

Keynes and Sraffa's 'Difficulties with J. H. Hollander'

A note on the history of the RES edition of *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo**

Christian Gehrke and Heinz D. Kurz

1. Introduction

It is well known that the realization of the famous editorial project of the Royal Economic Society (RES) to publish *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo* (Ricardo, *Works* 1951–73) was delayed for a considerable time. One of the main reasons for delay was the discovery of Ricardo's letters to James Mill in 1943. This forced the editor, Piero Sraffa, to alter the project radically and to postpone completion of the edition (see Sraffa's 'General Preface' in Ricardo, *Works* I: ix–x).¹ Another reason was Sraffa's difficulties in composing the introductions. In this paper we deal with yet another obstacle which up till now is largely unknown. This concerns the role a then leading authority on Ricardo – Jacob Harry Hollander (1871–1940), professor of economics at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and President of the American Economic Association in 1921 – played in the early phase of the project. Hollander effectively obstructed the progress of the edition for a considerable time. How and why he did so requires an intricate story to be unravelled.

Our paper uses hitherto unpublished material, especially from Piero Sraffa's Papers, Trinity College, Cambridge, John Maynard Keynes's Papers, King's College, Cambridge, and Jacob Harry Hollander's Papers.² The latter are kept in the Milton S. Eisenhower Library (Special

Address for correspondence

Department of Economics, University of Graz, Resowi-Centre F4, A-8010 Graz, Austria; e-mails: christian.gehrke@uni-graz.at or heinz.kurz@uni-graz.at

Collections) of the Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore (USA). However, it should be pointed out that, curiously, there are no letters from Keynes or Sraffa in Hollander's correspondence. Moreover, with respect to Hollander's correspondence with Frank Ricardo, a great-grandson of David Ricardo, only the part relating to the years prior to 1930 has been preserved. It is not clear when and by whom these parts of Hollander's correspondence were removed.³ Since in these cases we do not have access to the originals, all citations refer to the copies or drafts of letters kept by the senders.⁴

2. 'The "Big" Ricardo': the RES editorial project and the transfer of editorship

The formal decision to prepare a definitive edition of Ricardo's *Works* was taken at the meeting of the RES Council on 17 December 1925 (see LSE: RES/2/1/2).⁵ At the meeting of 11 March 1926 it was decided to entrust Professor T. E. Gregory of the LSE with the editorship. Gregory had been involved over the past couple of years, together with Hollander, in preparing an edition of Ricardo's notes on Malthus's *Principles*. In a letter dated 14 June 1926 Gregory informed Hollander that he was now in charge of 'the "Big" Ricardo'; Hollander replied on 28 June: 'you will feel at liberty to command me in any way in the matter of the Ricardo' (H: MS 59, Box 4).

Gregory, alas, made hardly any progress during the following years and soon showed signs of wanting to resign (see, e.g., K: RES/1/1/164–5 and S: D3/11/62: 52). Who should be invited to take over the task? While we are not aware of any evidence that his name was brought up, it might be thought that Hollander was an ideal candidate. A leading authority on David Ricardo, he had variously edited and published books and articles dealing with Ricardo (see, in particular, Hollander, 1895, 1904, 1910). However the Council, which met on 13 February 1930 to decide the transfer of editorship, might have had good reasons for not approaching him.⁶ First, the Council seems to have been keen to entrust a British economist or at least an economist working in Britain with the task as a precondition of a close collaboration with the RES. Second, it had not escaped the attention of the members of the Council that Hollander and Gregory had taken nine years to publish Ricardo's *Notes* (Hollander and Gregory 1928). More importantly, the edition had not been well received: the June issue of 1929 of the *Economic Journal* carried a review by Bonar pointing out a number of annoying editorial slips and printer's errors; and in the November issue of *Economica* of the same year Cannan published a devastating review article which concluded that: 'the printed text is often

nonsense if read with all the bracketed matter included, and equally nonsense if the bracketed matter is all excluded' (Cannan 1929: 359). As regards Sraffa, things were different. Several influential members of the Council held him in high esteem as a scholar and expert in the field of classical economics and monetary theory. Gregory, Foxwell, and Cannan had known him as a research student at the LSE in the summer of 1921 and in the academic year 1921–2, and they appreciated his meticulousness and outstanding intellectual power. In 1923 Foxwell had written a highly favourable letter of recommendation on Sraffa's behalf (see Naldi 2000: 27). Edgeworth had admired Sraffa for his 1925 paper (Sraffa 1925). It was hardly a surprise therefore when Keynes was requested to invite Sraffa to take over the editorship (see LSE: RES/2/1/2).⁷ Soon afterwards Sraffa appears to have accepted the invitation and embarked on the project. In the early phase he was assisted by Keynes, who supplied him with letters of introduction and helped him with the drafting of letters.

Keynes and Sraffa informed David Ricardo's descendants and a number of scholars and book collectors about the project (see S: D3/11/65: 42). On 17 March 1930 Sraffa wrote to Keynes: 'As regards Hollander, it will perhaps be better to write [to] him only after having ascertained from Gregory about the copyright of the Notes on Malthus' (S: D3/11/65: 40; the original letter is available in K: L/S/42). The next day Keynes wrote to Gregory:

Sraffa is now *tackling the Ricardo job like a maniac*; so it is becoming necessary to make various practical arrangements. We should like to include the notes on Malthus in some shape or form. Could you advise me what steps we ought to take about this if we are not to get into trouble with you or Hollander or your publishers?

(S: D3/11/62: 51)⁸

Gregory replied on 19 March 1930, making detailed and constructive suggestions for the edition (see S: D3/11/62: 38–46). Sraffa answered the day after and had several appointments with him in May.⁹ Sraffa was keen to devote all his time and energy to the project: on 5 June 1930 he applied for leave of absence in the following Michaelmas term (S: B9/1: 15).¹⁰

Before we provide an account of the collaboration between Hollander, on the one hand, and Keynes and Sraffa on the other, we recall how this collaboration was reflected in what Sraffa put in print about the American scholar in the Ricardo edition.

3. Sraffa in print on Hollander

In the 'General Preface' of Ricardo's *Works* Sraffa makes acknowledgment 'for valuable assistance, advice and information, to the late Dr James Bonar,

Professor Jacob Viner, Professor F. A. Hayek, Professor George O'Brien, the late Professor Edwin Cannan, Sir Theodore Gregory, Mr Nicholas Kaldor and Dr R. Mattioli' (*Works* I: xi). Interestingly, Hollander's name is missing. The latter is only mentioned in the following context: 'A bundle of similar papers, which had become separated from the main body, was found earlier by Mr Frank Ricardo and these were published by Professor J. H. Hollander while the present edition was in preparation, so that it was possible to include them as well' (*ibid.*: viii). This remark should be seen in connection with the special thanks Sraffa expresses to Frank Ricardo 'for his fruitful search for manuscripts, for making available those in his possession and *for much trouble taken in securing others*' (*ibid.*: xi; emphasis added). The following sections make clear what Sraffa probably meant by the discreet hint in the italicised part of the quotation.

Like Cannan and Bonar, Sraffa did not think highly of the Hollander–Gregory edition of the *Notes on Malthus*. In Volume II of the RES edition Sraffa pointed out: 'The method adopted in the present edition follows Ricardo's hint (when he "supposed" himself "about publishing a new edition" of Malthus's work): namely, of giving Malthus's text at the top and Ricardo's Notes at the bottom. This also conforms to Professor Cannan's idea, when he criticised the Hollander–Gregory edition' (*Works* II: xvi). A few pages later he stressed that the volume had been printed, for Malthus's text, from the first edition of 1820, and, for Ricardo's Notes, from a copy of the Hollander–Gregory edition – purged of 'the errors which abound in that edition and often distort the sense' (*ibid.*: xviii).

In Sraffa's 'Addenda to the Memoir' (of Moses Ricardo) in Volume X of the RES edition a number of errors in Hollander's biographical essay (Hollander 1910) regarding the date of birth of Abraham Ricardo and his move to England (see *Works* X: 18–21) and the date of birth of David Ricardo (*ibid.*: 29) are corrected. In 'Appendix A. Bibliography of Ricardo's Works' in Volume X Hollander's 1932 edition of Ricardo's *Minor Papers* is described as follows: 'This volume contains an oddly assorted collection of papers, notes and jottings, as well as a few letters, from that bundle of the Ricardo Papers . . . [which became] separated from the main body and [was] found with the Notes on Malthus in 1919' (*Works* X: 374). And in 'Appendix B. A Survey of Ricardo Manuscripts' Sraffa noted, after providing a brief description of some Ricardo manuscripts containing excerpts from and summaries of the writings of other economists, which he decided not to include in the RES edition: 'The summaries described in this and the preceding paragraph were printed *in extenso* in Ricardo's *Minor Papers*' (*Works* X: 391n; emphasis in the original).

4. Contact with Ricardo's descendants and with Hollander

In his capacity as Secretary of the RES, Keynes first contacted Colonel Henry G. Ricardo at Gatcombe Park, David Ricardo's former residence, who forwarded Keynes's letter to his cousin Frank Ricardo at Bromesberrow Place (Christchurch, Hants). In a letter dated 20 March 1930 Frank Ricardo wrote to Colonel Ricardo:

Many thanks for sending me enclosure. I agree with you: why in the world do they want to republish all the works again?

I thought – indeed I know – that *Professor Hollander (America) has 'squeezed all the juice' out of the matter.* It was to him that I handed that manuscript which I came across and he has now published it in company with Prof. Gregory of the London School of Economics. *Hollander promised to let me have it back, but he hasn't done so yet.*

I found a lot more letters of D.R. when clearing out Bromesberrow but they do not contain any MSS. I have them here.

(S: D3/11/71: 58)

Sraffa, who via Keynes had been invited to visit Gatcombe Park, went there on 28 March. From Gatcombe he informed Keynes about the additional material which had recently been found at Bromesberrow Place, and asked him to write immediately to Frank Ricardo (LSE: RES/2/1/2). To Keynes's letter of 2 April 1930 (S: D3/11/71: 59) Frank Ricardo replied on 6 April:

I shall be glad to assist in any way I can in the project of the Royal Economic Society of publishing the works of David Ricardo. . . .

As to the manuscript of 'Notes on Malthus' this is still with Professor Hollander: he promised to return it to me & I was then going to put it in the care of some Library or Museum. I note however that you will be communicating with Prof. Hollander and I entirely agree to your including the manuscript in your proposed publication. . . .

I have a box (recently recovered from a lumber room) containing a very considerable number of letters & other papers which originally belonged to D. Ricardo. Some (pamphlets etc.) have marginal notes in his handwriting, others are letters to him of a purely domestic nature, and there are three files (all as I found them) containing respectively letters from Mill, McCulloch, Trower and Malthus – all to David Ricardo. Lastly I have a few letters of his to Maria Edgeworth & of hers to him: these deal chiefly with the Potato Crop and Ireland.

If any of the above are of any use to your Society in their coming Publication I am quite ready to lend them.

(S: D3/11/71: 57)

Keynes replied immediately, asking Frank Ricardo to kindly send the box to King's College where he and Sraffa could examine its contents (S:

D3/11/71: 47), and informed Sraffa about the details of Frank Ricardo's find. In replying to this news Sraffa wrote to Keynes (from Milan):

The letters from Mill must be the most important thing that could have been found – even more than Ricardo's own letters to Mill; these would no doubt contain better economics, but we have plenty of that; what was really wanted was detailed evidence of Mill's influence on R., which must be nearly equivalent to the formation of R's mind. Incidentally, they may give us some clue for finding the whereabouts of the other side of the correspondence.

(K: RES/1/1/180)

The day after he had written for the first time to Frank Ricardo, Keynes informed Hollander

that the Council of the Royal Economic Society have decided to publish a *complete edition* of the Works of Ricardo. . . . The editorship was originally to have been given to Professor Gregory. But as he was unable to find the time we have now entrusted it to Mr Piero Sraffa, University Lecturer at Cambridge. Though an Italian citizen [!], he is specially qualified for the work by his knowledge and interest in Ricardian subjects.

He is, however, *most anxious that we should from the outset have your benevolent approval of our project* . . . *There is one particular matter in which we shall be grateful for your help. It is, of course, vital for us that the collection should be as complete as we can make it. We are therefore proposing, if we can, to include all extant letters of any importance, and there are also the Notes to Malthus.* . . .

I suppose there is no hope of you visiting England in the near future? It would be a great advantage to us if we could have your personal advice by word of mouth.

(S: D3/11/63: 71 (i))

Hollander responded to Keynes:

At the outset let me say that *I shall be happy to extend any possible aid in connection with the projected edition of the works of Ricardo*, and I beg that you will indicate this to the Council of the Royal Economic Society, if it be proper, and to Mr. Piero Sraffa. . . . You will be glad to know that I am to be in London from about June 25 to July 4. . . . [I]t would be a great pleasure to see something of you and to meet Sraffa.

(S: D3/11/63: 71 (ii))

By May Frank Ricardo sent Keynes 'the letters etc. relating to David Ricardo' he had recently found (S: D3/11/71: 53). Keynes reported on Sraffa's reaction when the latter had had the chance to consult the documents: 'Piero was [at] a pitch of excitement and stayed up all night, until six o'clock next morning, reading them' (K: letter to Lydia Keynes, 1 June 1930). A few days later, in a letter of 6 June in reply to one from Sraffa of 3 June (see S: D3/11/71: 54), Frank Ricardo invited Sraffa to Bromesberrow Place:

I am glad to hear that some, at all events, of the D. Ricardo correspondence is proving of interest.

It is curious – and unfortunate – that *it all appears to break off in 1821*. I do not think I can lay my hand on any more, but when you come here you can see for yourself as, I need hardly say, I have thrown nothing away. I shall be glad for you to glance through the remainder so as to make sure of no omissions.

(S: D3/11/71: 50)

According to Sraffa's diary he went to see Frank Ricardo in Christchurch on 18 June 1930. Among his papers Sraffa kept a handwritten memo: 'Frank Ricardo gives me letter to Hollander, letter 18.6.30 giving him full authority to hand over to me MS of Notes on Malthus' (S: D3/11/71: 44). The question of the missing correspondence of the final years of David Ricardo's life could not be settled on that occasion and, as we shall see, it required more time to finally answer it. Frank Ricardo made a thorough search at his solicitors on Sraffa's behalf, and then another one in early July, but, as he informed Sraffa in a letter of 3 July, he did 'not have much success' and the only letters he found 'are all of 1820' (S: D3/11/71: 43).

Towards the end of June 1930 Hollander arrived in London. Keynes arranged a lunch with him and Sraffa. In his diary Sraffa noted that on the occasion of the meeting on 1 July he and Keynes were handed over the Notes on Malthus from Hollander. The meeting appears to have been to Sraffa's full satisfaction, because he was given renewed assurance of Hollander's support for the RES project. Sraffa wrote to Keynes: 'Ever so many thanks for the lunch on Tuesday – I enjoyed it immensely' (K: L/S/54). There is no hint that at the meeting Hollander disclosed that he was in the possession of further 'Ricardiana'.

5. 'In Hollander's hands'

Sraffa did not give up the idea of tracing the missing pieces of correspondence. He asked Frank Ricardo to search anew Bromesberrow Place. While a few more items were found, the missing late letters were not among them. In a letter to Sraffa of 16 October 1930 Frank Ricardo speculated that 'the correspondence in question would probably have found its way to the Office of the Solicitors who were concerned with the Probate of his Will. Do you know who they were?' (S: D3/11/71: 42). In December Sraffa gave Frank Ricardo the names and addresses of the successors of David Ricardo's solicitors in order to contact them (see S: D3/11/71: 49). In addition, an announcement of the RES editorial project was placed in the December issue of the *Economic Journal* of 1930 in which the members of the Society

were asked to give 'what help they can in tracking down any of Ricardo's letters which have not yet been traced by the Editor'. Similar announcements were also placed in various newspapers.

Together with a letter dated 29 November 1930, in which he inquired about a letter from Ricardo to Say that had recently been sold by the Parisian bookseller Manier, Sraffa sent Hollander a newspaper cutting on the Ricardo edition. Hollander responded on 9 January 1931, disclosing some facts which must have taken Sraffa by surprise and shattered his confidence in Hollander's willingness to cooperate:

I have a few unpublished Ricardo letters, but like the Manier item *they are of little economic interest*. I am using them, wholly or in part in my opus, and *thereafter* you are entirely at liberty to reprint them.

As you will see from the enclosed, the Johns Hopkins Press is about to issue the letters of McCulloch to Ricardo – to which I have thought of adding a few letters of James Mill to Ricardo. In the clipping sent me, as in the paragraph in the current Journal, I notice that you have some, presumably additional letters, of McCulloch and of Mill. *I am wondering whether you would let me have copies of these for inclusion in the Johns Hopkins reprint.*

If I might have these promptly I could hold up the printers to ensure insertion. Thereafter it would be possible for you to include the entire series in your edition.

(S: D3/11/63: 67)

The enclosure was presumably a pre-publication announcement of the Fourth Series of 'Reprints of Economic Tracts' (see Sraffa's library, item 8112), in which the Johns Hopkins Press invited subscription to a reprint of four tracts: '(1) Letters of John Ramsay McCulloch to David Ricardo, 1818–1823; (2) Minor Papers on the Bullion Report, 1810. By David Ricardo; (3) Contributions of John Stuart Mill to the *Traveller* (London), in December 1822; (4) *Observations on the Circumstances . . .* By John Barton. London, 1817' (ibid.). Sraffa drafted two replies to Hollander and asked Keynes for his assistance. On 22 January 1931 he wrote to Keynes:

It is of course *extraordinarily cheeky* of Hollander to ask [for] copies of our letters in order to publish them in a great hurry, while he refuses to let us have copies of his, until he has published them. *But I doubt that his exhibition of jealousy is a good reason for my following his example.*

I am therefore, on the whole, inclined to let him have the McC. Letters. We have seventeen of them, all unpublished. He may have as many, or 25 or 26 at most: in this latter case, we would make his collection complete. The case is quite different as regards Mills [sic] letters. We have fourty-seven [sic], and he says he has only 'a few': very few indeed, probably, as he has not even thought it worth while advertising them in the prospectus of the McCulloch letters, to which they are to be 'added'.

(S: D3/11/65: 62)

The letter Sraffa finally sent, after having consulted with Keynes, is dated 31 January 1931 and reads:

I am most interested to hear of the proposed Johns Hopkins Press re-prints. I hope they come out as soon as possible; we are now getting seriously to work and it would be a great convenience to have the reprints published before we come to deal with the volume of letters. *As regards the letters which we have got hold of, they are somewhat extensive and ought to be reserved for the main collection.* I hope you will *follow up your own suggestion of including in the reprints the letters which you have from James Mill to Ricardo.*

I wonder if it would be asking too much of you to let me have proofs of the reprint or possibly of the letters, of course, *on the direct understanding that we should not publish them or make any other use of them until your volumes are out.* This would enable me to know how much space to keep for them and also to avoid any other last moment corrections. As regards your own Opus, it will be of great benefit to us if that too were to come out at an early date, so that we could have the benefit of it and of the many facts and items which you have got together since you last delivered yourself on this subject. But I expect that this is to hope for too much. Do you think that there is any likelihood of your book being finished in time for us to make reference to it in our edition?

(S: D3/11/63: 64(i-ii))

Hollander was never to answer this letter. In a letter dated 8 September 1931 and sent from Rapallo, Sraffa informed Keynes that Hollander had not replied 'to my (or rather, your) last letter, and his Ricardian pamphlets have not appeared: I fear he is holding them up till our edition has appeared. Could anything be done to speed him up?' (LSE: RES/10/2/1). Keynes reminded Hollander on 22 October 1931:

You will remember that there was some correspondence between you, Sraffa and myself about the Ricardo letters which you are publishing in your forthcoming reprint of Economic Tracts. The last letter was from Sraffa to yourself on January 31st of this year. Since then we have been hoping to hear something further from you, but unavailingly so far.

As your volume was already announced by the Johns Hopkins Press we have been expecting it before now, but doubtless it is on the point of publication. I shall be very glad if you can let me have proofs of the Ricardo portion at your earliest possible convenience.

You will remember that the Royal Economic Society is undertaking publication of the works and correspondence of Ricardo in 6 volumes, *as far as possible complete.* Obviously it is essential that we should include your interesting items. Our publication will not be ready for some little time yet, but preparations are at a fairly advanced stage, and *it would be a matter of very considerable convenience to be able to know just how much space to allow for the new material which you will be including in your reprint.*

(S: D3/11/63: 62)

By 14 December 1931 still no reply from Hollander had arrived. Sraffa therefore attempted to get the necessary information via Jacob Viner to whom he wrote on that day:

Professor Hollander has announced, about a year ago, some pamphlets containing unpublished letters to, & papers by, Ricardo. Although Keynes & I have written to him several times since then, we have never obtained a reply. We are anxious to know whether they will be published in time to be included in our edition, & if possible to obtain from him his proofs or an early copy – *though of course we would undertake to publish only after him.*

(PU: Jacob Viner Papers)

Viner replied on 19 January 1932:

Dear Sraffa: The McCulloch Letters to Ricardo have already been published and are, of course, available. I wrote to the Johns Hopkins Press to ask when the Bullion Controversy Papers would be published, but they replied that they could not give me any definite date. Hollander will be in Chicago for a conference at the end of this month, and I will then try to obtain definite information from him. *I hope that he is not playing a dog in the manger game.*

(PU: Jacob Viner Papers)

To Viner's regret Hollander did not turn up at the conference. In the meantime, on 18 December 1931, Keynes had received Hollander's reply dated 7 December:

Under separate cover I am sending you a set of the final page proof of the McCulloch Letters. The printed tract will be out within the week.

I am now at work upon the 'Minor Papers'. None of them have been printed before, and they will prove of considerable interest. I am including certain relevant letters, unpublished, as well as a few of the 'missing' letters from James Mill. I should have been glad to include the additional Mill letters which I understood are in your possession and had so written to Mr. Sraffa. *To my surprise – for I had supposed that our courtesies were to be reciprocal – he has answered that these 'ought to be reserved for the main collection'.*

I regret this decision; but I must, of course, respect it.

(S: D3/11/63: 63)

To this Keynes sent the following reply, drafted jointly with Sraffa, on 21 December:

I think there must be a little misunderstanding in what you say about 'reciprocal courtesies'. We had not asked you – obviously it would not have been reasonable – to let us have your new material in advance of your own publication of it. We only wanted to be able to publish it after you had published it. But meanwhile it would help the planning of our volumes if we could see the material, or at any rate have some idea how much space it would occupy, and also know the probable date of your publication. We are only too anxious that you should publish your material

yourself; and nothing will make us happier than to know that you are going to do so at an early date.

Moreover, you have to remember that we are trying to prepare a *definitive edition of Ricardo* . . . *All we are asking of you is that you should yourself make public the valuable material you have, at the earliest possible date, and meanwhile let us know, quite privately and with a pledge, of course, on our part that we should in no event publish it in advance of yourself, what it amounts to.*

(S: D3/11/63: 58(i-ii))¹¹

When Keynes and Sraffa eventually had access to Hollander (1931), they learned to their great astonishment from the introduction that the Notes on Malthus he had received from Frank Ricardo were not the only items (ibid.: 5). Apparently Hollander had never disclosed this fact to anybody, not even to his former co-editor Gregory, who had initially been in charge of ‘the “Big” Ricardo’. And as we shall see, even on this occasion he did not provide full information on what he had been given twelve years ago. Among his correspondence with Frank Ricardo Sraffa kept a memo: ‘Written to Frank Ricardo 25.1.32 Telling him of Hollander’s publication of McC.’s letters, & how he holds up Mill’s & Currency papers of R. Told him how he got them (quoted preface). Asked him to request H. to return “at his earliest convenience & after having taken copies of them, all the letters & MS *which you have lent him well over 10 years ago*” (S: D3/11/71: 39). At long last, one of the puzzles of the missing correspondence of Ricardo was about to be resolved.

Apparently, Keynes and Sraffa were not very optimistic that Hollander could be made to comply with their demands without further effort. Hence they asked colleagues of Hollander in the United States for their support. On 7 January 1932 Sraffa sent a letter to Professor F. W. Taussig (from Rapallo); in the draft version of it we read:

I should indeed be most grateful if you would be so good as to attempt to bring about a coordination of work between Dr Hollander & me, in the manner which you suggest. I am rather worried by the thought that there are in the possession of Dr Hollander some Ricardo letters, which he will probably publish himself too late for me to make use of them in the edition of R’s Works. . . .

It would be a great boon if it were possible to find an arrangement which were [sic] satisfactory to Dr Hollander, & which enabled me to make use of what are the only extant Ricardo MSS which I have not been permitted to see.

(S: D3/11/73: 5)

In April and May 1932 Sraffa, in collaboration with Keynes, made further attempts to obtain the Ricardo items retained by Hollander. On 26 April 1932 Viner wrote to Sraffa informing him about a letter he had received from Hollander in which the latter gave some indications as to what kind

of additional material he had and what he planned to do with it (see S: D3/11/74: 12; see also below, endnote 12). Sraffa replied on 17 May 1932:

The news from Hollander sounds like having to wait another ten years: in the circumstances I really do not know how to approach him. . . .

The position is that if I have not access to the Ricardo papers etc. within the next few months I shall not be able to include them in our edition. The alternative is postponement for an indefinite period, but with the type set this will be impossible. *To appear with a note in the Preface to the effect that certain unpublished manuscripts are known to exist, but Hollander who controls them has not consented to show them to us, would be as awkward to us as to Hollander himself. But is there a way out of this dilemma?*

(S: D3/11/74: 13)

6. 'We must not grumble – we are getting the MSS'

In a letter dated 29 April 1932, which is not extant, Frank Ricardo appears to have requested the return of the remaining material from Hollander. This is indirectly confirmed by Hollander's answer in a letter dated 13 May 1932:

I have been much distressed by the contents of your letter of April 29. You and your family have been so courteous to me in the past, that it would have been a gross impropriety had I failed to conform in every particular with your desires as to the return of the Ricardo material. I assure you that there has been no such intention on my part.

Your letter states 'I am writing to repeat my request to you to return the remainder of the letters and documents which I lent you several years ago' – to which I can only reply that no such request has ever been received by me. Had it been, there would have been instant compliance.

When you entrusted the material to me, it was with the assurance that I should retain it for study and publication as long as might be necessary and that thereafter it should be safely restored to you.

After the publication of the 'Notes on Malthus', under Professor Gregory's and my editorship, the MS. (of the 'Notes'), according to your instruction, was delivered to Professor Keynes.

More recently the 'Letters of McCulloch' were issued – a copy is enclosed, which I beg you will accept with my compliments. This part of the MSS. would likewise have been returned *but for my thought that instead of such piecemeal delivery you would prefer to have it returned in one parcel.*

I am now returning by registered letter post the MS. referred to in the preceding paragraph, together with other parts of the material.

There remain [sic] in my possession that part of the material which has been used in the 'Minor Papers on the Currency Question', now in course of publication by the Johns Hopkins Press, as per enclosed announcement. *I hope very much that you will permit me to retain this for a few months longer, in*

order that page proof may be read against the original MS. Any other procedure adds to the chance of typographical errors, which I should like very much to avoid. I can assure you that the delay in making this final delivery will be inconsiderable.
(S: D3/11/71: 33)

In a letter dated 17 May 1932 – Hollander’s letter just referred to had not yet arrived – Sraffa wrote to Frank Ricardo:

Many thanks for your very kind letter. I am anxious to know whether you have heard from Professor Hollander; *although I doubt that there will be any enclosures, unless it be only McCulloch’s letters, which are published.*

In spite of the assurance we have given to him that we shall not publish anything in his possession before he has published it himself, Hollander has refused to let us have copies, and has now indefinitely postponed his own publication. *It is now unfortunately clear that he does not see with sympathy our initiative. . . .*

If the R.E.S. could claim the return of the MSS as a matter of right, no doubt they could approach Hollander more effectively than they have been able to do as a matter of courtesy.

(S: D3/11/71: 38)

Sraffa’s doubts were well founded. In his reply dated 22 May 1932 – Hollander’s above letter still had not arrived – Frank Ricardo wrote to Piero Sraffa:

I have had no reply from Professor Hollander.

I cannot recollect what exactly the items are that he retains. . . . At the time of loaning them to Prof. Hollander the matter had not the importance that it now has and I am unable to bear in mind whether there were any McCulloch or other letters: if there were they were very few. . . . There was of course no inkling in those days that the RES was going to publish a Life & Works, but now in view of the fact that they are doing so *the Royal Economic Society has my full authority to tell Professor Hollander that I have lent all the documents, correspondence, etc. connected with D.R. to them for the purpose of this publication and that this loan includes the items still retained by Prof. Hollander.*

(S: D3/11/71: 36)

The next day Frank Ricardo finally received Hollander’s letter and immediately forwarded it to Sraffa (S: D3/11/71: 35). However, before Frank Ricardo’s letter reached Sraffa, Keynes had sent letters to Professors Wesley Mitchell and Edwin Seligman, in which he accused Hollander of ‘continued procrastination and retention of certain Ricardo documents which we need for our edition’, with the result of having ‘put off publication for years’. In addition he asked them to use their ‘influence with Hollander to be reasonable’ (see S: D3/11/71: 60 and 61).

On 25 May 1932 Sraffa wrote to Frank Ricardo regarding Hollander’s letter:

Your letter has really brought to us the very best news we could have expected. Thanks to your intervention *the main obstacle to our publication will now be removed*, and you have placed us in a new and deep obligation.

As regards the last paragraph in Hollander's letter – since you are so good as to ask my opinion – I shall state it quite frankly: *and I hope that I shall not give you the impression that we wish in any way to be unfair to Hollander* – much less that we wish you to be –: *for nothing could be more remote from our intentions.*

... [A]fter careful consideration, I am convinced that the genuine reason of Hollander's wish to retain the MSS 'a few months longer' cannot be the desire to read the proofs against the original MS.

No doubt you will expect me to state the grounds for this opinion, and you will excuse me, I hope, for doing it somewhat at length. In the first place, the prospectus which Professor Hollander has sent you was issued to the public in January 1931; *it is hard to see how, after seventeen months, some months longer can be required for printing what must be a thin pamphlet*, since it is offered to subscribers at 3/-. *The fact is, that Hollander, after having heard of our anxiety to secure an early publication on his part, so that the way should be open for us, had decided to cancel the announcement, and to postpone indefinitely publication: it is only after having received your letter that he has resorted to the earlier plan.* (In proof of this I may quote a sentence from a letter written by Hollander, on April 26th ult., to a Professor unconnected with our publication, and privately communicated to me: 'Starting with a few unpublished Ricardo items, which I planned to issue as a number of my "Economic Tracts", I have gotten together so much more that it has become necessary to substitute Malthus's "Observations on the Corn Laws" (1814) in the "Tracts", and to prepare to issue the Ricardo material in a separate publication.')¹²

Besides, nowadays *it is absurd to suggest that the actual MS is necessary for proof reading. Exact reproductions can be obtained by photostat in a few hours at a cost of less than 6d per sheet*; which for the 'Minor Papers' would probably amount to little over £1. . . .

Hollander's behaviour in this matter has all along been quite inexplicable to me. When I met him in London in July 1930, I gave him a detailed account of the contents of the box of letters you had found at Bromesberrow; and although I told him about the curious gap in the correspondence for the years 1822–23, and the efforts you were making to recover the missing letters by searching at your solicitors, etc., he did not utter a word about the letters he had had for ten years on loan from you. As it has turned out, the McCulloch letters now published by him go a fairly long way towards filling the gap (not less than seven belong to that period).

Afterwards, he has always refused not only to let us have copies of the MSS (although we had undertaken not to anticipate his publication) but even to let us know how much space we should allow for this new material, so that we might proceed with our arrangements. And now *I fear that the further delay it would inflict on us has something to do with his request to retain the 'Minor Papers' for some months longer.*

(S: D3/11/71: 31–2)

On 28 May 1932 Frank Ricardo received from Hollander a first set of documents, which he forwarded to Sraffa the following day. In the accompanying letter Frank Ricardo expressed his lack of understanding why Hollander would want to retain some of the material (see S: D3/11/71: 26). Sraffa replied in a letter of 1 June 1932, the draft of which reads:

D. Mr R., thanks for your letter & for the parcel (containing 17 letters of McCulloch & a number of miscell. letters & newspapers) which I have received. *Its contents has [sic] proved rather disappointing, as Hollander has retained everything of interest.* that is to say, not only the 'Minor Papers on Bullion', as he says in his letter, but also the letters of Mill, which he certainly has; & presumably some letters of Malthus & Trower, which could hardly be absent in such a miscellaneous lot. – As they are, these documents are welcome, as they enable me to correct a number of misprints in Hollander's published ed. of McC's letters, & supply a few scraps of additional information. – It is very kind of you to be willing to write to Holl. requesting the immediate return of the other papers: *it would be desirable if in your letter you specifically referred to the letters from Mill & others which Holl. has retained without even asking your permission.*

(S: D3/11/71: 29)

On 29 June 1932 Frank Ricardo received a further batch of letters from Hollander plus the latter's assurance that he had had reproductions made for proof-reading and was therefore sending back the originals. Frank Ricardo informed Sraffa on the same day by letter in which he also wrote that Hollander 'agrees that he has far outstepped the period allowed for retaining the papers etc. which I lent him, and consequently he is despatching *at once* all the remaining ones' (S: D3/11/71: 25).

At once? Further batches kept arriving, which prompted Frank Ricardo to write to Sraffa on 23 July 1932:

I do not know . . . how much nearer we are to the 'final instalment'. But still *we must not grumble – we are getting the MSS* – a fact which not many months ago seemed remote and difficult to bring about. . . . *I have not the least idea what more there is to come. I am therefore in Hollander's hands;* but I am quite sure he will return everything. It will probably be best policy to have him do it in his own way.

(S: D3/11/71: 19–20)

During the following weeks more material arrived which was forwarded to Sraffa. Finally, in October 1932 Frank Ricardo told Sraffa with reference to a letter from Hollander: 'I think I have now handed you everything for your purpose which lay in my power' (S: D3/11/71: 18).¹³ This issue was settled; yet the difficulties with Hollander were to continue.

7. Hollander's library at the disposal of scholars – with 'a single exception'

Taussig wrote to Sraffa in November 1932 offering his good services (S: D3/11/73: 7) and then again in February 1933:

I have communicated with my friend Hollander, and have a letter from him in which the following passages appear:

'I have included in the Minor Papers *all of the Ricardo manuscripts and letters in my possession. . . .*'

As you doubtless know, the volume 'Minor Papers' has been published. *I should judge that there are not in Hollander's possession, as you were led to suppose, Ricardo letters still to be published, such as would deserve a place in your edition of the Works.* At all events, he seems to think that nothing remains for him to do.

(S: D3/11/73: 10–11)

The following weeks showed that Taussig's judgement was wrong. In June Sraffa wrote to Maggs Bros. in London, asking for the name of the purchaser of Ricardo's letter to Barton (which had been advertised in Maggs Bros. Autographs Catalogue No. 352 of Christmas 1916). On 9 August 1933 Maggs Bros. eventually informed him that 'Professor Hollander purchased this letter in 1916' (S: D3/11/67: 49). Sraffa informed Taussig about his find on 12 August 1933:

In your letter of 23rd Feb. of this year you quoted Professor Hollander as having written to you: 'I have included in the Minor Papers all of the Ricardo manuscripts and letters in my possession'. *I acquiesced at the time, although I was aware of some still unpublished MSS in Prof. Hollander's possession.* In 1930 a Paris bookseller, Manier, had offered in his catalogue an autograph letter of Ricardo, 3¼ pages, dated 16th June 1822 and described as 'très belle lettre', and he informed me that he had sold it to Prof. Hollander. I wrote at once to Prof. Hollander, who replied on 9th Jan. 1931 declining to allow me access to this letter until he had published it and he added: 'I have a few unpublished Ricardo letters, but like the Manier item they are of little economic interest'.

Unfortunately the 'Manier letter' is not printed in the 'Minor Papers'. *These include only MSS belonging to Mr Frank Ricardo . . .*

I should not have pressed the matter any further, but for a new fact that has recently come to my knowledge.

I had for some time been aware of the existence of a very long letter, written by Ricardo on the 20th May 1817 to John Barton (. . .) and containing a detailed discussion of his theory of wages and profits. My efforts to trace the owner had been unsuccessful till the other day, when I learned from an absolutely reliable source that the autograph of this unpublished letter is (or was at one time) in the possession of Prof. Hollander. I need not emphasise the importance of this letter. The mere fact that as early as May

1817 (a few weeks after the publication of the 'Principles') Ricardo was corresponding with Barton, is of considerable interest – for Barton was undoubtedly one of the main influences which induced Ricardo to change his views on the effects of machinery and to add the chapter On Machinery in the 1821 edition of the 'Principles'.

I very much fear that it will be impossible for me to obtain access to the Barton letter for the purpose of printing it in the Royal Economic Society's edition. On the other hand, I shall have to mention its existence; and it will be necessary, however distasteful, for me to justify my failure to include it in an edition which purports to be as complete as possible by stating the circumstances of the case.

(S: D3/11/73: 12–14)

Taussig replied on 26 August 1933:

I have come to the conclusion that I should not address Hollander again. The tone of the answer to my previous letter did not indicate much promise. . . . I am not at all unwilling to help, and hope I am not mistaken in my belief that I should do more harm than good by 'butting in'.

(S: D3/11/73: 15)

Sraffa sought once more the help of Keynes who, in a letter of 14 September 1933, suggested writing 'an entirely unthreatening letter to Hollander' and made a proposal which Sraffa accepted with small changes. In the letter Sraffa sent by express mail on 17 September 1933 we read:

I am now getting rather near the publication date of Ricardo, and the Royal Economic Society want to get the edition complete in the case of miscellaneous correspondence, as well as his published works and the major series of correspondence.

I should therefore be most grateful if you could let me have a transcript of Ricardo's letter of May 20, 1817 to John Barton, particularly as the contents of this letter have some bearing on the 'Principles'. I should also like to have a transcript of Ricardo's letter of 16 June 1822 (the Manier letter), and anything else in your possession, even if it seems of minor importance. I had been hoping that these letters would appear in your published volume. Although, however, you have not thought them important enough to print, I should still like to have the opportunity of using them for the Royal Economic Society edition.

(S: D3/11/65: 65 (i))

At proof stage Sraffa asked CUP for a blank page in place of the Barton letter and inserted the following (handwritten) note on this page when proof-reading: 'MS in the possession of Professor J. H. Hollander since 1916, who, it is understood, intends to publish it with a reprint of Barton's . . . ; but in the meantime the text is not available' (D3/11/63: 57a).

After seven weeks without a reply from Hollander, Keynes on 9

November 1933 approached Professor Edwin F. Gay of Harvard University asking him to contact a friend at Johns Hopkins well acquainted with Hollander, who might perhaps be able to help: 'As our latest efforts have drawn completely blank, we should be very grateful if one last effort could be made' (S: D3/11/63: 40). As a result of his effort, Gay received a letter from Hollander, dated 15 December 1933, which he forwarded to Keynes. Hollander wrote to Gay:

In the first place let me express regret that you have been troubled in the matter at all. All the facts involved in what Keynes described as 'his difficulties with Hollander' are known to Keynes himself.

The circumstances are these: On April 3, 1930, from a clear sky, Keynes apprized me of the intention of the Royal Economic Society to publish a complete edition of the works of Ricardo under the editorship of Mr. Piero Sraffa, and besought my 'benevolent approval' of the project. I promptly wrote Keynes of my disposition to aid him in any practicable way, and thereafter took steps to make available whatever I had contributed to Ricardian literature [!]. In the summer of 1930 I met Keynes and Sraffa in London and renewed this assurance. In the course of this interview [!], however, I realized that the concept of 'benevolent approval' consisted in the main of my making available for their use whatever Ricardiana I might possess, either in the form of prompt publication or supply of manuscript copy.

In the succeeding eighteen months I published the 'Letters to McCulloch' and the 'Minor Papers on the Currency Question'; this under strain of time and effort. There remained certain other materials which were already integrated in the manuscript of prospective contributions.

Of this character are the Manier letter and the Barton letter to which Keynes refers. The first I am using in my critique of Ricardo; the second is a vital part of the reprint of Barton's tract, of which announcement has already been made. *It is an unjust and unreasonable request that I should turn over these letters as well as any other materials in process of use. I have not collected them as personalia but as material, and am using them as such. The most scrupulous standards of scientific cooperation would dictate no other course.*

As against the attitude which I have throughout taken, I might finally contrast Keynes' concept of scientific reciprocity. Upon being advised by Sraffa that he was in possession of various letters of James Mill to Ricardo, I informed him that I was about to publish certain others (of Mill to Ricardo) in the 'Minor Papers', then about to appear, and asked that copies of his might be supplied me for inclusion – the entire series thereafter to be used in the definitive edition. Sraffa refused to do this, explaining under date of January 31, 1931 that they 'ought to be reserved for the main collection'.

Inasmuch as you have been troubled in the matter, it seems necessary to inform you of what has transpired. I am entirely willing that you should communicate this letter.

(S: D3/11/63: 39(i–ii))¹⁴

On 5 January 1934 Keynes forwarded the letter to Sraffa asking for his observations (S: D3/11/65: 61). Sraffa produced a handwritten note for Keynes, in which he commented on the three points marked in his copy of the letter:

(1) In the interview no mention was made of any Ricardiana possessed by H: indeed we had no idea that he possessed any. We told him about the letters we had found, and of the curious gaps in the series we had; although, as it turned out later, H. possessed many of the wanted letters, he never uttered a word about them. On this occasion he only handed over to us the MS of the published Notes on Malthus, which Frank Ricardo, to whom it belongs, had previously instructed him to give us.

(2) H. purchased the Barton letter at Xmas 1916: it has been 'in process of use' for 18 years – four pages!

(3) H gives the impression that when he 'was about to publish' certain letters of Mill to R. he 'was advised that he (Sraffa) was in possession' of some others & asked them for publication. The reverse is true. H. heard of the letters & of our intention to publish in the interview of June 1930;¹⁵ he heard it again when both things were published in Keynes' letter to the Econ. Journ. Dec. 1930. Then, on Nov. 29, 1930, I wrote to him asking for the Manier letter & any others that he might have. And only on Jan. 9, 1931, in his reply, did H. intimate that he had some other letters in his possession, said that he intended to publish them, and asked for copies of ours to include in his publication. H's intended publication was only advertised in the QJE of May 1931. – As it turned out, H. had only two letters of Mill, as against our forty seven!

The true story therefore is as follows: H. had two letters of Mill since 1919: he sat tight upon them, never disclosing the secret to anyone (not even to Gregory, his joint-editor of the Notes on Malthus, with the MS of which the Mill letters were found), till January 1931. Only some time after the proposed publication of our collection of letters had been advertised, did he disclose the fact of his possession & did he decide to publish. And in response to our appeal to the public for further letters, instead of letting us have his treasures, he asked us to let him have our 47 Mill letters that he might complete his collection of 2. This we declined to do.

Even so, Hollander delayed publication of his two letters till the beginning of 1933; and even this was done only under pressure of Frank Ricardo, the owner of all the letters, who since early in 1930 had given us permission to publish all the MSS belonging to him.

(S: D3/11/63: 37(i–ii))

Keynes replied to Gay on 24 January 1934:

It is very good of you to have taken so much trouble in this small matter. If only Hollander will carry out his previous intention of publishing the Barton letter at not too remote a date for us, we shall be reasonably content, but the wretch has already had this document of four pages 'in process of use' for eighteen years, without disclosing it to the public or even confessing to us

that he possessed such a document. Beyond this I agree that nothing further can be usefully done in this connection. But Hollander's letter so completely misrepresents the position, to the best of my understanding, that I should like to append to this letter two papers giving our view of the matter. The first of these is a letter from me to Hollander of the 21st December, 1931, in which you will see that we have never asked him to allow us to publish any of his material in advance of himself. We have only urged him to expedite his own publication, since it is not fair that he should keep such documents up his sleeve for an indefinite number of years. As regards scientific reciprocity, we have never asked him to let us publish anything before he did, though this is what he has been asking us. We only want him not to take more than ten or twenty years in publishing the few scraps in his possession! The other document which I append is a note written for me by Sraffa which puts, I think, rather a different complexion [sic] on the matter of the Mill letters.

(S: D3/11/63: 36)

On 6 November 1934 Hollander sent Sraffa the galleyproof of the reprint of John Barton's tract, which was about to be issued in the series of 'Economic Tracts' and contained, in the appendix, Ricardo's letter to Barton (see S: D3/11/63: 53). Sraffa thanked Hollander on 12 November 1934, adding: 'I am keenly looking forward to your further publications . . . May we hope to see them in the near future?' (S: D3/11/63: 54).

In the following years Sraffa continued his search for Ricardiana and, not surprisingly, came across various of Hollander's activities as a collector.¹⁶ On 19 August 1937 he wrote to him:

Mr Keynes has lent me the Catalogue of your Library [see Hollander (1937)] and I have studied it with increasing admiration.

I was, of course, particularly interested in your 'Ricardiana' and above all in the impressive list of your collection of Ricardo autograph letters. May I take this opportunity of venturing to reiterate my request that you should be so good as to let me have copies of the unpublished letters of Ricardo in your possession? I should also be most grateful if you would kindly allow me to have a copy of Say's letter to Ricardo of October 10, 1819, which I suppose was presented to you by Mr Frank Ricardo.¹⁷ . . .

I should be doubly grateful if you would let me have copies of these letters (or, if that is more agreeable to you, if you will make them available by publication as you have done on previous occasions). In the first place, for the sake of making the Royal Economic Society's edition of Ricardo as complete as possible. And, in the second place because it would relieve me from an embarrassing situation: I should like to be able to make my fullest acknowledgements to you, to whom I am, along with every student of Ricardo, under such very great obligations; however, *since the catalogue of your library has been widely circulated, I should of course be under the necessity of stating that such and such letters are in your possession and that my failure to include them in the R.E.S. edition is due to my not having been allowed access to them.* Such a statement would,

inevitably, and to my great regret, bear the appearance of a reserve in my acknowledgements to you; and it would unfortunately be emphasised by the fact that I have to make no such reserve in respect of any of the other owners of Ricardo manuscripts.

(S: D3/11/63: 50(i–ii))

Hollander's reply is dated 6 October 1937:

The contents of my Library – books and manuscripts – have been and are at the disposal of scholars. Many books have from time to time been lent, under the usual restrictions . . . A single exception exists – a few unpublished letters of Ricardo. These, acquired over a term of years at considerable labor and expense, have been incorporated in the manuscript of my book, presently to be published, and I am unable to supply copies in advance. Such a conclusion conforms to your own practice. Some years ago when about to reprint letters of McCulloch and Mill to Ricardo I requested copies of those in your possession. You found it impossible to comply with this request on the ground that they must be 'reserved for the main collection'.

Finally may I express my amazement at the tenor of the final paragraph of your letter. We in this country are unaccustomed to the kind of pressure it seeks to exert, and I can only assume that your recourse thereto grows out of unacquaintance with the amenities that prevail among scholars. It cannot, of course, affect in the remotest degree the position set forth above, and I beg to assure you that in the event of your edition appearing with any statement as misleading as that which you suggest, I shall take prompt measures to acquaint the economic profession the world over with the facts in the case.

(S: D3/11/63: 49(i–ii))

Sraffa replied in a letter of 29 October 1937, after having consulted with Keynes (see K: EJ/1/4/205–6) and Kahn (see RFK/13/57/255):

You are mistaken in thinking that my object is to secure priority of publication over you. Far from it, . . . my aim being to produce, not a first, but as far as can be a definitive edition of Ricardo.

I feel obliged to disagree with the statement of facts . . . and I should like to be allowed to place a more accurate account on record. I wrote to you on November 29th, 1930, asking you for copies of any Ricardo letters in your possession and informing you that these were required for an edition which had been announced many months before: you replied on January 9th, 1931, when, in a document which I have preserved, you (a) refused to comply with my request; (b) requested that, instead, I should let you have our letters so that they might be published by you in advance of our edition.

As regards the last paragraph of your letter, I do not propose to say anything in my preface, which has not been first approved by the Council of the Royal Economic Society; so that you can rest assured that what appears will not merely represent a personal view, but will have the authority of the most responsible scholars in this country.

(S: D3/11/63: 51(i))

There was some further correspondence between Sraffa and Hollander in 1938 concerning, *inter alia*, Barton's address as it was wrongly transcribed by Hollander in his publication of Ricardo's letter to Barton. Sraffa would remind Hollander on 14 December 1938: 'I hope also to hear that your work is nearing publication, so that I may get the benefit of it for the last stages of our edition' (S: D3/11/63: 48).¹⁸ And on 23 January 1939 Sraffa sent a telegram to Hollander asking him to 'kindly cable how soon you will publish Say letter 3970 [of] your library catalogue and word-space we should reserve for printing' (S: D3/11/63: 45). On 26 January 1939 Hollander replied by telegram: 'Sending Photostat Say Letter' (S: D3/11/63: 44); the photostat was indeed sent the following day by Hollander's secretary.

8. Suffering under a new 'embargo'

Jacob H. Hollander died on 9 July 1940, with his *magnum opus* still unpublished.¹⁹ In a letter of 30 July 1942 Sraffa asked Jacob Viner what had happened to Hollander's library (see S: D3/11/74: 25). Viner investigated the situation and on 19 October 1942 was able to send the requested information. According to it the library was in storage as an asset of Hollander's estate and the material was not accessible (S: D3/11/63: 35), information confirmed by Hollander's son, to whom Sraffa had written on 30 October 1947 (see S: D3/11/63: 33–4).

Hence Sraffa had to publish his edition without having been able to fully consult the material in Hollander's library.²⁰ In 1955 Sraffa apparently made inquiries about the Hollander collection via Maggs Bros. Among his papers he kept a copy of a letter from the Maryland Trust Company to Maggs Bros, dated 26 October 1955, which contains the following statement: 'The Library of the late Dr Hollander, which is now owned by the Trustees for his estate, is for sale'. The estimated value of Hollander's library was given as US \$50,000 (see S: I 69: 3). Sraffa appears to have toyed with the idea of buying the library himself.

In 1958 the Hollander Collection was acquired by the University of Illinois. In a letter of 22 August 1958 Sraffa contacted that university (see S: D3/11/76: 1) and received a letter from Professor J. F. Bell, dated 18 September 1958. It confirmed

that we have purchased the Jacob Hollander Library. You may possibly know that it was crated and completely out of circulation for at least fifteen years. . . . I will gladly cooperate with you if you know of anything in the collection that may be of interest or of use.

(S: D3/11/64: 4)²¹

Sraffa replied in a letter of 20 October 1958:

It is a great pleasure to renew acquaintance on such a happy occasion as the acquisition by the University of Illinois of the Hollander Library. To me this is particularly welcome news as *I was one of the sufferers under the 'embargo'* . . . There are two main things in which I have long been interested in the Hollander collection: First, the Ricardo letters (Nos. 3973 to 3983 in the printed Catalogue) . . . Secondly, the MS of J. S. Mill's *Autobiography* (No. 4024 in the Catalogue) . . . Thirdly, there are besides two letters of minor importance of which I should be glad to have photostats: Malthus to Moses Ricardo, 18 June 1830 (No. 3962), and Adam Smith to George Baird, 7 February 1783 (No. 3936) . . . If you would be so good as to permit of, and arrange for, all this I should be very much obliged.

(S: D3/11/64: 3)

Sraffa was sent photographic copies of the material requested, except Mill's *Autobiography*, which, as Bell told Sraffa, was in the process of being prepared for publication (see S: D3/11/64: 5).

9. Concluding remarks

Jacob H. Hollander variously expressed his concern that a complete and as perfect as possible edition of Ricardo's works and correspondence be brought out, either by him or some other Ricardo scholars whom he liberally offered his good services and assistance. Alas, the material displayed in this paper shows that he did not mean it: Hollander's attitude towards the RES edition of *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo* was decidedly obstructive. To him the preservation of Ricardo's intellectual heritage appears to have counted for little as soon as he was no longer in full control of it. His main claim to distinction was in his bibliophile erudition and antiquarian's collection, and the RES editorial project came as a serious blow to him. Viner's comparison of Hollander to the 'dog in the manger' does not quite fit the story. As Paul Samuelson reminded us,²² the dog in the stable got no benefit from the hay which he deprived the horse of (and that only the horse did). The dog was a '*gratuitous* sadist'. Not so with Hollander who had to be wary of loss of reputation.

It goes without saying that the case under consideration is not unique. It is just one among several parallel cases in the history of textual scholarship, with the Dead Sea scrolls being perhaps the most famous.

University of Graz

Notes

- * An earlier version of this paper was presented at a session of the *HES* meeting at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, 30 June–3 July 2000, and at the *HETSA* meeting at Wesley College, Sydney, 4–7 July 2000. We are grateful to the participants for useful remarks. Special thanks go to Nick Baigent, Giancarlo de Vivo, Gilbert Faccarello, Geoff Harcourt, Arnold Heertje, Sam Hollander, John King, Nerio Naldi, Annalisa Rosselli, Paul A. Samuelson, Ian Steedman, and Donald Winch for valuable comments and suggestions. We should also like to thank four anonymous referees of the *Journal of the Royal Economic Society*, to which the paper had for obvious reasons originally been submitted, and two referees of *EJHET* for the depth of some of the considerations they gave our paper which were of great use to us in revising it. (The reader intrigued by the query why the paper was not published in the former journal might wish to consult the home page: <<http://www.kfunigraz.ac.at/vwlwww/kurz/kurz.html>>.) Any remaining errors and misconceptions are, of course, entirely our responsibility.
- 1 As Sraffa notes in his General Preface, 'by the summer of 1940, six volumes . . . had been set up in page-proof, while the volume of Speeches and Evidence had reached the state of galley-proofs' (Ricardo, *Works* I: ix).
 - 2 For most helpful assistance in the preparation of this paper we would like to thank the library staffs of the Wren Library at Trinity College, Cambridge (UK), of the Modern Archive Centre in the King's College Library, Cambridge (UK), of the Archives Division in the British Library of Political and Economic Science at the London School of Economics, London (UK), of the Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library at Princeton University, Princeton (USA), and of the Milton S. Eisenhower Library, Special Collections Branch, at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore (USA). We should like to thank the following people and institutions for granting us permission to quote from the various papers: Pierangelo Garegnani, literary executor of Sraffa's papers and correspondence; John S. Weeren (Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library); and Joan Grattan (Milton S. Eisenhower Library). We use the following abbreviations of the mentioned archives: S (Sraffa Papers), K (Keynes Papers), LSE (London School of Economics), PU (Princeton University), and H (Hollander Papers).
 - 3 See the letter dated 27 December 1999 from Mrs Joan Grattan of the Milton S. Eisenhower Library to the authors.
 - 4 For general information on the Jacob H. Hollander archive, see the online guide under gopher: [//musicbox.mse.jhu.edu:70/00/mss/ms059.txt](http://musicbox.mse.jhu.edu:70/00/mss/ms059.txt).
 - 5 Present at this meeting: 'Dr. Bonar (in the chair), Prof. Edgeworth, Mr Hoare, Prof. Gregory, Prof. MacGregor, Mr Tawney, Mr Keynes, The Assistant Secretary' (LSE: RES/2/1/2).
 - 6 Present at the meeting: 'The President [i.e., H. S. Foxwell], in the chair, Prof. Cannan, Prof. Gregory, Mr. Higgs, Mr. Hoare, Mr. Keynes, Prof. MacGregor, Asst. Secretary' (LSE: RES/2/1/2).
 - 7 We found no evidence in support of Porta's contention that Keynes was 'lending his own good offices over five years in order to secure the project to his own young man' (Porta 1986: 35).
 - 8 All italics in passages cited from letters and drafts of letters are ours, whereas all underlinings are in the original texts.
 - 9 In Sraffa's diary there are notes for appointments with many other scholars, including Bonar, Foxwell, Higgs, Laski and Robbins, in March, April and May 1930.
 - 10 Sraffa's resignation from his lectureship in May 1931 (see S: B9/1: 13) was motivated

- by his constructive theoretical work and the strain teaching put on him and was only indirectly related to his editorial work.
- 11 The draft copy kept by Sraffa contained the following additional paragraph crossed out by Keynes: 'Or do you mean by "reciprocal courtesies" that we should publish your material before you do, and that you should publish our material before we do? That would be amusing, but scarcely practical!' (ibid.)
 - 12 The passage quoted by Sraffa is from a letter of Jacob H. Hollander to Jacob Viner, who communicated it to Sraffa in a letter of 26 April 1932 (see S: D3/11/74: 12).
 - 13 Hollander's edition of Ricardo's *Minor Papers* was published in late 1932 (Hollander 1932). Sraffa's own copy (see Sraffa's Library, item 1024) is heavily annotated, with many corrections indicated on the margin.
 - 14 On 9 January 1934 Hollander sent a copy of his letter to Gay also to Edwin Cannan, adding: 'You will be interested in the enclosed copy . . . in connection with representations which Keynes had made to him – and to others – as to my disposition in the matter of certain Ricardo materials' (LSE: MF Cannan 1033/221).
 - 15 According to Sraffa's diary the meeting took place on 1 July 1930; see above Section 4.
 - 16 There is an interesting letter to Harold Laski, dated 19 August 1937, in which Sraffa wrote: 'You once told me the story of how you tried to get in touch, through Maggs, with the owner of the MS of Mill's Autobiography; and how he replied, in an anonymous letter, that *the whole point of buying such a thing was that no one else should see it*. – I was enormously pleased to-day, in turning over the pages of the Catalogue of Hollander's Library, to discover (p. 317) that he is your man! I have myself, together with Keynes, been struggling with this brute for the last six years . . .' (S: D3/11/66: 32).
 - 17 As Sraffa later found out, Hollander had in fact purchased this letter in 1917. In his copy of Hollander's *Minor Papers* (see Sraffa's Library, item 1024) Sraffa noted on p. 184: 'N.B. Hollander had since 1917 Say's letter to R. of 10 Oct. 1819 (see my edn VIII, 136) but did not publish it! (1.12.51)'.
 - 18 In July 1938 Sraffa was approached by a Mr McCrimmon who, knowing that Keynes was in bad health and not in Cambridge, asked whether Sraffa could perhaps arrange for him to see Keynes's collection of John Stuart Mill's letters (see S: D3/11/67: 44–5). Sraffa forwarded the request to Keynes who replied from Tilton: '*I am rather inclined to do a Hollander over the enclosed*. I have the excuse that the letters are scattered and locked up in various places, I do not quite know where, not easily accessible so long as I am away. In truth, I have nothing which would be of particular value to him except the correspondence with his wife. This, as you know, I still have the project of using myself. And there is nothing there which would be of any value for a general life which he is probably contemplating, and would only be valuable as the material for a special study. So can you manage to put him off?' (S: D3/11/67: 47). Sraffa wrote accordingly to McCrimmon (see S: D3/11/67: 46).
 - 19 Mrs. Holly Callahan, Assistant Curator of Manuscripts at the Milton S. Eisenhower Library, made a search of the Hollander Papers on behalf of the authors, but 'was unable to find either the manuscript on Ricardo or any mention of the manuscript' (letter to the authors, 5 June 2001).
 - 20 In volumes III to X there are several notes on manuscripts which are described as being 'in the possession of Professor Hollander' (see, in particular, *Works* III: 5n and 406; VII: 155n; VIII: 136n; and X: 81n).
 - 21 On Hollander's economic library, see Bell (1959).
 - 22 See his letter to us dated 26 March 2001.

References

- Bell, J. F. (1959). The Jacob H. Hollander Economic Library: the Monument of a Man and his Science. *Current Economic Comment*, 21: 21–28.
- Cannan, E. (1929). Review of Hollander and Gregory (1928). *Economica*, November: 358–65.
- Hollander, J. H. (ed.) (1895). *Letters of David Ricardo to John Ramsay McCulloch 1816–1823*. Edited with introduction and annotations by J. H. Hollander. New York: Macmillan and London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.
- Hollander, J. H. (1904). The Development of Ricardo's Theory of Value. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 18: 455–91.
- Hollander, J. H. (1910). *David Ricardo – A Centenary Estimate*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Hollander, J. H. (1928). Editor's Introduction. In J. H. Hollander and T. E. Gregory (eds), *Notes on Malthus's 'Principles of Political Economy' by David Ricardo*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Hollander, J. H. (ed.) (1931). *Letters of John Ramsay McCulloch to David Ricardo (1818–1823)*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Hollander, J. H. (ed.) (1932). *Minor Papers on the Currency Question 1809–1823 by David Ricardo*. Edited with an introduction and notes by Jacob H. Hollander. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Hollander, J. H. (1937). *The Economic Library of Jacob H. Hollander*, privately printed (500 copies). Baltimore. Reprinted as E. A. Marsh (ed.) (1966) *Economic Library of Jacob H. Hollander*. Gale Research.
- Hollander, J. H. and Gregory, T. E. (eds) (1928). *Notes on Malthus's 'Principles of Political Economy' by David Ricardo*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Naldi, N. (2000). Piero Sraffa's early approach to political economy: from the *gymnasium* to the beginning of his career. In T. Cozzi and R. Marchionatti (eds), *Piero Sraffa's Political Economy*. London: Routledge, pp. 23–40.
- Porta, P. L. (1986). How Piero Sraffa took up the editorship of David Ricardo's Works and Correspondence. *History of Economics Society Bulletin* (Nashville, Tenn, VIII, (1): 35–7.
- Ricardo, D. (1951–1973). *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo*, 11 vols. Edited by P. Sraffa with the collaboration of M. H. Dobb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sraffa, P. (1925). Sulle relazioni fra costo e quantità prodotta. *Annali di Economia*, 2: 277–328.

Abstract

The paper reports on Jacob H. Hollander's cooperation with John Maynard Keynes and Piero Sraffa in the preparation of the latter's edition of *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo*. The report is based on archive material from various sources, including the unpublished papers of Edwin Cannan, Piero Sraffa, Jacob H. Hollander, John Maynard Keynes, and Jacob Viner, and the archive of the *Royal Economic Society*. The archive material consulted by us shows that, put mildly, Jacob H. Hollander did not

promote Sraffa's editorial project: he held back material which he had received from Frank Ricardo and did not disclose to Sraffa that he owned several important letters which he had privately purchased. Moreover, Sraffa was refused access to Ricardiana even after he had traced them down in laborious detective work to be in Hollander's possession. Hollander's unwillingness to cooperate with Sraffa considerably delayed the publication of the Ricardo edition.

Keywords

Jacob H. Hollander, John Maynard Keynes, David Ricardo, Piero Sraffa, Royal Economic Society

Appendix

The delayed publication of Sraffa's Ricardo edition led to several requests for permission to be allowed access to specific parts of the material prior to publication, which Sraffa generally was most willing to give. However, there are two issues which should be briefly remarked upon for clarification. The first concern the publication of Ricardo's 'Notes on Bentham's *Sur les prix*'. In a letter of 24 January 1939 Jacob Viner informed Sraffa that

as Editor of the Journal of Political Economy, I received an offer from Dr. Edmund Silberner of a manuscript for publication, consisting of Ricardo's comments on an unpublished manuscript by Bentham, edited by Dumont, the latter bearing the title 'Matériaux d'un traité sur la hausse des prix et les effets de papier-monnaie.' . . . I would like to know what you know about the manuscript, and whether you plan shortly to publish it in Ricardo's works.

(S: D3/11/74: 20)

To this Sraffa replied on 7 February 1939:

I am very grateful to you for your kindness in writing to me before taking a decision about Ricardo's notes on Bentham-Dumont. As you will see from the stamp upon the enclosed . . . I have had them in page-proof since 1933! I really hope now that the whole thing (9 vols.) will be published before the end of the year. This is one of the very few entirely unpublished writings of Ricardo that will first appear in our edition, & therefore I should naturally be glad not to be forestalled. I do not know how the question of copyright stands in America, or whether Dr Silberner proposes to get in touch with the Ricardo family. In England of course unpublished MSS are copyright & the Ricardos have given the Royal Econ. Soc. the right to publish all D.R.'s works.

On looking up my files I find that the Bibliothèque publique et universitaire of Geneva, who own the manuscript, have given us permission to publish it.
(PU: Jacob Viner Papers)

Viner replied on 21 February 1939: 'In the light of what you tell me about the Bentham-Ricardo manuscript, I will certainly not accept it for publication in the *Journal of Political Economy*' (ibid.). However, as Sraffa notes in Volume III of the RES edition (*Works III*: 266), Ricardo's notes on Bentham were nevertheless published by Silberner in 1940 in the *Revue d'Histoire économique et sociale*.

The second issue concerns Sraffa's own collection of manuscripts and autograph letters. In his search for Ricardiana for the RES edition Sraffa had purchased a few letters himself. When publishing them in the edition he would not refer to them as 'MS in the possession of Mr Piero Sraffa' (as in the case of other owners of manuscripts) but by giving the name of the bookseller (or auction house) and the catalogue number (or auction date) where the respective item had been advertised (or been on sale). Similar information was also given in the case of all those manuscripts which Sraffa had transcribed prior to sale and for which he had to respect the purchasers' desire for anonymity.

Copyright of European Journal of the History of Economic Thought is the property of Routledge, Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.