

LATE X



SIR GORONWY EDWARDS

JOHN GORONWY EDWARDS

1891-1976

AFTER a painful last illness of some ten weeks, following a fall at his home in Barnes, Sir Goronwy Edwards, Fellow of the Academy since 1943, died in Roehampton hospital on 20 June 1976. He had then entered upon his eighty-sixth year, having been born on 14 May 1891.

Goronwy was the only child of John William Edwards and his wife Emma (*née* Pickering). The father came of a native Welsh family, farmers in the Vale of Clwyd. The mother was the daughter of an English miner who, having migrated from north Yorkshire to Cornwall and thence to the lead-mines at Halkyn in Flintshire, had married a Welshwoman, Emma's mother. J. W. Edwards first worked on the railway between Denbigh and Wrexham, but following his marriage transferred to Salford (Lancs.) where, or in Manchester, his wife had brothers living. It was in Salford that Goronwy was born. He was only two years old, however, when his parents returned to Flintshire, first to live at Halkyn again, but soon, certainly by 1902, at Bagillt. (His father was already signalman at Bagillt, on the main-line railway between Chester and Holyhead.) It was in Flintshire, then, that Goronwy spent his childhood and youth, amid a community which he once described as 'an alloy of two distinct elements, the Welsh element and the English element', 'fused together now for 1200 years'. The county was 'a border region, . . . the meeting-place and mixing-place of two peoples, of two traditions, of two languages'. Goronwy's own parents spoke both Welsh and English. Welsh, however, was the language of their home, and also of chapel, for they were Welsh Calvinistic Methodists. Goronwy learnt, therefore, to speak Welsh before English. Indeed, as he once recalled, 'as Welsh was my mother-tongue, I could read Welsh before I could read English'. (This must have been before he attended Halkyn National School, a Church of England school founded by the local landowner, the first duke of Westminster, a school where the teaching was in English, and where he was made to learn, somewhat to the anxiety of his parents, the Catechism.) It would seem to be of some significance that the

first books in Welsh Goronwy himself made claim to having read were a children's history of Wales, *Cymru'r Plant* (begun as a periodical in the year after he was born), and its companion, *Cymru*, both of them published by O. M. (later Sir Owen) Edwards, of Lincoln College, Oxford. The stimulus they provided was soon to be sharpened when, in 1902, Goronwy became a pupil at Holywell County Secondary School (now the High School), there to come under the influence of the Headmaster, O. M. Edwards's younger brother, John Morgan Edwards, who himself had read History at Jesus College, Oxford, and who, as Goronwy afterwards affirmed, was to familiarize him with the idea that 'the history of Wales is not a mere appendix to English history, but . . . is a history with a motion and a spirit of its own'. It was, however, what at the time must have seemed only bad luck that helped to determine that Goronwy should eventually become a historian, not a chemist. For having become the school's star pupil in Chemistry, he went down with rheumatic fever in his first year in the Sixth, was then told that he must abandon all laboratory work, and so had to transfer from the Science to the Arts side. He took it phlegmatically; and it was a measure of both character and his all-round competence that, within two years, he twice passed the Central Welsh Board Honours Certificate, Higher Stage, Examination, on both occasions being awarded Open County Exhibitions, and on the second (in 1908) coming out top in English, third in Welsh, and third in History, in the whole of Wales.¹ Being now entitled and able to think of a University career, his own first inclination was towards the University of Manchester. His headmaster, however, had other ideas, and Goronwy, having in December following sat for and been awarded a Welsh Foundation Scholarship in Modern History at Jesus College, Oxford, went up to Oxford for Michaelmas Term, 1909.

Goronwy took full advantage of what Oxford placed within his reach. For one thing, use of its libraries was, as he once told me, a thrilling experience. It must have seemed unfortunate that his first year at Jesus was the last of R. L. Poole's Lectureship in Modern History there, a post which Poole had held from 1886 (well before a Research Fellowship at Magdalen came his way); and although e'er long Poole was to be active in advancing Goronwy's postgraduate career, his knowledge of him was

¹ From information from the Welsh Joint Education Committee, Cardiff.

(as Goronwy was to put it in 1919) 'chiefly, so to speak, editorial', that is, arising out of Goronwy's early publications in the *English Historical Review*, of which Poole was the editor. The greatest tutorial influence brought to bear on Goronwy as an undergraduate was, in fact, that of C. T. Atkinson, Fellow of Exeter College, who succeeded Poole in the Jesus Lectureship (and held it until 1914): a notable military historian, a scholar 'full of forthright ideas, very outspoken and unconventional', and 'a splendid companion if he took to you'.¹ Goronwy evidently made such good progress that when, in the summer term of 1912, the term in which he was due to take finals, he was too ill with a kidney infection to be allowed to do so, the College extended his scholarship, originally granted him for three years, for an additional, fourth year. In the spring of 1913 Goronwy competed for the Stanhope Prize, that year's essay subject being 'Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, and Duke of Leeds', but had to be content with 'honourable mention'. (Andrew Browning won the Prize.) Come the summer he took Schools and was awarded a First Class, an ample consolation. Moreover his next immediate personal problem—what to do next?—had been already settled.

At the beginning of the following academic session (1913-14) Goronwy registered, as a student reading for the M.A., in the University of Manchester, having been there elected on 16 July previous to be the first holder of the recently founded Edmund Roscoe Postgraduate Research Scholarship, tenable for one year but renewable for a second. Unquestionably, this award was Professor Tout's doing, with Poole, once Tout's contemporary at Balliol, having scouted for him. So was Goronwy enabled to enter what Powicke, himself a pupil of Tout, was later to recollect as 'a little community dominated by a strong, but very human personality', the avowed object of which, on its postgraduate side, was to train professional historians through acquisition of the ancillary techniques and the production of a research thesis. Goronwy's own particular subject of research—originally defined as 'The history of Wales in the generation succeeding the conquest of the principality by Edward I'—was such that, with the sole possible exception of Professor J. E. Lloyd of Bangor, there was nobody, in or outside of Wales, better qualified than Tout to take him in

¹ From information given me by A. G. Dickens. It is perhaps worth adding that, so I have been told, Atkinson's lectures at Oxford were expressly advertised as 'for men only'.

hand and bring him on. Or more likely, either, to inspire his new pupil. For some of Tout's best research work thus far had been done in the field of Welsh and Anglo-Welsh history, including many biographies of Welsh princes (especially of the lineage of Gwynnedd), bishops of Welsh sees, and territorial magnates of both Anglo-Norman and Welsh ancestry, mostly for the *Dictionary of National Biography*; there was his classical paper 'The Welsh Shires' (1888), the long essay 'Wales and the March during the Barons' Wars, 1258-67' (1902), and more recently, and possibly no less moving to the young Oxonian from Bagillt, the inaugural address to the Flintshire Historical Society, 'Flintshire: its History and its Records' (1911); and it is inconceivable that Goronwy had not attended Tout's Ford Lectures in Hilary Term, 1913, his penultimate term as an undergraduate preparing for Schools, the lectures on Edward II's reign in which Tout supplied the first-fruits of the work which resulted in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*.

So did Goronwy become, in a very real sense, if only for a time, a 'Manchester man', and certainly he enjoyed a success there. In May 1914 it was reported to the University Council that he was 'exactly the sort of person that the Roscoe Scholarship was framed to attract'; and, having acquired some little experience of teaching in the WEA and among the undergraduates, he was now formally recommended for appointment as one of two Tutors in History. Tout must have thought well of him. In fact, the two men had entered upon what soon developed into as warm a friendship as disparity in years and the master-pupil relationship allowed: a warm friendship all the same, one that later became very much man-to-man and was to last for the rest of Tout's life. Goronwy made other friends in the place, including James Tait and W. T. Waugh, and, even specially, some of the young people (like Arthur Redford) who attended the lectures he gave. But, to begin with, his work on the Edwardian settlement in Wales had absorbed most of his attention; and the earliest, although very minor, product of this work was his first published article, 'The Name of Flint Castle'. Writing to Tout from Bagillt on Boxing Day, 1913, Goronwy said that his former headmaster had recently told him that, at Prestatyn earlier in December, J. E. Lloyd had spoken about the name 'Flint', and, having apparently 'unearthed' from the Welsh Rolls the term *Le Chaylou* (alias *Le Caillou*, in English 'the flint', or 'the rock'), had, on the strength

of this, thrown out the suggestion that the accepted derivation from *Castrum apud Fluentum* might have to be reconsidered, without, however, treating his hearers to anything very elaborate or systematic. 'As I had already unearthed the same fox', Goronwy went on, 'I think that I should like, if possible, to be somewhere in evidence at the death, so I decided to write down my theory, and if possible—subject to your criticism and advice—get it published, so as to play a sort of [A.] Russell Wallace to Lloyd's Darwin. I therefore amused myself this evening by elaborating my theory in writing, and I enclose the result If you think the thing is any good, perhaps you will advise me what to do with it'.¹ Tout evidently approved, and advised submission to Poole, who gave up the required two pages to it in the April 1914 issue of the *English Historical Review*. Within two years Poole was to afford room for two more papers, 'Sir Gruffydd Llwyd' (Oct. 1915) and 'The Early History of the Counties of Carmarthen and Cardigan' (Jan. 1916). In the second, and more important of these, Goronwy showed how both counties were in origin honours or castellaries under a new title: 'not definitely created as [under the Statute of Wales of 1284] were those of North Wales', but 'like Lancashire, . . . pre-existing aggregations of territory which acquired the name of county'. The two papers were, in part, the products of Goronwy's earliest work in the Public Record Office, work which had begun in early July 1914, when, amongst other things, he set into the Pipe Rolls, the Accounts of the Chamberlains of North Wales, Ministers' Accounts, and Ancient Petitions. He was not, however, so totally immersed in this work as to have been incapable of thinking ahead towards a permanent academic career. But he now failed in an application for the Lectureship in Modern History at his own Oxford college, recently vacated by Atkinson (his former tutor); and, during the autumn, 'shots' at Fellowships at Magdalen and All Souls fell short. (At All Souls, Andrew Browning and V. H. Galbraith, two Balliol 'Firsts' of that year, were similarly disappointed.) Still based on Manchester, therefore, Goronwy carried on with his research and, in June 1915, he was awarded the MA for

¹ This quotation is from the first of a long series of extant letters from Goronwy to Tout, reaching down, with explicable gaps, almost to the very end of Tout's life in 1929, and very revealing of Goronwy's doings and aspirations in that period. The letters are collected, although not as a separate congeries, in Tout's papers, now in the custody of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester. The series contains over forty letters, half of them from the time of Goronwy's war service, 1915-19.

his thesis, its subject now defined as 'The Edwardian Settlement of Wales; its Establishment and its Working, 1283-1307'. By then our country had been at war for nearly a year, with no hope of an early end to the agony. It was only natural that Goronwy should already have had thoughts of 'doing his bit'.

Early in 1915 Goronwy had joined the Manchester University OTC with a view to a Commission when he should 'join up', if this was possible. Subject as he was to rheumatism, there was serious doubt as to his physical fitness,¹ and Tout advised pursuit of an OTC Commission at Sheffield.² Goronwy, however, thought differently, and acted in accordance; and by early August his papers were with the War Office. On 6 September he was gazetted as 2nd Lieutenant in the 3/5th Royal Welch Fusiliers, went forthwith to join the Regiment near Oswestry, and before a month elapsed 'had his baptism of fire, scoring at the butts' (as he wrote to Tout). A few service excursions apart (including one to Rouen in October 1916), he was to remain at Park Hall Camp until shortly before 16 April 1918, when he went overseas. In the meantime he had occupied the posts of Assistant Adjutant, Acting Adjutant, and Adjutant, doing his best all along to get a posting to France. The explanation of his disappointment at not getting out earlier was partly (as he told Tout in February 1916) 'the draft-finding system' and 'the plethora of reserve battalions' (the latter 'too watertight, [so that] front line regiments couldn't get a proper supply'), partly

¹ Goronwy's illnesses in his youth and the persistent rheumatism had evidently precluded any athleticism of the usual kind. But the strenuous life he was to lead in the Army, eventually at the Front, seems not to have affected him unduly, and he later took up golf (always, characteristically, concentrating, so I am told, on the direction, rather than the length, of his 'drive'). His other recreations were mainly photography and (hardly surprising in a Welshman, especially one married to a lady with a cultivated musical interest) listening to music; and when, on his retirement, the Institute of Historical Research made him a present, this took the form of a camera and a gramophone. 'Archaeology' was ever one of his chief part-time interests, more particularly work in progress in Wales where the annual summer-time expeditions of the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments not only brought him into close personal touch with such experts in the field as Sir Mortimer Wheeler, W. F. Grimes, and Arnold Taylor, but also gave him to know south Wales as intimately as he knew the north and middle.

² All that I know of Goronwy from now until after the Armistice—save for his *English Historical Review* publications of 1915-16—relates to his military service, and it derives almost entirely from his correspondence with Tout, to whom he wrote very regularly, seldom at more than three- or four-monthly intervals, and sometimes at considerable length. The letters seem to record his every move or change of fortune.

because he himself soon came to be looked upon as indispensable in the camp's administration. Time and again his hopes were frustrated, and promotion to Captain in April 1917, only temporary in any case, was no consolation. Almost certainly he would have finished the war at Oswestry, had it not been for the near collapse of the Allied front under the weight of the German offensive of the Spring of 1918. The day Goronwy sailed for France (16 April) was ten days after 'the most disastrous day' in the history of the battalion he now joined—the 4th (Denbighshire) Battalion of the RWF, the Pioneer Battalion of the 47th (London) Division, the only battalion of his Regiment in France at this time, his own (the 5th) and others being in Palestine. Automatically reduced to the rank of Lieutenant, he was made second-in-command of one of the three companies. Their main work was digging, by night, support and communication trenches, 'as dangerous as most work, more thankless than any, and as inglorious as trench mud', as Goronwy wrote to Tout a month later, after over a fortnight up in the line. This was immediately west of Albert, a vital part of the line, for upon it depended the defence of Amiens, 'the great nerve-centre of the British front' (C. Ellis).¹ Periods in the line alternated with spells out until, in August and early September, the German front cracked in this last really great battle of the war. Meanwhile, following the death in action of his company's commander, at a time when it was acting as ordinary infantry as well as a pioneer unit, Goronwy was immediately given command. By 28 October, when the Division made its triumphal entry into Lille, he had been promoted Adjutant, and was again Captain. Having just crossed the River Scheldt when the cease-fire came, the battalion soon moved south again. It was not until May 1919 that Goronwy was finally to leave France.

Goronwy's early optimism as to the possibility of demobilization in the spring of 1919 alternated with qualms about his future, once demobilized, a future which was evidently very uncertain. He at first thought so seriously of an academic administrative post out in India that, when on leave in England in December, he called at the India Office 'to see Arnold' (the

¹ I have been able to use Goronwy's own letters to Tout and Captain C. Ellis, *The 4th (Denbighshire) Battalion, R.W.F., in the Great War* (Wrexham, 1926) to locate, with fair precision, Goronwy's movements in and behind the front. (Captain Ellis, a graduate of Bangor, preceded Goronwy as Adjutant, Nov. 1917–Oct. 1918.)

distinguished Orientalist [FBA, 1926] who was the Educational Adviser to the Secretary of State for India). However, this idea, which could have led to an 'oriental nabobship' in the Punjab, soon fizzled out. And it was not until the very end of March that Goronwy's future was finally assured. Following enquiries he had been making in Oxford, which at first elicited encouraging messages from Oriel as well as from Jesus, but with nothing at all decisive, his own college then offered him an Official Fellowship, with a Lectureship in Modern History, an offer he accepted on the day of its receipt. Even when only hoping for such an outcome, and with demobilization still pending, his thoughts had already been turning to various scholarly possibilities, and to a resumption of operations in the PRO. His ideas could now focus on something more definite, and one of his plans was to edit the Flintshire Plea Rolls of Edward I (1283-5), the only Welsh Plea Rolls of Edward I extant. Of these, to Tout as his confidant, he wrote: 'There is nothing very exciting in them, but they are an interesting vignette. . . . Incidentally, I should recall to mind much that has become blurred in the war.' Having spent the meantime with his unit in Artois, but including a largely photographic excursion up into the devastated areas of West Flanders, he was demobilized at Folkestone on 3 May. When next he wrote Tout, on the 9th, it was from the Randolph Hotel in Oxford. As he then confessed, he found the break with the Army somewhat difficult, psychologically. But, evidently, not for long: having done what he could in Oxford (including seeing Poole) and spent a few weeks at home in Flintshire (from where he went to stay with the Touts in Manchester), he was up in the PRO in the first fortnight of July and, in what was to prove a totally disappointing search for other Flintshire plea rolls of Edward I, at St. Asaph (as the bishop's guest) in August. Most of the preliminary work on *Flint Pleas, 1283-85* was already done. By the time the book was published by the Flintshire Historical Society in 1922, Goronwy was not only on the Council of the Society, having joined it in 1920 (partly as a Flintshire man himself, partly in order to represent it on the Council of the National Library of Wales), but was also one of the Society's two Editorial Secretaries, in which capacity he was to be party in 1924 to the inauguration of a Record Series, he himself contributing the first number, *Calendar of the Coleman Deeds relating to Flintshire*.¹ There can be no doubt that Goronwy's

¹ Whether or not this more ample programme of publication proved too

growth in reputation and influence, over roughly the next half-century, stood the Society in good stead, not only in the Principality, but among historians outside. That larger world of historical scholarship he had himself re-entered when, at the beginning of Michaelmas Term 1919, he was formally elected by Jesus College as Official Fellow and Tutor in Modern History (being the first to hold the latter title). He also now became, in succession to Sir John Rhys, President of the Dafydd ap Gwilym Society (an association open to all Welshmen in Oxford), an office which he was to retain until he left Oxford in 1948.

For all but the last of those next thirty years, then, J.G.'s life was Oxford-based,¹ and if ever he thought twice about leaving Oxford during that time, he resisted the temptation.² And resistance could only have been easier as time went on, especially after he came to have a home of his own. This latter maturation was, of course, an immediate consequence of his marriage, on 1 September 1925, to Gwladys, eldest daughter of the Revd William Williams,³ who, a friend from early childhood and contemporary with J.G. at Holywell County School, was a graduate of the University College of North Wales, Bangor. Their house in Old Headington⁴ became the resort of friends among the Oxford dons, including some of the women tutors (who were rather neglected in those days), and much for the Society to sustain, *all* publication ceased in 1929, and it was not until 1951 that a renewal of the Society became possible. Goronwy, then invited to become either President or Patron, preferred to resume as Editor, delivered to the 'new' Society an inaugural lecture ('The Building of Flint') and, before relinquishing editorship in 1969, saw to the production of twelve volumes, two of these (1955 and 1957) containing papers of his own, 'Flintshire since 1801', and 'Flintshire a Hundred Years Ago', both necessary to an understanding of twentieth-century Flintshire.

¹ Goronwy came to be known in Jesus as 'J.G.', and from now on I use that familiar abbreviation.

² When, in 1928, F. M. Powicke resigned the Chair of Medieval History at Manchester, and Z. N. Brooke declined an invitation to succeed him, Tout's advice was taken up in part and, accordingly, J.G. was invited to meet the appropriate committee of Senate, along with E. F. Jacob. J.G. replied that he could not see his way to doing so. Jacob accepted the invitation with the result that he was recommended for the appointment. (Manchester University, Senate Minutes, 1928-9.)

³ The Revd William Williams had, at Halkyn, conducted the marriage service for Goronwy's own parents.

⁴ Incidentally, the newly-weds' first staying guests at Old Headington were Professor and Mrs Tout, on the occasion of the University's conferment on Tout of the Honorary Degree of D.Litt., in February 1926.

a home-from-home for Jesus men. Of these, as was only natural, J.G. especially won the admiration and affection of the men he tutored in History. He was always not so much preaching as enforcing the need for caution in the writing of their essays, a point delightfully made by Arnold Taylor in his Memorial Service Address ('You know, Taylor, "probable" is a pretty strong word; are you sure you don't really mean not "probable" but "possible"?'').¹ By the time, in the thirties, J.G. was in his Oxford heyday, it was being said that he had made more natural thirds into seconds than any other Oxford tutor (a typical Oxford 'swipe'!). It would be truer to say that his pupils had a remarkable run of successes in the twenties and thirties in the annual competitions for the Stanhope and Gladstone Memorial Essay Prizes and, equally, in the number of Firsts awarded in the History School. But this sort of service to his College was not J.G.'s only contribution, for he came to play an increasingly prominent and influential part in the formal conduct of College affairs, moving up, as he did, through the *cursus honorum*: Librarian, 1920-5; Junior Bursar, 1926-9; Dean, 1929-31; Senior Tutor, 1931-46; and, finally, Vice-Principal, 1945-8. The particularity with which, in *Who's Who*, following his departure, and down to his death, J.G. continued to record his former tenure of all these College offices reveals, perhaps as directly as anything could, his strong emotional attachment to the College. And that he was not elected Principal when, with the death of his old friend A. E. W. Hazel, in August 1944, a vacancy occurred, can only have been, in fact was, a great disappointment to him.² He accepted the decision without

¹ Arnold Taylor has supplied me with another such anecdote: how, having said in a paper of his which J.G. was considering for the *English Historical Review*, that he had failed to find something or other 'after an exhaustive search in the P.R.O.', J.G., running through the paper with him, paused at that point and, after a silence, said, 'You know, Taylor, there is no such thing as an *exhaustive* search in the P.R.O.'

² It would appear that, on the death of Hazel, some of the Fellows considered that the election of so devoted a Welshman as J.G. always was, would run counter to the feeling then gaining ground in the Governing Body which aimed to make the College less of an enclave of Welshmen in England. And so Ogilvie, who had been Professor of Political Economy at Edinburgh, 1926-34, President and Vice-Chancellor of Queen's University, Belfast, 1934-8, and the second Director of the BBC, 1938-42, was offered the appointment and accepted. (He died in June 1949.) For a number of years J.G. had been regarded as 'heir-presumptive' to Hazel, and perhaps his whole career thus far had, in a way, been too obviously anchored to that ultimate ambition. It could be that this told against him.

comment, magnanimously. To the new Principal, Sir Frederick Ogilvie, he offered the same unswerving support that he had given to his predecessor, and in 1945, at a time when the well-remembered post-1918 situation was repeating itself, became, as already noted, Vice-Principal. In the year after he left, 1949, the College gave him an Honorary Fellowship, and he ever afterwards rejoiced in it.¹

Not only, while at Oxford, did J.G. serve his own College well. College appointments had overlapped with, or been covered by, spells of official duties in the University at large. He was a member of the Board of the Faculty of Modern History from 1924 onwards; was one of its Examiners in the Schools, 1926-8 and 1941-3; was University Lecturer 1928-36 and 1947-8; and, in the meantime, 1932-3, was University Proctor. Valuable though his administrative work was, it was naturally his teaching in the lecture room that most appealed to the many undergraduate historians.

J.G.'s style of lecturing—and one would imagine that it did not change overmuch, if at all—was a very personal style. He did not attempt to cover too much ground in a single lecture. Rather, having propounded his problem (and problems were what chiefly interested him), he hammered away at his main points, so cautiously and patiently sifting and weighing the relevant evidence that the deductions drawn and the conclusions reached seemed predictable, almost inevitable. And his points were all the more acceptable for having been, whatever the inherent complexity of the problem, presented lucidly. This lucidity, due basically to careful thought and preparation, was also partly due to vigorous vocal emphasis, possibly assisted by the strong Welsh accent and intonation that always characterized his utterance. Then, too, J.G. deliberately regulated his pace of delivery. (In this connection, it is amusing to note how, in the margin of his hand-written text of the Ford Lectures of 1961, he sometimes inserted a series of such monitions as 'Andante', 'Allegro', 'Andante', and 'Allegretto'.) He knew, moreover, how to create suspense, and keep his 'punch-line' to the end. Above all, however, he made sure that

¹ J.G. always continued to take a lively interest in the affairs of the College, and was the most powerful influence in the London branch of the Jesus College Association (which branch he founded). When it came to launching a College appeal on the occasion of the quatercentenary in 1971, the choice of him for Chairman was the only one possible. To the end he would whenever possible go to the annual College gaudies, as Honorary Fellow.

his argument was not only clearly developed, but made easy to follow, and he did not shrink from reiteration. Their substance of sound doctrine apart, it was this care to be plainly understood that made famous his lectures to the undergraduates at Oxford, particularly his course on 'English Constitutional History, with special reference to Stubbs' *Charters*', which was so renowned as to have become part of the folk-memory of Oxford historians. That course, which ran to three lectures a week for two terms, was delivered in the largest lecture room in the Schools, always to packed audiences (late-comers perching where they could). It was once said of the lectures that they were so masterly that it had become impossible for the examiners to set questions which were not child's play to those who had heard them. And there is a strong rumour that V. H. Galbraith, in one of his less discreet moments, said that J.G.'s lectures on Stubbs were too efficient and, because they did too much of the thinking his hearers should have been left to do for themselves, ought to be banned by the Faculty! Perhaps we may leave the last word on those lectures to one who was a grateful undergraduate of the time. In his Memorial Service Address, Arnold Taylor said about their having been 'packed out': 'I believe this was not just because Stubbs was prescribed reading, but because we all knew that this J. G. Edwards had an uncanny knack of making even the driest texts come alive, in the most telling, down-to-earth way.' When J.G. left Oxford there was, then, much for him to look back upon with satisfaction. It was a wrench, nevertheless.

What prompted J.G. to leave at all was a challenge offered him in the Spring of 1948. For he was then invited to become Director of the Institute of Historical Research, and Professor of History, in the University of London, in succession to V. H. Galbraith, who was leaving to succeed Powicke as Regius at Oxford. J.G. accepted, taking up his duties in September. (In each instance an erstwhile pupil of Tout was being followed by another.) J.G.'s credentials for the post were impeccable. Admittedly he was in his late fifties, but was still vigorous. There was his reputation as a teacher and writer of history. He was known to be a 'sound' man. He had long previously entered the 'establishment', in which he would now play a so much fuller part as soon to become one of the senior 'statesmen'. He had long been a member of the Board of Celtic Studies, chairman indeed of its History and Law Committee. As early as 1929 he, in company with Rait and Notestein, had been added

to the Treasury Committee on House of Commons Personnel and Politics 1264-1832, there to associate, among others, with Namier, Neale, Pollard, Previt -Orton and, briefly, Tout. Since April 1938 he had been co-editor of the *English Historical Review*, having first joined G. N. (later Sir George) Clark 'in a rescue operation when Previt -Orton's eyesight finally collapsed while an issue was going through the press'. (That was the beginning of an editorship which was to last until January 1959, and this tenure of nearly 21 years 'broke all records save that of "the great Reginald Lane Poole", to use Goronwy's own oft-repeated phrase'.¹) Moreover, in 1943, he had been elected FBA, and when he went to the Institute was about to enter upon his fourth year on the Council of the Academy.² But if J.G.'s move to London was by no means his first introduction to the convolutions and inter-meshed interests of the historical community, his Directorship of the Institute, and the fact that he must now live in London, obviously involved him in a widening and intensification of administrative and 'political' activity. He did not object to any of this: it was 'the price we academics have to pay in order to control the bureaucrats' (as he put it). In so uttering, he was doubtless thinking particularly of service on committees.

And, naturally, some such duties were implicit in his new office. He was chairman of the Institute's Committee of Management, of the Victoria County History Committee, and of the committee which was responsible for arranging the annual Anglo-American Conference of Historians. And then the

¹ For an appraisal of J.G.'s editorship of the *EHR*, see Denys Hay, 'Goronwy Edwards', *EHR* xci (1976), pp. 721-2. His co-editor from 1939 was Richard Pares, and then, after Pares' death in May 1958, until his retirement from the post following the issue of Jan. 1959, Denys Hay. Following Clark's resignation, J. G. was, and remained, 'the senior partner'. R. L. Poole had been assistant-editor, subsequently joint-editor, and from 1901 sole editor of the *EHR*, from its establishment in 1885 to 1920.

² J.G. served on Council 1945-54, 1956-9, and 1962-5. He served as a Vice-President in 1956-7 and 1963-4. He was Chairman of Section Two in the days before the historians were sub-divided, and when the Section was called Medieval and Modern History, from 1950 to 1955. He was on the John Rhys Lecture Committee from 1944, and on the Raleigh Lecture on History Committee from 1953, in both cases until his death. He also acted as Chairman of the small committee set up in 1955 to oversee the production of a repertory of the historical sources of the Middle Ages, designed as a revised and improved version of Potthast's *Wegweiser* (last edition, 1896), and continued to serve until 1971, though before then the committee had more or less lapsed.

British National Committee, which arranged for British participation in the quinquennial meetings of the International Congress of Historical Sciences, and also for the smaller *interim* bilateral meetings like the Franco-British conferences, found it convenient to have the Director as Honorary Secretary. More than ever before, the Institute became a clearing-house for historians and, evidently, not only for the British. Of course, as far as these commitments were concerned, he was excellently well served by an efficient and devoted administrative staff, headed by his 'adjutant', A. Taylor Milne, the Institute's Secretary.¹ But there were other *ex officio* involvements where delegation of functions could hardly, if at all, obtain. For example, he continued to arrange, for the postgraduate students frequenting the Institute (their number more than trebling in his time), the traditional Director's evening conferences which, once (in Pollard's day) held weekly during term, J.G. reduced to one, two, or three a term, but for which he provided, as Galbraith had done, a set programme, usually the exposition by a specialist, young or old, of some fresh historical enterprise or a reinterpretation of an old story; and he himself sometimes held forth, as on the question, 'The forty-shilling freeholder. Why forty-shilling?'² At first he also conducted a weekly seminar, including instruction in palaeography and diplomatic, that is until this responsibility was taken over by Francis Wormald who, in 1950, was appointed the University's first Professor of Palaeography. (Wormald was to succeed J.G. as Director.) Not the least of J.G.'s official duties was to edit the *Bulletin* of the Institute. He continued as co-editor of the *EHR*, and, so it appears, 'there were some who muttered at the monopoly which they suspected he exercised over the world of historical letters' (D. Hay). What possibly helped to provoke these 'mutterings' was the delays of acceptance (or rejection) of articles to which contributors (or would-be contributors) to the one or the other periodical felt themselves subjected. Certainly, sometimes, there were hold-ups as regards acceptance, but there are bound to have been occasions when these hold-ups were no great disadvantage, possibly no disadvantage at all. For what J.G. frequently did with scrupulous care was

¹ Milne has well appreciated J.G.'s contribution as Director in 'Twenty-five years at the Institute, 1946-71', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, xliv (1971), pp. 284-92.

² Sir Goronwy continued to attend these conferences long after his retirement, under his successors as Director, F. Wormald and A. G. Dickens.

to follow up contributors' references, and such activity was always liable to result in emendations. Incidentally, it was with characteristic courtesy that when, in the Department of Manuscripts at the British Museum, he needed to check references in articles submitted by members of its staff, he customarily enquired beforehand when they would be absent, so that he could come and do it without embarrassment to either party. One can see how, conscientious to a fault, he seemed to become, to some extent, 'the captive of his own capabilities'.

Technically external, but in fact vital to the broad objectives of the Institute, were other duties which J.G. undertook when Director, most of which he continued, faithfully, to discharge after retirement, being by then qualified by experience of the business in question, in some instances a long experience. In 1949 he was appointed to the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments in Wales and Monmouthshire, and from 1955 to 1967 (when he came off) he was its Chairman. Meanwhile, in 1959, he had joined the Ancient Monuments Board for Wales, and remained a member until 1974. In 1951, when it was decided to resume publication of the *History of Parliament* begun by Sir Josiah (later Lord) Wedgwood, J.G. was appointed to the newly constituted Editorial Board on which he continued to serve until 1974 again, having succeeded Sir Frank Stenton as Chairman in 1966. Another virtual permanency was his membership of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, beginning in 1953. It was again almost automatically that in 1958 he was included in the British Academy Committee on Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences (which functioned until 1960). Then, in January 1959, having earlier (1952-4) served on the Grigg Committee on Departmental Records,¹ he was appointed to the Advisory Council on Public Records established by the Public Records Act of the previous year² and, having served for three years, was then reappointed for a second three years' spell, following which he gave it up. In the meantime he had chaired the PRO Advisory Publications Committee, a body tacked on to the Advisory Council.

¹ The other historian on the Grigg Committee was Professor (now Sir John) Habakkuk (Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, since 1967).

² It is of particular interest here to note that the Act, which in its most important provision—that the custody of the Public Records should be transferred from the Master of the Rolls to the Lord Chancellor—ignored the Grigg Committee's advice, allowed for the transfer on deposit of the records of the Great Sessions of Wales (1536-1830) from Chancery Lane to the National Library of Wales.

Given all these intra- and extra-mural administrative and other labours, it is remarkable that J.G. should have found time to continue with original scholarly work of his own. In fact, during his Directorship he more than doubled the number of his previously published papers if, as we must, we include the Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture of 1944 (British Academy), the David Murray Foundation Lecture of 1955 (University of Glasgow), the Raleigh Lecture of 1956 (British Academy), and the Creighton Lecture of 1957 (University of London), each one of which named lectures was published while he was at the Institute.

All in all, J.G.'s Directorship had been a great personal success. What had been expected of him in 1948 can only be surmised, but that he more than satisfied expectations cannot be questioned. Originally appointed for a term of seven years, he had his tenure twice extended by the University Senate on the recommendation of the Institute Committee, so that when he retired in 1960 he had held office for all of twelve years. And if he himself had ever had any doubts on the score of his standing and popularity, these must surely have been set at rest on 5 July 1960, the day of his formal retirement, when not only was he knighted by the Queen, but on returning from the Palace to the Senate House with his wife, they were given a great ovation in the MacMillan Hall (no room in the Institute being adequate for the throng). J.G. was now in his seventieth year.

J.G.'s last year at the Institute had brought him two other signal honours, both highly prized by him, especially as bestowed by Oxford. The first was the invitation, issued by the end of 1959, to deliver the Ford Lectures in the next academic session, a responsibility he discharged in Hilary Term 1961. The other was the conferment of the Honorary Degree of D.Litt. in June 1960.¹ Subsequently, J.G.'s seventieth birthday was acknowledged by the publication of the *Book of Prests* ('the first modern publication of an entire medieval Wardrobe book', the book of payments for 23 Edward I), the costs of it borne by the subscriptions of 'colleagues, pupils, and many other friends'.²

¹ Manchester was to follow suit in May 1961. Reading had conferred its honorary D.Litt. on him in 1948 and Leeds in 1958.

² *The Book of Prests 1294-5*, ed. E. B. Fryde (Oxford, 1962), contains a list of Sir Goronwy's writings complete down to 1960. To this list should now be added the following: 'The Historical Study of the Welsh Lawbooks', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, vol. 12 (1962), pp. 141-55; 'The Royal Household and the Welsh Lawbooks', *ibid.*, vol. 13

By this time he was President of the Royal Historical Society, in succession to David Knowles, and he was President from 1961 to 1964 inclusive. Quite apart from his Presidential Addresses, two on Welsh topics, two on English, his presidency was an active one. His was the time of the negotiation of the Society's move from Cheyne Walk to University College. Upon this particular problem, which generated immense debate in the Council, J.G. brought to bear all his experience as a chairman and, being as usual indefatigably patient, and deferential to 'the sense of the meeting', eventually reached agreement. It was his successor as President, R. A. Humphreys (of UCL), who, not improperly, was left to organize the move itself.

The last decade of J.G.'s life was far from being, at any rate at first, a period in which he sat back, content simply to admire the passing scene. He continued to attend, almost religiously, committees and other bodies to which he was attached, and indeed what proved to be his last appearance at Burlington House, the meeting of Section Thirteen on 29 March 1976, only preceded by about a fortnight the fall that led to his death. From the point of view of scholarly production, the years at the Institute had taken their toll, at least in the sense that, had he stayed in Oxford teaching the Stubbs course, he would probably have produced his long-awaited new edition of Stubbs's *Charters*, a work which was well advanced in preparation when he went to London. Not unlikewise, following his delivery of the Ford Lectures of 1960-1, he only decided to edit for publication his manuscript text of the lectures that was already complete when, as fate decreed, it proved a decision taken too late to fulfil. One last challenge to J.G. as a historical writer he did not fail to meet: the challenge presented by the need to commemorate the

(1963), pp. 163-76; 'The Emergence of Majority Rule in English Parliamentary Elections', *ibid.*, vol. 14 (1964), pp. 175-96; 'The Emergence of Majority Rule in the Procedure of the House of Commons', *ibid.*, vol. 15 (1965), pp. 165-87; a review of Glanmor Williams, *The Welsh Church from Conquest to Reformation* (Cardiff, 1962), *English Historical Review*, vol. lxxx (1965), pp. 340-2; 'The "Second" Continuation of the Croyland Chronicle — Was it written "in ten days"?', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 39 (1966), pp. 117-29; *The Principality of Wales 1267-1967: A Study in Constitutional History* (Caernarvonshire Historical Society, 1969), 44 pp.; 'The Huntingdonshire Parliamentary Election of 1450', *Essays in Medieval History Presented to B. Wilkinson* (Toronto, 1969), pp. 383-95; *The Second Century of the English Parliament* (Ford Lectures of 1960-1) (Oxford, 1979), 91 pp.

seventh centenary of the treaty of Montgomery of 1267 between Henry III and Llywelyn II, a challenge which he met with the production of a long, instructive paper entitled 'The Principality of Wales, 1267-1967', which, first delivered as a lecture to the Caernarvonshire Historical Society, was appropriately published in the year of the Investiture, at Caernarvon, of HRH Prince Charles. This last challenge came from Wales, as had done the first of its sort half a century or so previously. It was also fitting that the last great public honour accorded J.G. should have been the bestowal, in 1969, of the Gold Medal of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, the oldest of Welsh patriotic organizations, this award being, by formal definition, for 'notable service to Wales'. J.G.'s service to Wales had been primarily in the field of Welsh historical scholarship. It was far from being his only, or perhaps even his main, contribution to historical scholarship.

Contributions to historical scholarship

When J.G.'s own personal contribution to scholarship is considered, it might be objected that it found expression in 'articles' rather than books. The four books he himself published—*Flint Pleas 1283-85* (1922), *Calendar of the Coleman Deeds relating to Flintshire* (1924), *Calendar of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales* (1935), and *Littere Wallie* (1940)—were all editions of documents; and his Ford Lectures of 1961, *The Second Century of the English Parliament* (1979) which made his fifth, are a series of relatively brief discussions of only some particular, albeit important, aspects of the subject, not a lengthy conspectus. The article was, of course, a vehicle characteristic of his generation, as it is of ours. J.G., his own editorial work aside, was devoted to the mode. This was because of his evident delight in particular problems and knotty points. What must be remembered is that his papers resolve themselves, in the main, into three categories—English, Welsh, and Anglo-Welsh history—and if J.G. mostly preferred to elucidate constitutional developments, the 'problems and knotty points' in question were often concerned or connected with matters of considerable importance and general interest. Besides, his articles represented such penetrating investigation and rigorous analysis as led, whenever this was justifiable, to definite and sturdy conclusions. His manner of writing, too, was economical. Indeed, his greatest gift was to be able, within the space of a single article, virtually to transform, in an easily intelligible way, one's understanding

of a major subject, as, for instance, with the lecture on Hywel Dda (1927), the Raleigh Lecture on 'The Normans and the Welsh March' (1956), or the article '“Justice” in early English Parliaments' (1954). There are so many such brilliantly perceptive essays for which he will be gratefully remembered that he can readily be forgiven for the absence of a large-scale work of sustained reinterpretation. The most important of his essays established fresh points of departure, and it now remains, with a view to evaluating J.G.'s 'doctrine', as it relates to both Welsh and English History, to examine some of the more interesting conclusions he reached. To do him justice a somewhat lengthy appraisal seemed to be called for. It will be readily perceived that I have let much of his work speak for itself.

(i) *Writings on Welsh and Anglo-Welsh History*

When writing his obituary on Sir John E. Lloyd (*antea*, xli), and alluding to the influence of Welsh nationalism on Lloyd as a student of Welsh history, J.G. said that 'what it did for him . . . was to sustain his studies, not to determine his conclusions'. That was well said of Lloyd, and it is no detraction from Lloyd's fame to say it again of J.G. It was characteristic of even his earliest approach to Welsh problems that, although, for example, in dealing with the career of Sir Gruffydd Llwyd (*EHR* 1915), J.G. was concerned to establish Llwyd's 'historicity' (which Tout, in the *DNB*, had referred to as 'unproved'), he was equally at pains to demonstrate from the record evidence that Llwyd was not at all the bardic hero of Welsh resistance to Edward II of tradition, a 'martyr in a national cause', but was rather 'both to the conqueror of Wales and his son . . ., always a loyal "Welshman of Snowdon"'. (This was in fact what Llwyd himself said he was.)

It may be doubted whether anybody appreciated more than J.G. did, J. E. Lloyd's two-volume classic of 1911—*A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest*—which laid secure foundations for later work on Welsh society in the Middle Ages, including J.G.'s own. But J.G., especially in taking up where, chronologically, Lloyd had left off, also laid foundations, foundations which he himself built upon. His work on the Welsh lawbooks is an exception, at least in the sense that although he recognized in them 'at once a mirror and a mould' of a people's way of life, he here built only little upon the foundation he laid. This is perhaps hardly surprising. For that work—if we exclude the paper 'The Royal Household and

the Welsh Lawbooks' (his second Presidential Address to the Royal Historical Society), in which, confining his attention to a single 'tractate', he dealt with the chief functionaries of a Welsh king or prince's court—was largely negative: it amounted to a warning not to treat 'lawyers' text-books', 'collections which were . . . always evolving', as 'codes', for the Welsh laws were neither complete nor systematic enough to be so dignified; and he warned scholars against being mesmerized by the pious tradition, enshrined in the prologues to the lawbooks themselves, into attributing them to Hywel the Good and the first half of the tenth century. 'The process of redaction and accretion can be traced *forwards* from the twelfth century, but not *backwards*. . . .' J.G. never, in fact, departed from the conclusions he had formed when making his first incursion into the subject in 1928, when he delivered the Hywel Dda Millenary Lecture. Although he ended that lecture by reassuring his audience that 'Hywel's law' was one of the two forces (the other being the Welsh language) that have 'marked off the Welsh from other people and strengthened their national consciousness', he was ready to admit that what he had told them might have been 'a little disquieting to a millenary celebration'. He had, in fact, removed a mass of myth and dead wood, so encouraging a younger generation of scholars to study the laws on sounder lines. All of J.G.'s other work on Wales falls into a very different category: its contribution was a positive one.

In 1944 J.G. delivered the Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture, *Edward I's Castle Building in Wales*, his subject being the great enterprise which represented 'the premium that Edward paid to insure his Welsh conquests against the fire of rebellion'. Far from eschewing the 'archaeological' approach, he dealt in such detail with each of the eight castles as enabled him either to settle some previously disputed points as to actual construction, or to carry the argument forward. But he concentrated on royal Exchequer evidence (the enrolled accounts and, more especially, when available, the *rotuli de particulis*), in order mainly to answer four questions: How long did the castles take to build? How much labour was required? What was the cost? and Whence came the necessary finance? And what he was at pains to stress was that although the construction of the castles extended over a long period, there was a series of comparatively short periods in which, depending upon events in Wales, some were going up simultaneously, so resulting in a heavy (if spasmodic) drain on the available labour force in England and, as

far as England again was concerned, contributing to serious royal financial crises containing political and constitutional dangers. J.G. was ever conscious of the background of the events and developments engaging his attention, or rather he appreciated how the background and the foreground were reciprocal.

Records of a different sort, although again lodged in the PRO, had already been made the basis of J.G.'s treatment of other, and more important, aspects of Welsh history. Having made a start in *Flint Pleas* and *Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales* (covering some 600 letters), he had published in 1940 what he himself always regarded as the centrepiece of his Welsh studies, the *Littere Wallie preserved in Liber A in the Public Record Office*. The 359 documents he transcribed range from 1217 to 1292, and they constitute the most important single collection of material relating to what he described as 'probably the most stirring and most momentous epoch of medieval Welsh history', its outstanding theme being the career of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd, the first Prince of Wales so entitled, a title formally recognized by Henry III in the treaty of Montgomery (1267). But the *Littere Wallie* is not only an essential source-book (a much more complete, and far more accurate, record of documents than is to be found in Rymer's *Foedera*). It contains, in the Introduction, original ideas and fresh interpretations which created for J.G. a subject for self-communing, and subsequently publication, to which he returned at intervals for the rest of his life. For as well as providing the most penetrating available analysis of Llywelyn II's career, he there treated of Wales in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries from the political and constitutional points of view, not only anent its own internal condition, but with reference also to its external relation to England. Regarding the latter, he began to explain how political instability in Wales in that period so strongly contrasted with the comparatively firm and stabilized political life of England, a political instability which 'provided both an excuse and an opportunity for interference by the Kings of England'. It was 'a contrast between two ways of life', a theorem which J.G. took much further in his British Academy obituary on Sir John Lloyd, published in 1955, and in his Raleigh lecture of the following year, *The Normans and the Welsh March*. What the theorem amounted to was this: whereas in England kingship had from Anglo-Saxon times been single, and the administrative sub-divisions, the shires, had been its 'outposts', kingship in

Wales had remained multiple, and the basic sub-divisions, the commotes, had been its 'seats'; and whereas England was a whole in which the parts were '*integrated* like cells in a honeycomb', Wales was a whole in which the parts were only '*aggregated*, like cards in a pack', so that while England had become centralized, Wales, though much smaller, remained 'fractionized'. Moreover, with a Welsh lord's commotes subject, as were his lands, to division at his death according to Welsh laws of inheritance, commotes could be, and constantly were, 'shuffled and re-dealt by changeful circumstance. . . .' But the investigation did not rest there. Having shown that the creation, by Norman conquest, of the March of Wales was the result of one great 'shuffling and re-dealing', that, in other words, the Norman invaders penetrated Wales by acquiring individual commotes or groups of commotes, J.G. was able to go on to explain why the Marcher barons, exploiting what they found, exercised in their lordships 'regalian' rights and other peculiar privileges, henceforward enjoying them all as according to 'the use and custom of the March'. So did J.G. dispose of the erroneous idea that the constitutional position of the Norman barons was different in the Welsh March from what it was in England because they needed special powers and privileges in order to act as a sort of frontier defence force. In fact, the lecture provided, in a Welsh context, a persuasive argument by which the apparent similarity in the course of development of Marcher regality and English franchise might be kept in perspective by reference to their ultimate origins. Far from incidentally, the lecture as a whole revealed the results of the author's deep incursions into the subject of the feudal geography of the areas of Norman penetration, particularly in NE and SE Wales.

What proved to be J.G.'s last lengthy piece of work in the field of medieval Welsh history was the lecture he delivered in commemoration of the 700th anniversary of the treaty of Montgomery, the paper entitled *The Principality of Wales, 1267-1967*, to which he gave a defiantly old-fashioned sub-title, viz. 'A Study in Constitutional History'. In it he discussed not only the treaty of 1267, but also the Statute of Wales (1284) and the so-called Acts of Union (1536, 1543), and in so doing emphasized the remarkable degree of institutional continuity in the history of the Principality, thereby removing some cherished misconceptions about the political development of Wales. What the treaty had done was to have determined the *extent* of the

Principality and, in the sense that it made Llywelyn II, Prince of Wales, himself a vassal of the English king, into feudal overlord of all the other native lords of 'Welsh Wales' (Wales outside the March), its *character* as well. What the Statute of 1284 had done was to 'shire' NE and NW Wales and recognize the existing shires of SW Wales, keeping all of them, however, governmentally and administratively separate and distinct from the English system, so effecting, within such limits, a *consolidation* of what had been previously fractionized. What the Acts of 1536 and 1543 did, by incorporating the Marcher lordships into the neighbouring English border shires or into now newly established Welsh border shires, was to bring about the political *unification* of Wales; and if, having been given representation in the English parliament, Wales was no longer separately governed, its judicial system did remain separate, even if the law to be administered was to be the common law of England. It was with characteristic cogency that J.G. argued that this Tudor legislation might be viewed less in terms of union with England than in terms of 'unifying Wales within itself'. And just as J. E. Lloyd had laid his emphasis not on the *dénouement* of the late thirteenth century, but on the earlier achievement which gave the Edwardian 'solution' its historical significance, so J.G. was able to see the union itself as being, not in any main sense a terminal, but rather as a halting-place upon a continuous progress from a state of separate but fractionized government to a state of separate but cohesive jurisdiction, and to see the whole progress not in constitutional and administrative terms alone, but as a nation's broader historical experience, an experience in which, over six centuries, there had been constantly at work 'the enduring force of the separate language and the distinctive culture of its people'.

(ii) *Writings on English History*

In the sphere of English history, too, J.G.'s production took shape in papers which dealt with particular aspects of rather specialized, although mostly important, subjects, and that production mainly related to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Moreover, he limited himself on the whole to topics of constitutional interest. (For J.G. constitutional history was always, as Stubbs had established it, a 'species' rather than a 'mere aspect' of history.) Even within such limits he concentrated heavily on questions relating to the history of the English parliament, especially its earlier history, and with particular

reference to the Commons. And whatever his subject, he naturally tended to concern himself with some special aspect or problem. Note, for instance, the title of his long, two-part paper on the political and constitutional crisis of 1297: '*Confirmatio Cartarum* and Baronial Grievances in 1297.' *Baronial* grievances: the English church hardly entered into the discussion. J.G.'s principal aim in the paper was to throw light on the attitude and intentions of those from whom came the greater threat to royal power and public order, and it was to this end that he sought to establish the proper meaning of such of the documents bearing upon the crisis as were most strictly relevant to an understanding of that particular aspect of it. Seeing that 'no secure approach to *Confirmatio* is attainable from the side of *De Tallagio*', his purpose was 'to attempt a traverse to an alternative line of ascent, and thereby approach *Confirmatio* on firmer footholds than those provided by the treacherous arête of *De Tallagio*'. The 'alternative line of ascent' he found in the *Monstraunces*, and once he had shown that the word 'tallage' had been used in this baronial document in only a non-specific, broad, and elastic sense, as a word merely 'imparting a suggestively sinister ring, which could easily be used in arousing or fortifying partisan feeling or political controversy', he had as good as proved that Edward I had substantially given way to the baronial demands, certainly as regards direct taxation. J.G. had not said the last word on 1297 (particularly not as regards *De Tallagio* as a whole). But his paper was like a star-shell illuminating an important part of a front that had long been obscure.

As far as parliamentary history was concerned, J.G. set himself from the start to criticize and oppose such a revolutionary reappraisal of the doctrines of Stubbs as was contained, not so much in the work of Maitland (1893), but certainly, over-all, in that of C. H. McIlwain (1910), D. Pasquet (1914), G. Lapsley (1919), and A. F. Pollard (1920), and, later on and continuously, in that of H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles. All these scholars criticized Stubbs on the grounds that in his *Constitutional History* he had not only given a disproportionate place in his scheme as a whole to the representative parliament, but had compounded his offence by exaggerating the importance of the elected Commons. J.G., while always recognizing Stubbs's greatness as 'surveyor' and 'map-maker', showed clearly, in a paper he wrote in Stubbs's defence later on (1952), that he too understood his excesses only too well.¹ But he

¹ He had no time for Stubbs's postulate of 'the Lancastrian experiment'.

declined to see why acceptance of the importance of the judicial capacity of the medieval parliament (to which Maitland had, quite properly, directed attention) should necessarily have the effect of obscuring the general omnicompetence of parliament, or of undervaluing the particular rôle of the Commons. If carried to extremes, it might do both. But then extremes were positions which J.G. eschewed, whether taken up by Stubbs or anyone else.

It was in 1925 that J.G. initially assumed the rôle of parliamentary historian. And he first did so, if only incidentally, as a critic of Stubbs. This was in his paper, 'The Parliamentary Committee of 1398' (*EHR* xl). Once he had proved that the powers of the committee set up at Shrewsbury in Richard II's last parliament had subsequently been extended by a falsification of the rolls of the parliament, it was clear that the king, not parliament, had been responsible for the committee's appointment. That apart, there was no reason to believe that the committee, even when given larger powers, was ever intended by Richard to be more than 'a temporary expedient', how much less 'a means of dispensing with parliament altogether'. On both grounds, therefore, J.G. was justified in rejecting Stubbs's description of the Shrewsbury parliament as 'suicidal'. But J.G.'s chief dispute in that same year was not with Stubbs, but with his detractors; and although he attacked on a narrow front, it was in relation to larger issues.

The immediate controversy arose out of J.G.'s contribution to the volume of essays presented to Tout, a paper entitled 'The Personnel of the Commons in Parliament under Edward I and Edward II'. He began that paper with a general protest against 'a distinct tendency [in recent work] to question many of the accepted opinions as to the place and importance of the Commons in the parliaments of the fourteenth century', a tendency which, particularly in the work of Pasquet and Pollard, had led to 'iconoclastic conclusions' that were 'now becoming fashionable'. All in character, he limited himself to a few specific, connected questions: Did constituencies, especially the boroughs, ever fail to elect? Did the men elected, especially the burgesses, fail to attend parliament? Was re-election rare, so resulting in a lack of parliamentary experience among the Commons? Such allegations he disproved. Certainly to Tout's satisfaction.¹ But not, especially as regards the last of the

¹ Tout, in a letter to J.G. of 26 October 1925 (in the month following

questions, to Pollard's. However, their dispute to some extent resolved itself into a question of semantics. Was 're-election' election following previous service (the sense J.G. preferred), or was it election to consecutive parliaments (the sense from which Pollard, in an immediate riposte, refused to budge)? J.G. was equally persistent, although in an early rejoinder he took steps to remove any ambiguity in the word 're-election' by substituting 'repeated election' for it. But he went on to make it clear that, as the real point of interest was the parliamentary experience of members in a period when parliamentary life was not continuous, repeated membership, not continuous membership, was all that was necessary to gain experience. And he concluded: 'We shall not understand the Commons . . . so long as we fix our attention upon the rarely re-elected and therefore inexperienced element; we must give equal weight to the equally typical members who, like Chaucer's Franklin, were repeatedly elected and therefore had experience and supplied . . . a valuable element of continuity.'

Useful though these last two parliamentary papers of 1925-6 had been as shots fired across the bows of the 'revisionists', the paper which J.G. contributed to the volume of essays presented to H. E. Salter in 1934, 'The *Plena Potestas* of English Parliamentary Representatives', was of much greater gravity and importance. For he there adverted to the problem of the very nature of parliament, and especially of the place and function of the Commons. Moreover, that problem had itself become more seriously controversial, those 'iconoclastic conclusions' that had been 'becoming fashionable' in 1925 having in the meantime been given a fresh impetus in the somewhat creedal pronouncements of H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles. Curiously, J.G. omitted to refer to the ecclesiastical, canonistic origins of *plena potestas* (an omission that was later to be made good by Gaines Post) or, come to think of it, to its use in secular diplomacy. Rather he limited himself to a close scrutiny of such of the early writs of summons as demanded the election of

publication of the *Essays*) wrote as follows: 'I have delayed [writing] until I could find time to read the article, though I was stimulated to do so by the ecstasy of Neale, who told me with rejoicings that you had disproved all the propositions that Pollard had devoted the Long Vacation to establishing. Whether this be accident or a strange gift for insight I don't know—or whether Neale's statement is literally fact. But anyhow you've refuted a good many of Pollard's published *obiter dicta*, and proved up to the hilt that expenses writs—to say nothing of surviving returns of sheriffs—are not exhaustive or complete.'

representatives of shires and towns, naturally paying particular attention to those writs which included the specific formula containing the expression 'full power'. Having pointed out how the formula varied at first (obviously the result of concern and deliberate policy on the part of the royal executive), he demonstrated the practical connection between the *plena potestas* and the granting of taxation that was at once 'general in scope and uniform in incidence', taxation to which, if it was to be fully binding upon the local communities where it was to be collected, consent would be required in parliament of their properly accredited representatives.¹ And finally, having hammered home the fact that the 'full power' that survived in writs of summons for almost six centuries (until 1872) was 'not the mere continuance of inert common form', he briefly entered into the field of strict political theory. For what he then insisted was that the legal sovereignty of parliament sprang not from a single root, but from a double root, one root being parliament's character as a high court, the second root the *plena potestas* of the representatives of the Commons. Simply by having put pen to paper on the subject of *plena potestas*, J.G. was implicitly confirming his earlier confession of faith, belief in the great importance of the medieval Commons.

However, in that essay for the Salter *festschrift*, he made no specific reference to a problem which, although it seems, as a constitutional issue, not to have troubled the people of the thirteenth or early fourteenth century, has caused modern parliamentary historians to speak with such different voices, supply such contradictory answers, and enter into a long, hard-fought, and still unresolved controversy: What, to begin with, really was a *parliamentum*? Or, stated less baldly: What did the word itself mean when it first achieved official recognition and currency? What sort of meeting or assembly could be accounted a properly valid parliament? When did a meeting of parliament cease to be merely an occasion when the king came face to face with his 'people', and parliament become a distinct institution? Should one be obliged to think in terms of essentialities, two basic criteria, indissolubly connected, would need to be separately applied: (a) Who were required to attend parliament?

¹ In a paper of 1942 (*EHR* lvii), 'Taxation and Consent in the Court of Common Pleas, 1338', J.G. was to cap the Salter paper, showing how early in Edward III's reign a common lawyer (Justice Rokel) could deduce from the *plena potestas* that a grant of taxation in parliament had a binding force that was 'unconditional and transcendent'.

(b) What was the king's object in summoning them, and what, in fact, did parliament do? If we are to understand the value of J.G.'s contribution to the debate, we must first give some attention to the ideas of others, especially those with whom he found himself at variance.

As regards parliament's essence in terms of 'make-up', Maitland had suggested that a session of the king's council was 'the core and essence of every *parliamentum*'. Pollard, too, recognized that the council, as supplying parliament with its motive force, was 'the essential factor'. But Pollard also opined that there were at first two kinds of parliament which had 'little in common': the terminal sessions of the council dealing mainly with judicial business, and the larger gatherings which also included prelates and lay magnates specially summoned and, although only occasionally, elected representatives as well. The two kinds of parliament, Pollard maintained, became, for convenience sake, subjected to an 'amalgamation' in the latter half of Edward I's reign. And Pollard's reasoning is not difficult to follow. For although, in drafting the writs of summons, Chancery continued until c.1300 to prefer the term *colloquium et tractatus* to the word *parliamentum*, that department of state could itself describe the full meeting of 1275 as Edward I's first *generale parliamentum*. This, said Pollard (and Tait, in *EHR* xxxvi, agreed), 'implies that an even less comprehensive assembly might have been called a "parliament" with equal propriety'. However, Richardson and Sayles evidently found Pollard's idea that parliaments had ever been of two kinds quite unacceptable: 'parliaments', they said in 1927, 'are of one kind only and, when we have stripped every non-essential away, the essence of them is the dispensing of justice'. Obviously these two scholars, in speaking of parliaments as 'of one kind only', were concerned with parliament's function rather than its 'make-up'. But it would follow that if, say, parliament's granting of taxes be 'stripped away' as inessential to its functioning, the Commons' attendance upon parliament, their contribution to its 'make-up' (especially in the period when they still attended irregularly), could only have been of little account. Although these ideas of Richardson and Sayles deservedly attracted universal attention and, in certain circles, won acceptance, there were some, J.G. apart, who on mature consideration objected. Powicke was very dubious, certainly as regards their demotion of the Commons. And in 1938,¹ adverting to the

¹ *Modern Historians and the Study of History* (London, 1955), p. 221.

dangers of discussing parliamentary origins in terms of 'essentialities' and 'non-essentialities', Powicke commented: 'Knights and burgesses might play a significant part without being essential; they might be essential and, at the same time, insignificant. The important thing is that, during the century c.1250 to 1350, the social and political character of a middle-class element was a fact.' Plucknett, too, had his doubts and in 1940, when attributing the fact that, in the course of the first half of the fourteenth century, the council ceased to be 'the core and heart' of parliament to a change in parliament's 'political complexion', went on to attribute *this* change partly to the eventually firm adoption, in that period, of the representative principle.

J.G.'s contribution to the now more intensive debate, his early paper on *plena potestas* apart, was long in coming. But when he re-entered the fray, that contribution was to become very substantial. All the more influential, too, for being so timed as to have a considerable impact upon another generation of constitutional historians as well as his own. It was in the paper *William Stubbs* (1952) that he first openly addressed himself to the bearing, upon the general problem of the nature of the early English parliament, of the particular question of parliament's 'make-up'. Giving credit to Stubbs for having realized that the word 'parliament' was originally an elastic term, J.G. did, however, criticize him for having failed to perceive that the representative parliament 'was brought into being, not by summoning representatives to attend upon just any of the central assemblies that were indiscriminately called "parliament", but by summoning them to attend upon the assembly that was *parliamentum* in the precise sense, the *parliamentum* that was a specially summoned and specially solemn session of the king's council'. The representative parliament was, as he described it, 'a kind of hybrid produced by a process of grafting'; the representative element was 'the scion'; 'the stock upon which it was grafted was the conciliar *parliamentum*'; and the latter, thereafter, 'became extinct as a species, giving way to the derivative hybrid that flourished in its stead'. Turning again to this question of parliament's 'make-up' in 1955, in *Historians and the Medieval Parliament* (Glasgow, 1960), J.G. commented on Maitland's famous dictum, that a session of the king's council was 'the core and essence of every *parliamentum*', and, in also criticizing it, came to reject it. 'Core' he would accept, but 'essence' not. Taking his stand upon the proper meaning of

this word, that it denotes that which makes anything what it really is, he denied that what Maitland had said was true: 'The evidence indicates that in the strict sense the "essence" of parliament in composition was that it was *the king's council afforced*, 'the council *plus*', and that 'the afforcement, the *plus*, as well as the council, was equally of the essence so far as the composition of parliament was concerned'. So much for 'make-up'.

Regarding that other aspect of the general problem, the question of parliament's function, J.G. had already spoken, in the paper '“Justice” in Early English Parliaments' (1954). First Maitland, then Pollard, and finally Richardson and Sayles had placed 'very strong emphasis . . . upon "justice" in the business of English parliaments during the century or so succeeding the crisis of 1258'. But then Maitland, in considering the judicial rôle of parliament, had been greatly concerned to establish the administrative value of the sessions of parliament, and the basic importance to parliament, therefore, of the king's council. And Pollard, after referring to the business of Edward I's parliaments as being 'mainly . . . to deal out justice', had further qualified this opinion (we ourselves may note) by allowing that the king and his council, in dispensing justice in parliament, had as a rule preferred 'to play the part of general practitioners rather than that of specialists', with the result that the value of parliament to the petitioner for justice was mostly in 'moving' the courts, not in actually doing justice itself. But Richardson and Sayles, 'proceeding [as J.G. put it] on the assumption that the "essence" of parliament consists in the function which is exercised in every parliament, and that the functions not exercised in every parliament may be "stripped away" as being non-essential', had decided that the dispensing of justice was *the* essential function. J.G. was not only opposing the general theory of Richardson and Sayles, but was now doing so on ground of their own choosing. He first objected to the tendency 'to lump the audience of all petitions in parliament under the general heading of "justice"'. (Maitland, too, had noted that some petitions only asked for 'pure favours'.) Then he went on to examine the question in the light of the reiterated demands for frequent parliaments made by the king's subjects—by the barons in 1258, the Lords Ordainers in 1311, and the Commons under Edward III—all of which demands Richardson and Sayles (and previously Pollard) had interpreted as a claim for the dispensation of justice in parliament. He first made

clear that in the Provisions of Oxford of 1258 the function of the thrice-yearly parliaments which that document imposed, was described in the widest of terms—to treat of ‘the common business of the kingdom and of the king’—‘terms which doubtless include, but which also certainly transcend, the dispensing of justice’. He then made a special point of referring to the Chancery memorandum of 1280, by which the government took steps to reduce to a minimum the number of petitions that had to be considered by the king and council in parliament, petitions which, from the government’s point of view, were impeding the transaction there of more important business. Next, he went on to show how the Lords Ordainers in 1311, in demanding one or two parliaments each year, were acknowledging that ‘justice’ was in practice being ‘crowded out’ by parliament’s other business, and how when, in the later years of Edward III, the Commons made their occasional demands for frequent parliaments, their object was to facilitate complaints against the king’s ministers, complaints such as were to result in the process of impeachment which, though judicial in form, was ‘political’ rather than ‘judicial’ in intent. Certainly, J.G. conceded, the judicial aspect of parliament’s business was what specially interested ‘the generality of Englishmen’; but what specially interested the king and his council was the government’s own business. And he concluded: ‘the competence of king in council in parliament was not a “judicial” competence. It was a general competence. It was an omnicompetence. Parliament was a “high” court not merely because it was judicially above other courts, but also because it was itself more than a judicial court; it was an omnicompetent organ of government at the summit of lay affairs in England.’ It is only fair to Richardson and Sayles to say that although they held to their main tenet, they had long before this come round to the view that it was ‘in popular estimation’ (‘in the eyes of the people’) that dispensation of justice was ‘the prime purpose of parliament’: a double disclaimer in effect, or at least a mitigation on their part.

Richardson and Sayles had also been ready to allow of ‘a widening of the functions of parliament’, ‘a greater admixture of politics’, as early as Edward II’s reign, and that this development was even more clearly discernible under Edward III. But to what extent were the Commons, now that they had become an integral part of parliament, effective politically and in relation to parliament’s other purposes? Richardson and

Sayles, having little time for the Commons (except as petitioners) remained inclined, if not to write them off, at any rate (J.G. felt) to write them down, and to see the new political involvement of parliament largely in terms of a response to aristocratic pressures. Indeed, if ever the Commons seemed to be mixed up in 'high politics', e.g. in impeaching the king's ministers at the end of Edward III's reign and under Richard II, Mr Richardson, considering them 'credulous and willing to be led', believed them to have been 'inspired and sustained' in such proceedings by the Lords, so denying them the initiative attributed to them in the records and by some chroniclers. 'The strength of the Commons in parliament', he said, 'was not their own, but the Lords'. K. B. McFarlane found this idea of the Commons' subservience to the Lords quite unacceptable—it was at variance with the social realities of the period. But both Richardson and Sayles were insisting that it mattered not how important many knights of the shire themselves were, nor how fragile the contracts by which they had become the retainers of individual peers, nor how free of aristocratic dictation or interference was the conduct of local parliamentary elections: what really mattered was what the Commons actually did in parliament, and whether they were capable of acting independently. It was to this crucial question that J.G. turned in his Creighton Lecture of 1957, *The Commons in Medieval Parliaments*. And he focused his attention, almost to the exclusion of all else, on Richardson's suggestion that the procedure of joint discussion between delegations of the Lords and of the Commons was exploited by the upper house as a means of directing the lower. McFarlane had questioned this interpretation of the practice of 'intercommuning', but only *en passant*. It was J.G. who first explained the procedure in detail, and not only was he in his element in so doing: he revealed, with some gusto, that 'intercommuning' had a significance quite opposite to that suggested. For having shown that it was quite commonly employed during the second half of the fourteenth century, he was able to demonstrate that, with the Commons usually nominating the Lords' delegations (as well as their own), and the Lords' delegations being sometimes required to meet not just a similar party from the lower house, but all the Commons assembled together, it was not the Commons who were liable to be directed by the Lords, but the Lords by the Commons. Direction of the Commons by the Lords was, to say the least, no more than 'an unverified hypothesis'. And the whole question was especially

important because 'intercommuning' was a method by which, as partners, Lords and Commons reached agreement about consenting to grants of taxation. Taxation, J.G. insisted, was a subject not to be waved aside: such a tendency had been a cause, as he put it, of 'one-sided conclusions'. Taxation was a subject to which J.G. was soon to return: in his Ford Lectures of Hilary Term, 1961.

It had not taken J.G. long to decide how to take advantage of the opportunity then afforded to undertake a series of lectures on the subject which had now become his main scholarly interest. His original idea is revealed by preparatory notes he made early in December 1959. It was 'to string together a number of studies which will show at any rate the stages that can be perceived of the evolutionary process which transformed the parliament (say) of 1327 into the parliament as described by Sir Thomas Smith in 1565, but without going much into the Tudor period except for points of departure'. 'I hope', he went on, 'to avoid wasting too much space on origins, but to concentrate rather on development. . . . The basic purpose of the lectures will be to consider two questions: (1) What work was done in/by parliament? (2) How/by whom was it done? And then to show how the answers to these two questions explain how parliament came to be as described by Sir Thomas Smith.' Expressing this basic intention in other words, he said that he would make 'a fresh attempt, in the light of intervening research, to tackle the topics treated by Stubbs in his chapter on "Parliamentary Antiquities" in his *Constitutional History*, vol. iii, and to see things as they really were—just as Poole did for the exchequer in the twelfth century in his Ford Lectures.' Recalling that the term *parliamentum* had been first used in English records and chronicles in c.1240, and also noting that Plucknett, writing on 'Parliament' in *The English Government at Work, 1327-1337*, had remarked several 'archaic' features giving the impression that 1-10 Edward III was a transitional period, J.G. decided to treat of parliament post-1340. This was a useful *terminus a quo* also because this date roughly coincided with the start of the Hundred Years War with all its importance for parliamentary taxation, a topic he certainly intended to discuss. And he ultimately defined his subject as 'The Second Century of the English Parliament' (this precise form being possibly a vague wave of the hand in the direction of another friend and predecessor in the Ford Lectureship, Sir Frank Stenton). Within this settled general framework, he hesitated as to the topics of

particular lectures in the series, evidently meaning if possible to treat his subject more comprehensively than in fact he was to do. 'Taxation' and 'Petitions and Bills' were, however, constant inclusions in his lists, and when he finally decided upon content, two of the six lectures were entitled 'Taxation', and another two, 'Petitions and Bills'.

The Commons' interest in these matters—taxation and petitions—was of course such that when J.G. began his last lecture, 'The Commons in their "Common House"',—a lecture in which he dealt with some problems relating to the Commons' own organization (the origins of the Speakership, and the manner in which the Commons reached decisions)—he was on firm ground in saying that his audience had already been made 'very much aware of the existence of the Commons'. However, he was still able to say also that the earlier lectures had been 'about parliament as a whole'; in other words, he had looked at the Commons 'mainly in the context . . . of the Parliament Chamber, where and when they met the King and his council and the Lords'. In dealing with taxation, i.e. indirect and direct taxation, J.G. consciously departed from Stubbs in concerning himself not with the sequence of grants, but with their pattern. So far as the wool subsidy and, later on, tannage and poundage were concerned, what he meant by 'pattern' was (*a*) the duration of the grants, and (*b*) their timing (the practical object of which was to produce a sequence that was chronologically unbroken). Having made the resultingly simple point that whereas indirect taxation was continuous, direct taxation was discontinuous, he went on to broader questions about taxation in general: How did parliament meet the financial challenge of the Hundred Years War which so nearly exactly coincided with his 'Second Century'? Did parliament resist taxation, did it grant taxes only reluctantly, and were the grants it made niggardly? What demands did the granting of taxation make upon the activity and initiative of parliament? What was the legal as distinct from the constitutional importance of parliamentary taxation? One of his conclusions may be stated as especially relevant to his general thesis: 'the Commons shared in the making of grants not as inferiors, but as having equal authority, and in practice often more than equal authority, alongside the Lords.' J.G. devoted the same amount of time to the trickiest of all problems confronting the medieval parliamentary historian: that posed by 'petitions and bills'—'the most numerous products of the parliamentary machine'. Regard-

ing 'common petitions', he was mostly concerned with such questions as these: Why 'common petitions' were so called? What may the description *not* be taken to mean and signify? How much, or how little, was meant by 'avowal' of petitions by the Commons? Were the Commons, when they 'put forward' common petitions, necessarily acting in a corporate capacity? Regarding 'singular petitions', the petitions presented by individual persons for their own private benefit: What sort of things did they ask for? How, originally, were they dealt with? Why did the Commons come to act as intermediaries for such petitioners? And regarding all petitions: To what extent was there a two-way traffic between the two Houses, and how had it originated? The Fords did not provide a conspectus, but they did achieve a coherence and, with parliament's 'second century' so remarkable a period in its development, they make a notable contribution to our understanding of that development as a whole.

In later contributions J.G. made to that subject, he went into questions for which the Fords had allowed no time, or not enough. Having referred there not at all to parliamentary elections (although the famous statute of 1430 fell within his 'second century'), he took up that amount of slack in one of his Presidential Addresses to the Royal Historical Society—'The Emergence of Majority Rule in English Parliamentary Elections'—and, in developing his earlier discussion on parliamentary procedures, took up still more in another—'The Emergence of Majority Rule in the Procedure of the House of Commons'. Of necessity, these two papers reached far beyond the medieval period: they incorporated evidence from, and so to some extent ranged over, the whole of the modern period as well. In the first of the two, J.G.'s starting point was, of course, the statute of 1430, which not only restricted the right of participating in county elections to the 40s. freeholders, but also ordained that the two candidates supported by 'the greater number' of such freeholders as attended were to be returned by the sheriff as knights of the shire, without, however, prescribing by what procedure the sheriff should discover who had the majority. But what, historically, was the practical value of the statute? Were even contested elections many or few? Working backwards from the eighteenth century to the fifteenth, and using the conclusions of Namier, Neale, and McFarlane, J.G. arrived at 'a provisional generalization', one that was applicable to boroughs as well as counties: 'The preponderant tradition

in English electoral practice was . . . the tradition of uncontested elections.' 'Management' was the thing: such prior arrangements as would preclude contests and so remove all need to invoke the majority rule. But supposing this rule had to be invoked, what then? What J.G. took pains to make clear was the difference between the 'general majority'—by 'voice', 'hands', or 'view' (a majority heard or seen, one which opened the door to partiality or arbitrary action on the sheriff's part and could lead to a false return)—and the 'majority by poll' (a counted, precise majority); and the conclusion he reached was that it was only gradually that, some two centuries or so after the Act of 1430, majority by poll prevailed. As regards 'majority rule' in the procedure of the Commons, there was no directly relevant evidence from the medieval period, and J.G.'s paper on this subject largely resolved itself into a discussion of later developments, mainly Tudor developments. So far as general points are concerned, he was able to establish that whereas the Lords reached decisions 'severally', the Commons did so collectively; that if, by the time Sir Thomas Smith was writing in Elizabeth I's reign, discussion upon a motion showed the Commons to be not of one mind, a decision might be arrived at by use of either one procedure or two, first, by their just shouting 'Aye' or 'No' (a majority heard) or, if that seemed uncertain, secondly, by a 'division' (a counted majority) as well; that the procedure by 'voices' was indispensable, a division merely supplementary; and that ever since divisions came in, both kinds of procedure have continued to co-exist. But his main problem of course was to determine, if possible, just when each of the two procedures—the one by 'voices', the other by 'division'—had originated. The emergence of the first would obviously depend upon there being some officer who would decide whether the 'Ayes' or the 'Noes' had the majority. But, then, there is no means of knowing when the Commons' Speaker, who himself only emerged towards the end of the fourteenth century, began to perform that function; and so J.G. could get no further with that. As regards the second, after a quite elaborate exposition of the evidence from the Commons' Journals and some foreign ambassadors' reports, and also having taken into account the structure of the College of St. Stephen which, early in Edward VI's reign, became the Commons' meeting-place, J.G. arrived at two typically guarded conclusions: 'It may well be true that the Commons' characteristic method of counting the Ayes and Noes was finally moulded

into the historic form of a division by their acquisition, in the early fifteen-fifties, of a "house" and an "outer house" which, structurally, perpetuated the chapel and ante-chapel of the extinguished college of St. Stephens'; 'the counted majority in the Commons' procedure—the majority by division—seems to have first come into operation largely in the course of opposition to the contentious government bills which accompanied the varied vicissitudes following upon the breach with Rome, and particularly in the course of the "reformist" opposition promoted by the pro-Catholic and pro-Spanish government of Queen Mary.' The paper thus supplied an informative, and an important, contribution to Tudor parliamentary history.

J.G.'s two Presidential addresses to the Royal Historical Society devoted to aspects of English parliamentary history had put the modernists, as well as the medievalists, directly in his debt. That the medievalists were already greatly indebted may easily be deduced from the fact that of the thirteen previously published essays which E. B. Fryde and Edward Miller, editors of *Historical Studies of the English Parliament*, included in its first volume (*Origins to 1399*) as many as four were from J.G.'s pen. It is a pity that J.G. did not himself publish a collection of his parliamentary papers, with a general introduction summarizing what it all meant to him. He had made it his business to identify the critical points and themes, and then deal with those capable of clarification. His articles took up these points one by one, and his studies, with all their tendency to particularize, have an uncanny ability to sustain his general conclusions. Medieval parliamentary history is full of difficult problems (hence the deep-seated disagreements), but certainly to some of the most important of them J.G. offered solutions which will not only continue to command respect, but remain very influential in future discussions.

Perhaps, to help me conclude, I may quote some words of H. W. C. Davis:¹ 'It is not given to all of us to write prose epics. For the humbler minded, whose ambition is simply to enlarge the empire of sound knowledge, there is spade work enough and more than enough to be done. . . .' 'To enlarge the empire of sound knowledge.' That Sir Goronwy Edwards had set himself this ambition and did in great measure achieve it, cannot be doubted.

J. S. ROSKELL

¹ The words are extracted from a passage of the Inaugural Lecture,

In preparing this obituary I have received, particularly with regard to family background and personal details, much help from Sir Goronwy's widow, Lady Gwladys Edwards, to whom I am very grateful. Colleagues, fellow-historians, and friends have also helped me in their various ways, and if, so numerous are they, I do not thank them all by name, I hope that the omission will be forgiven. I am, however, especially indebted to the following: Professor C. N. L. Brooke, Professor R. R. Davies, Professor A. G. Dickens, Professor A. Goodwin, Mr John G. Griffith, Professor T. G. Griffith, Professor J. H. Le Patourel, Miss G. A. Matheson, Mr A. T. Milne, Mr E. L. C. Mullins, Mr D. A. Rees, Mr J. Beverley Smith, Professor E. L. G. Stones, Dame Lucy Sutherland, Dr A. J. Taylor, Professor Glanmor Williams, and Professor J. Gwynn Williams. I must also declare my indebtedness to other sources which were available to me: the tribute to Sir Goronwy in his eightieth year by Professor J. Gwynn Williams and Mr Bevan-Evans, published in the *Journal of the Flintshire Historical Society*, vol. xxiv; and the obituaries published in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. xlix (anonymous), the *Transactions of the Flintshire Historical Society* (by Sir David Evans), the *English Historical Review*, vol. cxi (by Professor Denys Hay), *The Welsh History Review*, vol. 8 (by J. Beverley Smith), *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, vol. cxxv (by A. J. Taylor).

entitled 'The Study of History', delivered by H. W. C. Davis in the University of Oxford in 1925, a passage reproduced in C. H. Williams, *The Modern Historian* (1938), pp. 97-8.