story in such a way as to create and maintain what may have been regarded as a waning interest in the Divine revelation. (I.) *The Book of Jubilees* is so called from a division into jubilee periods of forty-nine years of a revelation said to have been given to Moses through the medium of an angel. The subtitle is due to the narrative largely corresponding to that in the Book of Genesis. The matter is singularly diversified with all manner of fable and legend, angelology and demonology, including a plea for the re-constitution of the calendar, then a subject of controversy. The original was possibly the work of a Hebrew priest who wrote either towards the close of the second century B.C., or at latest in the first century of our era, and expresses the opinions of a large and influential section of the Jewish people. The Ethiopic and Latin versions are based upon a Greek text. Dr. Charles' translation (first published in 1902) is grounded upon all the known MSS. (II.) *The Apocalypse of Ezra* (2 Esdras iii.-xiv.) is now only extant in Latin and Oriental translations, severally based upon a non-existing Greek version from a lost Hebrew text, possibly of early second-century date. The appended notes are of considerable interest. (III.) *The Apocalypse of Abraham* has been preserved in old Slavonic literature, the oldest MS. (*Codex Sylvester*), taken from the Greek, being now in the library of the Holy Synod in Moscow, and is of fourteenth-century date. The Apocalyptic section rests upon the story of Abraham's sacrifice and trance. *The Ascension of Isaiah* appeared in a translation from the original Greek in 1900, with Dr. Charles' interpretation and criticism; the principal extant version is Ethiopic.. There is a remarkable description of the seven heavens. These pseudepigraphical writings seem to have found their way into Russia at an early date. They contain much that is curious, and strange are the inferences drawn from the canonical books. A prevailing pessimistic view of the world in most of these documents doubtless reflects the then popular Jewish feeling.

BOLSHEVISM.

χαιρέτω εὐνομίη καλά τ' ἤθεα· πολλῷ ἄμεινον
δήμῳ συμμαχέουσ' ἁρπαγαὶ ἠδὲ φόνοι.

T. C. WEATHERHEAD.

OBITUARY

PROFESSOR F. HAVERFIELD.

PROFESSOR HAVERFIELD'S sudden death on October 1 is a heavy loss to Roman studies in England, and in particular to the study of Roman Britain. We cannot write over him *Felix opportunitate mortis*. He was not far past the prime of life, his powers and his knowledge were mature, his work was far from done. The illness which overtook him at the end of 1915 abated his natural force, but did not impair his mental powers nor weaken his intellectual interests. He even began new pieces of work, including a guide to the Roman Wall (would that he could have finished it!); but the times were unfavourable to serious learned work, and the horrors of the war—the shattering of ideals, the severance of old friendships, the loss of dear friends, the break-up of University life, the long years of anxiety—all told severely upon him.

He had a strong individuality and a forceful personality. Warm-hearted, generous, and loyal, he was direct and incisive in thought and speech, and in earlier life his candour was apt to express itself in brusqueness of manner when he encountered sham or pretentiousness or other kinds of foolishness, but he bore no malice: *honestius putabat offendere quam odisse*. He was as shrewd in practical life as in his

learned work; a striking tribute was paid in 1908 to his sanity and independence of judgment when he was returned as a member of the Hebdomadal Council in defiance of all the caucuses.

It was characteristic of him to leave Oxford in 1884 without any special reputation (ability tends to go only where interest draws it), and to have established his name as a Roman historian before 1891, when he was invited to take up the teaching of Roman history in Christ Church. During his seven or eight years of schoolmastering he found his real work, and used his holidays to lay deep the foundations of his unrivalled knowledge of Romano-British antiquities. But he did not stop there. Knowing that the work of the Romans in Britain could not be understood nor appreciated without a thorough knowledge of the Empire and its civilisation as a whole, he set himself to get such knowledge at first hand by extensive travel in Europe as far as the recesses of the Carpathians. Coming into contact with Mommsen, he was invited to take charge of the Roman epigraphy of Britain for the *Corpus* of Latin inscriptions, which had till then been in Huebner's hands. His first contribution to the *Ephemeris Epigraphica* was ready in 1889, his last was finished in 1912.

Round this commission developed his study of Roman Britain. He carried it on in the intervals of college duties, both educational and administrative, and the value of his work was publicly recognised before he was elected in 1907 to the Camden Professorship by his appointment as Rhind Lecturer in Scotland (1905-6) and as Ford Lecturer in Oxford (1906-7). His special work—not always appreciated and sometimes depreciated as 'specialism' even by University teachers—gave to all his teaching and writing that firm grip and that note of reality which are denied to men of mere book-learning. Partly to this he owed his great success as a lecturer, partly to his concise and almost Tacitean style, partly to the fact that he knew better than to fling exhaustive discourses, references and all, at the heads of his hearers. In lectures, as in business, he went straight to the heart of things.

His great service to history is that he put the story of Roman rule in Britain on a sure basis, introducing science where sciolism had reigned. Before his time, in his own trenchant words, 'prae ceteris hos nostros (antiquarios) scribendi quoddam cacoethes invasit. Eduntur societatum archaeologicarum acta, transactiones sive memorias quas vocant, rudis indigestaque moles et sepulchro potius archaeologiae quam monumento futura.' Besides his own learned work, he did much to educate and stimulate local antiquaries, who responded by making him President of many of their societies. He was also the moving spirit in the foundation of the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies. His literary output was considerable, but the mass of it is scattered (and buried) in learned periodicals. It is a bitter disappointment that his Ford Lectures, so highly appreciated as they were, did not lead to the publication of a comprehensive account of Roman Britain. The hope may still be cherished that these Lectures will see the light: later discovery has not materially affected them. The small volumes on the *Romanisation of Roman Britain*, first published in 1905 and now in its third edition, on the *Military Aspects of Roman Wales* (1910), and on *Ancient Town-Planning* (1913), are all models of precise, terse, and lucid exposition, bright in style and balanced in judgment. His other numerous monographs on Roman History and Roman Britain would make up several volumes. It is highly desirable that the more important of these, particularly the admirable accounts of Roman towns contributed to the *Victoria County History* and to learned journals, should be brought together. They would furnish a good picture of the development of town life, and go far to lessen the void which the author's great knowledge alone could have adequately filled.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.