

Resources and Extracts for Session Four – Academic Writing

“He Said, She Said” – How To Write Like An Academic

Practice Questions:

We will be practising writing answers to two different questions, one on women and one on slaves in the Roman plays. We will be using Padlet, and you will be asked to comment (anonymously) on another person’s piece of writing.

Padlet Link for Question One:

<https://padlet.com/jessicclarke15/group-one-roman-women-h9tnsl81423yfgzp>

Padlet Link for Question Two:

<https://padlet.com/jessicclarke15/group-two-roman-slaves-ueqi33knqjkc6tgd>

We will also be discussing some examples of academic writing and their various strengths and weaknesses. They will be provided on the PowerPoint during the class, but they are also provided here for those who find it easier to read extracts in advance.

Example One:

The Glorious Revolution has no historical consensus. The ‘Whig’ approach to history, exemplified by the work of G. M. Trevelyan, has viewed the Revolution as the triumph of constitutional liberty over monarchical absolutism.[1] This over simplistic view stimulated a new trend of ‘revisionism’. For instance, the work of J. P. Kenyon demonstrated that the degree of active support for the Revolution in England was vastly exaggerated by Whig historiography.[2] More recent scholarship has sought to see the Revolution in a wider international context. This was begun by the work of J. G. A. Pocock, which pleaded for a less insular form of British history.[3] Both Whig and revisionist historiography view England in isolation and do not consider the involvement of foreign powers or the impact of the Revolutionary settlement upon the peripheral nations of Scotland and Ireland.

[1] G. M. Trevelyan, *The English Revolution, 1688-1689* (1938)

[2] J. P. Kenyon, *The Nobility in the Revolution of 1688* (1963)

[3] J. G. A. Pocock, ‘British History: A Plea for a New Support’, in *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 47, no. 4 (1975) pp. 601-621.

Example Two

The modern scholarship of the Augustan age is still heavily indebted to the work of T. Mommsen in the nineteenth century and R. Syme in the twentieth. Mommsen's *History of Rome*[1] was the first to use the term 'Principate' to describe the system established by Augustus. Ronald Syme's *The Roman Revolution*,[2] uses the historical method of prosopography to study Roman life after the assassination of Julius Caesar. His analysis is considered masterly, however, must be treated carefully. The interpretation of Augustus' rule and the creation of the Principate was heavily influenced by Syme's own context, within the fascist regimes of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, the work of these two scholars still shapes the view of Augustus in recent historiography.

[1] C. Bryans and F. J. R. Hendy, *The History of the Roman Republic. Abridged from the History by Professor Mommsen* (1912).

[2] R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (1939).

Example Three

The British legislative measures failed to deter mariners from the pursuit of profitable pirate enterprise. The potential economic rewards made piracy a popular alternative to the exacting and often brutal conditions on board autocratic merchant ships.[1] Exquemelin records that Captain Morgan had hundreds, if not thousands, of men under his command during the attack on Panama in 1670.[2] It should be noted, that the *Buccaneers of America*, is riddled with inaccuracies, exaggerations and occasional inventions. Morgan's trip to Panama however and the size of the fleet he commanded, is corroborated by other sources.[3] Pirate activity also intensified during peacetime, as demobbed sailors sought profitable employment of their maritime skills. There was a wave of piracy at the conclusion of the Nine Years War in 1697 and after the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713.

[1] P. Leeson, 'An-arrgh-chy: the law and economics of pirate organisation', *Journal of Political Economy* (2007): 1058-9

[2] A. Exquemelin, *The History of Buccaneers of America*, vol. 1, fifth edition (1724): 197

[3] A. Ayres, *The Voyages and Adventures of Capt. Bath. Sharp...* (1684): 75.