

Editorial - Changing of the Guard
Stephen M. Lyon, Durham University

As I prepare to hand over the responsibility for *History and Anthropology* to my successor, David Henig, I am acutely aware that this is the first time I have taken the opportunity to write an editorial in the five years that I have edited the journal. When I joined Paul Sant Cassia as co-editor in 2009, I was focussed on not letting down the fine tradition of the journal and making sure that we had a high quality of manuscripts to consider. When Paul stepped down shortly after, I found that there didn't seem to be much that needed saying from the editor. The contributors to the journal often made the points that I might want to make about the intersections of history and anthropology or the importance of comparative analyses. In short, I didn't feel a pressing need to voice my own editorial views in what is one of the finest scholarly journals of its kind. My voice was there throughout the selection of manuscripts, in the suggestions I made to authors about what to change or which comments from the referees should be prioritised. While my voice may not have been as transparent as it should have been, I can see it lurking in the corners of every issue. This is not to diminish what the authors and the referees do-- they are the ones who make any journal possible. It is their goodwill, thick skin and patience which have made *History and Anthropology* such a privilege and an honour for me.

During my time as editor of *H&A*, we have increased the number of submissions overall and, perhaps more importantly, attracted submissions from a much broader geographical distribution. While I would love to claim credit for this, much of the cause for this increase is directly linked to the online manuscript submission system that Routledge has provided all of its journals. To be sure, not everyone is in love with these systems and we continue to deal with a small number of superb scholars who have drawn a line in the sand and will not cross over into the brave new world of cybertopia (at least when it comes to manuscript submission or reviewing). As a result of this increased submission rate, Routledge raised our annual page budget and allowed us to publish a 5th issue each year. This is, for those of you who have paid attention to such things, the very first issue 5 for any volume of *H&A* (who knows-- perhaps it'll be worth money one day as a collectible!). I could rattle off statistics about improvements in decision times and acceptance to rejection rates, but I don't think any of those actually reflect what's important about a journal. What matters is who reads it and who writes in it-- and on both of those counts, I could not be happier with *H&A* than I am now. This is an excellent journal because of the people who choose to submit their original and creative research and the readers who have rightly identified our journal as a place to find such work.

All good things must come to an end, however, and it is now time to pass on the baton to someone else who can quietly shape and nudge this journal to wherever it is meant to be in the coming five years. It is some comfort to me that the colleague who has provided invaluable support and advice in recent years as Associate Editor of *H&A* has agreed to take on the greater role of editor in chief. David Henig comes to this role with considerable experience, despite his youth. He and I edited a special issue of a journal together that emerged from a workshop we organised with Michael Fischer and David Sosna in 2010 in the Czech Republic. We co-taught a module when he was still at Durham University and of course, I had the pleasure of supervising his doctoral research some years ago. He has generously invited me to stay on the editorial board and has promised to be patient when I slip and try to nudge or shape the direction of the journal in future. I, in turn, have promised not to take offence when he tells me to keep my nose out of things.

Finally, I would like to thank all of the contributors, reviewers, members of the editorial board, proofreaders, copyeditors and everyone at Routledge for working so cooperatively and with such good humour over the years. Even when we may have disagreed, I have been continuously impressed with the professionalism and courtesy with which I have been treated by everyone.

Stephen M. Lyon