

upon a sketch—a caricature really—reproduced from a left-wing French periodical of the beginning of the century and purporting to show a European in a solar topee sitting in an easy chair, with revolver in hand and drink at his side, receiving the obeisance of grovelling and cowering natives. As though this picture depicted ascertainable historical fact, the caption declares: “unprofitable or dangerous natives must be exterminated like vermin: a nineteenth-century French colonialist does his bit for civilisation.” The West is guilty of “atrocities” in Korea, the Americans in Viet Nam, the French in Algeria, and the French police in Paris in 1968. These “atrocities” are the sign of breakdown, and “moral responsibility for the breakdowns of civilisations lies upon the heads of the leaders.” This passage occurs on page 166 of the one-volume abridgment.

As I have said, Toynbee is not a popular writer,

and makes no concessions to his audience. We may assume that the readers who had the diligence to persevere so far would be educated enough and knowledgeable enough to know that those against whom the Western forces were fighting in Korea, the Americans in Viet Nam and the French in Algeria were ruthless and unscrupulous enemies fully capable, as a matter of ascertainable historical fact, of committing the most chilling atrocities. Would this reader then wonder why the North Koreans, the Viet Cong, and the FLN are not denounced with the same stern and prophetic accents? If it is right to assume that some such thought would revolve in such a reader's mind, then not the least paradoxical in this budget of paradoxes is Toynbee's continuing popularity in the Western world to which Mr Urban has attested, and to which the illustrated edition of *A Study of History* constitutes such weighty testimony.

The English Revolution

Sunbeams and Lumps of Clay—By WILLIAM M. LAMONT

“How the purer spirit is united to this clod is a knot too hard for fallen humanity to untie. How should a thought be united to a marble-statue or a sunbeam to a lump of clay!”

JOSEPH GLANVILL

EXCELLENT BOOKS on the English Revolution pour from the presses, and yet the task of synthesis becomes ever more difficult. Why should this be so? My argument in this article is against a tendency in historical writings to divorce political ideas from political actions. For instance, Christopher Hill offers this advice in the introduction to his study of sectarian thought, *The World Turned Upside Down*:¹

“The reader who wishes to restore his perspective might with advantage read the valuable book recently published by Professor David Underdown, *Pride's Purge* (Oxford U.P., 1971). This book deals with the same period as I do, but from an entirely different angle. His is the view from the top, from Whitehall, mine the worm's eye view. His index and mine contain totally different lists of names.”

Such division of powers can have unforeseen consequences. Political ideas can be seen as something separable from the real world of practical politics. Indeed political theory can be seen as something which only happens to scholars

and non-gentlemen. On the one hand the cerebral relay race, where Aquinas is forever handing the baton on from Plato to Locke; on the other hand, riots in the stands, with tinkers declaiming from the Book of Revelation and soldiers debating the Rights of Man. Meanwhile, back in the box-office, Cromwell and Ireton are coolly pocketing the receipts. The theme has variations: a non-gentleman may even *become* a scholar. Thus in that same book Dr Hill can learnedly show affinities between the Digger leader, Gerrard Winstanley, and Hobbes, and—hey presto!—a year later Winstanley is promoted to a “Pelican Classic.” He has become an intellectual athlete instead of a nuisance on the terraces: he has been raised to a new level of ineffectuality. The real world—where Thomas Cromwell makes Privy Councils and Oliver Cromwell unmakes Parliaments—lies somewhere else.

Another book by Dr Hill—*Antichrist in England*²—illustrates the dangers in such a division. The publisher's blurb calls the book “a significant contribution to historical studies, and also a fascinating account, with many colourful quotations, of a movement of what might be called ‘left wing’ thought.” Well, it might be called that, but it would be extraordinarily ineptly called that. The purpose of Dr Hill's study is to educate us out of the mistaken belief that Antichrist in the 17th century was an evocative figure

¹ Temple Smith (1972).

² Oxford University Press (1971).

only to the lunatic fringe. On the contrary, he shows the centrality of this obsession and documents its appeal to lawyers, bishops and princes. No man is his blurb-writer's keeper, but I would argue that this astonishing gap in communication could only come from a background in which it was assumed that the study of ideas belonged to the wings of history.

To argue for their reimposition to the centre of the stage of any reconstruction of the English Revolution is not to revive the ghost of Walzer. In 1966 Michael Walzer published his *The Revolution of the Saints*:³ an audacious attempt to see Puritanism as a modernising ideology. He traced the foundations of the English Revolution to a radical aspiration and organisation which went back to Calvin himself and to the work of the Marian exiles. He freely admitted that—within a rough chronological framework—he had jumped over the years to support his thesis, drawing here upon the Tudors, there upon the Stuarts and again there upon the revolutionary period itself. There were merits to the book, besides the clear, vigorous prose in which it was written. Walzer focused on a real issue: the problem of the regicide. How did men summon up the nerve to execute their King? Walzer worked back from this question, and found the answer in the appearance of revolutionary organisation and radical ideology in the 16th century.

HISTORIANS HAVE NOT found his answer convincing. Basically, his method is ahistorical. The lumping together of the experiences of Puritans (always supposing that we know who they are), at very different periods of development and in response to very different challenges, is unsound, and unwarranted. One thinks of the eagerness of a Puritan in the 1630s, like William Prynne, to embrace the cause of Archbishop Whitgift against his Elizabethan Puritan opponent, Cartwright, whom Prynne dismisses as an "opposite." Walzer has made it easy for himself in the way that a reader of Agatha Christie can: read the last chapter first and the butler's earlier plausibility now has a hollow ring. With sufficient ingenuity one can tease out enough reservations in the public statements of English Puritans before 1640 to construct a genealogy of resistance theorising. Without that borrowed-from-hindsight omniscience, the situation looks very different. C. H. George has demonstrated how loyal and deferential English Puritans were on the eve of the English Revolution: more recent research in other areas has remarkably strengthened his case. Walzer's book is in reality a glossy expression of the "line of development" approach—the pursuit of a single theme through different periods of time—

³ Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

History TODAY

Edited by
Peter Quennell and Alan Hodge

The April issue includes:

ROMAN PORTRAIT BUSTS
Michael Grant

**RODIN'S MONUMENT
TO BALZAC**
Michael Greenhalgh

THOMAS AQUINAS, 1274–1974
Tudor Edwards

**COAL, ART
AND THE BEAUMONTS**
E. M. Howe

**RICHARD COCKS,
MERCHANT IN JAPAN**
Michael Cooper

and in May (on sale April 26):

**THE IMPEACHMENT OF
ANDREW JOHNSON, 1868**
Henry I. Kurtz

**THE HOURS OF THE
GEORGIAN DAY**
John Riely

**GALDOS, THE NOVELIST AS
HISTORIAN**
Douglas Hilt

**THE BRITISH PRESS AND
THE AMERICAN COLONIES**
Wallace Brown

35p monthly from your newsagent
or by postal subscription £4.20
(U.S.A. \$13.00) from: Bracken
House, Cannon Street, London EC4

which was dreamed up by M. V. C. Jeffreys in the 1930s to improve the teaching of history in schools. We are still reaping that particular harvest.

PERHAPS WALZER's greatest error can now be seen as investing too much significance in the execution of Charles I. We have already seen that it led to a distortion *backward*: to an exaggerated respect for the radicalism of pre-Revolutionary Puritanism. But it also led to a distortion *forward*: to an equally exaggerated disdain for a Rump Parliament and Protectorate which had so signally failed to sustain the momentum of a "Revolution of the Saints." This is where two excellent new books redress that particular imbalance: Blair Worden's *The Rump Parliament*⁴ and Gerald Aylmer's *The State's Servants*.⁵ The Rump has often been described unfeelingly as lazy and oligarchical, while the men who administered the Commonwealth and Protectorate have in their turn been called time-servers or faceless bureaucrats or both. Both are now shown in good, but not uncritical, light in these two detailed monographs. Worden sees the Rump as over-burdened rather than indolent, the not wholly innocent casualties of the events of the 1640s. The abolition of Star Chamber and Privy Council increased the administrative burden on the Rump, while a taste for petitioning had been planted in the demonstrations of the earlier period. The Rump was overwhelmed by the sheer volume of business. Nor is it necessary to posit a wilful obstructive policy by "moderates" to explain the failure of the "revolutionaries" in the Rump. The "revolutionaries" never were very revolutionary. David Underdown has already shown that Cromwell's own commitment to regicide was very late indeed; that even up until 23 December 1648 he was working for compromise, with the Earl of Denbigh as the go-between. Once committed, there was to be no shirking on his part, but if a revolutionary is defined by his commitment to regicide then Cromwell was, at best, a four-week revolutionary. Worden challenges even that assumption. He shows how, for the majority of the regicides, the judgment was on Charles I, not on Kingship: the decision to abolish the office came a week after, not before, the death of the man. Some men like Hutchinson and Purefoy saw the act of regicide as less revolutionary than the Purge; others like Heveningham supported both the Purge and the regicide in order to keep power in civilian, not military, hands; while even a

committed regicide like Ludlow had nothing to offer for the future—except sneers at lawyers and clergy. Worden's careful study acquits the Rump alike of early radicalism and later dilatoriness. The difference between 1649 and 1653 is not in the quality of the Members, but in the quality of Cromwell's response to them. Cromwell, not the Rump, had decisively changed. Worden's most striking revision is of the customary view that the Rump fell because they were seeking to perpetuate their existence indefinitely. This charge appears again in Aylmer's book, but I found Worden's refutation of it convincing.

Elsewhere Aylmer joins Worden in a skilful apology for non-revolutionary non-saints. The English Republic did not founder on the incapacity or dishonesty of its officials. Thurloe feathered his nest, much as "reformer" Cranfield had done in an earlier period, but he was not a profiteer in the Strafford class. Aylmer complains at the common confusion of 17th-century Puritanism with 19th-century nonconformity (in another context Hill called them as different as vinegar from wine): his research in Poor Law administration confirms other work that throws doubt upon Tawney-like stereotypes of the Puritan response to poverty. Nor was there anything peculiarly repressive about the "Rule of the Saints": no pronounced war upon alehouses or witches (as Keith Thomas had already established), no crusading defence of the Sabbath. Aylmer is impressed by the theme of continuity in studying the published records of court and assizes, while the Major-Generals are seen as "an English upper-class bogey", unpopular for what they were, not for what they did. In an odd way Pepys becomes the beneficiary of Barebones: the Restoration civil servants combined the taking of fees and gratuities on the pre-Civil War scale with the higher salaries of the Interregnum. Unhaunted by visions of what-might-have-been, Aylmer praises a period in English life when the rich were less under-taxed, careers more open to talent, the navy more efficient and committees less corrupt than was true before, or indeed after.

THE WORKS OF WORDEN and Aylmer show what we gain in perspective when we measure the English Revolution by what it achieved rather than by the aspirations which it failed to satisfy. The study of politicians in practice has highlighted the weaknesses of an over-ambitious study of political ideas. This must not be misread as a vindication for studying the political practice minus the political ideas. For I now want to make two further points: that Walzer's political theory has been challenged not only by political practice but also by *better* political theory; that the neglect

⁴ *The Rump Parliament*. By BLAIR WORDEN. Cambridge University Press, £4.40

⁵ *The State's Servants*. By G. E. AYLMEYER. Routledge & Kegan Paul, £8

of political ideas in Worden and Aylmer qualifies even their splendid contribution to our understanding of the English Revolution.

Walzer distorted *forward*: non-revolutionary non-saints got short shrift from him. But he also distorted *backward*: he made revolutionary saints out of provincial, backward-looking, Monarchy-loving nonconformists. We know much more now about the appeal of magic-giving attributes of Kingship in the 17th century through the writings of Keith Thomas and Frances Yates. Our much greater understanding of the grip that the Book of Revelation held upon the minds of men in this period does not cancel this out. On the contrary: it reinforces it. When a Puritan of the stature of Richard Baxter could write in secret in his prison cell in 1686 that "no part of Scripture more fully sheweth the Royal Supremacy than the Apocalypse and former prophecies", he was only echoing a belief held by many English Protestants.

Walzer consistently underplays this reverence for authority in English Protestant thought. He also shares with historians of the Left and of the Right the illusion that the "Right" is synonymous with stability (they differ only about whether stability is a good thing). But in the recent collection of essays edited by Conrad Russell, *The Origins of the English Civil War*,⁶ Dr Tyacke advances the thesis that Puritans were fighting a defensive war in the 1630s against the ruthless imposition of Arminian ideology from above.

THE THESIS is not in itself novel. Puritans were saying that themselves in the 1630s. On the whole their protestations have not been taken too seriously by historians. A famous pun stood in the way of understanding: its ready acceptance by historians itself speaks volumes for their lack of respect for ideas. Bishop Morley is said to have remarked: "What do the Arminians hold? Why, they hold all the best bishoprics and deaneries." It is a good joke, but not the last word on Laud's Arminianism. Until Tyacke's massive doctoral study it seemed in danger of becoming so. The Archbishop's social policies had been explained by Professor Trevor-Roper, and Dr Seaver showed how he failed to crush Puritan lectureships. But recent research by Professor Bangs, working within a European rather than English context, supports Tyacke's contention that the Arminian ideology—the direct challenge to Calvinist faith in the Predestination of the Elect—should be put in the foreground of the Puritan case against Laud. I only think it a pity that Tyacke does not relate the imposition of this doctrine more closely to the parallel claim, advanced by Laudian bishops for their office, that

⁶ *The Origins of the English Civil War*. Edited by CONRAD RUSSELL. Macmillan, £3.50, paper £1.60.

Archaeology and History

A Plea for Reconciliation

D. P. DYMOND

192 pp. 9½ × 6½ in.

ISBN 0 500 050139 £3.75

A Concise History of the Spanish Civil War

GABRIEL JACKSON

With 150 illustrations. 192 pp. 9½ × 6½ in.

ISBN 0 500 82001 5 £2.95

Excavations at Tocra 1963–65

The Archael Deposits II and Later Deposits

JOHN BOARDMAN and JOHN HAYES

The British School at Athens. With 54 illustrations. 182 pp. 10 × 7½ in.

ISBN 0 500 420106 £12.00

The Finlay Papers: A Catalogue

J. M. HUSSEY

The British School at Athens. 200 pp. 10 × 7½ in.

ISBN 0 500 420084 £8.00

The Gods and Goddesses of Old Europe: 7000–3500 BC

Myths, Legends and Cult Images

MARIJA GIMBUTAS

With 434 illustrations. 303 pp. 9½ × 7½ in.

ISBN 0 500 050147 £8.50

The Greek Experiment

Imperialism and Social Conflict 800–400BC

ROBERT J. LITTMAN

180 pp. 8½ × 6 in.

Hardcover ISBN 0 500 32020 6 £2.25

Paperback ISBN 0 500 33030 1 £1.25

A History of American Archaeology

GORDON R. WILLEY

and JEREMY A. SABLOFF

With 121 illustrations. 252 pp. 10 × 7½ in.

ISBN 0 500 780021 £3.50

 **Thames and Hudson**

For our complete catalogue,
please write to Thames and Hudson
30 Bloomsbury Street, London WC1

they existed by divine right, not by virtue of the Royal Supremacy. The two claims are strictly not parallel: High Church Calvinists flourished in the reign of James I—men like Carleton and Downe. They were not extinct in Laud's time—witness Joseph Hall—but they were becoming rarer. The panic felt by English Protestants came from their perception of a twin menace; an assault on their Calvinist faith and on the Royal Supremacy from the same source: Arminian bishops. Prynne's pamphlet of 1637 was entitled *A Breviate of the Prelates Intollerable Usurpations Upon the King's Prerogative*. With our knowledge of Civil War developments this seems perverse. It did not seem so at the time. I have shown elsewhere an original intent in the Puritan prosecutors—only reluctantly and belatedly discarded—to charge Laud with seeking to *destroy* the Royal Prerogative. Laud may not have been a prolific controversialist, but we know from his correspondence with Bishop Hall how much he contributed to Hall's defence of divine right sanction for bishops in 1639—the writings which triggered off Milton, Smectymnus and the “root and branch” agitation. Saints willing revolution, or Calvinists defending themselves (and King) from a real or imagined counter-revolution? I prefer Tyacke's model to Walzer's.

ONE REACTION to Walzer is to stress that ideology *is* important but that it comes in as a consequence, rather than cause, of the English Revolution. This is the argument of Brian Manning in the volume of essays edited by him, *Politics, Religion and the English Civil War*¹: that a constitutional conflict changed, somewhere around 1643, into a religious one. This is one possible interpretation (favoured by Cromwell himself), but is here given disproportionate weight by the choice and arrangement of themes. A study of Chester Puritanism on the eve of the Civil War is taken up with squabbles about surplices, Sabbath, and the sign of the cross in baptism. This is one truth about Puritanism but not the whole truth: neither “Arminianism” nor “Apocalypse” appear in the Index, although Manning, in his introduction, recognises “the study of ideas” as “proving one of the most successful methods of understanding attitudes and issues in this period.” Another essay is concerned with showing the groundlessness for contemporary fears of Popery, not in exploring the consequences of holding such a fallacious belief. Dr Manning's own essay on the politics of 1641 rests heavily on the accounts of

Clarendon and Baxter, both written well after the event. Both, moreover, had different reasons for underplaying religion as the most important divisive factor in 1641. Two other essays, it is true, seek to relate Leveller thinking to Christianity and discuss the role of women petitioners, but both are drawn from the later period. On the evidence of this volume alone, the reader could be forgiven for thinking that the clash of religious ideas *was* a post-1643 phenomenon: that before the scholars and non-gentlemen (Levellers and women) broadened the issues, the English Revolution was about nit-picking political differences.

If Aylmer and Worden also underplay ideas in their analyses of the Revolution their betrayal is at a more subtle level. There is a wrong case to make against Aylmer: he anticipates and ably refutes it. The historian who seeks, as Aylmer does, to understand the mechanics of administration can be accused of neglecting ideas and principles. He becomes a “Namierite”: one who takes the mind out of history. As a description of the methods and achievements of the late Sir Lewis Namier this is a vulgar parody. Nor will it do as a statement of Aylmer's own contribution. Aylmer has written a significant book. Its strength is precisely his willingness to go behind the ideas expressed in pamphlets of the period to the reality which underlay them. Let one small example illustrate the scholarship and balance of his research. In discussing corruption, Aylmer deals in passing with the accusation of Leveller John Lilburne that the Commissioners for Compounding had allowed themselves to be intimidated by Heselrige in a disputed case of litigation. The Commons treated it as a gross breach of privilege, and fined and banished Lilburne. Neither Lilburne's biographers nor the editor of the Compounding Commissioners' papers consulted the original record. Behind the fair-copy order book which they used was an original rough minute-book, which Aylmer found to contain nine entries on this case. Remarkably some of these contain some heavy crossings-out. Aylmer used an ultra-violet lamp to penetrate their secret but to no avail. Even so, his balance is such that he refuses to read necessarily sinister inferences from these deletions. The Lilburne case is not central to his thesis and yet is explored as if it were: an incomparable piece of scholarship.

NOR IS AYLMER a dryasdust. He has an eye for telling detail, the incident that amuses as well as informs. From him we learn of the man sentenced to six months in Newgate for writing to his sweetheart that he would rather be in bed with her than in heaven with Jesus Christ. There are

¹ *Politics, Religion and the English Civil War*. Edited by BRIAN MANNING. Edward Arnold, £4.

allusions to Hofstadter and Djilas as well as to the Public Record Office State Papers. Aylmer acknowledges that this was "an age of ideological conflict and of upheaval in society arising partly from this clash of ideas." But he goes on to say that he has therefore "wherever possible included men's beliefs and ideological connections" when describing the backgrounds and careers of the Republic's officials. The wording is significant: ideas are included, but as an appendage of men's careers, not woven into an interpretation of them. It is at this high level of criticism that even Aylmer's work reveals the division that I have discussed.

A few examples will help. There has been a great deal of work on the political theory of *de facto* rule: Aylmer mentions the work of Skinner and Wallace but does not try to synthesise their findings with the career problems of officials with scruples. He says that there is "no point in swelling the chapter out with little biographies of Cromwell and Milton"; even if true, there are people of lesser stature—Robinson, Vane and Harrison, for instance—of whose ideas enough is known for him to chance his arm with some hypotheses. His treatment of Henry Parker is particularly disappointing. Parker was the most creative mind, on the Parliamentary side, thrown up by the Civil War pamphlet battles. His career plummets downward in 1644 after a promising start. Why? Aylmer leaves him as "a puzzling figure", but there is enough material in Parker's writings to offer suggestions why he should respond in different ways to the different political and religious challenges in this period. Aylmer's way is not to chance his arm. The price that we pay is that we see the officials only from the outside. The paranoid John Bernard—convinced of a Jesuit/Leveller plot involving Speaker Lenthall—surfaces as a litigant; the collective paranoia of the time—in which many officials less hysterical than Bernard would serve a régime that protected them from conspiracies no less exotic—does not emerge so clearly. The Royal Touch was traditionally supposed to cure the scrofulous. Henry Marten, the sardonic Republican, suggested that in the Interregnum the Great Seal of Parliament should be used as a healing substitute. The quip illuminates the dilemma of the State's Servants, as opposed to the King's Servants: it is significant that I encountered it, not in Aylmer, but in Keith Thomas's investigation into religion and the decline of magic.

WORDEN'S STUDY of the Rump Parliament is scholarly, searching and balanced. Yet his work also fails on occasions to bridge the gap between practice and theory. John Goodwin's

decline, for instance, is seen as part of the Rump suspicion of those who had championed the Purge and the regicide. Maybe, but Goodwin had also won notoriety by his retreat from orthodox Calvinism: his fall from grace may have been due to his disbelief in the Fall from Grace. Similarly Worden sees the quarrel between Presbyterians and Independents in the 1640s as a trifling over technicalities. In one sense this was certainly true. To read the correspondence between Baxter and Owen is to be made aware of how trifling the areas of disagreement were *about forms of government*: yet their disagreement over who should be admitted to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper revealed a profound difference of philosophy. In the terminology of Ernst Troeltsch, it is the difference between "sect ideal" and "church ideal." When Worden is discussing religious toleration he refers to the Quaker James Nayler as "a sorry lunatic accused of imitating Christ." By failing to penetrate to a deeper understanding of Nayler than was shown by his contemporary critics in the Commons, Worden drastically reduces the value of his subsequent analysis of political attitudes thrown up by the Nayler case. Dr Geoffrey Nuttall has written a long, careful study of Nayler, in which he has set Nayler's seeming eccentricity against the background of his time. Moreover a physically weakened but intellectually chastened Nayler made the heroic effort himself, after suffering for his blasphemy, to put his seeming excesses in context. It is the context which itself explains the ferocity of the reaction no less than the abuse that triggered it off: just as Pride's Purgers were very much aware of the imminent possibility of a World Turned Upside Down. Names in Hill's and Underdown's studies may not overlap, but their fears and hopes did: this is the crassness of separating political ideas from political practice.

Nor would Worden himself have lapsed in that way in discussing the career of one of his Independent or Presbyterian Rumpers. Before pigeonholing Nayler as "a sorry lunatic" he would have examined the number of times that Nayler appeared as a teller for The Sorry Lunatics, the importance of the divisions, and the pressures to which he was exposed; and probably concluded that he was a half-sorry half-lunatic at best. The historian's double standard, in his comparative treatment of political practice and political ideas, could hardly be more mercilessly exposed.

It is fascinating that Worden's splendidly detailed study of Rump M.P.s' political behaviour should end with a mystery. On 20 April 1653, Cromwell abandoned four years of fairly consistent conciliation. Why? Too sensitive to dis-

miss the Protector as being "in the grip of a millenarian trance", Worden yet sees it as "the resolution of a prolonged private spiritual drama." What Worden is recognising in these words is the impossibility of our having a definitive biography of Cromwell until the patient research of Underdown, Aylmer and Worden

himself into the politics of the period has been synthesised with the insights into Cromwell's mind offered by R. S. Paul and Christopher Hill. No more shall we see the English Revolution whole until sunbeams have been united to lumps of clay: and not even the most powerful ultra-violet lamp will achieve *that*.

Monuments to Whom?

The State of Industrial Archaeology—By KENNETH HUDSON

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL, *Industrial Archaeology*, is ten years old. Volume 1, Number 1 contained articles on early fulling stocks in Gloucestershire, a Wiltshire paper mill, charcoal-burning in the New Forest, the Bristol Coalfield, the Port of Southampton, company museums, industrial archaeology in Belgium and the plans for an open-air museum in the North-East. Volume 10, Number 4 dealt with the history of William Wilson Dickie and Sons, the East Kilbride firm of implement makers and agricultural engineers, Alfred Holt and the Lancashire plate-way scheme, the development of the insulators used for overhead transmission lines, the Museum of Technology for the East Midlands, industrial buildings in Upper Silesia. The first editor was a West Country journalist and lasted five years. The second, a Scottish academic, is still there. Fifty pages of articles, fifteen of notes and news and a dozen or so of book reviews are regularly and faithfully produced every three months. All the well-known figures in British industrial archaeology have contributed, at one time or another, in exchange for a fee of six off-prints. It is to be found, on the publisher's oath, in university libraries and public libraries from Sydney to Moscow, and from Naples to Dundee, and it has always covered its costs. Volume XI is to have a bigger page, just like the real archaeological journals. Yet Mr Philip Riden, of St Edmund Hall, Oxford, is not satisfied.

Writing in a recent number of *Antiquity*,¹ Mr Riden, who is an industrial archaeologist of the strict Baptist wing, set out his current worries about the subject. "Why," he demanded, "has 'industrial archaeology' [the quotation marks are his] not received the scholarly recognition accorded medieval and post-medieval archaeology? Why has *Industrial Archaeology* not joined

Medieval Archaeology and *Post-Medieval Archaeology* as an important outlet for archaeological research?" It is clear that for Mr Riden, and no doubt for many of his colleagues with whom he has to talk, eat and hold up his head day by day, nothing exists unless it has received scholarly recognition. It must be worrying for him to be associated with something which, "after more than a decade of energetic activity", still has "so little to offer the historian", something which has a popularity it has done nothing to deserve. This last fact, one feels, is what really bothers Mr Riden, and he puts his finger neatly and accurately on the centre of his trouble when he notes that "however weak academically 'industrial archaeology' may be, a large and enthusiastic readership has sprung up during the last ten years for books on the subject." They are, of course, misguided and deceived, conned by unscrupulous publishers and hack authors into believing that they are reading real food.

Antiquity is a serious publication, but this does not necessarily mean that we should take Mr Riden as seriously as he takes himself. Industrial archaeology may or may not be a "subject." It may or may not be a fit bed-fellow for classical archaeology, medieval archaeology and the rest of the academic clan. Its potentialities as a 'discipline' may be limited. But, if one trend is sadly clear over the past ten years, it is the widening gulf between those sensual sinners who see industrial archaeology as something to be enjoyed and those who are determined to make it proper material for Ph.D.s. This is, of course, a perfectly normal process. There are those who chatter in French and write novels and make love in it, and those who spend a lifetime studying French prosody and prepositional use. But, even so, the movement to academise industrial archaeology is more than usually sad, for reasons that are worth exploring.

¹ XLVII, 1973.