probable general election opponent, a close primary will be the better forum for obtaining the publicity for this than a safe primary, because of the greater coverage it will be given in the media.

These kinds of hypotheses would merely be the starting point in any study of divisive primaries. The sorts of questions which seem worth studying include the following: how much ideological difference between candidates does there have to be before there is a significant withdrawal of resources by the supporters of a primary loser? To what extent does 'mud-slinging' in a primary lead to voter alienation from the winner? In what circumstances do closely contested primaries result in either 'mud-slinging' or the raising of 'sensitive' public issues against a primary opponent? How does a divisive primary affect the ability of a candidate to raise campaign funds from the party regulars amongst his opponents' supporters? What effect does the length of time between primary and general elections have on the ability of a candidate to induce organizational and voting support from the backers of his primary opponent? Research of the type undertaken by Johnson and Gibson can take us some of the way to answering such questions. But all we can learn from studies of the success rate at general elections of candidates who have won narrow primary victories is that some sorts of primary contest are more common than others; unfortunately, we are not able to identify which ones these are, because such research is concerned solely with an aggregation of several kinds of primary election, all concealed under the label of 'narrow victory' (or 'divisive') primaries.

*Erratum by Kenneth Wald**

There is an error in Table 1 of my recent article, 'Class and the Vote Before the First World War' (this *Journal*, October 1978, p. 445). The '*N*' column for middle-class Anglicans should indicate a total of twenty-four cases, with eighteen Conservative identifiers and just six respondents in the 'Other' partisan category. These adjusted figures correspond to the percentages which are printed correctly in the adjacent column.

* Department of Political Science, Memphis State University, Tennessee.