

Editorial

IT'S A PLEASURE to be back, after a year's sabbatical leave. It's especially gratifying to remark that the journal has prospered in my absence, under the clever and congenial editorial guidance of Robert M. ("Bob") Martin. I have read Bob's Editorials during the last year, and have therefore had at least a few occasions to admire his irrepressible wit and his shrewd yet careful judgements. These are qualities that I have known about for a long time, and have come to appreciate at close range ever since Bob agreed to serve as Associate Editor two years ago. This is a position which, I am very happy to say, he is now willing to resume, so readers of the journal and colleagues on the editorial staff will continue to profit from his many talents and his limitless energy. What I am trying to do, by indirections, is to thank Bob for his splendid work on *The Dalhousie Review* during my period of leave.

Sarah Emsley has been our Editorial Assistant for three years, during which time she has adroitly and cheerfully performed hundreds of tasks that have to be done if a journal is to meet its publication schedule and arrive on the desks of its subscribers. I am referring to such glamorous activities as filing information, checking footnotes for accuracy, organizing the shipment of an issue of the journal according to the requirements of Canada Post, and so on. All of these tasks Sarah has managed with great skill. But she has also contributed in more conspicuous ways: by reviewing several books, for example, and by contributing an article on Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great*. Since she is now leaving her position, I take this opportunity to thank her for all of her contributions, large and small. Saying goodbye to Sarah is made easier when it is combined with the pleasure of welcoming our new Editorial Assistant, Elizabeth Boyd, who brings to the journal a strong academic background and plenty of valuable experience.

The articles, stories, poems, and reviews in this issue will have to speak for themselves, as of course they are designed to do.

So I will mention only that, in response to James O. Young's article, "The Ethics of Cultural Appropriation," we have revived the practice of printing commentary and rebuttal under the rubric "Positions." Let me repeat the substance of what I said at the time this format was introduced (in 76.2). "Positions" offers readers the opportunity to engage in argument about or to comment on any of the issues raised in the pages of this journal. The question of cultural appropriation has been (and remains) a perplexing one, and I would invite readers with strong opinions on this question to record them in brief but cogent statements, and to continue the debate initiated by Young and taken up by Jennifer Epp and Steven Burns. I would further encourage readers who wish to comment on other issues of substance that arise from the materials published in this journal, or who wish to initiate discussion of entirely different questions of interest, to submit brief essays outlining their positions, even if these don't conform to the usual requirements of a fully researched article. In short, I am proposing a way in which readers of the *Review* can take on the more active role of being writers as well. Of course I can't promise in advance that all such contributions will be published, but I can assure you that we are interested in creating a space in which debate and dialogue can flourish. I hope you will agree that this is a worthwhile objective, and that you will participate in showing why.

R.H.