



ALAN BISHOP

Terence Alan Martyn Bishop

1907–1994

IN JANUARY OF 1980 I was rash enough to send a copy of my first published article to Alan Bishop. The letter he wrote in response deserves to be quoted in full, for it conveys much of Bishop's personality.

The Annexe, Manor House, Hemingford Grey,
Huntingdon, Cambridge PE18 9BN
28 ii 80

Dear Ganz,

Many thanks for letting me see this. It is impressively learned, and you made good use of your time in Leningrad. Scholars who are interested enough to read it will come out at the other end disposed to agree that you have identified and appreciated books from a Corbie Merovingian library and accounted for some of the source factors motives etc. which helped to create it. They will use your article as a quarry of miscellaneous information and as an authority for any particular inferences which happen to suit their own arguments. The title alone (no matter for the text) will get it into bibliographies. You should be very far from satisfied with this degree of acceptability or with anything short of a continuous command over your readers' minds. Please read your article again and ask yourself what—from one sentence to another—the best disposed reader would make of it. I suggest the following exercise.

Thesis. Find, and express in one sentence, simple or complex but not compound, an hypothesis of which the proof will take in facts and arguments relevant to your title. If what you intend to prove comprises several elements, elect a principal one and subordinate the others.

Precis. Epitomize, at the rate of one sentence per intended paragraph (this does *not* refer to your existing paragraphs), the stages of your proof. Each sentence

Proceedings of the British Academy, 111, 397–410. © The British Academy 2001.

(a) should be relevant to your thesis (b) should be provisionally acceptable—whether it expresses fact, inference, doubt or ignorance—so far as it goes (c) should neither expect nor apprehend that the reader will take into consideration anything that you have not yet cited in evidence (d) should not anticipate any evidence which requires proof but is not going to get it until a later paragraph (e) should not anticipate any argument which you intend to put forward in a later paragraph (f) should not repeat any argument nor—unless to draw new inferences from it—any fact recorded in an earlier paragraph (g) should justify its place in the sequence by its relationship to its predecessor or successor. If the result amounts to a readable specimen of prose you have found a possible way of presenting your case.

Text. Construct each paragraph by the same painful method (which can be given up, with practice in writing, but must be resorted to whenever you can't visualise each step of your way ahead). Express in crude plain words your certain probable or possible answers to or failures to answer any of the questions *quis quid ubi quibus auxiliis cur quomodo quando*. Arrange these statements in a logically consecutive order. Turn the result into syntactically consecutive prose.

Yours sincerely,
TAMB

The generous and precise advice to the young, the legal training in the treatment of evidence and the proper way to persuade a jury, the concern for logic, and the meticulous construction of an argument here displayed were the hallmarks of Alan Bishop's legacy. He was perhaps the most sharp eyed of the younger contemporaries of Richard Hunt and Neil Ker: his ability to identify the hands of individual scribes was second only to that of Albinia de la Mare, and his laconic and sometimes almost inscrutable writings transformed our understanding of the palaeography of English manuscripts. And of the importance of palaeography Bishop left his students in no doubt: 'In any society above the tribal level, before the invention of printing and means of recording voices, dialects, pronunciations and their changes, evolving languages, *script* is the most valuable index of culture and civilization, not merely literary culture, rather more important than all other archaeological artifacts put together' (unpublished Cambridge lecture).

Alan Bishop was born at Pebsham on the Sussex coast in 1907 and educated at Christ's Hospital. In 1926 he was awarded an exhibition to Keble College to read Classics. His tutors there were A. S. Owen and J. P. V. D. Balsdon, who recorded that 'he works hard and has fresh ideas'. After he was awarded a second class degree in Mods he changed to History, and was taught by J. Jolliffe, who was a university lecturer in

Medieval History, and for Economics by E. M. Hugh-Jones, (later Professor of Economics at Keele) who regarded him as 'so very feeble that he will need all his time for the job'. As an undergraduate he was elected a member of Tenmantalle, the College History Society in 1928 and read a paper on 'The English in France 1415–90'. His tutors praised him for working hard. However Neil Denholm-Young, who may have introduced him to working with manuscripts, reported that 'he works well at times but has fits of idleness'. He took Finals in 1930 and was awarded a second class honours degree.

After Keble he spent a year as a schoolmaster at Glenalmond, which had a Keble College connection. Frederick Matheson, a former Dean of Keble, was Warden of Glenalmond. On 18 May 1932 he was appointed a senior assistant in the Department of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, where his duties were to sort and hand list deeds and other manuscripts, and to catalogue manuscripts.

In December 1933 he resigned from Bodley on his appointment to a studentship at the London School of Economics, where he began a thesis on 'The Vale of York, 1086–1301' under the supervision of Eileen Power. He published articles on Manorial Demesne, edited manorial records and corresponded with Stenton and Cheney. He was an early reader of Marc Bloch on French Rural History, (Bloch had lectured at the LSE in 1934), and he occasionally reviewed for the *English Historical Review*. He supported himself working in the City of London Records Office on a salary of £7 per week.

In June 1936 he was appointed the first archivist for Westminster City Council, whose archives, chiefly parish records for the parishes in the City of Westminster, had been transferred to the Public Library Committee the previous year. (W. G. Hoskins had also applied, but Bishop was a year older and based in London.) He was appointed on a temporary basis, working in the Westminster History Department at the Buckingham Palace Road Library at a salary of £425 per annum. During his first year there were over 200 visitors. Bishop was responsible for 'the arduous task of setting in order this little-known and previously largely inaccessible mass of documents. The archives consist mainly of the records of the ecclesiastical parishes now incorporated in the city: they number upwards of 22,000 volumes or parcels, and they range in date from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century.' He then worked for the City of Westminster Archives, in St Martin's Library. It was Bishop who devised the extremely efficient system for consulting Westminster's great series of rate books, and prepared memoranda on Westminster life of the past. Those who

only knew him as a shy and laconic scholar may be surprised to discover that he gave thirteen broadcast talks entitled 'From the Archives' and was allowed to retain the fees received. Sadly the talks do not survive, but the Report of the Public Libraries Committee for 1936–7 may preserve a fragment: 'It is strange to note what curious crumbs and scraps of information such humdrum ledgers yield when the names entered therein are those of famous men. For many men famed in English history have in their day lived at Westminster. Even the great Oliver Cromwell meekly paid his rates to a Westminster rate-collector, and the dread Lord Protector's name is down in the book side by side with Jack Noakes and Tom Styles. . . . Even in our own times street names are changed, and the old names soon forgotten, but in the extensive rebuilding that took place at the end of the nineteenth century many hundreds of small streets and courts disappeared, and have left no trace but in old maps and the entries in these faded muster rolls. But between Anne and Victoria much, if not most, of English literature and art came from the alleys and courts of old Westminster, and their half-forgotten names are fragrant with memories of the famous men and women who walked and worked there.'

On 28 January 1937 he was admitted to read law at the Middle Temple, and remained proud of his dining rights there. He enlisted on 15 December 1939, but as a permanent officer of Westminster Council he was able to keep his civil pay, in addition to his army pay. In 1940 he became a second lieutenant in the Royal Artillery, and in 1944 a Captain, serving in West Africa. After the war he returned to Westminster, but in April 1946 he was appointed college lecturer in Medieval History at Balliol College for one year, replacing R. W. Southern. A later lecture on 'Old English Lordship: Factors in Social Depression' reveals Bishop the historian 'A weak central government cannot protect the underprivileged against the local boss. The problem of political power was perhaps temporarily solved under Cnut. At an enormous cost, that of the Danegeld, he employed Danish and English housecarls. But they remained apparently a salariat.'

In 1947 he moved from Oxford to the newly created Readership in Palaeography and Diplomatic at Cambridge, which he held until 1973. His first palaeography class, held in the Music School, began with eight students including C. R. Dodwell and Ian Doyle. They used the plates from Steffens, *Lateinische Palaeographie*, as Lowe had done in Oxford, but by the end of the term he had only got to Merovingian cursive, and had lost all but one of his students. He complained to friends that few students attended his lectures.

The classes on script were meticulously prepared: he had large cards with drawings of ligatures and abbreviations. David Luscombe recalls that ‘He taught the new medievalist research students between Mill Lane and Silver Street in Faculty Rooms in the little lane. There were four of us: Michael Kelly who wrote a Ph.D. on William Wareham; Jim Laidlaw who wrote a Ph.D. on Alain Chartier, Keith Egan, whose Ph.D. was on the Carmelite order in England, and myself, working on Abelard and the twelfth century. Bishop gave two courses, one on the *History of Latin Handwriting*, and the other *Aids to Reading*. The problem with the first course was that it did not remotely come near to the periods in which any of us was commencing research. The problem with the latter was that, although Bishop displayed cards containing abbreviations and asked us to work out what they represented, he did not set any practical work that enabled us to practice transcription. He was a rum sort of character, impenetrable, remote, even though we were five round a table; no gossip or small talk at all. I don’t think we were ever put before a manuscript.’ Jonathan Riley Smith recalls Bishop lecturing at 12 but exhausted at 12.50, dashing off for a glass of beer and a look at his copy of the *Racing Times* before going to place a bet. But he also taught codicology to two students in the university library ‘which entailed sitting beside TAMB in the UL while he talked us through the structure, layout, copying scheme etc. etc. of MS after MS’. Rosamond McKitterick reveals his vision when she recalled that ‘The course on the history of the development of Latin script he gave was to my mind the clearest guide to the historical development of letter forms I heard precisely because that attention to the letter forms and their development was so clearly connected. Listening to him as he provided an exposition of what kind of exemplar a scribe may have worked from was a revelation.’

His formal lectures can be reconstructed from notebooks and from the Cambridge lecture lists. Their painstakingly constructed prose deserves quotation: ‘It has been suggested that the hand of any given scribe witnesses an extrinsic object, which he copied: the presumption is not, of course, universally valid: it would suppose that no MS ever shows the hand of an author, an original commentator, a textual critic, an emendator.’ In 1970–1 and 1973 he lectured in Middle English palaeography.

In a letter to Julian Brown he admitted ‘I am quite fond of my classes.’

Sadly his teaching in Cambridge was undervalued. The Faculty had hoped for an economic historian, and did not grasp the merits of a palaeographer. In a letter of 21 May 1965 to Lieftinck, Bishop describes himself as ‘under very disagreeable and disquieting pressure to prepare

and give lectures on Constitutional and Economic History'. In the late 1960s the History Faculty had recommended that his readership be not re-filled. A letter from Edward Norman, secretary to the Faculty Board in 1971 reveals that the General Board had refused requests for an annual grant of 20 pounds to be spent on providing materials for the study of palaeography. Bishop had arrived in Cambridge assuming that he would receive a college fellowship, or at least dining rights. His situation made him even more of a loner, but a most helpful loner. In his study of Anglo-Saxon punctuation Peter Clemoes thanked him for advice. E. A. Lowe asked for information about Cambridge and Leningrad manuscripts. (Lowe never visited Russia, and the entries in *Codices Latin Antiquiores*, I–XI and Supplement (Oxford 1934–71) depend heavily on the work of others.) Marjorie Chibnall recalls asking him for his opinion about the identification of hands in two manuscripts in Paris which she had reason to believe to be the work of Orderic Vitalis. He spent a day studying the scripts, and the following morning explained why he thought both manuscripts to be the work of the same hand.

As Reader he and Pierre Chaplais together published a volume of Facsimiles of English Royal Writs to 1100, which was presented to V. H. Galbraith. They realised that analysis of the activities of chancery scribes offered a means of reconstructing the minutiae of royal administration. College archives were combed for early charters. Bishop recognised that charter scribes might also be found in manuscripts and made himself master of the early manuscripts in the various Cambridge collections. An unrivalled knowledge of the hands in Cambridge manuscripts enabled him to identify individual scribes and so to group manuscripts. He had identified over 150 scribal hands in manuscripts copied between 1066 and 1166, and was able to identify a Psalter leaf in Wearmouth-Jarrow uncial which had eluded E. A. Lowe. His classical training was not forgotten, laconic notes on the manuscripts of Persius, Statius, Martianus Capella, and Pelagius explored textual families and led to supremely subtle investigations of the textual tradition of Aethicus and of John the Scot's Periphyseon. His papers contain the extensive collations which preceded his terse and authoritative pronouncements. When Professor R. H. Rodgers was working on the St Denis manuscript of Palladius (Cambridge CUL Kk 5 16) for his Teubner edition, Bishop provided help.

Bishop's major study of the twelfth-century English royal chancery, *Scriptores Regis* was published in 1961. Sadly Oxford University Press decided that Bishop's original text was too long, and he was asked to cut it down. But his originality and his achievement were recognised by his

peers. Letters to Bishop praise the book: ‘which I have found valuable beyond rubies’ H. Cronne (who had been lecturer in Palaeography at King’s College London;) ‘It is a splendid book and to have achieved a list of 785+68 documents is in itself a real achievement, considering the wide dispersal of charters. But to have made as much sense of them as you have made is something more than that’ Neil Ker, 2 April 1961; ‘You’ve made the first real step forward since Delisle’s charters of Henry II and dear old Salter’s photographs’ V. H. Galbraith; ‘Its historical implications are tremendous, and it makes all the difference in the world not only to work like the *Regesta*, but also to one’s conception of the administrative history of the twelfth century’ R. H. C. Davis, 20 Feb. 1961; ‘It cannot be too highly praised’ Pierre Chaplais.

Subsequent publications would concentrate on the palaeography of manuscripts, though Bishop, believing that many charters were copied by their recipients, was always aware that documents could provide essential evidence for dating and localization of hands. A letter to Richard Hunt emphasises how he worked ‘I should not venture to identify—or distinguish—the hand of any individual without making a sustained attempt to imitate some specimen of it.’ He advised Rutherford Aris, a distinguished chemist on research leave in Cambridge, ‘It is best to imitate forms with a sharp hard pencil, outlining thickened strokes and noting especially how the pen turns curves’ and urged him ‘to exaggerate not soften any changes of direction and thickenings of stroke’ He saw script in terms of individual hands, rather than types of script, and here he may have been in advance of many of his contemporaries. But his skills were hard to teach, in a letter to Neil Ker he acknowledged the difficulty ‘The moral is that I shall have to work out and publish a full dress theory of handwriting identification’.

His *Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts* published in the Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society were the first attempt to isolate the scribes of Anglo-Norman and Anglo-Saxon houses. The *Notes* strive for an aphoristic prose, as for example:

There is of course a wide potential difference between the best and worst handwriting of any scribe, the identity is affirmed as certain, but to explain the quality of his script in the mortuary roll and the fact that he used a badly cut pen, it is necessary to invoke the palaeographical law which relates the external to the internal features of a M.S. and to reconstruct the scribe’s mental attitude towards the work in hand.

In a calligraphic form the Caroline minuscule, which of its nature taxes to their limits the scribe’s resources and compels him to find his own personal solutions

to its problems, offers special difficulties to the production of a M.S. de luxe by closely collaborating scribes.

Until the Gothic minuscule (including some transitional styles) was devised as a quasi-mechanical method of overcoming the difficulties of calligraphy and of reducing scribes to a common level, the good scribe—always rare—seems to have been heavily exploited.

His style was deliberate, as he wrote to Ker:

I like a form which lets me isolate original contribution with the bare minimum of references to the learning accumulating around every important manuscript.

Publication of the *Notes* often left his readers thirsty for more. His identifications of scribal hands depended on his own meticulous analyses of the letterforms used. The letterforms of each scribe in a manuscript were meticulously recorded on a system of index cards. But readers should be aware that on 18 January 1972 he wrote to Julian Brown ‘There is a good deal of error, you know, in my CBST [Cambridge Bibliographical Society Transactions] pieces.’ Brown encouraged Bishop to present his conclusions about English Caroline minuscule in a series of Palaeography lectures in London, and Richard Hunt managed to persuade him to publish them. The opening of the first lecture, laid out in Bishop’s characteristic manner to guide him in his reading, displays his command of the material:

After the earliest revival of vernacular and Latin literacy in England
in the late ninth century
the degenerate Anglo Saxon minuscule
gave way to a new and at first experimental script
If the scribes ignored the continental script and in devising the Square minuscule
were to some extent influenced by the Anglo Saxon majuscule
written in a greater age of English learning
the fact suggests that their models and exemplars
had survived in England from that age
The suggestion is not immediately contradicted
by the majority of the authors and titles translated, or copied in Latin
in the late ninth and early tenth century.

English Caroline Minuscule was published in the series of Oxford Palaeographical Handbooks in 1971 and has been quoted an authority for the localisation of tenth- and eleventh-century English manuscripts ever since. Based on examination of some 200 manuscripts Bishop distinguished two well differentiated styles in English Caroline, and linked them to Abingdon and to Canterbury. He surveyed the development of the

script, making telling observations about the low level of Latin learning in England. ‘Intellectual curiosity and Anglo-Latin letters (were) alive but hardly flourishing.’ It is generally true of developing scripts that they grow artificial and ornate. Reviews recognised the merits of the work, and regretted that it was so concise: Reviewing the volume in *Medium Aevum*, 1973, Ludwig Bieler expressed an enduring view ‘It has left me with the wish for an enlarged edition’, and P-M. Bogaert in the *Revue Bénédictine*, 1972 ‘il est des livres qui ne peuvent se résumer, mais qu’il faut étudier’. V. H. Galbraith in a letter of 9 January 1972 best conveys the pleasure that the book still gives. ‘Merely to browse on it soothes and cheers the mind. I rejoice to find how you seem to love its sheer beauty, but with the difference that you have understood its development. A long life has taught me that your sort of expertise is the rarest in the whole of scholarship. Delisle had it beyond question.’

The work on English Caroline Minuscule led Bishop to search for the continental model for that script, and to his final project, the study of the script of Corbie. Corbie had been the training ground of palaeographers since Mabillon. Delisle had published a study of named scribes and of the identifiable volumes in the medieval catalogues, Traube worked on the ab script, which had previously been called Lombardic and Paul Liebaert worked on the earliest scripts before his untimely death. Bishop’s work was presented in his Lyell lectures in 1975, and showed his command of the manuscripts and their production. In April 1965 E. A. Lowe wrote ‘the “Script of Corbie” is a project worth tackling, especially by one who has already . . . a whiff of powder in his palaeographical nostrils on our champs de bataille and Good luck to you!’

In 1967 Bishop received ‘the first sabbatical leave that I have ventured to claim’, and asked Lowe for a reference enclosing his programme in an effort to persuade the Treasury to provide him with a full allowance at a time when currency restrictions impeded continental travel. Lowe thanked him for his hard work on Leningrad MSS with detailed examinations of their ruling and pricking, and for his investigation of the hand of Ingreus, the scribe named at the end of St Petersburg F. v I 6. In 1973 he wrote to Julian Brown ‘I have been ill-advised enough to get interested in the AB and there has been nothing for it but to separate and identify the scribes (about 70).’

In 1975 he gave the Lyell Lectures in Oxford, which he planned to publish as a monograph on *The Scripts of Corbie c.775–c.875*. With the help of Bernhard Bischoff he had identified about 250 MSS containing Corbie script. The plan of his monograph survives, along with the text of

the lectures. It is clear that his study would have been a very different work, as he wrote: ‘Lectures addressed to a senior and learned audience (not undergraduates) are not called upon to cover the ground. Covering the ground is not achieved by the procedure—forensic, quasi-dramatic, fragmenting and dispersing and largely neglecting palaeographical routine—which was used to make the lectures supportable as lectures.’ The plan for the book was set out for his publishers as follows:

a Sources

Stages of Development

Pre-Caroline (*c.*750–*c.*800)

a Uncial and half uncial

b Pre-Caroline minuscule the Corbie ena script and other highly developed minuscules.

a) Earlier Caroline minuscule

earliest Caroline minuscule of Corbie

b) The Maudramnus type strongly characteristic house style present in about 60 mss of *c.*775–820

c) ordinary Caroline minuscule (Lowe)

The Corbie a–b (*c.*780–810) a highly developed non-Caroline minuscule, identified in 32 MSS and fragments, written in an ordered but alien and collaborating Corbie scriptorium

Traditional minuscule of Corbie (*c.*810–*c.*850)

Later Caroline minuscule *c.*840–880

some additional evidence for the later date as a distinct term to the activity of the scriptorium)

appears in more than 100 mss

60 plates, with opposing descriptions of MSS and some part-transcriptions.

Bishop’s work on Corbie would have been the fullest study of a Carolingian scriptorium. His three preliminary articles, on the script of Corbie, the *Liber Glossarum*, and the ab scriptorium set markers for future work. Because the lectures have not been published, it is worth quoting some of the more important sections at some length, laid out as he insisted to aid their delivery: They opened as follows:

Lyell lectures 1

The script of Corbie near Amiens

an abbey which was governed at first by a rule founded on the Benedictine and eventually conformed to it

the remains of the Corbie library

now in Amiens Leningrad and the Bibliotheque Nationale mostly include strays in many other modern repositories

Delisle and other scholars have traced its devolution

a major event was the transfer in 1638 of some hundreds of books to St Germain

where scholars used them in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries
 the Germanensis of a conspectus codicum as often as not turns out to be a
 former Corbiensis

Provenance is a clue to origin but not a proof of it
 Not all written at Corbie the remains of its library
 are far from comprising all the extant manuscripts that were written there
 Professor Bernhard Bischoff has identified Corbie-written manuscripts
 in collections all over Europe
 greatly enlarging the sources already large
 for the history of the Corbie scriptorium
 Something of its history in the Carolingian renaissance will take in a distinct
 episode of intense activity
 in the middle and third quarter of the ninth century
 and an episode less distinct of activity perhaps not less intense
 in the last quarter of the eighth century and the early years of the ninth
 it begins with a small group of manuscripts
 not all certainly dated or attributed
 monuments of the celebrated script which is known
 from the probable origin of some the supposed origin of all examples
 and from characteristically formed letters
 as the Corbie a–b.

perfectly legible which no script can be that is not well designed
 and learned and executed with some difficulty
 the a–b is for the executant perhaps the most impracticably difficult Latin script
 that was ever devised
 More difficult to write correctly than the Caroline
 because of the many rules
 it is even more difficult to write well
 it uses a greater variety of component strokes
 Only partly as a result of these graphic resources
 the letter forms are perfectly distinct
 and they are far from being limited to one for each letter of the alphabet
 they are subtly or decisively modified by their positions in words
 and by their juxtapositions in quasi-ligatures
 Of true ligatures the range is not very wide
 and they are not very freely used.

the creation of a single artist
 having an extraordinarily comprehensive vision of what might be achieved
 governing a highly disciplined school
 and resolved that they should learn to write the hard way

There is given to some palaeographers
 to Delisle and Lowe and Bischoff
 the ability acquired in vast experience
 to take in and appreciate all the heterogeneous features
 that attribute a manuscript on the evidence of its generic style

something of this its exercise limited to a single scriptorium
is acquired in the laborious identification of individual scribes.

The lectures contained important maxims; the distilled learning of a distinguished teacher

Lyell lecture 4.

The problem of dating undated manuscripts is affected by the rule that they are not to be dated, by the mere evidence of style and aspect, more closely than to the nearest quarter on the nearest third of a century.

Lyell lecture 5

It is perfectly evident that many of the scribes took a normal satisfaction in the exercise of an advanced manual skill.

in Gospel books in particular scribes are seen cultivating a well tilled field they preserve the codicological structure evolved in generations of experience they refine and elaborate the script and ornament of predecessors up to and sometimes beyond the point of mannerism and artificiality.

From unknown sources a great number of exemplaria might seem to have been procured perhaps borrowed
The adaptable system of collaboration by temporary syndicates of scribes seems calculated to achieve what in other scriptoria
larger numbers of collaborating scribes are sometimes seen doing for single exemplaria
that is expeditious copying and return.

It is the fate of palaeographers to look at far more than they can hope or read or can pretend to have read.

In the expanding commerce of the Carolingian renaissance there was no future for house-scripts.

The treatment of the autograph of John the Scot in the fourth lecture deserves particular attention. Ludwig Traube had remarked on the annotations in manuscripts of John's *Periphyseon* in Bamberg and Reims, and ascribed their distinctive Irish script to John himself. But Traube's pupil E. K. Rand recognised that there were two separate scribes involved. Bischoff had suggested that one of these was indeed John, but Bishop had doubts. In July 1975, at a conference on John the Scot held in Laon, he presented his conclusions based on the text of the annotations in all of the manuscripts involved and Bischoff was the first to express his admiration.

Bishop was not elected to a college fellowship, and was happiest living from 1966 as a tenant in the Norman manor at Hemingford Grey near Huntingdon, where he featured in one of the children's books about the house written by his landlady, Lucy Boston, and was able to indulge his

passions for gardening, especially strawberries, and for riding. His photographs of his carrots, beans, and peas survive. A hunting man, he rode with the East Essex Hunt Club from 1950 to 1973.

Though a profoundly shy man he enjoyed invitations to lecture, and at Durham he was superb. At an Oxford dinner given during the Lyell lectures, when a graduate asked him brightly about Palaeography in Cambridge he turned to her and replied 'I've killed it.' This bluntness was characteristic: Eduard Jeaneau recalls being told that all Englishmen were unbelievers. Bishop enjoyed the Beachcomber column in the *Daily Express*, and was a prodigious reader of detective stories. He also read and reread European fiction, revering Balzac and Henry James, and was glad to be reminded of Stendhal's visit to the library at Wolfenbuetel when exploring the codicology of a Corbie manuscript in that collection.

As he grew more deaf he was less active, and his shyness extended to a reluctance to answer letters, going so far as to write 'Gone Away' in an unmistakable hand on those letters he had decided to return unopened. He moved from Hemingford Grey to Wimbledon, but the London of the 1980s was no longer the city he had known. He still worked on, extensive collations survive for a monograph on Trinity College B 10 5 for *Armarium Codicum Insignium* which he hoped to publish in the late 1980s. Yet his working conditions were far from comfortable, and in letters he described mislaid notes and photographs. Alone and unvisited, his work on Corbie and on the Trinity Pelagius gradually came to a stop.

Bishop was a very shy man, made more withdrawn as he became deafer, but when he felt that he had an attentive audience he was eloquent and full of advice. He was generous to young scholars, and very ready to encourage them, urging them to model their style on Gibbon or Macaulay, sadly without success. He told me to read Buffon on style, and urged me to tape lectures before they were delivered so that each word would tell. David Dumville has written, 'I should acknowledge at once the inspiration which Mr. Bishop provided' and has developed Bishop's suggestions about the importance of Welsh and Breton manuscripts, and the nature of square minuscule script. Michael Gullick, Richard Gameson, and Tessa Webber have followed his and Ker's lead in attributing Anglo-Norman manuscripts to particular scribes or scriptoria. But it was Lucy Boston who best described him reading a manuscript 'his face grew brilliant, as if he were drinking champagne': *An Enemy at Green Knowe* (1964).

Alan Bishop was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 1971. His sponsor was R. W. Hunt supported by the distinguished medievalists

Francis Wormald, Dorothy Whitelock, E. M. Carus-Wilson, R. W. Southern, and Christopher Cheney. The citation reads in part: ‘He has done distinguished work in three fields, economic history, diplomatic, and palaeography. In none of these is his output large, but in all three it is important not only for its quality but for the way in which it has opened up new lines of work for others. His papers on economic history have been described as seminal. . . .’ He died on 29 March 1994.

DAVID GANZ

King’s College, London

Note. I first met Alan Bishop in 1976, and my account depends on generous assistance from others. Malcolm Parkes has provided documentation of Bishop’s Keble career. Steven Tomlinson searched for records of his duties in the Bodleian, and Elizabeth Cory traced his career at Westminster. Pierre Chaplais, Marjorie Chibnall, and Joan Gibbs supplied memories. Simon Keynes, David Luscombe, Rosamond McKitterick, Jonathan Riley Smith, and David D’Avray told me about his teaching in Cambridge, and Rutherford Aris kindly passed on his letters from Bishop about Pembroke College Cambridge 308. Edouard Jeaneau sent recollections and letters from Bishop about John the Scot. For Bishop in literature see L. M. Boston, *An Enemy at Green Knowe*. Patrick Zutshi allowed me to consult T. A. M. Bishop’s papers, now on deposit in Cambridge University Library.

