



Obituary.

F. J. HAVERFIELD, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A.,
Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University
of Oxford.

OUR Society has suffered a very great loss by the death of our member, Professor Francis John Haverfield, at his house, Winshields, Headington, Oxford, on the 1st of October last (1919).

Professor Haverfield was born in 1860, the son of the Rev. W. R. Haverfield by his wife Emily, sister of the Right Rev. John Mackarness, Bishop of Oxford. He was a scholar of Winchester and of New College, Oxford, M.A., Hon. LL.D. (Aberdeen), Hon. D. Litt. (Leeds), Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries, Fellow of the British Academy, President of the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological Society, of the Oxford Architectural and Historical Society, and of the Somerset Archaeological Society. He was senior Censor, Student and Librarian of Christ Church, Oxford, between 1891 and 1907, when he was appointed Fellow of Brasenose College and Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, in succession to his friend, Professor Henry Pelham, which appointment he held at the time of his death. He was also a Visitor of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, a member of the Commission on Historical Monuments (England), and first President of the Roman Society, to mention only the most important of his activities and offices.

His death has removed one who was not only one of the greatest living authorities on the history and archaeology of Roman Britain, but also a most inspiring teacher and friend of all students of the subject that he made so peculiarly his own. While still an undergraduate he had already shown his capacity for research, devoting much time to classical philology, inspired by the teaching of Professor Nettleship. This study led him to that of Roman epigraphy, a subject with which he already had some acquaintance. His father, owing to delicate health, lived for many years in Bath, where his son attended a preparatory school. The Headmaster, Mr. Dunn, took an

active interest in the remains of the Roman Spa which were then coming to light during some rebuilding of the baths, and his enthusiasm first excited his pupil to observe and study—as far as a boy can—the buildings and remains of the Romans in this country. Before he had taken his degree he was writing to Mommsen about an inscription recently discovered in Oxford, and contributing articles and reviews on philology and epigraphy to the *Academy* and *Journal of Philology*. Later, while a schoolmaster at Lancing, whither he proceeded from Oxford, he spent most of his holidays abroad, studying Roman inscriptions and antiquities in remote parts of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Balkans, as well as in the more frequented parts of the Continent. One of the earliest of these journeys took him to Berlin, where he met Mommsen in person. The latter was so impressed with his knowledge and capacity that he persuaded him to undertake the publication of Roman inscriptions in Britain in connection with the great *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, on which he was then engaged. The volume for Britain had been already published, edited by Emil Hübner, but it was full of errors and inaccurate statements and *lacunae*, and needed much revision. The collection of material for additions to and corrections of this work led the future Camden Professor to visit local museums, private collections, and Roman sites all over Britain, and soon, from a study of epigraphy he was led to the study of Roman Britain in all its aspects. His researches into Roman History, and more particularly of the province *Britannia*, may originally have been inspired by a close study of Tacitus, but his interest had been quickened by the appearance in 1885, a year after he left Oxford, of Mommsen's *Roman Provinces*, a work which shewed him the real uses of archaeology, and which put the history of the Roman Empire on an altogether different basis, allowing its true character to be properly appreciated; as he remarked in an obituary article on Mommsen :—

Our horizon broadened beyond the back-stairs of the Palatine to the wide lands north and east and south of the Mediterranean, and we began to realise the great achievements of the empire—its long and peaceable administration of dominions extending into three continents, its gifts of civilisation, citizenship, and language to almost all its subjects, its establishment of a stable and coherent order out of which arose the western Europe of to-day.

He saw that Mommsen's work was based upon a study of archaeology, combined with a detailed examination of the

texts of the historians; he realised, too, that it was possible to see at work the Roman method of conquest, and still more of administration, in this remote corner of the empire, as clearly or more clearly than in Rome itself. As Dr. Craster says in his admirable article in the January number of the *English Historical Review*, "Henceforward Mommsen became his master." Mommsen's appreciation of the Roman empire and his method of study provide the key to Professor Haverfield's interest in Roman Britain. It was the zeal of the historian that excited him to the study of Romano-British archæology in all its branches. No object was too small to be neglected: a brooch, a potsherd, a coin, equally with an inscription, could help to elucidate or to add to the history of the Roman province and of the empire in general. All finds, however, he compared with others in other parts of the empire, and thus regarded them in their true proportions. He studied Roman remains from every part of the Continent, and kept abreast of the latest discoveries made anywhere within the empire. This may be seen in the articles and reviews which began to appear as early as 1882, but became more numerous in 1884. By 1889 he had already acquired a reputation as a student of Romano-British archæology and history.

It was at this juncture that he first came to Chester, being then still a schoolmaster at Lancing. In repairing the north wall of the City near Morgan's Mount in 1883, the interior of the lower part was found to contain Roman stones: and again, in that part of the wall which bounds the Deanery field, Mr. Matthews Jones, M.I.C.E., the City Surveyor, made striking discoveries in the spring of 1887. Here the lower courses were faced with massive stones, while the interior consisted of inscribed, sculptured and moulded stones, obviously taken from a Roman cemetery. These finds aroused great interest, and a committee was formed by our Society and £100 collected for the further exploration of the north wall. Thirteen inscribed stones had already come to light; now (October, 1887) the excavations yielded fourteen more. Great discussions arose as to the age of the walls, and even of some of the stones, more especially of one termed the "Ecclesiastical stone" from the long cloak worn by the man to whom the stone had been set up. These discussions mostly took place at the meetings of our Society, and the papers read—some of them by eminent scholars—were printed in the *Journal*, the discoveries having attracted the attention of archæologists such as Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, Dr. Collingwood Bruce, C. R. Smith, A. W. Franks, Dr. John Evans, E. P. Loftus Brock, Sir Henry Dryden, Thompson Watkin,

Scarth, W. De Gray Birch, Robert Blair, and others. In 1888 some of these papers, including the official report of the excavations by Mr. Matthews Jones, M.I.C.E., and others on the inscriptions by Thompson Watkin and W. de Gray Birch, and one on the date of the wall by G. W. Shrubsole, were reprinted, with many illustrations and an historical introduction by the late J. P. Earwaker, M.A., F.S.A., as a separate pamphlet entitled *Recent discoveries of Roman remains found in repairing the North Wall of Chester City*. It was in a review of this pamphlet in the *Academy* of June 22nd, 1889, that Professor Haverfield first entered the scene of Chester archæology. Nothing better illustrates the value of his wide outlook to local archæology than this and the many other reviews and letters and articles he contributed to the *Athenæum*, *Academy*, and other papers, as well as to our *Journal*, in connection with these Chester discoveries. His common sense and sound judgment, his wide grasp and sense of proportion, his comparative knowledge and appreciation of historical value of the finds enabled him to take them out of the sphere of local archæology, and fit them into their proper place in the history of the empire. And all this he did with that untiring energy and fine carelessness of trouble which appeared in everything he undertook, and which, indeed, is the mark of all really good work. In the first of the reviews mentioned above, in that terse classical style of which he was a master, he at once seized on the salient points. He showed that the lower part of the wall was Roman work *in situ*; he attacked *a priori* arguments; "Arguments, indeed," he said, "are the least satisfactory part of the whole business. Many of them are purely *a priori*: and while they glibly decide what the Romans ought to have done, they are little concerned with what the Romans really did. . . . Hence there is a terrible waste of print, energy, and time over facts which ought never to have been doubted—the date of the 'Ecclesiastical stone,' the use of tombstones for building material, and so forth. . . . The date of a few yards of masonry is not a matter of supreme importance. The wall dwindles into insignificance beside the inscriptions and sculptures found in it." He then remarked that the thirteen stones were adequately described by Thompson Watkin, but points out how untrustworthy was the account of the fourteen by de Gray Birch, and closed the review with a demand for the continuation of the work. "It is hardly doubtful that there are other valuable stones in the unexplored wall: and, as Canon Raine says, vandalism would consist not in pulling down and rebuilding the wall, but in suffering the inscrip-

tions to remain undiscovered. . . No archæologist should shrink from searching Chester walls."

In the early part of 1890, Professor Haverfield, in conjunction with Professors Pelham and Middleton and Dr. John Evans, issued an appeal for funds for further excavation, and in June 1st of the same year, in order to arouse greater interest, he published a letter from Mommsen on the subject, in which he said:—"Since Deva was garrisoned by the 20th Legion from the earliest time to the end of the Roman occupation, the results are likely to be of importance to English archæologists and to all professed scholars. . . For the story of the Roman empire there is nothing so instructive as a great headquarters of the imperial army. The cemetery discovered at the beginning of this century at Mayence has more advanced our knowledge of this period than all the vulgar scribbling with which the *plebs urbana* has filled our volumes. We Latin scholars will pray very earnestly for good luck to the English pickaxes occupied at Deva: and the last discoveries give good hope. Perhaps Greek inscriptions are more in vogue with your classic and roving nation; but I think you do not lack men who, remembering or not remembering our poet's words '*Willst du immer weiter schweigen? sieh! das gute liegt so nah,*' will act up to it." Professor Haverfield had also enlisted the help of many scholars in England and abroad, and at his instigation a committee was formed to raise funds and assist the Corporation of Chester with money and advice, he himself generously contributing, and taking an active part in the proceedings. The following formed the Committee:—

MEMBERS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES.—Henry Pelham, M.A., F.S.A., Camden Professor, Oxford; F. Haverfield, M.A., F.S.A.; John Evans, President of the Society of Antiquaries; J. H. Middleton, M.A., F.S.A., Slade Professor of Fine Arts in the University of Cambridge; Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L.; Right Rev. John Wordsworth, D.D. (Bishop of Salisbury); E. P. Loftus Brock, F.S.A.; J. Collingwood Bruce, LL.D., D.C.L.

SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE TOWN COUNCIL.—Charles Brown, Alderman, Mayor of Chester; John Jones, Councillor, Sheriff of Chester; J. Gerrard, Alderman, Chairman of the Improvement Committee; Henry Thomas Brown, Alderman.

SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE CHESTER ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—T. S. Gleadowe, M.A., Inspector of Schools; Dr. Stolterfoth; A. Lamont; and Henry Taylor, F.S.A., Honorary Secretary.

During November and December, 1890, in repairing the wall west of the Northgate, more Roman remains were found. Professor Haverfield at once sent money to enable excava-

tions to be carried down to the lower part of the wall, with the result that seven more inscribed and four sculptured stones were found. This discovery Professor Haverfield immediately announced in the *Athenæum* and other papers, at the same time making a further appeal for funds. All these efforts resulted in serious excavations during the next two or three years. Mr. Matthews Jones was put in charge of the work, while Professor Haverfield helped in every possible way, more especially with the inscriptions, which he published periodically in the *Academy*, *Athenæum*, and other English and foreign papers and journals. He persuaded the Society of Antiquaries, Oxford University, the trustees of the Craven fund at Cambridge (who sent Mr. E. F. Benson, then a scholar of King's College, with a grant), and other bodies to make grants towards the expenses, remarking that "It is most gratifying to find the Universities thus encouraging the study of Roman Britain, which from the days of Bentley (or earlier) they have somewhat overlooked." He never lost an opportunity of pointing out to the Universities that they interested themselves in excavations at Rome, at Athens, or in Egypt, while they neglected the antiquities at their door. Perhaps his greatest contribution to the study of archæology and history was the encouragement he gave to it when he himself became Camden Professor of Ancient History, by interesting the younger members of the University, by training a school of Romano-British archæologists, and by promoting excavations in every part of Britain. How much he had it at heart is shown by the fact that at his death he left to the University of Oxford a sum of money for the excavation of Romano-British sites under proper direction, in the hope of bringing together ancient historians and local archæologists.

During the period of the Chester discoveries, Professor Haverfield published some thirty-five inscriptions. He was constantly at Chester, not only supervising the excavations, but attending meetings of our Society, and reading papers on the inscriptions and on other subjects. He made many personal friends in Chester then and later, and was ever ready to give information, guidance and assistance from the great store of his knowledge and experience in Roman archæology and history, sparing neither his time nor his purse. This connection with Chester did not cease when the excavations of the City wall came to an end, owing to the refusal of the late Dean to allow them to be carried on in that part of the wall which bounds the Deanery field. He was ever willing to assist in any excavations in the City rendered necessary by

the re-erection of buildings or otherwise, and in fact was always appealed to when any find was made, the result frequently being a paper to our Society. The following is the list of the papers which he read from time to time :—

“*The Administration of Roman Mines*,” Vol. IV., N.S., p. 80, 19th January, 1891; “*The Origins of Deva*,” Vol. V., N.S., p. 99, 1893; “*The Characteristics of Roman Chester*,” Vol. V., N.S., p. 353, read 18th March, 1895; “*Roman Altar discovered in Chester in 1896*,” Vol. VI., N.S., p. 76; “*Roman uses of Roman Tombstones*,” Vol. VI., N.S., p. 137; “*The Antiquity of Place Names*,” Vol. VI., N.S., pp. 36 and 249; “*An Inscribed Roman Fragment from Shoemaker’s Row, Chester*,” Vol. VI., N.S., p. 139; “*Inscription found on Lead Pipes*,” Vol. VIII., N.S., p. 89 (which mentions Agricola; of this Professor Haverfield says: “No other inscription exists which bears his name”); “*The Roman Walls of Chester*,” Vol. VIII., N.S., read 19th December, 1899; “*On the Roman Remains discovered on the site of Allen Buildings, Bridge Street, Chester*,” Vol. XVI., N.S., p. 118, 16th November, 1909; and a paper on “*The Roman Wall*,” read for him before our Society by Miss M. V. Taylor, M.A., in January, 1919, which was not printed in our *Journal*.

Perhaps the most valuable of his contributions is the descriptive and illustrated Catalogue of the inscribed and sculptured stones found during the excavations and earlier, and arranged by him in the Grosvenor Museum. The catalogue forms Volume VII. of our Society’s *Journal*. This collection he regarded as “one of the richest and most important collections of Roman stones in England.” The volume is now out of print, and has become difficult to obtain. Prof. Haverfield himself, some little time ago, not being able to obtain a copy for a friend in this country, after much difficulty bought one in Germany. He had taken steps to prepare a second edition, with additional information, but his death prevented the execution of this intention, to the great loss of our Society. It is not too much to say that this catalogue has made the name of Chester famous to archæologists and classical scholars in every part of Europe.

This is not the place for a long account of Professor Haverfield’s many activities. That has been, and is being, given much better elsewhere. Dr. Craster’s article in the *English Historical Review* has already been mentioned. A bibliography of all his works, compiled by Dr. George Macdonald, C.B., has just appeared in Volume VIII. of the *Journal of Roman Studies*. This, and a memoir for the *British Academy*,

also by Dr. Macdonald, are to be reprinted as an introduction to the famous Ford Lectures on Roman Britain which Professor Haverfield gave at Oxford in 1907, and will shortly be published by the Clarendon Press. To these we would refer our readers, who will there find all that they want to know of Professor Haverfield and of his work. Then, perhaps, they will be able to realise what a great loss to learning has been sustained by his death. Two of the best of his pupils were killed during the war, and there is literally no one in the same plane to succeed him as the leader of Romano-British archæological and historical studies. One may only hope that the means he has provided for excavation and for the study of the Roman empire, more especially of Roman Britain, by the great impulse he gave to those studies, and by the bequest to the University of Oxford both of money and of his very complete library, may in time produce the effect he desired, and that others may appear to follow in his footsteps.

OXFORD, *August*, 1920.

M. V. T.

NOTE.—Much of the information given above is derived from the reviews and letters in the *Athenæum*, 13th December, 1887; January and 30th June, 1888; 7th June and 13th December, 1890; 16th May and 31st October, 1891; 16th April and 9th July, 1892; 27th January, 1894; and the *Academy* of 22nd June, 1889; 14th March and 7th November, 1891 (the last on the reading of the word *Deceangi* or *Deceangl* on the Chester pig of lead).

