



Photograph by Vandyk

SIR FREDERIC G. KENYON, G.B.E., K.C.B.

SIR FREDERIC GEORGE KENYON

1863-1952

THE task of writing a necessarily brief memoir of a man so fruitfully active in so many fields as Sir Frederic Kenyon is no light one. Its difficulty is considerably lessened by the fact that towards the end of his life Kenyon wrote for the use of his family, under the title 'Autobiographica', a summary review of his life and principal activities. This short autobiography, which is characteristically headed 'Not for publication', seems to have been written in 1948, and bears the motto 'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength' (Isaiah xxx. 15), a motto which, in its Latin form, 'In silentio et in spe erit fortitudo vestra', he had earlier had illuminated for him by the nuns of Maredret. He explains that neither when he chose it for that purpose nor when he prefixed it to his autobiography had he any conscious memory of the fact that in a contribution written by him for Lady Laura Ridding's life of her husband (Bishop of Southwell) he had referred to a sermon by him on this text which had particularly impressed him when he was a boy at Winchester. Doubtless all who knew Kenyon will recognize its singular appropriateness as a motto for 'Autobiographica'.

In an introduction to these reminiscences he sets forth, with much cogency though without quite establishing conviction, his reasons for disliking autobiography, his own or another's,¹ and reiterates his desire that his heirs will keep these notes private; but since he adds 'except so far as bits of them may be useful as material for the use of anyone who has to write a short memoir of me for the *Proceedings of the British Academy*', the writer selected for that task may feel, and has felt, free to quote from them wherever that seemed desirable.

Frederic George Kenyon was born on 15 January 1863, the seventh son of John Robert Kenyon, D.C.L., Q.C., of Pradoe, co. Salop, and Mary Eliza, only daughter of Edward Hawkins, F.R.S. The Kenyon family claims descent from Jordan Kenyon,

¹ Cf. Kenyon's reason for choosing *The British Museum in War Time*, rather than 'my experiences, or the opinions to which those experiences might have led', as the subject of his David Murray Lecture at Glasgow: 'I have not the gift of autobiographical reminiscence; to describe the development of the British Museum during the past generation might have the appearance of claiming credit to myself to which I have little more title than the fly on the wheel for the progress of the vehicle.'

lord of Kenyon, co. Lanc., *temp.* Henry III, but the first name in the continuous pedigree given in Burke's *Peerage* is that of Thomas Kenyon, born 1668, who married Catherine, eldest daughter of Luke Lloyd of Bryn, in the parish of Hanmer, co. Flint. His eldest son, Lloyd, born 1696, married, in 1730, Jane, the eldest daughter of Robert Eddowes, of Eagle Hall, co. Chester, and Gredington, co. Flint; and at the latter place the Kenyon family settled. Lloyd Kenyon, 1st Baron Kenyon, a distinguished lawyer, who became Lord Chief Justice, had, besides his successor in the title, a son, Thomas Kenyon of Pradoc, whose third son was John Robert, the father of the subject of this memoir. He, too, was a lawyer of distinction, a Fellow of All Souls, Vinerian Professor of Law at Oxford, a judge of the Vice-Chancellor's Court, and Recorder of Oswestry. Of his brothers one, who died unmarried in 1836, was a captain in the Royal Horse Guards and another was a major in the 8th Foot. Two of F. G. Kenyon's brothers became major-generals. Thus there are discernible in the family two strong inclinations, to the law and to the army; and it is easy to recognize both in the make-up of Sir Frederic himself. He would have made an excellent Chancery lawyer, and a not less distinguished judge; one can well imagine the clarity and impartiality with which he would have summed up a perplexingly complicated issue. And as for the army, he was always greatly interested in military and naval matters, and was an ardent and valued member of the Inns of Court Volunteers. His maternal grandfather, Edward Hawkins, the eldest son of Edward Hawkins of Macclesfield, banker, a botanist and a Fellow of the Linnean Society, was a numismatist and antiquary, and had been Keeper of Antiquities in the British Museum. It was no doubt mainly from this side of his ancestry (though here too a military trend may be discerned, for his maternal grandmother was the daughter of Major Rohde) that Kenyon derived his bent for scholarship, and it was perhaps not merely the necessities of his position as Director of the British Museum but some natural inclination which gave him, whose Museum experience had been in the Department of Manuscripts, a special interest in archaeology and excavation.

He was born, not at Pradoc, but at his maternal grandfather's house, 6 Lower Berkeley Street, Portman Square, but he was not for long a Londoner, since at the age of six Pradoc became his home. He expresses his gratitude for this country upbringing: 'The pleasures and advantages of town life—society, public exhibitions, pictures, music, and the like—can be learnt

in adult life, indeed can only be learnt and appreciated then; but country knowledge and country life can only be fully learnt by living in it, by a process of unconscious absorption', and he adds, with a characteristic touch of dry humour and a reference to Mark Twain, 'it is not from books that one learns which end of a horse gets up first when it rises from lying down, and which end of a cow'. Those who saw him only casually in his official capacity or presiding at a committee or learned gathering might well think of him as purely a scholar, but one could not associate with him for very long without being conscious of another element, the unmistakable suggestion of the country gentleman, who had spent much time in the open air and could appreciate country sport.

He owed his first steps in Latin and Greek to his sister Mary, whose tuition gave him a good start at his preparatory school, a school which seems to have led a somewhat migratory existence; Kenyon mentions it as being at one time at Blackheath and later at Cordwalles, Maidenhead. From there he went in due course to Winchester, where his first form masters were 'Freddie Morshead and Sergeant, each of whom was preferable as a teacher to the masters taking the divisions parallel to theirs'. In his second year, under H. Moberly, he was less fortunate, and instead of getting out of the division in one half he was 'senior left down', a position which he occupied again at the end of the second half. His ill success was, he thought, partly due to the unstimulating character of Moberly's teaching but more to his own fault, since he was devoting too much time to other things, especially (it is interesting to note) English literature and military history. Two halves in the next division were equally unsatisfactory, and 'I lapsed into such apathy that I barely secured promotion at the end of the second half'. With the removal to the Junior Division, Sixth Book ('what in other schools would be called the Lower Sixth'), came a decisive change. Fearon's 'stimulating teaching', communicating his own enthusiasm to his class, gave the necessary stimulus, especially in history. The periods studied were those of Charles I and George III, but there was apparently some ancient history as well, since a visit to the Assyrian sculptures in the British Museum was recommended.

After four halves under Fearon, about the normal allowance, Kenyon passed, in September 1879, into the Senior Division, under Ridding, where he passed 'three most profitable years'. He speaks with enthusiasm of Ridding's teaching, which was, however, very different from Fearon's. The latter was 'straight-

forwardly enthusiastic, along fairly obvious lines', whereas 'Ridding was always breaking out in unexpected directions'. For example, he got the Clarendon Press to print a polyglot text of *Philippians* in fourteen languages, by way of giving his class a glimpse into the nature and value of comparative philology, and took his pupils on a journey through the history of the Nearer and Middle East, 'from the call of Abraham to the first Reform Bill', illustrated by pictures of Oriental scenery. This may have helped to give direction to Kenyon's later studies. Ridding's influence may clearly be recognized in another respect: in English essays 'he insisted on our getting down to hard facts and saying clearly what we meant. All woolliness of expression was ruthlessly expunged. "Say what you mean, and mean what you say" was one of his mottoes'. Every line Kenyon wrote in later life shows how well he had learned this lesson.

From Winchester he went in 1882 to New College, Oxford. He was not, he says, on intimate terms with any of his teachers there; he mentions his initiation into Aristotle's *Ethics* by Spooner, Pelham's lectures on Roman constitutional history, and W. L. Courtney's on philosophy, but he owed most to Warren, who had examined him for the Goddard scholarship at Winchester and took notice of him when he went up to Oxford. It was Warren who encouraged him, 'after some failure elsewhere', to enter for a Fellowship at Magdalen, and Kenyon even suggests that in a strong field Warren's appreciation of his work may have contributed to his success. A personal friendship between the two lasted till the end of Warren's life.

His Oxford career did not merely prepare Kenyon to play the part in Classical scholarship which first made his name; it confirmed (though it did not originate) two other interests which were to figure largely in his life. All the members of the Kenyon family were well grounded in the Bible. Every morning after breakfast the children gathered in their mother's room to hear her read a chapter of the Bible, and at one time they would also meet on Sunday evenings for a joint investigation into some agreed subject on which they collected the relevant texts. So prepared, Kenyon entered his preparatory school better fortified with Biblical knowledge than most boys; and it was hardly surprising that in his second summer there (1874) he won a prize for 'Divinity and History'. The book given was Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, which he read with interest. This may have helped him, in December 1880, to win the Moore-Stevens Prize at Winchester, when the subject set was

the Acts of the Apostles. Encouraged by this, he entered in 1885, during his third year at Oxford, for the Hall-Houghton Junior Greek Testament Prize, and was successful, making a rather intensive study of St. Matthew's Gospel.

The other interest referred to was the poetry of Robert Browning. It has often been supposed, by the present writer among others, that Kenyon was related to the John Kenyon who played so large a part in the life of both the Brownings, and it was a definite statement to this effect by Francis Smith, a New College friend, to his elder brother, Reginald, the active partner in the firm of Smith, Elder & Co., which evoked the invitation to prepare the work entitled *The Brownings for the Young* (1896); but Kenyon declares that the statement was 'only remotely true, if at all'. His first acquaintance with Browning's poetry was made at Winchester, where a schoolfellow introduced him to 'The Lost Leader'. He at once became an ardent admirer, and by the time he left school he had read all Browning's poems then published, with the possible exception of *Sordello*. Browning remained to the end of his life his favourite poet.

He had been a keen, though never an outstanding cricketer as a boy, had been for a time captain of the fourth eleven at his preparatory school, and during his last summer term was in the first eleven, but at Winchester his cricket never rose above house-match level. His football there was rather better, and at Oxford he played in informal games of Association football, but without much enthusiasm. Tennis, beagling, and walking were his favourite and most enduring forms of physical exercise.

He entered the British Museum in 1889, as an Assistant in the Department of Manuscripts, at the princely salary of £120 per annum, with an annual increment of £10. At first, like all entrants to the Department, he was put on to the work of describing 'charters', but after about two months of this he was, as a classical scholar, assigned the task of cataloguing the Department's small collection of Greek papyri, many of which had been published in 1839 by Forshall. He had not been very long at the task when, one morning in January 1890, he was summoned to the Departmental laboratory and shown a number of papyrus rolls, spread out under glass on the table, which he was told to examine. The Museum had made what must certainly be regarded as the most remarkable single acquisition of Greek papyri in the history of papyrology. The rolls first shown to Kenyon were those containing the lost treatise of Aristotle on the Athenian constitution, which he was not long in identifying.

The work of decipherment was not easy, since the text, written on the verso of rolls already used for agricultural accounts, was in a very cursive hand, with numerous abbreviations. 'I remember well', he writes, 'the thrill of first suspecting and then finding proof that the work in a then unfamiliar hand which I was laboriously deciphering was the lost treatise of Aristotle on the history of Athens.' He confesses that he was inadequately equipped for such a responsibility, that there were many mistakes and oversights in the first edition, and that it suffered also from misprints due to his lack of experience as an editor and proof-reader. But it was pioneer work, and the edition (1891), even with such faults, was a remarkable achievement for a young scholar's *primitiae*. It was received by the learned world with appreciation and an enthusiastic interest. A second edition (little more than a reprint) was almost immediately called for, and in 1892 a third was issued, in which the misprints and more obvious errors were corrected. Honorary doctorates at Durham (1897) and Halle (1898) followed, and in 1900 Kenyon was elected a Corresponding Member of the Berlin Academy. He had followed up the first edition immediately by a translation of the work (*Aristotle on the Athenian Constitution*, 1891), of which a second edition, based on the Greek text of the third edition, appeared in 1895. He was also called on to edit the Greek text for the *Supplementum Aristotelicum* of the Berlin Academy (1903), in which he was able to use the additional fragments mentioned below, and for the series of Oxford Classical Texts (1920), while the English translation was included in the Oxford translation of the works of Aristotle in 1920.

Though the Aristotle was the most important item in the great acquisition of 1890, it was by no means the only one. Of the others the most sensational was one which, as Kenyon remarked in editing it, restored 'not merely a work or an author hitherto practically unknown, but a species of ancient literature of which no complete specimen has been extant within modern times'. This was the roll containing the mimes of Herodas. In another was the latter part of the lost oration of Hyperides against Philippides and the earlier part of the third epistle attributed to Demosthenes. There were also the second half of a roll containing the oration of Isocrates on the Peace, another which had on one side a continuous text of *Iliad* ii. 101-iv. 40, on the other Tryphon's τέχνη γραμματική, and a long roll containing a medical treatise by an unknown author. These (except the last) were

included in the catalogue, *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum* (1891), the mimes, the Hyperides, and the Tryphon being published in full, the others merely collated. Of the very difficult Herodas poems—difficult not so much to read (though there are defaced patches where decipherment is not easy) as owing to the allusive style and the dialect—only a transcript, as accurate as was then possible, without punctuation or accents, was published; it remained for other scholars to edit the interesting text in more generally intelligible form. The Hyperides was a different matter. Kenyon later edited in a separate volume this speech and the much more extensive and important speech against Athenogenes which had appeared in France at about the same time, adding an English translation of both (1892). He was later commissioned to edit the orations of Hyperides restored to us by papyri along with the other extant fragments for the series of Oxford Classical Texts (1907).

An amazing amount of official work was thus packed into the years 1890–1, but that did not prevent Kenyon from completing in time for publication in 1893 the first volume of the papyrus catalogue, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*. In this were included, in an improved text, the Serapeum papyri and various other documents published by Forshall, some long and important magical texts, the farm accounts on the recto of the rolls later used for the Aristotle, the Museum's share of the so-called Fayum papyri, and some miscellaneous papyri.

Kenyon's luck was not exhausted by the purchases of 1890. Some years later the Museum acquired a mass of miscellaneous fragments which were found to contain scraps belonging to the earlier collection. It was thus possible to recover in part the imperfect conclusion of Aristotle's work and to add appreciably to the Isocrates. The new fragments of the latter were placed and the text edited in full in the *Journal of Philology* by another hand. But this was a very minor stroke of fortune compared with that which in 1896 brought to the Museum two rolls containing the epinician odes and dithyrambs of Bacchylides. Kenyon's *editio princeps* of these appeared in 1897, and to Pindar was thus added another of the classical Greek lyric poets.

Such work as this naturally gave Kenyon an interest in the hands used in the papyrus texts and the criteria to be employed in dating them. In the introduction to the first volume of the Museum catalogue he devoted several pages to a very useful sketch of the palaeography of Greek papyri. This he expanded into a long essay which he submitted for the Conington Prize at

Oxford. He was successful in the competition and was encouraged by Bywater to publish his essay as *The Palaeography of Greek Papyri* (1899). This still remains the only monograph on the subject in English, and it was the only one in any language till the appearance in 1925 of Schubart's *Griechische Palaeographie*, the first and longer portion of which is devoted to papyri. So much new knowledge has been accumulated in the present century that many of Kenyon's conclusions have been corrected or rendered obsolete, but the volume, which was for a long time indispensable to any papyrologist, can still be used with advantage.

The Museum was acquiring papyri in considerable quantities during the last decade of the nineteenth and the first few years of the present century. In 1892 Kenyon was sent to Vienna to examine a large collection accumulated by the dealer Theodor Graf and was eventually successful in purchasing many of them. In 1898 appeared the second volume of the catalogue, in which these texts and others were included. The volume was a good deal larger than the first, and the Roman period is far better represented in it. It also included the Museum's share of the important Abinnaeus papyri, dating from the fourth century. Kenyon was at work on the preparation of vol. iii when I myself joined the Department in 1903. He had in 1898 been promoted Assistant Keeper (the rank now denoted by the name Deputy Keeper), creating what I believe to be a record by passing to that post direct from the grade of Second Class Assistant, without going through the First Class. The Department had previously had only one Assistant Keeper, G. F. Warner, and there was no separate room available for Kenyon, who sat therefore in an inner alcove of the so-called 'Working Room' until Warner succeeded Scott as Keeper in 1904, when Kenyon took his room. I saw him at his place daily for many months, and, having acquired an interest in papyri during a year spent in Germany after leaving Oxford, I would look enviously at the piles of papyri brought to him by the Attendants. He worked with great absorption and took hardly any share in the desultory conversation, whether on Departmental or on general matters, which from time to time relieved the monotony of official work. He was indeed for the most part a silent member of our company, and some of his colleagues, like many people outside, regarded him as cold and aloof. This view did him an injustice. His taciturnity in the Department sprang, I am sure, partly from a reluctance to interrupt his work, partly from a natural reserve, even a certain

shyness. Several times, in talking to him, I happened to strike a more personal note, and each time was conscious of an instant response which, had not I, so much his junior, suffered from an even greater shyness, might have passed into something like intimacy. It was as if some imprisoned self had suddenly looked out of the window of his personality and then shrunk back again. He was wholly free from any tendency to magnify himself or to stand on his dignity. I remember once, not very long after I had begun work on papyri, having occasion to write to him when he was absent on sick leave and addressing him as 'Dear Dr. Kenyon'. His reply began with the words, 'My dear Bell (no Mrs between colleagues please!)'. His predecessor as Director was a great stickler for the dignity of his office, insisting, with a sharp reprimand for infringements of the rule, on members of the staff taking off their hats when they met him. Shortly after Kenyon had been appointed Director two friends of my own in the Department of Printed Books, going out to lunch, saw him at the far end of the King's Library. They debated whether to follow the custom, decided it was safer to do so, and as they neared him took off their hats. Looking straight before him and with his usual upright bearing and firm tread, Kenyon said as he passed them, 'Don't do that!' He was genial enough out of official hours, though his most ardent admirer would hardly have described him as a born conversationalist, and few who knew him can have failed to see instances of his real kindness and his readiness to give help when it was needed.

His reputation in the world of scholarship and the high opinion obviously held of him by the Director seemed to mark him out as a likely successor to Maunde Thompson. He can hardly have been unaware of this, and he was no doubt asking himself who would take up his work at papyri if he left the Department. It was the accidental discovery, a year after I joined the staff, that I had studied the history of the Hellenistic age in Germany that led him to select me; and, the Keeper agreeing, I was called on to assist him in the preparation of vol. iii of the Catalogue, which appeared in 1907. It was his last piece of work at documentary papyri. In 1909 he was appointed Director.

Kenyon cannot be reckoned among the very earliest papyrologists, even if we disregard Forshall and the other scholars who edited the papyri first brought to Europe, for Wessely and Wilcken were in the field before him, but he certainly belonged to the pioneer age, when it was possible for a worker on papyri to carry in his head a fairly complete

knowledge of all the material then extant, and he was among the founders of papyrological studies as a separate discipline. To the end he adhered in some respects to the methods of the earlier decipherers, dividing words indeed and using capital initials for proper nouns, but otherwise printing the texts as written, without punctuation marks, accents, or breathings. There was much to be said for this practice, especially in the early days of the science, and Kenyon says it very cogently in his introduction to vol. iii of his catalogue, but as the importance of the papyri became more widely realized and the texts were increasingly used by scholars who were not themselves papyrologists the case for it weakened, and the modern practice, following the example of Grenfell and Hunt, was generally adopted. In another respect also Kenyon's transcripts did not always conform with the best later practice; when transcribing a badly mutilated but partially preserved passage, if it seemed quite certain what the reading was, he would at times cut the Gordian knot by either putting the whole between square brackets or printing it without brackets but with cautionary dots under the letters, without distinguishing minutely between letters which were or seemed to be partially visible and those wholly lost. But he was certainly one of the great editors of papyri, documentary no less than literary, and both as decipherer and as interpreter. He had a lucid clarity of mind, equally remote from pedantry and from uncritical fantasy, which, combined with the balanced and objective judgement characteristic of a legal temperament, enabled him to grasp the essential points of a document and to assess its significance. I may instance among his more noteworthy contributions to papyrology his re-edition of the Serapeum papyri, and his editing of the magical texts in vol. i, the illumination he brought to the question of the census in Roman Egypt and his edition of the Abinnaeus papyri in vol. ii, and the work, arising out of the long roll, P. Lond. 1164, which he did on the organization of Antinoopolis. Yet I suspect that documents never appealed to him quite as intimately as literary and Biblical papyri.

The editions of Aristotle, Bacchylides, *Classical Texts*, and the first three volumes of *Greek Papyri* might seem a whole-time occupation, but Kenyon was employed during his time in the Department of Manuscripts on many other tasks as well. As an Assistant he helped in the work of cataloguing the Stowe manuscripts, and he arranged, described, and indexed the huge correspondence of the Hardwick family (Add. MSS. 35349-36278), acquired in 1899. In 1896 he was sent to Shrewsbury to

negotiate the purchase of the military correspondence of the first Lord Hill, including many Wellington papers, which he subsequently arranged and catalogued. In 1905 he obtained leave to organize a Naval Exhibition of manuscripts and prints in honour of the Trafalgar centenary, selecting and describing the manuscripts himself. He remarks, 'I have always been rather proud of the Guide to this exhibition, though I don't know that anyone else took much interest in it.' He had from boyhood been interested in the Navy. Among the favourite books of his early years he names one 'called, I think, *The Ship, from its Cradle to its Grave*', the other *Deeds of Naval Daring*. In the library at Pradoc were a table and chair made from the timbers of the *Téméraire*, whose captain at Trafalgar, Capt. Harvey, was related to the Lloyds of Aston, one of whom was Kenyon's grandmother. It was in connexion with the Trafalgar exhibition that Kenyon first became a subscriber to the Navy Records Society, and in 1908 he was asked to serve on its Council. In 1924 he was invited by Lord George Hamilton to succeed him as President, which he did, remaining in office for twenty-four years and retiring in 1948. He was for some years a member of the Navy League. His interest in naval history is well illustrated by an incident told me by an acquaintance of his. Standing with him on the deck of a boat which was approaching harbour, Kenyon gave him a lucid and comprehensive account of the tactics of the Battle of Copenhagen.

Another substantial task was his share in the great Catalogue of the Royal manuscripts, planned and started by Warner in 1894 and completed by Gilson (published in 1921). Kenyon's work was done on the earlier portion of this, comprising especially the Bibles and Biblical commentaries. He described in all some 360 manuscripts. It was no doubt because of his interest in these that he was given the task of preparing the volume, *Facsimiles of Biblical Manuscripts in the British Museum* (1900). He was also responsible for the manuscript portion of the *Guide to the Manuscripts and Printed Books Exhibited in Celebration of the Tercentenary of the Authorized Version* in 1911.

It is an amazing record for an official career, in the Department, of only twenty years, especially when we remember that the man who achieved it was engaged on a vast amount of work in his private time also. I have already mentioned some products of this activity, like the unofficial editions of Aristotle and Hyperides. One further and very laborious piece of papyrological work done unofficially was the transcribing of the long

medical papyrus (by no means easy to read) for Diels, who published it for the Berlin Academy's *Supplementum Aristotelicum (Anonymi Londinensis ex Aristotelis Iatricis Menoniis et Aliis Medicis Eclogae, 1893; recently edited anew by W. H. S. Jones, The Medical Writings of Anonymus Londinensis, 1947).*

I must now turn to some of Kenyon's work in other fields. An inquiry by Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode for someone qualified to write a popular account of the textual history of the Bible elicited from Warner a recommendation of Kenyon. The result was the well-known volume, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, first published at the end of 1895, of which several revised editions have since been called for. As Kenyon himself emphasizes, this was second-hand work, since his own knowledge of the manuscripts was small at the time, but it set him on a line of study which he was subsequently to make specially his own, and it brought him lasting friendships with Armitage Robinson and F. C. Burkitt and later with others also, like Sanday and White. It evoked almost immediately an invitation from Messrs. Macmillan to undertake a handbook on the textual criticism of the Greek New Testament, designed for readers of the Greek rather than for the general public. The *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* appeared in 1901 and a second edition was called for in 1912. Kenyon mentions in his 'Autobiographica' that both the books just mentioned were written during his evenings at home at Harrow, where he was then living, often while his wife was practising her singing in the same room. He adds, 'I think the ability to concentrate upon one's subject in spite of surrounding noises may have been partly due to one's having been accustomed at Winchester to work in common chambers and not in private studies.' The two official publications already mentioned (page 279) were based largely on the researches made in preparation for these works of his leisure. After his appointment as Director he had no time for such work, but on his retirement he was free to return to Biblical studies, to which he was to make valuable contributions. With no touch of mysticism and little taste or aptitude for philosophical speculation, he was yet a man of strong religious convictions and genuine, if unobtrusive, piety, greatly concerned to defend the credentials of the faith he held against inadequately based and unscholarly criticism.

Kenyon's volume, *The Brownings for the Young*, has already been mentioned. Its appearance led to his being asked to edit the letters of Elizabeth Browning, of which Messrs. Smith, Elder

& Co. held a large quantity on behalf of her son, Robert Wiedeman Barrett Browning. This was a big undertaking, as not only was it necessary to make a selection of the letters but a biographical narrative connecting them was required; yet, despite all his other work, *The Letters of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, edited with biographical Additions*, was published, in two volumes, at the end of 1897. Already, in 1896, Kenyon had been asked to contribute the few brief notes to *The Ring and the Book* in the two-volume edition of Browning's poems published in 1896, and in 1897 he edited the companion single-volume edition of Mrs. Browning's works, both verse and prose. In 1906 he edited *Robert Browning and Alfred Domett*, a volume containing letters of Browning to Alfred Domett, to which was prefixed a previously unpublished poem, 'A Forest Thought', and in the same year he re-edited Mrs. Orr's life of the poet. Finally, in 1912, he edited the Centenary edition of Browning's poems in ten volumes, and in 1914 a small volume of *New Poems*, mostly by Robert but including six by Elizabeth. It was not till long afterwards that he again published anything on this theme. This was in 1946, when he contributed to the *Times Literary Supplement* (14 Sept.) a general survey of the present position of the two poets, in celebration of the centenary of their marriage.

In 1891 Kenyon had married Amy, daughter of Rowland Hunt, J.P., by whom he had two daughters, and who died in 1938. When I first knew him, in 1903, they were living at Harrow. It was in March of that year that he was elected a Fellow of the British Academy. He was thus not an original Fellow, but, as appears clearly from his sketch of the Academy's history published in 1952 (and it is certain that his own part would not be exaggerated there), he took an active share in the negotiations which led to its foundation. He was present at the historic meeting of 28 June 1901 which really decided the question whether such a body was to be formed, and which appointed a sub-committee to work out the details. In 1906 he became a member of Council. From that time he was continuously and closely associated with the activities of the Academy. He was constantly consulted by Gollancz on its affairs, and it was on his initiative that Annual Reports were introduced. He was President from 1917 to 1921, represented the Academy at most meetings of the Union Académique Internationale from 1919 till the outbreak of the Second World War, and was Secretary, succeeding Gollancz, from 1930 to 1949 and Hon. Treasurer from 1940 to 1950.

In 1909 he was appointed Director of the British Museum in succession to Maunde Thompson, and thus created another record by passing direct to that position from the status of Assistant Keeper. He was then at the height of his powers and, being still comparatively young, could count on an unusually long tenure of the office, which in fact he held till the end of 1930. No occupant of such a post can hope to escape some unfavourable criticism, and it cannot be said either that Kenyon was wholly immune or that he never made a mistake; but I feel sure that all who served under him would agree in describing him as one of the very greatest in the list of the Museum's Directors. He had a remarkable combination of the requisite qualities. Himself a scholar of world-wide reputation and holding a lofty conception of what scholarship demands, he was always jealous for the reputation of the Museum and vigilant to see that the highest possible standards were maintained. Yet he was sufficiently a man of affairs to realize that the scholar's world is a limited one and that a national institution must cater for the needs of a wide public possessing no claims to scholarship. He was indeed the antithesis of the pedant or narrow specialist. I once heard him described, rather spitefully, as 'a bit of a journalist'. It was a quite unjust jibe, but, as not infrequently happens with hostile criticism, it did reveal, though under an unfriendly light, a quality which he actually possessed, the power to pick out the salient points, and their implications, of a document or a problem or a new discovery, and, by crisp and arresting statement, bring them within the comprehension of those who had no specialized knowledge. It was this capacity which secured for his popular works on the Bible so wide and appreciative a public. He introduced the picture postcards which have been so popular, and that institution of Guide Lecturers which for thousands of people has made a visit to the British Museum not an aimless and slightly bewildered drifting from gallery to gallery but an educational experience, and sometimes a stimulus to further study. It was no doubt this sense of responsibility to the ordinary man and the consequent desire to understand his requirements which led him on occasion to join a party of visitors and make the tour under the conduct of the Guide Lecturer.

The diversity of his interests was another asset. A major difficulty for any Director of the British Museum is that, coming from a single Department and being presumably a specialist, he knows his own and perhaps the allied Departments so much better than others. There have always existed the seeds of a

conflict between the 'Museum' and the 'Library' Departments. It was from the latter that Kenyon came, but his work at papyri and perhaps, as I have already suggested, some ancestral strain in him had given him an interest in archaeology. In reading his papers one is struck by the frequency of references to archaeological questions and the grasp which he had of them.

He had, moreover, a mind which was eminently practical as well as scholarly. His clear, masculine intelligence enabled him to grasp the essentials of an administrative problem and made him an ideal chairman of committee. I had many occasions to admire the clarity and quickness of apprehension which he showed in dealing with some complicated issue; and no committee over which he presided was ever in danger of losing itself in a morass of irrelevances.

His previous work had brought him friendships and contacts with many people in various fields of scholarship, a valuable qualification in the Director of an institution embracing so wide a range of subjects as the British Museum.

Lastly, the very reserve and apparent coldness of his nature served him well. He held strong convictions, and no doubt he had his prejudices, his favourites even and his aversions among his colleagues, though it was rarely possible from anything he did or said to discover which they were; but I do not believe that in any single instance he ever allowed personal feeling to deflect him from a policy of which his objective judgement approved. It would be a gross error to suppose him destitute of feeling. I well recall the way in which he handled the case of a junior official of whose foolish and improper letter complaint had been made. His dignity, tact, and firmness not only ended the matter but won the admiring devotion of the culprit himself. He had not only a regard for the reputation of the Museum (the present Director has recalled an occasion when he told a somewhat disorderly meeting of the staff that 'he was not prepared to tolerate behaviour . . . that he could liken only to that of a boys' school, and "a school for very small boys at that"'); he was determined that those who worked for it should be adequately paid and properly treated. It was characteristic of him that when in the course of his cross-examination by a Royal Commission which was inquiring into salary scales in the Museum, he was asked who were the persons whose salaries should be raised he replied 'everyone except the Director', or words to that effect. Thus, when, several years afterwards, an improved scale of salaries was actually conceded his was the only one which remained

unchanged. Yet such abilities as his would certainly have commanded a vastly larger income in the legal profession, in business, or even in any one of the administrative departments. If the settlement arrived at was not at once accepted by all concerned, and indeed occasioned some heart-burning, that was a reflection less on the diplomacy of the Director than on the imperfections of human nature.

While he was always ready to consult the interests of his subordinates he was a no less stalwart defender of the Museum's standing against official philistinism. He fought hard and sometimes with pungent phrase against the closing of the building, from motives of economy, during the First World War, a measure which, as he caustically remarked afterwards, paid for exactly two and a half minutes of the war. He lost this battle, partly because safety in case of air raids became an added motive for the policy, but he was successful in thwarting a monstrous proposal to take over the building for the Air Board, and, after the war, in opposing a plan to charge for admission. These were no easy victories. He writes himself in reference to the question of the Air Board:¹ 'With one exception, the members of the War Cabinet showed complete indifference to the interests of the Museum or to the effect which the proposed action would have on the good name of the country.' His gift for stating a good case (I doubt if he ever advocated a bad one) is seen in a masterly reply to the Treasury apropos a large increase of staff asked for by the Director of the British Museum (Natural History) at South Kensington to which the Treasury had raised rather contemptuous objection. Kenyon's statement in defence of his colleague was crushing and secured immediate victory. Not less masterly was his letter, in 1922, on a Treasury move to make up for the long overdue increase of salaries by increasing the burden of work on the staff. He wrote reasonably and with restraint, but in a way that left no doubt as to the impracticability of the idea; and the moderation of his language gave added bite to an occasional sarcasm: 'If a man's salary is improved because he has previously been underpaid, it is illogical to demand that his increased pay should be accompanied by increased work.' No more was heard of the proposal.

His support of the demand made for the Natural History Museum is evidence of a vast improvement in the relations between the two divisions of the British Museum which was mainly due to Kenyon. A constitution which gave the Director

¹ *The British Museum in War Time*, 1934, p. 24.

at Bloomsbury a real but ill-defined superiority over his colleague at South Kensington was almost bound to cause friction, and it is an open secret that such friction had existed under Kenyon's predecessor. Kenyon's tact and judgement, his modesty, and his freedom from any tendency to self-aggrandizement enabled him to arrive at an amicable settlement which, giving the two Directors an equal and co-ordinate authority, with mutual independence, finally removed any cause for misunderstanding. After his retirement from the Directorship at South Kensington Sir Lazarus Fletcher wrote to Kenyon (20 Mar. 1919) expressing his debt to him: 'The feeling that there was at my side a man acquainted with both Bloomsbury and South Kensington business, and ready to take my place at once if at any time I suddenly found myself unequal to the reading aloud of the agenda, was so calmative to a nervous system, somewhat weak after the long illness in 1906-8, that I rarely needed to call for the physical help'; and after his death his widow wrote (15 Jan. 1921): 'My dear Husband always spoke so affectionately of you and knew in any difficulty he could rely on your help and support.'

It is impossible to read through even a selection of Kenyon's papers during his Directorship without being impressed by the multiplicity of the subjects on which he was consulted. The establishment of the National War Museum, archaeological research in Palestine or Mesopotamia, even an expedition to Karakoram, the disputed authenticity of a royal letter offered to the King, the choice of a motto for the Port of London authority, unfounded allegations about the treatment of Napoleon's heart, a complaint about the arrangement of the sculptures in the Halicarnassus room, the fable of the haunted mummy case, negotiations for the purchase of manuscripts, whether for the Museum or for private collectors, the Italian claims to art treasures at Vienna after the First World War, the choice of new Trustees, the squabble over the manuscript of *De Profundis*—a random selection like this shows how various were the matters with which he was called on to deal. And he handled them all with the same unruffled and judicial objectivity, and the same incisiveness of phrase. On a complaint regarding a change in the position of statues at South Kensington, for example: 'You talk of Owen looking down on Darwin, but that is a mere figure of speech. He doesn't look down on him, for he can see nothing of him but his boots.' Or on the excavator's right to the first publication of his results: 'After all, the present-day

inhabitants have done nothing for the antiquities found except live on top of them for several centuries and, when accessible, burn them with lime.'

Only once in the whole course of his Directorship does Kenyon seem to have been tempted into any neglect of his official duties, and that, characteristically, was on the outbreak of the First World War. As already mentioned, there was a pronounced military strain in the family, and even as a boy Kenyon was much interested in military matters. He remembered poring over newspaper reports of the battles in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, and he kept to the end of his life a bundle of newspaper cuttings relating to the Russo-Turkish War of 1877. While in Fearon's division in 1878, 'I rather astonished him by an essay on Napoleon as a general, which he marked α^+ and read aloud to the division.' In December 1899, during the South African War, he obtained the Director's leave to join the Inns of Court Rifle Volunteer Corps (as it was then called). He was assigned to E Company, commanded by F. H. L. Errington, who became the Corps Commander shortly before the outbreak of war in 1914. He was an enthusiastic and hard-working recruit, regularly attending drills and going yearly to camp. He received an Acting-Corporal's stripe in 1900, in April 1905 became a Sergeant, and in 1906 accepted a commission. In 1912 he was promoted Captain and succeeded to the command of the company.

On 30 July 1914, when about to leave for six weeks' vacation, he was told that the Corps had been asked to supply officers for service overseas with the Censorship in case of mobilization. The chance, he writes, 'was too good to be missed', and he volunteered. On 9 August he and his companions crossed to Havre, 'in the first boat that had taken a British force by that route since Henry V crossed on his way to Agincourt at the same time of year, 499 years before'. He had informed the Archbishop of his movements, and after some delay received a kind reply, but on 5 September there arrived a telegram stating that his return was desired by the Trustees. Despite an appeal from Kenyon, definite orders were received on the 9th; the Archbishop and the Prime Minister had applied to the War Office for his recall.

The Archbishop, [he writes], might reasonably have complained of my departure without effective notice, but he never uttered a word of blame. He said the King had told him that he ought never to have let me go, to which he naturally replied that I had started before he knew about it: but I did not gather that the King was seriously annoyed, and

my appointment as Gentleman Usher of the Order of the British Empire when it was founded in 1917 did not look like it.

Though back in England, Kenyon did not sever his active connexion with the Corps. An arrangement was made which enabled him to spend three weeks out of every four in command of his Company (now called B Company) at Berkhamsted, performing his Museum duties by correspondence. He was promoted Major in 1916 and in 1917, on his appointment to the War Graves Commission, became a Lieutenant-Colonel.

It is impossible to read the letters received by him during this period without realizing how great were his services to the Corps and how efficient an officer he was. Those who had served under him looked back to their time in B Company as a kind of golden age. His kindness is often referred to: 'Your sympathetic letter suggests humanity', writes a sergeant in trouble; 'it is difficult to write to you Sir but I do appreciate your kindness'; and a fellow officer writes at the end of the war, 'Now that this business is ended I may perhaps tell you how grateful we both are to you for your many kindnesses and your gentle guidance', while another assures him, 'More than once at Berkhamsted I told men in No. 8 Platoon exactly what I thought of them if they expressed any doubt as to acting on advice which you had given them'. It is hardly surprising that when the Corps was reconstructed at the end of the war Errington and others strongly urged that Kenyon should be given the command, but the War Office, to the relief of Kenyon, who did not see how the post could be combined with the Directorship, took the view that the new commander should be someone who had seen active service overseas. Incidentally this military correspondence, with its evidence of warm friendship and unembarrassed intimacy, shows how far from the truth was the common conception of Kenyon as a cold and rather inhuman personality.

On the outbreak of the Second World War he was too old for military service, but when, in May 1940, there was an appeal for men to join what afterwards became the Home Guard he at once offered himself. 'The difficulty was that the Government appeal was for men up to the age of 65, and I was 77. However, a slight alteration in the form of application, giving my date of birth as 1877 and my age as 63 (instead of my birth as 1863 and my age as 77) was accepted by the local policeman without turning a hair, and so I definitely joined up on June 15th.' He was by no means a merely honorary member of the force. After being at first 'a sort of subaltern', he sank, owing to age, to the rank of

private, and did his full share of duty till, about a month before his 80th birthday, it was intimated to him that he had better retire, which he did with a good grace and good will on both sides. But he served with the A.R.P. throughout the war. His reminiscences of experiences during air raids recall to me one day in 1944, during the flying bomb attacks. A warning had been sounded, but warnings were then so frequent that one took little notice of them, and my wife and I were about to leave the Museum when the 'danger overhead' signal was heard. We retired to some distance from the windows. The bomb passed above us, making the building quiver as it passed, and then exploded not far away. We went out at once but had hardly reached the terrace when there was a blinding flash and a deafening peal which drove us back to the door, till we realized that this was not a second bomb but an ordinary thunderstorm. All the time Kenyon, who had been in the Hall when we first entered it, had remained standing just inside the glass doors, with folded arms, and I do not think he had stirred a muscle for either bomb or lightning flash.

Iustum et tenacem propositi virum
 non civium ardor prava iubentium,
 non voltus instantis tyranni
 mente quatit solida . . .
 nec fulminantis magna manus Iovis.

I have mentioned the Imperial War Graves Commission. His appointment to this was due ultimately to an episode remote indeed from the war. Shortly after he became Director he had been asked by Fabian Ware, the then editor of the *Morning Post*, to join a committee which he was getting together in order to investigate a claim by the paper's art critic that he had discovered a signature of the artist del Mazo on the 'Rokeby Venus', attributed to Velazquez. Kenyon never pretended to be an art critic, but his experience in deciphering papyri and other manuscripts was invaluable in 'distinguishing between casual fibres of material (whether papyrus or paint) and deliberate writing'. His success in exposing this mare's nest led Ware, when appointed in 1917 head of the Graves Registration Service, to ask for Kenyon's collaboration, his task being 'to prepare a scheme for the general design and treatment of the War Cemeteries abroad, and to organise the service of the architects'. After first visiting a good deal of the front in France and Belgium, Kenyon drafted a scheme, and had then the responsible task of securing the consent and co-operation of the military authori-

ties, the Churches, the architects, and the relatives of the fallen, and subsequently of examining and approving the plans for cemeteries. All this was not accomplished without controversy and much delicate negotiation, and it also involved an excursion to the East, to inspect cemeteries in Egypt, Palestine, the Gallipoli peninsula, Turkey, Salonica, and Serbia. During the Second World War Kenyon was again asked to assist in the task of planning the cemeteries which would be needed, and for some time he was actually associated with the work, but withdrew on the retirement of Sir Fabian Ware.

It is amazing that Kenyon could combine his military activities and those of the War Graves Commission with the heavy responsibilities involved in his post at the British Museum, and the wonder is increased when we remember that, even during the war, these were by no means his only commitments. I have already mentioned his work for the British Academy, of which he was President from 1917 to 1921. He was intimately concerned with the Council for Humanistic Studies, the report of whose proceedings (*Education Scientific and Humane*) he edited in 1917, and he was associated also with the report for 1919, *Education Secondary and University*. He was Vice-President of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies from 1910, President from 1919 to 1924, a member of its Council for many years, and later a Trustee. He had belonged to the Classical Association from its foundation in 1904, was President for the year 1913, and preceded Mackail as Chairman of the Executive Committee. He was also active in the foundation of the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, becoming a member of its Council and a Vice-President, though, when informally sounded, he declined the Presidency, 'partly', he says, 'because I did not feel well qualified for it, and partly because I thought younger men should be brought forward'. Finally, he was a member of the Council of the Victoria League, and on the outbreak of the Second World War became Chairman of the Finance Committee and of the Committee for the Club for Servicemen in Malet Street.

After the war yet other activities were added. The University Grants Committee, of which he was an original member, involved both much work and a good deal of travelling, but he continued to take a very active part in its proceedings till 1947, when, on his resignation, he was entertained by the Committee at a dinner arranged in his honour. He was invited in 1924 by the Minister of Education to become Chairman of a Departmental

Committee on the Public Library service. Sittings continued from November 1924 to March 1927, and the report of the Committee (written in part by Kenyon himself) led to the establishment in 1933 of the National Central Library, with which Kenyon was closely associated, being Chairman of the Executive Committee, a post which he held till 1947, when he succeeded Mr. Mansbridge as Chairman of the Trustees. As far back as 1904 he had been appointed a Fellow of Winchester as one of the three representatives of New College on its Governing Body. He very soon made his influence felt and was successful in defeating a resolution, practically adopted before his appointment, to convert the old Brewery into a house for the Headmaster, a proposal which seemed to him likely to spoil the building, and to be open to other objections; but he was later (in 1932) a party to its conversion into a School Library, though he confesses that he was never wholly satisfied with this scheme. From 1925 to 1930 he was Warden, and he performed the duties of the position with the conscientious thoroughness which he put into everything he undertook.

He had never tried to secure election to the Society of Antiquaries, believing, as he says, that since his work was mainly concerned with classical scholarship, palaeography, and the like, the appropriate bodies for him were the Hellenic and Roman Societies and the Classical Association, but in 1926 he was asked to allow himself to be nominated *honoris causa* by the Council, and 'gladly accepted the compliment'. In 1934 he was elected President and held the office till 1937. He expresses his gratitude to the Society for its 'acceptance of a President who certainly could not pretend to be an expert on most of the subjects dealt with at its meetings, and on which he was expected to comment'. In 1934 he became a member of the Cocked Hat Club, the Society's dining club. He held in it the office of Praeses in 1940 and 1941, and in 1939 was elected its Recorder. Since February 1911 he had belonged to another distinguished fellowship, a body so august that it bears no other name than The Club. In 1914 he was put on the Committee for the publication of its Annals and was associated with Lord Welby in the Treasurership. On Welby's death in 1915 he became Senior Treasurer, an office which he continued to hold till the end. Finally, during the years 1928-31 he was President of the Union Académique Internationale.

Throughout his Directorship Kenyon had no opportunity for original research on any large scale, but with his retirement at

the end of 1930 he was freed from official duties. The Secretary of the British Academy, Sir Israel Gollancz, had died the previous June, and Kenyon, in view of his own approaching retirement, intimated his willingness to undertake the vacant post. He was accordingly appointed and held the office till 1949. It is by no means a sinecure, and what has already been said will have shown that he had many other irons in the fire, but his inexhaustible energy enabled him to combine with the duties entailed by these a surprising amount of scholarly work. Fortune, which had smiled on him at the very outset of his career, was again in friendly mood, and he had not long left the Museum when Mr. Chester Beatty acquired the remarkable collection of papyri, ranging in date from the second to the fourth century, which must certainly be reckoned the most important discovery in the sphere of Biblical studies since Tischendorf found the Codex Sinaiticus. Kenyon was the obvious man to undertake their publication and when approached consented with alacrity, eventually editing (1933-41) the whole of Mr. Beatty's share of the find.

Out of this work sprang several volumes of kindred interest. A by-product of it was the very handy and useful volume, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, published by the Clarendon Press in 1932, of which a second edition appeared in 1951. A more direct result was the volume of Schweich Lectures for 1932, *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*, 1933, in which the Beatty papyri occupied a prominent place. Further work on these papyri necessitated the modification of certain statements made in the lectures, and some of the views expressed there and in his communication, *The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts* (*Proceedings*, 1938), have been challenged, but in a subject developing so rapidly under the impact of new discoveries and constant research, and with a problem so baffling as the Western text, differences of opinion are inevitable. It has been found, moreover, that Kenyon's editions of the Beatty papyri require occasional correction, in respect of both readings and restorations; but his achievement is none the less remarkable, especially in view of his age and the multiplicity of his occupations.

Other volumes concerned with Biblical studies were: *The Story of the Bible* (1936, five times reprinted since), *The Text of the Greek Bible: A Student's Handbook* (1937), *The Bible and Archaeology* (1940), *The Reading of the Bible* (1944, twice reprinted since), *The Bible and Modern Scholarship* (1948), and *Literary*

Criticism, Common Sense, and the Bible (1949). These might all be described as, in greater or less degree, *œuvres de vulgarisation*, but all of them are also true works of scholarship, intended for serious students, *The Text of the Greek Bible*, indeed, for students of Greek. They show a critical judgement, unwavering in its belief that the Bible contains an inspired record of God's dealings with man, but fully abreast of modern research and speculation, never shirking a difficulty, and frankly recognizing imperfections and contradictions in the record. In *The Bible and Modern Scholarship* Kenyon answers, very effectively, the out-dated and generally discredited ultra-scepticism towards the historical evidences which Dr. Barnes took over from an earlier time, though probably only a minority of contemporary scholars would agree with him in accepting the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. In the last volume mentioned, a lecture given for the 'Friends of Dr. Williams's Library' in 1948, he states, with moderation but great cogency, the case against the destructive criticism fashionable in the nineteenth century.

Even the literary work just mentioned and the activities recorded previously did not absorb the whole of Kenyon's energies. He was, for example, a leading agent in the negotiations which led to the purchase from the Russian government of the Codex Sinaiticus in 1933; and when the volume had been received and the campaign began for raising that part of the purchase money which was to be obtained by public subscription, he was active in writing, speaking, and answering letters and criticisms. During the Spanish Civil War, when mutual accusations were made about the neglect or actual destruction of art treasures, archives, and the like, Kenyon was approached by both sides with complaints and appeals, and in 1937 he went to Spain with Sir James Mann in order to make a personal examination of the facts. His own political views can hardly have predisposed him to any bias in favour of the popular side in the war, but he showed throughout an admirable balance, refusing to commit himself to an opinion except on the fullest possible evidence, and his report, published in *The Times* of 3 and 4 September 1937, is a model of judicial statement, thorough, studiously cautious, and eminently fair.

In 1949 Kenyon retired from the Secretaryship of the Academy, though he agreed to assist his successor in the routine duties of the office and continued to be Honorary Treasurer. He also undertook, at the request of the Council, to write the history of the Academy during the first fifty years of its existence which

appeared in 1952. In 1950 his many services were recognized by electing him an Honorary Fellow, and by commissioning Mr. Augustus John to execute a pencil portrait of him, which now hangs on the Academy's walls. Shortly after this he was taken seriously ill. He recovered sufficiently to finish the history of the Academy, but increasing weakness and incapacity led him to give up all his work on committees and other bodies, and his death on 23 August 1952 must have come as a release.

In the foregoing pages I have tried to summarize Kenyon's principal occupations and at least to mention his chief publications, but so multifarious were his activities that to do more than that was manifestly impossible without extending this memoir to an intolerable length. Only a complete bibliography, which it may be hoped that someone will undertake, could give an adequate conception of his achievement. Nor is there any need to set down in detail the many honours and distinctions which he received. He was a Corresponding Member of many Academies and held honorary degrees from many universities. He became a K.C.B. in 1912 and received the Grand Cross of the Order of the British Empire in 1925, and he was an Honorary Fellow of both Magdalen and New College. He begins his autobiography by acknowledging the good fortune which he had enjoyed. His was indeed a fortunate and a happy life; but it was fortunate and happy largely because he had the capacity and the will to turn to the best use the opportunities which fell to his lot. He held a strict, even an austere, sense of duty and a lofty conception of the claims of scholarship; only the best of which he was capable could be accepted as a worthy contribution to a world from which he felt that he had received so much. He never spared himself or shirked an obligation. His judgement was both shrewd and just, as was shown (to quote one among many instances) during the First World War, when many voices demanded the expulsion from learned societies of scholars belonging to the nations with which we were at war. He strongly opposed any such move ('science', he declared, 'knows no distinction of allies or enemies'), but he frankly acknowledged that those who, on quite insufficient evidence, had rushed to sign the notorious manifesto of the ninety-three German scholars had committed 'a gross crime against scholarship'.¹ He was always opposed to any introduction of personal motives or private animosities into the world of letters, and when contro-

¹ The quotations are from his Presidential Address for 1920, *International Scholarship*.

versy was necessary he always conducted it with the courtesy of a true gentleman: 'Fighting is at times necessary, to break up the crust of tradition and to remove barriers, but in itself, like war, it is an evil, though it may sometimes be a necessary evil.'¹

On his retirement from the British Museum *The Times* wrote in a leading article, 'To-day the British Museum says good-bye to a truly great head.' It is doubtful whether it has ever had a greater, and there can have been very few who could justly be regarded as his equal.

H. I. BELL

¹ *The Fellowship of Learning* (Presidential Address for 1921).

[This memoir is much indebted to the kindness of Miss Kenyon, who placed at the author's disposal 'Autobiographica' and other papers. Mr. T. C. Skeat consulted one or two books not accessible at Aberystwyth. H. I. B.]