

# "Researching Bishop Stephen Neill: Engaging History, Methods, and the 'Reconstruction'."

*Dyron Daughrity,*

*University of Calgary.*

This presentation will be split into two sections: the first deals with Stephen Neill, and the second deals with the research process, from where I get my information on Stephen Neill. Thus it will have an autobiographical component to it. It is my hope that the first half gives you a sense of the man and the second half provides insight into the craft of historical research in general, as well as leading us to consider some issues to engage for further reflection today. Let me put my cards on the table and tell you that I had hoped to use this presentation as an opportunity to reflect with you on the wider issues involved in my research such as method, biography, and the difficulties involved in "doing" history. For about two months now, I have been all over England and India chasing down every piece of information I could on this man Stephen Neill. His ghost has taken me into villages, archives, libraries, special collections, and many people's homes. I have been intensely focused on trying to read and understand this man and his context. So it is an honor for me to step back from the page and reflect on what I've been doing. There is no better place to fulfill this task than here at Cambridge-which was Stephen Neill's *alma mater* (actually Trinity College).

My research into Neill began quite suddenly in 1999 when I was in the first year of my doctoral studies. My supervisor and I were meeting with Peter Erb, a visiting professor to our University, when we got onto the topic of my future thesis. I had been considering continuing my work in interreligious dialogue, however, I was looking for a "case-study" which could serve as a **touchstone** for exploring further the issues of interreligious intercourse between Christians

and non-Christians. In addition, I was hoping to steer away from dialogical discourse and was leaning more towards an historical approach. Dr. Erb suggested I look at Stephen Neill. It was only a statement he made in passing, and I began to investigate this Stephen Neill, of whom I knew very little, other than the fact he had written several books that were well known. This launched my study of a man who has taken me all over Germany, North America, England, India, and, if I can muster up the funds and time, to Geneva and Nairobi.

What makes Stephen Neill such a fascinating figure for analysis is that he can be seen as a microcosm for what was happening to Christian understandings during the 20th century. What immediately caught my attention about Neill was his importance in one of my areas of interest: interreligious dialogue, because of his first-hand knowledge of other cultures, in particular, India. I came to see that while he served as a missionary there for over two decades in the 1920's, '30's, and '40's, his attitude toward other religions shifted during this time as well as throughout the rest of his career. Neill did not construct a formal presentation on religious dialogue until 1961-well beyond his departure from India. But it is clear that his experiences there remained with him and indelibly affected his perception not only of other religions, but of his own faith. Neill never did abandon his missionary impulse nor his intense Christocentrism, but he certainly explored new ideas as to how a Christian was to make sense of the reality of the religious other.

While these were the issues that initially drew me into studying him, I began to recognize that I would have to gain a certain level of competence in a few other areas if I was going to deal adequately with a man of so many extraordinary gifts. Some of you will know Neill was also a prominent voice during the height of the Ecumenical Movement-he was entrusted with the task of editing the definitive *History of the Ecumenical Movement* which is a standard reference work to this day. His treatment of the history of Christian missions is still used in University and Seminary classrooms and is still in print in its revised form thanks to Owen Chadwick. His most striking gift was his brilliant linguistic capabilities. This man could work with or speak around 15 languages! He also understood very well the history of New Testament

criticism. One scholar said that in Neill's *Interpretation of the New Testament: 1861-1961* he discussed each of his subjects with such fluid clarity you would think they were his uncles.[1] Tom Wright updated this classic text several years back and you will still find it here in the bookstores of Cambridge-I saw it on the shelf at Heffers. I talked to Tom Wright on Tuesday after his lecture and his admiration for Neill is clear. When Neill agreed that Tom should be the one to bring this text up to date, Neill replied something along the lines of, "I'm glad you're the one . . . as long as you keep the correct dating for Galatians." [2] Many still consider Neill's treatment of Anglicanism one of the best. I'm particularly interested in his views on Colonialism's relationship to Christian missions, of which he was an historian. It was also his work in Christian missions that gained him admittance to the British Academy. Not a few of Neill's 60-odd books were considered important during his day. Timothy Yates writes that Neill's lectures on the Apostle's Creed, entitled *Beliefs* (1939) and *Foundation Beliefs* (1941) "deserve to be reprinted." [3] It would not be an overstatement to conclude that Neill was an intellectual giant and an important voice in several academic areas.

His voice was significant for a number of reasons. **First**, at 84 years and in spite of his atrocious health (at least according to him), his life was a long one, and his career was intricately woven into the discussions that were occurring throughout the century. **Second**, he was often in high places at important times; most importantly, he was in India during the formation of the United Church in South India (although he left India before it would reach fruition) and he was also a first hand witness to the independence movement there-an experience that had no small effect on his office as bishop. He was in Geneva as the World Council of Churches was being born. He was in West Germany during the crucial years of rebuilding during the 1960's. He again faced imperial demons in Kenya where during the early 1970's colonial resentment was brewing in the University of Nairobi. **Third**, Neill's significance is highlighted by the fact that he was a very popular writer. This gave him a natural advantage in dispersing his views to the public. Because of his prodigious literary career, he was able to share his ideas with a great many thinkers at a time. All of these factors make for a remarkable case study that

can serve as a touchstone for investigating the greater issues and themes of the history of Christianity in the 20th century.

Surprisingly, there has not been a whole lot of work done on Stephen Neill. I'm aware of two Master's theses. Jolyon Mitchell wrote one of these. I talked to him on Monday and he too remains surprised why more work has not been done on Neill. There are several brief biographical writings about Neill that have been written since his death. Christopher Lamb, Eleanor Jackson, Richard V. Pierard, Kenneth Cragg and Owen Chadwick are among those who have written article-length discussions on Neill.[4] There are many reviews on some of his more important writings. There were a few obituaries and tributes made for him following his death in 1984. However, his life and work certainly deserve a more thorough treatment, and this is the gap I'm hoping to fill.

There are three periods my research engages: missionization (late 19th and early 20th century), ecumenism (early to mid-20th century), and interreligious dialogue (mid to late 20th century). These periods provide a remarkable index for interpreting the development of 20th century Christianity. But there is another important component to my research into Neill that inevitably comes up when discussing his missionary efforts: Colonialism and imperialism, particularly regarding British missionaries to south India. And this makes for very exciting research, partly because it is such a lively and provocative field right now.[5] Historians involved in the task of researching the history of this "lively and provocative" period are in a precarious position. Eric Sharpe has rightly pointed out,

The missionary historian whose "period" is the past century or so can hardly avoid becoming involved in the whole question of colonial politics, and may find reaching a balanced judgment on either generalities or details extraordinarily difficult. He or she is walking a minefield of conflicting ideals and aspirations, quarrels and controversies, some of which divide communities in the 1980's almost as they did in the 1930's. The great historical question concerns the nature and extent of Christian missionary agencies' involvement with the colonial enterprise.[6]

Sharpe's insights remain relevant today. Andrew Porter has provided a particularly enlightening overview of the "minefield" Sharpe refers to. In his

"'Cultural Imperialism' and Protestant Missionary Enterprise, 1780-1914,"[7]he articulates the issue very well, distilling what has come to be known as the "Orientalist critique," popularized by Edward Said.[8]

The essence of their argument is simple. Missions were the van of Europe's expansion. Once their bridgeheads were established, the presence and teaching of missionaries ridiculed indigenous beliefs, called customs into question, undermined self-confidence, eroded respect for traditional authorities, and consequently stimulated political or social conflict. . . . Missionaries were thus prime agents of an intrusive "cultural imperialism.[9]

Said certainly proliferated the issues, but the linkage of the missionary enterprise to the project of imperialism, was already being researched by J. N. Ogilvie in his *Our Country's Debt to Missions* in 1924![10]However, by the late 1960's, with the writings of Alan Cairns, Max Warren, and Stephen Neill, the issue had become centre-stage.[11]

Neill's understanding of the colonial enterprise has received and continues to receive the attention of historians. Professor George Ooman of UTC Bangalore told me that when he was lecturing in Pittsburgh and Australia, Neill's work on the history of Christianity in India kept coming up in the discussions. However, Ooman protested and said he does not allow his students even to read Neill's account, as Neill is clearly an imperialist. Nevertheless, Neill was one of the important thinkers to chronicle this chapter of history prior to it being such a burgeoning field. And because of his breadth of awareness of the global church, he was uniquely gifted for this work. Using historical methods, I'm attempting to gain insight into the terrain of Christian happenings, particularly in regard to missionary history and historiography, ecumenism, and interreligious issues from a historical, biographical analysis of this great thinker from the previous century. I'm seeking to cast light on the bigger picture described in these 20th century shifts from missionization to ecumenism to dialogue that I believe characterize 20th century Christian history.

So I hope I've given you a sense of what I'm doing. But I must emphasize that while my research will touch upon these larger issues, my dissertation is first

and foremost an historical, biographical investigation of the life and thought of Bishop Stephen Neill. Let me now give you a rough sketch of Neill's life.

### **Neill's Early Years: 1900 to 1924**

Stephen Neill was born in Edinburgh on Dec. 31, 1900, the last day of the 19th century, a fact he loved to point out. He often joked about this. He once told Richard Padfield of Dean Close School in Cheltenham that his only remaining ambition was to live to his third century. He enjoyed explaining what he meant by this to the puzzled listener. He was born into a context of strong Irish evangelicalism. His parents were for a time missionary doctors in India and they stayed on the move throughout Neill's earliest years.

Eventually, he went to Dean Close School in Cheltenham, where he found security and a sense of belonging.

Two different movements were beginning to cohere during Neill's childhood, and they undoubtedly influenced him: ecumenism and interreligious discourse. Two major events occurred around this time which illustrate this point: **First**, the World's Parliament of Religions in 1893, and **second**, the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910. The Chicago Parliament is rightly cited these days as the beginning of the dialogical movement among the various world religions, thanks largely to Swami Vivekananda. Of course the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910 is recognized as the official starting point for the Modern Ecumenical Movement. Naturally, this climate would affect Neill.

He was also profoundly affected by the war, and he goes into great lengths about both world wars in his autobiography. At Dean Close, the school's monthly paper would give regular reports of former students writing from the trenches or eulogies of killed alumni-it was all very graphic and at times unsettling. One can tell the first war stirred all kinds of emotions in the child Neill, demonstrated by one telling quote from his autobiography, "I know exactly where I was on 11 November 1918 when the sirens sounded and told us it was all over-(I was) reading Plato in the big schoolroom.[12]

However, there was one movement above all others within Christianity that was in full steam at the time of Neill's birth, and that was this massive missionary enterprise that so strongly characterized European and North American Christianity. That missionary spirit and motivation of the day was evident in Neill's later missionary fervour.

Neill went to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1919, and became a leader in many student groups, such as becoming Chairman for the Cambridge Student Christian Movement. He was certainly exposed to ecumenism here. But most importantly during his Cambridge years, Neill came to be characterized as a person of great intellectual brilliance. It was common knowledge that if Stephen Neill competed for a scholarship or award of some sort, he was virtually guaranteed to win. And win he would. In fact (I must include this), at Dean Close, there was a tradition that anytime a former student won a scholarship or competition of some sort, the school would celebrate by taking a half day off. Neill was "mopping up awards,"[13]so prodigiously the Headmaster of Dean Close, Dr. Flecker, cut the term short by one week! Yesterday at the Wren Library I documented all of Neill's awards -a task that took over an hour.

### **Colonialism, Neill, and Christian Missions: 1924 to 1945.**

In 1924, shortly after gaining his prestigious Prize Fellowship at Trinity, the first theological student to do so,[14] Neill became a missionary to India. He began his missionary career by joining with his parents and a sister to help the Dohnavur mission under Amy Carmichael. The Neill's could only take six months of that and they quickly left. Neill stayed on a while but eventually these two strong personalities clashed, with Neill leaving about six months after his parents.

Eventually, in 1927 or 1928, Neill was ordained at the Westcott House here in Cambridge (the same place where his father was ordained) and went back to India as a missionary for the CMS. He served the Tirunelveli (Tinnevely) and Travancore dioceses in various ways until 1930 when he became Warden of Tirumaiur, a theological college he built near Nazareth. He became bishop of

Tirunelveli in 1939. Interestingly, when Neill became bishop of Tirunelveli, Carmichael severed her mission's connection with the diocese.

Neill might best be remembered as a missionary in the latest years of colonial India. That vibrant context, including the interplay of mission work in a country that was wrestling with the whole idea of foreign missions and was heading toward the inevitability of independence, raised many crucial problems for understanding not only Neill, but the ideological shifts that were taking place there. In Neill's earliest writings one can gain insight into his convictions that India must be conquered in the name of Christianity. But a slight change occurred during Neill's life. This change would not be so evident until his later reflections when he was writing as an historian of Christianity in the light of other religions. In my thesis I try to accentuate the idea that Neill's missionary fervor, while not at all abandoned, would certainly integrate fresh understandings and become much more nuance later in life. By chance I met an Anglican minister on the bus recently from London to Birmingham who did his thesis under Neill at Oxford in the late 1970's and he concurred with this view.

Neill had many health problems, as well as his fair share of psychological disturbances. The reason he was dismissed from his post as Bishop was covered up by the church for obvious reasons. One thing that is clear, however, is that Neill did not want to surrender his see, and he went to great lengths to cover that up in his autobiography.

While Neill left the land of India halfway through his life, India never quite left him. The time in India working with other missionaries, learning Indian languages, cultures, and religions, and being more immersed in a worldview other than his own would prove significant for this important figure of 20th century Christianity. Neill incorporated insights he gained from those years, as they would surface in his work to come. Eventually, he would become a prominent voice in all three of the movements of Missions, Ecumenism, and interfaith Dialogue.

### **Contribution to Christian Ecumenism: 1946 to 1961.**



From 1946 to 1961, Neill was highly active in, and frequently wrote about, the Ecumenical Movement. He wholly committed himself to the ecumenical cause during this period, becoming Assistant Bishop to the Archbishop of Canterbury so he could serve as liaison between the Archbishop and the World Council of Churches in Geneva, where he moved. He served in that role from 1947 to 1951. Again, he was asked to resign under murky circumstances. However, Neill's natural ability to write came on in force during this period. Along with Ruth Rouse he edited the landmark book, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement. 1517-1948* (1954). Three influential books on ecumenism he wrote during this period were *Christian Partnership* (1952), *Brothers of the Faith* (1960), and *Twentieth Century Christianity* (1961), which he edited but also contributed three articles to.

### **An Historian in Hamburg: 1961-1969.**

In the 1960's, Neill served as the Chair of Missions at the University of Hamburg. His thinking returned to the problems of Christian missions in colonial India during these years. For Neill, this was a productive time for writing on this topic. He produced a trilogy on Colonialism during this time that began with *A History of Christian Missions* (1964), followed by *Colonialism and Christian Missions* (1966), and finally *Call to Mission* (1970). Of this period, Owen Chadwick and Kenneth Cragg write, "But now the professor at Hamburg made that series of contributions to knowledge which in seven years brought him election to the British Academy.[16] I have found that Neill remained an active churchman during this period as well. He regularly preached for the Thomas a' Beckett church there in Hamburg and his name occurs several times in the Church records. But once again, Neill was asked to leave against his wishes because the distinguished professor Hans Margull became available for the post, as Neill was serving in a sort of titular capacity.

### **A Religious Studies Professor in Kenya: 1969-1973.**

In 1969, Neill moved to east Africa and started a Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies at the University of Nairobi. It still exists, as they

honored Neill as founder in 1999 with a series of lectures. He had to contend with the anti-colonial movement that was in full steam at the time. He wrote, "The minds of all our students had been deeply influenced and thoroughly conditioned by the anti-missionary myth.[17]Not only did he contend with a lack of sympathy and a lack of resources, he had to deal with a lack of personnel. He taught philosophy, religious education, Old Testament, Greek, Religion in the modern world, Hinduism, and several other subjects. Of this period, he wrote, "Giving so many bad and ill-prepared lectures is bad for the soul."

### **Semi-Retirement: 1973-1984.**

Neill's final years were spent traveling and lecturing, but most commonly one could find him at Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, where he served as an Assistant Bishop and had the academic title of "Senior Scholar". One of his former students told me that Neill was a "walking encyclopaedia" during these years-his intellectual brilliance had not the slightest evidence of diminishing. As he settled (for Neill) and made England his permanent home, he was struck by the many changes that had occurred in England over the last decades, particularly regarding Christianity. It was during this period he intended to write his *magnum opus*, a three-volume history of Christianity in India. He died having completed the research for the second volume. It was published a year after his death.[18]The literature Neill produced during this period, which would include his final work-on interreligious dialogue-was quite impressive.[19]

### **Engaging History, Methods, and the "Reconstruction"**

My discussion of method and history will not be very sophisticated, due mostly to time, but also because I was asked to lecture on Stephen Neill. However, reflecting on the research process is only expected from responsible historical scholarship, and more importantly, it forces us to step back and look at the big picture, the context, the various locations wherein we have been transfixed on a particular text or event or in my case a person.

My research method for looking into Neill's life and thought is historical biography. Exploring method has been one of the most fascinating aspects of my research. I have been forced to become aware of problems and issues regarding both "history" as well as "biography". Let's first look at some of the issues involved in writing. biography

For centuries biography was seen as a sort of rejected step-child to history, according to Paul Kendall. There was an atmosphere of condescension to the method[20] Scott Casper claims that biography has had a double-edged relationship with history. He points out that many historians, particularly in the nineteenth century, faulted biographers for mishandling their sources, for example, whitewashing flaws and making the subject a hero in order to achieve a particular outcome such as patriotism or morality. That attitude persisted for some time. However, Casper argues, biography has more recently emerged as a helpful genre in its ability to force people to rethink how history should be done. [21]

Kendall claims that biography, while a science, will always involve an intimate connection between two people. I agree entirely. The historian spends inordinate amounts of time following the subject, gathering information about him or her, and talking to people in order to precisely understand the individual. The biographer will inevitably develop feelings for the subject, good and bad. Thus, it is impossible to be completely free of partiality. [22] I would question whoever claims otherwise. Nevertheless, Kendall argues that all of the criticisms levelled against biography have only been fruitful in that they have raised the bar for historical biographers. [23]

During my research, I have found these insights around historical biography to be of particular relevance. During my research trip to Germany in 2000, I remember standing in the pulpit where Neill preached; looking out at the same pictures and pews that Neill would have seen. I remember looking in the church registry and seeing Neill's first visit recorded there with his signature. I went to the University of Hamburg and had a cup of coffee where Neill often sat and talked with students.

The last two months have given me similar opportunities. In south India I stayed in the Bishop's mansion, where Neill lived. I preached in two

cathedrals where Neill preached. Here in Cambridge I strolled the courtyards of Trinity College, imagining Neill's gregarious personality dominating the campus. It's all very illuminating to experience these things, but there is something intrinsically intimate about it. I automatically think, "Aha! I'm sure Neill ate supper here" or "No doubt he walked there." Like it or not, biographers are in the business of tracking another person and understanding his or her context.

So, yes, this idea of devoting three or four years to a person can induce a certain intimacy. And these "feelings" of knowing a person, admiring a person, knowing some of his frailties, peering into the intricacies of what makes him who he is . . . these things have forced me to deal with the question of what it means to write "history", whatever that means, about another person. I have learned some intriguing and sometimes disturbing things about this man. Yet I also think I know the greatness within him like few others. Stepping back and reflecting on methodology, questioning my presuppositions and motivations, investigating the investigation-this has been rewarding both for me and, I hope, for the veracity of my research. It has forced me to grapple with these issues, whereas many biographers of the past have simply not been trained in methodology or thought in terms of questioning the historical process-of being aware of the issues involved in attempting to "reconstruct" a life or event or era. Critiquing the historian's methods was not often done in the past, partly because biography was *almost expected* to be either defamation or hagiography.

Allow me to conclude with a few words regarding the "reconstruction" of history. Eminent historian Arthur Marwick has written, "Historians do not 'reconstruct the past'-(an) impossible and absurd task if you just think about it for a moment." [24] I wholly agree with this observation. However, without unpacking this debate, I think it is fair to say that history can be done in a scientific way as opposed to a clearly polemical or blatantly uninformed-if not ignorant-way. The great historiographer Georg Iggers argues that trained historians recognize good history from bad history, just as trained physical scientists can quickly expose poor science. He claims that while good history cannot, of course, reconstruct anything, it can certainly claim to have

discovered the truth of a matter, or, yes, objective facts. Iggers is a staunch defender of the historical-critical method in the face of postmodern critiques that seem to want to debunk the "myth" of doing history altogether. Indeed, Iggers believes the stakes are high as the very credibility of the scientific method is at issue.

More and more I am convinced that historians must join the pursuit of defending the notion of truth in history against slipshod claims of relativism. If we could resurrect Stephen Neill the historian, I think he would join the battle. Timothy Yates has written a particularly relevant passage regarding Neill, albeit in a different context, which I would like to quote with the author's permission, "Neill . . . found the relativism of the modern world a disturbing feature. Questions of truth were at issue and truth must be necessarily exclusive and intolerant of alternatives." After living out of a suitcase for the last two months chasing every conceivable morsel of information regarding this enigmatic character, I can boldly proclaim, "ditto."

**Notes:**

i[15] *Out of Bondage: Christ and the Indian Villager* (1928); *Builders of the Indian Church: Present Problems in the Light of the Past* (1933); *Annals of an Indian Parish* (1934); as well as the unpublished materials.

---

i[1] Jolyon Mitchell told me this at Clare Hall on March 3, 2003. I think he was referring to Lesslie Newbigin, but I'm not altogether sure. Contact him to get the details.

i[2] See Neill, Wright in the preface to the updated version-*Interpretation of the NT: 1861-1986*.

i[3] Timothy Yates, *Christian Mission in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: University Press, 1994), p. 144.

i[4] Others include Donald Coggan, Richard Holloway, Christof Mauch, Cecil Northcott, Ruth A. Tucker, Annelise Vahl.

i[5] See Antony Copley, *Religions in Conflict: Ideology, Cultural Contact and Conversion in Late Colonial India* (Oxford: University Press, 1997); Koji Kawashima, *Missionaries and a Hindu State: Travancore 1858-1936* (Oxford:

---

University Press, 1998); Bernard Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* (Oxford: University Press, 1996).

i[6] Eric Sharpe, "Reflections on Missionary Historiography," in *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 13 (April, 1989), p. 79.

i[7] *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 25:3 (September, 1997), pp. 367-91.

i[8] Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (NY: Vintage Books, 1978); and *Culture and Imperialism* (NY: Vintage Books, 1993).

i[9] Porter, "'Cultural Imperialism' and Protestant Missionary Enterprise, 1780-1914," p. 367. It must be noted that Said doesn't spend a lot of time discussing the missionaries, however, many who do critique colonial missions are clearly receiving inspiration from Said.

i[10] This was demonstrated in Mary Angela Schwer's Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Notre Dame entitled *Religious and Imperialist Discourse in 19th Century British Popular Missionary Literature* (March, 1996). She argues, "[Ogilvie] . . . interpreted the missionary project as beneficial, enabling the British empire to exert the moral influence which legitimated its rule. In the same way, missionary historians of the 1960's . . . strive to explain missionary participation as benign in intention, no matter how flawed in execution (p. 2)."

i[11] Schwer discusses what she believes to be "Two of the most important answers to Stephen Neill's challenge (p. 4)": *The Christian Missionaries in Bengal 1793-1833* (1971) by Kanti Prasanna Sen Gupta, and Jacob S. Dharmaraj's *Colonialism and Christian Mission: Postcolonial Reflections* (1993).

i[12] *God's Apprentice*, p. 42.

i[13] In the words of Richard Padfield of Dean Close.

i[14] *God's Apprentice*, p. 76..

i[16] P. 610 of their article on Neill.

i[17] *God's Apprentice*, p. 304

i[18] *A History of Christianity in India: The Beginnings to A. D. 1707 (Part One)*, and *A History of Christianity in India: A. D. 1707-1858 (Part Two)* (Cambridge: University Press, 1984, 1985).

---

i[19] *Crises of Belief: The Christian Dialogue with other Faiths*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984). This was actually a revision of ,*Christian Faith and Other Faiths* (1961).

i[20] Kendall, , *The Art of Biography*, p. 3.

i[21] Casper, *Constructing American Lives*, pp. 5-10.

i[22] Kendall, *The Art of Biography*, p. 16.

i[23] Kendall, , *The Art of Biography*, p. 118.

i[24] Book Review: Author's Response." This quotation comes from a response to a book review on Marwick's *The New Nature of History* (Palgrave, 2001) on the web site for the Institute of Historical Research