
Readings:

1. Gottschalk, Louis (1969). *Understanding History: A Primer of Historical Method*. New York: A.A. Knopf, pp. 41- 61 and pp. 117-170.
2. Howell, Martha and Prevenier, Walter (2001). *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods*. New York: Cornell University Press, pp. 17-68.

Answer the following questions:

1. Three (3) things that I significantly learned from the readings

a. Historical facts in the context of objectivity, coins, parchments, artifacts, relics, and ruins survive from the past may be a part of history as they serve as evidence of significant important events. In the sense of subjectivity, such objects can only represent in such events as a symbol, and they have no object reality of their own, since they exist only in the minds of observers and historians who are either untrue or biased.

b. The distinction between primary and other original sources is that primary sources are the original source of the event , usually obtained simultaneously with the event, the eye witnesses, and the materials capturing the event. Secondary sources are historical accounts that as he / she says it is not present on those events.

c. Sources are very important to the interpretation of the word "past" because we need a reference, a evidence, an indication of the significant events that have occurred. Sources are either relics (remains) in which their existence can tell historians what might happen about the past, or testimonies that are oral or written reports describing past events.

2. Three (3) things that are still unclear to me

a. After reading Gottschalk 's post, I want to know the similarities and the value of Historical Method and Historiography because I want more information about it so I can understand the thinking and the meaning of it.

b. I also want to know the value of questioning a history-sources' reliability and integrity, since in the article it just focuses on the issue (which is do vague to me).

c. Lastly, I want to enlighten and clear details about the Origin of Typologies, Their Evolution and Complementarity.

3. I used to think that....

History is made in order to enable us to understand the past which we can apply in the present. This is the answer to understanding our minds that helps us find the answer to the troubling questions in our minds, it also represents our thoughts on the roots of our culture and traditions. I also used to think that today's knowledge of history is just a small portion of what really occurred in the past, because not all historical events are remembered and documented. Sources are very significant as they act as our hint and reference for historical determinations.

4. Three (3) questions that I want to ask about the readings

- a. What are the differences and similarities between Certitude and Certainty?
- b. Why did historians collect information from this? How have they made history?
- c. What's the core meaning of our lives in history?