PLATE XXI

HENRY GERALD RICHARDSON

# HENRY GERALD RICHARDSON

1884–1974

H. G. RICHARDSON, 'Gerald' to the family circle though no such familiarity was encouraged outside it, was born in Vincent Square, Westminster, on 23 September 1884 and died, a few days short of his ninetieth birthday, on 4 September 1974. His ancestors had long been farmers in Cumberland but his great-grandfather came south to settle in London and go into business as a shopkeeper. His father, born in 1854, was busily occupied until he retired at eighty-three with the exacting and frequently arduous task of printing the 'Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons'. I remember him as a genial old man, always with a flower in his buttonhole and expert beyond my knowledge in matters of horticulture. His main hobby, however, lay in numismatics and he gathered together from the London auction rooms a miscellaneous collection of coins and medals, Greek, Roman, medieval and modern, which was regrettably dissipated on his death in 1941 during the Second World War. It was this collection and his father's discourses thereon that did much to decide his son to be a historian. For his education at the City of Westminster School gave no inkling of his future intellectual eminence and the main benefit he received was a thorough grounding in French from the same refugee from the Second Empire as had taught his father before him at the same school. Whereas his brother John, younger by four years, followed a course which took him from University College School, Hampstead, to the Royal School of Mines and thereafter to many parts of the world as a mining engineer and consultant,[1] Gerald was not considered particularly bright by his headmaster, who advised his father that there was no point in keeping him on at school. He therefore left just before he was sixteen and entered the Civil Service on 20 December 1899 in the now long defunct grade of boy clerk. He was established on 21 April 1902 after success in a very limited competition and spent 1903–9 in the Colonial Office as a Second Division Clerk. It is impossible to ascertain what exactly fired his imagination so long ago and steeled his resolve to become first and foremost a

[1] In December 1974 he published a book on *Metal Mining* (Allen Lane: Industrial Archaeological Series) which has been well received.

scholar. There lay before him many years of study and, looking back, he once lamented that he never had enough sleep. However, he was living in a world in which the Victorian was merging into the Edwardian, a world which still never doubted that the virtue of hard work would receive its just reward. And always self-reliant and self-confident, he found that doors did indeed open in the Brave Old World.

He first of all in 1905 attended evening classes at Birkbeck College when it was at Breams Buildings in Fetter Lane, and he contributed essays and poems under the prophetic pen-name of 'Hereticus' to the first six issues of the 'Lodestone', as the College student magazine was called when it began in 1905. He paid the penalty of his enthusiasm by being invited to edit the magazine, only to find that it had debts and no assets and required him to write most of one issue himself. By cleverly arranging for the 'Lodestone' to become the organ of the Students' Union he put its finances on a secure basis.[1] But a letter he persuaded the next editor to print proved too avant-garde and the Students' Union felt compelled to disown him, convinced though he was of his own rectitude and the justice of his judgement.

His connection with Birkbeck was becoming tenuous. Though he continued to attend there for classes on Latin and Old French, he had begun in 1906 to pursue his studies as a full-time student at the London School of Economics, combining them in some mysterious way with his civil service duties. When Richardson knew the School, it was little more than ten years old, situated in a small building in Clare Market. And, if the part-time students are left out of the reckoning, the regular students attending a full university course were hardly more than a handful. Still, the sense of belonging was correspondingly stronger, and none doubted that the riddle of social justice was on the point of being solved. He and his fellows were far more mature than most undergraduates and included for various periods of time a number of Poles like Augustin Zaleski, a future Minister of Foreign Affairs in Poland, and Bronislaw Malinowski, the result of the recent dispersion of the universities of Warsaw and Cracow. Richardson's decision to study economics was a deliberate break with a predominantly classical education and he had to cope with a course of studies that was

[1] After the last war, when the College was badly bombed, he was able to give the Librarian back numbers of the 'Lodestone' to make up the College set.

heavy and by modern standards overloaded. For, in addition to all the demands in economics, he was required in connection with his honours subject of medieval history to achieve a competence in Medieval Latin, Old French, Middle English, German, Palaeography, and Diplomatic. Only Richardson and Zaleski faced that programme and completed it. In 1909 Richardson emerged with a B.Sc. in Economics and, rather anomalously, First Class Honours in Medieval History, and he was awarded the Cobden Prize and the Gladstone Memorial Prize. Incidentally he was for a year the Chess Champion of London University. Though, in common with most students, he came across the lecturer who shuffled his notes like a greasy pack of cards, he was fortunate in many of his teachers and he looked back with pleasure to the lectures of Graham Wallas, Lowes Dickinson, Alfed Zimmern, and M. R. James. But his greatest friend was Hubert Hall, the dullest of all lecturers and the most kindly of men: he taught me in King's College in 1923–4 and I can fully confirm that all who knew him forgave him his failings and gave him their hearts. The tie between them was not broken until Hall died in 1944, a victim at eighty-seven of enemy bombing. Richardson remained at the L.S.E. to take an M.A. by thesis and he joined Hall's postgraduate seminar and helped him to produce a *Bibliography of Economic History*, a *Manual of British Archives*, and a *Classified List of Agrarian Surveys* with an Introduction written by Richardson. After the First World War the new L.S.E. began to arise in Houghton Street and Richardson felt that the type of scholarship with which he identified himself was vanishing: he mourned the gradual disappearance of the old disciplines, of the friendliness of life on a small scale, of the homes where books were held in esteem and education was regarded as a serious business. As the years went by he charged modern education with frivolously spending vast sums of money on the production of illiteracy, and it seemed to him that only in France was education worth the name to be found.

A year after taking his first degree he married Katharine (Katie) Margaret Hearn on 10 September 1910. She had herself graduated with honours at Birkbeck, attended with her future husband the same courses of lectures on classics and on Anglo-Norman, then a pioneer study of Dr. F. J. Tanquerey, and had been the popular secretary of the Students' Union. She was an absolutely devoted wife and provided the perfectly ordered home and comfort which were indispensable if

Richardson was to follow his double life as a civil servant and as a medieval historian.

On 22 July 1909 he was appointed to the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and rose steadily to the rank of Principal in 1921. Fresh-coloured and always looking younger than his years, he felt at that point compelled to grow a neat and becoming beard, imperial type, in order to convince official visitors that, as he put it, he really was not the office boy. From 1923 to 1931 he was attached to the Research Advisory and Machinery Branch which concerned itself, among other things, with the growing of flax[1] and beet sugar. Promoted Assistant Secretary in the Markets Branch in 1932–3 and Principal Establishments Officer and Assistant Secretary in 1934–6, he was appointed Secretary of the Tithe Redemption Commission on 5 August 1936, a position which must have seemed tailor-made for him, for the payment of tithes was a practice which reached back into almost the immemorial past and was regarded by many as an abuse that needed to be eliminated from English life. This post he held until he formally retired on 23 September 1949 on his sixty-fifth birthday, though he continued as Secretary in a temporary capacity until 31 December 1957. He was then appointed a Member of the Commission and served as an unpaid Commissioner until 1960. The staff magazine, the 'Commissionaire', could depend on him every Christmas to contribute to it a *conte de Noël* of considerable inventiveness and literary charm. At various times in his career he had served as a member of the Board of Governors of the Imperial Institute, a member of the Poisons Board, a representative on the Sheep Breeding Committee of the British Research Association, and secretary of the Foot and Mouth Disease Research Committee.

It has seemed proper to give in some detail his duties and commitments as a civil servant. However heavy they were, they did not lessen his determination to make his mark in medieval scholarship. I would have liked to know more about his comings and goings in the half-dozen years before the First World War and I sought access to the civil service file on Richardson four months after his death. After much correspondence and many telephone calls I was at length officially informed that it had been destroyed 'unfortunately and prematurely' after he died. In consequence I have few facts to

[1] Flax Industry Development Society Ltd.—Report on the Operation of the Society, 1925–1934. By Sir Basil Mayhew and H. G. Richardson (London, 1934).

illumine these years. It is evident that his sympathies lay with those students who were making their way, as he had done, the hard way, with men and women of a mature age, often married and with families, drawn from divers employments, who were determined by their own efforts and sacrifices to acquire the benefits of advanced education. It was therefore with Birkbeck College rather than the London School of Economics that he became very closely associated. He continued to be a student member there until 1919 when he was thirty-five years old and he served as a Governor from 1913 to 1937, first as a student representative and then from 1921 on behalf of the Court of Electors, that is the alumni. His efforts to raise Birkbeck from the status of a polytechnical institute to that of a constituent college of the University of London (which it became in 1920) took place in a storm of controversy, and Richardson did not shun the polemics of a zealot, impatient at the slowness of advance. He was still being remembered by students in 1958 as a 'bonny fechter' in the creation of the 'Birkbeck Tradition', and in 1963 Sir Herbert Broadley recalled with glee a week-end spent at Richardson's house 'when we were concocting bombs, or possibly squibs, to launch at the Governing Body'.[1] Richardson gave such untiring and doughty service that in 1960 he was invited to be 'one of a small group of persons for admission to a Fellowship on the first occasion'. He was still contributing to the 'Lodestone' when he was eighty years old.

In 1912 Richardson proceeded to an M.A. degree with a thesis on 'English Economic Thought in the Middle Ages', and this work determined the direction of much of his immediate research. His endeavour to find out what influence canonist doctrines of usury and the just price could possibly have upon the rank and file of the clergy broadened out the same year into the Alexander Prize Essay of the Royal Historical Society on 'The Parish Clergy of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', in which he watched them, with little or no formal education at their command, in their daily intercourse with the world around them: holding land, selling grain, trading in wool, founding uncanonical families.[2] One source of information on which he drew heavily was the popular dialogue called 'Dives and Pauper', one of the first books in English to be printed by Pynson (1493), Wynkyn de Worde (1496), and Bethelet (1536).

[1] Sir Herbert Broadley was made an Honorary Fellow in 1963 and a Governor in 1965.

[2] *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, Third Series, vi (1912), 89–128.

To Richardson's mind it was essential to establish the original text of a work which, by showing the application of the Ten Commandments to ordinary life as well as the virtues of Holy Poverty, taught the essentials of religion to the laity and provided a guide to the good life. It was typical of him to take the hard way, to pass by the texts in the British Museum and to make the version in the Library of the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield Cathedral his main source. He scandalized its custodians by requesting that it be deposited in the British Museum for his use. In the end they reluctantly capitulated for a period of six months and the precious manuscript was taken to London on 2 January 1913 by the Chapter Clerk (the Chapter having decided 'especially at this time of year not to send the book by registered post') and it was brought back home on 2 July 1913 by the Sacrist. Within that time Richardson had copied in large and immaculate handwriting some 200,000 words of the 216 folios on to 679 foolscap pages and noted variants from other texts. Furthermore, in characteristic fashion before the task was finished, he undertook to edit 'Dives and Pauper' for the Early English Text Society. But in the end this prodigious labour produced only two notes: a short contribution to *Notes and Queries* in 1911,[1] followed by a brief paper in *The Library* in 1934.[2] Nevertheless, the traditional ascription of authorship to a Carmelite Friar in 1470 was destroyed and he proved beyond reasonable doubt that the manual was written some time between 1405 and 1411 by a contemporary of Chaucer rather than of Caxton. After the First World War Richardson abandoned the enterprise. Perhaps it was for the best, for the four texts he used have been augmented by at least another four, and the Lichfield version apparently does not stand as high as he placed it in the stemma of manuscripts. But 'Dives and Pauper' is only the first of a long line of commitments for which the groundwork was to be carefully prepared and the superstructure never completed.

This regrettable failure in fulfilment was plainly revealed by the third enterprise suggested to him by his M.A. thesis, and on it he set to work immediately after the war ended in 1918. He had intended to write a paper on 'The Legal Aspect of Usury in Medieval England' for the *English Historical Review* but, as was always apt to happen with him, the article had swollen in the course of writing beyond the dimensions of an article. So it seemed to him that the subject was eminently suitable for

[1] *Notes and Queries*, XI Series, iv (1911), 321–3. [2] pp. 31–7.

a new series of 'Cambridge Studies in English Legal History' which was to be published under the editorship of Professor H. D. Hazeltine, and Hubert Hall had no hesitation in sponsoring the project in a letter he wrote to Hazeltine in November 1921. Richardson sent Hazeltine a typescript of what he had so far written and himself suggested that he should add a sketch of canonist doctrine on usury and an account of the rise of credit before the close of the fifteenth century in order to provide a proper setting. Hazeltine agreed, adding that it would be desirable to consider also the subject of usury in medieval continental law for the purpose of comparison. Acting with caution, he wished to see the work in completed form before he approached the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, particularly because costs were rising. But so impressed was he that he saw no obstacle to publication. Richardson took his advice to heart and from August 1922 to July 1923 he assiduously read at his favourite seat (M 8) in the British Museum every text he could find on the practice of usury in France: the records of cases heard in the courts of the archbishops of Sens, Rouen, Bourges, and Bordeaux, the evidence in the custumals of Normandy, Poitou, and the Dauphiné, royal legislation against usurers, the eventual legalization of usury, and the administration of usury laws. His general argument was that the high-water mark of ecclesiastical law was reached in the thirteenth century but even then it was imperfectly enforced and only with the assistance of the State. Thereafter it became more and more a dead letter, being superseded by civil legislation and the practice of civil courts, for canonist doctrine had never had any close relation to real life despite all attempts to square theory with everyday practice. Against this background Richardson placed his study of usury in England from the twelfth to the fifteenth century and watched it in operation in the courts of common law, in local courts, especially those in London, in courts christian, and even in the court of chancery, though this required him to seek his information in unprinted Chancery Proceedings and Ancient Deeds at the Public Record Office. He calculated that his appendix of unprinted documents from English sources would constitute one-half of a volume of some 100,000 words. In October 1923 G. G. Coulton asked if he could add an appendix of his own of some 3,000–5,000 words on 'Some Ecclesiastical and Agrarian Aspects' so that he could get some documents into print as quickly as possible, and Hazeltine hoped that Richardson would concur and permit Coulton's

name to appear on the title-page as author of the appendix. Hazeltine added that he would be glad to receive the work when it was ready. But, though largely written, it was never completed. In November 1943 Coulton, writing from the History Department of Toronto University, reminded Richardson of 'the slips I had collected in a drawer for your use whenever you should come to the point', and in October 1946, a year after he had returned to Cambridge, Coulton informed him that he was sending to Chicago some 6,000 volumes and notes on manuscripts, among which was a big paper bag endorsed 'Usury, H. G. Richardson and G. G. Coulton. Collection for an unwritten book giving evidence for actual practice, as apart from theory, in the Middle Ages. Transferred to Chicago by permission of H. G. Richardson'. No one would deny that Richardson had learned prodigiously, particularly in handling source material in England and France, and his research pointed his attention to a host of problems that were to be tackled by him later in article form. But, as so often, we can only wonder why, with publication assured, he should discard his project.

Richardson's thoughts at this time were not devoted solely to usury, and his professional attachment to the Board of Agriculture diversified his interests. In 1919 he wrote an essay on 'The Early History of Commissions of Sewers', basing his account of land drainage on documents from Chancery Miscellanea, Ministers' Accounts, Court Rolls, and Duchy of Lancaster records in the Public Record Office up to Henry VIII's reign.[1] This was an important contribution to the history of medieval local government. In 1922 the Royal Scottish Arboricultural Society published a long paper on 'British Forest History from Roman times to the Seventeenth Century', in which he eschewed the common topics of forest law and gaming rights and concerned himself with timber, the economic aspect of woodlands which had always been of first importance, especially as fuel for the heating of towns. He brought Scotland and Ireland into the argument and it was typical of him that he should use manuscript evidence at St. Paul's for details about the kind of timber used in building.[2] To aid his discussion on the use of timber by iron-works and glass-works, 'the twin-enemy of English woods', as he termed them, he entered into correspondence with numerous local landowners like the owner of Gravetye Manor near East Grinstead, built in 1546, with its

[1] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxiv (1919), 385–93.

[2] *Transactions* xxxv, 157–67; xxxvi, 174–96.

many acres of different species of trees. As a consequence of his interest in the subject he was asked to review a book dealing with commercial forestry in Britain by a university professor but found little in it but 'a morass of economic fallacies'.[1] This long review affords the first instance I know of his tendency to expand footnotes and add riders at proof stage, especially if proofs were long in coming to hand, but on this occasion the editor would have none of it: what was printed stood as printed, apart from casual misprints, and the additions were ignored.

But this catalogue of his activities does not complete the picture of his varied pursuits in the years before and after the First World War. And it is well to remember and record that in those distant days the effort to recover the buried past meant long journeys at one's own expense, the dust and cold of unheated libraries, the weariness of reading manuscripts in the deep gloom of a church, the custodians who watched in case their neglected treasures were embezzled and who required to be paid by the hour for their presence. Things are so very different now when the fields of research have become a golden land where it is always afternoon. His interest in the details of financial accounting, which stayed with him throughout his life, led him to question the views of J. H. Round and R. L. Poole on the meaning of 'The Exchequer Year'. Richardson was never a respecter of reputations and his first effort to obtain publication was unsuccessful because of an editorial 'dislike of controversial matter and a desire to keep it to a minimum'. But his contention that the 'Exchequer Year' was not used for any other purpose than accounting was eventually published in 1925 and received at once the unqualified acceptance of scholars.[2] However, the first paper to command general attention was 'Year Books and Plea Rolls as Sources of Historical Information'[3] which destroyed the then current belief that, as W. C. Bolland put it, the Year Books contained 'innumerable matters of interest, legal, historical, constitutional, and social, about which the record is entirely silent'[4] or, in A. F. Pollard's words, 'were the great unexplored sources for constitutional history down to the Tudor period'.[5] Such views could not stand in face of the evidence that Richardson adduced and they have not been put forward again. But my particular interest is to see Richardson already in 1921 turning his attention to legal records and, by his studies in the

[1] Vol. xxxiii, 146–57.
[2] *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, Fourth Series, viii (1925), 171–90, ix (1926), 175–6.
[3] Ibid. v (1922), 28–70.
[4] *The Year Books* (1921), p. 29.
[5] *History*, vi (1921–2), 217.

plea rolls, beginning to examine documentary evidence for the early history of parliament.

If towards the end of his life Richardson had been asked which of the long list of uncompleted works he would have liked to have finished I think it would have been 'London and Middlesex: Studies in the Administrative History of the City and County from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Centuries'. In the 1920s he had already drafted many of the chapters and the headings indicate the range of his survey: (i) The Boundaries of London; (ii) Town Haws and Rural Manors; (iii) the City and the County; (iv) the Shires belonging to London; (v) the Burghal System; (vi) Early London and the Government, with an excursus on 'Frithgild, Husting and Gildhall'; (vii) the City and the Sokes; (viii) the City and Municipal Government; (ix) the Government of London under Henry II; (x) the Commune of London. Many appendixes, giving among other things lists of justiciars, portreeves, and sheriffs of London and sheriffs of Middlesex from the eleventh century on, were also drafted. In 1961 Richardson was still trying to put the finishing touches to this book on early London, believing that it explained much that had escaped notice. But all that appeared in print of this major investigation was a discussion of the 'Law Merchant in London in 1292'[1] and a new version of Henry I's charter to London, emending the hitherto accepted text given by Liebermann and rejecting Round's statement that 'London' and 'Middlesex' could be regarded as equivalent terms.[2] Richardson always sought 'the severity of perfect truth' but we may perhaps understand sympathetically the editorial request: 'I wonder if you would be willing to put your view in a less positive form.'

And all the while Richardson was maintaining a correspondence with scholars prominent and pre-eminent in their day: drawing the attention of W. H. Stephenson to the evidence of an unprinted charter on Old English personal names; providing G. G. Coulton with a document which the latter found to be 'of the greatest value to me and I will print it as a communication from you if I may'; informing H. M. Chadwick of a text which, though printed in Hickes *Thesaurus* (p. 109), had been ignored in any discussion of the mid-tenth-century borough and was unknown to Chadwick himself; asking the advice of J. P. Gilson of the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum upon 'an interesting point' which baffled Gilson's great erudition; sending F. J. Tanquerey copies of

[1] *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxxvii (1922), 242–9. [2] Ibid., xlii (1927), 80–7.

Round Room at the Public Record Office I was informed by an documents in French which, as he acknowledged, 'I know only through you' and which 'will be the gem of the collection' of texts he was then editing.[1]

In January 1926 Richardson obtained two months' leave from his official duties by special arrangement and spent it working on the records of the parliament of Paris in the Archives Nationales. He had been abroad as a lad in pre-war days when one could travel from St. Katherine's Dock in London to the Continent and back first class for 10*s.* 6*d.* and without a passport, and he had visited the great cities of Flanders—Bruges, Ghent, and Antwerp—and gone along the Meuse valley into France. But his second visit was more serious. He had acquired a great admiration for French culture and education and he took his only child, Helen, to be educated at the now famous Collège Sainte-Marie, founded by the French educationist Madame Daniélou. Helen completed her school education there and went on to graduate at University College, London, with First Class Honours in 1936 and to obtain a B.Litt. at Somerville College, Oxford, in 1939. Six years later she was awarded the Alexander Medal of the Royal Historical Society for her essay on 'The Use of French in England in the Later Middle Ages'.[2] When the Society decided to reprint in 1968 a collection of a dozen of its most interesting lectures on medieval history, there appeared among them her father's essay on 'The Origins of Parliament'[3] in 1928 and her own essay in 1945.

Richardson's work in Paris produced one paper in 1927 on 'Illustrations of English History in the Medieval Registers of the Parlement of Paris' to evoke the interest of English historians in a largely neglected, because unprinted, source of information upon the relations between Englishmen and Frenchmen during the Hundred Years' War,[4] and the paper on 'The Origins of Parliament' which won instant acclaim for the new light it cast upon the early English parliament when set against the background of the French parliament in particular. It was at this point that I myself came in contact with him in time to give him some assistance before his paper was printed.

It is a little embarrassing that I should write about myself in this memoir but I fear that I cannot leave myself out of the discussion. In the summer of 1927 when I was working in the

[1] *Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature offerts à Alfred Jeanroy* (Paris, 1928), 213 f. [2] *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, Fourth Series, xxviii (1946), 61–83.
[3] Ibid., xi (1928), 137–83. [4] Ibid., x (1927), 55–85.

attendant that the parliamentary document I was reading had been asked for by someone else. I sent it over to this dapper, bearded man and we later got into conversation. It became clear that his work on parliament from the viewpoint of the records of the parliament of Paris and my work on the same institution from the viewpoint of the English court of king's bench had caused us, though working quite independently, to arrive at remarkably similar conclusions. To give a precise instance, I remember that the list of parliaments I had constructed for the reign of Edward I contained one of which he knew nothing and one which he convinced me ought not to be included: otherwise my list and his list were identical. We therefore agreed to write one article together: thus began that collaboration over forty years which Professor Knowles found unique in this century and this country in the annals of European historical co-operative enterprises.[1] I persuaded my old teacher, A. F. Pollard, the editor of the Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, to agree to instant publication and I visited Richardson at Christmas 1927 to discuss our project. It was then that I first saw his dynamic or demoniac energy. Arriving at tea-time on 27 December in the midst of a heavy snow-storm which had made it necessary for milk to be delivered by sledge, I found myself the next morning clambering over the immovable garden gate on my way to the railway station and the Public Record Office. On 30 December I was heading back to Glasgow for more traditional celebrations.

It does seem to me, as I look back, that when we joined forces there occurred a remarkable explosion of energy in the sphere of parliamentary studies. The next two years saw the publication of nine articles on the parliaments of England, Ireland, and Scotland and the acceptance, early in 1930, of a volume of unprinted parliament rolls for inclusion in the Camden Series of the Royal Historical Society. The rate of progress was so rapid that in my enthusiastic optimism I made arrangements for the publication of a definitive history of the English parliament and received most generous support for that purpose. In October 1928 the Glasgow University Publication Fund gave me a security against loss; in July 1929 the Carnegie Trust in Scotland made me its maximum grant in aid of publication; in December 1929 the Clarendon Press gave me encouragement to print with it. Yet in the end it all came to nothing and the original purpose of our collaboration was never to be fulfilled.

[1] *History*, 54 (1969), 1–12.

I do not know why Richardson jibbed. He was never tolerant of delays except of his own making and there was a constant danger that a new interest, a new path of investigation, would divert his attention and he would never get back on the old road again. It was perhaps unfortunate that just at this time we should have become involved with the Committee, set up under Colonel the Rt. Hon. J. C. (later Lord) Wedgwood in 1929, to study the personnel and politics of members of parliament between 1264 and 1832. Wedgwood had written to me at Glasgow a letter of inquiry on 10 July 1930 and I had brought Richardson, based as he was in London, into the consequent discussions. The scheme developed rapidly, doubtlessly stimulated by pleasant dinners at the Athenaeum and the House of Commons; the Committee produced its Interim Report and the Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald, gave it his blessing in an eloquent broadcast on 1 September 1932; the Committee planned the work on 23 March 1933 and, with funds from the Pilgrim Trust, Richardson and I were commissioned in the following August to undertake that portion of the History of Parliament which extended from the beginnings to the end of Edward III's reign. We established ourselves in an office near Parliament Square and we were most fortunate in obtaining the services of four highly trained research assistants, including Miss D. M. Broome who had collaborated closely with T. F. Tout, and Miss Doris Leech who had worked on behalf of Eileen Power. We hardly thought with Wedgwood that the biographies of members of the House of Commons would reveal 'the mind of man developing, the creation of conscience, the birth of altruism, the rise of economic reasoning, the cult of freedom', and he must have felt that we were falling short, dismally short, of his desired goal. In particular he reproached us for the brevity of our biographies. We forebore to say that they would be much longer and much more quickly written if we could assume that every Mr. Smith we came across was our Mr. Smith, and we felt that the ebullient amateur went rather far in telling the cautious professionals that 'this donkey work of identification is not your line; leave that to crossword puzzlers like me'. However that may be, we found that we had misunderstood what was required. We had thought that the first of the four volumes entrusted to us would provide a full history of parliament, accompanied by a corpus of corroborative documents, and we increasingly felt that purely biographical volumes, concerned only with the Commons and ignoring the Lords,

would be deceiving the public at large by giving countenance to the view that the medieval parliament was essentially a democratic assembly. We were far from being alone among the historical experts associated with the project in expressing our misgivings, though we were, I think, the first to request the cancellation of our agreement at the end of February 1935. Thus nearly five years had elapsed during which we nullified our own plans for publication. Richardson never got back to square one again. All we produced on our own during this period was a long discussion of 'The Early Statutes', which somehow managed on publication to escape controversy,[1] and a discourse on that *ignis fatuus*, the 'Modus tenendi parliamentum' which, if it had appeared in print, was certain to invite repudiation. For our contention was that the English version of this tract must be attributed to the reign of Richard II and no earlier (and here, so it seems to me, the arguments are irrefutable) and that it was based upon an earlier Irish version (and here the arguments are not likely to be easily acceptable). A paper containing these interpretations of the evidence was accepted by the *English Historical Review*, but as a result of long and learned discussions with the editor, C. W. Previté-Orton, it became far too bulky for appearance as an article. It was accepted for publication as a book by the Cambridge University Press early in 1935 with the addition of three associated tracts. Nothing came of all the negotiations. Still, the subject was never far from our minds: indeed, it became far too obsessive for the next thirty years. In 1963 Richardson sent me all his notes in despair and asked me to add them to my own and prepare the final version. This I did over many weeks, placing definitive texts of the English Modus and the Irish Modus on facing pages and providing a long introduction, heavily annotated, for his comments. These I never received but, after his death when my work came back to me, it was clear that he had continued to chop and change. In consequence the thesis has so far not been exposed in print for the consideration and evaluation of others.

I may perhaps be allowed here to add a note about the small book I was to publish as 'The King's Parliament of England' in 1974. Some four or five papers on isolated topics came from Richardson's pen after 1935 and we wrote together in 1961 a long reply to critics of our views in a paper called 'Parliaments and Great Councils of Medieval England'.[2] But my main

[1] *Law Quarterly Rev.* 50 (1934), 201–23, 540–71.

[2] Ibid., 77 (1961), 213–36, 401–26.

efforts were devoted to the completion of the projected *magnum opus*. In June 1947 I had two sets of our offprints carefully mounted by a Belfast printer on some 300 specially large sheets and spent many months entering in the appropriate places in the margins all I had continued to learn over the years. Richardson had agreed to annotate similarly and we could then agree a final version and see the gaps that needed to be filled. But it was in vain. My mounted offprints returned to me in 1974: they had been quite untouched.

Richardson showed the full catholicity of his interests and the profundity of his knowledge in the decade before the end of the Second World War. It was once caustically remarked to me that he was like a cat on hot bricks and it was certainly difficult to say where his investigations would next take him. I can only give, by way of illustration, the subjects of some of his many papers: the re-examination of the twelfth-century treatise of the 'Dialogus de Scaccario' (which had seemed to be already exhaustively edited) in order to show its bearing upon the use of the pipe rolls in financial accounting, the circuits of the justices in eyre, and usury regulations; the detailed description of the careers under King John of civil servants like William of Ely and Louis of Rockingham; the observation of the part played by the papal curia in the dispute between King John and the barons, and the attitude of the London clergy to the pope; the new light upon the administration of England after 1215 when the barons sought to establish an alternative government after the king's repudiation of the Great Charter; the destruction of the belief that an 'eight-ox plough' meant that the plough was drawn by eight oxen, accompanied by a discussion of medieval agriculture; the quite brilliant reconstruction in eighty-seven pages of the structure of central government in the twelfth century, revealing the Justiciar as the king's *alter ego* and the exchequer as an office of general administration in law as well as finance; the writing of a lost chapter on education in medieval England when he combined his knowledge of roman law and canon law with an intimate and unique knowledge of formularies to reveal the regular instruction supplied at Oxford from the reign of John onwards to students who remained outside the normal university organization but needed to be taught how to draw up simple legal documents, keep manorial accounts, write letters on behalf of their masters, and represent their interests in local courts—in brief, the training of clerks in business methods who would be responsible for the way in which

much of the land of England was managed; the illuminating picture of English Cistercian Houses in the first half of the fourteenth century; the analysis of the co-operation between Church and State in the eradication of heretics and their teachings; the close scrutiny of English coronations and coronation oaths in the successive recensions of rites and formulas from the tenth to the fourteenth century, which propounded the novel thesis that the coronation office (*ordo*) was supplemented by a formulary which provided for the developing ceremonies and thus allowed the office itself to remain unrevised for more than two centuries.

It seemed ordained that Richardson was to be an article-man after the fashion of that other iconoclastic historian, J. H. Round, and it was not easy to get his attention concentrated upon the production of books. It was the restrictions imposed by war in 1939 that served this purpose. In my desire to understand the reasons why all and sundry were permitted to present petitions in the parliaments of Edward I, I had been led to examine the practice of beginning litigation in central and local courts by informal bills rather than formal writs, and in 1939 I had fortunately had a large selection of cases already transcribed for me at the Public Record Office. I cannot forbear recording that a first-rate copyist, expert in medieval Latin, Old French, and palaeography and writing a legible hand that could be submitted as it was to the printer, charged at the rate of 6*d.* for seventy-two words. Richardson for his part had been working somewhat less intensively on the same subject and, when war began and the public records were transferred from London to H.M. Prison in Shepton Mallet in Somerset, we had enough between us to write the volume on *Procedure without Writ in the Reign of Henry III*: the present Director of the Selden Society, Professor Milsom, has recently remarked that 'it must rank as one of the most important the Society has ever published'. It also occurred to Richardson that a simple undertaking in wartime would be to edit the late thirteenth-century legal treatise called 'Fleta', for it survived as a whole in a single manuscript. He accordingly made a contract with the Selden Society for its publication and obtained a beautiful photostat from the National Library of Wales, in whose care the manuscript had been placed. But he found the task of coping with the four projected volumes too great and he asked me if I would assist him. Since the substance of Fleta was divided into six books, the division of labour was simple and clear-cut and I

agreed to help. The proofs of Books I and II, comprising the first volume to be published, were ready in 1944–5 and I had no great difficulty in passing them. But Richardson would not let his own set of proofs go to the printer, despite personal appeals from both the President and the Secretary of the Selden Society in 1953. I could never understand why, though I surmised that differences had arisen over the translation of legal terms between him and the Literary Director, Professor Plucknett: neither was a lawyer, though both were daily occupied professionally with the law, and neither apparently would give way. The volume, held up for ten years, made its appearance in 1955. The second volume, comprising Books III and IV, had a still more difficult journey. After we had secured a grant from the British Academy in 1965 in aid of its publication, Richardson felt that it could then be left safely at anchor while he turned his attention elsewhere. In the event he held the final typescript for two years before returning it to me untouched, and he read none of the proofs before the volume appeared in 1972.

When I was appointed to the Chair of History at Queen's University, Belfast at the end of the war in 1945 and had ready access at last to Irish documents, particularly the registers of the archbishops of Armagh, the largest single source of information still remaining for the lost history of medieval Ireland, our mutual interest in Ireland, reaching back to 1929, was now focused on the subject and we edited a collection of documents on *Parliaments and Councils of Medieval Ireland* in 1947 and a history of *The Irish Parliament in the Middle Ages* in 1952. It should be added that the bulk of the work on *The Administration of Ireland, 1172–1377*, was also done at this time, though unnecessary delays prevented the volume from appearing in print until 1964.

For Richardson had engaged himself with zest in a controversy in which he could do battle with his peers. Professor G. E. Woodbine of Yale gave thirty-five years to the collation of some fifty manuscripts containing the treatise of the thirteenth-century legist, Henry Bracton, called 'On the Laws and Customs of England'. His laudable aim was to find the most authentic text of what Maitland had commended as 'the crown and flower of English medieval jurisprudence'. But this single-minded approach took no account of the fact that the text he eventually provided was corrupt and frequently unintelligible. He thus laid himself open to an unhappily bitter attack by Hermann Kantorowicz who showed that sense could be made

out of nonsense by examining the textbooks on roman and canon law which Bracton had undoubtedly laid under contribution while he was writing. And Kantorowicz did not hesitate to declare that Woodbine's work would have to be done all over again.[1] There followed a flurry of excitement as scholars examined Bracton's text more closely than Maitland had done when he showed the indebtedness of Bracton to Azo's 'Summa'. Thus Fritz Schulz pointed out the connection with Tancred's 'Ordo Judiciarius' and Richardson revealed Bracton's knowledge of Raymond de Penaforte's 'Summa de Matrimonio', and he must have cherished Schulz's tribute when he wrote to him to say that 'the fine discovery of Raymond as one of Bracton's sources really came as a surprise'. But how were the numerous errors in the text of Bracton to be explained? Kantorowicz argued that Bracton left at his death in 1268 an uncompleted manuscript, a collection of disconnected pieces, badly written, interlined and heavily corrected, full of additions and qualifications of what he had first set down. A redactor (or editor) had put the bits and pieces together rather clumsily and had frequently miscopied and misunderstood what lay before him. In that case, none of the manuscripts can give us the true text of Bracton, he cannot be held responsible for a blundered version of roman law, and his reputation as a learned civilian is not diminished. Schulz accepted the hypothesis of such a redactor. But not so Richardson. He argued that the introduction of a redactor was an unnecessary complication and had nothing to recommend it save on the assumption that Bracton was an impeccable civilian. In his view, the archetype, the single manuscript from which all succeeding copies were derived, was essentially Bracton's own work and the mistakes could be explained by his failure to understand and properly assimilate his roman and canon law textbooks. Indeed, Richardson hazarded the guess that studies at Oxford had for some unknown reason been interrupted. Richardson was therefore supporting Maitland's conclusion that Bracton was an uninstructed civilian. But neither Kantorowicz nor Richardson had extended their close gaze from the first part of the treatise, the 'roman' part, to the nine-tenths that concerned the 'English' common law. In this field it could hardly be suggested that Bracton was not a master of his subject and yet, as Professor S. E. Thorne has learnedly pointed out,[2] the same faults and careless blunders are to be observed throughout. He has thus

[1] *Bractonian Problems* (Glasgow 1941). [2] *Bracton*, i, pp. xxxviii f.

furnished the most powerful argument for the presence of a redactor at work on the treatise as a whole, who produced a slipshod copy and added non-Bractonian passages just to make it difficult. No one can deny that Richardson made notable contributions to Bractonian scholarship but his main thesis seems unacceptable.

Every scholar has his 'vavassor of Champagne', that faintly remembered and almost forgotten source of information about Joan's angelic voices without which Anatole France felt he could not complete the *Vie de Jeanne d'Arc* on which he was working,[1] that hidden witness who may testify to one's discomfiture in some overlooked manuscript or in some printed book that every one knows and no one reads. There is no way of avoiding this silent menacing enemy of the erudite except to cease to write. Richardson met his 'vavassor' when as a side issue to his Bractonian studies he turned his attention to the short Scottish legal treatise called the 'Regiam Majestatem' and suggested that its anonymous author was a contemporary of Bracton and used the same textbooks of Azo, Tancred, and Raymond about 1245 in Scotland.[2] But Professor Peter Stein has demonstrated conclusively that every one of the citations of roman law came from a single source, Godfredus of Trano's 'Summa in Titulos Decretalium', written *c.* 1241–8.[3] It is surprising that Richardson in his ardent pursuit of contemporary canonists had left this author unread, and I can only conjecture that he was put off by Schulz who had compared Godfredus with Bracton and had stated that there was no connection between the two writers. Richardson had accordingly but rather untypically ignored Godfredus.

Richardson had given full treatment of his Bractonian studies in the expansion of a lecture he delivered to the Selden Society in 1961. In 1960, when he was seventy-six, he produced the only other book to appear under his sole authorship, a study of *The English Jewry under the Norman Kings*. It was a focal point for his lifelong interest in usury, financial auditing, contemporary developments in France, the relations between Church and State. It has been little realized that the material for the history of the Jews in the Middle Ages is quite copious in England in contrast with other countries where relatively little has survived, and Richardson used it to controvert received

[1] Jean Jacques Brousson, *Anatole France Himself* (trans. London 1925), 108–17.
[2] *Juridical Rev.* lxvii (1955), 155–87.
[3] *Scot. Hist. Rev.* xlviii (1969), 107–23.

opinion on many points. It is unlikely that this very learned and sympathetic work will be supplanted as the standard authority on the subject. Richardson remarked to Stephan Kuttner that he 'would be lucky to have a single intelligent review in Europe' and it was sad for him that the book received from the reviewer in the *English Historical Review* less space (ten lines) than the shortest of the Short Notices.[1]

In more than a century of combined work we had raised a multitude of problems which we were not likely to be able to tackle at the full length they deserved, for one of us was approaching and the other had long passed the biblical three score years and ten. And they were too many to appear in article form. I therefore recalled a textbook I had written in 1948 on *The Medieval Foundations of England*, in which I ignored the convention that such a book must reflect generally accepted views (which meant that it would be out-of-date as soon as it appeared), and I often ventured to express my own opinions, unfortified by any footnotes, in the daring belief that what was then heterodox would sooner or later become orthodox. I suggested to Richardson that we should write another textbook on these lines and give the freest rein to the expression of our beliefs but this time with as much corroboration as possible by reference to documents. The result was *The Governance of Medieval England* in 1963, with its complement *Law and Legislation in Medieval England* in 1966, both books beautifully produced by the artistry and typographical skill of Mr. A. R. Turnbull, the Secretary of the Edinburgh University Press. The reception given to the *Governance* was gratifying: its sales were double what the publishers had expected and it formed the subject of many article-reviews. To one critic at Harvard, Professor Thorne, it was our 'masterpiece'; to another critic it was an 'amazing book, iconoclastic to the last page, yet objective to a remarkable degree, a fresh breeze blowing through some very dusty corridors'. As its courageous purpose was to compel historians to rethink the old grounds of their beliefs from the sixth to the thirteenth centuries, we were not surprised to find that other critics were less appreciative. We intended a second volume to cover the years from Magna Carta to the Long Parliament of the Reformation in 1529 and we had written much before we abandoned the enterprise. We had grown too old but, going over the many fragments, I still find them exciting to have thought out and written, novel and strong meat though they be for weak digestions.

[1] *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxxvii (1962), 138.

From a practical point of view it was a pity that Richardson's interests surpassed his capability to cope with them all. The work he formally committed himself to write far exceeds the total of what he wrote, extensive as that was by any standard. I have already referred to the unfinished books on usury, on parliament, on law, but there was much more left incomplete. The Royal Historical Society had accepted for publication in the 1930s the 'Historia Roffensis'. In 1948, when the Literary Director asked if the edition was likely to appear 'in the immediately realisable future', Richardson informed him that he had finished the text but needed to visit Paris in the hope of finding a parallel text of a treaty embodied in the 'Historia': 'this is the only major subject of enquiry outstanding'. The next two Literary Directors were still pursuing a fruitless correspondence over the following twenty years. Again, in 1959 Richardson offered to supervise the work of editors transcribing the plea rolls of the exchequer of the Jews and to write an introduction. The Latin text went to the printers in 1964; by 1967 they were asking permission to distribute the type; in 1969 Richardson was still retaining the page proofs and promising the introduction; in 1972 the volume appeared in his despite without the introduction or the subject index for which he had made himself responsible. A still longer delay occurred over the publication of a well-known martyrology contained in the Guildhall MS. 1231. Richardson became interested in this 'Historia Aliquot Martyrum' through the Revd. Dom Andrew Gray, a Carthusian and an old friend of Birkbeck College days. It contained an account of the martyrdom of the Carthusian Fathers, written by Maurice Chauncy shortly after he had landed in Flanders in 1547 and subsequently revised and expanded by him: one version was printed in Mainz in 1547 and another in London in 1888. Richardson believed that the Guildhall MS. represented the first form, the primitive text which had hitherto escaped notice. It testified to the simplicity, even naïvety, of Carthusian thought and practice, while the successive changes in the narrative showed how Chauncy's mind altered under the impact of a harsher world and how knowledge of the Henrician persecutions reached and spread over the Continent. By the end of 1952 Richardson had completed both text and translation and both were in a state, so he said, to go to the printers. But though plans for publication were settled, the introduction was never written and the whole project lapsed with Gray's death in 1968.

Evidently Richardson had no consuming desire to rush into print and, indeed, much of his time was spent in acquiring knowledge for its own sake and for his own enlightenment. In 1937 he made a beautifully written copy of two monastic chronicles of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: the Lichfield Chronicle (B.L., Cleopatra D. IX), and the Hailes Abbey Chronicle (B.L., Cleopatra D. III) to which attention has recently been drawn for its fresh information about John Balliol, king of Scotland.[1] The only practical use he made of this chronicle was to draw attention to a somewhat defective list of the many children of Edward I by his two wives which concluded with the words 'Johannes Botetourt nothus'. This reference to a bastard son not only explained at once why this seeming parvenu had reached high office in the state but it destroyed Stubbs's picture of Edward I as a 'model of chastity'. The only other reference Richardson made to his work seems to be in a casual note in a paper written in 1936.[2] In 1953 Richardson had toyed with the idea of a book giving the various texts of the English coronation oath in its development and, as he wrote to me, 'Schramm, who once contemplated some such book himself, handed his material to me for the purpose. Whether I shall ever get down to it is another matter'. He did not, and I have found no trace of Schramm's notes and presume that they may not have come into Richardson's possession. In 1958 he purposed publishing 'An Introduction to Old French', with a collection of texts and translations and an introduction on grammar, but this got no further than a rough draft. The last paper he wrote in 1968 was on pilgrimages, a topic which had remained in his mind since he began to read round the subject in 1919 and for which I remember that I supplied him with many references in 1930. Pilgrimages abound in problems and the kind of human dilemma that fascinated him was, for instance, whether a villein had an absolute right in law to go on pilgrimage if the Church gave him its blessing but his lord imposed a veto. The relations between Church and State in the Middle Ages were never far from his mind. And during his visits to Paris after 1926 and before 1939 he copied the register of criminal causes in the court of the archdeacon of Paris. He regarded this register of the Officialité of the Archdeaconry of Paris, covering roughly twelve years in the mid-fourteenth century, as probably unique in Europe.

[1] *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, xlviii (1975), 94–106.

[2] *Eng. Hist. Rev.* li (1946), 5.

It was well preserved but written with a fiendish degree of illegibility, doubtful grammar and spelling. He wrote, 'At what distant time I shall write out a few hundred extracts, work out statistics, and compose an introduction I can't guess'. That time never came: he seems to have wished to examine a similar register at Arras before getting down to the job. So often I urged him not to get it right but to get it written, but the 'vavassor of Champagne' was ever at his side.

Unlike Stubbs, who gave none of his time to reviewing books, Richardson gave too much time to it. With an unrivalled knowledge of English and continental sources, written and unwritten, and a broad spread of interests over many centuries, he was in constant demand and his reviews, even if not always appreciated in some quarters, were always stimulating. He wrote well and frequently produced the telling and felicitous phrase and he always practised the greatest art of all, the art of clarity. He was a stern critic of shoddy work and, looking upon the academic world from the outside, he could be unusually outspoken in his comments. He once surmised that writing afforded him an outlet, otherwise closed to him by the rules of silence imposed upon civil servants, but he was combative by nature. A few illustrations may be given to show the calibre of the man. W. C. Bolland, who was so often at a loss to know what to put into the introductions to the Year Books he edited, found them nicely likened to 'shoes and ships and sealing wax'.[1] He castigated the *Calendar of Charter Rolls* as 'the least satisfactory of the several series of chancery enrolments' in which 'the editors had shown disregard for the elementary principles' in dating documents, 'errors for which glaring is hardly too strong a description'.[2] Again, after pointing out that the introduction to the Register of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, discussed no more than the historicity of the early chapters of the abbey, none of which were to be found in the register itself, he proceeded to provide an outline of the introduction as, in his opinion, it ought to have been written, throwing light upon the legal and agricultural institutions and customs of Kent.[3] Then, against Plucknett's eulogy of Littleton's *Tenures*, which was in line with Chief Justice Coke's declaration that it was 'the most perfect and absolute book that was ever written in any human science', Richardson pointed out that the three brief tracts constitute 'a boy's book', intended for a beginner, written simply and not

[1] *Law Quarterly Rev.* 39 (1923), 252.
[2] Ibid. 45 (1929), 86.
[3] Ibid. 42 (1926), 277–9.

without fables drawn from antiquarian fiction.[1] And only so well versed a student of French institutions could have dared to assert that Jacques Boussard in *Le Gouvernement d'Henri II Plantagenêt* had 'failed to provide adequate answers to the important questions he has posed' and then proceed to demonstrate the reasons for his criticism.[2] He rarely withheld his thunders—a well-known medievalist once escaped: 'I have a soft spot in my heart for her, perverse as she can be. I must have tried her sorely. But what can you do for maiden aunts except shock them?[2]' Yet he accorded generous praise where it was due and praise from him was indeed earned. If all his reviews, especially those in the *Law Quarterly Review*, for which he had a great affection, and the *English Historical Review* were to be printed together, a student would never again see medieval history as it so often appears in textbooks and he might well be set on a fruitful line of investigation that otherwise would not occur to him.

Richardson was very much a 'loner'. It is true that, when he removed from Sevenoaks to Merton in 1929, many highly distinguished medievalists came down for the day, usually a Sunday, to enjoy the hospitality so graciously and perfectly supplied by Mrs. Richardson: C. H. McIlwain, G. G. Coulton, Julius Goebel Jr., B. H. Putnam, W. A. Morris, P. E. Schramm, C. R. Cheney, Jocelyn Otway-Ruthven and many others. But no one just dropped in on haphazard visits, nor did he himself go out much to visit. His devotion to the advancement of historical knowledge left him no time to spare for chit-chat and persiflage on the ephemera of the day. Often when I was speaking on nothing in particular to Mrs. Richardson he would steal away to his study to write some letters and return in the hope that the conversation had reached a higher level. Small talk utterly bored him and he avoided dinners and social occasions like the plague and, indeed, he was not at his best at them. In consequence, since he courted no publicity, few people got to know him personally and such a picture was painted of him that the late Derek Hall told me that he had called upon him in London in trepidation and had come away much amused. Those who knew him found him young in looks and young in mind, not an inhuman producer of articles but an affable and even a jovial man, willing to help all who sought his counsel beyond their rightful expectations, though his advice usually imposed standards that they could not or did not wish to attain.

[1] *Law Quarterly Rev.* 75 (1959), 266. [2] *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxxiii (1958), 659.

The only ambition he acknowledged to me was the dream of becoming Deputy Keeper of the Public Records. This was not by any means an impossibility, for civil servants from outside were occasionally appointed to that office. But the mind boggles at the thought of the impact of a mind that teemed with usually endless schemes upon that sedate band of scholars who manage so urbanely the affairs of the Public Record Office.

A few weeks after Mrs. Richardson's death in January 1950 he remarried and early in 1953 he left Merton for Goudhurst in Kent. There he was lost to the view of his academic friends. No visitors were encouraged and he was to be seen only when he came to London to read or to attend occasional meetings. In 1968 he stopped work abruptly and completely, leaving all his commitments to look after themselves as best they could, and he ceased even to answer letters. Six years later he died peacefully in his bed.

I acknowledge gratefully my indebtedness to Mrs. Helen Suggett (daughter), Mr. J. B. Richardson (brother), and Mrs. E. J. L. Richardson (widow); to Mr. Edmund Dell, the Paymaster-General, for information received through the kindly offices of Mr. Geoffrey Johnson Smith, M.P.; to Dr. R. C. Tress, Master of Birkbeck College, and Mr. J. Alcock, the Academic Secretary of the London School of Economics.

G. O. SAYLES