

Handling the Thoughts of Others without Repeating the Author's Name Constantly

If you are dealing with the thoughts of a particular thinker or writer, there are ways of conveying these thoughts without having to repeat the person's name over and over again (Plato says, Plato thinks, Plato argues, etc.). If the whole paragraph consistently deals with the thoughts of one author, then you may only have to repeat the name a few times in the paragraph. Sentences in between, even though they are written as simple declarative statements, can be understood in context to still be attributed to the particular author.

****This only works, though, if you are consistently dealing with one thinker for a particular length of time. If you are moving back and forth between different thinkers, or between the author and context, you will need to specify the author's names.*

Remember, too, that when you move away from the writer's ideas to your own, you will have to indicate that somehow.

Example A (from one of my Grad school papers)

<p><i>Here, it is implied that this sentence is an extension of earlier idea.</i></p> <p><i>Burying the "Nietzsche writes" within a sentences also often allows you to take on Nietzsche's voice for a time.</i></p>	<p>Nietzsche emphasizes that each type of history "belongs to a certain soil and a certain climate and only to that: in any other it grows into a devastating weed."¹ Utilizing history properly requires flexibility and instinct, both of which disappear when history becomes a science. When history turns into "pure sovereign science," Nietzsche writes, it is for mankind "a sort of conclusion of life and a settling accounts with it."² Men who strive for knowledge without any need for it become "walking encyclopedias." With "scientific" history expelling all passion and creativity from their work, historians become nothing better than "thinking-, writing- and speaking-machines."³ Scientific</p>
--	---

¹Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations*, p. 72.

²Ibid., p. 67.

³Ibid., pp. 79, 85.

<p><i>Normally, if you have taken on Nietzsche's voice for a time, you should end the section by getting Nietzsche in there one last time.</i></p> <p><i>Here, contradicting Nietzsche allows for your own voice to reemerge.</i></p>	<p>historians might think of themselves as “objective,” but Nietzsche belittles this claim as merely a ruse to disguise their lack of feeling.</p> <p>Nietzsche fails, however, to consider how important it is for us to have a store of knowledge about the past in order to give us a proper perspective on the present and future.</p>
---	---

Example B (rewritten from student paper)

<p><i>At this point, the author takes on Plato's voice for a time.</i></p> <p><i>Again, a reminder that this is all coming from Plato.</i></p> <p><i>Here, making a conjectural statement about Plato (that is, what he might have thought) allows for your own voice to reemerge.</i></p>	<p>Like the modern man, Plato suggested that men should not be attached to the family, but should dedicate themselves to their jobs and to the state. Plato had a distinctive idea of what men in his society should be like. Men, he argued, should be providers in the sense that they would do specialized jobs. They should dedicate themselves to their jobs, perfecting their skills and improving their performance. However, the goal would not be to gain money in order to provide for his family or improve his station in life. Plato did not want men to be driven by money, but instead by love for the state. Given this attitude, Plato would not be opposed to the lack of loyalty modern men have to their families because this would allow men's loyalty to be shifted towards the state. He might not agree with all the radical changes in the roles of men, yet he would like the way modern man has evolved.</p>
--	---

****Boldface indicates shift in voice from author back to you.**