Photograph by Lafayette

JOHN HAROLD CLAPHAM

SIR JOHN HAROLD CLAPHAM

1873–1946

SEVERAL hill-villages in different parts of England have given the surname 'Clapham' to families which originated in them, but in all probability our late President derived it from the most beautiful of them, which lies under the windy slopes of Ingleborough in Yorkshire, near the Westmorland border. In the year of Queen Victoria's accession his grandfather, Thomas Clapham, was farming within a long day's walk from there, at Birstall in the West Riding. According to tradition, his farm-house, Oakwell Hall, was the original of Field Head, the home of Shirley Keeldar in Charlotte Brontë's novel. From it John Clapham, the son of Thomas, betook himself at the age of fifteen to the neighbouring town of Bradford, where he found employment with a jeweller. His choice of occupation was fortunate, for he had 'the jeweller's eye', a fine perception of the precious goods he handled. At nineteen he moved to Manchester to work with a firm of jewellers and silversmiths of which subsequently he became the head. He married the daughter of Thomas Chambers, a small-ware manufacturer, by whom he had two sons and seven daughters.[1] After her death he married her sister Mary Anne Chambers, and by her had two sons and a daughter. John Harold, the youngest son, was born on 13 September 1873.

Thomas Clapham was not only successful in business; he was very well read in English literature, and in his Bradford days he had become a Methodist. It was, therefore, natural that he should send his sons to the Leys School, Cambridge. The Leys was founded in 1875, shortly after the abolition of religious tests in the older universities, by Wesleyan Methodists, and in intimate connexion with their conference, whose chairman was *ex-officio* chairman of the governors. It aimed at bringing Methodists more fully into the main currents of English education, from which the old exclusions had separated them. By 1887, when Clapham went there, it was prospering. The headmaster was W. F. Moulton, the biblical scholar, from whom no doubt Clapham acquired the interest in Old- and New-Testament studies which he retained all his life. Moulton was not

[1] Of these, one son and four daughters died in infancy.

himself a Cambridge graduate, but he was an eminent Cambridge figure. He had worked in close association with some of the best Cambridge scholars as a reviser of the New Testament, and he was the brother of an outstanding Senior Wrangler, who was later Lord Moulton, the judge. In things more immediately concerning the boys the school had been equally successful. They numbered about 150 and they had an unusually informative school magazine, *The Leys Fortnightly*, in which many of Clapham's doings are recorded. He went steadily up the school, and was good at games as well as work. Tall, strongly built, and energetic, he played for the school at rugby football, cricket, and lacrosse, and he came in second in the Public Schools quarter-mile. In the end he was senior prefect. Later in life he served the school as a governor and one of his sisters was married to Dr. Barber, who became headmaster. In some of the entries in the school magazine the man we knew can be recognized. The cricket correspondent describes him as a very stiff bat, but a safe catch in the field. He gives the literary society his views on John Ruskin, and is not a convert to the great man's economic ideas.

Before the end of his school-days Cambridge had taken possession of Clapham for good. He decided not to go into business, for which also he was well fitted, but to follow a literary or academic career, and, although his classical work was competent, he chose history as his subject. At that time the Leys School had special links with King's College. The headmaster's son, James Hope Moulton, the classical and Persian scholar, who had himself been a master at the school, held a fellowship at King's from 1888 to 1894. Among the old Leysians who went up to King's in these years there were at least two who afterwards became historians, the late Walford Davies Green and Mr. W. F. Reddaway, who is now the doyen of the Cambridge historical faculty; so that when Clapham went up with a history exhibition in 1892, he was still within a mile of his old school and in touch with his friends.

As an undergraduate he went steadily forward in the ways he had begun at school. He still played cricket, and at rugby, although he did not play for the university, he was good enough to play against it for the Old Leysians and other teams. In 1894 he was elected to a scholarship and in the following year he took a first class in the Historical Tripos. It was in June of that year that Lord Acton gave his famous inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History, so that Clapham had already

taken his degree when he attended Acton's courses of lectures. He won the Lightfoot Scholarship in ecclesiastical history in 1896; and in the next year he won the Prince Consort Prize with an essay on the causes of the war of 1792. Both the subject and the treatment show Acton's influence, and in the same year, after a letter of recommendation from Acton, the *English Historical Review* published the first of Clapham's many contributions. In this he examined a series of letters of the French revolutionary period, and assigned them to their place, a low place, as historical authorities. Both in the essay, which was published later, and in this article Clapham showed that he was already a well-equipped historian. He had brought his French and German up to the requisite pitch by stays in Paris and Göttingen. His style was clear, terse, and forcible and he handled his materials with a mature and characteristic firmness. It is not surprising that, in 1898, when he put in the essay as his dissertation he was elected into a fellowship at King's.

The ten years he spent at King's as an undergraduate and a young graduate formed in many ways a single period in his life. One thing that distinguished the later years from the earlier was that, like so many other Cambridge residents, he took up mountaineering, in which he learned much from his tutor, Alfred Cooke. He became a keen member of the Alpine Club and ultimately, greatly to his satisfaction, a Vice-President. For nearly forty years after he took his degree, climbing holidays in the Alps or Cumberland were his greatest enjoyment, and more than an enjoyment.[1] He began to lecture on historical subjects, and those who remember the magisterial gusto of his lecturing manner in later years, when he was one of the best of all historical lecturers, may be surprised to learn that at first he had to overcome a visible diffidence. He also practised another kind of speaking: 'In accordance with the traditions of his family and school, he acted as a lay preacher, at first in Methodist and later in Anglican pulpits, a training which helped to make him a ready and impressive speaker.'[2] There do not seem to have been any sharp or startling changes in his opinions or interests; but another personal influence on his historical work gradually became stronger than that of Lord Acton. As early

[1] He contributed a number of articles to the *Alpine Journal*. The last of these, entitled 'How it all began', in vol. liv (1943), traces the effect of hills and mountains on his imagination from childhood to his first regular climbs, and has considerable autobiographical interest.

[2] *The Times*, 30 March 1946.

as 1897 Alfred Marshall, the economist, wrote a prophetic letter to Acton:

> I feel that the absence of any tolerable account of the economic development of England in the last century and a half is a disgrace to the land, and a grievous hindrance to the right understanding of the economic problems of our time. London and Cambridge are the only places where the work is likely to be done well; but till recently the man for the work had not appeared. But now I think the man is in sight. Clapham has more analytic faculty than any thorough historian whom I have ever taught; his future work is I think still uncertain; a little force would I think turn him this way or that. If you could turn him towards XVIII or XIX century economic history economists would ever be grateful to you. . . . If he works at anything but recent economic history he will disobey Babbage's canon that every one should do that work for which all his best faculties are wanted and no other.[1]

Every sentence of this letter deserves a commentary, but much of what the commentator would say is implicit in the subsequent course of Clapham's life. Long afterwards his greatest book appeared with a dedication to the memory of Alfred Marshall and William Cunningham, and he wrote in the preface: 'I have ventured with the consent of those entitled to give it, to dedicate this volume to the memory of two Cambridge scholars of very different temper and outlook. One of them told me twenty-five years ago, that it was my business to write something of the sort. The other first taught me Economic History.'[2] Archdeacon Cunningham, although Clapham always spoke of him with respect, was completely unlike him in his cast of mind and his political sympathies; it was Marshall, with his liberal principles, and his mathematician's ideas of method who turned the younger man towards economic subjects. For a time Clapham worked for Marshall, correcting the papers written by undergraduates who attended Marshall's lectures. About the time when Lord Acton died Clapham seems to have reached a conditional acquiescence in the plan Marshall had proposed: looking back on this stage of his life he wrote, 'Nearly thirty

[1] This extract was printed by Professor H. Butterfield in his obituary notice in *Cambridge Historical Journal*, vol. viii (1946), p. 115. The same number contains a bibliography of Clapham's historical works.

[2] *An Economic History of Modern Britain*, vol. i: the preface is dated 13 September 1926. In his inaugural lecture, *The Study of Economic History* (1929), p. 8, Clapham wrote of Marshall: 'Long ago he pointed out to me tracts of economic history which needed someone's work. Then he pointed at me and said—"Thou art the man". I hesitated then, for Acton's power was on me, as I hope it still is. But Marshall has prevailed.'

years ago I decided to shift into economic history for twenty years—if I were allowed—and to begin at 50 to built up some part of history on its economic frame. However there came interruptions and digressions into other fields and now I am afraid I shall not have years, learning and vigour for the work when (as they say "and if") I complete my present economic programme.'[1]

Few men were in fact less diverted than he was by interruptions and accidents; he always had an exceptional power of planning the use of his time by the day or by the decade. Almost the only critical decision he ever had to make about his working plans came at this stage, when he was invited in 1902 to become Professor of Economics at the Yorkshire College in Leeds. He was reluctant to go. Until this time most of his interests had seemed inseparable from Cambridge; but the economic teaching there was still on a very small scale, and the historical work of his own college was provided for, with no prospect of a vacancy. He went to Leeds and spent six years there, to his own and the general advantage. The Yorkshire College, a college of the old federal Victoria University, was on the point of being raised to the status of the University of Leeds, and he took a large share in the administrative work of this transformation. He acted as Honorary Librarian. He discharged his teaching duties with his accustomed thoroughness and success, but they were not heavy, and in the business community around him he found the stimulus and the subject-matter which set him to the kind of writing that suited him best. He made friends among the business men, especially the employers of labour, and he wrote a number of articles connecting their current preoccupations, such as that over 'tariff reform', with economics and history. Leeds is a city of many and various industries, but he concentrated on that which had first made it famous, the working of wool. In 1907 he published a short book *The Woollen and Worsted Industries*, 'a sketch, not a fully finished picture', in which he made 'no attempt to deal with any but the most recent history, except where the past throws direct light on the facts of the present'. Although it is not primarily historical it could not have been written except by an historian with an orderly mind. It describes the processes and organization of the industries, and pays some attention to their needs and problems. It does not openly display the analytic faculty of which Marshall had written. Its tone in dealing with problems

[1] Letter to the present writer dated 9 February 1930.

is on the whole optimistic and robust, in contrast with the questionings and lamentations which were common then among both tariff reformers and socialists. It makes much use of the available statistics, and points out their limitations. It includes a survey of the same industries in foreign countries, especially France. On almost every page it shows a quality that was important in all Clapham's economic work: his vivid imagination of physical facts, such as those of maps and of technical processes. His memory, which was good all round, was superlatively good at retaining such things as these, a gift comparable with the 'jeweller's eye', or perhaps akin to it.

The most important event of Clapham's stay in Leeds was his marriage, in 1905, to Miss Margaret Green, who happened to be working there in the office of the Yorkshire Ladies' Council of Education, but came from the more gracious environment of Ross-on-Wye, in Herefordshire. Three years after their marriage there came an invitation to return to Cambridge: Oscar Browning, the senior member of the historical staff, was leaving King's, and the college took the opportunity of recalling Clapham. In Cambridge, therefore, he spent almost the whole of his married life, at first in Bateman Street, and, after a few years, in the house that he built, naming it Storey's End, for the straightforward reason that it is the last house in Storey's Way. In position it stands as well as a house in the levels of Cambridge can—he used to boast that the fifty-foot contour-line ran through the garden—and, as might be expected of him, it is a good house, well designed and solidly built. The high yew hedge that shuts it off from the road and the arable field below was his own especial care: as long as he lived no other hand than his ever touched it with the shears. In this happy and hospitable home his four children grew up, a son and three daughters. One incident from their earlier family life, in the Bateman Street days, is recorded in print. He was far away on a climbing expedition in Switzerland when, in the first light of an August morning, his wife saw his figure standing in the room and his little daughter then saw him mowing the lawn outside. Not everyone would have judged the apparition as summarily as he did: 'Its main interest is that my appearance had no significance.'[1]

Returning to King's meant coming back to historic beauty and dignity, to old friends, to observances and amenities all of which he greatly valued. Coming back at that time meant

[1] *Society for Psychical Research. Journal*, vol. xiv (1909–10), pp. 380–2.

rejoining the life of the college when it was entering on a period of memorable brilliance. During Clapham's absence his friend Montague James had become Provost. Among the forty-eight Fellows were many distinguished scholars and scientists, several of them specially fitted by their studies to appreciate his work and discuss it with him. There was Professor Pigou, Marshall's successor; the Bursar, Corbett, was learned in agrarian history; Bury and Lowes Dickinson, Sorley, F. E. Hutchinson, who was one of the chaplains, his old schoolfellows Reddaway and Sir Joseph Barcroft, all had interests which touched his at one point or another. It was a society in which the dons were freely accessible to their juniors, and there were younger men coming on in Michaelmas Term 1908 whose names will long be remembered. Among the scholars who were B.A.s were Maynard Keynes and two present members of our own body, Sir Charles Webster and Professor Adcock. Rupert Brooke was an undergraduate. No wonder that in that year, and the years that followed, King's was a home of every intellectual and imaginative delight. Clapham was one of the pillars of the college. He was assistant tutor in history and economics, and Junior Dean. He became President of the undergraduates' Political Society, which Oscar Browning had founded, and in that capacity he not only 'spoke from the hearthrug upon other people's papers with incisive, robust candour' but he read a new paper of his own every year for thirty-eight years.[1] In the private supervision of undergraduates he gave the impression of keeping his distance as an older man, but he drilled them and stimulated them with learning, encouragement, and much humour. He stood indeed apart from the more surprising intellectual adventures of his colleagues. He was a liberal, both in the party sense and in most of the other senses of the word; but he took no pleasure in speculation for its own sake, and he had an attachment to the old standards of morality and patriotism that might be called conservative and conventional. His mind was formed and stable, and he used his extraordinary power of work to reach definite conclusions and impart them. From 1908 for many years his lectures on English economic history, which are, in large part, to be published, were of the greatest value to freshmen reading for the History Tripos. He took his full share of examining and of administration both in the Faculty of History and in the growing Faculty of Economics,

[1] Mr. Christopher Morris, quoted by the present Provost of King's in *Cambridge Review*, 4 May 1946.

and he was active in university business as a member of syndicates and boards. In 1913 he succeeded W. H. Macaulay in the responsible and exacting office of Tutor, perhaps the most important of all for the good health of the college. So much teaching and so much business would have prevented most men from writing; but he found time for a number of papers on new subjects, including one that he was rightly proud of, the conclusive little study of 'The Horsing of the Danes', in the *English Historical Review* for 1910, in which he put Oman and Vinogradoff right. He even published a book *The Abbé Sieyès; an Essay in the Politics of the French Revolution* (1912) but this was really clearing off an unfinished work of his Actonian period. The book is a study of the revolutionary and Napoleonic period, mainly in the light of the kind of political science that was taught in Cambridge at that time, and with allusions to some contemporary problems of democracy. It shows no inclination to explain political events and ideas in economic terms; indeed it is the only one of his books that reveals the full breadth of Clapham's interests, and his competence to handle philosophical and other general ideas. It suffers, however, from the disadvantage that the materials did not exist for bringing Sieyès himself back to life. He remains a partially animated connecting tissue between his pamphlets and speeches.

In 1914 the sunlit years came to an end. Clapham was over forty, and for men of his age there was no question of military service. For two years he carried on his duties in the more than half-empty university, and in 1916 he went to the Board of Trade. He rose to be a member of the Cabinet Committee on Priorities, and this service brought him a C.B.E. in 1918. No doubt it also broadened his knowledge of the business world, and strengthened his equipment for his later work. After the war he was busier than ever in Cambridge, where there was not merely a return to the old life, but a great press of undergraduates returning from the war, and a crop of new financial and administrative problems. Nevertheless he published a book in 1921, and though it was a short book with comparatively little in the way of footnotes or critical discussions, it gave him a new standing among historians. Until this time his career had been like that of many other able and hard-working university teachers. He had produced a number of sound and well-executed studies on limited subjects within the general framework of the history customarily taught for examinations. This book on *The Economic Development of France and Germany, 1815–*

1914, opened up a field on which nothing had been available in English except what was difficult, fragmentary, or inadequate. Although it was published only two years after the peace, and although Clapham loved France and detested much in German policy, the book nowhere judges either nation by a different standard from the other. It might have been still better if it had covered a somewhat wider region and if its geographical limits had followed more strictly economic lines instead of the boundaries of two great states; indeed it did include a good deal about Belgium as well, though not about other neighbouring countries; but it was so well written, so compact, so full of meat, and so relevant to the needs of historians and economists, that it made a hit. In 1944 it reached its fifth edition.

From this success Clapham went straight on to his great work, *An Economic History of Modern Britain.* The first large volume, beginning at about 1820, was published in 1926, the third, continuing to 1914 on the full scale, with an epilogue on the subsequent years, appeared in 1938. There were perhaps two other English historians who published even larger books in those troubled years, but it is not to its remarkable size that the book owes its rank. It is a standard book covering the whole of an immense subject which had not been treated as a whole except in superficial sketches or in essays which mixed illumination with guess-work. There were many monographs on parts or aspects of it, but they were unequal in quality and by no means easy to relate to one another. Although Clapham used an almost incredible mass of printed authorities, he nowhere merely summarized or conflated. Every page of the long book is his own, and the style, freer and more confident than in his early writings, carries the reader easily forward, even through the more severe passages of statistics. The happiest pages are those which describe the face of the country at different times. Those which deal with industry show much the same method as the book on the woollen and worsted industries. Where the subjects of the earlier book are treated, parts of it are followed fairly closely, but there is an advance in grip as well as in literary skill. The newest and best parts of the book are the cardinal chapters on money, prices, banking, and investment. In these Clapham showed all the analytic power with which Marshall had credited him.

This is no place for a detailed criticism of the book. For a general estimate it is enough to say that it is the most important book in the whole field of British economic history. Some of

its readers have complained that it emphasizes facts more than ideas; that it is divided up into compartments of different subjects, instead of fusing them all into a single argument; or that it shows little of the sympathy with economic misery or the indignation against economic oppression which inspired many of those who wrote on the same period, from Karl Marx and Arnold Toynbee down to our own day. Some have even thought that Clapham intended to 'debunk' the version of nineteenth-century economic history which eloquent writers of 'the left' had popularized, and to restore the complacency of Samuel Smiles. This is to misunderstand both his purpose and his achievement. It is true that, among the many kinds of British men and women, he found it easiest to enter into the minds of those whom Matthew Arnold called the Puritans, from whom he had come, and there were times when he seemed to show that impatience with weakness or incompetence which has caused Puritanism to be described as the religion of the strong. But another Puritan quality is reticence, and he felt sympathies which he did not put into words. In private life he was generous in charity, and he gave in secret. In public affairs he took for granted the need for social reform, and he whole-heartedly supported the social legislation of his party. If he did not state the case against the nineteenth-century economy, it was partly because he took this, too, for granted. He had, in fact, a habit of taking main points for granted, assuming that his readers or hearers already had the accepted opinions in their minds. He also had, all his life, the habit of putting his commentary in the form of a well-regulated assemblage of facts. He was perfectly capable of constructing a theoretical interpretation, though a certain modesty sometimes prevented him from doing it. He never read Keynes's *General Theory*, because he concluded from conversations with the author that he would find it too difficult. His purpose was scientific: he wanted to make available the information which economists, statesmen, and general historians needed, and in the form which would be useful to them. In this purpose he succeeded. He did not write against anyone. Those who heard him talk about the legends of modern economic history admire the restraint of the few controversial passages in his masterpiece. If he had chosen to write polemically he could have done it with smashing effect; but he had something better to do.

It would be tedious and confusing to name all the honours and employments that were heaped on him from the time of the

great book. He read parts of the manuscript as Ford Lectures in Oxford in 1926. The universities of Leeds and Harvard conferred honorary doctorates on him; Montpellier, much to his happiness, was about to do the same at the end of his life. He was a corresponding member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. In 1928 he was elected to our Academy, and to the chair of economic history then established in Cambridge. This meant the end of his tutorship at King's, but he was Vice-Provost for ten years from 1933. Before he ceased to be Vice-Provost, he was knighted. He retained his fellowship until the end of his life, and his portrait by Mr. Gunn commemorates his unqualified loyalty and devotion to the college. In 1938 he reached the age at which the Cambridge statutes, more rigid than those of other universities and permitting no exceptions, prescribe that professors must retire. His retirement did not bring relaxation. He went on with much university business, especially the congenial work of the Press and Library Syndicates. With Eileen Power he began, and after the blow of her sudden death he completed, the very heavy task of planning and editing the first volume of the *Cambridge Economic History of Europe*. He wrote reviews, introductions, articles. The Bank of England wanted to have its history written for its two hundred and fiftieth anniversary, and Clapham was exactly the man to do it. The Bank was the sort of institution he admired, solid, undemonstrative, unique. He had never worked before from manuscripts, and with his typically generous respect for things he had not attempted himself, he had always disparaged his own work in comparison with work based on unprinted records. Now he dealt with the Bank's papers as easily as if he had always worked with such materials; indeed, considering how intermittent their evidence proved to be, it is doubtful whether anyone else, at least in the time available, could have constructed so much from them. Punctually on the appointed day in 1944 the two substantial volumes of the history, carrying it down to 1914, came out. They are more difficult to read than his other books, because they are mainly occupied with a close study of the Bank's policy and practice; and they show even more strongly the tendency to assume that the reader has some general acquaintance of the subject. Very probably most of those who address themselves to two volumes on the history of a single institution do approach them with some previous knowledge, and Clapham's clear statement of the Bank's side in transactions which had been known only from other sources

is of fundamental and permanent value. In narrative vigour it is up to his best level. In a continuation which has not been published but remains with the Bank, he completed its history down to 1939.

It was a matter of much congratulation to the Bank that it was able to issue this book, admirably printed on good paper, at the right time, although that time fell in the fifth year of the late war. But if the printers and binders and promoters had reason to be proud, what are we to think of the author? Emeritus when the war began, he shouldered one new burden after another. Many lecturers were called away from the Cambridge history faculty, so he turned to and lectured again. He served as Chairman of the Cambridge Employment Committee, the local Refugee Committee, the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning, and as a member of a Conscientious Objectors' Tribunal. He was an active President of the Economic History Society. In 1941 he became President of our Academy, and his tenure of this office was renewed in 1945. He did other things from which he might have excused himself on grounds of age, for instance, he was an Air-raid Warden in college, and a fire-watcher at home. His regular journeys from Cambridge to the Bank or Burlington Gardens went on through all the delays and discomforts of bombing and the black-out, and he came back not only to do his share of the housework but to help with the poultry. A stiff knee, dating back to his climbing days, grew worse and he walked lame; but he never gave up bicycling. He was in the doctor's hands now and again, but he never showed the slightest sign of giving in. In dealing with business, a kind of abruptness, which had nothing ungenial in it, seemed to grow on him, and this was an indication that he was ageing, but he seemed unconscious that it was so. He set to work preparing his lectures on British Economic History for the press, and he finished them down to the middle of the eighteenth century. His last piece of public work was one of his most valuable. Mr. Attlee, before becoming Prime Minister, invited him to become chairman of a committee on the organization of economic and social research, which is known as the Clapham Committee. He saw this work through until the final report was in draft, and the recommendations, published after his death, were accepted by the Government and are being put into effect. On 20 February 1946 he presided over our Council, as quick and efficient as ever. Travelling back to Cambridge in the train, he talked about the changes in

New Testament criticism since his boyhood, about Alfred's and Guthrum's Peace, and how well men knew their frontier-lines before they had any maps, about Polybius, whom he had been reading in a translation. He spoke doubtfully about the likelihood of his taking a holiday that year in Palestine, where he had once before visited the home of his eldest daughter. It seemed that, although his powerful physical frame was beginning to wear out, there was no change in the activity of his mind. On 29 March, a month later, a day of unseasonable heat, he was again travelling down by the same line and, with merciful suddenness, in the middle of conversation, he died.

His long course of well-directed effort was singularly consistent. He was ambitious and, like an athlete, he delighted in competition and success; but he was never tempted to disregard the rules of any game he was engaged in. He was always at once emphatic and cautious, with a manliness that never made him impatiently self-assertive. Few men of such strong individuality are so bound by a sense of indebtedness to their teachers. In these he was very fortunate, and he gained much from them, especially from Acton's wide European view, from Marshall's exacting faith in his science, and from the high seriousness that the two had in common. He was hardly aware that they had singled him out from among their many pupils because there was that in him which responded to their teaching. It was his way to acknowledge obligations handsomely, for instance, to Werner Sombart, whose influence may perhaps be traced in his work, but only in a much transmuted shape. In some of his other relations with people he was very independent. He never had any secretary or research-assistant. He used to say that research-assistants were a pest to their employers, who always had to find jobs for them to move on to; but this was almost consciously a humorous excuse for his dislike of having things done for him that he could do for himself. Though so much of his time was spent with young men or in committees of his contemporaries, he never had the gift of easy intimacy with all and sundry. His public manner was 'professorial', that is, rather formal and perhaps a little important. He did not cultivate airs and graces; he was never effusive in praises or compliments, and he sometimes expressed disapproval or disagreement with uncompromising bluntness. If anyone fell short of his standards of principle in scholarship or in conduct he was easily shocked, and might be stern. It was noticed, however, that in the last ten years or so of his life he became more

tolerant and far less ready to censure, preferring to bear in mind the best qualities of those he had to do with, and respecting their right to make their own decisions.

He seemed to bring something of a schoolboy's solemnity to the externals of academic and public life, such as tripos dinners or the fly-sheets he wrote about university business. Yet he knew as well as anyone that they were externals. He was so much a writer that he expressed his attitude to people more fully and freely at his desk than in his daily business, and all through his later books there glows an appreciation of the 'fair field full of folk' as warm as that of his close friends Eileen Power and G. M. Trevelyan. To him economic history was 'the story of how men have kept alive and as comfortable as may be . . . a story full of attractive oddities'. He liked the people around him for their attractive oddities as well as their solid merits, and he did his utmost to make them as comfortable as might be. In personal matters he felt deeply; he was very kind and very just. As an adviser he was wise and disinterested; many sought his advice. In business he was firm, but sometimes he changed his mind with an unexpected willingness to accept another point of view. A sense of his limitations, sometimes an exaggerated sense, was often in his mind, and the unvarying adequacy of his work was possible only because he marked out limits for himself and kept within them. But he was aware of much beyond his chosen limits. When he wrote about statistics he never forgot 'the unmeasurable thoughts which make the measured things'. His faithfulness to tradition, to Cambridge, to King's, all came from that religious αἰδώς which was his open secret.

G. N. Clark