



T. J. BROWN

THOMAS JULIAN BROWN

1923–1987

JULIAN BROWN made a crucial contribution to the study of the script of the earliest surviving manuscripts of the British Isles, those dating between the sixth and the ninth centuries. Equally important, by his public lectures and his teaching and through his wider involvement with scholars in a variety of subject areas both in this country and abroad he established palaeography more firmly and visibly as an academic subject within the British University system.

He was born on 24 February 1923, his father, Thomas Brown, being a landagent in Penrith, Cumberland, whose first wife had died leaving a daughter, Julian's half-sister Betty.¹ Thomas Brown died in 1934. Julian's mother, Helen Wright Brown, received the MBE for services in the Women's Royal Volunteer Service. After education at Westminster School where he was a King's Scholar from 1936–40, Julian went up to Christ Church, Oxford in 1941. He took Honour Moderations in Classics in 1942 and then served in the Border Regiment from 1942–5, being for most of the time attached to the Infantry Heavy Weapons School at Netheravon. Returning to Oxford he completed his degree in Greats in 1948. He had a lengthy viva for a First and the fact that he so narrowly missed it must be attributed to an emotional breakdown the previous summer which led also to his missing the entire Michaelmas term in 1947. Among the teachers who powerfully influenced him were R. H. Dundas and Paul Jacobsthal, both of whom he acknowledged in his first major publication, the facsimile of the Lindisfarne Gospels. Dundas was the Greats tutor

¹ Betty Gilson (Mabel Raven Brown) 1909–65, was a Fellow and Lecturer in Botany at Newnham College, Cambridge from 1939–46. See *Newnham College Roll Letter*, 1960, for a memoir.

for Ancient History at the House. His Mods tutor was Barrington-Ward and it was he who persuaded Julian to take the Special Paper on Greek Art in Mods. Julian wrote of this: 'A weekly class on sculpture with Jacobsthal, attended by one other undergraduate, and two lectures a week on Greek vases by Beazley, attended by half a dozen others at most, for four terms marked me for life.'²

In 1950 Julian entered the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum. The Keeper at that time was A. J. Collins who was succeeded by Dr Bertram Schofield. It was then and still is the custom for newly entering staff to be put to work on describing the uncatalogued material accessioned as 'Additional Manuscripts' and 'Additional Charters'. In this way they received a hands-on training under the supervision of a senior member of staff and they were expected to achieve a general competence in all areas of the collections from ancient to modern.

Julian Brown's earliest publications were thus concerned with literary autographs.³ Accompanied by well-chosen facsimiles his papers on the script of prominent authors have proved of enduring use, and they already show the qualities of Julian's scholarship as a palaeographer in the way in which they lay down clear principles and criteria for the study of scribal characteristics and for the distinction of genuine from fake documents. At the same time he had had to work on the papers of Bernard Shaw. The expertise he gained at that time he continued to put at the disposal of the Society of Authors, advising them on matters concerned with Shaw's unpublished papers via the Academic Advisory Committee set up by the Society in 1973, of which he served as Chairman from 1974 until it was wound down in 1984. His wisdom and tact in difficult decisions were greatly valued.

In 1953 a project was approved by the Trustees of the Museum to publish a full facsimile of the Book of Lindisfarne. Two publishers had put forward such a proposal, and Urs Graf under the direction of Dr Titus Burkhardt, was entrusted with the task. It was apparently understood from the first that the commentary

² 'Names of scripts: a plea to all medievalists'. This is scheduled to appear in *A Palaeographer's View. The Selected Papers of T. J. Brown*, ed. M. B. Brown, J. Bately, J. Roberts, to be published by Harvey Miller, London, 1990. The volume will contain corrected reprints of Julian's most important articles as well as several unpublished papers, and will provide a full bibliography of his writings.

³ 'The detection of faked literary MSS', *Book Collector*, 2 (1953), 3-14. 'English literary autographs I-L' and 'English scientific autographs I-VIII', *Book Collector*, 2-15 (1953-66). 'Some Shelley forgeries by "Major Byron"', *Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin*, 14 (1963), 47-54.

text would be mainly written by internal staff of the Museum. Francis Wormald, who might otherwise have been expected to be involved, had left the Museum for the Chair of Palaeography at London University in 1950. Other senior staff could evidently not be spared from their particular responsibilities. Thus it was that the palaeographical commentary was entrusted to a young man with no formal palaeographical training and at that point no publications on medieval let alone Insular palaeography. The fact that Jacobsthal was an authority on Celtic art is unlikely to have had anything to do with it. The triumphant way in which Julian rose to this challenge was in effect to shape the remainder of his scholarly life.

The facsimile itself appeared in 1956, but the commentary volume not until four years later.⁴ The authors apologize for this lapse in time in their preface. It was hardly surprising, however, for the final publications can claim to be the most thorough and scholarly investigation of a single manuscript ever produced. It seems that the Trustees were generous in granting 'Facility time' and Julian thanks them for allowing him seventy-eight days special leave since 1953. Nevertheless to make himself master of the material as he did must have required intense effort and Professor David Wright remembers encountering him in the Warburg Institute working before and after his duty hours at the Museum.

The volume was a collaborative effort. The art historical side was covered by Rupert Bruce-Mitford of the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities. The philological questions involved in the tenth-century Latin gloss were discussed by A. S. G. Ross and E. G. Stanley, who had been working on this aspect for some years. A section on the pigments was contributed by the German scholar H. Roosen-Runge in collaboration with another authority on painting techniques, A. E. A. Werner, then Keeper of the Research Laboratory at the Museum and formerly of the National Gallery. In his preface Sir Thomas Kendrick, at that time Director of the British Museum, wrote that the text: 'represents a consensus of opinion and it is all the more valuable for that reason'. Julian worked particularly closely with Bruce-Mitford, certain parts of the text being written jointly. Bruce-Mitford recalls their feeling a keen sense of responsibility to deal adequately

⁴ *Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis*, Vol. 2 (Olten and Lausanne, 1960), ed. T. D. Kendrick, T. J. Brown, R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, H. Roosen-Runge, A. S. C. Ross, E. G. Stanley, A. E. A. Werner.

in the publication with such a masterpiece. It was certainly a unique opportunity to examine a manuscript in minute detail comparing all aspects of script and decoration on a continuing day-to-day basis and this is very apparent at every point in their text. Their important new conclusions as to the identity of scribe and artist, for example, were reached as a result of observations of changes in plan in the script and decoration which might have passed unnoticed from a less intensive examination.

As has been said, Julian's training as a palaeographer was from practical experience in the Department and he never, so far as I know, had formal instruction through lectures or classes. At Oxford he is unlikely to have had any contact with Neil Ker, who had been appointed University Lecturer in Palaeography in 1936. The Mods part of his degree will have given him a sense of the transmission of classical texts via manuscript sources, however, and no doubt he will have known Housman's famous description of editors clinging to a single manuscript for their readings to drunks clinging to a lamppost. Though one Oxford undergraduate, E. O. Winstedt, went to the Bodleian to look at the manuscripts of Juvenal for himself and thereby made a famous discovery, there is no record of Julian's ever having done the same. In the Museum, however, he will have benefited certainly from the long tradition of expertise in manuscript studies, and from the wide knowledge and international scholarly contacts of his colleagues. The earlier monograph on the Lindisfarne Gospels of 1923 had an introduction by Eric Millar, who retired as Keeper of Manuscripts in 1947. He also thanks Francis Wormald in particular even though, as has been said, he was no longer in the Department. His British Academy memoir of Wormald makes clear how much he felt he owed to him and expresses his affection and respect.⁵ Otherwise he was dependent on his own reading and his own first hand examination of originals. Bruce-Mitford recalls that he was impressed from the first by Julian's knowledge of matters textual and liturgical as well as codicological and palaeographical.

Julian's main debt at this stage not surprisingly was to E. A. Lowe who had begun his publication *Codices Latini Antiquiores* with a first volume on the manuscripts in the Vatican Library in 1934. The second volume on manuscripts in Great Britain and Ireland, the most important for Julian at this stage, appeared in 1935. By

⁵ 'Francis Wormald', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 61 (1976 for 1975), 523-60.

1953 *C.L.A.* had reached volume VI so that the manuscripts in France were covered, also important in that they included the manuscripts of Echternach founded by St Willibrord. Julian was later to entitle his inaugural lecture 'Palaeography since Traube' and he thereby situated himself in a line of descent, for Lowe had studied with Traube in Munich.

Thinking back to what was known of Insular palaeography in 1953 is not easy. Traube had taken the initial step of identifying some of the characteristics of the script to describe which he introduced the term 'Insular'. The term served positively to separate Irish and Anglo-Saxon from Continental scripts, but it also worked negatively by tending to avoid the issue of which manuscripts were in fact written in Ireland or by Irish scribes and which in England or by Anglo-Saxon scribes. Lowe in *C.L.A.* relied on Traube's criteria and extended them as he makes clear in the preface to volume II. And he did not hesitate to distinguish 'Irish' from 'Anglo-Saxon' or even 'Northumbrian'. Julian's work as he constantly acknowledged took *C.L.A.* as a point of departure.⁶ But he was to take the process of classification further and that was to entail many revisions and amplifications.

The work had four main aspects and all appear already in *Codex Lindisfarnensis*, though the first two are in the foreground and the second two are rather implied there than fully worked out. First came the identification of individual 'hands'. Julian made a detailed analysis of the script of the Gospels which he concluded had been written by a main hand, identifiable as Eadfrith, bishop of Lindisfarne from 698 to 721, with minor additions by 'the rubricator'. His identification of another scribe whom he argued had written two other manuscripts, the Gospels in Durham (A.II.17) and the Echternach Gospels (Paris, Latin 9389), the man he named the 'Durham/Echternach calligrapher' and whom he considered to have been probably Eadfrith's teacher, will be discussed later.

Second came the establishment of groups of manuscripts which can be ascribed to a particular scriptorium at a particular date. Julian thus isolated five groups of manuscripts ascribed to Northumbria and showed that Lindisfarne, Durham, Echternach and a fourth, Lincoln College, Oxford, Lat. 92, his first group, are

⁶ His obituary of Lowe was reprinted from the *London Times*, 11 August 1969: 'Dr. E. Lowe: expert on Latin manuscripts', *Journal of Historical Studies*, Autumn 1969, 213-15. See also 'E. A. Lowe and *Codices Latini Antiquiores*', *Scrittura e civiltà*, I (1977), 177-97.

particularly closely related. This was done on the evidence of the script, that is the appearance of the letters and the way they were formed and arranged, but also on what was beginning to be called 'codicology'. By this was meant the study of all the various physical aspects of the book, such as the way the animal skin was prepared, ruled, combined in quires and bound up. The term 'codicology' served as it were as a rallying cry for a new attitude to the manuscript book, one which was to be more comprehensive and more 'scientific'. Belgian manuscript experts centring on the Royal Library in Brussels and involved with the new periodical aptly named *Scriptorium* also used the term 'archéologie du livre' to emphasize the necessity of minute observation of the stages of a manuscript's production, including the evidence of changes of plan or later alterations or additions. The proof that Eadfrith was both artist and scribe depended, as has been said, on such evidence. The codicological approach was espoused perhaps most forcefully and persuasively by a Belgian scholar, Bob Delaissé, whose work Julian greatly admired and whom he later came to know well, especially after Delaissé came to live and work in England. Julian was always sympathetic to 'codicology', which had its own tradition in England in the work of Cockerill, Millar and others, and he many times referred to the contribution it could make. The commentary in *Codex Lindisfarnensis* is thus also exemplary in its deployment of codicology.

Discussion of individual hands and the house styles of different scriptoria inevitably led back to wider questions of origin and training. Thus already in *Codex Lindisfarnensis* Julian had to think about two overarching issues. One was the respective contribution of Irish and Anglo-Saxon scribes to the development of the Insular system of scripts. Since Lindisfarne was one of the very few Insular books whose place and date of making were established through the tenth-century colophon of Aldred the priest, it did not need to be a central issue in the Commentary *except* in terms of origins. But it did arise both in relation to the Durham and Echternach Gospels and also in relation to the Book of Durrow, which Julian and Bruce-Mitford, following Lowe, held to have been produced in Northumbria.

The other overarching question, already adumbrated in *Codex Lindisfarnensis*, concerns the development of the Insular scripts, whether Irish or Anglo-Saxon, out of the writing of the late Roman Empire. The questions raised here concern sources and continuity and also involve complicated issues of the uses different types of script were put to, the way scribes were trained, and

whether the same scribe could and did write different types of script and could be recognized doing so.

These four closely interrelated areas of enquiry continued to exercise Julian for the remainder of his scholarly career. But before tracing the way they appear and reappear in his work like a piece of four-strand Insular interlace, something more may be said to emphasize the strengths of his scholarship as contributed by his training and temperament. First, the Mods/Greats course does I believe (having done it myself) provide an exceptional training in a variety of skills. The philological side of the initial Mods course has already been mentioned as it affects textual studies. The Mods course also gives the student a sense of words, their origins and meanings. Julian wrote well with a prose style which is clear, succinct and elegant, so that it is always a pleasure to read his publications. Evelyn Waugh attributed his own consummate skill in writing the English language to the emphasis placed on translation into and out of Greek and Latin in his schooling, and the same can surely be said of Julian. In the second part of the course, Greats, historical method was taught, that is how to use sources both primary and secondary. The major emphasis was on primary sources which must be pressed for everything they may reveal. Julian mentions by name some of the outstanding Ancient Greek historians teaching in Oxford at that time, Wade-Gery, Meiggs, Andrews, as well as his own tutor Dundas.⁷ In *Codex Lindisfarnensis* the careful examination of historical sources, for example the account by Simeon of Durham of the opening of St Cuthbert's coffin, or the various sources for the later history of the community of St Cuthbert, is exemplary.

Thirdly, Greats included a training in philosophy, his Tutor at the House being J. O. Urmson. Of this Julian himself happens to say less, though he was evidently equally engaged by this part of the course.⁸ His training in philosophy as it was practised at this time in Oxford, where he was able to attend lectures by Gilbert Ryle, J. L. Austin and A. J. Ayer, is likely to have reinforced a tendency to distrust metaphysics, to embrace the specific, and to be empirical in his approach. In the paper just referred to he quotes the famous last sentence of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*, 'which', he characteristically writes, 'I sometimes think I understand': 'Wovon man nicht sprechen kann, darüber muss man schweigen.' I think there is perhaps one obverse to these qualities

⁷ 'Names of scripts', as in note 2.

⁸ The viva referred to earlier was conducted by J. L. Austin.

instilled in him by his training, but I will return to this in discussing the work on the 'Durham/Echternach' calligrapher and the Book of Kells.

In 1960 Wormald moved from the Chair in Palaeography to direct the Institute of Historical Research and Julian was appointed to succeed him, which must certainly have been a blow to the Department of Manuscripts, as is clear from a letter Schofield wrote to the Trustees at the time. Once at King's, Julian turned out to be not only a conscientious but an extremely gifted teacher, who was capable of communicating not only his learning, but also his enthusiasm for the subject. The move was undoubtedly good both for him and for palaeography in general. Whether if he had remained in the Department he would have written more is to be doubted. Certainly his teaching took up a great deal of his time. In the early 1960s he must have been especially busy preparing his courses and lectures and extending his knowledge of the script of the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance. But he would have had to devote his energies and time to answering the very large numbers of letters he received asking for advice and expertise in either job, and probably the administrative duties which he fulfilled so conscientiously at King's College would have also lain heavily on him in a different form in the Museum.

His publications followed in any case steadily, and his principles of enquiry, which he set out clearly in his inaugural lecture given in 1962, would never have allowed a flood.⁹ This lecture not only traces the history of the discipline to that point in time, but discusses recent trends and developments and clearly sets out a programme for the future. He always stressed that palaeography is 'eine unentbehrliche Hilfswissenschaft', though one that entitled the palaeographer, as he put it, 'to put one's finger in many pies'. But his view of palaeography's task was broadened and he also wrote of a much wider and more ambitious task: 'we are beginning to find that we can go behind the books to the thoughts and behaviour of men, while they are composing, copying and decorating them; and the time has come to accept that kind of knowledge as a conscious aim.'

The writing of commentaries to facsimiles of Insular manuscripts was a job into which Julian was inevitably drawn and which he no doubt welcomed as an opportunity to extend his knowledge and

⁹ 'Latin palaeography since Traube', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 3 (1963), 361-81; reprinted in *Codicologica*, Vol. 1, ed. A. Gruys & J. P. Gumbert (Leiden, 1976), pp. 58-74.

put his thoughts on paper, even though it took him away from his project of a wider synthesis. In 1969 appeared the Roxburghe Club facsimile on the Stonyhurst Gospel of St John.¹⁰ This small manuscript is written in an expert uncial script and, though without illumination, is additionally notable for its original decorated binding.

E. A. Lowe's *English Uncial* had been published in 1960 and so here too Julian was in the position of amplifying Lowe's work, rather than starting *de novo*. Lowe had finally laid to rest the earlier theory that the manuscripts written in uncial script at especially Wearmouth/Jarrow were written by Italian not English scribes. Julian concentrated on the questions of the origin of the script and its date. He made certain suggestions as to which early books acted as models in the British Isles at this date, including the Maccabees fragment still at Durham and an Augustine fragment in Paris. His examination of the historical evidence that the book had been placed in the Coffin of St Cuthbert in 698 and was that described in the sources as discovered there in 1104 led him to a characteristically thorough discussion of the use of books as amulets and of miniature script throughout the Middle Ages. He also argued from the development of its script that Stonyhurst was likely to have been written after the *Codex Amiatinus*, which has an important bearing on the date of the latter.

Also in 1969 appeared the facsimile of the Durham Ritual.¹¹ Here too the work followed on naturally from *Codex Lindisfarnensis* in which Julian had already discussed the script of the Anglo-Saxon glossator of Lindisfarne, the priest Aldred of Chester-le-Street, where the community of St Cuthbert was resident for a period in the later tenth century. Aldred had long been identified by Neil Ker and Wanley before him as being also one of the scribes of the Ritual.

In 1972 Julian published his paper on the Book of Kells, based on his Jarrow Lecture of 1971.¹² At that point some sort of consensus existed that the Book of Kells was produced at Iona *c.* 800, its decoration being interrupted by the Viking raids which

¹⁰ *The Stonyhurst Gospel of St. John* (Roxburghe Club, Oxford, 1969).

¹¹ *The Durham Ritual* (Early English manuscripts in facsimile, Vol. 16, Copenhagen, 1969), ed. T. J. Brown with contributions by F. Wormald, A. S. C. Ross, E. G. Stanley. Work had started on this in the early sixties and publication was delayed.

¹² 'Northumbria and the Book of Kells', *Anglo-Saxon England*, Vol. 1, (1972), pp. 219-46.

necessitated the community there fleeing to Kells in Ireland. This was held to account for the illumination being unfinished. That the manuscript was later at Kells is fact, proved by the insertion of charters in the twelfth century. Julian argued that so many features in the Book of Kells of both its script and decoration seemed to depend on the Lindisfarne Gospels that it could well be that it was produced both nearer in date to the Lindisfarne Gospels and nearer geographically to the island of Lindisfarne itself. He was thus prepared to consider Northumbria and also some unknown centre in Pictland as a possible place of manufacture. As usual the arguments were carefully marshalled and the evidence clearly set out.

Inevitably the conclusion, however, judiciously stated, was highly controversial, and it was unlikely that it would go unchallenged. It does not need to be said that contemporary politics have had an effect on the study of Irish art and there have been strands of nationalistic prejudice and even propaganda in at least some of the less scholarly writing on Celtic and Anglo-Saxon art. The Book of Kells, which has been reproduced on Irish stamps and a poster for Aer Lingus has become a potent national symbol. The suggestion that it was in fact made somewhere in North Britain was in the circumstances bold. Julian was very conscious of his Northumbrian links as is shown by his phrase in the preface of *Codex Lindisfarnensis*: 'on the mosses and bogs of my native Bernicia.' But as Bruce-Mitford has recently stressed it is nonsense to call him prejudiced.¹³ The conclusion is there because that was the way Julian saw the evidence pointing and he could never shrink from a controversial or unpopular opinion, if it was what he believed in. Nor is the conclusion pronounced *ex cathedra* or as if it was incontrovertible, that never being Julian's way.

I myself do not believe he was right. But if the suggestion provoked debate, as had also been a consequence of the Belgian scholar François Masai's much more polemical intervention of 1947, that was for Julian a good, even if incidental, consequence.¹⁴

¹³ R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, 'The Durham-Echternach Calligrapher', *St Cuthbert. His cult and his community*, ed. G. Bonner, D. Rollason, C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 175–188.

¹⁴ *Les origines de la miniature dite Irlandaise*, 1947. Bruce-Mitford (as in note 13) discounts the influence of Masai's book on Julian's thinking. He describes Masai as attacking positions already abandoned by up-to-date scholarship. See also C. Nordenflak, 'One hundred and fifty years of varying views on the early insular Gospel Books', *Ireland and Insular Art A. D. 500–1200*, ed. M. Ryan (Dublin, 1987), p. 3: 'Its heresy lacked the charm of novelty: it contained little that had not been already said before by Clapham, Burkitt and Lowe.'

The evidence adduced, matters such as the way in which the manuscript was planned in relation to script and decoration, has to be accounted for by those who favour a different date and a different origin.

Such a debate may take time to develop, but there are interestingly some signs that this is materializing at this moment. Here, however, it may be suggested that the classical training received by Julian, whose strengths have been stressed above, had also one possible disadvantage. It reinforces certain tendencies to value more highly whatever is considered to relate to classical art and culture. Those works which preserve the content or style of that culture are given priority and conversely there is a failure to value properly the creativity of oppositional, that is in this case Celtic achievements. To stress the debt of Kells to Lindisfarne is surely to miss what makes Kells a significant work of art *in opposition* to Lindisfarne.

The view on Kells had much to do with Julian's discovery of the 'Durham/Echternach calligrapher'. Already in *Codex Lindisfarnensis* Julian had concluded that the 'Durham/Echternach calligrapher' was the artist as well as the scribe in both books. From his background Julian was always sensitive to the decoration of manuscripts and keenly aware of art historical evidence. Here he became convinced that the Crucifixion miniature and the single surviving initial in the Durham Gospels were by the same artist as painted the four pages with Evangelist symbols and the initials in the Echternach Gospels. The inevitable consequence was that the stylization of the human figure, also seen in the Book of Durrow, which has been associated particularly with Celtic art, was still being practised in Northumbria, in fact, if Julian was right, at the same moment and in the same community where Eadfrith had produced the new synthesis of Mediterranean and Insular style in using Cassiodoran models for his Evangelist portraits.

In 1980 Julian collaborated once again with a team of scholars in the commentary accompanying another facsimile, this time of the Durham Gospels itself.¹⁵ He did not change his mind on the identity of the 'Durham/Echternach calligrapher', but restated his palaeographical evidence. Meanwhile, however, his conclusions on the attribution of the miniatures had not been accepted by art historians such as Françoise Henry and Carl Nordenfalk. For the

¹⁵ 'Palaeographical description and commentary', in C. D. Verey, T. J. Brown & E. Coatsworth, *The Durham Gospels* (Early English manuscripts in facsimile, Vol. 20, Copenhagen, 1980), pp. 36–52.

moment there is no consensus, though clearly the consequences of Julian's view are very far reaching for the history of Insular book production at this period.¹⁶ For the facsimile Dr Elizabeth Coatsworth wrote on the decoration, concentrating mainly on a different set of questions, the aspects of design, decorative sources and links with contemporary sculpture. Christopher Verey wrote on the text and the history of the manuscript. Verey had written a Durham MA on the texts of three Durham Gospels and embarked on a London Ph.D. under Julian's supervision, 'The Vulgate Gospels in Northumbria', which has not been completed.¹⁷ He had already contributed an Appendix to the Kells paper in which he reported the very important discovery that Lindisfarne and Durham have textual corrections written by the same hand and that in Durham these were written before the rubrics. This seemed to vindicate Julian's view of their relationship and their date, even if certain problems as to the relative date of the three manuscripts remain.

In 1976–7 Julian was appointed J. P. R. Lyell Reader in Bibliography in the University of Oxford. The duties of this Readership, which is held for one year, are to give five lectures, and the subject matter alternates between printed books and manuscripts. Julian must have known several years ahead of this appointment and started to plan the lectures which would give him the opportunity to attempt a wider synthesis on Insular script. He had in fact already begun on this project in two E. A. Lowe Memorial Lectures delivered at Corpus Christ College, Oxford, in 1973. Julian's Lyell lectures, like many of their predecessors and successors, have not been published, but a manuscript exists which may in future be edited or adapted for publication some other way.¹⁸ His later R. W. Chambers Memorial Lecture at University College, London in 1978, 'Tradition, Imitation and Invention in Insular Handwriting of the 7th and 8th centuries', covers some of the same ground. In the Lyell lectures

¹⁶ See Bruce-Mitford (as in note 13) responding to D. Ó Cróinín, 'Pride and prejudice', *Peritia*, I (1982), 352–62, and *idem*, 'Rath Melsigi, Willibrord and the earliest Echternach manuscripts', *Peritia*, 3 (1984), 17–49.

¹⁷ C. D. Verey, 'A collation of the Gospel texts contained in Durham Cathedral MSS. A.II.10, A.II.16 and A.II.17 and some provisional conclusions therefrom regarding the type of Vulgate text employed in Northumbria in the eighth century together with a full description of each MS.' (Durham, 1969).

¹⁸ B. Barker-Benfield, 'The Insular hand', *Times Literary Supplement*, 27 January 1978, gives a valuable account of the lectures. I am grateful to Dr Barker-Benfield for sending me a copy of this.

Julian had space to take on what I have described as the third and fourth of the preoccupations already visible in the *Codex Lindisfarnensis*, that is the origin and development of the Insular scripts, both Irish and Anglo-Saxon. This is a huge task and the lectures were extremely complex and detailed. Two papers published in 1982 and 1984 stem from Lyell material.

In the first of these Julian tried to particularize the Irish contribution and to map out the material in a more coherent way.¹⁹ Though the oldest manuscripts, for example those now at Bobbio, were included in *C.L.A.*, for the ninth century he was charting much more of a *terra incognita*, even though he was preceded by such notable palaeographers as W. M. Lindsay, Ludwig Bieler and Bernhard Bischoff. An important part of the paper concerns the question of nomenclature. The necessity of agreeing terms which would describe the variety of scripts in the Middle Ages and Renaissance had become urgent, particularly as scholars paid more attention to the later periods and especially in relation to the project of the Comité internationale de paléographie of producing illustrated catalogues of dated manuscripts.²⁰ Julian's lecture hand-outs show that he was very aware of these problems and, as Professor de la Mare has pointed out, they were extremely relevant in the teaching he was doing. Part of the students' training lay in learning to describe medieval manuscripts. It was thus essential that the students should be able to describe scripts, that is give them recognizable and accepted names.

For the Insular scripts Julian proposed the terms cursive minuscule which might vary in two opposed directions, an accelerated version to be termed 'current' and a more formal version to be termed 'set'. He also proposed going back to the earlier term 'half-uncial' which Lowe had replaced, in his view wrongly, with the term 'majuscule'. He pointed out that half-uncial is very rare in Insular manuscripts by comparison with 'hybrid minuscule', a script which admits some letters from half-uncial, the 'oc' 'a' and uncial 'd', 'n', 'r', and 's'. Within these scripts it is important to note the slant of the nib and the way it is cut.

Something very important about Julian's palaeography emerges

¹⁹ 'The Irish element in the Insular system of scripts to circa A.D. 850', *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. H. Löwe, Vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 101-19.

²⁰ Especially important was the paper by B. Bischoff, G.I. Lieftinck, G. Batelli, *Nomenclature des écritures livresques* (Paris, 1954).

here, which has not been sufficiently stressed above. He recalled Jacobsthal in the Greek sculpture classes at Oxford hissing at him: 'What do you *see*?' Julian one might say was a 'visual palaeographer' as opposed to a 'philological palaeographer'. That is to say he responded especially to the range of problems connected with the appearance of script, the letter forms and the way they are combined. In this way his work is linked to that of E. A. Lowe rather than to that of W. M. Lindsay or Neil Ker. Not that he neglected any of the questions centring on the text copied, what was the model, what errors a scribe made, what abbreviations he used, or any of the range of questions of provenance and ownership, also relevant to palaeographers, how books were catalogued, used and annotated by their readers. But his visual sense and love of script as a skill are always noticeable in his writings. This also meant that he was keenly aware of the craft of handwriting. He writes of the importance of 'ductus'.²¹ It seems likely that Edward Johnston's *Handwriting* was one of the first books he read on script; it remained on his reading lists for students, and he refers to it often.²² He maintained links with contemporary practitioners through the Society of Scribes and Illuminators, and his own handwriting was a variety of Italic, both legible and full of character.

The second paper re-examining Lyell lecture material addressed what I have called the fourth question, that of origins and the problem of whether there was continuity from Romano-British culture in Britain.²³ Julian had become fascinated by the obscure period of the fifth and sixth centuries and an earlier paper had already contained speculations on the extent to which literacy had survived, using the meagre evidence in Gildas and such other sources as exist.²⁴ His argument here is that the earliest Irish manuscripts are characterized by features which had been commonplace or standard in the Late Roman world of the fifth century, but which were modified or changed in Italy and the Mediterranean world in the sixth and seventh centuries. These

²¹ 'Names of scripts', as in note 2.

²² See also 'Irish element' (as in note 19), p. 102 n. 1: 'My analysis of scripts is based on Edward Johnston, *Formal Penmanship*, ed. Heather Child (London, 1971).'

²³ 'The oldest Irish manuscripts and their late antique background', *Irland und Europa*, ed. P. Ní Chatháin & M. Richter (Stuttgart, 1984), pp. 311–27.

²⁴ 'An historical introduction to the use of classical Latin authors in the British Isles from the fifth to the eleventh century', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 22 (Spoleto, 1975), 237–99.

included systems of quiring and ruling, and the method of preparing membrane, this last, another important topic on which he had written a paper, in 1972.²⁵ The logical deduction was that these practices existed in the British Isles before the Romans left, and that the succeeding isolation of Ireland allowed them to continue there unchanged. He also hypothesized that the cursive minuscule found in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of the eighth century was not solely a development from Continental half-uncial of the fifth and sixth centuries, but also represented a continuity from the late Roman world. There must, he argued, have been earlier Irish examples which do not survive but whose existence can be inferred from the later eighth century examples. These must have been based in turn on Late Roman and sub-Roman scripts ranging up from 'scrittura di base' and the less formal scripts used for correspondence and administration. From these early Irish examples the Anglo-Saxon scribes derived significant characteristics of their versions of the script. It should incidentally be noted that both papers stress the Irish contribution, since, as hinted earlier, Julian has been accused of a Northumbrian bias in his work. In connection with the problem of the origin of Insular minuscule Julian considered the Vatican manuscript of Paulinus of Nola particularly important. The last piece of work he was able to complete was the commentary for a facsimile of this, which has now appeared posthumously.²⁶

It can be seen from even this rapid survey of his publications that Julian, despite his many other interests and the many other calls on his time, worked steadily along a particular path. His premature death is therefore even more tragic, because over nearly forty years concentrated work he had achieved a unique familiarity with the original material which was his primary evidence. The text of the Lyell lectures, which is handwritten, shows that he still had not completed the arrangement of this material and drawn his conclusions from it in a way which finally satisfied him. It is fortunate that in the two papers just discussed and in the Chambers lecture of 1978 there are valuable statements of some of his findings. However, his death cut short a project of great importance which in a sense only he could

²⁵ 'The distribution and significance of membrane prepared in the Insular manner', *La paléographie hébraïque médiévale*, Colloques internationaux du CNRS 547 (Paris, 1974), pp. 127-35.

²⁶ *Codex Palatinus Latinus 235, Paulinus Nolanus* with T. Mackay (Armarium Codicum Insignium, Turnhout, Brepols, 1989).

complete, even if some of those taught by him will have gained a knowledge of his way of working and his insights which, one hopes, will enable them to continue his work.

Palaeography is a difficult subject to teach and Julian's skill and the commitment which he communicated so successfully to his students have already been stressed. The effort which went into his teaching finds visible expression in the variety and number of detailed hand-outs which he used.²⁷ Though most of his published work was concerned with script of the early period, he gave lectures on, for example, 'Script in Italy 12th to 16th centuries' and on 'The handwriting of manuscripts in Middle English', and he often reviewed publications on later script and illumination.²⁸ As he writes in one of the reports that have been required at such frequent intervals lately from Universities by Government and the U.G.C.: 'For his ordinary teaching, the professor at King's needs to know Western European palaeography (documentary as well as literary), codicology, illumination, book production and the history of libraries at least from the Battle of Actium in 31BC to the sack of Rome in AD 1527.' To outsiders it might seem that the subject was specialized, the students in consequence few, and the job not very onerous. In fact Julian did a great deal of direct teaching by lecture and class, and a great deal more by advice and correspondence. The same paper quantifies this as: 'Between fifty and sixty students, of whom about half are doing research for an M.Phil/Ph.D. and about half are M.A. students taking a paper in the subject, attend classes and lectures each year; the number of them coming from King's College itself seldom exceeds 15 per cent.' His class on Anglo-Saxon palaeography taught jointly with Dr Jane Roberts of the English Department of King's was a notable instance of successful collaboration. He also writes in a letter in December 1984: 'I have helped a lot of other people's students in a lot of different ways with expert advice on manuscript problems, both particular and general.' Letters to him (chosen at random from many) read: 'I hope that you will forgive me troubling you with this letter but I would be very grateful for any help you can offer on three associated palaeographic problems'; 'This is to ask if you would be kind enough to

²⁷ File copies of some of these are kept in the Palaeography Room, London University Library.

²⁸ For example 'French painting in the time of Jean de Berry: a review', *The Book Collector* (Winter 1969), 470-88 is a lengthy discussion of a purely art historical work by Millard Meiss. Note also that Julian translated J. Porcher, *French miniatures from illuminated manuscripts* (London, 1960).

provide an appropriate reference for my footnote citation.' A 'Hilfswissenschaft' indeed! Julian must often have felt that he spent more time on other people's scholarship than on his own, but he seldom showed he begrudged it.

His teaching of palaeography centred on the Palaeography Room in London University Library, which has become an international meeting place for all interested in script, illumination and the manuscript book. To the strengthening of this library which he described as 'an open-access reference library which is now possibly the best of its kind in the world', he devoted much time and energy, working closely with its scholarly librarian, Joan Gibbs. He also took a special interest in the Lambeth Palace Library on whose Committee he served from 1973 on, becoming Chairman and a Trustee in 1979. As his teaching hand-outs and the footnotes to his articles show he was both immensely learned and also up-to-date in his bibliographical knowledge.²⁹ He knew personally most of those working in the field of the manuscript book, and he took an active part in the work of the Comité international de paléographie. It was due to his initiative that the Comité met for the first and only time in London in 1984, and he undertook all the onerous administration of the conference at a time when he was already ill. It was very pleasant to see the respect and affection in which he was so obviously held by all those present, as well as his own equally obvious joy and enthusiasm on the occasion. These same responses were noticeable in the other colloquies and lectures which Julian organized, the informal classes on the history of the book held two or three times a term with invited speakers, usually graduate students with work in progress, or the more formal palaeography lectures held annually at King's College. These latter brought British and overseas scholars to London and were all part of the way in which Julian worked to make palaeography visible and respected throughout London University. The Manuscripts Committee of the Standing Committee of National and University Libraries was yet another body which has grown and prospered due in no small part to his commitment and hard work on its behalf.

The interests of his own subject as well as his own conscientious-

²⁹ He also contributed lengthy bibliographies under 'Palaeography', *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* (Cambridge, 1974), cols. 209–20 and under 'Bibliography: palaeography, diplomatic and illumination', in *Anglo-Saxon England*, Vol. 1 (1972) onwards. His contribution with E. G. Stanley and R. Barbour to *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th edn (1974), pp. 645–70, s.v. 'Calligraphy', should also be mentioned.

ness no doubt motivated Julian to play a part in administrative duties at King's College and as usual he gave unstintingly of his time and energy. He was Dean of the Faculty of Arts 1968–70 and served at different times on the General Purposes Committee, Advisory Committee on Staff, Delegacy and Finance Committee and the Accommodation Committee. His work on the King's Library Committee where he served from 1968 to 1975, being Chairman from 1969, was especially important. He was on Council from 1981. There were other University Committees, including Management Committees of the Institute of Classical Studies and the Warburg Institute and the Central Research Fund Advisory Committee 'A' of which he was Chairman from 1977–82. Another area in which he took a leading role was his support of the University archivists, through the Archives and Manuscripts Sub-Committee of the London Resources Co-ordinating Committee. When he decided after much heart searching to take early retirement in 1984, he continued to teach almost as extensively as before. His contribution to the life of the College was recalled at his Memorial Service held in the College Chapel.³⁰

Julian was made a Fellow of King's College in 1975 and awarded a D. Litt. *honoris causa* by Durham University in December 1986. Other honours and appointments included Fellowship of the Society of Antiquaries, 1956, Membership of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1966–7, Visiting Fellow, All Souls College, Oxford, 1976–7, and Fellowship of the British Academy, 1982. He was a Medieval Academy of America Visiting Professor of Palaeography at the University of Chicago in 1973 and Visiting Distinguished Professor in Medieval Studies at the University of California, Berkeley in 1976.

Julian's first marriage to Alison Dyson, now Alison Chorley, an academic scholar and teacher in the field of Italian Renaissance

³⁰ Address by the Very Revd Sydney Evans, 17 March 1987. Among obituaries (copies of most of which are kept in the Palaeography Room) mention should be made of those by Professor Sir Michael Howard, one of Julian's oldest friends, *Independent*, 28 January 1987, by Professor Andrew Watson, *The Times*, 24 January 1987, by Professor Janet Bately and Dr Jane Roberts, colleagues at King's, *Old English Newsletter*, xx/2 (Spring 1987), and by Patricia J. Methven, archivist at King's, in *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, ix/1 (1988), 59–60. Another memoir by Dr Jane Roberts will appear in *Medieval English Studies Newsletter* and in *Medieval English Studies: Past and Present*, 1990. A discussion of Julian's scholarly work with a moving tribute to him as teacher and friend, is by M. P. Brown, 'T. J. Brown, An Affectionate memoir', *Scrittura e civiltà*, 12 (1988), 305–16. This also contains a partial bibliography. I am very grateful to Michelle Brown for allowing me to read this before publication and for other help.

history, was dissolved in 1979. They had two daughters, Charlotte and Rachel. He then married Sanchia Mary David, née Blair-Leighton. In concluding an account which has concentrated on his scholarly work I am aware that I have said little of Julian personally. It should be stressed, however, that he was a person who was not only trusted and respected, but was also held in great affection by all who knew him. His blue eyes and very engaging smile were welcoming and there was no pride or pomposity about him whatever. More than one of his students have said how much his encouragement and practical help meant at crucial moments to them. He moved round London on a bicycle which was certainly prompted by practicality, but was also typical of his informality. He was a committed member of CND and this was partly prompted by a sense of responsibility as a scholar to the preservation of the artifacts whose survival, none knew better, was so precarious. A side of his activity little known to his professional colleagues at least was his writing of poetry, and here some of his more personal convictions and concerns are revealed. A volume edited by Jenny Stratford and his daughter, Charlotte, and privately printed by Sebastian Carter at the Rampant Lion Press, appeared posthumously in 1988.³¹ One of the poems was also printed in *Encounter*.³²

JONATHAN J. G. ALEXANDER

³¹ The manuscript of the poems is in the British Library, Additional 68902–3.

³² In preparing this memoir I have had the benefit of consulting Janet Backhouse, Charlotte Brown, Michelle Brown, Sanchia Brown, Rupert Bruce-Mitford, Albinia de la Mare, Patrick Gardiner, Joan Gibbs, Michael Howard, Patrick McGurk, Jane Roberts, Jenny Stratford and David Wright, to all of whom I express my thanks.