2 (1980): 157-176.
[27] Robert Phillips, 'Historical Significance – the Forgotten Key Element?' *Teaching History 106* (2002): 14-19; Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 39-61.
[28] Christine Counsell, 'Looking Through a Josephine-Butler-Shaped Window: Focusing Pupils' Thinking on Historical Significance', *Teaching History* 114 (2004): 30-36.
[29] Carla Peck and Peter Seixas, 'Benchmarks of Historical Thinking: First Steps', *Canadian Journal of Education* 31, no. 4 (2008): 1015-1038.

to expand the frame of reference available to the student. Having said that, it is important for students to understand that historical research occurs within the context of pre-existing historiography. Research may be intended to fill a gap in the historical record or challenge a pre-existing interpretation of the past. In both cases, research must address the existing literature.

Students should consider how a range of criteria might apply simultaneously. Take, for example, the Irish Potato Famine. The event was understood at the time as a terrible crisis. Having said that, the response of vested interests to the attempt by British Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel to repeal Corn Laws to make grain available in Ireland demonstrates that some people were more concerned with their wealth than the lives of others. The event is remembered as a turning point in the history of Ireland. One million people perished from starvation or disease. Even more people emigrated in the wake this catastrophe. The crisis lasted from 1845 to 1852. These factors all represent changes that immediately followed the onset of the event. In the longer term, ineffective famine relief efforts increased Irish nationalism and calls for change. The event reveals the nature of English rule over Ireland. The famine was worst in the west as the tenant farmers of absentee landlords were reliant on the potato. It reveals the cost of empire, laissez faire economics and racism.[30]

Historians draw evidence from sources to construct arguments about the past, including evaluation of historical significance. In Chapter 1, the discussion of the use of sources in the classroom drew on the semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce. Unlike Saussure, Peirce offers a three-part model of the sign: the *representamen* (the form of the sign), the *interpretant* (the sense that is construed) and the *object* (that to which the sign refers). Late in his career, Peirce returned to work on signs and linked it to ideas about scientific inquiry. He viewed inquiry as a process that begins with beliefs that are subject to doubt and concludes with views that are certain.[31] This led him to divide the object of inquiry

[30] Edward J. O'Boyle, 'Classical Economics and the Great Irish Famine: A Study in Limits', *Forum for Social Economics* 35, no. 2 (2006): 21–53.
[31] Albert Atkin, 'Peirce's Theory of Signs', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2013 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta, https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/peirce-semiotics/. See Joseph Ransdell, 'Some Leading Ideas in Peirce's Semiotic', *Semiotica* 19 (1977): 157-178; T. L. Short, 'The Development of Peirce's Theory of Signs' in *The Cambridge Companion to Peirce*, ed. Cheryl Misak (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 214-240.

in two. The *immediate object* is how the topic is understood before the investigation is complete. The *dynamic object* is how the focus of research is understood at the end of the inquiry.[32] A degree of caution is required, as the second term refers to the reality of object. Furthermore, Peirce held that scientific method was the only path to truth.[33] Nevertheless, this is a useful way to approach historical inquiry. The immediate object (initial knowledge) approaches the dynamic object (deeper understanding) through inquiry.

The first chapter explored models of epistemological authority offered by Doug Roberts, building on the work of Israel Scheffler. These models of pedagogical exchange – each consisting of exchangers between teacher, student and domain – allow teachers to demonstrate that learning has occurred. In all three, the source is a pedagogical instrument that points to an aspect of the past or historical inquiry. In the second chapter, it was argued that the addition of another element – other students – captures the complexities of a constructivist learning environment. In the case of historical significance, the teacher might assign a different event to different groups of students. A primary source pertaining to the event could be used to refer to the domain. Each group would be asked to evaluate the significance of their event. This establishes the immediate object. Teachers might then provide each group with one of the sets of criteria for historical significance formulated by researchers in education. The students would discuss and apply these criteria. This moves students toward the dynamic object. Next, each group might read historiographic extracts dealing with the significance of their allocated event. This provides students with a sense of the way in which a historian has evaluated the event. At every stage of this process, the emphasis of discussion is on the collaborative construction of meaning and historical reasoning.

---

[32] Christopher J. Hookway, *Peirce* (London: Routledge, 1985), 139. In 'Prolegomena to an Apology for Pragmaticism' (CP 4.536), Pierce wrote that 'We must distinguish between the Immediate Object, – i.e., the Object as represented in the sign, – and the Real (no, because perhaps the Object is altogether fictive, I must choose a different term; therefore:), say rather the Dynamical Object, which, from the nature of things, the Sign *cannot* express, which it can only *indicate* and leave the interpreter to find out by *collateral experience*' (Letters to William James. L [R] 224); see 'Immediate Object' *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own* Words, New *Edition*, ed. Mats Bergman and Sami Paavola, accessed September 12, 2019. http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-letters-william-james-17.

[33] Charles S. Peirce, 'The Fixation of Belief', *Popular Science Monthly* 12 (1877): 1-15. Reprinted in *Collected Papers of Charles S. Peirce*, vol. 5., ed. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931): 223-247.

Narrative of Historical Inquiry

Traditionally, teachers have been good at making statement about historical significance. Joseph Schwab cautions against offering students a 'rhetoric of conclusions', instead preferring 'a narrative of the course of an inquiry'.[34] He identifies three kinds of narratives of inquiry: *climactic narrative with downward movement of discussion*, *climactic narrative with upward movement of discussion*, and *multilinear narrative*. In all three instances, instruction proceeds from the presentation of a common situation or phenomenon which indicates the 'subject-material' to be explored. For example, students might be asked to consider the impact of technology on their lives. This could be a starting point for exploring the significance of the Industrial Revolution. Instruction would use questions and sources until a satisfactory conclusion is achieved. *Downward discussion* starts with this conclusion and directs students to reflect on how it was reached. This presents historical knowledge as the product of inquiry and furnishes an example. Having said that, Schwab observes that it represents that inquiry as linear and unproblematic. It fails to address other source material or debates in the discipline. It is the teacher, not the students, who has undertaken the inquiry. Consequently, the ensuing conversation is 'recitative'. *Climactic narrative with upward movement of discussion* works in the reverse order. Rather than proceeding from the conclusion, it proceeds from questions and the sources that were used to conduct the historical inquiry. The resultant discussion calls into question the choice of sources and the uses to which they were put. This strategy gives a much stronger sense that historical inquiry proceeds from judgments of significance. *Why these questions? Why these sources?* This approach makes it clear that one source may support many inferences about the past.

Climactic narrative with downward movement of discussion presents historical reasoning *from* a conclusion. On the other hand, *upward movement of discussion* explores historical reasoning *to* a conclusion. The third approach is *multilinear exposition* or *narrative*. This is more complex than the previous two approaches. The teacher provides students with a detailed understanding of paths not taken. For example, a teacher might have adopted a Revisionist position on the Bolshevik overthrow of the provisional government in 1917.

[34] Joseph J. Schwab, 'The Teaching of Science as Enquiry', *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 14 (1958): 374-379.

Now, conversation might turn to Western Liberal and Marxist historiography. Discussion would address strengths and limitations of these views. It would address key questions of historical method such as the availability of sources and the challenges that exploring this material presents. Schwab notes that this third type of narrative provides opportunities for students to engage in secondary investigation as it places them in the best position to engage in historical argument and inquiry. On the topic of historical significance, students might investigate topics that had not been addressed at length in class. In each instance, students would be asked to evaluate the historical significance of their chosen event.

Narrative, Images and Significance

People, groups and events are frequently presented as significant aspects of the past by textbooks. Having said that, stories that people tell about their collective past can also be significant. Jerome Bruner holds that there are two ways in which we construct meaning: the narrative and the paradigmatic.[35] The paradigmatic mode makes use of arguments and proofs. The narrative mode aims for authenticity (see Chapter 5). It follows that stories can be historically significant. Take, for example, the myth of Venice. Constructed in the late Middle Ages, the myth presents Venice as the ideal republic. Rather than having the bedrock of Rome as its foundation, Venice developed on the sea.[36] In his eleventh century chronicle, John the Deacon offers the following narrative:

> There are two Venices. One is that of which the ancient histories speak, extending from the confines of Pannonia up to the river Adda. Its capital is the city of Aquilea, in which the Holy evangelist Mark, illuminated by divine grace, preached the Gospel of our Lord, Jesus Christ. The other is that Venice which is situated in the insular zone in the gulf of the Adriatic, where the water flows

[35] Jerome S. Bruner, *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986); *Acts of Meaning* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990); 'The Narrative Construction of Reality', *Critical Inquiry* 18, no 1 (1991): 1–21; *Making Stories: Law, Literature, Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

[36] Cassiodorus offers the earliest reference to habitation in the lagoon (12.12.24). The earliest archaeological evidence for the habitation of the lagoon dates from the fifth or sixth centuries. This is two centuries earlier than finds near San Marco; see Albert J. Ammerman, Maurizia De Min and Rupert Housley, 'New Evidence on the Origins of Venice', *Antiquity* 64 (1992): 913-16; Albert J. Ammerman, Maurizia De Min and Rupert Housley, 'More on the Origins of Venice', *Antiquity* 69 (1995): 501-10, Patricia Fortini Brown, *Venice and Antiquity: The Venetian Sense of the Past* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 6; Rupert Housley, Albert J. Ammerman, M. C. McLennan, 'That Sinking Feeling: Wetland Investigations of the Origins of Venice', *Journal of Wetland Archaeology* 4, no. 1 (2004): 139-153

> between island and island, in a pleasant position, pleasantly inhabited by a numerous people. This people, from what we know from their name and from the annals, draws its origin from the first Venice … [37]

John the Deacon recounts how mainlanders fled Lombard invaders hundreds of years earlier. Under the Patriarch of Aquilea, the people of this first Venice find a haven in the lagoon. Further settlers follow. From these humble beginnings, the new city of Venice is born:

> Thus they gave to these islands the name of Venice, from whence they came, and those who live in these islands today call themselves Venetici. Eneti, although in Latin it has one more letter, is a name that derives from the Greek and signifies "worthy of praise." After these [immigrants] decided to establish their residence on these islands, they constructed some well fortified castles and cities, and in such a way they recreated a new Venice and altogether an excellent province.

Elizabeth Crouzet-Pavan observes that central elements of the myth are already present in this early account: predestination, exceptionality, stability and justice: [38] This is identity making through story. During the tenth century, the expansion of Venice into the Adriatic was seen to reflect the predestined hegemony of the city over the waves. In this way, the lagoon became more than a place of refuge. It is part of a divinely ordained domain of the sea. The reference to St Mark in the narrative presented by John the Deacon is important. The vision of predestination received its most powerful expression in the legend of Mark the Evangelist. According to the story, St. Mark preached in Aquileia. There he received a vision that his body would be laid to rest in the lagoon. Centuries later, some Venetian ships were driven by unfavourable winds into Alexandria. St. Mark had been martyred in

[37] The account is contained in the *Chronicon Venetum et Gradense* and presented in Brown, *Venice and Antiquity*, 11.

[38] Elizabeth Crouzet-Pavan, 'Toward an Ecological Understanding of the Myth of Venice,' in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City State, 1297-1797* ed. John Martin and Dennis Romano (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 41: 'This account of the original migration, which established once and for all the basic outlines of the city's history – antiquity, liberty, faith in God – also established an image of the waters around Venice that for centuries remained equally inviolable. Because the inhospitable marshes and mud flats of the lagoon basin were never described, the area came to be seen as an auspicious shelter, a tranquil settling wherein a blessed history was free to begin again, or, rather, begin again'.

this city and his relics were in the safekeeping of Greek priests. The merchants persuaded the priests to surrender the body to protect it from desecration should the church become a mosque. The priests agreed and the Venetians departed with the relics hidden beneath a cargo of pork. Travelling under the protection of the saint, the merchants returned home triumphant. The myth served to render political, military and economic power legitimate. In opposition to this ideal, however, stands a counter myth. This was the result of Venetian expansion on the mainland and portrayed Venice as an expansionist, oligarchic state.[39]

The topic offers many opportunities for students to explore historical significance. The waters of the lagoon lead the Venetians to construct a distinct identity.[40] The myth is expressed through a range of sources. To trace the myth is to discover how Venetians constructed their civic identity. Investigation of the counter-myth reveals how the identity of the city became a site of contest. One of the challenges of teaching historical significance is the extent to which students can be afforded the opportunity to select substantive content. Usually, it is the teacher who decides what is to be taught. The teacher can defend selection of the topic on the grounds of its prominence in the disciplinary literature, but where does this leave students? One pedagogical strategy is student research within the broader topic. Instruction would commence with explanation of myth and counter-myth. The teacher would use sources as a focal point of discussion. The way in which the teacher addresses each of these would exemplify aspects of source analysis. With this groundwork laid, students might then be asked to select a work of art and construct an argument about its historical importance. This kind of approach need not be limited to the iconography of the Venetian state. Jacob Burckhardt holds that Florence and Venice were the two engines of the Renaissance. He contrasts Florentine motion with

[39] Nicolai Rubinstein, 'Italian Reactions to Terraferma Expansion in the Fifteenth Century', in *Renaissance Venice*, ed. J. R. Hale (London: Faber and Faber, 1973), 197-217. For an exploration of the iconography of Venice, see David Rosand, *The Myths of Venice: The Figuration of a State* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

[40] Elisabeth Crouzet-Pavan, 'Toward an Ecological Understanding of the Myth of Venice,' in *Venice Reconsidered*, 42: 'Thanks to this barrier, to this supposedly impenetrable frontier, the fate of the lagoon was totally divorced from that of the Continent. Out of this came the fundamental axiom that Venetians by their very nature shunned the mainland. The divorce between the two worlds was supposed to be ontological, and of course it had to be maintained if Venetian history were to preserve its coherence and deeper meaning'.

Venetian stability.[41] Students might undertake research on an aspect of the Renaissance using significance and change as the twin themes. Students would select sources, defend those choices, and build an argument. The pedagogical challenge is to foster historical reasoning, rather just transmitting information. It follows that the teacher needs to take account of the needs of the learner: the background of the student is a powerful influence on judgements of historical significance.[42] There is an ethical imperative here for teachers to honour the representations of students and affirm historical reasoning.

Significance and Images: Historical Experience

Images can be a powerful way to point to aspects of the past. They reflect judgments of historical significance. In 1902, the great Dutch historian Johan Huizinga attended an exhibition of Flemish art. The sublime historical experience engendered by the pictures enabled him to sweep aside centuries of interpretation like layers of dust. Through these works, Huizinga discerned the character of the period. Rather constituting products of the Renaissance, Huizinga saw them as the final flowering of medieval culture. The result was his landmark study of the Low Countries in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: *The Waning of the Middle Ages*. It was significant source material that rendered this work possible. Later, Huizinga wrote of historical experience as a sense of contact with the past, the world behind the source. This is an encounter which language can never fully capture. For Frank Ankersmit, such experience is only possible when the historian perceives himself or herself as connected to the past; yet, there is also a sense in which

[41] Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore (London and New York: Penguin, 1990), 82: 'Florence, the city of incessant movement, which has left us a record of the thoughts and aspirations of each and who, for three centuries, took part in this movement, and Venice, the city of apparent stagnation and of political secrecy. No contrast can be imagined stronger than that which is offered by these two, and neither can be compared to anything else which the world has hitherto produced'.

[42] Terrie L. Epstein, 'Makes No Difference if You're Black or White?' African-American and European American Adolescents' Perspectives on Historical Significance and Historical Sources', paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1994; 'Deconstructing Differences in African-American and European-American Adolescents' Perspectives on U.S. History', *Curriculum Inquiry* 28, no. 4 (1998): 397-423. Keith C. Barton and Linda S. Levstik, 'It Wasn't a Good Part of History: National Identity and Students' Explanations of Historical Significance', *Teachers College Record* 99, no. 3 (1998): 478-513; Keith C. Barton, "You'd be Wanting to Know about the Past": Social Contexts of Children's Historical Understanding in Northern Ireland and the United States', *Comparative Education* 37 (2001): 89-106; Keith C. Barton, 'School History as a Resource for Constructing Identities: Implications of Research from the United States, Northern Ireland, and New Zealand' in *History Education and the Construction of National Identities*, ed. Mario Carretero, Mikel Asensio and Maria Rodríguez-Moneo (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2012), 97-103.

context recedes.[43] Robin Collingwood holds that the historical imagination allows historians to re-enact the thoughts of people in the past.[44] This is doubted by most historians today, but intentions constitute a key concern of historical inquiry.

Exploration of the past certainly necessitates use of imagination. One of the most enticing aspects of the discipline is that the object of study – the past – is not available in its entirety through direct experience. This means that we must exercise imagination constrained by evidence. Huizinga offers a nuanced reflection on the idea of historical imagination in which he evokes the founding father of history: Herodotus.[45] In the first work of history as a form of critical inquiry, Herodotus offers a vivid image of Xerxes, the Great King of Persia, moved to tears at splendour of all that he beholds:

> Xerxes wished to look upon all his host: so as there was a throne of white marble upon a hill near the city, which they of Abydon had prepared beforehand, by the king's bidding, for his especial use, Xerxes took his seat on it, and, gazing thence upon the shore below, beheld at one view all his land forces and all his ships. While thus employed, he felt a desire to behold a sailing match among his ships, which accordingly took place, and was won by the Phœnicians of Sidon, much to the joy of Xerxes, who was delighted alike with the race and with his army.
>
> And now, as he looked and saw the whole Hellespont covered with the vessels of his fleet, and all the shore and every plain about Abydos as full as possible of men, Xerxes congratulated himself on his good fortune; but after a little while he wept. (7.44-45)[46]

Herodotus places the reader on the throne of white marble. We picture the thong of fighting men. We imagine the sails of the ships as they cross the water. Xerxes seems to

[43] Frank R. Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005).
[44] Robin G. Collingwood, *An Autobiography* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1944), 111: 'the historian must be able to think over again for himself the thought he is trying to interpret. If for any reason he is such a kind of man that cannot do this, he had better leave the problem alone. The important point here is that the historian of a certain thought must think for himself that very same thought, not another like it'.
[45] Johan Huizinga, 'The Aesthetic Element in Historical Thought' in *Dutch Civilisation in the 17th Century and Other Essays* (London: Collins, 1968), 219–243.
[46] As cited in Huizinga, 'The Aesthetic Element in Historical Thought', 241.

shed his tears again. This is the power of historical narrative. Huizinga's reflection on the passage is illuminating:

> We are there: we see the sun on the white sails, the milling crowds, the blaze of arms and the crimson costumes. We can hear the murmur of the voices, the splashing of the sea, and feel the salt sting of the wind on our faces. And we see *through the eyes of the king* and feel his pride and his passion. If we follow our imagination, we shall find that the details that have sprung unbidden to our minds can either be verified or else do not affect our logical understanding of the whole. Only when we deliberately encourage our imagination to transcend the bounds of historical imagination and to soar into the realms of shear fantasy, do we risk falsifying the true past.[47]

The historian paints the scene with words. Similarly, history teachers offer pictures of the past. These representations reflect judgments about what is important in history. As traces of the past, primary sources are subject to the ascription of historical significance. Some sources are more important than others. The American Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen changed the world. Private letters and diaries can also be significant because of what they reveal about the past. For teachers, power rests in the authentic historical resources at hand – not just textbooks. We must consider the images that our students encounter. By firing the historical imagination, these pictures are essential to the experience of learning in history.

Conclusion

Historical understanding includes the ability to determine what is important in the past. There are many criteria that might be used to support such judgments. Thucydides argues that the value of his work resides in its practical value. In Book 1, Thucydides hopes that it will be 'judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the understanding of the future, which in the course of human things must

[47] Huizinga, 'The Aesthetic Element in Historical Thought', 241. For an alternative translation of 7.45, see Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt, revised John Marincola (London: Penguin, 2003), 433: 'And when he saw the whole Hellespont hidden by ships, and all the beaches and plains of Abydos filled with men he called himself happy – and the moment after burst into tears'.

resemble, if it does not reflect it' (1.22.4). Thucydides offers similar sentiments at the conclusion of his account of the crisis at Corcyra. At this point in the text, he writes that 'The sufferings which revolution entailed upon the cities were many are terrible, such as have occurred and will always occur as long as the nature of mankind remains the same; though in a severer or milder form, and varying in their symptoms, according to the variety of the particular cases' (3.82.2). Virginia Hunter writes that Thucydides embraces the concept of *prognosis*: patterns of behaviour in the past may inform our understanding of the future.[48] The most striking application of Thucydidean history in the modern world is the idea of the Thucydides trap. Political scientist Graham Allison uses this term to express the idea that when an established power fears a rising power the result is war.[49] Allison warns the United States to avoid this result in its dealings with China.[50]

The past does not repeat, but it does resonate. Hopefully, the questions, sources and topics that teachers select will resonate with their students. Traditionally, ascription of historical significance has been the province of historians, teachers and textbooks. The pedagogical challenge is to offer learning experiences to students that enable them to ascribe historical significance. Researchers have developed sets of criteria that students can use to expand their frame of reference for determining what is important in the past. To these, we add that an aspect of the past may be important because it is the result of change. Furthermore, it might be indispensable to a historical explanation. To draw on the language of Peirce, the use of sources and questions enables discussion of significance to draw the immediate object (present knowledge) to the dynamic object (knowledge at the end of a process of inquiry). Discussion of historical significance makes use of the idea of change. It is to this concept that the present study now turns.

[48] Virginia J. Hunter, *Thucydides The Artful Reporter* (Hakkert: Toronto, 1973), 121-122.
[49] See Graham Allison, *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap?* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2017).
[50] Thucydides confines his analysis to Sparta and Athens, but the reflections at 1.22.4 and 3.82.2 indicate that he wanted his work to be taken up and used. The patterns that historians identify in the past alert their readers to possibilities for the future. Having said that, no event is ever the same as another.

5. Continuity and Change

How might classical historiography help us to teach the concept of change?

> Now the most obvious thing about time is that it strikes us as some kind of 'passing along' and changing; but if we follow this clue, we find that, when any particular thing changes or moves, the movement or change is in the moving or changing thing itself or occurs only where that thing is; whereas 'the passage of time' is current everywhere alike and is in relation with everything. (Arist. *Phys.* IV.10, 218b10-14)[1]

Aristotelian philosophy distinguishes between time and change. For Aristotle, time is ubiquitous and constant. In contrast, change is subject to variation. Modern science has replaced uniformity with relativity, but rates of change remain central to a range of fields of inquiry. In British philosophy, 'Cambridge change' refers to the difference in an entity (or relationships between entities) at different points in time. This definition is insufficient as it fails to address transformation between states.[2] History explores processes of change in society. Social, political and economic developments are central to historical inquiry. A key aspect of historical investigation is the idea of the event. At its most basic level, an event is a change.[3] Realism (the mainstream view) holds that events exist independently of the historian.[4] In contrast, constructionism argues that this is not the case.[5] The present research takes the position that change occurs in the past and is explained by the historian. The challenge is to construct the most convincing explanation.

---

[1] Aristotle, *Physics, Volume I: Books 1-4,* trans. Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford, Loeb Classical Library 228 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957), 377-379.

[2] Peter T. Geach, *God and the Soul* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), 69-71; Carol E. Cleland, 'The Difference between Real Change and *Mere* Cambridge Change', *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition* 60, no. 3 (1990): 257-280.

[3] Rolf Gruner, 'The Notion of an Historical Event, I' *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume 43*: 141-52; cf. William H. Walsh 'The Notion of an Historical Event, II' *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 43 (1969): 153-64. See also the helpful discussion of events, realism and constructionism in Harry Ritter, *Dictionary of Historical Concepts* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986), 138-142.

[4] Maurice Mendelbaum, *The Problem of Historical Knowledge: An Answer to Relativism* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); David H. Fischer, *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971); Adrian Kuzminski, 'Defending Historical Realism', *History and Theory* 18, no. 3 (1979): 316-349; C. Behan McCullagh, 'Historical Realism', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 40, no. 3 (1980): 420-425.

[5] Leon J. Goldstein, *Historical Knowing* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1976).

Change in History: The Sicilian Expedition

Historians must account for change. The key mode of historical explanation is narrative. Narrative explains change by addressing events. These events are held together by causal relationships. The constituent events and relationships of narrative result from judgments of historical significance. These dynamics are also at work when teachers turn to narrative to explain the past. The three epistemological models presented by Doug Roberts require the teacher to observe the domain, and to build representations and/or explanations of it. The prominence of narrative in history means that this is often an element of the domain that the teacher addresses. Consequently, it is useful for us to explore a historical narrative that foregrounds change. Thucydides provides an enduring narrative in his account of the ill-fated Sicilian Expedition (415-413 BC).

Thucydides explores the Sicilian Expedition in Books 6 and 7. In the preface, he asserts that the Peloponnesian War was the greatest disturbance (*kinesis*) to befall Hellas (1.1.2).[6] It becomes clear over the course of the introduction that 'greatness' refers to the magnitude of destructive change.[7] Building on this foundation, he later argues that the significance of the Athenian expedition to Sicily cannot be overstated: 'This was the greatest Hellenic achievement of any in this war, or, in my opinion, in Hellenic history; at once most glorious to the victors, and most calamitous to the conquered' (7.87.5). The expedition is a tragedy for the Athenians. For their enemies, it is a great victory. For Thucydides, the expedition marks the start of the second phase of a conflict that that he explains as a single event: the Peloponnesian War.[8] To understand how he approaches the Sicilian Expedition

[6] Arnold W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945), 91. The term may refer to a convulsion in a creature, see Simon Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 6; John A. Whitehouse, 'Historians of Disillusionment', *Iris* 20 (2007): 13-14.

[7] Jonathan J. Price, 'A Puzzle in Thucydides 1.18', *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997): 665-76.

[8] On the Sicilian Expedition, see Donald Kagan, *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981); Christopher J. Mackie, 'Homer and Thucydides: Corcyra and Sicily', *Classical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (1996): 103-113; June W. Allison, 'Homeric Allusion at the Close of Thucydides' Sicilian Narrative', *American Journal of Philology* 118, no. 4 (1997): 499-516; Lisa Kallet, *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides: The Sicilian Expedition and its Aftermath* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Michael Zahrnt, 'Sicily and Southern Italy in Thucydides' in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. Antonios Rengakos and Antonis Tsakmakis (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 629-55; Emily Greenwood, 'Thucydides on the Sicilian Expedition' in *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, ed. Ryan K. Balot, Sara Forsdyke and Edith Foster and (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 161-177.

– and the role of change in his account of the past – it is necessary to turn to his account of the first part of the conflict between Athens and the Peloponnesians.

Soon after the outbreak of war, Attica (the region surrounding Athens) was twice laid waste by her foes. Taking refuge behind the city walls, rich and poor Athenians witnessed the destruction of their property by the invading army. Emissaries were sent to Sparta but failed to secure peace (2.59.2). When the prospect of peace vanished, Athenians directed their anger at Pericles, the leading figure of the city. Consequently, he called an assembly to address ill-feeling and promote resolve. Nevertheless, public hostility persisted until a fine was imposed on him (2.65.3). Having said that, the Athenians re-elected Pericles as *strategos* (2.65.4). At this point in the text, Thucydides reflects on the nature and quality of his leadership:

> For as long as he was at the head of the state during the peace, he pursued a moderate and conservative policy; and in his time its greatness was at its height. When the war broke out, here also he seems to have rightly gauged the power of his country. He outlived its commencement two years and six months, and the correctness of his previsions respecting it became better known by his death. He told them to wait quietly, to pay attention to their marine, to attempt no new conquests, and to expose the city to no hazards during the war, and doing this, promised them a favourable result. What they did was the very contrary, allowing private ambitions and private interests, in matters apparently quite foreign to the war, to lead them into projects unjust both to themselves and to their allies. The success of these projects would only conduce to the honour and advantage of private persons, and the failure of which entailed certain disaster for the country in the war. (2.65.5-7)

Thucydides clearly admires Pericles.[9] He depicts him as a statesman who is blessed with foresight and resolve. Pericles leads Athens to war but adopts a moderate policy for the

[9] Thucydides offers the following evaluation of Pericles: 'Pericles indeed, by his rank, ability, and known integrity, was enabled to exercise an independent control over the multitude--in short, to lead them instead of being led by them; for as he never sought power by improper means, he was never compelled to flatter them, but, on the contrary, enjoyed so high an estimation that he could afford to anger them by

conduct of hostilities. The Athenians must not engage the Spartans in Attica. The Long Walls will provide defence (a tactic that does not anticipate the outbreak of plague). The Athenians must not try to expand the empire during the war. The fleet must be preserved as it is the foundation of Athenian power (Thucydides establishes the indispensability of sea power to empire at the start of his work). The historian notes that the wisdom of this approach to the conflict becomes evident after the death of Pericles. This foreshadows the Sicilian Expedition, subsequent reversals, and, ultimately, the loss of the war. Pericles had the measure of the people and led well (2.65.8). He loses his life to a plague that he did not anticipate. After this death, the quality of Athenian leadership declines:

> With his successors it was different. More on a level with one another, and each grasping at supremacy, they ended by committing even the conduct of state affairs to the whims of the multitude. This, as might have been expected in a great and sovereign state, produced a host of blunders, and amongst them the Sicilian expedition; though this failed not so much through a miscalculation of the power of those against whom it was sent, as through a fault in the senders in not taking the best measures afterwards to assist those who had gone out, but choosing rather to occupy themselves with private cabals for the leadership of the commons, by which they not only paralysed operations in the field, but also first introduced civil discord at home. (2.65.11)

Historical inquiry requires exploration of processes of change. The death of Pericles means that Athens can no longer benefit from his leadership. Lesser figures can now take the political stage and do so. The demagogues of the post-Periclean democracy lead Athens to disaster.[10] The explanatory process is clear: the historian uses causal

---

contradiction. Whenever he saw them unseasonably and insolently elated, he would with a word reduce them to alarm; on the other hand, if they fell victims to a panic, he could at once restore them to confidence. In short, what was nominally a democracy became in his hands government by the first citizen' (2.65.8-9). For modern scholarship, see Henry D. Westlake, *Individuals in Thucydides* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 23-42; Philip Stadter, 'Characterization of Individuals in Thucydides' *History*' in Balot et al., *Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, 283-99.

[10] The shortcomings of post-Periclean democracy were exemplified in the treatment of Mytilene (427 B.C.). Following the unsuccessful Mytilenean Revolt, the Athenians voted to execute all the male citizens and to enslave the women and children. A trireme set sail to convey the brutal order. Subsequently, the decision was retracted, and a second trireme had to race the first. Only the ringleaders were punished. Thucydides uses the episode to explore the themes of democracy and empire; see Felix M. Wassermann, 'Post-Periclean

relationships between aspects of the past to account for change. Cambridge change does not address such connections. Difference is important, but so too is process. Furthermore, it is necessary for the historian to evaluate the significance of change. Thucydides singles out the Sicilian Expedition as a tragic error. He argues that it failed because Athens did not give adequate support to the force that they sent to Sicily; factionalism at home caused ruin in the field. We will see that events in Sicily do not necessarily support his claim. Nevertheless, the endorsement of Periclean policy by Thucydides frames his depiction of the Sicilian Expedition. The perspective of the historian matters, but his aim is to convince the reader. Before turning to the account of the expedition, we need to explore another section of the text: the Melian dialogue.

The key event that precedes the planning of the Sicilian Expedition is the fall of Melos. In the summer of 416 BC, Athens launched a campaign against the island (5.84). A colony of Sparta, the Melians were not part of the Athenian Empire. Thucydides tells us that the Melians were neutral and took no part in hostilities until faced with Athenian aggression (5.84.2). In a famous section of the history – the Melian Dialogue – Thucydides presents an exchange between the two parties.[11] The Athenians claim that 'the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must' (5.89).[12] This was not a new idea, but Thucydides

Democracy in Action: The Mytilenean Debate (Thuc. III 37-48)', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 87 (1956), pp. 27-41; Donald Kagan, 'The Speeches in Thucydides and the Mytilene Debate', *Yale Classical Studies* 24 (1975): 71–94. See also Virginia Hunter, 'Thucydides and the Sociology of the Crowd', *Classical Journal* 84 (1988): 17-30; cf. John Zumbrunnen, 'Thucydides and Crowds' in Balot et al., *Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, 475-490. On the demise of Athens, see Donald Kagan, *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).

[11] On the Melian Dialogue, see Felix M. Wasserman, 'The Melian Dialogue', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947): 137-144; H. Ll. Hudson-Williams, 'Conventional Forms of Debate and the Melian Dialogue', *American Journal of Philology* 71 (1950): 156-69; Antony Andrewes, 'The Melian Dialogue and Pericles' Last Speech', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* n.s. 6 (1960): 1-10; Jacqueline de Romilly, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism*, trans. Philip Thody (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), 273-310; Wolf Liebeschuetz 'The Structure and Function of the Melian Dialogue', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 88 (1968): 73-77, Geoffrey E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London: Duckworth, 1972) 12-23; Colin W. Macleod, 'Form and Meaning in the Melian Dialogue', *Historia* 23 (1974): 385-400; Albert B. Bosworth, 'The Humanitarian Aspect of the Melian Dialogue', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 113 (1993): 30-44; Clifford Orwin, *The Humanity of Thucydides* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994): 97-141; Michael G. Seaman, 'The Athenian Expedition to Melos in 416 B.C.', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* Bd. 46 (1997), 385-418.

[12] The Greek is more difficult than this translation implies; see Mary Beard, *Confronting the Classics: Traditions, Adventures and Innovations* (London: Profile Books, 2013), 33-4. The Loeb translation reads as follows: 'the powerful exact what they can, while the weak yield what they must'; see Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume III: Books 5-6*, trans. Charles F. Smith, Loeb Classical Library 110 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921), 159.

gives the notion special prominence.[13] The Melians protest that the exclusive Athenian focus on interests, rather than matters of fairness (or other arguments), poses a threat to the 'common protection' of justice. The Melians argue that it is not in the interests of the Athenians to invalidate this as their fall 'would be a signal for the heaviest vengeance and an example for the world to meditate upon' (5.90). Thucydides thus foreshadows the outcome of the war and the enduring significance of his own work. The Athenians will have none of the Melian argument. They are motivated by realism and empire:

> Of the gods we believe, and of men we know, that by a necessary law of their nature they rule wherever they can. And it is not as if we were the first to make this law, or to act upon it when made: we found it existing before us, and shall leave it to exist for ever after us; all we do is to make use of it, knowing that you and everybody else, having the same power as we have, would do the same as we do. (5.105)

The Melians do not give up their freedom, so the Athenians lay siege (5.114.1). The result is the fall of Melos. Thucydides states that the Athenians 'put to death all the grown men whom they took and sold the women and children for slaves' (5.116.4). It is with this event that Thucydides closes Book 5. Francis Cornford observes that the placement of the Melian Dialogue highlights the ironic nature of events.[14] This should not be taken to mean that Thucydides agrees with the Melians, or that the historian thinks that 'Might is Right'; the dialogue is a reflection on empire as an immutable aspect of existence, irrespective of claims of justice.[15] For Thucydides, the Fall of Melos is an instance of the unchanging law of existence that the strong prevail over the weak. The Athenians will overcome the Melians, but their fortunes will change with the destruction of their forces in Sicily.[16]

Thucydides opens his account of the Sicilian Expedition by asserting that the Athenians harboured ambitions to conquer Sicily (6.1.1). Echoing his treatment of the causes of the

[13] W. Robert Connor, *Thucydides* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 151.
[14] Francis Macdonald Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London: Edward Arnold, 1907), 182-85.
[15] Ste Croix, *Origins*, 14-15; Antony Andrewes, 'The Melian Dialogue and Pericles' Last Speech', 6.
[16] The dialogue may be read as an indictment of post-Periclean Athens in the sense that the Athenians fail to heed their own advice in the Sicilian Expedition; see Kagan, *Peace of Nicias*, 152.

war, Thucydides holds that Athenian concerns for kin and allies were pretexts; the real cause of the expedition was that the Athenians hoped to add Sicily to their empire (6.6.1). It seems unlikely that this was the plan from the start. Envoys from Segesta approached Athens to seek military aid in their dispute with Selinus. The Selinuntines had secured the support of Syracuse. This had the potential to harm Athenian interests in Sicily. As Segesta offered to finance the expedition, the Athenians decided to send envoys to investigate (6.7.3). On their return with a considerable amount of silver (6.8.1), the Athenians voted to despatch sixty ships to Sicily (6.8.1). The force would be commanded by Alcibiades, Nicias and Lamachus (6.8.2). Sixty ships were insufficient to take Sicily, so it is difficult to believe that this was the objective from the outset. [17] Thucydides does not provide us with an account of this assembly. Donald Kagan observes that Alcibiades would have spoken in favour of the undertaking. Nicias would have opposed it but failed to persuade enough Athenians. In a disastrous turn of events, Nicias was appointed as one of the leaders 'against his will' (6.8.4). Lamachus would be a moderating influence – a supporter of the expedition who would respect Nicias.[18]

Five days later, a second assembly was convened to plan for the expedition (6.8.1). It is at this point that Thucydides offers speeches by Nicias and Alcibiades. The historian introduces Nicias by noting that he 'thought that the state was not well advised, but upon a slight and specious pretext was aspiring to the conquest of the whole of Sicily' (6.8.4). This repeats the judgment with which the historian opens the book, but Thucydides now links this view to Nicias. Nicias opens by repeating his opposition to the proposal (6.9). He points out that the peace treaty with Sparta will not protect the city should they decide to attack, and that Athens remains at war with some states (6.10). These points are in line with Periclean policy. He cautions the Athenians against 'grasping at another empire before we have secured the one we have already' (6.10.5). In addition to this, he argues that an expedition to Sicily is not in Athenian interests and that Sparta remains the true threat (6.11). Indeed, Athens has already endured both war and plague (6.12.1). He casts aspersions on Alcibiades and argues that Athenian policy should not be driven by such a

[17] Donald Kagan, *Thucydides: The Reinvention of History* (New York: Viking, 2009), 166-171.
[18] Kagan notes that epigraphic evidence has been recovered from this first assembly that refers to sixty ships and the matter of leadership; see Russell Meiggs and Davis Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), 78.

self-serving and inexperienced youth (6.12.2). Older, wiser men should check 'the mad dream of conquest' (6.13.1). Segesta should end hostilities without Athenian involvement, particularly as Athens was not consulted at the start of the conflict (6.13.2). The speech ends with a call for another vote on the proposed expedition. This was illegal because the item was not on the agenda.[19] Thucydides offers the following comments:

> Most of the Athenians that came forward spoke in favour of the expedition, and of not annulling what had been voted, although some spoke on the other side. By far the warmest advocate of the expedition was, however, Alcibiades, son of Clinias, who wished to thwart Nicias both as his political opponent and also because of the attack he had made upon him in his speech, and who was, besides, exceedingly ambitious of a command by which he hoped to reduce Sicily and Carthage, and personally to gain in wealth and reputation by means of his successes. For the position he held among the citizens led him to indulge his tastes beyond what his real means would bear, both in keeping horses and in the rest of his expenditure; and this later on had not a little to do with the ruin of the Athenian state. Alarmed at the greatness of his licence in his own life and habits, and of the ambition which he showed in all things soever that he undertook, the mass of the people set him down as a pretender to the tyranny, and became his enemies; and although publicly his conduct of the war was as good as could be desired, individually, his habits gave offence to every one, and caused them to commit affairs to other hands, and thus before long to ruin the city. (6.15.2-4)

Thucydides writes that the leading advocate of the expedition was Alcibiades (6.15.2). A member of the Alcmaeonidae family, Alcibiades became a ward of Pericles following the death of his father. [20] His ancestry was to the benefit of his political career (5.43.2).[21] As a youth, he studied with Socrates (Plat. *Alc*. 1 & 2). He sent seven chariot teams to the Olympic Games – an expensive undertaking – and won glory (6.16.2). He also

[19] Edward M. Harris, 'Nicias' Illegal Proposal in the Debate about the Sicilian Expedition (Thuc. 6.14)', *Classical Philology* 109, no. 1 (2014): 66-72.
[20] For biographical studies, see Jean Hatzfeld, *Alcibiade: Étude sur l'histoire d'Athènes à la fin du V^e siècle*. 2nd ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951); Walter M. Ellis, *Alcibiades* (London: Routledge, 1989); Peter J. Rhodes, *Alcibiades* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2001).
[21] Kagan, *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition*, 63.

distinguished himself on the battlefield and was elected *strategos*. Plutarch writes that he engaged in considerable misbehaviour, but many Athenians ascribed this to the follies of youth (Plut. *Alc*. 16). When Nicias and Laches negotiated peace (420 BC), Alcibiades was incensed that the Spartans ignored him (5.43.2). He then fostered an Athenian alliance with Argos, Mantinea and Elis (5.45). This undermined Sparta on the Peloponnese and the peace that Nicias had achieved (5.46). Now, Alcibiades opposed Nicias again. Thucydides presents the opening of Alcibiades' speech as follows:

> Athenians, I have a better right to command than others, I must begin with this as Nicias has attacked me--and at the same time I believe myself to be worthy of it. The things for which I am abused bring fame to my ancestors and to myself, and to the country profit besides. The Hellenes, after expecting to see our city ruined by the war, concluded it to be even greater than it really is, by reason of the magnificence with which I represented it at the Olympic games, when I sent into the lists seven chariots, a number never before entered by any private person, and won the first prize, and was second and fourth, and took care to have everything else in a style worthy of my victory. Custom regards such displays as honourable, and they cannot be made without leaving behind them an impression of power. (6.16.1-2)

For Nicias, the extravagance of Alcibiades is a cause for shame. For Alcibiades, it is the means through which he wins glory for the city. Alcibiades observes that wealth is often the cause of envy (6.16.3). He claims that it is only right to embrace distinction (6.16.4). The fact that he established a coalition to oppose Sparta is offered as proof of his capacity to lead (6.16.6). Naturally, Alcibiades does not refer to his failure to secure re-election as general after the creation of this alliance. He urges the Athenians to maintain their backing for the expedition. Alcibiades supports his position with several points. He argues that the Sicilians are divided, self-serving and do not have as many hoplites as they boast; furthermore, the Spartans pose no threat to Athens as they lack her power at sea (6.17). Alcibiades then turns to matters of empire. The purpose of alliances with states in Sicily was to prevent powers such as Syracuse from attacking Athens; these agreements must be honoured (6.18.l). It is through action that empire is won (6.18.2). Furthermore,

empires must grow or face decline (6.18.3). It is only at this point that Alcibiades raises the potential of the expedition to establish Athenian dominion over Sicily and mastery of Greece: 'we shall either become masters as we very easily may, of the whole of Hellas through the accession of the Sicilian Hellenes, or in any case ruin the Syracusans, to the no small advantage of ourselves and our allies' (6.18.4). The Athenian navy guarantees a safe return (6.18.5). He calls on the support of the old and the young (6.18.6). This strikes a contrast with intergenerational division. Alcibiades closes with the claim that inaction goes against the character of Athens and inaction will only result in atrophy (6.18.7).[22]

The preferred mode of explanation is narrative. This means that change is indispensable to the text as historical narrative consists of events held together by causal relationships. The arrival of the Segestan envoys is an event that disrupts the prevailing circumstances, setting further changes in motion. Early in his work, Thucydides argues that Spartan fear of the growth of Athenian power was the underlying cause of the war (1.23.6). The short-term causes should not be accorded too much explanatory force. Similar thinking is evident in the case of the Sicilian Expedition. The plea of support for from the envoys represents a short-term cause of Athenian intervention in Sicily, but the underlying cause is Athenian ambition. Thucydides presents this as a pre-existing aspect of Athenian thinking. The chance to act on this desire in Sicily is a change. Nicias champions continuity of Periclean policy. Alcibiades argues the reverse. He argues that such change is fundamental to the character of the Athenians. In terms of the consequences of change, Nicias demonstrates far greater foresight than Alcibiades. Thucydides' perspective influences the construction of the account. Thucydides knows the disastrous consequences of committing Athenian forces to Sicily. This informs his unsympathetic depiction of Alcibiades. In this way, the historian does more than explain change. Historical interpretation evaluates change.

Alcibiades fires the enthusiasm of the Athenians for the expedition. As a result, its main opponent changes tack. Nicias argues that opposition in Sicily will be formidable (6.20).

[22] The speech may use medical thought. Nicias employs medical terms in his speech, so these may inform Alcibiades reply. The effect is to present the two men who wish to treat Athens in different ways; see Simon Hornblower, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008),353. On the notion as the state as a body, see Roger Brock, *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), 69-82.

The superiority of the Sicilian cavalry is of particular note (6.20.4). Consequently, Athens will need to commit an immense force (6.21). The distance to Sicily is so great that this is the only way that Athens could strike decisively, avoid the need for reinforcements and prevent the humiliation of retreat (6.21). The expedition would require immense numbers of hoplites, archers, slingers, mercenaries, provisions and funds (6.22). Even with such a force, it would be difficult to conquer Sicily or escape defeat (6.23).

> With this Nicias concluded, thinking that he should either disgust the Athenians by the magnitude of the undertaking, or, if obliged to sail on the expedition, would thus do so in the safest way possible. The Athenians, however, far from having their taste for the voyage taken away by the burdensomeness of the preparations, became more eager for it than ever; and just the contrary took place of what Nicias had thought, as it was held that he had given good advice, and that the expedition would be the safest in the world. All alike fell in love with the enterprise. The older men thought that they would either subdue the places against which they were to sail, or at all events, with so large a force, meet with no disaster; those in the prime of life felt a longing for foreign sights and spectacles, and had no doubt that they should come safe home again; while the idea of the common people and the soldiery was to earn wages at the moment, and make conquests that would supply a never-ending fund of pay for the future. With this enthusiasm of the majority, the few that liked it not, feared to appear unpatriotic by holding up their hands against it, and so kept quiet. (6.24)[23]

Rather than securing his objective, Nicias only succeeds in generating greater enthusiasm for the expedition. Eventually, someone steps forward and demands that Nicias specifies

[23] Nicias uses allusive language to reminds his overly confident audience that there is no guarantee of a safe return for the expedition; see Arnold W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 261.

After Arnold Gomme passed away, Andrewes and Dover completed his commentary on Thucydides. Responsibility for Books 6 & 7 was given to Dover. Consequently, subsequent references to this volume are under his name.

Hornblower, *Commentary*, vol. 3, 321; 'The most important structural point to note about these three speeches is the way they anticipate the subsequent narrative; this is specially true of Nikias' speeches. Alkibiades also makes predictions, but they are notably falsified by the narrative'. See Rood, *Thucydides and Narrative Explanation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998): 159-167; Nanno Marinatos, 'Nicias as Wise Advisor and Tragic Warner in Thucydides', *Philologus* 124 (1980): 305–10.

the exact number of forces that should be voted to him. Thucydides does not identify this man, but Plutarch calls him Demostratus (*Nicias* 12.4). One suspects that the persuasive tactic adopted by Nicias was lost on him. Nicias replies that Athens would need to commit one hundred triremes, at least 5,000 hoplites (Athenians and allies) and other men as required (6.25). The Athenians vote to discretionary powers to the three generals (6.26). The debate is over, and preparations begin. One morning before the fleet set sail, the people of Athens awoke to find that the Hermae had been mutilated. These sacred statues consisted of a bust of Hermes atop a pillar that included an erect phallus. Hermae served as boundary markers and were believed to promote both fertility and good fortune. Since Hermes was worshipped as the god of travellers, the desecration was taken to bode ill for the expedition. Furthermore, some thought that the transgression was part of a conspiracy to overthrow Athenian democracy (6.28). The desecration of the Hermae transforms the mood of the city from one of excitement to dread. Rewards are offered for the apprehension of the culprits, and anyone who had committed an act of impiety. The result exemplifies some of the difficulties that beset post-Periclean Athens:

> Information was given accordingly by some resident aliens and body servants, not about the Hermae but about some previous mutilations of other images perpetrated by young men in a drunken frolic, and of mock celebrations of the mysteries, averred to take place in private houses. Alcibiades being implicated in this charge, it was taken hold of by those who could least endure him, because he stood in the way of their obtaining the undisturbed direction of the people, and who thought that if he were once removed the first place would be theirs. These accordingly magnified the matter and loudly proclaimed that the affair of the mysteries and the mutilation of the Hermae were part and parcel of a scheme to overthrow the democracy, and that nothing of all this had been done without Alcibiades; the proofs alleged being the general and undemocratic licence of his life and habits. (6.28)

The politics of factionalism may have been the cause of the mutilation of the Hermae.[24] If the crime was part of a plot to overthrow the democracy, then the aristocratic demagogue Alcibiades would be a leading contender to become tyrant. On the other hand, his rivals may have sought to incriminate him. Protesting his innocence, Alcibiades wanted his trial to take place immediately as the expedition was now ready (6.29.1). His rivals argued that it should occur after his return as the fleet should sail without delay; Thucydides observes that this is would provide time to concoct further charges (6.29.3). Athens was shaken by the events, but the trial was deferred. Alcibiades retained his position as general and a throng of onlookers watched the departure of the fleet:

> The ships being now manned, and everything put on board with which they meant to sail, the trumpet commanded silence, and the prayers customary before putting out to sea were offered, not in each ship by itself, but by all together to the voice of a herald; and bowls of wine were mixed through all the armament, and libations made by the soldiers and their officers in gold and silver goblets. In their prayers joined also the crowds on shore, the citizens and all others that wished them well. The hymn sung and the libations finished, they put out to sea, and first out in column then raced each other as far as Aegina, and so hastened to reach Corcyra, where the rest of the allied forces were also assembling. (6.32)

The Athenians experience no greater single defeat than the ruin of the Sicilian Expedition. Kagan likens the start of the journey to a regatta.[25] The hubris of the Athenians would not have been lost on the audience. Within two years the fleet is destroyed, and the surviving members of the expedition are sent to Syracusan quarries. Athens never fully recovers. For Thucydides, the desire for empire represents an unchanging aspect of human affairs.[26]

---

[24] On the desecration of the Hermae, see William D. Furley, *Andokides and the Herms: A Study of Crisis in Fifth-Century Athenian Religion* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 1996); cf. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 4, 264-288, Oswyn Murray, 'The Affair of the Mysteries: Democracy and the Drinking Group' in *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 149-161. Hornblower, *Commentary*, vol. 3, 367- 381.

[25] Kagan, *Thucydides: The Reinvention of History*, 187. See Hornblower, *Commentary*, vol. 3, 381-95. On the wastefulness of the departure of the expedition, see Lisa Kallet, *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides: The Sicilian Expedition and its Aftermath* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

[26] See comments by Athenian envoys to Sparta in 1.76: 'You, at all events, Lacedaemonians, have used your supremacy to settle the states in Peloponnese as is agreeable to you. And if at the period of which we were speaking you had persevered to the end of the matter, and had incurred hatred in your command, we

Thucydides holds that this impulse led the Athenians to seek domination of Sicily. He presents the expedition as dangerous change from Periclean policy. He builds a narrative that consists of events held together by causal relationships. Each event is a change. Determination of which events to include in the narrative rests on the judgment of the historian. Evaluation of historical significance is critical. Thucydides presents the second assembly in greater detail than the first because it enables him to contrast Nicias and Alcibiades. In terms of the Sicilian Expedition, the former offers change for the better. Alcibiades brings change for the worse. Nicias tries to dissuade the Athenians from the proposal, but this attempt backfires and public enthusiasm becomes even greater. For Nicias, this is unexpected and undesirable change. The fortunes of Alcibiades change when he is accused of impiety. In terms of the fortunes of Athens, her decline and fall is in motion. Thucydides observes that it demonstrates the strength which Athens achieved under Pericles that the city was still able to challenge her enemies for years after the destruction of the expedition to Sicily (2.65.12-13).[27] Turning points such as the death of Pericles and the Sicilian Expedition are pivotal, but the rate of change is not uniform. Furthermore, judgments about progress and decline are exercised by the historian. This was the case in antiquity, and it is also true today.

Teaching and Learning: Continuity and Change

Let us pause and return to matters pedagogical. The first chapter included an exploration of epistemic authority for pedagogical decision-making. Roberts offers three models that the teacher might use to defend their approach to teaching – the "imposition model" in which the teacher's interpretation and construction of the sources are presented to the student; the "abdication model" in which the student is left to construct their own interpretation of the sources, and his preferred "social construction model" in which the

---

are sure that you would have made yourselves just as galling to the allies and would have been forced to choose between a strong government and danger to yourselves. It follows that it was not a very wonderful action, or contrary to the common practice of mankind, if we did accept an empire that was offered to us and refused to give it up under the pressure of three of the strongest motives, fear, honour, and interest. And it was not we who set the example, for it has always been law that the weaker should be subject to the stronger. Besides, we believed ourselves to be worthy of our position, and so you thought us till now, when calculations of interest have made you take up the cry of justice--a consideration which no one ever yet brought forward to hinder his ambition when he had a chance of gaining anything by might. And praise is due to all who, if not so superior to human nature as to refuse dominion, yet respect justice more than their position compels them to do'.

[27] On the indispensability of Pericles, see Gomme, *Commentary*, vol. 2, 198.

teacher's and students' representations and constructions are discussed.[28] Each of orientations consists of three elements: teacher, student and domain. In the case of the present research, an aspect of the past (or historical inquiry itself) is the domain. In the preferred model, the teacher observes the domain and offers representations of it. The student does likewise. There is, however, a third element of the model: the exchange of representations and constructions between teacher and student. This allows the teacher to discern what the student understands. Furthermore, it allows the student to encounter externally validated representations of the domain. This exchange is pivotal to learning. The student's contribution to any epistemological claim allows understanding to be tested and verified in the history lesson as historical knowledge. This triadic model admits representation of the domain by a pedagogical resource such as a selected piece of Thucydides' writing, or another source. The semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce are helpful here. The pedagogical resource becomes a sign that refers to an element of the domain that can be revisited in subsequent discussion. The first or immediate representation of the source can become a dynamic object when reconstructed with the teacher. In the case of history in schools, the source points to the past or some process of historical inquiry. Roberts offers his model to defend the authority of teachers' claims to knowledge, here that their students have learnt some aspect of the domain of history. In the second chapter we added another element: the class. The purpose of this modification is to capture classroom conversation. Constructivist theories of learning hold that we learn through social interaction. It is important for teachers to acquire a repertoire of strategies that enable students to deliberate about sources, exchange inferences and discuss the past. The third chapter addressed the concept of historical significance and linked it to inquiry. It presented historical inquiry as an on-going conversation with selected aspects of the past. The result is a detailed picture of learning and teaching in history. Keeping these complexities in mind, let us return to Thucydides' account of the Sicilian Expedition and consider how the teacher might use it.

We have established that an event is an instance of change. A complete explanation of an event addresses its causes, course and consequences. It is important for students to grasp

[28] Douglas A. Roberts, 'Epistemic Authority for Teacher Knowledge: The Potential Role of Teacher Communities – A Response to Robert Orton', *Curriculum Inquiry* 26, no. 4 (1996): 417-431.

these insights. Having examined the deliberations surrounding the expedition, teaching and learning would then turn to the campaign. Narrative is a tool that history teachers can employ to explain the past. It can provide foundational knowledge that enables students to contextualise sources (see Chapter 5).[29] Just as historians can compress or expand their treatment of time, so too can history teachers. The teacher could follow Thucydides and explain that when the fleet arrived at Rhegium, on the east side of the strait between Italy and Sicily, the locals denied the Athenians access to their city due to the immense size of the Greek force. Consequently, a potential base is denied to the Athenians (6.44.3). Events take a dramatic turn when Alcibiades is called home to stand trial for sacrilege (6.53). Rather than doing so, Alcibiades flees (6.61.6). He later denounces Athenian democracy and throws his support behind Sparta (6.89). Thucydides tells us that he advised the Spartans to fortify the town of Decelea in Attica (6.91.6). This will provide Sparta with a base on the very doorstep of Athens. It will force Athens to obtain its food by sea, provide refuge to escaped slaves and block production of silver at nearby mines. Due to its clear strategic value, it is hard to believe that Sparta would not have fortified the town. Having said that, Thucydides underscores the link between Alcibiades and Decelea. It is worth discussing this with students as it speaks to the intentions of our narrator. The significance of the town is reflected in the name of the last stage of the conflict: the Decelean War.

The recall of Alcibiades leaves Nicas and Lamachus in command of the Athenian forces. The Athenians achieve little against in the opening months of the campaign. Alcibiades had planned to win support from the cities of Sicily and then to move against Syracuse. Thucydides tells us that Nicias implemented this strategy without success. Furthermore, it transpires that Segesta is good for only thirty talents of silver, rather than the promised treasure (6.46.1). Without reinforcements or further funds, the Athenians move against Syracuse. Although an attack at the beginning of the campaign may have succeeded, the enemy had now had time to prepare. The Athenians land in the Great Harbour and defeat the Syracusans near the Anapus River, but the Syracusan cavalry protects the retreating army and it falls back behind the walls of Syracuse (6.70). The Athenians and Syracusans

[29] On fostering contextualisation as a skill, see Abby Reisman and Sam S. Wineburg, 'Teaching the Skill of Contextualizing in History', *The Social Studies* 99 (2008): 202–207; Tim Huijgen, Paul Holthuis, Carla van Boxtel and Wim van de Grift, 'Promoting Historical Contextualisation in Classrooms: An Observational Study', *Educational Studies* 45, no. 4 (2019): 456-479.

then try to gather support. Sparta sends the general Gylippus to defend Syracuse (6.93.2). The siege involves construction of walls and counterwalls. Nicias falls ill and Lamachus dies in battle (6.101.6). Nicias does nothing to prevent Gylippus from reaching Syracuse. The Spartan general goes on the offensive, taking an Athenian fort (7.3.4) and preventing the Athenian encirclement of Syracuse (7.6). Although the Athenians are now in danger, Nicias does not risk his reputation by ordering a withdrawal. Instead, Nicias uses the same ploy that created the vast expedition in the first place, requesting massive reinforcements or advising the Athenians to recall the expedition (7.15.1). As before, the ploy backfires and the Athenians despatch men and ships (7.16.1). Nicias asks to resign on the grounds of ill-health, but the Athenians refuse. Instead, Demosthenes and Eurymedon join him in command (7.16.2). Seeking to take advantage of the consternation that the arrival of his men caused, Demosthenes was determined to go on the offensive (7.42.3). Demosthenes assaults the counterwall, but the assault fails (7.43). A subsequent night offensive results in disaster for the Athenians (7.44). The Athenian generals confer and Demosthenes votes to return home (7.47.3). At this point in the text, Thucydides tells us that Nicias takes the opposite position:

> . . . Nicias, without denying the bad state of their affairs, was unwilling to avow their weakness, or to have it reported to the enemy that the Athenians in full council were openly voting for retreat; for in that case they would be much less likely to effect it when they wanted without discovery. Moreover, his own particular information still gave him reason to hope that the affairs of the enemy would soon be in a worse state than their own, if the Athenians persevered in the siege; as they would wear out the Syracusans by want of money, especially with the more extensive command of the sea now given them by their present navy. Besides this, there was a party in Syracuse who wished to betray the city to the Athenians, and kept sending him messages and telling him not to raise the siege. Accordingly, knowing this and really waiting because he hesitated between the two courses and wished to see his way more clearly, in his public speech on this occasion he refused to lead off the army, saying he was sure the Athenians would never approve of their returning without a vote of theirs. Those who would vote upon their conduct, instead of judging the facts as eye-witnesses like themselves

> and not from what they might hear from hostile critics, would simply be guided by the calumnies of the first clever speaker; while many, indeed most, of the soldiers on the spot, who now so loudly proclaimed the danger of their position, when they reached Athens would proclaim just as loudly the opposite, and would say that their generals had been bribed to betray them and return . . . (7.48.1-4)[30]

This is an invaluable extract to examine with students. One way to approach the text is to use a version of the three-level reading guide.[31] This strategy assists students to read text at the levels of literal comprehension (*on the lines*), implication (*between the lines*) and application (*beyond the lines*). The first level explores literal meaning. The teacher might use a combination of class reading, discussion and questions to help students achieve this foundational stage of comprehension. Nicias agrees with Demosthenes that the Athenians are in a difficult position, but he does not want to admit weakness. Furthermore, he does not want the enemy to learn that consideration is being given to retreat. Intelligence that Nicias has received indicates that the Syracusans may exhaust their funds and traitors may surrender the city. Nicias hesitates, but then speaks against retreat. Thucydides notes that Nicias does so because the Athenian assembly would not endorse a decision by the generals to end the campaign. The soldiers would agree that the best course is to withdraw and later betray their commanders with baseless accusations of corruption. Once students grasp the passage at this level, discussion can then turn to matters of inference.

Reading between the lines presents a greater challenge to students. It is often helpful for students to draw on prior knowledge. The teacher might ask students to explain what how conditions have changed. Nicias has received his requested reinforcements, but these men have not turned the tide. Furthermore, Nicias now has the opinion of another experienced commander that continuing the campaign in Sicily would be unwise. This is a good time to remind students that Nicias spoke against the campaign in the first place. Despite these factors, Nicias argues that the Athenians should remain in Sicily. Why? The answer is fear. He fears how the decision to leave would be received in Athens. Nicias also believes

[30] On Nicias in 7.48-9, see Dover, *Commentary*, 425-29; Hornblower, *Commentary*, 632-639.
[31] Albert Morris and Nea Stewart-Dore: *Learning to Learn from Text: Effective Reading in the Content Areas* (North Ryde, Sydney: Addison-Wesley, 1984). These writers build on earlier research in this area; see Harold L. Herber, *Teaching Reading in Content Areas* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978).

that the men might betray their leaders. On this basis, what might we conclude about the Athenian democracy? Thucydides tells us that the voters 'would simply be guided by the calumnies of the first clever speaker' (7.48.3). It is constructive to ask students to consider how things have changed since earlier in the conflict. A key difference between this point and the start of war is that Athens is not led by Pericles. Indeed, the Sicilian Expedition is a violation of Periclean policy. This explains the praise that Thucydides gives Nicias later in the text (7.86.5).

The final level of the reading strategy involves application: moving beyond the passage. Students need not agree that Nicias was worthy of praise. The history teacher would have drawn a careful distinction between the past and Thucydides' representation of the war at the start of the learning and teaching sequence. The teacher could offer additional sources to students at this point. In his *Life of Nicias*, Plutarch notes that the Nicias was criticised for hesitancy (16.8). The comedian Aristophanes mocked him for the same reason (*Birds* l. 640). Furthermore, information contained in Thucydides' account may be used against Nicias. On landing in Sicily, Demosthenes had no wish to fall into the same traps as Nicias (7.42.3). Building on the extract and prior knowledge, students could write a statement about change and continuity in Athenian decision-making and test it against subsequent events. Thucydides writes that Gylippus prepares a new offensive (7.50.3). In the face of this change, Nicias agrees to depart, and the Greeks make ready to leave. At this point, a lunar eclipse occurs. Nicias and most of the Athenians regard this as an ill-omen and defer their departure for twenty-seven days, as per the advice of a soothsayer (7.50.4). Disaster soon follows. The Syracusans attack by land and sea (7.51-2). Soon, the Athenian fleet is trapped in the Great Harbour and suffers a terrible defeat (7.71).[32]

The model of pedagogical reasoning and action offered by Lee Shulman underscores the role of teacher judgement in the selection of sources and their use in the classroom.[33] For the Sicilian Expedition, the principal source is a historical narrative. The use of extracts enables teachers and students, in their representations and explanations, to step into and

[32] On the techniques that Thucydides use to create angst at this point, see Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation*, 175-6.
[33] Lee S. Shulman, 'Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform', *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 1 (1987): 1-22.

out of that story. Narratives include beginnings, middles and ends. This means that, for a historical explanation that is cast in narrative form, it requires all three elements to be complete. Each of its constituent events constitutes a change. Thucydides recounts how the Sicilian Expedition spirals into total disaster. Peter Seixas and Tom Morton observe that concepts of progress and decline are judgements of change that are based on perspective.[34] Defeat for Athens is victory for Syracuse. Two passages stand out in terms of how the teacher might approach the end of the campaign. The teacher must construct links between the first of these and the Athenian defeat in the Great Harbour. Although sixty Athenian ships remain, neither Demosthenes nor Nicias can persuade their demoralised sailors to return to their ships and break through the naval blockade (7.72). The Athenians attempt to escape overland (7.73.1). The army splits in two with Nicias in the front and Demosthenes in the rear (7.80). The Syracusans pin down the trailing group and subject it to a hail of missiles. Demosthenes and his six thousand men surrender (7.81-2). Nicias and his men struggle on. Driven by exhaustion and thirst, the Athenians make for the River Assinarus. Thucydides offers the following terrifying account:

> As soon as it was day Nicias put his army in motion, pressed, as before, by the Syracusans and their allies, pelted from every side by their missiles, and struck down by their javelins. The Athenians pushed on for the Assinarus, impelled by the attacks made upon them from every side by a numerous cavalry and the swarm of other arms, fancying that they should breathe more freely if once across the river, and driven on also by their exhaustion and craving for water. Once there they rushed in, and all order was at an end, each man wanting to cross first, and the attacks of the enemy making it difficult to cross at all; forced to huddle together, they fell against and trod down one another, some dying immediately upon the javelins, others getting entangled together and stumbling over the articles of baggage, without being able to rise again. Meanwhile the opposite bank, which was steep, was lined by the Syracusans, who showered missiles down upon the Athenians, most of them drinking greedily and heaped together in disorder in the hollow bed of the river. The Peloponnesians also came down and butchered them,

[34] Peter Seixas and Tom Morton, *The Big Six: Historical Thinking Concepts* (Toronto: Nelson Education, 2013), 74.

> especially those in the water, which was thus immediately spoiled, but which they went on drinking just the same, mud and all, bloody as it was, most even fighting to have it. (7.84)

The Athenians suffer a terrible defeat. Led by Nicias, they make for a water that appears to promise life. They must endure waves of debilitating missile fire. When they finally reach the river, any semblance of order is lost. They stumble into the water, desperate to quench their thirst. The onslaught of the Syracusans and Peloponnesians is unrelenting. The Athenians lose their humanity as they trample over each other and fight for the bloody water. This is the cost of the Sicilian Expedition. The Athenians pay with their humanity and their lives. Against the protests of Gylippus, the Syracusans slaughter Demosthenes and Nicas (7.85). Most of the captured army is put to work in quarries, where they endure shocking conditions. After seventy days, none of these men still lived (7.86). In his *Life of Nicias*, Plutarch writes that news of the of annihilation of the expedition reached Athens via a visitor who sat down for a haircut; the barber raced off to the archons (magistrates) and uproar swept through the city. The stranger was tortured until his account was verified (30.1). Although this story contrasts with the splendour of the departure of the expedition, Thucydides does not refer to these events. Instead, he offers a eulogy for Nicias which notes that he was undeserving of his fate (7.86.5).[35] Having described the suffering of the Athenians prisoners in the quarries of Syracuse, he closes with the following coda:

> This was the greatest Hellenic achievement of any in this war, or, in my opinion, in Hellenic history; at once most glorious to the victors, and most calamitous to the conquered. They were beaten at all points and altogether; all that they suffered was great; they were destroyed, as the saying is, with a total destruction, their fleet, their army, everything was destroyed, and few out of many returned home. Such were the events in Sicily. (7.87)[36]

---

[35] George Grote, *A History of Greece* vol. 6 (London: Dent, [1888] 1906), 182-3: 'Our great historian – after devoting two immortal books to the expedition – after setting forth emphatically both the glory of its dawn and the wretchedness of its close, with a dramatic genius to parallel the Oedipus of Sophokles – when he comes to recount the melancholy end of the two commanders has no words to spare for Demosthenes (far the abler of the two, who perished by no fault of his own), but reserves his flowers to strew on the grave of Nicias, the author of the whole calamity'.

[36] The Loeb translation speaks in terms of events; see Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume IV: Books 7-8*. trans. Charles F. Smith, Loeb Classical Library 169 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard

As Professor of History at Harvard, William Ferguson stated in *The Cambridge Ancient History* that Thucydides offers an exemplary account of the expedition.[37] Scholarship has grown since 1927, but no historian who is more closely associated with the events that he describes than Thucydides. Writing eighty years after Ferguson, Donald Kagan notes that the exacting way in which the text is crafted means that 'Modern historians are more than usually prone in this case to follow Thucydides' narrative and to accept his interpretation of events without much question'.[38] At the start of his work, Thucydides writes that the war was the greatest upheaval in history (1.1.2).[39] It is helpful for teachers to set the preface alongside the coda of Book 7. In each instance, it is the magnitude of change that determines historical significance. Thucydides argues that these events are remarkable because of the degree of devastation that results from them. His narrative explores human purposes. So too does history as a school subject. It is important to ask students where responsibility lies for the disaster. For Thucydides, poor leadership after the loss of Pericles is the answer. We need not agree. The teacher might provide students with a passage from Pausanias (1.29.12). He writes that the Athenians omitted Nicias from a memorial to the fallen.[40] From this, we can infer that they blamed Nicias. Again, we need not take their view. It is the task of each student to be able to argue for their construction

University Press, 1923), 179-81: 'This event proved to be the greatest of all that had happened in the course of this war, and, as it seems to me, of all Hellenic events of which we have record—for the victors most splendid, for the vanquished most disastrous. For the vanquished, beaten utterly at every point and having suffered no slight ill in any respect—having met, as the saying goes, with utter destruction—land-force and fleet and everything perished, and few out of many came back home. Such was the course of events in Sicily'. On the end of Book 7 as the tragic outcome of Athenian greed for empire, see Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation*, 198-201.

[37] William S. Ferguson, 'The Athenian Expedition to Sicily' in *The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 5: Athens 478-401 BC*, ed. John B. Bury, Stanley A. Cook and Frank E. Adcock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 282n: 'We can do little but paraphrase his famous narrative' (quoted in Kagan, *Thucydides*, 243 n. 1).

[38] Kagan, *Thucydides*, 162.

[39] Jonathan J. Price, 'A Puzzle in Thucydides 1.18', *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997): 675.

[40] Pausanias, *Description of Greece, Volume I: Books 1-2 (Attica and Corinth)*, trans. William H. S. Jones, Loeb Classical Library 93 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918), 162-4: 'The names of the generals are inscribed with the exception of Nicias, and among the private soldiers are included the Plataeans along with the Athenians. This is the reason why Nicias was passed over, and my account is identical with that of Philistus, who says that while Demosthenes made a truce for the others and excluded himself, attempting to commit suicide when taken prisoner, Nicias voluntarily submitted to the surrender. For this reason Nicias had not his name inscribed on the slab, being condemned as a voluntary prisoner and an unworthy soldier'.

from the sources. Athens fights on for a decade, but the annihilation of the expedition to Sicily marks the beginning of the end.[41]

Turning Points: The Example of Livy

There are times in the past when change shifts direction or pace. Historians describe these moments as turning points. Whether or not an element of the past is identified as a turning point depends on the judgment of the historian. As with many other aspects of the syntax of the discipline, identification of turning points as part of the discussion of change is not a product of modern historical writing. Classical historians address turning points in their works. Take, for example, the presentation of the end of the Roman monarchy offered by the historian Livy. Born in Patavium (modern Padua), Livy lived through the demise of the republic and the rise of Augustus. His monumental work consisted of 142 books recounting the history of Rome from its beginnings to the reign of Tiberius.[42] In addition to offering traditional accounts of the foundation of the city, the first book engages with history and legend to explore the rule of the kings. It concludes with an account of the overthrow of the monarchy (1.57-60). This is an important turning point. Indeed, patriotic Romans viewed this as the most important point in the history of their city. Let us turn to Livy for his account of this event.

Livy writes that the last king was Tarquin the Proud. Arrogant and tyrannical, he mounted a campaign against the Rutuli (a rival Italian people) to replenish his finances which had been drained by an overly ambitious building program. He hoped to win the favour of his subjects by sharing spoils of victory (1.57). When the war bogged down, the leaders took to feasting. Discussion turned to their wives. Lucius Tarquinius Collatinus claimed that

[41] In my view, the Athenian democracy is to blame for the disaster. Having said that, it is far preferable for students to come to their own conclusion.

[42] For an excellent introduction to Livy, see Ronald Mellor, *The Roman Historians* (London: Routledge, 1999), 48-75. Patrick G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1961); John Henderson, 'Livy and the Invention of History' in *History as Text*, ed. Averil Cameron (London: Duckworth, 1989), 64-85; T. James Luce, *Livy: The Composition of his History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977); Gary B. Miles, *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995). For analysis of the first five books of Livy, see Robert M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965). For the next five books, see James Lipovsky, *A Historiographical Study of Livy: Books VI-X*, vols 1-4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997–2005).

his wife, Lucretia, was the most virtuous of all.[43] The men rode back to Rome to spy on the women. Lucretia and her servants were at work, unlike the others. Later, Prince Sextus Tarquin crept into her bedchamber. He threatened to kill Lucretia if she did not allow him to sleep with her. When that threat failed, he said that he would kill her and a slave and claim that he caught them in adultery. This threat succeeded. After he departed, Lucretia sent for her husband and father. Each was permitted to bring a companion. She explained what has transpired, called for vengeance, and took her life with a concealed knife (1.58). Lucius Junius Brutus had accompanied Collatinus. He takes up the knife and swears on the blood of Lucretia to drive out the royal family and free Rome from the rule of kings (1.59). The others do likewise. The body is conveyed to the forum. There, it sparks anger that turns into a popular uprising. Tarquin the Proud is soon overthrown. Collatinus and Brutus are elected as the first consuls of the republic (1.60).

Livy continues a written tradition that reaches back over two hundred years.[44] This is well short of the traditional date of the birth of the republic (509 BC). The tale of Lucretia is the stuff of legend. It is clear, however, that at some point during the late sixth century Rome overthrew her monarchy. Michael Stanford notes that perception of change requires that the observer is 'simultaneously aware of two states of affairs, one before and one after the alteration'.[45] We can build on this reflection to suggest that the identification of an event as a turning point is an ascription of historical significance. It necessitates that the historian, teacher, or student grasps the prevailing conditions both before and after the turning point. Cambridge change is insufficient in the study of the past; historical explanation must account for change as process. In the case of Livy, the reader is presented with an initial prevailing condition: tyranny under the kings. The turning point is their overthrow. Ronald Ridley writes that we should not fall into the trap of thinking

[43] On the representation of women in Livy, see Tom Stevenson, 'Women of Early Rome as *Exempla* in Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, Book 1', *The Classical World* 104, no. 2 (2011): 175-189.
[44] T. P. Wiseman, 'Roman Republic, Year One', *Greece & Rome* 45, no. 1 (1998): 19-26. Wiseman explores how ancient writers weave together tales of Lucius Junius, Lucretia, Publius Valerius, and Marcus Horatius; cf. Tim J. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000-264 B.C.)*(London: Routledge, 1995). On how Livy uses his sources, see Ronald T. Ridley, 'The Historian's Silences: What Livy Did Not Know – Or Chose Not to Tell', *Journal of Ancient History* 1, no. 1 (2013): 27-52.
[45] Michael Stanford, *A Companion to the Study of History* (Blackwell: Oxford, 1994), 170. Writing before the terrorist attacks, Stanford uses the example of an elevator ride in the World Trade Centre to argue that perception is indispensable to how we understand change. 9/11 itself constitutes a turning point in history.

that Livy confused legend with historical fact; a clear statement in the preface indicates that he did not (*praef.* 6.).[46] Livy's point is that the transformation of Rome from monarchy to republic is significant. The process of change consists of the actions of the historical actors. Lucretia, Sextus Tarquin, Brutus and even the Roman crowd all act with purpose. Although intention drives action, the consequences of actions cannot always be foreseen by the historical actors. Prevailing conditions are different after the turning point. Livy explains that Rome is transformed after the downfall of Tarquin the Proud:

> The history of a free nation in peace and war will be my theme from this point on, the election of annual magistracies and greater obedience to the commands of law than to those of men. The arrogance of the last king caused the advent of liberty to be all the more welcome, whereas the rule of earlier monarchs was such that they are deservedly reckoned successive founders of at least those parts of the city that they annexed to accommodate the new peoples each had added to the state. (2.1)

Teaching and Learning: Turning Points

Teachers can use turning points to plan for learning and teaching. As we have argued, the selection of a turning point is a judgment of historical significance. It is a way to address change in history. Teachers might select sources that enable students to draw inferences about the initial prevailing conditions, the turning point, and the new conditions. Drawing on the research of Doug Roberts, we can say that the turning point is offered to the student as a product of the teacher's observation and representation of the domain (history). From a constructivist standpoint, the observations and representations of the students are vital, as the mind of the student is not just a *tabula rasa* on which learning is inscribed. Students can also identify turning points in the past. As a research activity, students might be asked to identify a turning point and evaluate its importance. This requires students to use the historical thinking concepts of change and significance. Students learn from each other, so it is valuable for teachers to include opportunities for class members to discuss their different constructions and exchange ideas about their work. Exchanges between the teacher and individual students, as well as the teacher and the class are pivotal to a claim

[46] Ronald T. Ridley, 'Livy the Critical Historian', *Athenaeum* 102, no. 2 (2014): 444-474.

of a knowledge of history, that is to be able to defend their interpretation of the sources. The teacher needs to address the historical reasoning of students. Such responses must demonstrate disciplinary understanding *and* meet the learning needs of students.

Teachers can use turning points to organise the substantive content of a unit. The learning and teaching sequence need not always proceeds chronologically. For example, study of the fall of the Roman Republic might begin with the assassination of Julius Caesar. The focus of investigation could then shift back in time almost ninety years to another murder: the death of Tiberius Gracchus. As tribune of the plebs, he tried to engage in land reform, but he and a large group of his supporters were killed by conservatives. His brother, Gaius Gracchus, attempted to bring about similar reform and was also killed. The substantive content would then move forward to the point at which Caesar was made dictator for life (*dictator perpetuus*) and his murder eleven days later. In terms of modern history, a unit on the Second World War might commence with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour and then turn to the Treaty of Versailles. The effect of such approach is to underscore the turning point as an instance of significant change.

Planning for learning and teaching requires time and care. Furthermore, the conditions under which teachers work are specific. Joseph Schwab observes that four commonplaces that shape learning and teaching: *teacher*, *students*, *milieu* and *subject matter*.[47] In the context of the present discussion, history teachers work from their own knowledge base to select changes, turning points and sources. These decisions are informed by views of historical significance (see Chapter 3). At the same time, teachers respond to pedagogical imperatives. *Students* exhibit different learning needs: prior knowledge, predisposition to learn, and literacy and numeracy levels vary enormously. Decision-making must take account of the *milieu* of the school. Factors such as nationality, ethnicity, gender and class are relevant. Furthermore, the human and material resources at the disposal of the school are also at play. Lastly, teachers must take account of the discipline itself. The questions, concepts, knowledge, exchanges, practices, and modes of inquiry that together constitute

[47] Joseph J. Schwab, 'The Practical: A Language for Curriculum', *School Review* 78, no. 1 (1969): 1-23.

the disciple of history play their part.[48] Consequently, Schwab argues that the deliberation that underpins curriculum must occur at school level. [49] He suggests that the curriculum planning group should consist of teachers, the principal, a member of the school board and student representatives. To these categories, he adds the university-based or educated curriculum specialist. It is the task of this academic to chair the group and promote its effectiveness.[50]

The curriculum group is intended to develop educative responses to issues that are lived out locally. Take, for instance, the experience of students in an area with a high proportion of migrant families. The curriculum must attend to the aspirations of these students for a better life, but it should not do so in ways that relegate the complexities of their identity and experience to the realm of null curriculum. Instead, the curriculum should capitalise on the experience of students. The result might be a unit that explores migrant experiences over time. It is impossible to understand Australian history after the Second World War without discussing the waves of migration that have transformed our society. Such a unit enables migrant and the children of migrants to see themselves in the explicit curriculum. The migration stories of individual students become sources for the class. One wonderful activity is for students to take on the role of documentary maker. Students can formulate

[48] Joseph. J. Schwab, 'Education and the Structure of the Disciplines' in *Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education: Selected Essays. Joseph J. Schwab*, ed. Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 242: 'If we are now to reverse the long trend of the past and begin to take cognisance of the structure of the disciplines, we should warn ourselves that the task will not only be difficult but painful. We will not only have the task . . . of finding appropriate ways of including structure as a facet of curriculum *content*. We also have the task of learning to live with a far more complex problem – that of realizing that we will no longer be free to choose teaching methods, textbook organization and classroom structuring on the basis of psychological and social considerations alone. Rather, we will need to face that fact that methods are rarely if ever neutral. On the contrary, the means we use color and modify the ends we actually achieve through them. How we teach will determine what our students learn. If a structure of teaching and learning is alien to the structure of what we propose to teach, the outcome will inevitably be a corruption of that content. And we will know that it is'.

[49] Joseph J. Schwab, 'The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to Do', *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (1983): 240: 'Curriculum is what is successfully conveyed to differing degrees to different students, by committed teachers using appropriate materials and actions, of legitimated bodies of knowledge, skill, taste, and propensity to act and react, which are chosen for instruction after serious reflection and communal decision by representatives of those involved in the teaching of a specified group of students who are known to the decisionmakers'. For an appraisal of the contribution of Schwab to the field of curriculum studies, see Elliot Eisner, 'No Easy Answers, Joseph Schwab's Contributions to Curriculum', *Curriculum Inquiry* 14, no. 2 (1984): 201-210; F. Michael Connelly, 'Joseph Schwab, Curriculum, Curriculum Studies and Educational Reform', *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 45, no. 5 (2013): 622-639.

[50] For discussion of curriculum specialists in schools, see Henrietta Schwartz, 'Schwab's "Practical 4" and Its Corroboration in Recent History', *Curriculum Inquiry* 14, no. 4 (1984): 437-463.

questions and then interview each other, family members or friends who have experienced immigration. Importantly, the curriculum should also include historical content that is not readily available in the home. Building on personal and family stories, the teacher would address migration as a catalyst of change in Australian history. This requires exploration of the dispossession of Indigenous peoples, the anxieties about Asia in the colonial period, and the expression of these fears in the form of the Immigration Restriction Act (1901). The content should address developments such as efforts by the Bruce-Page government to source migrants from Britain ('Men, Money and Markets'), the imperative to 'Populate or Perish' after World War Two, waves of migration, and the end of the White Australia policy. The offshore processing and detention of asylum seekers is the most recent, awful chapter in a long story. The ethical dimension of human purposes or agency impels history teachers to address this feature of the resources studied. The overall approach affirms local narratives and links them to wider change.

Schwab exhorts professors of curriculum to engage in meaningful dialogue with schools. The deliberative group approach that Schwab suggests is not the prevailing approach to planning for learning and teaching. In the absence of such committees, academics in discipline-based pedagogy still offer an important contribution by building relationships with schoolteachers. Roberts' triadic epistemic model presupposes this fourth component: other teachers; teachers validate the pedagogical decisions that they make through discussion with their colleagues. When working with individual teachers, the history education academic adopts this fourth position. Individual teachers might discuss their understanding of the discipline, its representation through the selection and use of source material, and the learning needs of students. This demands a high degree of trust. The nature of such conversations varies. It might turn to suggestions for primary sources that might be useful for exploring change in ancient history. On the other hand, teachers might need extracts that capture the views of historians. The array of possible changes is vast. The pedagogical and disciplinary knowledge of teachers as curriculum leaders must be broad to offer effective constitutive collaboration. Curriculum specialists who have knowledge and training in the substantive and syntactic knowledge of history need to walk the talk and talk the walk. For the study of migration, the specialist could offer the following source:

> Mr. Bruce said … he was more than ever convinced that men, money and markets accurately defined the essential requirements of Australia. Within the last few days finality had been reached with the British Government for the provision of money at a nominal rate of interest to the States to carry out developmental works which would increase Australia's power to absorb migrants. The promotion of a greater flow of British immigrants was had occupied the attention of British and Australian Ministers since the end of the Great War … At the Imperial Conference he said that the position of not only of Australia but also of the whole Empire depended upon a redistribution of its white population. Australia offered the best opportunity of any part of the Empire for migration, but it would be limited unless money was available to carry out necessary developmental works, and markets were provided where the production of our increased population could be absorbed. (*Argus* 9 April 1925)

The source sets out the immigration policy of the Australian government during the 1920s under the leadership of Prime Minister Stanley Bruce. It meets a key practical need as the teacher receives a pedagogical instrument (the source) that points to social, political and economic change. Moreover, the source is a focal point for deliberation. It provides the basis for a discussion of the substance and syntax of history, as well as teaching strategies. It is different to speaking in the abstract. To contextualise a source, it is necessary to grasp key substantive concepts and related landmarks in time.[51] In the case of this source, substantive concepts include migration, development, government, the British Empire and race. The date of the text and the reference to the Great War are significant temporal references. Discussion could turn to ways of addressing these concepts in the classroom, strategies for analysing the source, and reflection on the idea of change.

The scenario becomes even more complex when a group of teachers with different training is in play. Here, specialist history teachers are integral to the discursive circle of the subject department in the school. In the case of any one school, a history department

[51] Carla van Boxtel and Jannet van Drie. '"That's in the time of the Romans!" Knowledge and Strategies Students use to Contextualize Historical Images and Documents', *Cognition and Instruction* 30, no. 2 (2012): 113-145.

consists of many teachers who are responsible for various levels and topics. These diverse needs shape how specialists interact with their colleagues. A useful starting point can be to share approaches to teaching a history topic based on a relevant source (such as an extract from Thucydides for Ancient History or the abovementioned article for Australian History). What do students understand by continuity and change when they step into their history classroom? Does this form part of the explicit or implicit curriculum? How could sources be used to discuss these concepts? Such questions invite reflection on pedagogical reasoning. As the conversation unfolds, specialist history teachers can offer disciplinary content, pedagogical strategies and resources. The same is true of curriculum professors. In 'The Practical 4', Schwab notes that curriculum professors are in a strong position to share knowledge and experience gained in classrooms and collegial discussion of learning and teaching history with the school's curriculum group.

At the beginning of this chapter, we observed that Aristotle regarded time as constant and objects as subject to change. History does not confine an understanding of change to the difference between one aspect of the past at two different points in time. Historical inquiry must account for *process*. A reading of Thucydides demonstrates that there are different kinds of change. Furthermore, change occurs at different rates. The coexistence of change and continuity adds another layer of complexity. A useful starting point for instruction is the idea that an event is an instance of change. Teachers can use turning points to identify times of significant change. Historical narrative depicts events that are held together by causal relationships. This is the dominant mode of historical explanation, so it is to it that we now turn.

6. Historical Narrative

How does narrative help us to understand the past?[1]

The dominant mode of historical explanation is narrative. This is the case in both the discipline and the classroom. Anne Curthoys and John Docker discern a fundamental tension in history from its inception as a form of critical inquiry in ancient Greece: history as rigorous inquiry into the past, and history as literary endeavour.[2] Historical narrative is defined by this duality. First, historians investigate the past through sources. This includes identification of causal relationships between events. Such links are the building blocks of historical narrative. Second, history is a form of literature. Historical narrative pursues authenticity in its depiction of the past. Historical actors are its characters. It employs plot, themes and scenes. It is vital to note that such narrative is a way to *explain* the past. It is not the past. Given the centrality of historical narrative, teachers must consider its implications for learning and teaching. What can we learn about historical narrative from one of its leading exponents in ancient Rome: the historian Tacitus? How might this shape the practice of history teachers?

Cornelius Tacitus was one of the greatest historians of classical antiquity. It appears that he was born *c*. A.D. 58 in Gallia Narbonensis or Transpadane Italy.[3] His provincial birth was no barrier to success. Following the reign of Augustus, the senate began to embrace new families from provinces such as Gallia Narbonensis. Tacitus wed Julia Agricola, daughter of Gnaeus Julius Agricola (a leading member of the senatorial elite).[4] Tacitus advanced along the *cursus honorum*, the series of offices (quaestor, praetor, consul) that defined senatorial success. He held office during the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96).[5]

[1] This chapter includes material that appeared in the following publication: John A. Whitehouse, 'Historical Thinking and Narrative in a Global Culture', in *Nation-Building and History Education in a Global Culture*, ed. Joseph Zajda (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2015), 15-27.
[2] Anne Curthoys and John Docker, *Is History Fiction?* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2006), 13: 'Herodotus and Thucydides established the curious *doubleness* of history: history as a sustained inquiry into the past; history as literary, engaged in narrative, history as drama, engaged in the creation of scenes, characters and speeches'.
[3] Anthony R. Birley, 'The Life and Death of Cornelius Tacitus', *Historia* 49 (2000): 230-47.
[4] Ronald Syme, *Tacitus* vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 614.
[5] There is debate about the degree of Domitian's tyranny, it is clear, however, that the senate condemned his memory (*damnatio memoriae*) after his assassination; see Brian W. Jones, *The Emperor Domitian*

Many members of the Roman elite lost their lives during his reign. In his biography of his father-in-law, Tacitus reflects that these years were robbed from him and the price of safety was silence (*Agr*. 3.2). Nevertheless, Tacitus did more than stay silent: he became *consul suffectus* in A.D. 97 – an honour that would have been arranged by Domitian. We can only surmise that Tacitus prospered as others suffered. This influences his historical writing. Tacitus produced three minor works: the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, the *Germania* and the *Agricola*. The first of his major works, the *Histories*, explores Rome under the Flavian emperors: Vespasian, Titus and Domitian (A.D. 69-96). In the preface (1.1.4), he repeats a promise first made in the *Agricola* (3.3) to write about the present. In his second major work, the *Annals*, Tacitus does not depict Rome after Domitian, instead choosing as his subject the end of the rule of Augustus and the reigns of the succeeding Julio-Claudian emperors (A.D. 14-68). This masterpiece includes one of the most powerful examples of narrative in ancient historiography: the arraignment of Cremutius Cordus (A.D. 25).[6]

History on Trial

Tacitus begins the narrative as follows:

> With Cornelius Cossus and Asinius Agrippa as Consuls, Cremutius Cordus was arraigned on a change which was new and heard only then for the first time – that, having published annals and praised M. Brutus, he had spoken of C. Cassius as the last of the Romans. The prosecutors were Satrius Secundus and Pinarius Natta, clients of Sejanus. That was ruinous for the accused, as was the callous look with which Caesar received his defence … (4.34.1-2)[7]

(London: Routledge, 1992); Pat Southern, *Domitian: Tragic Tyrant* (London: Routledge, 1997); Mark Wilson, 'After the Silence: Tacitus, Suetonius and Juvenal', in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Images, Text* ed. Anthony J. Boyle and William J. Dominik (Leiden: Boston, 2003), 523-42.

[6] The principal analyses of this passage are Anthony J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London: Croom Helm, 1988), 160-196; Ronald H. Martin and Anthony J. Woodman, *Tacitus: Annals IV* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 169-84; John Moles, 'Cry Freedom: Tacitus *Annals* 4.32-35', *Histos* 2 (1998): 95-184.

[7] Tacitus, *The Annals*, trans. Anthony J. Woodman (Indianapolis: Hakkert, 2004), 138. All references are to this edition.

This is dramatic history. The scene is the Roman senate. Cremutius Cordus, historian of the Republic, stands accused of praising opponents of tyranny. Emperor Tiberius trains his malevolent gaze upon the historian. Tiberius need not speak as his lackeys conduct the prosecution. How does Tacitus explain this turn of events? Alun Munslow holds that historical explanation depends on the historian's response to three key questions. *What happened?* This is the realm of historical fact. *How did it happen?* This is the field of historical interpretation. *Why did it happen?* This is domain of causation.[8] The current example demonstrates the utility of these questions. What happened? Cremutius is arraigned and loses his life. *How did it happen?* Cremutius writes history in a manner which might be regarded as inimical to Tiberius. He is subject to a change which is laid by sycophants of Sejanus, a leading member of the regime. Cremutius appears in the senate to deliver a speech in his defence, but then commits suicide. *Why did it happen?* It is in the interests of the two prosecutors to pursue enemies of Tiberius. Under the Republic power was shared between the leading citizens of Rome. In the *principate* power is concentrated in the hands of the *princeps* (leader/first citizen). Winning his favour is the surest route to advancement. Moreover, Cremutius ends his life because he is fully cognisant of the fact that Tiberius has determined his guilt. He has no doubts about the power of the princeps. For Tacitus, the main cause of the demise of Cremutius is the malevolence of Tiberius.

What are the features of the narrative which Tacitus presents? The dramatistic pentad of Kenneth Burke is a helpful way to approach the parts of narrative and their interaction. The pentad consists of the following components: an *agent*, an *act*, a *scene*, a *purpose* and an *agency*.[9] Developed in the context of drama and philosophy, this approach to exploring psycho-social transactions through personal narrative construction, influenced educational theorists such as Jerome Bruner.[10] In terms of history, an *agent* may be an historical actor: a person, group or process. Tacitus offers Cremutius, the prosecutors, and

[8] Alun Munslow, *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2006), 131-135.
[9] Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1969); Keith Barton and Linda S. Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good* (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2008), 130.
[10] Jerome Bruner, 'The Narrative Construction of Reality', *Critical Inquiry* 18, no. 1 (1991): 1-21; see also Rutten, Kris, and Ronald Soetaert. 'Narrative and Rhetorical Approaches to Problems of Education. Jerome Bruner and Kenneth Burke Revisited', *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 32, no. 4 (2013):327-343.

Tiberius Caesar as agents. An *act* is an event – an incident that has taken place - a change in affairs such as the arraignment of Cremutius. Here, the act is the trial of Cordus. A *scene* is the background to the narrative: the context in which events take place. In the current instance, the scene is the senate under the principate of Tiberius. In the Republic, the senate was the embodiment of liberty.[11] Now, however, the leading institution of the Republic is bereft of true authority. Ironically, it enables agents of tyranny (themselves senators) to suppress liberty. *Purpose* refers to the motive driving the action of the agent. The ostensible purpose of Cremutius is to prove his innocence. Cremutius knows that Tiberius has already made up his mind, however, so the real purpose of Cremutius Cordus runs deeper than self-preservation. History is on trial; the historian endeavours to defend his craft. Moreover, Cremutius demonstrates courage and integrity in the face of tyranny. The purpose of the prosecutors is to secure a guilty verdict, but this outcome is certain. This means that the minions of Sejanus need to pretend that the proceedings are not an exercise in hypocrisy. This enables them to curry favour with the regime. The purpose of Tiberius is to maintain his grip on power by suppressing opposition. Tiberius, however, cannot call himself king. Rome overthrew its last king in 509 B.C. and formed the Republic. The principate is built on the fiction that the Republic survives. Here, history is the most dangerous enemy since it threatens to lay bare this façade. Cremutius writes that virtue rests with opponents of the dictator and the Julian party. *Agency* is the means through which an agent acts. In the case of the arraignment, agency resides in the prosecution and the speech by the defence. Tacitus does not include any other speeches. Instead, the reader must focus on the words of Cremutius. The *princeps* exerts agency through his presence and the system which sustains his power.

The dramatistic pentad is a helpful method to identify the components of narrative and to consider the relationships between them, but it does not provide a complete account of the passage. To borrow from reader-response criticism, the pentad focuses on the world of the text, rather than the worlds of the writer or the reader.[12] The principal focus of

[11] On Tacitus and liberty, see Michael Morford, 'How Tacitus Defined Liberty', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (*ANRW*) 2.33.5 (1991): 3420-50.

[12] Reader-response criticism underscores the individuality of the reader but pays insufficient attention to prevailing conditions such as power and class. For this school of literary theory, see Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974); Norman N. Holland, *The Dynamics of Literary Response* (New York:

historical inquiry is the world of the writer.[13] It is also useful to reflect on the intended audience of a source and our own position as readers in the present. This means that the pentad is a useful addition to the instructional repertoire of the teacher, but it does not represent a comprehensive account of narrative in history as a discipline or in schools. In terms of the world of the text, the constituent elements of narrative remain the subject of debate. The components of the model interact to generate plot, but the pentad does not address its organisation. This is problematic as historical narrative uses causal chains to link events in sequence. To understand this aspect of historical narrative it is helpful to turn to classical Athens. In fact, Burke builds on Aristotelian foundations. Aristotle holds that a tragedy consists of six parts: *plot*, *character*, *thought*, *speech*, *song* and *spectacle* (*Poetics* 6). What does the application of this theory to the narrative by Tacitus reveal?

Aristotle argues that plot, the initial first element of his theory of tragedy, should consist of a beginning, middle and end (*Poetics* 7). In the case of the arraignment, the beginning is an explanatory section in which Tacitus marks the new year in the traditional manner by stating that Cornelius Cossus and Asinius Agrippa were consuls. He underscores the novelty of the charge. It sets in motion a chain of cause and consequence that will lead to the death of Cremutius Cordus. The events that have resulted in the arraignment do not receive detailed treatment. Tacitus simply provides the key information: the nature of the charge, the names of the prosecutors, and notes the vindictive gaze of Tiberius. This conforms to the Aristotelian notion of a beginning which is not dependent on anything else out of causal necessity. This is, of course, untrue. Events are linked in chains of cause and consequence. This means that historical narrative is inherently disruptive; to begin an account is to ignore some of the links that bind past events.[14] Historical narrative invites readers to accept some events and causes, and suppresses others, to form a coherent representation of the past.

Norton, 1975); Louise M. Rosenblatt, *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978); David Bleich, *Subjective Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978); Stanley E. Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1980).

[13] Sam Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 76.

[14] Frederick Pollock and Frederic William Maitland, *The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1898), 1: 'Such is the unity of all history that any one who endeavours to tell a piece of it must feel that his first sentence tears a seamless web'. Causal relationships exist in the past. They can be ignored or misrepresented, but these links cannot be broken.

The middle consists of the speech by Cremutius. It offers an opportunity for exploration of the second and third elements of the Aristotelian theory of tragedy: *character* and *thought*. The accused displays dignity and integrity. In a way, history is a character as it is also on trial. Cremutius Cordus demonstrates courage by speaking for them both. In contrast, Tiberius says nothing.[15] Nevertheless, the reader is constantly aware of his menacing presence. Much of the thought of the narrative is expressed through the words of the accused. Although he is aware that an adverse finding is the pre-determined outcome of proceedings, Cremutius opens by distinguishing between words and deeds:

> 'It is my words, conscript fathers, that are criticised, so completely am I innocent of deeds; but not even they were directed at the princeps or the princeps's parent, whom the law of treason embraces. I am said to have praised Brutus and Cassius, whose achievements, though many have compiled them, no one has recalled without honour. (4.34.1)

The condemned historian faces his accusers bravely, remarking that it is his words, not his actions, which stand accused. Nevertheless, thought is expressed through the act of diction. In the past, historians lauded Republican heroes without facing trial. Cremutius states that the historian Livy praised Pompey, an enemy of Julius Caesar, yet no harm befell him with Augustus, Caesar's heir. In this way, the charge breaches convention. Its novelty is stressed by Tacitus who describes it as 'new and heard only then for the first time' (4.34.1). Cremutius offers further precedents in which the past was not conflated with the present; for example, Cicero praised Cato, yet the only response that he had to face was rhetorical. Cremutius argues that the same was true of the Greeks: words were repaid with words. Aristotle values the delivery of words as *speech* (the fourth element of his model). The speech which Cremutius delivers is a rhetorical tour-de-force:

> 'What was particularly exempt, had no one to disparage it, was to publish about those whom death had removed from hatred or favour. For surely it is not the case that, by my having Cassius and Brutus armed and holding the plains of Philippi, I

[15] On Tiberius and speech, see Norma P. Miller, 'Tiberius Speaks: An Examination of the Utterance Ascribed to him in the *Annals* of Tacitus', *American Journal of Philology* 89, no. 1 (1968): 1-19.

> am inflaming the people in public addresses with civil war as my motive? Is it not rather the case that, slain as they were seventy years ago, they for their part come to be known by their images – which not even the victor abolished – but retain some part of their memory among writers in exactly the same way? (4.35.1-2)

Cremutius articulates the conventional view of classical antiquity that the historian may claim freedom from bias if he does not stand to benefit or suffer harm from the subjects of the work.[16] Tacitus expresses the same understanding in the preface (1.1.3). Although historical narrative is capable of conjuring Cassius, Brutus and their host, their army is in the mind of the reader. Cremutius takes the position that he is not mustering a force of his own or inciting revolt. Cremutius declares that history commemorates the deeds of Cassius and Brutus in time, just as the images of the dead were preserved by masks. If the victors at Philippi did not obliterate these traces of the past, why should the words of Cremutius lead to arraignment? Tiberius is not inclined to accept this argument. He sees the threat which history poses: the preservation of public memory. The historical narrative includes people and events that the regime wants consigned to oblivion. History has the power to expose the dominant fiction of the principate: the pretence that the Republic lives. Past and present collide because memory exists in the here and now. This insight is not lost on the accused: 'Posterity pays to every man his due repute; and, if condemnation is closing in on me, there will be no lack of those who remember not merely Cassius and Brutus but also myself' (4.35.3). Cremutius will be remembered along with heroes of the Republic. On the other hand, historians can record infamous conduct. Tiberius will have to face the judgement of history.

Aristotle argues that tragedy includes the embellishments of *song* and *spectacle*. Song refers to the use of the chorus in tragedy and is not relevant to prose. Spectacle may be understood as an aspect of narrative. The fate of Rome is determined by the clash of the armies at Philippi; the drama of the arraignment is played out on the stage of the senate. Like a Greek tragedy, the death of the protagonist takes place off stage. Tacitus concludes

[16] T. James Luce, 'Ancient Views of Causes of Bias in Historical Writing', *Classical Philology* 84 (1989): 16-31; John Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 158-74.

the drama by stating the Cremutius then departed the senate and brought his life to an end by fasting (4.35.4). From an Aristotelian perspective, the causal chain that began with the charge ends in the death of Cremutius. Having said this, Tacitus offers a further comment. To borrow from socio-linguists William Labov and Joshua Waletzky, this statement is a *coda*: a means through which narrative perspective is restored from past to present.[17] Its use by Tacitus is highly effective:

> The cremation of his books by the aediles was proposed by the fathers; but they survived, having been concealed and published. Wherefore it is pleasant to deride all the more the insensibility of those who, by virtue of their present powerfulness, believe that the memory of a subsequent age too can be extinguished. On the contrary, the influence of punished talents swells, nor have foreign kings, or those who have resorted to the same savagery, accomplished anything except disrepute for themselves and for their victims glory. (4.35.5)

The writings of the historian endure. The magisterial authority of history – its authority to commemorate and condemn – is confirmed. The reader is drawn beyond the reign of Tiberius. The historian here achieves a form of immortality by shaping the memory of ages to come. This is a special triumph. Cremutius and Tacitus share the laurels.

Tacitus and his Audience

There is a further element which we must consider: Cremutius did not deliver this speech. In the words of the Tacitean scholar, Sir Ronald Syme: 'The speech is all Tacitus'.[18] Where does this leave us? The creation of a speech is clearly at odds with modern historiography. Leopold von Ranke exhorted historians to show the past as it was (*wie es eigentlich gewesen*).[19] He called for a scientific history in which the analysis of primary

[17] William Labov and Joshua Waletzky, 'Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience', in *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, ed. June Helm (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967), 12-44; see also William Labov, *Language in the Inner City* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Press, 1972).
[18] Ronald Syme, *Tacitus* vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 337 n.10.
[19] Leopold von Ranke, Preface to *Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations from 1494 to 1514*. In *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present*, ed. Fritz Stern (London: Macmillan, 1956), 55-58. The translation of this dictum is the subject of debate; see Richard Evans, *In Defence of History* (London: Granta Books, 1997), 17: 'The German phrase which Ranke used – "Wie es eigentlich gewesen" – is better translated as "how it essentially was", for Ranke meant not that he just wanted to collect facts, but that he sought to understand the inner being of the past'.

sources was paramount; Ranke has exerted a profound influence on the practice of history as a discipline. From the perspective of nineteenth century positivism, the composition of a speech is at odds with the pursuit of historical fact. As Lévesque notes, this approach to writing history confuses evidence with fiction.[20]

In his digression on method, the historian Thucydides – one of the founders of history as a form of critical inquiry – reflects on the place of speeches in his work (1.22.1). He writes that the speeches in the text are as close as possible to the words that were spoken, but he also acknowledges his role in composing them as part of his masterpiece (See Chapter 3). The ambiguity of this sentence has been long been the subject of debate in Thucydidean scholarship. It is clear, however, that creation of speeches was an accepted convention of historical narration in the classical world. To dismiss ancient historiography because its conventions differ from those of modern scholarship is deeply problematic. Such a view fosters an ahistorical perspective on the discipline: history is not the creation of Leopold von Ranke. We should not conflate inquiry, explanation and narrative. It does not follow that a device of historical narrative in antiquity should void Greco-Roman historiography of meaning. Tacitus employs a convention, an understanding between writer and reader, to offer a truth. He is trying to make a point about the historian's didactic purpose in writing history and the alienating effect of history on the contemporary reader. To understand this point, we must turn to the reflection on history writing which precedes the arraignment of Cremutius Cordus.

In the section of the *Annals* which precedes the arraignment, Tacitus breaks off the narrative to present a digression on history writing. Over the previous chapters, he recounts the vindictive intrigue which has come to dominate Rome. The history is replete with stories of accusations, trials and suicide. In the previous chapter, for example, Tacitus tells the story of a member of the equestrian order who was convicted for a derogatory poem about Tiberius. He also recounts how P. Suillius was expelled from the senate as a penalty for corruption. This is different to the kind of history written by his predecessors; rather than offering examples of *virtus* (manly vigour and courage

[20] Stéphane Lévesque, *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the Twenty-First Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 21.

exercised in the service of state), Tacitus depicts the worst kinds of behaviour. The subject matter of the historical narrative is at odds with the expectations of his readers
:

> That much of what I have recorded, and of what I shall record, seems perhaps insignificant and trivial to recall I am not unaware; but no one should compare my annals with the writing of those who compiled the affairs of the Roman people of old. Mighty wars, stormings of cities, routed and captured kings, or – whenever they turned their attention to internal matters – discord between consuls and tribunes, agrarian and grain laws, and contests of plebs and optimates – it was these which they recalled and had the freedom to explore. My work, on the other hand, is confined and inglorious: peace was immovable or only modestly challenged, affairs in the City were sorrowful, and the princeps indifferent to extending the empire. (4.32.1-2)

The disturbing subject matter which confronts Tacitus forces him to write a new kind of history. Before the creation of the principate, members of the Roman elite exercised *virtus* by serving the state (*res publica* or 'common wealth'). The task of the historian was to preserve such deeds for posterity. Successful service enabled men to climb the *cursus honorum*: the series of offices that defined a career in public life. Under the principate, the *cursus honorum* is controlled by Caesar. Power is not shared. *Virtus* does not function in the traditional way. It is no coincidence that this digression precedes the arraignment of Cremutius. Praising the *virtus* of Brutus and Cassius leads Cremutius to disaster. The *princeps* condemns Republican history. The changed political context means that courage in the face of tyranny is the new *virtus*.[21] This demands a new kind of history. It is this that Tacitus sets out to write.

[21] Ronald Mellor, *The Roman Historians* (London: Routledge, 1999), 95: 'Tacitus told stories of traditional *virtus*, but a central theme of his history is to relate the loss of virtus to the loss of political freedom at Rome. Hence Tacitus saw moral courage as needed in the political arena more than the battlefield, and if Livy's heroes are Horatius and Camillus, Tacitus' are senators like Thrasea and Helvidius who suffered martyrdom for their political beliefs, and his own contemporaries who endured the terror of Domitian. Courage in the face of hopelessness is the *virtus* of the subjects of tyrants'.

The new history that Tacitus offers is written under the principate. His own context and that of his readers is not the Republic. He understands his audience, but his subject matter offers little entertainment: 'It is the localities of peoples, the fluctuations of battles, and the fates of brilliant leaders which rivet and reinvigorate readers' minds; but in my case it is savage orders, constant accusations, deceitful friendships, the ruin of innocents and always the same reasons for their extermination that I link together, confronted as I am by a satiety of similar material' (4.33.3). Instead, readers of the *Annals* must learn to follow a narrative which investigates moral decay. The arraignment of Cremutius Cordus should not be read as literal truth. The digression and the arraignment narrative function together form a vehicle for Tacitean historical explanation. He expresses the insight that the principate has rendered the Republican form of *virtus* untenable. Tacitus and his intended readers must seek a new path. In the Tacitean conception of historical narrative the reader counts. He positions the reader carefully from the start of the *Annals*:

> The City of Rome from its inception was held by kings; freedom and the consulship were established by L. Brutus. Dictatorships were taken up only on occasion, and neither did decemviral power remain in effect beyond two years, nor the military tribunes' consular prerogative for long. Not for Cinna nor for Sulla was there lengthy domination, and the powerfulness of Pompeius and Crassus passed quickly to Caesar, the armies of Lepidus and Antonius to Augustus, who with the name of princeps took everything, exhausted as it now was by civil dissensions, under his command (1.1.1).

Ronald Martin holds that it is in the structure of an historical account that the purpose of the historian is most evident.[22] If this is the case, then readers must pay special attention to the beginning, middle and end of an historical narrative. In the case of the *Annals*, Tacitus underscores the trajectory of his historical inquiry by placing the City of Rome (*urbem Romam*) as the initial words of the opening line. Moreover, the Latin alludes to the monographs of Sallust.[23] This intertextual technique enables Tacitus to situate his

[22] Ronald H. Martin, 'Structure and Interpretation in the *Annals* of Tacitus', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (*ANRW*) 2.33.2 (1990): 1501.
[23] Anthony J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, 167-8.

work alongside that of his predecessor. Sallust depicts the fading years of the Republic; Tacitus explores the decay of Roman political life under the principate, yet both present histories of disillusionment.[24] Tacitus combines freedom and the most important elected office in Rome in a doublet (*libertatem et consulatum*); under the Republic it was unnecessary to use both words, but now the Senate is no longer free and the consulship is controlled by the princeps.[25] Tacitus notes the exceptional nature of dictatorships and the brief tenure of other offices. The next sentence possesses irresistible momentum; Tacitus names a series of figures who have sought to dominate Rome. Friedrich Klinger reads this as an account of freedom at Rome, but it is best understood as a history of threats to liberty.[26] By the end of the sentence, power is concentrated in the hands of Augustus. Tacitus uses this to frame his narrative account of the reign of the first princeps.

> When after the slaughter of Brutus and Cassius there were no more republican armies and Pompeius had been overwhelmed off Sicily, and, with Lepidus cast aside and Antonius killed, not even the Julian party had any leader left but Caesar, he, putting aside the name of triumvir, presented himself as consul and as content with the tribunician prerogative for protecting the plebs; but, when he had enticed the soldiery with gifts, the people with food, and everyone with the sweetness of inactivity, he rose up gradually and drew to himself the responsibilities of senate, magistracies, and laws – without a single adversary since the most defiant had fallen in the battle line or by proscription and the rest of the nobles, each in proportion to his readiness for servitude, were being exalted by wealth and honours and, enhanced by revolution, preferred the protection of the present to the perils of old (1.2.1).

In a single grand sentence, Tacitus presents a compelling account of the rise of Augustus. The historian covers the same material that was so costly to Cremutius Cordus. Let us ask

[24] Ronald Syme, 'Thucydides', in *Roman Papers* vol. 6, ed. Anthony R. Birley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 84; John A. Whitehouse, 'Historians of Disillusionment', *Iris* 20 (2008): 13-19.
[25] Christina S. Kraus and Anthony J. Woodman, *Latin Historians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 94. Livy writes that law prevails over men in the Republic (2.1). This is the foundation of freedom. Elected magistrates only hold office for one year.
[26] Friedrich Klinger, *Tacitus über Augustus und Tiberius: Interpretationen zum Eingangder Annalen* (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1954); cf. Michael M. Sage, 'Tacitus' Historical Works', *ANRW* 2.33.2 (1990), 971 n.611.

the questions that define historical explanation for Munslow. *What happened?* Octavian has become master of Rome. *How did it happen?* Julian forces defeated the army led by Brutus and Cassius, the Second Triumvirate disintegrated, and even the victorious party itself had eliminated leaders other than Caesar. Military power is insufficient to enable the absolute domination which the princeps seeks. Instead, he cloaks his ambition in the forms of the Republic by discarding the special title of triumvir in favour of the traditional office of consul. This, however, is only the start. Unopposed, Augustus comes to dominate the instruments of government in an insidious process of revolution.[27] *Why did it happen?* The aim of Augustus is to dominate. His opponents have lost their lives though war or execution. Romans are complicit in their subjugation. The greater the preparedness of aristocrats to accept the new regime, the greater the reward that they receive from it. Oppressor and oppressed are products of the same diseased state. The collapse of the Republic is a moral failure. Military and naval victories are necessary causes for the rise of Augustus. They do not explain the whole story, however. For Tacitus, the underlying cause of events is the disease in the Roman body politic.

In his reflection on history as discourse, Michael Stanford suggests that historical narrative is comprised of twelve elements: *beginning*, *subject*, *events*, *characters*, *setting*, *sequence*, *plot*, *perspective*, *verisimilitude*, *internal time*, *ending* and *truth*.[28] Stanford builds on Aristotelian foundations. A narrative maintains structural cohesion through a *beginning* to an *ending*. *Subject* refers to the content of the narrative. Historical narrative consists of a series of *events* that relate to each other. As history takes as its focus human action in the past, *characters* (historical actors) are indispensable to an historical narrative. Having said this, historical actors may include groups of people or institutions (such as nation-states). *Setting* is central as historical narrative is an explanation of human action in a specific time and place. *Sequence* refers to the temporal organisation of events. *Plot* draws together the beginning, middle and end in a coherent whole. Aristotle understood plot as 'the construction of events' (*Poetics* 6).[29] *Perspective* is central to

[27] Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960).
[28] Michael Stanford, *A Companion to the Study of History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 88-92.
[29] Aristotle, Longinus, Demetrius. *Poetics. Longinus: On the Sublime. Demetrius: On Style*, translated by Stephen Halliwell, W. Hamilton Fyfe, Doreen C. Innes, W. Rhys Roberts. Revised by Donald A. Russell, Loeb Classical Library 199 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 49.

historical writing: the past is always depicted from a certain point of view. *Verisimilitude* is also important; an historical narrative must be convincing. *Internal time* allows the historian to concentrate on some events more deeply than others; the temporal organisation of historical narrative means that centuries may pass in a few sentences, but an event may be examined over the course of chapters. Lastly, history distinguishes itself from fiction, because it seeks to present an authentic treatment of the past.

How might the features of narrative that Stanford presents assist us to analyse Tacitus' chapter on the rise of Augustus? The narrative begins with the demise of the opponents of the *princeps*. It ends with Augustus supreme and the laws themselves compromised. The events include the defeats suffered by Augustus' rivals in the closing years of the Republic, the constitutional manoeuvres of Augustus and the compliant response of the people. The historical actors are Octavian, his opponents Brutus and Cassius, Sextus Pompey, triumvirs Lepidus and Antony, the Roman nobility and people. The setting of the narrative is the empire, with the city of Rome at its political heart. The sequence charts the demise of freedom; the narrative moves from instances of defiance, through the machinations of Augustus, to the pervasive servitude of the Roman people. The plot captures the insidious way that Augustus draws power to himself. Perspective enables Tacitus to express this moral. Having survived, and, indeed prospered under the tyranny of Domitian, he trains his historical gaze on the foundation of the system of government that defines his own context. Causal relationships between the events of the account are convincing: Augustus defeats his adversaries, takes power and corrupts Rome. The internal time of the narrative covers a span of years in a few lines. The chapter ends with the subjugation of Rome and the corruption of law. The truth that Tacitus tried to offer through his historical narrative would have had profound resonance with the intended audience of the work (the senatorial and knightly orders): there is disease in the Roman body politic.

The features of narrative delineated by Stanford distinguish it from other rhetorical forms. Having considered the difference between fictional and historical narratives for each part of his model, Stanford concludes that the essential difference between fiction and history

is that 'history purports to be true; fiction does not.'[30] Drawing on the scholarship of Michael Lemon, Alun Munslow holds that the distinguishing feature of historical writing is *referentiality*.[31] Historical narrative presents itself as depicting the past in an authentic manner. Most contemporary historians subscribe to correspondence theory to some degree: the idea that truth resides in the correlation between the historical account and the past.[32] Having said this, the past is not directly available to the historian. Instead, historical knowledge rests on inferences drawn from sources. To be judged as historical by the contemporary discipline, a narrative must be supported by evidence. In classical antiquity, however, aspects of historical writing and the expectations of the audience differed from those of the modern world.

The senatorial and equestrian elite who comprised the intended audience of the text would have known that Cremutius did not deliver the speech that Tacitus has him present. They would have viewed the conventions of the narrative a way to convey meaning: Tacitus is making a point about the relationship between history, power and leaders of the state.[33] To grasp that point, it is necessary to consider the placement of the trial narrative within the text. The frustration and disillusionment that Tacitus experiences leads him to put history itself on trial. Just because the events did not occur in the way that Tacitus presents them does not mean that we should simply discard his contribution to historical inquiry. Tacitus employs a convention of history writing in classical antiquity to offer a truth. The challenge is for the modern reader to consider the narrative from the perspective of the intended audience of the work. This community of readers would have been aware of the facts of the matter. They also lived under the political system in which Cordus loses his

[30] Michael Stanford, *Companion*, 92.
[31] Alun Munslow, *Deconstructing History* (London: Routledge, 1997), 4: 'What, then, is the relationship of history to its closest neighbour, literature? The bottom line seems to be one of referentiality. I take this to mean the accuracy with which the narrative relates what actually happened in the past. As Lemon argues, while literature is not wholly "devoid of referentiality", it is "not referential in the same manner" as the historical text'. See also M. C. Lemon, *The Discipline of History and the History of Thought* (London: Routledge, 1995).
[32] Alun Munslow, *Narrative and History* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Pallgrave Macmillan, 2007), 131.
[33] Reader Response Theory would argue that the intended audience of the *Annals* constitutes an interpretive community; Stanley E. Fish, 'Interpreting the *Variorum*', *Critical Inquiry* 2, no. 3 (1976): 483: 'Interpretive communities are made up of those who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. In other words these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore determine the shape of what is read rather than, as is usually assumed, the other way around.'

life. Such an audience valued the message that history is the opponent of tyrants. Tacitus also observes that changing political circumstances demand that virtue finds new forms of expression. This includes the writing of history.

Teaching and Learning: Historical Narrative

Researchers distinguish between different types of history in schools. Peter Seixas identifies three forms of the subject.[34] The first type – 'enhancing collective memory' – presents history as heritage. Following Hegel, the proper subject of this form of history is the state: the nation is how progress is achieved. The grand narrative charts the progress of the state. David Lowenthal argues that this approach is 'heritage' rather than 'history' as it does not foster historical inquiry, but instead favours transmission of knowledge in a way that ignores disciplinary processes.[35] Pierre Nora calls this 'memory-history' due to its epistemological naïveté and conservative function.[36] In the absence of disciplinary structures, this form of history is adrift in a perpetual present, unconscious of the processes through which historical knowledge is established and lacking critical evaluation of the uses to which it is put. Stéphane Lévesque employs the term in his critique of the limitations of such history: 'memory-history, as an unscientific study of history, subject to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, supplies no formal evaluating principle or adequate answer to the challenges of the new global (dis)order and the conflicting memories and collective claims about the past that it has engendered'.[37] In an increasingly complex, multifaceted and integrated world, memory history offers a simplistic, narrow, and one dimensional perspective.

---

[34] Peter Seixas, 'Schweigen! die Kinder! or, Does Postmodern History Have a Place in Schools?', in *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, ed. Peter Stearns, Peter Seixas and Sam Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000). 19-37. Alun Munslow distinguishes between three kinds of historians. *Reconstructionist historians* attempt to present the past as it happened. *Constructionist historians* employ social theory to explain the past (e. g. Marxist historians). *Deconstructionist historians* insist on the inseparability of meaning and form in their writing. See Alun Munslow, *Deconstructing History* (London: Routledge, 1997); For the application of these categories to schools, see Robert J. Parkes, 'Teaching History as Historiography: Engaging Narrative Diversity in the Curriculum', *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research* 8, no. 2 (2009): 118-132.

[35] David Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[36] Pierre Nora, 'General Introduction. Between Memory and History' in *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past,* ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 1-20.

[37] Stéphane Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 6-7.

'Disciplinary-history' is the second type of history identified by Seixas. It also represents the second form of the subject in the dichotomies postulated by Nora and Lowenthal. In *The Process of Education*, Jerome Bruner holds that the disciplines as practices and organizing ideas can be taught to school students in an authentic manner.[38] This insight has had a profound effect on the practice of many history teachers, but its full implications are yet to be realised. Building on the work of Bruner, Paul Hirst and Philip Phenix developed the 'disciplines thesis': the notion that there are distinctive forms of knowledge and that they may be used to define the curriculum. For Hirst, at least seven forms of knowledge are essential to a liberal education: 'mathematics, physical sciences, human sciences, history, religion, literature and the fine arts, philosophy'.[39] Each of these forms is distinguished by the method(s) it uses to test the truth of a proposition. Forms differ in their key concepts, structure and modes of truth testing. Phenix concurs that disciplines should shape the curriculum, but his approach integrates and connects these as six 'realms of meaning'. The result privileges syntax over substantive knowledge.[40] Kenneth Ruthven argues that the definitions of disciplines offered by Hirst and Phenix do not adequately address their practical and political construction in any period.[41] Working in changing circumstances, the historian responds to aspects of the historical record that are erroneous or incomplete. The resultant inquiry can redefine our understanding of the past.

Practice is inevitably shaped by social purpose, here of history teaching. Elliot Eisner and Elizabeth Valance offer five conflicting conceptions of curriculum.[42] Disciplinary history

[38] Jerome Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960).
[39] Paul Hirst, *Knowledge and the Curriculum: A Collection of Philosophical Papers* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), 46.
[40] Philip H. Phenix, *Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education* (New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. 1964). For useful discussion, see William F. Pinar, William M. Reynolds, Patrick Slattery and Peter M. Taubman, *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses* (New York: Peter Lang, 1995), 170. See also Arthur R. King and John A. Brownwell, *The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge: A Theory of Curriculum Practice* (New York: Wiley, 1966).
[41] Kenneth Ruthven, 'The Disciplines Thesis and the Curriculum: A Case Study', *British Journal of Educational Studies* 26, no. 2 (1978): 163-176.
[42] Elliot W. Eisner and Elizabeth Vallance, 'Introduction – Five Conceptions of Curriculum: Their Roots and Implications for Curriculum Planning', in *Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum*, ed. Elliot W. Eisner and Elizabeth Vallance (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974), 1-18. The authors identify five different approaches to the curriculum: *the development of cognitive processes*, *curriculum as technology*, *self-actualisation* (*or curriculum as consummatory experience*), *social reconstruction-relevance* and *academic rationalism.*

aligns with the academic rationalist approach offered by these writers.[43] Students engage in historical inquiry (this may include evaluation of rival historical narratives). The aim is for each student to construct a valid interpretation of the past. Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby observe that approach involves the use of substantive concepts related to the period under study such as democracy, revolution and immigration, as well as procedural concepts such as significance, causation, continuity and change.[44] Brunerian in character, disciplinary history draws students into the practices of the discipline for the purpose of pedagogy.[45] Although this form differs from heritage history, learning and teaching in disciplinary history also occur in a socio-political context. History links the individual and society through exploration of shared stories. Its magisterial effect in public debate makes it a site of contest. Furthermore, the historical arguments formulated by students through disciplined inquiry may have implications for the present. In terms of discussion about the classroom, the procedural concepts that underpin disciplinary history offer a way to talk about learning and teaching that is not limited to issues of substantive content (subject matter).

The prevailing discussion in research on learning and teaching history adopts a focus on this form: subject as discipline. The restrictive parameters of history as heritage, the first approach, close more opportunities for learning than they generate. Seixas also points to a third form: 'postmodern history'. Informed by the postmodern critique of knowledge, this approach to the subject regards historical interpretation as an imposition on the past. Postmodernism sees meaning as unstable, inherently subjective and inextricably bound up with language. Engagement with multiple narratives, issues of representation, and an interest in the uses to which historical interpretations are put characterise this form of history. Clearly, narrative is central to all three forms of history. How then might history teachers who value inquiry and debate employ narrative in their classrooms?

[43] The disciplines represent the most effective ways to respond to foundational questions about the world in which we live; see Howard Gardner and Veronica Boix-Mansilla, 'Teaching for Understanding in the Disciples – and Beyond', *Teachers College Record* 96, no. 2 (1994): 198-218.
[44] Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby, 'Progression in Historical Understanding Among Students Ages 7-14', in *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History*, 199-222.
[45] Chris Husbands, *What is History Teaching? Language, Ideas and Meaning in Learning about the Past* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996), 44-5.

History, Narrative and Pedagogy

Munslow offers the following definition of the place of narrative in history:

> Narrative is central to historical explanation as the vehicle for the creation and representation of historical knowledge and historical explanation. What is narrative? For the historian it is the telling of an event or connected flow of events, by a narrator/author (the writer/historian) to a narratee (the actual/imagined reader) and rarely is it so obtuse (akin to a scientific narrative) that it is cast in other than a relatively jargon-free language.[46]

The dominant mode of historical explanation is narrative. This is the case in the discipline and the classroom. Anne Curthoys and John Docker observe that a fundamental tension has existed in history as a form of critical inquiry since its inception in classical antiquity: history as rigorous inquiry into the past, and history as literary endeavour. Historical narrative is defined by this duality. Historians use primary sources to discern causal relationships between events. The resultant chains of cause and consequence are the building blocks of narrative. This means that historical narrative is an explanation of the past; it is not the past. The creation of any historical narrative necessitates interpretation.[47] For W. B. Gallie, historical understanding *is* the ability to follow such a narrative.[48] This overstates the case as historical understanding includes the capacity to engage in inquiry and argument. Nevertheless, historical understanding empowers the reader to approach historical narratives in a critical way. The importance of narrative to the discipline means that history teachers must consider its pedagogical significance. A useful starting point is an accessible model of historical narrative developed by Stéphane Lévesque.

---

[46] Alun Munslow, *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*, 180.

[47] Linda S. Levstik and Keith C. Barton, *Doing History: Investigating with Children in Elementary and Middle Schools* 5th ed (New York: Routledge, 2015), 5: 'whenever history is told as a narrative, someone has to decide when the story begins and ends, what is included or left out, and which events appear as problems or solutions. As a result, historical narratives always involve interpretation: Someone decides *how* to tell the story'.

[48] Walter B. Gallie, *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1964), 105: 'Historical understanding is the exercise of the capacity to follow a story, where the story is known to be based on evidence and is put forward as a sincere effort to get at *the* story so far as the evidence and the writer's general knowledge and intelligence allow. But to follow an historical narrative always requires the acceptance, from time to time, of explanations which have the effect of enabling one to follow further when one's vision was becoming blurred or one's credulity taxed beyond patience'.

Lévesque adapts the work of Stanford to make it manageable in the classroom. This model consists of six parts: *subject matter, characters, sequence of events, evidence, moral* and *perspective*.[49] *Subject matter* refers to the content of the narrative. Historical narrative takes as its focus human action in the past. *Characters* (historical actors) are necessary to set the narrative in motion. Historical actors encompass groups of people or institutional structures (such as nation-states). *Sequence of events* pertains to the organisation of events in time. Historical interpretation results in the selection of events and the presentation of relationships between them.[50] These first three elements of this narrative framework, as well as the fifth and sixth, may also apply to fiction. The fourth component, *evidence*, grounds the framework in history as a discipline. Sources must be selected, interpreted and evaluated for use as evidence. The fifth part of the framework is the *moral*. Implicit or explicit morals are at work in every story. The value structure of the historian informs the selection of events, the depiction of historical actors and authorial comment. The final component of the framework is *perspective*. Historical actors and narrators are anchored in time. Values at work in the past are not necessarily those of the historian. Nevertheless, ideological frameworks define the way in which people, ideas and events are perceived during the period in question and across time. Historical narrative must negotiate these complexities. It provides a structure for historical understanding.

Narrative is central to the way in which students understand time: story offers a means of making sense of the past.[51] Bruner distinguishes between two ways in which we make

[49] Stéphane Lévesque, 'Rethinking the 'Bush Doctrine': Historical Thinking and Post-September 11 Terrorism', *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research* 7 (2007). Retrieved from https://history.org.uk/publications/categories/304/resource/4862/the-international-journal-volume-7-number-1

[50] Barton and Levstik, *Doing History*, 6: 'Even when the factual events of history can be established, their meaning – their arrangement in a narrative – is always a matter of interpretation'.

[51] Linda S. Levstik, 'The Relationship between Historical Response and Narrative in a Sixth-Grade Classroom', *Theory and Research in Social Education* 14, no 1 (1986): 1-19; Linda S. Levstik, 'Historical Narrative and the Young Reader', *Theory into Practice* 28, no 2 (1989): 114-119; Bruce VanSledright and Jere Brophy, 'Storytelling, Imagination and Fanciful Elaboration in Children's Historical Reconstructions', *American Educational Research Journal* 29, no. 4 (1992): 837-59; Linda S. Levstik, 'Narrative Constructions: Cultural Frames for History,' *The Social Studies* 86, no. 3 (1995): 113-116; Keith Barton, 'Narrative Simplifications in Elementary Students' Historical Thinking', in *Advances in Research on Teaching* vol. 6, *Teaching and Learning in History*, ed. Jere Brophy (Greenwich, CO: JAI Press, 1996), 56-60; Grant Bage, *Narrative Matters: Teaching and Learning History Through Story* (London: Falmer Press, 1999); Keith Barton and Linda S. Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good* (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2008), 129-149.

sense of the world: narrative and paradigmatic thought.[52] Each mode creates meaning in different ways; one cannot be reduced to the other. Narrative thought enables the construction of meaning through story. Its object is verisimilitude. In contrast, paradigmatic thought verifies truth claims through proofs and experimentation. Narrative grapples with subjective human experience; the paradigmatic mode engages with abstract forms and the universal. Narrative thinking underpins the humanities; paradigmatic thought is foundational to the sciences. If the distinction that Bruner draws is correct, then history offers disciplinary processes to the narrative mode of discourse. Having said this, it may be a simplification to confine history to narrative. Nevertheless, the research of Bruner underscores the centrality of narrative to learning. The work of the history teacher involves more than interaction with an individual mind: teachers must engage with groups of students, ideology and informal social constructs (Raymond Williams describes these as 'structures of feeling').[53] In this light, what is the place of narrative in the history classroom?

The present research presents a five-part model to inform the work of teachers of disciplinary history. The first part of the model is *involvement and engagement*. Prawat notes that dealing with motivation and learning separately is unhelpful; expert teachers do not doubt the importance of capturing the imagination of students as instruction moves these learners from the known to the unknown.[54] Fine historical writing reflects this insight. Consider, for example, how Christian Meier opens his history of Athens:

> In the late summer of 480 BC, most likely toward the end of September, a dramatic, heartrending scene played out on the coast of Attica. Athens' entire population, including men, women, children and slaves, was fleeing from the approaching Persian army. Only a few people remained, mostly the old, the

[52] Jerome Bruner, *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).
[53] The concept of 'structures of feeling' accounts for change more effectively than Antonio Gramsci's idea of hegemony. Hegemony refers to the dominant ideology underpinning society: common sense thought that underpins power relations between groups. 'Structures of feeling' are emergent mindsets that may not be fully defined. These shared perceptions lack the systematic character of ideology. See Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1961).
[54] Richard S. Prawat, 'Current Self-Regulation Views of Learning and Motivation Viewed Through a Deweyan Lens: The Problems with Dualism', *American Educational Research Journal* 35, no. 2 (1998): 199-224.

> infirm, and a few priests. The Athenians left behind the graves of their ancestors, their shrines, homes, fields, and plantations, entrusting them to the protection of their goddess, Athena. Horses, donkeys, and dogs may have accompanied the convoy as far as the harbour, but there they, too, presumably had to be left behind. There was hardly enough room on the ships for the 100,000 or more human beings, much less their animals. The Athenians did take along the statues of some gods, at least the wooden figure of Athena, for safekeeping and probably also to invoke the goddess's assistance.[55]

This is evocative historical writing. The reader experiences a sense of being transported to Athens. Every detail that the historian includes is replete with pathos. We encounter the fear of the Athenians as they flee the Persian host. We feel something of the loss of the men, women and children as they abandon their home. The few people who remain face death at the hands of the invading army; the atmosphere is foreboding. Hoping for the protection of their patron goddess, they carry the statue of Athena from the old Parthenon. In a way, she has been cast out with them. As they board the ships, they step into an uncertain future. They may never return home. The world has been shattered and it is unclear how, or if, it will be restored. In the hands of a teacher, such a narrative can be used to foster the predisposition to learn *and* to engage students in historical thinking. The second way in which the teacher employs narrative in the history classroom is as a *mode of explanation*. The historian uses narrative to explain the past, so too do teachers and students. To discuss the explanations offered by teachers it is useful to return to the four types of historical questions offered by Van Drie and Van Boxtel: *descriptive, causal, comparative* and *evaluative*.[56] These are not the only kinds of questions that might be asked in a history classroom, but they form a useful guide. We will begin with the first three types in the context of the previous example. What were the Greco-Persian wars? What caused the conflict? What were the similarities and differences between the Greco-Persian Wars and the Peloponnesian War? The explanations offered in response to such questions afford teachers the opportunity to model historical thinking for students. The

[55] Christian Meier, *Athens: A Portrait of the City in its Golden Age*, trans. Robert Kimber and Rita Kimber (London: Pimlico, 2000), 3.
[56] Jannet van Drie and Carla van Boxtel, 'Historical Reasoning: Towards a Framework for Analyzing Students' Reasoning about the Past', *Educational Psychology Review* 20, no. 2 (2008): 87-110.

first question invites the teacher to present a basic account of the past. This provides a springboard for further learning. The second question draws attention to the causal relationships that enable the narrative offered by the teacher to retain coherence. Identification of further causes may call aspects of the initial account into question. Comparative questions may lead teachers to present accounts of the past that students can read against each other. This affords rich opportunities for historical thought. Evaluative questions invite judgments of worth. For example, how much emphasis should we give war as a catalyst of historical change? Such questions offer many opportunities for teachers to model and guide. Furthermore, the explanations of the past that students bring to the classroom are the starting point for learning. As a result of instruction, the narrative explanations of the past that students offer should reflect historical thinking. Teachers need to design learning activities that enable students to use, and to explain their use, of historical thinking concepts. Historical understanding must also be captured in the assessment tasks that students complete.

Third, teachers use narrative to provide a *context for historical inquiry*. An investigation of the causes of World War Two, for example, could open with an account of Neville Chamberlain and the events of 30 September 1938. It was on this day that the British Prime Minister returned home from Germany. In his meeting with Hitler, Chamberlain signed the Munich Agreement that permitted Germany to annex the border regions of Czechoslovakia. Speaking at Heston Aerodrome, Chamberlain announced the fruits of the policy of appeasement: the pact was ‘only the prelude to a larger settlement in which all Europe may find peace’. In triumph, he held aloft the declaration as evidence a peaceful future before reading it to the crowd. Later, outside 10 Downing Street, he proclaimed that the note with his signature and that of the German Führer heralded ‘Peace for our time’. In less than a year, Great Britain and her allies would be at war with Germany. It is hard to overstate the irony of these events.

What was the historical significance of the policy of appeasement? What caused the British government to pursue this policy? How were the events of 1938 understood by people at the time? How does our own position in time shape the way in which we perceive the same events? These are rich questions for historical inquiry. Although the

key primary source for this inquiry could be the Anglo-German Agreement, the film footage of Chamberlain disembarking from his airplane and delivering his speech is far more engaging. Moreover, the cheers of the crowd demonstrate the perils of regarding appeasement as the sole responsibility of Neville Chamberlain. Time has generated many interpretations of the events by historians, some more sympathetic to the British Prime Minister than others. Historical inquiry would need to reach back to the Great War and its aftermath, as well as forward into the Second World War. Narrative thus enables teachers to construct a framework for inquiry. It is through such inquiry that students can use the procedural concepts presented in the various historical thinking models.

Robert Mayer observes that students need to attend to the narrative offered by the teacher and to consider the way in which it has been constructed. Historical narrative rests on source material.[57] The distinction that Frederick Drake and Sarah Drake Brown draw between first, second and third-order sources may be applied here (see Chapter 3).[58] The first-order source is foundational to the inquiry. Second-order sources confirm aspects of the initial source or call it into question. Third-order sources are discovered by students through their own inquiry. The narrative that the teacher constructs to contextualise the first-order source shapes learning. The creative tension between the first and second-order sources generates further opportunities for teachers to explain and contextualise. The treatment of the first- and second-order sources provides a springboard for students to engage in historical inquiry using third-order sources.

Fourth, narrative is a *form of source*. The use of primary sources by the teacher enables students to engage in historical thinking. The heuristics identified by Wineburg apply to the treatment of narrative sources.[59] The first of these – *sourcing* – is foundational. It is necessary to recognise a narrative to offer a meaningful interpretation of it. The features of narrative identified by Lévesque are valuable here. Following recognition of form, a

[57] Robert H. Mayer, 'Connecting Narrative and Historical Thinking: A Research-based approach to Teaching History', *Social Education* 62, no. 2 (1998): 97-100.
[58] Frederic Drake and Sarah Drake Brown. 'A Systematic Approach to Improve Students' Historical Thinking', *The History Teacher* 36, no. 4 (2003): 465-489.
[59] Sam Wineburg, 'Historical Problem Solving: A Study of the Cognitive Processes Used in the Evaluation of Documentary and Pictorial Evidence', *Journal of Educational Psychology 83*, no. 1 (1991): 73-87; Sam Wineburg, 'Reading Abraham Lincoln: An Expert/Expert Study in the Interpretation of Historical Texts', *Cognitive Science* 22, no. 3: (1998): 319-346.

series of questions remain. Who composed the narrative? When and where was it created? Why? Answers to these questions anchor the narrative in place and time. Such questions invite students to abandon the naïve perception of sources as unproblematic and free of bias. They also establish a foundation for the second heuristic: *contextualising*. What links can the student establish between the narrative and the world in which it was produced? What mindset is at work? The third heuristic is *corroborating*. This invites students to evaluate the narrative: the source is checked against others to determine its reliability. In discussing narrative texts, Linda Levstik notes that the critical analysis of such material by students rests on mediation by the teacher. [60] It is useful to consider the implications for the use of textbooks in the classroom. The historical narrative presented in a textbook may be pedagogically useful, but it is not the only version of the past. Historical inquiry requires exploration of further sources. It is valuable for teachers to speak in these terms.

The fifth component of the model is narrative as the *outcome of historical inquiry*. Narrative is the preferred form of writing for many students, but the argumentative essay tends to promote greater understanding.[61] Nevertheless, narrative is central to the practice of history. Should it not follow that a Brunerian treatment of the subject invites students to write about the past in the form of narrative? There are opportunities and dangers here. It is necessary for teachers to formulate activities that position narrative as the *outcome* of an investigation. This approach means that students are not required simply to impose a fictive overlay on material from a textbook or repeat an account in their own words. Instead, the narrative is the response to a question. The narrative must explain the past. Narrative connects events though causal chains. The arrangement of causes constitutes an interpretation, an argument. Such insights must be manifest in the writing. The student's narrative must be supported by evidence. In short, it must reflect historical thinking. Disciplinary rigour matters.

[60] Linda S. Levstik, '"Any History is Someone's History": Listening to Multiple Voices from the Past', *Social Education* 61, no. 1 (1997): 48-51.
[61] James Voss and Jennifer Wiley, 'A Case Study of Developing Historical Understanding via Instruction: The Importance of Integrating Text Components and Constructing Arguments', in Stearns et al., *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History*, 375-89; Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 136-138.

One might object to the focus on procedural or 'syntactical' knowledge in this chapter by arguing that it fails to engage with the selection of substantive content. In the context of his own work, Rom Harré warns against the enchantment of substantivalism (a reliance on vocabulary at the expense of syntax).[62] Excessive focus on substantive content often works its spell on the development of history courses. Records or relics become labels, rather than objects of investigation. History as heritage suffers from this imbalance – the result is an epistemologically naïve rendering of history. Substantive knowledge cannot be all there is to classroom narrative about history any more than the syntactical can. In exemplary classroom narrative, as opposed to the stimulative or expository narrative, the mutual interdependence of substantive and syntactical elements of historical inquiry is made clear. The curriculum and the agency of the teacher (in the selection of events and sources) is critical. Attention to the syntactical domain is integral to the scope and depth of curriculum development in history. Narrative is central to such matters as it is part of the syntax of history.

The teacher can use narrative to foster *involvement and engagement*. Narrative is also a *mode of explanation*, a *context for inquiry*, and a *form of source*. Furthermore, narrative can represent the *outcome of inquiry*. Each of these aspects of narrative finds a home in the 'social construction' mode of conversation discussed in previous chapters. Teachers and students can build and exchange representations of the domain (history) in the form of narrative. The source (sign) that enables discussion may take the form of narrative. In the course of historical inquiry, teachers and students encounter a range of explanations cast in narrative form. It is the nature of the discipline that a source can support more than one valid narrative. The next chapter addresses historical interpretations in the classroom.

[62] Rom Harré, 'The Siren Song of Substantivalism', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 39, no. 4 (2009): 466-473.

7. Historical Interpretations

How can historiography assist students to reason about the past?[1]

> *Sing to me of the man, Muse, the man of twists and turns*
> *Driven time and again off course, once he had plundered the hallowed heights of Troy.*
> *Many cities of men he saw and learned their minds,*
> *Many pains he suffered, heartsick on the open sea,*
> *Fighting to save his life and bring his comrades home.*
> *But he could not save them from disaster – hard as he strove –*
> *The recklessness of their own ways destroyed them all,*
> *The blind fools, they devoured the cattle of the Sun*
> *And the Sungod wiped from sight the day of their return.*
> *Launch out on his story, Muse, daughter of Zeus,*
> *Start from where you will – sing for our time too.* (Hom. *Od.* 1.1)[2]

The poet of the Odyssey begins the epic with the invocation of the Muse. Daughters of Zeus, the Muses offered inspiration and skill. The Homeric narrator asks them to sing to him of the hero of the epic. They offer knowledge of the subject matter and skill in performing the poem. The Muse will recount the story of the hero with all its perils. It will be cast a tale of discovery, danger and loss. The Muse will nominate its point of departure. Troy, foreign peoples and the cattle of Helios are far removed from the listener, but the Muse will ensure that the poem will speak to their time. The poet Hesiod is the first to name the Muses. In the *Theogony*, the Muses offer the gift of song. Furthermore, they hold knowledge of the past which they also give to him (Hes. *Th.* 22-34).[3] This is

[1] This chapter contains material that appeared in the following two publications:: John A. Whitehouse, 'Teaching the Historians', *Agora* 43, no. 2 (2008): 4-8 and John A. Whitehouse, 'The Role of Questions and Sources in Promoting Historical Thinking', in *Historical Thinking for History Teachers: A New Approach to Engaging Students and Developing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Tim Allender, Anna Clark, and Robert Parkes (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2019), 60-71.

[2] Homer, *The Odyssey*, trans. Robert Fagles (New York: Penguin, 1996), 77.

[3] The Loeb translation is as follows: 'One time, they taught Hesiod beautiful song while he was pasturing lambs under holy Helicon. And this speech the goddesses spoke first of all to me, the Olympian Muses, the daughters of aegis-holding Zeus: "Field-dwelling shepherds, ignoble disgraces, mere bellies: we know how

not surprising as the mother of the Muses was the Mnemosyne, personification of memory. It is only later that Clio became the Muse of history. Entomologically, her name is related to *kleos*: the term for glory, renown and celebration. One of the functions of epic was the commemoration of glorious deeds through song. It is in this cultural context that Herodotean history appears.

Herodotus opens his history with his name and a statement of the purpose of his work, namely that mighty deeds performed by Greeks and non-Greeks may not be forgotten. He also seeks to explain the cause of conflict between the two (1.1.1). Where an epic poet would evoke the Muse, the name of the historian stands. This a profound change. Thucydides begins his work in a similar way: 'Thucydides, an Athenian, wrote the history of the war between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, beginning at the moment that it broke out, and believing that it would be a great war and more worthy of relation than any that had preceded it' (1.1.1). The historian has displaced the Muse; textual authority rests with the author.[4] The narrative that the historian offers must rest on events that have occurred. Thucydides clearly seeks to associate his work with that of Herodotus by composing his first line in a similar manner. Nevertheless, one would be mistaken to conclude that Thucydides is in total harmony with Herodotus. The subject and magnitude of Herodotean history invite comparison with Homeric epic.[5] Thucydides tries to outdo Homer and Herodotus. In the case of Homer, Thucydides accepts the historicity of the Trojan War, but rejects the oaths of Helen's suitors as a factor in the conflict (1.8.9).

---

to say many false things similar to genuine ones, but we know, when we wish, how to proclaim true things'. So spoke great Zeus' ready-speaking daughters, and they plucked a staff, a branch of luxuriant laurel, a marvel, and gave it to me; and they breathed a divine voice into me, so that I might glorify what will be and what was before, and they commanded me to sing of the race of the blessed ones who always are, but always to sing of themselves first and last', see Hesiod, trans. Glenn W. Most, *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 5.

[4] On the treatment of the past in Greece prior to the development of history as a literary genre, see T. J(ames) Luce, *The Greek Historians* (Routledge: London, 1997), 1-14. On Herodotus and epic, Deborah Boedeker, 'Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus' in *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, ed. Egbert J. Bakker, Hans van Wees, Irene J. F. de Jong (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 97-116; Christopher Pelling, 'Herodotus and Homer' in *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils*, ed. Michael J. Clarke, Bruno G. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 75-104.

[5] John Marincola uses an extract from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (11.22 1396a 4-23) to discuss the authority of the classical historians to apportion praise or blame; see *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 19997), 161. Aristotle states that conclusions must be based on facts. Marincola notes that rhetorical amplification could be applied to fact; see also Anthony J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, 87-9.

Instead, Troy provides an opportunity to demonstrate his capacity to engage in reasoned argument. In the case of Herodotus, he Thucydides first speaks in terms of the shortcomings of his contemporaries:

> The way that most men deal with traditions, even traditions of their own country, is to receive them all alike as they are delivered, without applying any critical test whatever. The general Athenian public fancy that Hipparchus was tyrant when he fell by the hands of Harmodius and Aristogiton, not knowing that Hippias, the eldest of the sons of Pisistratus, was really supreme, and that Hipparchus and Thessalus were his brothers; and that Harmodius and Aristogiton suspecting, on the very day, nay at the very moment fixed on for the deed, that information had been conveyed to Hippias by their accomplices, concluded that he had been warned, and did not attack him, yet, not liking to be apprehended and risk their lives for nothing, fell upon Hipparchus near the temple of the daughters of Leos, and slew him as he was arranging the Panathenaic procession (1.20.2).

Thucydides regarded Herodotus as a rival. This becomes clear in subsequent discussion in which he exposes errors made by the Father of History. The first of these concerns Spartan government – specifically, the number of votes held by the kings on the Council of Elders (*Hdt*. 6.75.5). The second refers to a Spartan military company (*Hdt*. 9.53.2). The two are presented in succession:

> There are many other unfounded ideas current among the rest of the Hellenes, even on matters of contemporary history, which have not been obscured by time. For instance, there is the notion that the Lacedaemonian kings have two votes each, the fact being that they have only one; and that there is a company of Pitane, there being simply no such thing. So little pains do the vulgar take in the investigation of truth, accepting readily the first story that comes to hand. (1.20.3)

The extract reflects a need to demonstrate excellence (a key aspect of Hellenic culture). It should not be read as a wholesale rejection of Herodotean history.[6] Thucydides endeavours to underscore his capacity to reason about the past. The extract pre-supposes a detailed knowledge of Herodotus. This tells us much about the intended audience. Thucydides demands that his work is honoured by audience who revered Homer and knew fine details of Herodotus. Neither continuity nor discontinuity fully account for these relationships. Herodotus and Thucydides align their work with epic due to the monumental scope of the subject matter. This approach makes sense in terms aligning the text with the expectations of the audience: epic was one of the ways through which Greeks understood their past. In line with Homer, Herodotus and Thucydides take up war as their subject matter. Having said this, the historians write contemporary history. Thucydides rejects the 'exaggeration' of the poets and compositions by storytellers 'that are attractive at truth's expense' (1.21.1). His work differs from that of Herodotus in that he offers the result of his inquiry as a finished interpretation, the product of his capacity to reason about the past. He underscores this difference with his rivals at the start of the work. He also makes his ambitions for the text clear:

> The absence of romance in my history will, I fear, detract somewhat from its interest; but if it be judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the interpretation of the future, which in the course of human things must resemble if it does not reflect it, I shall be content. In fine, I have written my work, not as an essay which is to win the applause of the moment, but as a possession for all time. (1.22.4)

Roman Historiography

The founding father of the Roman tradition of senatorial history was Quintus Fabius Pictor.[7] A member of the senatorial elite, Fabius began his history with Aeneas and the foundation of Rome and concluded with an account of the Second Punic War (218-201

[6] D. H. Kelly, 'Thucydides, Herodotus and the Pitanate *Lochos*', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 22 (1981): 31-8; John A. Whitehouse, 'Historians of Disillusionment', *Iris* 20 (2007): 13-19; cf. Francis Macdonald Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London: Edward Arnold, 1907), 75.
[7] For an introduction to early Roman historiography, see Ronald Mellor, *The Roman Historians* (London: Routledge, 1999), 6-29.

BC). The work was composed in Greek. Fabius sought to address the account of rival historian Timaeus. This scholar composed a history of Greece that ran from the archaic period to the Second Punic War. Timaeus recognised Rome as a threat and depicted the city in a negative light. Thus, from its inception, the writing of history at Rome was bound to the state. The chronological formula that Pictor adopted (*ab urbe condita* – 'from the foundation of the city') established the temporal framework for his work and that of later writers. Cato the Elder was the first Roman historian to write in Latin. His *Origines* only survive as fragments, but the work was clearly a celebration of Roman virtue. Unfortunately, most early Roman historiography is lost or only survives as fragments and in the work of later authors. In the closing years of the Republic, Sallust sought a place in this long senatorial tradition. His work embodies many of the concerns of his forebears. Indeed, such concerns are more keenly felt in times of crisis. He offers a key refection on history writing in *The War with Catiline*:

> It is a fine thing to serve the Republic well with deeds; even to do so with words is by no means worthless; one may become famous in either peace or war. Both those who have done deeds, as well as those who have written about the deeds of others, receive praise in many instances. And in my view, although by no means equal renown attends the narrator of deeds and the one responsible for them, nevertheless the writing of history is an especially difficult task: first, because words must match the deeds recorded; next, because such criticisms as you make of others' faults are thought by most readers to be uttered out of malice and envy. But when you recount great merit and renown of good men, while everyone accepts with equanimity that which he thinks he could easily do himself, everything over and above he regards as false, tantamount to fiction. (*Cat*. 3)[8]

One may serve the state through deeds or words. This is the heart of the Roman senatorial tradition of historical writing: the historian renders a service to the state. One may win renown in peace or war through actions. The same is true of the use of words. Those who

[8] Sallust, *The War with Catiline*. *The War with Jugurtha*, trans. John Carew Rolfe, revised John T. Ramsey, Loeb Classical Library 116 (Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press, 2013), 23-25. All subsequent references are to this edition. For discussions of Sallust, see Christina S. Kraus and Anthony J. Woodman, *Latin Historians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 10-50; Mellor, *Roman Historians*, 30-47.

have done great deeds merit greater acclaim than those who preserve such acts for posterity. Nevertheless, both deserve their due measure of praise. The task of the historian is a difficult one: fine deeds demand fine words. Moreover, the historian risks incurring the condemnation of readers. The motives of the historian might be misunderstood in assigning praise or blame. In the subsequent chapter, Sallust displays a strong understanding of the power of the historian to shape perceptions of the past:

> But Fortune assuredly is master of every situation. It is she that makes all events famous or obscure according to her pleasure rather than in accordance with the truth. The acts of the Athenians, in my judgment, were fairly great and glorious, but nevertheless somewhat less important than fame represents them. But because Athens happened to have writers of exceptional talent, the deeds of the men of Athens are heralded throughout the world as unsurpassed. So it is that the merit of those who perform deeds is rated as high as brilliant intellects have been able to exalt it with words of praise. But the Roman people never had this advantage, since their cleverest men were always most engaged with affairs; no one employed his intellect apart from his body; the best individuals preferred action to words, to have their good deeds praised by others rather than to be themselves reporters of others' accomplishments. (*Cat*. 8)

The Hellenic world was fortunate to have produced writers such as Herodotus and Thucydides. Although the deeds of the Athenians were worthy of preservation, the importance of these actions was magnified by these masterful writers. This is not the case for Rome. Great Romans committed themselves to deeds, not words. Here, Sallust distances himself from Roman writing. Although Cato the Elder was an important influence, Sallust seeks to emulate the style of Thucydides.[9] In this way, Sallust links

[9] For stylistic influences on Sallust, Ronald Syme, *Sallust* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964); G. M. Paul, 'Sallust' in *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey (London: Routledge, 1966), 85-113; Thomas. F. Scanlon, *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1980); Francis R. D. Goodyear, 'Sallust' in *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* vol. 2, ed. E. J. Kenney (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 269-70; Thomas. F. Scanlon, *Spes Frustrata: A Reading of Sallust* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1987); Denis C. Feeney, 'Beginning Sallust's *Catiline*,' *Prudentia* 26 (1994): 139-46; David S. Levene, 'Sallust's Catiline and Cato the Censor,' *Classical Quarterly* 50 (2000): 170-91.

Greece and Rome. Presumably, the approach that he adopts is designed to win renown. His writing is clearly intended to inspire:

> I have often heard that Quintus Maximus, Publius Scipio, and other eminent men of our country were accustomed to declare that their hearts were set mightily aflame for the pursuit of virtue whenever they gazed upon the representations of their ancestors. It is evident that not the wax nor the effigy had any such intrinsic power, but rather it was from the memory of accomplishments that this flame swelled in the breast of exceptional men and could not be assuaged until their own prowess equaled the fame and glory of those models. (*Jug*. 4.5-6)

In the *War with Jugurtha*, Sallust offers a reflection on the purpose of Roman history. He informs the reader that leading figures of the Roman republic found inspiration through the funeral masks of their ancestors. These were produced to commemorate the dead. The behaviour that the effigies inspire is of a special kind: deeds performed in the service of the state (*virtus*). In this way, Sallust positions himself as the successor of Ennius and Cato the Elder; the aim of history is to promote civic virtue. It is not the wax artefacts that produce this effect, but the memories to which they are linked. The same is true of history: it is a form of public memory. The passage highlights the need that powerful Roman men felt to distinguish themselves. The historian cannot stand apart from his context. Sallust responds to this drive by writing about the past. In a way, the masks of Quintus Fabius Pictor and Cato the Elder are now set before Sallust.

Tacitus positions himself alongside Sallust in the preface of *The Annals*. Its opening words are *Urbem Romam*; this signals a focus on the city of Rome. Furthermore, the first sentence alludes to two historical works by Sallust: *The War against Catiline* and the *Histories*.[10] By crafting these allusions, Tacitus positions his work in the tradition of Sallustian history. This means that readers can expect a narrative of political intrigue and

[10] Anthony Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, 167-8; John A. Whitehouse, 'Historians of Disillusionment', *Iris* 20 (2017): 18. The preface may contain another such allusion; see Anthony J. Woodman, 'The Preface to the *Annals*: More Sallust?' in *Tacitus Reviewed* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 21-2. The sentence may be interpreted as a condemnation of the Augustan principate: see Ronald H. Martin, Tacitus (London: Batsford, 1981), 108.

decay. Michael Sage suggests that the chapter is a history of dangers to Roman liberty.[11] Livy remarks that 'the birth of liberty was owing to the annual nature of the consuls' tenure than to any lessening of power that the kings had possessed' (2.1.6). Under the Republic, power was shared, and the tenure of office was brief. There is no such limit on the *princeps*. In time, flawed Roman leaders undermine the writing of history itself:

> The Roman people of old, however, had their successes and adversities recalled by brilliant writers, and to tell of Augustus' times there was no dearth of deserving talents, until they were deterred by swelling sycophancy. The affairs of Tiberius and Gaius, as of Claudius and Nero, were falsified through dread while the men themselves flourished, and composed with hatred fresh after their fall. Hence my plan is the transmission of a mere few things about Augustus and of his final period, then of Tiberius' principate and the remainder – without anger and partiality, and reasons for which I keep at a distance. (1.1)

Tacitus offers a damning indictment on Roman historiography after the death of Augustus. During the Republic, a series of excellent writers preserved the collective memory of the Roman people. Although Augustus brings civil war to an end and draws Rome under his rule, he does not hamper the talent of a writer such as Livy. It is in the succeeding age that the quality of historiography wanes. Abominable leaders bring out the worst in those whom they rule. In the *Agricola*, Tacitus recounts the terror evoked by Domitian. Under such tyrants, toadying offers advancement. Words of criticism cannot be spoken; senators prefer silence to death. The political life of Rome and its histography are inseparable. Just as criticism of such leaders invites disaster on the floor of the senate, so too is it a dangerous in the pages of history. For example, Cremutius Cordus is arraigned for praising the opponents of Caesar in his history (see previous chapter). Neither flattery nor fear make for good history. Tacitus distances himself from such writing. He claims to write *sine ira et studio* ('without anger and partiality') since there is a considerable distance between himself and his subject matter. This reflects the

[11] Michael M. Sage, 'Tacitus' Historical Works: A Survey and Appraisal', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (*ANRW*) 2.33.2 (1990), 971 n. 611. On Tacitus and freedom, see Chaim Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950); Michael Morford, 'How Tacitus Defined Liberty,' *ANRW* 2.33.5 (1991): 3420-50.

standard understanding of freedom from bias in the classical world.[12] The historian does not stand to benefit from these rulers, nor can he be harmed by them. This does not mean that his account will aspire to modern standards of impartiality or objectivity.

Reading history involves discerning continuity and discontinuity. Ancient Greeks understood the past through epic. This shaped the monumental character of Herodotean and Thucydidean history. The person of the historian displaced the Muse to set narrative in motion. Thucydides presupposes an audience that is familiar with Herodotus. For Thucydides, the Father of History is an honoured rival. Similar continuities and discontinuities are at work in Roman history. Roman historiography begins in tension with Greece. The senatorial tradition provides a profound continuity between historians with its consensus on chronological structure and subject matter. Placing himself in this tradition, Sallust addresses profound continuities of memory and identity. Tacitus claims a place in this tradition too. He aligns himself with Sallust and rejects a series of later writers. Continuity and discontinuity are indispensable concepts to reading history. Furthermore, the writing of each historian is shaped by his context. The inquiries of Herodotus and Thucydides are products of the Greek world. Its creative ferment is manifest in the realms of philosophy, science, mathematics, tragedy, comedy, art and architecture. Roman intellectual life was profoundly influenced by the Greece. The initial work of Roman historiography was composed in Greek by one of the political elite. Roman history flourishes within the context of the senate. Its values are those of the state. The transformation of that state undermines history writing. Continuity, discontinuity and context are indispensable themes in reading historiography.

An Example: The Gallipoli Landing

Take, for example, the Gallipoli landing which took place on 25 April 1915. To contextualise this event, teaching would combine description, explanation and narration. The learning and teaching sequence would sketch the prevailing conditions in Europe with reference to concepts of imperialism, nationalism, alliances and militarism. These concepts are necessary, but not sufficient. It is important to explore the assassination of

[12] T. James Luce, 'Ancient Views on the Causes of Bias in Historical Writing,' *Classical Philology* 84 (1989), 16-31.

Archduke Franz Ferdinand as the immediate cause of the crisis. It is vital to examine the decisions of individuals and groups, including German leaders and the Russian Tsar. Having discussed the short and long-term causes of the war, it is vital to explain the relationship between Australia and Britain (and the way in which the war was greeted in Australia). Turning to the Gallipoli campaign, it is important to identify the role of the Ottoman Empire, British imperatives in the region and attempts to force a passage through the Dardanelles. Having laid this foundation, the class could examine the first source: a dispatch by journalist Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett providing an account of the landing.

The source is a dispatch that was written for publication in the press (*Identification*). Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett was an official British war correspondent. He accompanied the contingent to the Dardanelles, but came ashore on the peninsula *after* the landing occurred (*Attribution*). These details are important because they influence what might be said about the past based on the source (*Judging Perspective*). The first account of the landing to appear in Australian newspapers, the article was intended to appeal to the public:

> The Australians who were about to go into action for the first time under trying circumstances, were cheerful, quiet, and confident, showing no sign of nerves or excitement. As the moon waned the boats were swung out, the Australians received their last instructions, and men who six months ago were living peaceful civilian lives began to disembark on a strange, unknown shore in a strange land to attack an enemy of different race...
>
> The boats had almost reached the beach when a party of Turks entrenched ashore opened a terrible fusillade with rifles and a Maxim. Fortunately most of the bullets went high. The Australians rose to the occasion. They did not wait for orders or for the boats to reach the beach, but sprang into the sea, formed a sort of rough line, and rushed the enemy's trenches. Their magazines were uncharged, so they just went in with cold steel.
>
> It was over in a minute. The Turks in the first trench either were bayoneted or ran away, and the Maxim was captured.

> Then the Australians found themselves facing an almost perpendicular cliff of loose sandstones, covered with thick shrubbery. Somewhere about half way up the enemy had a second trench, strongly held, from which poured a terrible fire on the troops below and the boats pulling back to the destroyers for a second landing party.
>
> Here was a tough proposition to tackle in the darkness, but those colonials were practical above all else and went about it in a practical way. They stopped a few minutes to pull themselves together, get rid of their packs, and charge their rifle magazines. Then this race of athletes proceeded to scale the cliff without responding to the enemy's fire. They lost some men, but didn't worry, and in less than a quarter of an hour the Turks were out of their second position, and either bayoneted or fleeing…
>
> But then the Australians, whose blood was up, instead of entrenching, rushed northwards and eastwards, searching for fresh enemies to bayonet. It was difficult country in which to entrench. They therefore preferred to advance.[13]

This is not some unbiased, objective account from which the student can compose a factual summary. Instead, the perspective of the author infuses every word of the dispatch. This means that the source must be subject to a process of evaluation before it can be used as evidence to support a statement about the past (*Reliability Assessment*). The account rests on beliefs, values and attitudes of British society during the period: the Australian troops are presented as members of the British imperial family. Ashmead-Bartlett writes that they confront an enemy of another race. The land itself is menacing and alien. Nevertheless, when the Turkish guns open fire, the Australians meet the challenge. There is no reference to confusion: the Anzacs demonstrate initiative and resolve. Nor is there any mention of fear, pain, or suffering. Instead, the author prefers to laud the Australians. The second half of the extract returns to the idea of blood. The 'race of athletes' overcome the challenge before them. Undaunted by their losses, the heroic 'colonials' demonstrate a pragmatism that enables them to succeed. Ashmead-Bartlett crafts an account that the

[13] *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 May 1915

Australian public wanted to read. Harvey Broadbent observes that the dispatch marks the beginning of the first strand of the Anzac legend: the digger who overcomes.[14] The second strand originates in the writing of Charles Bean: the digger who endures.

Building Understanding: A Second Source

To acquire a nuanced understanding of the past, it is necessary to consider the perspectives of different people and groups. Teachers facilitate this by presenting students with sources that enable them to explore more than one perspective. This enables students to corroborate or question inferences about the past drawn from a previous source. In the case of the Gallipoli landing, the Ashmead-Bartlett dispatch is one of many accounts of events. Take, for example, the representation of the same event in *A Fortunate Life* – an iconic piece of Australian literature by Albert Facey:

> Suddenly all hell broke loose; heavy shelling and shrapnel fire commenced. The ships that were protecting our troops returned fire. Bullets were thumping into us in the rowing-boat. Men were being hit and killed all around me.
>
> When we were cut loose to make our way to the shore was the worst period. I was terribly frightened. The boat touched bottom some thirty yards from shore so we had to jump out and wade into the beach. The water in some places was up to my shoulders. The Turks had machine guns sweeping the strip of beach where we landed - there were many dead already when we got there. Bodies of men who had reached the beach ahead of us were lying all along the beach and wounded men were screaming for help. We couldn't stop for them - the Turkish fire was terrible and mowing into us. The order to line up on the beach was forgotten. We all ran for our lives over the strip of the beach and got into the scrub and bush. Men were falling all around me. We were stumbling over bodies - running blind.
>
> The sight of the bodies on the beach was shocking. It worried me for days that I couldn't stop to help the men calling out. (This was one of the hardest things of the war for me and I'm sure for many of the others. There were to be other times

[14] Harvey Broadbent, *Gallipoli: The Fatal Shore* (Camberwell, Melbourne: Penguin, 2005), 145.

> under fire when we couldn't help those that were hit. I would think for days, 'I should've helped that poor beggar'.
>
> We used our trenching tools to dig mounds of earth and sheltered from the firing until daylight – the Turks never let up. Their machine-guns were sweeping the scrub. The slaughter was terrible.
>
> I am sure that there wouldn't have been one of us left if we had obeyed that damn fool order to line up on the beach.[15]

The perspective offered by Facey differs sharply from the account by Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett. Written in the first person, there is nothing of the romanticism of the dispatch. Facey paints a nightmarish scene of fear and slaughter. Wading ashore, Facey is confronted by the bodies of the dead and the screams of the wounded. The Anzacs must run for cover in disorder and confusion. Injured men are left behind. This provokes feelings of guilt in Facey as a survivor. A plan to assemble on the beach is both mentioned and dismissed with disdain.

It is important to note that this source is far from unproblematic. Writing for the Australian War Memorial, Brigadier Chris Roberts observes that Facey's record states that he came ashore at Gallipoli on 7 May – well after the landing.[16] Roberts points out that machine guns may not have been used at Anzac Cove: official war official historian Charles Bean and battalion diaries note heavy fire, not mass slaughter. This does not mean that the narrative is without value. It raises issues around the reliability of sources, memory, and the prominence of Gallipoli in the historical consciousness of many Australians. Facey served in the Great War and experienced the horror of battle, but it seems that *A Fortunate Life* is not a first-hand account of the landing. It is necessary to turn to further sources. Take, for example, the diary entry of infantryman Eric Rapkins for 26 April, as a contemporaneous account from a soldier's perspective:

---

[15] Albert B. Facey, *A Fortunate Life* (Melbourne: Penguin, 2014), 400-1.
[16] Chris Roberts, "Turkish Machine-Guns at the Landing," *Wartime* 50 (2010): 14-19; For a recent appraisal of the Gallipoli landing and a discussion of the account by Bert Facey, see Chris Roberts, *The Landing at Anzac: 1915*, 2nd ed. (Newport, New South Wales: Big Sky Publishing, 2015).

> Landed last night … (there are) plenty of wounded. I have carried some dead uns past too. The shrapnel from the Turks is flying over as I write. The Turks bombarded us all day. We lost a few men. One of our sergeants got shot through the brain. Shrapnel has done a lot of damage to us. There are a hell of a lot of killed and wounded.[17]

Further Possibilities for Historical Thinking

The potential scope of historical inquiry is immense. To engage in research, historians select some aspect of the past to explore. This same is true for teachers and students. Determination of historical significance is a judgement about the past. To make such an evaluation, it is necessary to identify and describe the aspect of the past. For example, the Gallipoli landing occurred on 25 April, 1915. Troops from Australia and New Zealand came ashore on what would become known as Anzac Cove (in modern Turkey) and engaged Ottoman forces. This action formed part of a campaign to take the Gallipoli Peninsula. This is historical fact. Having said this, the establishment of elementary meaning is not necessarily straightforward. Furthermore, it is impossible to escape the influence of language: the words that we use to describe the past reflect the beliefs, values and attitudes of the present. With foundational understanding established, discussion can turn to the causes and consequences of the event. Beginners often employ limited criteria to support judgements about the relative importance of aspects of the past.[18] This means that it is important for teachers to expand the frame of reference available to students. Possible criteria include how the event was understood at the time, the degree and extent of its impact, its duration and contemporary relevance.[19] Christine Counsell observes that an event might be *remarkable, remembered, resonant, resulting in change* or *revealing*.[20]

---

[17] John Rapkins with Jon Coghill, 'Gallipoli 2015: Fragile WWI Diary Records Five Days of Horror at Gallipoli', accessed September 12, 2019, http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-04-18/fragile-ww1-diary-records-five-days-of-horror-at-gallipoli/6375816

[18] Peter Seixas, 'Students' Understanding of Historical Significance', *Theory and Research in Social Education* 22, no. 3 (1994): 281-304; 'Mapping the Terrain of Historical Significance', *Social Education* 61, no. 1 (1997): 22-27. Stéphane Lévesque, 'Teaching Second-Order Concepts in Canadian History: The Importance of 'Historical Significance', *Canadian Social Studies* 39, no. 2 (2005), https://sites.educ.ualberta.ca/css/Css_39_2/ARLevesque_second-order_concepts.htm.

[19] Geoffrey Partington, *The Idea of an Historical Education* (Windsor, England: NFER Publishing, 1980), 112-116; Robert Phillips, 'Historical Significance – the Forgotten Key Element?' *Teaching History* 106 (2002): 14-19; Lévesque, *Thinking Historically*, 39-61.

[20] Christine Counsell, 'Looking Through a Josephine-Butler-Shaped Window: Focusing Pupils' Thinking on Historical Significance', *Teaching History* 114 (2004): 30-36.

From an Australian perspective, the Gallipoli landing dominated the imagination of a public that was eager learn of events at the front. It marks the origin of the Anzac myth/legend. This view of Australian soldiers has been invoked by countless commentators. The landing was an important change: it was the first major engagement of Australian troops in the Great War. Conservative commentators hailed it as a baptism of fire for the new nation. The landing and subsequent campaign resulted in death and injury for many servicemen on both sides of the conflict. From the British perspective, the campaign was a failure as Turkey retained the peninsula. The event and its depiction reveal much about the beliefs, values and attitudes of the period. Different Australian historians have ascribed significance to the event for a range of reasons. Teacher should offer students opportunities to do likewise.

As the above discussion indicates, historical thinking concepts are interrelated: evaluation of the historical significance of an event might involve an assessment of key changes that arose from it. The key pedagogical imperative is for teachers to offer students opportunities to *use* these concepts. A teaching and learning sequence that includes questions and source material is an important foundation. A range of co-operative learning activities provides students with opportunities to use historical thinking concepts. Team Jigsaw is one such strategy intended to promote discussion.[21] Students form small groups of equal number. Each group is then allocated a different task. After completing the task, students form new groups which include a representative of each of the base groups and undertake a co-operative task. In the case of history, each base group might be allocated a different source on the topics such as the Western Front, recruiting or the conscription campaigns. The whole class could explore the same question, but different base groups could explore different sources. Students would then form new groups and report their findings. Following this, students might consider similarities and differences between the sources. This could provide the springboard for a discussion of historical perspectives or other historical thinking concepts.

[21] Following the desegregation of schools in the United States, Jigsaw 1 was introduced to promote inter-racial co-operation in classrooms, see Elliot Aronson et al., *The Jigsaw Classroom* (Beverley Hills, CA: Sage, 1978). For the Team Jigsaw strategy and other useful co-operative learning activities, see Spencer Kagan, *Cooperative Learning* (Heatherton, Melbourne: Hawker Brownlow, 2007).

Teaching and Learning: Historical Interpretations

How might we encourage students to set their interpretations of the past alongside those of professional historians? The idea of student as historian creates rich possibilities for learning. The challenge is to take this approach one step further. How might we construct a curriculum that engages with issues of historiography? Given the prominence of Gallipoli in Australian historical consciousness, it is a useful site from which to launch an exploration of historiography. We will then explore implementation strategies for the classroom.

> A strange light plays over the Gallipoli landing on April 25, and no matter how often the story is retold there is still an actuality about it, a feeling of suspense and incompleteness. Although nearly half a century has gone by, nothing yet seems fated about the day's events, a hundred questions remain unanswered, and in a curious way one feels that the battle might still lie before us in the future; that there is still time to make other plans and bring it to a different ending.[22]

In this reflection on the Gallipoli landing, the writer Alan Moorehead captures the difficulty of bringing closure to the events of 25 April, 1915. Writing forty years after the Gallipoli landing, he highlights the unfinished and problematic nature of the story. Questions remain unanswered. Uncertainties persist. Although events have taken their course, retelling the story seems to raise new possibilities. It is the power of historical writing that animates such thoughts. The power of narrative is such that the Anzacs wade ashore again in a battlefield of the historical imagination. Moorehead raises significant issues for historiography and the history classroom. A single event casts a different light in the eyes of each historian. The historian and the representation of the past are inextricably linked. In order to teach history, we must teach the historians.

Harvey Broadbent argues that the Anzac legend consists of two main strands.[23] He attributes the first theme to Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, the official British war correspondent.

---

[22] Alan Moorehead, *Gallipoli* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1956): 128.

[23] Broadbent, *Gallipoli: The Fatal Shore*, 145: 'The hyperbole about courage and dash that surrounds the Anzac Legend is Ashmead-Bartlett's. The more human features of the image – the mateship, the robust vigour, and the ability to endure and put a cheerful face on adversity – can be traced back to Bean'.

The account of the landing by Ashmead-Bartlett extols the heroism of the Australians: "There has been no finer feat in this war than this sudden landing in the dark and the storming of the heights."[24] Ashmead-Bartlett built on the popularity of his reports with an Australian lecture tour in which he eulogized the daring and prowess of the Anzacs. Broadbent traces the second strand of the legend to Charles Bean, the Australian war correspondent. Bean celebrates ideals of egalitarianism, mateship and endurance. Although his writing is less dramatic than that of Ashmead-Bartlett, Bean shaped the Anzac legend through reporting and editing at the front, his monumental work as official war historian, and his instrumental contribution to the Australian War Memorial.

In the opening volume of his history, Bean offers his account of the Gallipoli landing:

> Something was clearly wrong. Everything seemed wrong. The 9th and 10th, on the point itself and on its southern bend were fairly protected from rifle-fire. Many of the Turks were shooting at the destroyers further out; but north of the point where the 11th landed, a machine-gun in the foothills 500 yards to their left was shooting into the men behind the bank, and the grassy tussocks on the sandslope above it gave no better protection. As Lieutenant-Colonel Johnston and Corporal Louch lay there side by side, a bullet thudded into the sand between them. The country was unrecognisable. They had not the least idea as to whether the other tows had yet landed. "What are we to do next, sir?" somebody asked of a senior officer. "I don't know, I'm sure," was the reply. "Everything is in a terrible muddle."[25]

Bean offers an account of the landing in which confusion is underscored. The all-encompassing, yet imprecise acknowledgement of disorder frames the experience of Johnston and Louch. In the face of confusion, they must endure. Their compatriots face a barrage of Turkish fire. The senior officer confirms the authorial comment at the start of the extract. Soon, the Anzacs press ahead. Bean constructs an image of the Australian

[24] *Argus*, 8 May 1915.
[25] Charles E. W. Bean, *Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-1918*. Vol. 1, *The Story of ANZAC from the Outbreak of War to the End of the First Phase of the Gallipoli Campaign, May 4, 1915*. 11th ed. (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1941), 256.

soldier as the ideal son of the nation. For Bean, virtues of endurance, humility and egalitarianism are the unique products of Australia.[26] This is evident in his account of the landing. The country is "unrecognisable" but the Australians work together. There is a sense of egalitarianism as lieutenant-colonel and corporal take cover side by side.

Subsequent historians have adopted sharper views of the landing. Recently, the popular historian Les Carlyon has taken issue with Bean. Although there is a consensus between the writers on the presence of confusion on the day of the landing, Carlyon offers a far more critical account than Bean. For Carlyon confusion is a cause, rather than an atmosphere:

> There *was* confusion on April 25 – everywhere and all day – and Bean probably should have written more of it. As much as the examples of "Australian manhood" he offered in such plenitude, this confusion explained why the first day went the way it did. The forays of Tulloch and others who got "farthest in" were important; but so was Bridges' muddling, the failure to get the field artillery ashore and firing, and the fact that no-one in authority seemed to understand the battle on the left.[27]

Carlyon stresses that confusion causes disaster. Confusion displaces effective leadership. Confusion prevents artillery from being deployed. Confusion supplants coherent strategy on an entire flank of the battlefield. At the same time, Carlyon affirms the efforts of those Australians who manage to advance. Carlyon offers his interpretation through critique of Bean. He demonstrates awareness of Bean's project to construct an ideal in which the soldier embodies the loyal nation. For Carlyon, this agenda undermines a balanced account of the landing. The representation of the past by Carlyon is not isolated from the

[26] Joan Beaumont, 'The Anzac Legend', in *Australia's War 1914-18* (St Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1995), 149-180. See also Alistair Thomson, "Steadfast Until Death? C. E. W. Bean and the Representation of Australian Military Manhood," *Australian Historical Studies*, 23 no. 93 (1989): 462-478. The work of Ken Inglis is particularly influential; see *Anzac Remembered: Selected Writings by K. S. Inglis*, ed. John Lack (Melbourne: History Department, University of Melbourne, 1998); Graham Seal, *Inventing Anzac: The Digger and National Mythology* (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2004).
[27] Les Carlyon, *Gallipoli* (Sydney: Macmillan, 2001), 172.

work of Bean. Instead, Carlyon engages with his predecessor to construct his own representation of the landing.

The method of the historian shapes the representation of the past. By drawing on private sources such as diaries and personal letters, Bill Gammage captures the horror of war for the individual soldier. These voices make for a history that is as powerful as it is moving. Written during the Vietnam War, *The Broken Years* speaks to its own context, the past and the future:

> In the short term the sacrifice made outweighed the glory won. Instead of a heady charge into a great victory, "The first day we landed we ran into a real live Hell, shrapnel, bullets, machine guns all over the place. I do not know how on earth I ever got out of it alive." [Private D. J. C. Anderson] As Lance Corporal Mitchell lay open to the Turk rifles on 400 Plateau, he saw death not as the welcome risk of glory, but, perhaps for the first time "as a painful shutting out of all life's promise". Illusions faded during the days that followed and he wondered about the romance of battle, and wanted to see the war won and go home intact. By early June he had abandoned even the hope of returning, for he found himself not in a short Imperial campaign, but in a bitter, savage, bloody conflict. Hard truths had shaken the dreams of the past.[28]

Gammage weaves the voices of Anderson and Mitchell into his account with great skill. Like Bean, he presents the experience of two Anzacs, but the effect is very different. The reader encounters "a real live Hell" rather than a "terrible muddle". Anderson's words present Gallipoli as a personal tragedy. He wonders how he manages to survive. The reader soon learns that Anderson was killed in August. This is a poignant discovery. For Mitchell, death is transformed from distant risk to imminent threat. Gallipoli offers disenchantment rather than glory.

[28] Bill Gammage, *The Broken Years: Australian Soldiers in the Great War* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1974), 58-9.

Any work of history reflects the context of its production. Context shapes the questions that historians ask about the past. During the Vietnam War, readers discerned contemporary relevance in the work of Lloyd Robson on the recruitment of the A.I.F. In the preface to a later edition of the text, Robson reflects on the relationship between the debates of the Great War and the issue of conscription for service in Vietnam to support an anti-communist alliance: "people perceived in the conscription campaigns of the Great War striking similarities to issues canvassed at the time when the Australian Liberal-Country party government supported the United States in the war in Vietnam. To many individuals, the subject of conscription became extremely relevant indeed. The authority by which a government might force men to go to war was seen by many as unjust."[29] Robson poses questions about recruiting. This leads him to examine the reception of the Ashmead-Bartlett account in Australia:

> The despatch and the subsequent news from the embattled soldiers at Gallipoli excited Australians to move to more strenuous exertions in recruiting, especially because the despatch was brought to the attention of schoolchildren all over the nation at the suggestion of the Prime Minister [Andrew Fisher]: it was either read out to wide-eyed boys and girls or printed in the State education publications.[30]

Robson's depiction of the impact of the despatches on the home front demonstrates that narrative is an effective technique of representation. Awestruck students listen to the daring feats of the empire loyal Anzacs. The recruiting effort will soon depend on these children. Classrooms have become the battlefield for the hearts and minds of young Australians.

Marilyn Lake also explores the uses of the Ashmead-Bartlett account. For Lake, the reception of the despatch raises issues of gender. War is a catalyst for the growth of the nation. In this process of maturation, manhood and nationhood are conflated. This is evident in the conservative press:

---

[29] Gammage, *The Broken Years*, ix.
[30] L. Lloyd Robson, *The First A.I.F.: A Study of its Recruitment 1914-1918* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1982), 43.

> "The highest hopes of the people of Australia and New Zealand have not merely been realised", proclaimed the Melbourne *Argus*, "they have been vastly exceeded, and this Commonwealth and the Dominion have in one moment stepped into the world-wide arena in the full stature of great manhood". The achievement of Australian manhood was proclaimed to be nothing less than the achievement of nationhood. Such eulogies encouraged Australia's returning soldiers to formulate special claims. Grand achievements suggested commensurate rewards.[31]

The *Argus* represents more than just a source. It stands for a political context dominated by men. Rather than the battle at Gallipoli, the historian turns her attention to conflict of a different kind: political struggle in Australia. Through the close reading of sources, Lake examines relationships between masculinity, war and images of nationhood. She explores political uses of the Gallipoli narrative by returned servicemen. The questions posed by the historian, as well as the selection and analysis of evidence, produce a distinctive representation of the past.

What do these extracts reveal about historiography? First, historians make sense of the past in different ways. They ask diverse questions and interpret sources differently. Arguments between historians are central to the construction of historical knowledge. For example, Carlyon takes issue with Bean. Differences include variation in method. By using primary sources such as diaries and letters, Gammage presents the past in a distinctly personal manner. The purposes of historians differ. Robson explores the impact of the despatches on recruiting. Lake uses the same narrative to examine gender, nationhood and division. Second, continuities exist between historians. Even though they differ on causation, Bean and Carlyon share a consensus on the confused nature of the landing. Robson and Lake hold that the despatches had significant effects at home. Even the debates between historians establish webs of intertextual relationships. One interpretation may presuppose understanding of another. Historians may position their

[31] Marilyn Lake, 'The Power of Anzac', in *Australia: Two Centuries of War and Peace*, ed. Michael McKernan and Margaret Browne (Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 1988), 195.

work as part of a school. Lake, for example, is informed by feminist thought. Third, the context of the historian shapes the representation of the past. Gammage and Robson write during the Vietnam War. This is evident in purpose and method. Fourth, the study of historiography reveals the nature of the discipline. Historians ask questions about the past and use sources as evidence.

Historical Interpretations as Pedagogical Instruments

The implications of historiography for learning and teaching history are profound. Historiography is an implicit part of historical understanding, not some peripheral aspect of the discipline. Leading students to this understanding can create rich possibilities for historical understanding. As a first step, teachers must examine key historical works on the topics that they plan to teach. In approaching such material and using it as a pedagogical instrument, the epistemological beliefs that history teachers hold about the discipline are foundational. They have profound influence on learning and teaching.[32] In Chapter 3, we discussed *objectivism*, *subjectivism* or *criterialism* in regard to causation.[33] This approach is also relevant to understandings of historical interpretation and evidence. Objectivism holds that historical knowledge rests on evidence; interpretation is not

[32] For an exploration of research on the beliefs of teachers and their pedagogical implications, Zhihui Fang, 'A Review of Research on Teacher Beliefs and Practices' *Educational Research* 38, no 1 (1996): 47–65. For history teaching, see Bruce VanSledright, 'Closing the Gap Between School and Disciplinary History? Historian as High School History Teacher' in *Advances in Research on Teaching: Vol. 6: Teaching and Learning History*, ed. Jere Brophy (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1996), 257-289; Bruce A. VanSledright and Margarita Limón, 'Learning and Teaching Social Studies: A Review of Cognitive Research in History and Geography' in *Handbook of Educational Psychology*, ed. Patricia A. Alexander and Philip H. Winne (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 2006), 545-570; Kaya Yilmaz, 'Social Studies Teachers' Conceptions of History: Calling on Historiography', *Journal of Educational Research* 101, no. 3 (2010): 37–41; Chris Husbands, 'What Do History Teachers (Need to) Know? A Framework for Understanding and Developing Practice' in *Debates in History Teaching*, ed. Ian Davies (London: Routledge`, 2011), 84-95; Michiel Voet and Bram De Wever, 'History Teachers' Conceptions of Inquiry-Based Learning, Beliefs about the Nature of History, and their Relation to the Classroom Context', *Teaching and Teacher Education* 55 (2016): 57-67; Bruce VanSledright and Liliana Maggioni, 'Preparing Teachers to Teach Historical Thinking?: An Interplay Between Professional Development Programs and School-Systems' Cultures' in *Handbook of Research on Professional Development for Quality Teaching and Learning*, ed. Teresa Petty, Amy J. Good and S. Michael Putman (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2016), 252-280; Mallihai M. Tambyah, 'Teaching for 'Historical Understanding: What Knowledge(s) do Teachers Need to Teach History?', *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 42, no. 5 (2017): 35-50.

[33] Liliana Maggioni, Bruce VanSledright, and Patrick A. Alexander, 'Walking on the Borders: A Measure of Epistemic Cognition in History', *The Journal of Experimental Education 77*, no. 3 (2009): 187-213; Bruce VanSledright and Liliana Maggioni, 'Epistemic Cognition in History' in *Handbook of Epistemic Cognition*, ed. Jeffrey A. Greene, William A. Sandoval and Ivar Bråten (New York: Routledge, 2016), 128-146; See also, Elizabeth McCrum, 'History Teachers' Thinking about the Nature of their Subject' *Teaching and Teacher Education* 35, no. 1 (2013): 73-80.

relevant. Conversely, subjectivism privileges interpretation over evidence. Criterialism holds that an interpretation must rest on evidence. These positions present different perspectives on the value of engaging with historical interpretations in the classroom. For objectivist teachers and students, there is no point in addressing such material. This is a naïve epistemological position. For subjectivists, interpretation becomes the pedagogical focus, not evidence. This might approximate the constructionist view of history discussed by Alun Munslow in which a theoretical and/or ideological framework is used to explain the past (such as Marxism, for example).[34] The test of any historical interpretation resides in its congruence with evidence; subjectivist teaching does not enable students to apply this insight. Subjectivism sets students adrift on a sea of relativism. Rigor and value rests in criterialism. Teachers need to present a range of historical interpretations, but these are not necessarily of the same value. Any historical interpretation consists of three elements: *What happened? How did it happen? Why did it happen?* Responses to these questions must be supported by evidence. The argument must be logical, complete, consistent and balanced. Furthermore, convincing arguments take counter-arguments into account. This is very powerful knowledge that enables students to become critical readers of history.

Our discussion of questions and sources demonstrated that the model of pedagogical reasoning and action developed by Lee Shulman offers a productive way to discuss how teachers might plan for teaching and assessment.[35] The same is true for the use of historical interpretations. The model starts with *comprehension*. The previous discussion of the way in which the teacher conceives of the discipline is foundational. Historical interpretations enable discussion of perspectives, inquiry and debate. Teaching needs to acknowledge these dynamic aspects of the discipline. Furthermore, the teacher needs to understand the learning needs of the students and the intended curriculum as defined by policy documents. Hopefully, those documents underscore the value of students using historical interpretations to construct arguments about the past.

[34] Alun Munslow, *Deconstructing History* (London: Routledge, 1997).
[35] Lee S. Shulman, 'Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform', *Harvard Educational Review* 57 no. 1 (1987): 1-22.

The second stage in Shulman's model of pedagogical reasoning and action is *transformation*. This consists of four sub-stages: preparation, representation, selection and adaptation. First, the teacher prepares by choosing historical interpretations. These need to capture key lines of thought on the topic. The next step is the representation of key ideas. For example, one insight in historiography is that explanations of the past are shaped by the context of their production. In terms of Gallipoli, the extract from Gammage embodies concerns of the Vietnam era in an accessible manner. Next, the teacher selects activities that enable students to understand the historical interpretations. One example might be the selection of the team jigsaw strategy to facilitate discussion. For Gallipoli, each base group could analyse a different account. Having established an understanding of that source, students then form new groups. Each of these includes a representative of each of the base groups. Students discuss each source and might attempt to construct an argument based on that material. The last part of this stage is adaptation. The teacher needs to make sure that the material can be understood. This means the teacher needs to present extracts that capture the key concerns of the historian. Pedagogical decisions must be made about the length and content of abstracts. Language difficulties must be addressed. The sociologist of knowledge Basil Bernstein employs the concept of recontexualisation to describe the process of transformation of material from a context oriented to the discovery of knowledge to one in which the imperatives are pedagogical.[36] This is a useful way to conceive of how the teacher works with historical interpretations in the classroom. As is the case with primary sources, pedagogy and discipline both exercise claims as students must be able to grasp the content, but the extract must also illuminate history as a domain. This speaks to the epistemic authority of the teacher. The pedagogical content knowledge of the teacher is pivotal.

The third stage of the model of pedagogical reasoning and action is *instruction*. Presentation of historical interpretations enables students to strengthen their own arguments about the past and to explore historical inquiry itself. An exclusive focus on primary sources creates a distorted image of the discipline. Instruction must provide structured opportunities for the analysis of secondary sources. An effective approach is a strategy often used in classical studies. When presented with an extract, students analyse

[36] Basil B. Bernstein, *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse* (London: Routledge, 1990).

the material according to two categories. First, students identify the ideas raised by the extract. Second, students explore techniques used by the writer to present those concepts. In terms of history, students discuss ideas about the past offered by the historian. This is followed by an exploration of the techniques used to formulate and present those concepts. For example, an analysis of Bean would yield different results to an exploration of Gammage.

Evaluation, reflection and new comprehension are the other parts of the model. Assessment can serve diagnostic, formative or summative ends.[37] How well has each student grasped the historical interpretation? To what extent can they use the material to support their own arguments about the past? The historical interpretations also need to be evaluated for their effectiveness as pedagogical instruments. Was the adaptation of the material effective? Did accompanying teaching strategies meet the diverse learning needs of students? To what extent did each extract facilitate discussion of the past? Evaluation of learning and teaching feeds reflection. Students can surprise teachers with fresh insights. Furthermore, the way in which an interpretation of the past is discussed in one class may influence its treatment in another. Valuable insights may be drawn from reflection on these matters. New comprehension is the final stage of the model. Through reflection, the teacher comes to new understanding of pedagogy, the discipline and the relationship between the two.

Historiography underpins historical knowledge in many ways. Suzanne Wilson has developed a helpful framework to capture depth of disciplinary knowledge in history.[38] The model consists of four key elements: differentiation, elaboration, qualification and integration. Differentiation refers to the capacity of students to comprehend the multifaceted nature of historical events or concepts. Engaging with a range of historical interpretations encourages students to examine different aspects of an event such as the Gallipoli landing. Historiography provides opportunities to explore concepts such as

[37] On assessment and history, see Bruce VanSledright, *The Challenge of Rethinking History Education* (New York: Routledge, 2011); *Assessing Historical Thinking and Understanding: Innovative Designs for New Standards* (New York: Routledge, 2014).
[38] Suzanne Wilson, 'Understanding Historical Understanding: Subject Matter Knowledge and the Teaching of US History' (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1988).

purpose, bias and historical context. Elaboration represents the ability to expand on an idea or event. Historiography offers a textual framework in which students develop such understandings. Students qualify events by placing them in historical context. This underscores the provisional and open-ended nature of historical knowledge. Debates between historians highlight the role of interpretation in history. Integration enables students to identify causal chains and establish thematic interpretations. Such epistemological processes drive historiography. Sam Wineburg places knowledge of historiography under this category.[39]

Building on the work of Wilson, Wineburg adds a fifth measure of historical understanding: generativity. This refers to understanding of key points of growth in the discipline. Advances in history as a discipline arise through historiography. By studying layers of historical interpretation students explore the processes through which historical knowledge is constructed. Engaging with historical interpretations is not literary interpretation. Teachers and students use sources at hand to evaluate interpretations in terms of their value in explaining the past. Wineburg notes that disciplinary knowledge in history transcends lists of facts and dates. Students need to understand, and teachers need to model how knowledge is constructed in the discipline. Exploring the work of historians is central to this process of discovery. Such an approach enables students to set their own interpretations of primary sources alongside the interpretations of their teacher representing professional historians' constructions.

To return to history teaching as conversation, it is useful to consider historical interpretations and two of the pedagogical orientations outlined by Roberts. For the purposes of this discussion, these are understood as forms of conversation. The 'trialogue' approach is replete with possibilities for exploring historical interpretations. Such a conversation might be understood to consist of the teacher, the student and the historical interpretation. In such a model, the teacher and the student offer observations and representations of the interpretation. As is the case with reading primary source material,

[39] Sam Wineburg, 'Beyond Breadth and Depth: Subject Matter Knowledge and Assessment', *Theory into Practice* 36, no. 4 (1997): 255-261. See also, Suzanne M. Wilson and Samuel S. Wineburg, 'Wrinkles in Time and Place: Using Performance Assessments to Understand the Knowledge of History Teachers', *American Educational Research Journal* 30, no. 4 (1993): 729–769.

the teacher must take representations offered by the student seriously. Having said this, the teacher must compare the understandings offered by the student to those produced by historians. For example, the French Revolution might be understood as one revolution or many. Students might read historian of this event and offer a view. The teacher is obliged to offer compare this to conclusions of experts in the discipline. The resultant discussion enables learning to occur.

The second pedagogical orientation offered by Roberts is also very interesting here. This approach may be equated with the Augustinian mode outlined by Scheffler. Here the conversation proceeds from a shared vision of the discipline. The preliminaries have been established prior to this stage. In the case of historical interpretations, students would know that interaction between historians is pivotal to history. They would grasp the influence of context on historical writing. The students would have detailed knowledge of the relevant substantive content. Teaching could proceed without the need to explain these matters. In the case of the Russian Revolution, for example, the teacher might offer Marxist, Western Liberal and Revisionist interpretations of events in October 1917. Students would recognise these broad groups of interpretation and assess the material for use in their own writing about the past. Discussion of such material could assist students to build counter-arguments. For example, a student who ascribes to a Western Liberal or Revisionist view of the Russian Revolution might endeavour to expose potential flaws in a Marxist interpretation. The point is that the teacher provides the interpretations and students can use them effectively.

Engaging with historiography is more than a matter of addressing debates. Reading the works of classical historians reveals that continuities and discontinuities exist between historical accounts. Furthermore, the context in which historians writes influences their treatment of the past. These complexities also are evident in the writing of modern historians. Consequently, the pedagogical reasoning and action of the teacher must take account of such factors. Building from a careful exploration of primary sources, a teaching and learning sequence can then address interpretations of that subject by experts in the discipline. On the other hand, analysis of primary source material might be framed around an exchange between historians. Either path offers a range of possibilities for

learning about the past *and* the nature of historical inquiry. There is a role for the curriculum specialist here. It is difficult for many teachers to access historical writing that is fundamental to the discipline. The knowledge base of the teacher is a factor, but so too is access to resources and constraints due to time. The curriculum specialist can address these issues by selecting extracts that might be used as pedagogical instruments in a range of schools.

8. Conclusion

In *The Process of Education*, Jerome Bruner challenges teachers to draw on the structures of the disciplines to create learning experiences for students.[1] It follows that processes of inquiry are central to an education in any discipline. In a later piece, Bruner distinguishes between the 'paradigmatic' and 'narrative' modes by which knowledge is constructed. He writes that the first of these modes 'deals in general causes, and in their establishment, and makes use of procedures to assure verifiable reference and to test for empirical truth'.[2] In contrast, narrative aims for verisimilitude. History draws on argument and narrative. Consequently, identification of its grammar is challenging. Models of historical thinking designed to serve pedagogical purposes imply a degree of consensus that is absent from the discipline. Nevertheless, students must grasp syntactic and propositional concepts to engage in historical inquiry and argument. The elucidation and application of ideas that enable the construction of meaning in history constitute the focus of the present study. In this way, the research engages with enduring issues in the study of the past.[3]

The present research proceeds from a synthesis of two key models of historical thinking. Led by Peter Seixas, the Historical Thinking Project offers an influential six-point model: *establish historical significance*, *use primary source evidence*, *identify continuity and change*, *analyse cause and consequence*, *take historical perspectives*, and *examine ethical dimensions of history*. This approach can be usefully combined with research by Jannet van Drie and Carla van Boxtel. The resultant eight-part model consists of the six syntactic concepts offered by Seixas but adds elements that make explicit the importance of asking questions and building arguments in history. This study addresses questions and sources, causation, significance, and change. To these ideas, it adds two related meta-conceptual

[1] Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960); see also Herbert M. Kliebard, 'Structure of the Disciplines as an Educational Slogan', *Teachers College Record* 66, no. 7 (1965): 598-603; Joseph J. Schwab, 'Education and the Structure of the Disciplines', in *Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education: Selected Essays. Joseph J. Schwab*, ed. Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 229-272.

[2] Jerome S. Bruner, *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986, 13. On the features of narrative, see Jerome S. Bruner, 'The Narrative Construction of Reality', *Critical Inquiry* 18, no. 1 (1991): 1-21.

[3] Peter Seixas, 'Conceptualizing the Growth of Historical Understanding' in *The Handbook of Education and Human Development: New Models of Learning, Teaching, and Schooling*, ed. David Olson and Nancy Torrance (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 765-83.

elements of a different kind: narrative (the signature mode of historical explanation) and historical interpretations (disciplinary explanations constructed by historians).

In addressing a number of these concepts, the present research posits history education as a *field of study*. In his defence of a liberal education, epistemologist Paul Hist distinguishes between *disciplines (or forms of knowledge*) and *fields of knowledge*.[4] Hirst argues that different disciplines validate truth claims about certain aspects of experience in different ways based on knowledge that is core to that discipline.[5] In contrast, fields of knowledge combine knowledge that is drawn from more than one discipline. The present research is of this kind. It regards history education as a field of knowledge which teachers exercise. In curriculum deliberation, history teachers weave together history, philosophy and psychology. In turning to ancient historiography to investigate the syntax of history, this study rejects the notion that there exists an unbridgeable gulf between the understandings of classical historians and the knowledge of teachers and students today. Reading Greek and Roman historiography can inform an appreciation of history as a form of critical inquiry and shape history education in the contemporary world.

Historians in the classical world engage with challenges for investigation of the past that continue to confront us today. This means that their works are of enduring relevance. Herodotus and Thucydides address questions about the past by exploring source material. Specifically, these historians draw inferences about aspects of the past based on sources. A tenet of historical inquiry is that any source must be evaluated before it can be used to support a claim about the past. The initial step is identification of the basic features of the

[4] Paul H. Hirst, 'Liberal Education and the Nature of Knowledge' in *Philosophical Analysis and Education*, ed. Reginald Archambault (London: Routledge, 2010; originally 1965), 76-93. For a sociological view, see Basil Bernstein, 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge', in *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Knowledge*, ed. Michael F. D. Young (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), 47-69.

[5] Hirst defends liberal education on the grounds that it fosters reason through curriculum organised around forms of knowledge. Such forms enable propositions about experience to be verified. For an opposing view, see Philip H. Phenix: *Realms of Meaning* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1964). For additional discussion, see Marie Schilling, 'Knowledge and Liberal Education: A Critique of Paul Hirst', *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 18, no. 1 (1986): 1-16. Hirst later revised his view by embracing the importance of social practices; see Paul H. Hirst, 'Education, Knowledge and Practices', in *Beyond Liberal Education: Essays in Honour of Paul H. Hirst*, ed. Robin Barrow and Patricia White (London: Routledge, 1993), 184-199.

source. *What is it? Who made it? When? Where? Why?* The final question necessitates consideration of intentions. We cannot stop here. Responses to these questions establish the foundation of discussion. *Content analysis* explores the information that the source conveys about the past. *Context analysis* necessitates linking the source to the world in which it was made. *Evaluation* challenges students to assess the value of the source as evidence. The ability to use sources as evidence in response to questions about the past is essential to historical explanation.

Historical explanation necessitates the use of concepts such as causation, significance and change. Herodotus and Thucydides invoke causes in response to *why* questions. *Why did the Persians and Greeks wage war against each other? Why did the Peloponnesian War occur?* Causes may operate over different periods of time. This is evident in Thucydides' account of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. For him, the short-term causes of the conflict are mere pretexts: Spartan fear of the growth of Athenian power leads to the war. In contrast, Donald Kagan holds that the best explanation resides in the short-term causes. Historians use causes to construct explanations of the past, but this does not mean that the resultant interpretations always match. Historical inquiry proceeds from decisions about what is important in the past. A range of criteria may be applied to such an evaluation. Significance may be ascribed to an aspect of the past because it results *in* or *from* change. The judgment of the historian is pivotal. For example, Thucydides views the war between Sparta and Athens as one event, but this was not the prevailing understanding at the time. Furthermore, an event (or other aspect of the past) may be important because an historical explanation would be incomplete without it. For example, explanation of the Sicilian Expedition necessitates reference to the death of Pericles as this event enables later leaders to abandon his caution policy for the conduct of the war.

Narrative is the central mode of historical explanation. It consists of events (changes) held together by causal relationships. Thucydides offers a compelling example in his account of the Sicilian Expedition. This text reveals that change and continuity coexist. Narrative makes use of turning points. These are moments when the course or pace of change shifts. For example, Livy marks the birth of the Roman republic as a point of significant change. Narrative records change for posterity. In his account of the trial of Cremutius Cordus,

Tacitus demonstrates that historical narrative is indispensable to civic life; Cremutius dies but his work lives on. Walter Gallie holds that historical understanding is the ability to comprehend a historical narrative.[6] This definition does not address the capacity to engage in historical inquiry and argument. Having said that, historical understanding empowers the reader to identify the syntax of historical writing. Such readers can trace continuities and discontinuities between historical interpretations and place historiography in context. Historical thinking concepts provide the syntax of a conversation about the past.

The present study employs a constructivist approach to learning and teaching. Rom Harré and Luk van Langenhove note that social constructionism denotes a series of positions in psychology that understand action as purposeful and subject to normative constraints (i.e. behaviour can be measured against standards); a second tenet is that social interaction is fundamental to our human nature.[7] Social exchanges are the focal point of such research. The present study adopts a specific approach to conversation.[8] Building on foundations established by Israel Scheffler, Doug Roberts advocates a 'social construction' model to defend the epistemic authority of teachers. The teacher observes the domain and makes representations of it. The student does likewise. The exchange of constructions between teacher and student is crucial to learning and teaching. It is necessary to add the remainder of the class as a fourth element to capture the dynamics of conversation in the classroom. Teachers and students must use a pedagogical instrument (sign) to refer to the domain.

In history, the pedagogical instrument is a source. It refers to an aspect of the past (or historical inquiry). The linguistic model offered by Ferdinand de Saussure holds that the

---

[6] Walter B. Gallie, *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1964), 105.
[7] Rom Harré and Luk van Langenhove, 'The Dynamics of Social Episodes', in *Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts of Intentional Action*, ed. Rom Harré and Luk van Langenhove (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 1-13.
[8] A range of positions in the social sciences privilege structure and agency over language. Roy Bhaskar and Anthony Giddens hold that structures are inseparable from agency; cf. Rom Harré, 'The Siren Song of Substantivalism', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 39, no. 4 (2009), 470: 'The Bhaskar/Giddens double structure theory can be replaced by the Vygotsky/Wittgenstein double grammar theory of the reproduction of culture. According to the latter theory, the apprentice, whose activities are in the zone of proximal development, acquires the skills that lead from one stage of actual development to another. The apprentice is learning the "rules of the game", acquiring a social representation of what to do and how to recognise when to do it and with whom in a "conversational" process, that is in a social setting with people showing or telling what to do, supplementing the learner's attempts.'

sign is comprised of a signifier and signified which have an arbitrary relationship. This neglects the sense that students make of the sign and ignores the possibility of building meaning through discussion. The social semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce offers a more thorough account of the sign. His triadic model consists of the *representamen* (form), the object (referent), and the *interpretant* (the sense made of the two). Later, he distinguishes between the *immediate object* (initial understanding) and the *dynamic object* (knowledge at the end of inquiry). The immediate object moves towards the dynamic object through exchanges of the type outlined by Roberts in his 'social construction' model. In this way, the current study presents a theory of pedagogical method. There is significant potential for further research and application of this approach beyond history.

The present study is an argument for teaching historical method. It affirms the agency of the teacher in selecting sources and activities to create learning experiences for students. For example, we note that Frederick Drake and Sarah Drake Brown distinguish between different orders of sources to plan for teaching.[9] We add questions to this approach. First-order questions and sources are indispensable to the teaching and learning sequence. They establish foundational concepts and issues. Second-order questions and sources exist in creative pedagogical tension with first-order ones. They enable teachers to direct students to additional aspects of the past (or to elements of historical inquiry). They allow students to explore a range of perspectives. Third-order questions and sources are the realm of student inquiry. Planning such learning experiences requires teachers to use historical knowledge (amongst other kinds of expertise) to serve pedagogical ends.

Writing from a sociological perspective, Basil Bernstein offers a detailed treatment of the contextualisation of knowledge in education.[10] Central to his account is the notion of the *pedagogic device*. This refers to rules that enable the transformation of knowledge into pedagogic discourse. *Distributive* rules regulate knowledge, intensity and power in the academy. *Recontextualising* rules organise knowledge to serve pedagogical purposes.

[9] Frederick Drake and Sarah Drake Brown. 'A Systematic Approach to Improve Students' Historical Thinking', *The History Teacher* 36, no. 4 (2003): 465-489.
[10] Basil Bernstein, *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse* (London: Routledge. 1990); Basil Bernstein, *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1996); for a helpful discussion see Parlo Singh, 'Pedagogising Knowledge: Bernstein's Theory of the Pedagogic Device', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 23, no. 4 (2002): 571-582.

Evaluative rules address pedagogy and assessment. These sets of rules have a hierarchical relationship: knowledge is produced by the first, reorganised by the second, and assessed by the third. Although it explains much about education, this approach is not without its difficulties. One problem is the absence of a model of semiosis.[11] This is addressed in the present research by the semiotics of Peirce. Furthermore, Bernstein's distributive model privileges structure over agency. In contrast, Lev Vygotsky and Ludwig Wittgenstein stress the centrality of social transactions, context and language.[12] From this viewpoint, attention to conversation is vital. Meaning is constituted through social exchanges.[13] The consequences for how we understand history education are profound. Bernstein offers a perspective in which social beings - now and in the past - are governed by institutions and their reproduction. Instead, the present research argues for a constitutive approach to sensemaking. Social rules are at work, but these address the actual moves of play. From this viewpoint, collaborations (orders of practice) and agency are central. Teachers and students interact to construct meaning in the history classroom.

The professional development of teachers is critical to how history is taught, that is how any history curriculum is lived out in schools. Lee Shulman holds that Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) resides at the intersection of domain-based knowledge and pedagogical knowledge.[14] He speaks of this as 'knowledge *for teaching*'. This view has been criticised as privileging practical epistemological knowledge over the moral craft knowledge that teachers draw on to serve the educational needs of their students.[15] Effective history teachers know the substance and syntax of the discipline in a way that renders them accessible to their students. At the same time, the moral dimension of our work requires that teachers anticipate and respond appropriately to their students'

[11] William Tyler, 'Silent, Invisible, Total: Pedagogic Discourse and the Age of Information', in *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein*, ed. Johan Muller, Brian Davies and Ana Morais (London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004), 15-29.
[12] Lev Vygotsky, *Thought and Language* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1962); Ludwig J. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, ed. Gertrude E. M. Anscombe and Rush Rhees, trans. Gertrude E. M. Anscombe (Oxford: Blackwell, 1953).
[13] Anne Warfield Rawls, 'Wittgenstein, Durkheim, Garfinkel and Winch: Constitutive Orders of Sensemaking', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 41, no 4 (2011): 396-418.
[14] Shulman, Lee S. 'Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching'. *Educational Researcher* 15, no. 2 (1986): 4-14.
[15] Sockett, Sockett, Hugh T. 'Has Shulman Got the Strategy Right?' *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 2 (1987): 208-219. For a rejection of teaching as applied science, see Alan. R. Tom, 'Teaching as a Moral Craft: A Metaphor for Teaching and Teacher Education', *Curriculum Inquiry* 10, no. 3 (1980): 317-323.

representations and constructions of meaning in class. Consequently, professional learning programs cannot adopt an exclusive focus on substantive content. The current research demonstrates that knowledge of the syntax of history is vital and that discussion of such concepts collapses without substantive episodes, questions and sources. The pedagogical challenge is to make history knowable, learnable, and, above all, *valuable* to students. This aim is best served by aspects of classroom conversation advocated in the present study. Such conversations do not offer students a past that repeats, but one that resonates.

9. Bibliography

Primary Sources

Andocides. ‘On the Peace with Sparta’. In *Minor Attic Orators, Volume 1: Antiphon. Andocides.* Translated by Kenneth J. Maidment. Loeb Classical Library 308. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by Christopher Rowe. Introduction and comments by Sarah Broadie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

—. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 73. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

—. *Physics, Volume I: Books 1-4.* Translated by Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford. Loeb Classical Library 228. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Aristotle, Longinus, Demetrius. *Poetics. Longinus: On the Sublime. Demetrius: On Style*. Translated by Stephen Halliwell, W. Hamilton Fyfe, Doreen C. Innes, W. Rhys Roberts. Revised by Donald A. Russell. Loeb Classical Library 199. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Euripides. *Medea and Other Plays*. Translated by Philip Vellacott. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.

Herodotus. *The Persian Wars*. Translated by Alfred D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library 117. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

—. *The Histories*. Translated by Aubrey De Sélincourt. Revised by John Marincola. London: Penguin, 2003.

Homer. *The Odyssey*. Translated by Robert Fagles. New York: Penguin, 1996.

Pausanias. *Description of Greece, Volume I: Books 1-2 (Attica and Corinth)*. Translated by William H. S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 93. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.

Sallust. *The War with Catiline. The War with Jugurtha*. Translated by John Carew Rolfe. Revised John T. Ramsey. Loeb Classical Library 116. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Tacitus. *The Annals*. Translated by Anthony J. Woodman. Indianapolis: Hakkert, 2004.

Thucydides. *The History of the Peloponnesian War.* Translated by Richard Crawley. London: J. M. Dent, 1910.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 4 vols. Translated by Charles F. Smith. Loeb Classical Library 108 -110 & 169. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919-1928.

Secondary Sources

Alford, Elizabeth M. 'Thucydides and the Plague at Athens'. *Written Communication* 5, no. 2 (1988): 131-53.

Allison, Graham. *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap?* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2017.

Allison, June W. 'Homeric Allusion at the Close of Thucydides' Sicilian Narrative'. *American Journal of Philology* 118, no. 4 (1997): 499-516.

Ammerman, Albert J., Maurizia De Min, and Rupert Housley. 'New Evidence on the Origins of Venice'. *Antiquity* 64 (1992): 913-16.

—. 'More on the Origins of Venice'. *Antiquity* 69 (1995): 501-10.

Andrewes, Anthony. 'Thucydides on the Causes of the War'. *Classical Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (1959): 223-239.

—. 'The Melian Dialogue and Pericles' Last Speech'. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* n. s. 6 (1960): 1-10.

Anderson, Lorin W., and David R. Krathwohl, eds. *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman, 2001.

Ankersmit, Frank R. *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983.

—. *Sublime Historical Experience*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Aronson, Elliot, C. Stephan, J. Sikes, N. Blaney, and M. Snapp. *The Jigsaw Classroom*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage, 1978.

Ashby, Rosalyn, and Peter Lee. 'Children's Concepts of Empathy and Understanding in History'. In *The History Curriculum for Teachers*, edited by Christopher Portal, 62-88. London: Falmer, 1987.

Atkin, Albert. ‘Peirce's Theory of Signs’. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta (Summer 2013 Edition). Accessed September 12, 2019. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/peirce-semiotics/.

Bailey, Thomas A. *America Faces Russia*: *Russian-American Relations from Early Times to Our Day*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1950.

Bage, Grant. *Narrative Matters: Teaching and Learning History Through Story*. London: Falmer Press, 1999.

Balot, Ryan K., Sara Forsdyke, and Edith Foster, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Barton, Keith. ‘Narrative Simplifications in Elementary Students’ Historical Thinking’. In *Advances in Research on Teaching*. Vol. 6, *Teaching and Learning in History*, edited by Jere Brophy, 56-60. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1996.

—. “‘I Just Kinda Know”: Elementary Students’ Ideas about Historical Evidence’. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 25, no. 4 (1997): 407-30.

—. ‘Primary Children’s Understanding of the Role of Evidence: Comparisons between the United States and Northern Ireland’. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research* 1, no. 2 (2001): 21-30.

—. ‘“You’d be Wanting to Know about the Past”: Social Contexts of Children’s Historical Understanding in Northern Ireland and the United States’. *Comparative Education* 37 (2001): 89-106.

—. ‘School History as a Resource for Constructing Identities: Implications of Research from the United States, Northern Ireland, and New Zealand’. In *History Education and the Construction of National Identities*, edited by Mario Carretero, Mikel Asensio, and Maria Rodríguez-Moneo, 97-103. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2012.

Barton, Keith, and Linda S. Levstik. ‘“It Wasn’t a Good Part of History”: National Identity and Students’ Explanations of Historical Significance’. *Teachers College Record* 99, no. 3 (1998): 478-513.

—. *Teaching History for the Common Good*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2008.

Bean, Charles E. W. *Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-1918*. Vol. 1, *The Story of ANZAC from the Outbreak of War to the End of the First Phase of the Gallipoli Campaign, May 4, 1915*. 11th ed. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1941.

Beard, Mary. *Confronting the Classics: Traditions, Adventures and Innovations*. London: Profile Books, 2013.

Beaumont, Joan. 'The Anzac Legend'. In *Australia's War 1914-18*, edited by Joan Beaumont, 149-180. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1995.

Bedford, David, and Thorn Workman. 'The Tragic Reading of the Thucydidean Tragedy'. *Review of International Studies* 27, no. 1 (2001): 51-67.

Bennett, Beth S. 'Hermagoras of Temnos'. In *Classical Rhetorics and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources*, edited by Michelle Ballif and Michael G. Moran, 187-193. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Doubleday, 1966.

Bergman, Mats, and Sami Paavola. *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition*. Accessed September 12, 2019. http://www.commens.org/dictionary/term/sign.

Bernstein, Basil B. 'On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge'. In *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Knowledge*, edited by Michael F. D. Young, 47-69. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

—. *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge, 1990.

—. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1996.

Bevir, Mark. *The Logic of the History of Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Bevir, Mark, and Frank Ankersmit, 'Exchanging Ideas'. *Rethinking History: The Journal of Theory and Practice* 4, no. 3 (2000): 351-372.

Biggs, John B., and Kevin F. Collis, *Evaluating the Quality of Learning: The SOLO Taxonomy (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome)*. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Birley, Anthony R. 'The Life and Death of Cornelius Tacitus'. *Historia* 49 (2000): 230-47.

Bleich, David. *Subjective Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Bloom, Benjamin S., ed. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: David McKay, 1956.

Boardman, John, Nicholas G. L. Hammond, David M. Lewis, and Martin Ostwald, eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History.* Vol. 4, *Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525–479 BC.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Boedeker, Deborah. 'Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus'. In *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, Irene J. F. de Jong, and Hans van Wees, 97-116. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Bosworth, Albert B. 'The Humanitarian Aspect of the Melian Dialogue'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 113 (1993): 30-44

Braudel, Fernand. *A History of Civilizations*. Translated by Richard Mayne. New York: Penguin, 1995.

Broadbent, Harvey. *Gallipoli: The Fatal Shore.* Camberwell, Melbourne: Penguin, 2005.

Brock, Roger. *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Brown, Patricia Fortini. *Venice and Antiquity: The Venetian Sense of the Past*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Bruce, I. A. F. 'The Corcyraean Civil War of 427 BC'. *Phoenix* 25, no. 2 (1971): 108-117.

Bruner, Jerome. *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.

—. *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

—. *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.

—. 'The Narrative Construction of Reality'. *Critical Inquiry* 18, no. 1 (1991): 1-21.

—. *Making Stories: Law, Literature, Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. Translated by S. G. C. Middlemore. London: Penguin, 1990.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Bury, John B., Stanley A. Cook, and Frank E. Adcock, eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History.* Vol. 5, *Athens 478-401 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.

Cam, Philip. *Twenty Thinking Tools*. Camberwell, Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research, 2006.

Carlyon, Les. *Gallipoli*. Sydney: Macmillan, 2001.

Carr, Edward H. *What is History?* 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1990.

Chandler, Daniel. *Semiotics: The Basics*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2007.

Chapman, Arthur. 'Camels, Diamonds and Counterfactuals: A Model for Teaching Causal Reasoning'. *Teaching History* 112 (2003): 46-53.

Clark, Anna. 'What Do They Teach Our Children?' In *The History Wars*, Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark, 171-190. Melbourne: University of Melbourne Press, 2003.

—. 'Teaching the Nation's Story: Comparing Public Debates and Classroom Perspectives on History Education in Australia and Canada'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 41, no. 6 (2009): 745-762

—. 'Politicians Using History'. *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 56, no. 1 (2010): 120-131.

Clark, Christopher. *The Sleepwalkers – How Europe Went to War in 1914*. London: Allen Lane, 2012.

Cleland, Carol E. 'The Difference between Real Change and *Mere* Cambridge Change'. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition* 60, no. 3 (1990): 257-280.

Cochrane, Charles N. *Thucydides and the Science of History*. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.

Collingwood, Robin G. *An Autobiography*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1944.

—. *The Idea of History*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Connelly, F. Michael. 'Joseph Schwab, Curriculum, Curriculum Studies and Educational Reform'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 45, no. 5 (2013): 622-639.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Cornell, Tim J. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars c.1000-264 B.C.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Connor, W. Robert. *Thucydides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Cogan, Marc. 'Mytilene, Plataea, and Corcyra: Ideology and Policy in Thucydides'. *Phoenix* 35 (1981): 1-21.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Cornell, Tim J. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000-264 B.C.)* London: Routledge, 1995.

Cornford, Francis Macdonald. *Thucydides Mythistoricus*. London: Edward Arnold, 1907.

Counsell, Christine. 'Historical Knowledge and Historical Skills: A Distracting Dichotomy'. In *Issues in History Teaching*, edited by James Arthur and Robert Phillips, 54–71. London: Routledge, 2000.

—. 'Looking Through a Josephine-Butler-Shaped Window: Focusing Pupils' Thinking on Historical Significance'. *Teaching History* 114 (2004): 30-36.

—. 'What Do We Want Students to Do with Historical Change and Continuity?' In *Debates in History Teaching*, edited by Ian Davies, 109-123. London: Routledge, 2011.

—. 'Historical Change and Continuity: How History Teachers are Advancing the Field'. In *Debates in History Teaching*, 2nd ed., edited by Ian Davies, 109-123. London: Routledge, 2017.

Croce, Benedetto. *History, Its Theory and Practice*. Translated by Douglas Ainslie. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1921.

Crouzet-Pavan, Elizabeth. 'Toward an Ecological Understanding of the Myth of Venice'. In *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City State, 1297-1797*, edited by John Martin and Dennis Romano, 39-64. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Culler, Jonathan D. *Saussure*. Glasgow: Fontana, 1976.

Curthoys, Anne, and John Docker. *Is History Fiction?* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2006.

Davies, John K. ‘Greece after the Persian Wars’. In David M. Lewis et al., *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 5, *The Fifth Century B.C.*, 15-33.

Dermot, Paul. ‘The Causes of the Athenian Plague and Thucydides’. In *Thucydides between History and Literature*, edited by Antonis Tsakmakis and Melina Tamiolaki, 73-87. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Dillery, John. ‘Exile: The Making of the Greek Historian’. In *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jan Felix Gaertner, 51-70. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Drake, Frederick D., and Sarah Drake Brown. ‘A Systematic Approach to Improve Students’ Historical Thinking’. *The History Teacher* 36, no. 4 (2003): 465-489.

Dermot, Paul. ‘The Causes of the Athenian Plague and Thucydides’. In *Thucydides between History and Literature*, edited by Antonis Tsakmakis and Melina Tamiolaki, 73-90. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Dray, William H. *History as Re-Enactment: R. G. Collingwood's Idea of History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.

Eisner, Elliot W. ‘No Easy Answers, Joseph Schwab’s Contributions to Curriculum’. *Curriculum Inquiry* 14, no. 2 (1984): 201-210

—. *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs.* 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2002.

Eisner, Elliot W., and Elizabeth Vallance. ‘Introduction – Five Conceptions of Curriculum: Their Roots and Implications for Curriculum Planning’. In *Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum*, edited by Elliot W. Eisner and Elizabeth Vallance. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974, 1-18.

Ellis, Walter M. *Alcibiades*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Elton, Geoffrey R. *The Practice of History*. London: Collins, 1967.

Endacott, Jason. ‘Reconsidering Affective Engagement in Historical Empathy’. *Theory & Research in Social Education* 38, no. 1 (2010): 6-49

Endacott, Jason, and Sarah Brooks. ‘An Updated Theoretical and Practical Model for Promoting Historical Empathy’. *Social Studies Research and Practice* 8, no 1 (2013): 41-57.

Epstein, Terrie L. '"Makes No Difference if You're Black or White?" African-American and European American Adolescents' Perspectives on Historical Significance and Historical Sources'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1994.

—. 'Deconstructing Differences in African-American and European-American Adolescents' Perspectives on U.S. History'. *Curriculum Inquiry* 28, no. 4 (1998): 397-423.

Evans, James A. S. 'Father of History or Father of Lies: The Reputation of Herodotus'. *The Classical Journal* 64, no. 1 (1968): 11-17.

Evans, Richard. *In Defence of History*. London: Granta Books, 1997.

Facey, Albert B. *A Fortunate Life*. Melbourne: Penguin, 2014.

Fang, Zhihui. 'A Review of Research on Teacher Beliefs and Practices'. *Educational Research* 38, no 1 (1996): 47–65.

Fay, Sydney B. *The Origins of the World War*. New York: Macmillan, 1930.

Feeney, Denis C. 'Beginning Sallust's *Catiline*'. *Prudentia* 26 (1994): 139-46

Ferguson, William S. 'The Athenian Expedition to Sicily'. In Bury et al., *The Cambridge Ancient History.* Vol. 5, *Athens 478-401 BC*, 282-311.

Fischer, David H. *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Fischer, Fritz. *Griff nach der Weltmacht: die Kriegszielpolitik des kaiserlichen Deutschland 1914/1918* (Dusseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1962). English translation: *Germany and the Origins of the First World War*. London, Chatto & Windus 1967.

—. *War of Illusions*. London: Chatto & Windus 1975.

Fish, Stanley E. 'Interpreting the *Variorum*'. *Critical Inquiry* 2, no. 3 (1976): 465-485.

—. *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *The Great Gatsby*. London: Penguin, [1926] 1990.

Fornara, Charles. 'Plutarch and the Megarian Decree'. *Yale Classical Studies* 24 (1975): 213-228.

Foster, Stuart J. 'Using Historical Empathy to Excite Students about the Study of History: Can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain?' *The Social Studies* 90, no 1 (1999): 18-24.

—. ‘Historical Empathy in Theory and Practice: Some Final Thoughts’. In *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*, edited by Ozro L. Davis, Jr, Elizabeth Yeager and Stuart Foster, 167-182. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001.

Foster, Stuart J., and Elizabeth A. Yeager. ‘The Role of Empathy in the Development of Historical Understanding’. *International Journal of Social Education* 13, no. 1 (1998): 1-7.

Freebody, Peter, and Jill Freiberg. ‘Public and Pedagogic Morality: The Local Orders of Instructional and Regulatory Talk in Classrooms’. In *Local Educational Order: Ethnomethodological Studies of Knowledge in Action*, edited by Stephen K. Hester and David Francis, 141-162. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000.

French, Alfred. ‘Thucydides and the Power Syndrome’. *Greece and Rome* 27 (1980): 22-30.

Fuks, Alexander. ‘Thucydides and the Stasis at Corcyra’. *American Journal of Philology* 92, no. 2 (1971): 48-55.

Furley, William D. *Andokides and the Herms: A Study of Crisis in Fifth-Century Athenian Religion.* London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 1996.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. New York, Seabury Press, 1975.

Gaddis, John L. *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941–1947.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.

—. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Gallie, Walter B. *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1964.

Gammage, Bill. *The Broken Years: Australian Soldiers in the Great War*. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1974.

Gardiner, Patrick L. ‘The “Objects” of Historical Knowledge’. *Philosophy* 27 (1952): 211-220.

—. *The Nature of Historical Explanation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Gardner, Howard and Veronica Boix-Mansilla. ‘Teaching for Understanding in the Disciples – and Beyond’. *Teachers College Record* 96, no. 2 (1994): 198-218.

Garrity, Thomas F. ‘Thucydides 1.22.1 Content and Form in the Speeches’. *American Journal of Philology* 119 (1998): 361-84.

Geach, Peter T. *God and the Soul*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Gillies, Robyn M. *Cooperative Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications, 2007.

—. ‘Cooperative Learning: Developments in Research’. *International Journal of Educational Psychology* 3, no. 2 (2014): 125–140.

—. ‘Co-operative Learning: Review of Research and Practice’. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 41, no. 3 (2016): 39-54.

—. ‘Dialogic Interactions in the Cooperative Classroom’. *International Journal of Educational Research* 76 (2016): 178-189.

Goldstein, Leon J. *Historical Knowing*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1976.

Gomme, Arnold W. *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1933.

—. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945-1956.

Gomme, Arnold W., Anthony Andrewes, and Kenneth J. Dover. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Goodyear, Francis R. D. ‘Sallust’. In *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 2, *Latin Literature*, edited by Edward J. Kenney, 268-280. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Gould, John. *Herodotus*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1989.

Greenwood, Emily. ‘Thucydides on the Sicilian Expedition’. In Balot et al., *Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, 161-177.

Grethlein, Jonas. *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Grote, George. *A History of Greece*. Vol. 6. London: Dent, [1888] 1906.

Grundy, George B. *Thucydides and the History of His Age*. Vol. 1, 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1948.

Gruner, Rolf. ‘The Notion of an Historical Event, I’. *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 43: 141-52.

Guyver, Robert. ‘Reflections on the History Wars’. *Agora* 46, no. 2, (2011): 4-12.

—. ‘History Teaching, Pedagogy, Curriculum and Politics: Dialogues and Debates in Regional, National, Transnational, International and Supranational Settings’. *International Journal of Historical Learning Teaching and Research*, 11, no.2 (2013): 3-10.

Hammond, Nicholas G. L. ‘The Composition of Thucydides' History’. *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1940): 146-152.

—. ‘The Expedition of Datis and Artaphernes’. In Boardman et al., *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 4, *Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525–479 B.C.*, 491-517.

—. ‘The Expedition of Xerxes’. In Boardman et al., *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 4, *Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525–479 B.C.*, 518-591.

Hansen, Mogens H. ‘Athenian Population Losses 431-403 BC and the Number of Athenian Citizens in 431 B.C.’. In *Three Studies in Athenian Demography*, 14-28. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters, 1988.

Harré, Rom. ‘The Siren Song of Substantivalism’. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 39, no. 4 (2009): 466-473.

Harré, Rom, and Luk van Langenhove. ‘The Dynamics of Social Episodes’. In *Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts of Intentional Action*, edited by Rom Harré and Luk van Langenhove, 1-13. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

Harris, Edward M. ‘Nicias’ Illegal Proposal in the Debate about the Sicilian Expedition (Thuc. 6.14)’. *Classical Philology* 109, no. 1 (2014): 66-72.

Harris, Roy. *Reading Saussure: A Critical Commentary on the Cours de Linguistique Générale*. London: Duckworth, 1987.

Hatzfeld, Jean. *Alcibiade: Étude sur l’histoire d’Athènes à la fin du V^{e} siècle*. 2nd ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951.

Henderson, John. ‘Livy and the Invention of History’. In *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*, edited by Averil Cameron, 64-85. London: Duckworth, 1989.

Herber, Harold L. *Teaching Reading in Content Areas*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Hirst, Paul. *Knowledge and the Curriculum: A Collection of Philosophical Papers*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Historical Thinking Project. 'Historical Thinking Concepts'. Accessed September 12, 2019. http://historicalthinking.ca/historical-thinking-concepts.

Hofer, Barbara K., and Paul R. Pintrich, eds. *Personal Epistemology: The Psychology of Beliefs about Knowledge and Knowing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002.

Holladay, A. J. 'Sparta's Role in the First Peloponnesian War'. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97 (1977): 54-63.

—. 'Sparta and the First Peloponnesian War'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105 (1985): 161-162.

Holladay, A. J., and J. C. F. Poole, 'Thucydides and the Plague of Athens', *Classical Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (1979): 282-300.

Holland, Norman N. *The Dynamics of Literary Response*. New York: Norton, 1975.

Hookway, Christopher J. *Peirce*. London: Routledge, 1985.

Hornblower, Simon. *Thucydides*. London: Duckworth, 1987.

—. *The Greek World, 479-323*. London: Routledge, 1991.

—. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991-2008.

Housley, Rupert, Albert J. Ammerman, and M. C. McLennan. 'That Sinking Feeling: Wetland Investigations of the Origins of Venice'. *Journal of Wetland Archaeology* 4, no. 1 (2004): 139-153.

Hudson-Williams, H. Ll. 'Conventional Forms of Debate and the Melian Dialogue'. *American Journal of Philology* 71 (1950): 156-69

Hughes-Warrington, Marnie. *'How Good an Historian Shall I Be?': R. G. Collingwood, The Historical Imagination and Education*. Exeter: Imprint, 2003.

Huijgen, Tim, Paul Holthuis, Carla van Boxtel, and Wim van de Grift. 'Promoting Historical Contextualisation in Classrooms: An Observational Study'. *Educational Studies* 45, no. 4 (2019): 456-479.

Huizinga, Johan. 'The Aesthetic Element in Historical Thought'. In *Dutch Civilisation in the 17th Century and Other Essays*, 219–243. London: Collins, 1968.

Hunter, Virginia J. *Thucydides The Artful Reporter*. Hakkert: Toronto, 1973.

—. 'The Composition of Thucydides' History: A New Answer to the Problem'. *Historia* 26 (1977), 269-94.

—. *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

—. ‘Thucydides and the Sociology of the Crowd’. *Classical Journal* 84 (1988): 17-30.

Husbands, Chris. *What is History Teaching? Language, Ideas and Meaning in Learning about the Past*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996.

—. ‘What Do History Teachers (Need to) Know? A Framework for Understanding and Developing Practice’. In *Debates in History Teaching*, edited by Ian Davies, 84-95. London: Routledge, 2011.

Immerwahr, Henry R. ‘Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus’. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 87 (1956): 241-280

—. *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Cleveland: American Philological Association, 1966.

Inglis, Kenneth S. *Anzac Remembered: Selected Writings by K. S. Inglis*, edited by John Lack. Melbourne: History Department, University of Melbourne, 1998.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Jay, Lightning, and Abby Reisman. ‘Teaching Change and Continuity with Historical Analogies’. *Social Studies Research and Practice* 14, no. 1 (2019): 98-104.

Jenkins, Keith. *Re-Thinking History*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Johnson, David W., and Roger T. Johnson. ‘Learning Together and Alone: Overview and Meta-analysis’. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 22, no. 1 (2002): 95-105.

—. ‘An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning’. *Educational Researcher* 38 (2009): 365-379.

Jones, Brian W. *The Emperor Domitian*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Joseph, John E. *Saussure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Kagan, Donald. *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966.

—. *The Archidamian War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974.

—. ‘The Speeches in Thucydides and the Mytilene Debate’. *Yale Classical Studies* 24 (1975): 71–94.

—. *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1981.

—. *The Fall of the Athenian Empire*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987.

—. *The Peloponnesian War*. New York: Viking Press, 2003.

—. *Thucydides: The Reinvention of History*. London: Viking, 2009.

Kagan, Spencer. *Cooperative Learning.* Heatherton, Melbourne: Hawker Brownlow, 2007.

Kallet, Lisa. *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides: The Sicilian Expedition and its Aftermath*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

—. 'Thucydides, Apollo, Plague and the War'. *American Journal of Philology* 134, no. 3 (2013): 355-382.

—. 'The Pentecontaetia'. In Balot et al., *Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, 63-80.

Kapuscinski, Ryszard. *Travels with Herodotus*. Translated by Klara Glowczewska. New York: A. A. Knopf, 2008.

Kelly, D. H. 'Thucydides, Herodotus and the Pitanate *Lochos*'. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 22 (1981): 31-8.

Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

King, Arthur R., and John A. Brownell. *The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge: A Theory of Curriculum Practice*. New York: Wiley, 1966.

King, Patricia M., and Karen S. Kitchener. 'The Reflective Judgment Model: Twenty Years of Research on Epistemic Cognition'. In Hofer and Pintrich, *Personal Epistemology*, 37-61.

Kitson, Alison, and Chris Husbands with Susan Steward. *Teaching and Learning History 11-18: Understanding the Past*. McGraw Hill: Open University Press, 2011.

Klinger, Friedrich. *Tacitus über Augustus und Tiberius: Interpretationen zum Eingangder Annalen.* Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1954.

Kobayashi, Chinatsu, and Mathieu Marion. 'Gadamer and Collingwood on Temporal Distance and Understanding'. *History and Theory* 50, no .4 (2011): 81–103.

Kraus, Christina S., and Anthony J. Woodman. *Latin Historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Kuhn, Deanna, and Michael Weinstock. 'What is Epistemological Thinking and Why Does it Matter?' In Hofer and Pintrich, *Personal Epistemology*, 121-144.

Kuzminski, Adrian. ‘Defending Historical Realism’. *History and Theory* 18, no. 3 (1979): 316-349.

Labov, William. *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Press, 1972.

Labov, William, and Joshua Waletzky. ‘Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience’. In *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, edited by June Helm, 12-44. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967.

LaFeber, Walter. *America, Russia and the Cold War, 1945-1992*. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.

—. *America, Russia and the Cold War, 1945-1992*. 10th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006.

Lake, Marilyn. ‘The Power of Anzac’. In *Australia: Two Centuries of War and Peace*, edited by Michael McKernan and Margaret Browne, 194-222. Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 1988.

Lateiner, Donald. *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Lee, Peter. ‘History Teaching and Philosophy of History’. *History and Theory* 22, no. 4 (1983): 19-49.

—. ‘Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History’. In *How Students Learn: History, Mathematics and Science in the Classroom*, edited by M. Suzanne Donovan and John D. Bransford, 31-77. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 2005.

Lee, Peter, and Rosalyn Ashby. ‘Progression in Historical Understanding Among Students Ages 7-14’. In Stearns et al., *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History*, 199-222.

Lee, Peter, Alaric Dickinson, and Rosalyn Ashby. ‘Children’s Ideas about Historical Explanation’. In *Raising the Standards in History Education*, vol. 3, edited by Alaric Dickinson, Peter Gordon and Peter Lee, 97-115. London: Woburn Press, 2001.

Lee, Peter, and Denis Shemilt. ‘A Scaffold, not a Cage: Progression and Progression Models in History’. *Teaching History* 113 (2003): 13–24.

—. ‘Is Any Explanation Better than None? Over-determined Narratives, Senseless Agencies and One-way Streets in Students’ Learning about Cause and Consequence’. *Teaching History*, 137 (2009): 42-49.

—. ‘The Concept that Dares not Speak Its Name: Should Empathy Come out of the Closet?’. *Teaching History* 143 (2011): 39-49.

Lemon, M. C. *The Discipline of History and the History of Thought*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Levene, David S. ‘Sallust’s Catiline and Cato the Censor’. *Classical Quarterly* 50 (2000): 170-91.

Lévesque, Stéphane. ‘Teaching Second-Order Concepts in Canadian History: The Importance of ’Historical Significance’. *Canadian Social Studies* 39, no. 2 (2005). Accessed September 12, 2019. https://canadian-social-studies-journal.educ.ualberta.ca/content/articles-2000-2010#ARLevesque_second-order_concepts221.

—. ‘Rethinking the ‘Bush Doctrine’: Historical Thinking and Post-September 11 Terrorism’. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research* 7 (2007). Accessed September 12, 2019. https://history.org.uk/publications/categories/304/resource/4862/the-international-journal-volume-7-number-1.

—. *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the Twenty-First Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Levstik, Linda S. ‘The Relationship between Historical Response and Narrative in a Sixth-Grade Classroom’. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 14, no 1 (1986): 1-19.

—. ‘Historical Narrative and the Young Reader’. *Theory into Practice* 28, no 2 (1989): 114-119.

—. ‘Narrative Constructions: Cultural Frames for History’. *The Social Studies* 86, no. 3 (1995): 113-116.

—. ‘“Any History is Someone’s History”: Listening to Multiple Voices from the Past’. *Social Education* 61, no. 1 (1997): 48-51.

—. ‘Articulating the Silences: Teachers’ and Adolescents’ Conceptions of Historical Significance’. In Stearns et al., *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*, 284-305.

Levstik, Linda S., and Keith C. Barton. *Doing History: Investigating with Children in Elementary and Middle Schools*. 5th ed. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Levisohn, Jon A. 'Historical Thinking--and Its Alleged Unnaturalness'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 49, no. 6 (2017): 618-630.

Lewis, David M. 'The Origins of the First Peloponnesian War'. In *Classical Contributions: Studies in Honour of Malcolm Francis MacGregor*, edited by Gordon S. Shrimpton and David J. McCargar, 71-78. Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1981.

Lewis, David M., John Boardman, J. K. Davies, and M. Ostwald, eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 5, *The Fifth Century B.C.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Liebeschuetz, Wolf. 'The Structure and Function of the Melian Dialogue'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 88 (1968): 73-77.

Lipovsky, James. *A Historiographical Study of Livy: Books VI-X*. New Hampshire: Ayer Company, 1984.

Lomas, Tim. *Teaching and Assessing Historical Understanding*. London: Historical Association, 1990.

Loughran, John. *What Expert Teachers Do: Enhancing Professional Knowledge for Classroom Practice*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin, 2010.

Lowenstein, Wendy. *Weevils in the Flour: An Oral Record of the 1930s Depression in Australia*. South Yarra, Melbourne: Hyland House, 1978.

Lowenthal, David. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Luce, T. James. *Livy: The Composition of his History*. Princeton, 1977.

—. 'Ancient Views of Causes of Bias in Historical Writing'. *Classical Philology* 84 (1989): 16-31.

—. *The Greek Historians*. London: Routledge, 1997.

MacDonald, Brian R. 'The Megarian Decree'. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 32, no. 4 (1983): 385-410.

Macdonald, Douglas J. 'Communist Bloc Expansion in the Early Cold War: Challenging Realism, Refuting Revisionism'. *International Security* 20, no. 3 (Winter 1995–1996): 152-188.

Mackie, Christopher J. ‘Homer and Thucydides: Corcyra and Sicily’. *Classical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (1996): 103-113.

Maggioni, Liliana, Bruce VanSledright, and Patricia A. Alexander. ‘Walking on the Borders: A Measure of Epistemic Cognition in History’. *Journal of Experimental Education* 77 (2009): 187-214.

—. ‘At a Crossroads? The Development of Epistemological Beliefs and Historical Thinking’, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 2 (2004): 169-197.

Marinatos, Nanno. ‘Nicias as Wise Advisor and Tragic Warner in Thucydides’. *Philologus* 124 (1980): 305–10.

Marincola, John. *Greek Historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

—. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

—. ‘Genre Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography’. In *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, edited by Christina S. Kraus, 291-301. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Martin, Bridget. ‘Debating History in the Australian Curriculum: A Clash of Paradigms?’ *Agora* 51, no. 1 (2016): 4-12.

Martin, Raymond. ‘Causes, Conditions, and Causal Importance’. *History and Theory* 21, no. 1 (1982): 53-74.

Martin, Ronald H. *Tacitus*. London: Batsford, 1981.

—. ‘Structure and Interpretation in the *Annals* of Tacitus’. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (*ANRW*) 2.33.2 (1990), 1500-1581.

Martin, Ronald H., and Anthony J. Woodman. *Tacitus: Annals IV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Mayer, Robert H. ‘Connecting Narrative and Historical Thinking: A Research-based approach to Teaching History’. *Social Education* 62, no. 2 (1998): 97-100.

McCullagh, C. Behan. ‘Historical Realism’. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 40, no. 3 (1980): 420-425.

McCrum, Elizabeth. ‘History Teachers' Thinking about the Nature of their Subject’. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 35, no. 1 (2013): 73-80.

McMeekin, Sean. *The Russian Origins of the First World War*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011.

McGrew, Sarah, Joel Breakstone, Teresa Ortega, Mark Smith, and Sam Wineburg. ‘Can Students Evaluate Online Sources? Learning from Assessments of Civic Online Reasoning’. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 46, no. 2 (2018): 165-193.

Macleod, Colin W. ‘Form and Meaning in the Melian Dialogue’. *Historia* 23 (1974): 385-400.

Meier, Christian. *Athens: A Portrait of the City in its Golden Age*. Translated by Robert Kimber and Rita Kimber. London: Pimlico, 2000.

Meiggs, Russell, and Davis Lewis. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Meloth, Michael S., and Paul D. Deering. ‘The Role of the Teacher in Promoting Cognitive Processing During Collaborative Learning’. In *Cognitive Perspectives on Peer Learning*, edited by Angela O’Donnell and Alison King, 235-255. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1999.

Mellor, Ronald. *The Roman Historians*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Mendelbaum, Maurice. *The Problem of Historical Knowledge: An Answer to Relativism*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Meiggs, Russell, and Davis Lewis. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Miles, Gary B. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Miller, Norma P. ‘Tiberius Speaks: An Examination of the Utterances Ascribed to him in the *Annals* of Tacitus’. *American Journal of Philology* 89, no. 1 (1968): 1-19.

Missiou, Anna. *The Subversive Oratory of Andokides: Politics, Ideology and Decision-Making in Democratic Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Mitchell-Boyask, Robin. *Plague and the Athenian Imagination: Drama, History, and the Cult of Asclepius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Moles, John. ‘Livy’s Preface’. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39 (1993): 141-68.

—. ‘Cry Freedom: Tacitus *Annals* 4.32-35’. *Histos* 2 (1998): 95-184.

Mombauer, Annika. *The Origins of the First World War: Controversies and Consensus*. Harlow, England: Longman, 2002.

Moorehead, Alan. *Gallipoli*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1956.

Morford, Michael. ‘How Tacitus Defined Liberty’. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (*ANRW*) 2.33.5 (1991): 3420-50.

Morgan, Thomas E. ‘Plague or Poetry? Thucydides on the Epidemic at Athens’. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124 (1994): 197-209.

Morris, Albert, and Nea Stewart-Dore. *Learning to Learn from Text: Effective Reading in the Content Areas*. North Ryde, Sydney: Addison-Wesley, 1984.

Munby, Hugh, and Tom Russell. ‘The Authority of Experience in Learning to Teach: Messages form a Physics Methods Class’. *Journal of Teacher Education* 45, no. 2 (1994): 86-95.

Munby, Hugh, Tom Russell, and Alice K. Martin. ‘Teachers' Knowledge and How it Develops’. In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, edited by Virginia Richardson, 877-904. Washington: American Educational Research Association: 2001.

Munn, Mark. *The School of History: Athens in the Age of Socrates.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Munslow, Alun. *Deconstructing History*. London: Routledge, 1997.

—. *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2000.

—. *Narrative and History*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

—. ‘Genre and History/Historying’. *Rethinking History: The Journal of Theory and Practice* 19, no. 2 (2015): 158-176.

Murray, Oswyn. ‘The Affair of the Mysteries: Democracy and the Drinking Group’. In *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*, 149-161. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Nadeau, Ray. ‘Classical Systems of *Stases* in Greek: Hermagoras to Hermogenes’. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 2 (1959): 51-71.

National Curriculum Board, *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum: History* (May 2009). Accessed September 12, 2019. http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Australian_Curriculum_-_History.pdf

Ng, On-cho, and Q. Edward Wang. *Mirroring the Past: The Writing and Use of History in Imperial China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005.

Nielsen, Margit Hurup. ‘Re-enactment and Reconstruction in Collingwood’s Philosophy of History’. *History and Theory* 20, no 1 (1981): 1-31.

Nora, Pierre. ‘General Introduction. Between Memory and History’. In *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*, edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman, 1-20. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Nöth, Winfried. *Handbook of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

O’Boyle, Edward J. ‘Classical Economics and the Great Irish Famine: A Study in Limits’. *Forum for Social Economics* 35, no. 2 (2006): 21–53.

Orton, Robert E. ‘How Can Teacher Beliefs About Student Learning Be Justified?’ *Curriculum Inquiry* 26, no. 2 (1996): 133-146.

Orwin, Clifford. *The Humanity of Thucydides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Page, Denys L. ‘Thucydides’ Description of the Great Plague at Athens’. *Classical Quarterly* 3, no. 3/4 (1953): 97-119.

Parkes, Robert J. ‘Teaching History as Historiography: Engaging Narrative Diversity in the Curriculum’. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research* 8, no. 2 (2009): 118-132.

Parry, Adam M. ‘The Language of Thucydides’ Description of the Plague’. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 16 (1969): 106-18.

Partington, Geoffrey. *The Idea of an Historical Education*. Windsor, England: NFER Publishing, 1980.

—. ‘What History Should We Teach?’ *Oxford Review of Education* 6, no. 2 (1980): 157-176.

Paul, G. M. ‘Sallust’. In *Latin Historians*, edited by T. A. Dorey, 85-113. London: Routledge, 1966.

Peck, Carla, and Peter Seixas. ‘Benchmarks of Historical Thinking: First Steps’. *Canadian Journal of Education* 31, no. 4 (2008): 1015-1038.

Peirce, Charles S. ‘The Fixation of Belief’. *Popular Science Monthly* 12 (1877): 1-15 (reprinted in *Collected Papers of Charles S. Peirce*. Vol. 5., edited by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss, 223-247. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931).

—. ‘On A New List of Categories’ in *The Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition*. Vol. 2., Peirce Edition Project, 49-59. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 1984.

—. ‘Prolegomena to an Apology for Pragmaticism’ 1906 CP 4.536; see ‘Immediate Object’. In *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition*, edited by Mats Bergman & Sami Paavola. Accessed September 12, 2019. http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-letters-william-james-17

Pelling, Christopher. ‘Herodotus and Homer’. In *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils*, edited by Michael J. Clarke, Bruno G. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, 75-104. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Phenix, Philip H. *Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Phillips, Robert. ‘Historical Significance – the Forgotten Key Element?’ *Teaching History* 106 (2002): 14-19.

Pollock, Frederick, and Frederic William Maitland. *The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1898.

Prawat, Richard S. ‘Current Self-Regulation Views of Learning and Motivation Viewed Through a Deweyan Lens: The Problems with Dualism’. *American Educational Research Journal* 35, no. 2 (1998): 199-224.

Price, Jonathan J. ‘A Puzzle in Thucydides 1.18’. *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997): 665-76.

—. *Thucydides and Internal War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Rabel, Robert J. ‘Agamemnon’s Empire in Thucydides’. *Classical Journal* 80 (1984): 8-10.

Racine, Félix. ‘Herodotus’ Reputation in Latin Literature from Cicero to the 12th Century’. In *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jessica Priestley and Vasiliki Zali, 193-212. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Ransdell, Joseph. ‘Some Leading Ideas in Peirce's Semiotic’. *Semiotica* 19 (1977): 157-178.

Rapkins, John, with Jon Coghill. ‘Gallipoli 2015: Fragile WWI Diary Records Five Days of Horror at Gallipoli’. Accessed September 12, 2019. http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-04-18/fragile-ww1-diary-records-five-days-of-horror-at-gallipoli/6375816.

Rawlings, Hunter R. ‘Thucydides on the Purpose of the Delian League’. *Phoenix* 31 (1977): 1-8.

Rawls, Anne Warfield. ‘Wittgenstein, Durkheim, Garfinkel and Winch: Constitutive Orders of Sensemaking’. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 41, no 4 (2011): 396-418.

Shulman, Lee S. ‘Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching’. *Educational Researcher* 15, no. 2 (1986): 4-14.

Reisman, Abby, and Sam S. Wineburg. ‘Teaching the Skill of Contextualizing in History’. *The Social Studies* 99 (2008): 202–207.

Rengakos, Antonios, and Antonis Tsakmakis, eds. *Brill’s Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Retz, Tyson. ‘A Moderate Hermeneutical Approach to Empathy in History Education’. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 47, 3 (2015): 214-226.

—. *Empathy and History: Historical Understanding in Re-enactment, Hermeneutics and Education*. New York: Berghahn, 2018.

Rhodes, Peter J. *Alcibiades*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2001.

—. ‘Thucydides on the Causes of the Peloponnesian War’. *Hermes* 115 (1987): 154-165.

Richardson, John S. ‘Thucydides 1.23.6 and the Debate about the Peloponnesian War’. In *Owls to Athens: Essays in Classical Studies Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, edited by Elizabeth M. Craik, 155-61. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Ridley, Ronald T. ‘The Historian’s Silences: What Livy Did Not Know – Or Chose Not to Tell’. *Journal of Ancient History* 1, no. 1 (2013): 27-52.

—. ‘Livy the Critical Historian’. *Athenaeum* 102, no. 2 (2014): 444-474.

Ritter, Harry. *Dictionary of Concepts in History*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Roberts, Chris. ‘Turkish Machine-Guns at the Landing’. *Wartime* 50 (2010): 14-19.

—. *The Landing at Anzac: 1915*. 2nd ed. Newport, New South Wales: Big Sky Publishing, 2015.

Roberts, Douglas A. ‘Epistemic Authority for Teacher Knowledge: The Potential Role of Teacher Communities – A Response to Robert Orton’. *Curriculum Inquiry* 26, no. 4 (1996): 417-431.

Robinson, Jr., D. W. ‘A Note on the Classical Origin of the “Circumstances” in the Medieval Confessional’. *Studies in Philology* 43, no. 1 (1946): 6-14.

Robson, L. Lloyd. *The First A.I.F.: A Study of its Recruitment 1914-1918*. Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1982.

Rokeah, P. D. 'Speeches in Thucydides: Factual Reporting or Creative Writing?'. *Athenaeum* 60 (1982): 386-401.

Romilly, Jacqueline de. ‘La vengeance comme explication dans I’oeuvre d’Hérodote’. *Revue des Études Grecques Année* 84 (1971): 314-337.

Rood, Tim. *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Rosand, David. *Myths of Venice: The Figuration of a State*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978.

Rubinstein, Nicolai. ‘Italian Reactions to Terraferma Expansion in the Fifteenth Century’. In *Renaissance Venice*, edited by J. R. Hale, 197-217. London: Faber and Faber, 1973.

Russell, Tom, and Andrea K. Martin. ‘Reflective Practice: Epistemological Perspectives on Learning from Experience in Teacher Education’. In *Reflective Theory and Practice in Teacher Education*, edited by Robyn Brandenburg, Kathryn Glasswell, Mellita Jones, and Josephine Ryan, 27-47. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2017.

Ruthven, Kenneth. ‘The Disciplines Thesis and the Curriculum: A Case Study’. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 26, no. 2 (1978): 163-176.

Rutten, Kris, and Ronald Soetaert. ‘Narrative and Rhetorical Approaches to Problems of Education. Jerome Bruner and Kenneth Burke Revisited’. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 32, no. 4 (2013):327-343.

Sage, Michael M. ‘Tacitus’ Historical Works: A Survey and Appraisal’. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (*ANRW*) 2.33.2 (1990): 851-1030.

Salmon, John B. *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 B.C*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Sansom, Chris. ‘Concepts, Skills and Content: A Developmental Approach to the History Syllabus’. In *The History Curriculum for Teachers*, edited by Christopher Portal, 116-141. London: Falmer Press, 1987.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Translated by Roy Harris. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013.

Scanlon, Thomas. F. *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1980.

—. *Spes Frustrata: A Reading of Sallust*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1987.

Scheffler, Israel. 'Philosophical Models of Teaching', *Harvard Educational Review* 35, no. 2 (1965): 131-143.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. 'Origins of the Cold War'. *Foreign Affairs* 46, no. 1 (1967): 22-52.

Schön; Donald. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Schwab, Joseph J. 'The Teaching of Science as Enquiry'. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 14 (1958): 374-379.

—. 'The Practical: A Language for Curriculum'. *School Review* 78, no. 1 (1969): 1-23.

—. 'Eros and Education: A Discussion of One Aspect of Discussion'. In *Science, Curriculum, and Liberal Education*, 105-132.

—. 'Education and the Structure of the Disciplines'. In *Science, Curriculum, and Liberal Education*, 229-272.

—. *Science, Curriculum, and Liberal Education: Selected Essays*, edited by Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

—. 'The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to Do'. *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (1983): 239-265.

Schwartz, Henrietta 'Schwab's "Practical 4" and Its Corroboration in Recent History'. *Curriculum Inquiry* 14, no. 4 (1984): 437-463.

Scriven, Michael. 'Causes, Connections and Conditions in History'. In *Philosophical Analysis and History*, edited by William H. Dray, 238-264. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Seal, Graham. *Inventing Anzac: The Digger and National Mythology*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2004.

Sealey, Raphael. 'Thucydides, Herodotus and the Causes of War'. *Classical Quarterly*, n. s. 7 (1957): 1-12.

—. 'The Causes of the Peloponnesian War', *Classical Philology* 70 (1975): 103-105.

Seaman, Michael G. 'The Athenian Expedition to Melos in 416 B.C.'. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* Bd. 46 (1997): 385-418.

Seixas, Peter. ‘Historical Understanding among Adolescents in a Multicultural Setting’, *Curriculum Inquiry* 23, no. 3 (1993): 301-327.

—. ‘Students' Understanding of Historical Significance’. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 22, no. 3 (1994): 281-304.

—. ‘Mapping the Terrain of Historical Significance’. *Social Education* 61, no. 1 (1997): 22-27.

—. ‘Schweigen! die Kinder! or, Does Postmodern History Have a Place in Schools?’. In Stearns et al., *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History*, 19-37.

—. ‘Historical Consciousness: A Scheme of Progress in Knowledge for a Post-Progressive Age’. In *Narrative, Identity and Historical Consciousness*, edited by Jürgen Straub, 141-62. New York: Berghahn Books, 2005.

—. ‘A Model of Historical Thinking’. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 49, no. 6 (2017): 593-605.

Seixas, Peter, and Tom Morton. *The Big Six: Historical Thinking Concepts*. Toronto: Nelson Education, 2013.

Shemilt, Denis. *History 13-16 Evaluation Study*. Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall, 1980.

—. ‘Beauty and the Philosopher: Empathy in History and Classroom’. In *Learning History*, edited by Alaric K. Dickinson, Peter J. Lee and Paul J. Rogers, 39-84. London: Heinemann, 1984.

Short, T. L. ‘The Development of Peirce's Theory of Signs’. In *The Cambridge Companion to Peirce*, edited by Cheryl Misak, 214-240. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shulman, Lee S. ‘Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching’. *Educational Researcher* 15, no. 2 (1986): 4-14.

—. ‘Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform’. *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 1 (1987): 1-22.

—. ‘Sounding an Alarm: A Reply to Sockett’. *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 4 (1987): 473-482.

Silverman, Kaja. *The Subject of Semiotics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Singh, Parlo. ‘Pedagogising Knowledge: Bernstein's Theory of the Pedagogic Device’. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 23, no. 4 (2002): 571-582.

Slavin, Robert E. *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995.

Sloan, Michael C. 'Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics as the Original Locus for the *Septem Circumstantiae*'. *Classical Philology* 105 (2010): 236-51.

Sockett, Hugh T. 'Has Shulman Got the Strategy Right?' *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 2 (1987): 208-219.

Southern, Pat. *Domitian: Tragic Tyrant*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Spoehr, Kathryn T., and Luther W. Spoehr. 'Learning to Think Historically'. *Educational Psychologist* 29, no. 2 (1994): 71-77.

Stanford, Michael. *A Companion to the Study of History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Stadter, Philip A. Stadter. 'The Form and Content of Thucydides' Pentecontaetia (1.89-117)'. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 34, no. 1 (1993): 35-72.

—. 'Characterization of Individuals in Thucydides' *History*'. In Balot et al., *Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, 283-99.

Stawson, Peter F. 'Causation and Explanation'. In *Essays on Davidson: Actions and Events*, edited by Bruce Vermazen and Merrill B. Hintikka, 115-135. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Starr, Chester G. 'Thucydides on Sea Power'. *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978): 343-50.

Stearns, Peter, Peter Seixas, and Sam Wineburg, eds. *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.

Ste. Croix, Geoffrey E. M. de, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London: Duckworth, 1972.

Stevenson, Tom. 'Women of Early Rome as *Exempla* in Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, Book 1'. *The Classical World* 104, no. 2 (2011): 175-189.

Stoel, Gerhard L., Jannet P. van Drie, and Carla A. M. van Boxtel. 'Teaching Towards Historical Expertise. Developing a Pedagogy for Fostering Causal Reasoning in History'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 47, no. 1 (2015): 49-76.

—. 'The Effects of Explicit Teaching of Strategies, Second-order Concepts, and Epistemological Underpinnings on Students' Ability to Reason Causally in History', *Journal of Educational Psychology* 109, no. 3 (2017): 321-337.

Syme, Ronald. *Tacitus*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

—. ‘Livy and Augustus’. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 64 (1959): 27-87.

—. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960.

—. *Sallust*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.

—. ‘Thucydides’. In *Roman Papers*, vol. 6, edited by Anthony R. Birley, 72-87. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Tambyah, Mallihai M. ‘Teaching for ‘Historical Understanding: What Knowledge(s) do Teachers Need to Teach History?’. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 42, no. 5 (2017): 35-50.

Taylor, Tony. *What is History?* Collingwood, Melbourne: History Teachers' Association of Victoria, 2005.

Taylor, Tony, and Carmel Young, *Making History: A Guide for the Teaching and Learning of History in Australian Schools*. Carlton South: Curriculum Corporation, 2003.

Thomas, Rosalind. ‘The Intellectual Milieu of Herodotus’. In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola, 60-75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

—. ‘Thucydides’ Intellectual Milieu and the Plague’. In Antonios Rengakos and Antonis Tsakmakis, *Brill’s Companion to Thucydides*, 87-108.

Thomson, Alistair. ‘Steadfast Until Death? C. E. W. Bean and the Representation of Australian Military Manhood’. *Australian Historical Studies* 23, no. 93 (1989): 462-478.

Tosh, John. *The Pursuit of History*. 5th ed. Harlow, England: Pearson, 2010.

Tyler, William. ‘Silent, Invisible, Total: Pedagogic Discourse and the Age of Information’. In *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein*, edited by Johan Muller, Brian Davies, and Ana Morais, 15-29. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004.

Van Boxtel, Carla, and Jannet van Drie. ‘“That's in the time of the Romans!” Knowledge and Strategies Students use to Contextualize Historical Images and Documents’. *Cognition and Instruction* 30, no. 2 (2012): 113-145.

Van Drie, Jannet, and Carla van Boxtel. ‘Historical Reasoning: Towards a Framework for Analyzing Students’ Reasoning About the Past’. *Educational Psychology Review* 20, no. 2 (2008): 87-110.

Van Drie, Jannet, Carla van Boxtel, and Jos van der Linden. ‘Historical Reasoning in a Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Environment’. In *Collaborative Learning, Reasoning and Technology*, edited by Angela M. O’Donnell, Cindy E. Hmelo-Silver, and Gijsbert Erkens, 265-296. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2006.

Van Drie, Jannet, Carla van Boxtel, and Martine Braaksma. ‘Writing to Engage Students in Historical Reasoning’. In *Writing as Learning Activity*, edited by Perry Klein, Pietro Boscolo, Lori Kirkpatrick, and Carmen Gelati, 94-119. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2014.

Van Drie, Jannet, and Piet-Hein van de Ven. ‘Moving Ideas: An Exploration of Students’ use of Dialogue for Writing in History’. *Language and Education* 31, no. 6 (2017): 526-542.

VanSledright, Bruce. A. ‘Closing the Gap Between School and Disciplinary History? Historian as High School History Teacher’. In *Advances in Research on Teaching*. Vol. 6., *Teaching and Learning History*, edited by Jere Brophy, 257-289. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1996.

—. ‘From Empathetic Regard to Self-Understanding: Im/Positionality, Empathy, and Historical Contextualizations’. In *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*, edited by Ozro L. Davis, Jr, Elizabeth Yeager and Stuart Foster, 51-68. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001.

—. *In Search of America’s Past: Learning to Read History in Elementary Schools*. New York, Teachers College Press, 2002.

—. ‘Confronting History’s Interpretive Paradox While Teaching Fifth Graders to Investigate the Past’. *American Educational Research Journal* 39, no. 4 (2002): 1089-1115.

—. ‘Fifth-Graders Investigating History in the Classroom: Results from a Researcher-Practitioner Design Experiment’. *Elementary School Journal* (November 2002): 131-60.

—. ‘What Does It Mean to Think Historically … and How Do You Teach It?’ *Social Education* 68, no. 3 (2004): 230-233.

—. ‘Thinking Historically’. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 41, no. 3 (2009): 433-438.

—. *The Challenge of Rethinking History Education: On Practices, Theories, and Policy*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

—. *Assessing Historical Thinking and Understanding: Innovative Designs for New Standards*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

VanSledright, Bruce A., and Jere Brophy. ‘Storytelling, Imagination and Fanciful Elaboration in Children’s Historical Reconstructions’. *American Educational Research Journal* 29, no. 4 (1992): 837-59.

VanSledright, Bruce A., and Liliana Maggioni. ‘Epistemic Cognition in History’. In *Handbook of Epistemic Cognition*, edited by Jeffrey A. Greene, William A. Sandoval and Ivar Bråten, 128-146. New York: Routledge, 2016.

—. ‘Preparing Teachers to Teach Historical Thinking?: An Interplay Between Professional Development Programs and School-Systems' Cultures’. In *Handbook of Research on Professional Development for Quality Teaching and Learning*, edited by Teresa Petty, Amy J. Good and S. Michael Putman, 252-280. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2016.

VanSledright, Bruce A., and Margarita Limón. ‘Learning and Teaching Social Studies: A Review of Cognitive Research in History and Geography’. In *Handbook of Educational Psychology*, edited by Patricia A. Alexander and Philip H. Winne, 545-570. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 2006.

Voet, Michiel, and Bram De Wever. ‘History Teachers' Conceptions of Inquiry-Based Learning, Beliefs about the Nature of History, and their Relation to the Classroom Context’. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 55, no. 1 (2016): 57-67.

von Ranke, Leopold. Preface to *Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations from 1494 to 1514*. In *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present*, edited by Fritz Stern, 55–58. London: Macmillan, 1956.

Voss, James, and Jennifer Wiley. ‘A Case Study of Developing Historical Understanding via Instruction: The Importance of Integrating Text Components and Constructing Arguments’. In Stearns et al., *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History*, 375-89.

Vygotsky, Lev. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1962.

Walbank, Frank W. *Speeches in Greek Historians*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.

Walsh, Patrick G. *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Wardman, A. E. ‘Herodotus on the Cause of the Greco-Persian Wars: (Herodotus, I, 5)’. *The American Journal of Philology* 82, no. 2 (1961): 133-150.

Wasserman, Felix M. ‘The Melian Dialogue’. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947): 137-144.

—. ‘Post-Periclean Democracy in Action: The Mytilenean Debate (Thuc. III 37-48)’. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 87 (1956): 27-41.

William H. Walsh. ‘R. G. Collingwood’s Philosophy of History’. *Philosophy* 22, no. 82 (1947): 154-118.

—. ‘Historical Causation’. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, n. s., 63 (1962-1963), 217-236.

—. ‘The Notion of an Historical Event, II’ *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume 43* (1969): 153-64.

Westlake, Henry D. ‘Athenian Aims in Sicily’. *Historia* 9 (1960): 385–402.

—. *Individuals in Thucydides*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

—. ‘The Two Second Prefaces of Thucydides’. *Phoenix* 26, no. 1 (1972): 12-17.

Whitehouse, John A. ‘Historians of Disillusionment’. *Iris* 20 (2008): 13-19.

—. ‘The Prefaces of Sallust and the Historiography of Disillusionment’. *Iris* 23 (2010): 2-9.

Wick, Terry E. ‘Thucydides and the Megarian Decree’. *L'Antiquité Classique* 46 (1977): 91-99.

Williams, Mary F. *Ethics in Thucydides: The Ancient Simplicity*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1998.

Williams, Raymond. *The Long Revolution*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1961.

Williams, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. Cleveland, OH: World Publishing, 1959.

Wilson, Mark. ‘After the Silence: Tacitus, Suetonius and Juvenal’. In *Flavian Rome: Culture, Images, Text*, edited by Anthony J. Boyle and William J. Dominik, 523-42. Leiden: Boston, 2003.

Wilson, John. ‘What Does Thucydides Claim for his Speeches?’. *Phoenix* 36 (1982): 95-103.

Wilson, Suzanne M. ‘Understanding Historical Understanding: Subject Matter Knowledge and the Teaching of US History’. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1988.

Wilson, Suzanne M., and Sam Wineburg, ‘Wrinkles in Time and Place: Using Performance Assessments to Understand the Knowledge of History Teachers’. *American Educational Research Journal* 30, no. 4 (1993): 729–769.

Wineburg, Sam. ‘Historical Problem Solving: A Study of the Cognitive Processes used in the Evaluation of Documentary and Pictorial Evidence’. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 83, no. 1 (1991): 73-87.

—. ‘On the Reading of Historical Texts: Notes on the Breach Between School and Academy’. *American Educational Research Journal* 28, no. 3 (1991): 495-519.

—. ‘Beyond Breadth and Depth: Subject Matter Knowledge and Assessment’. *Theory into Practice* 36, no. 4 (1997): 255-261.

—. ‘Reading Abraham Lincoln: An Expert/Expert Study in the Interpretation of Historical Texts’. *Cognitive Science* 22, no. 3: (1998): 319-346.

—. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Wirszubski, Chaim. *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950.

Wiseman, T. P. ‘Roman Republic, Year One’. *Greece & Rome* 45, no. 1 (1998): 19-26.

Wong, Roy Bin. ‘Causation’. In *A Concise Companion to History*, edited by Ulinka Rublack, 27-56. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.

Woodcock, James. ‘Does the Linguistic Release the Conceptual? Helping Year 10 to Improve their Causal Reasoning’. *Teaching History* 119 (2005): 5–14

—. ‘Causal Explanation’. In *Debates in History Teaching*, ed. Ian Davies, 124-136 (London: Routledge, 2011).

Woodman, Anthony J. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London: Croom Helm, 1988.

—. ‘The Preface to the *Annals*: More Sallust?’ In *Tacitus Reviewed*, 21-2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Yeager, Elizabeth A., and O. L. Davis, Jr., ‘Classroom Teachers’ Thinking About Historical Texts: An Exploratory Study’. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 24, no. 2 (1996): 146-166.

Yilmaz, Kaya. ‘Social Studies Teachers’ Conceptions of History: Calling on Historiography’. *Journal of Educational Research* 101, no. 3 (2010): 37-41.

Young, Michael. *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From Social Constructivism to Social Realism in the Sociology of Education*. London: Routledge, 2008.

—. ‘Powerful Knowledge as a Curriculum Principle’. In *Knowledge and the Future School: Curriculum and Social Justice*, edited by Michael Young, David Lambert, Carolyn Roberts, and Martin Roberts, 65-88. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.

Zahrnt, Michael. ‘Sicily and Southern Italy in Thucydides’. In Antonios Rengakos and Antonis Tsakmakis, *Brill’s Companion to Thucydides*, 629-55.

Zemelman, Steven, Harvey Daniels, and Arthur Hyde. *Best Practice: New Standards for Teaching and Learning in America’s Schools*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1998.

Zumbrunnen, John. ‘Thucydides and Crowds’. In Balot et al., *Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, 475-490.