



Photograph by Walter Stoneman

ARNOLD HUGH MARTIN JONES

ARNOLD HUGH MARTIN JONES

1904–1970

IN a papyrus published in 1964, *P. Beatty Panop.* 2, there are recorded a series of payments to Roman army units in Egypt. They were donatives to the troops, and the figures, in drachmas, run as follows: 1,386,250; 526,875; 1,097,500; 93,125; 2,496,250; 53,750; 32,500. Mr T. C. Skeat, in publishing the document, remarked:

Perhaps the most interesting feature of these payments is the opportunity they give for estimating the strength of the units concerned. Here the starting-point is the brilliant observation of Professor A. H. M. Jones that, without exception, all the amounts of the donatives are divisible by 625.

A characteristic which great Roman generals were held to possess was *felicitas*; over and above their being very skilful, victory at certain crucial moments fell into their laps. So it sometimes seems also with the achievements of eminent scholars; over and above their God-given talents their academic Premium Bonds, as it were, turn up. Of course, that which looks like luck is really—and no less mysterious for so being—flair; as it was in the case of the drachmas, for one of Jones's characteristics was a facility for metrology. He could cope undismayed with the relation between *artabae* and *modii*, the ratio of silver to gold, of grain consumption to population: his paper 'The Origin and Early History of the *Follis*' in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1959 is a typical and classic example, elegantly confirmed by that selfsame *P. Beatty Panop.* 2. He was an excellent prosopographer, too, which went with his marvellous memory; and he was truly at home, domestically familiar and happy, with some of the most daunting of all historical sources, such as the Theodosian Code and the Novels of Justinian.

These, however, are just isolated examples of Jones's dexterity at the craft of history; to evaluate the products of his craftsmanship one can only begin in the conventional way with a survey of his academic career.

Arnold Hugh Martin Jones was born on 9 March 1904, a son of J. Arthur Jones, who edited a great liberal newspaper, the *Statesman* of Calcutta, from 1908 to 1924 and was made a C.I.E.

for his public service to India. At the time of his birth his father was on the staff of the *Liverpool Post*, but the family sailed for India in 1906. In 1910 they returned to England on leave, and his mother stayed, enabling the young Hugo (so let him at once be named, for as such we all knew him) to be entered as a day boy in the preparatory department of Cheltenham College. He became a scholar of Cheltenham, a scholar of New College, a Craven scholar. On taking his first degree in 1926 he was immediately elected to a Senior Studentship at his College and then a Fellowship of All Souls. He married a year later, and with promptitude and decision set out to come to grips with Classical antiquity at first hand. He took part in excavations of the Hippodrome of Constantinople in 1927 under Stanley Casson, and for two seasons, 1928 and 1929, at Jerash under John W. Crowfoot; his first significant publications were 'Inscriptions from Jerash', I, in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1928, pp. 144-78, and II, in the same journal, 1930, pp. 43-54.

It would be neat to see in Jones's career a profoundly organic unfolding, and to attribute its next and, in retrospect, very decisive stage to the lure of the Near East exerted by Constantinople and Jerash. Possibly a shade too neat; for it seems probable that the more elementary economic motive was paramount—the need to get a job. In 1929 he accepted the post of Reader in Ancient History at the Egyptian University of Cairo, and he was there until 1934. Whatever the motive, much in his work and his mind was, one may think, conditioned by that quinquennium. What he acquired was not merely topographical knowledge, though he certainly acquired that, travelling about by car, exploring the eastern and the western desert—an adventurous proceeding in the cars and on the Egyptian mud roads of the early thirties. It was not merely a touch of Arabic, for that was little enough, although it gave him satisfaction on revisiting Egypt many years later to recall sufficient to prevent himself being diddled by the taxi-driver. It was not merely a familiarity with the papyri, though he did afterwards handle papyrological evidence with a lack of awe that inspired awe in others. Rather it was that he saw the whole life of the Roman empire thereafter in a very wide perspective and, after those eight years in the east, not exclusively from a western point of vantage. Jerash required him to deal with matters Greek, and municipal, and Christian; Constantinople and Cairo stretched and liberated his time-scale to embrace the Roman empire right down to the triumph of Islam.

Almost immediately upon his return to All Souls there appeared Jones's first book—and, not long afterwards, his first major book. The first book, *A History of Abyssinia*, was only half his, being written in collaboration with Elizabeth Monroe, who did the more recent part. It was published in 1935; in fact it had a final chapter on events down to the autumn of that very year. The claims of Italy to empire in the Horn of Africa were being pressed, and Italy was looking for a *casus belli*; and in the state of total public ignorance about affairs in that remote part of the world somebody, it seems, decided that one thing it might be well to promote was a quick history. Jones had a characteristic willingness, even at times eagerness (it would be tempting to invoke a touch of the paternal journalism in his genes) to hurl something on to paper in a fit of energy; the product of this particular fit became a standard work in the kingdom of Ethiopia itself (it was reprinted in 1955 as *A History of Ethiopia*), and made Jones a *persona* unexpectedly *grata* when, thirty years on, he visited the kingdom.

The major book was *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, which came out in 1937 but was the fruits of work done over all the years since his graduation. Though it was very large, and won the Conington Prize, Jones saw it as a preliminary study, as groundwork for *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, published only three years later. Two major books in so short a time: that was to make one's name as an ancient historian with a vengeance; and it was not all, for in between *Cities* and *The Greek City* there appeared another smaller but substantial volume, *The Herods of Judaea*, 1938. *Herods* was Jones's most 'exoteric' work, written for a general public who might wish to know more about the kings and tetrarchs of the familiar biblical story. Never again was he to get as close to popularization as in the sentence with which that book began: 'In the year 538 B.C. a huge caravan, numbering nearly fifty thousand souls, trailed across the desert from Mesopotamia to Syria. They were the Jews.' He told all the good stories, and showed that he could write effective narrative history; the book remains valuable, and has recently been reprinted.

It must be recorded that during those same years Jones also made a contribution to an altogether different kind of history. Volume III of the *Victoria County History of the County of Oxford*, the volume concerned with the University, was published in 1954, but its preface states that nearly all the contributions contained in it were in type before the war of 1939–45 began.

To that volume Jones contributed the account of the history and also of the buildings of New College, and accounts of the buildings of All Souls and Worcester College, while his wife did the history and buildings of Hertford College. Between the two of them they had a formidable armoury of knowledge about archives and architecture and the structure of medieval church and government; and though the professional in the first of those fields was Mrs Jones the accounts given by both of them were models, and Jones's account of New College is an acknowledged masterpiece in miniature of the integration of College records with social history.

In 1939 Jones was appointed to a Lectureship at Wadham College, but the war supervened and he went off to London to work first in the Ministry of Labour on deployment of manpower (the understanding of which he subsequently claimed to be of some academic profit) and then in Intelligence at the War Office: a blank, therefore. In 1946 he took the Chair of Ancient History at University College, London, which provided stimulus in more than one way. He found himself with an outstanding generation of pupils; and his lecturing, on both Greek and Roman history, brought in its train a number of tasks and ultimately publications. There were, for example, the *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, published in collaboration with Victor Ehrenberg in 1949. That was pioneering work. Its only Classical predecessor (for 'Greenidge and Clay' is a quite different kind of source-book) had been Charlesworth's *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Claudius and Nero* (1939), a small personal selection that arose out of papers for the Classical Tripos. 'Ehrenberg and Jones' was a paradigm which has since been extended to several other periods of the Roman Principate. Not everyone approves of these compendia: they are held to be methodologically unsound because they give a 'received' text without commentary and discourage reference to the original publication; but, granting all reasonable force to the arguments of the stern guardians of documentary integrity, they are outweighed by the practical advantage to the ordinary student of making much accessible to him that would otherwise not be so without more time than he can afford and more facilities than he has available.

From Jones's teaching derived also his reconsideration of Athenian government and society in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. The fruits were to be harvested in Cambridge, where he succeeded Adcock as Professor of Ancient History in 1951,

and 'to show them he knew some Greek history as well as Roman' gave his inaugural lecture on 'The Athens of Demosthenes', the product of a very typical re-reading of the Attic orators. The rest of the harvest of papers on Athens was collected in the volume *Athenian Democracy*, published in 1957.

Now the great influence on Jones's generation was Rostovtzeff, and so his ambition for the long term was to produce a major work in the steps of the master. Already in London he was beginning to set his course up the foothills of the huge subject that was to be the summit of his academic achievement, and to hack a path through the jungle of the written sources for the later Roman empire. An early product of his growing thought on the period was *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* in the 'Teach Yourself History' series (1948). Sixteen more years were to go by before the *magnum opus* was published, and they were filled with all kinds of preparatory work. In the first place, salvos of preliminary studies were fired off in all the principal English periodicals. (Jones did not often write for foreign journals, except reviews, and except occasionally when he had given a paper at a conference abroad.) Another procedure was to bring seminars into being—one, for example, in which topics of Church history were discussed, another on problems of Roman law. Jones's own primary purpose with them, naturally, was to promote discussion of matters he wished to understand more clearly and to act as a sounding-board for first versions of some of his own papers. The third and very important and permanent by-product of Jones's needs is the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. He begot it, secured the finance for it, assembled the team of scholars for it, guided and supported it through all the preliminary stages of slips and filing, drafted the articles on *viri illustres* for Volume I, and had checked the final proofs of that volume before he died. The other scholars who have brought the *Prosopography* into being will in the end have done the major part of the huge task, but Volume I at least will stand as a particular and lasting monument to Jones.

This period marked the height of his creativity and intellectual force. He was President of the Roman Society (1952–5), and besides the papers on the later Roman empire that poured from his pen so did those which were collected in *Athenian Democracy* (1957) and the no less powerful series that appeared ultimately in collected form as *Studies in Roman Government and Law* (1960). And then at last in 1964 the coping-stone was placed upon his life's study by the appearance of the work of

depth and riches and mastery: *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602*. And that is the point at which it will be appropriate to turn to an attempt to estimate Jones's achievement and characterize his mind and stance as a historian.

Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces is political geography (or historical topography). It represents, in one aspect, the need Jones always felt for a particularized sense of place, a need that led him to regard the volume of maps in *The Later Roman Empire* as an extremely important part of that book, and moved him to travel all he possibly could about the Roman world. It was the kind of work on which time inevitably imposes the need for revision, and before his death he had, with the co-operation of numerous specialists, seen to the publication of a revised edition. For its day, and for a young scholar, the most striking thing about the book was its chronological range; and that was necessary in order to provide the groundwork for tackling the questions to be posed and answered in the excellent and abiding book *The Greek City*—two questions, fundamentally: what was the political role of the *polis* in antiquity after it had ceased to be a 'state', and what was its cultural role? How successfully did it diffuse and maintain the 'Greek View of Life'? Jones had a predecessor, J. S. Reid's fine *Municipalities of the Roman Empire* (1913); but Reid began from the Western end, and so discussed mainly the Western phenomenon, 'municipalization'. From Jones's Greek standpoint the fate of the *polis* was indeed 'municipalization'; but, as he put it in a later survey in which his thought returned to the Greek city, 'The Greeks in the Roman Empire', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* no. 17 (1963), 'The Greek city sank to the status of a municipality. . . . The Principate saw the political extinction of the Greek city, but the consolidation of Greek culture.'

Constantine, though a little book, is as good as anything Jones ever did. Strongly drawn though he was to the analysis of institutions rather than ideas, he did not make the mistake of supposing that men are uninfluenced by ideas. Wholly rejecting the Gibbonian picture of Constantine, and no less decisively rejecting the fashionable hyper-scepticism about the sources for the emperor's life, he managed, by a powerful effort to grasp the psychological climate of the age, to write a sympathetic account of the emperor and his achievement, which yet remained profoundly critical—he refused Constantine the epithet 'great'. Jones's ability to appreciate the importance of religiosity in the make-up of the men of late antiquity (paradoxical in

one who, in spite of a strong clerical element in his family background—for his mother was the daughter of a clergyman and his father the son of the Revd. Hugh Jones, D.D., minister of the Welsh Wesleyan Methodist Church of Mount Sion in Liverpool—was quite unreligious) comes out again in the paper in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1959, called 'Were the ancient heresies national or social movements in disguise?' That *démarche* aroused a discussion which is still going on; it was Jones's protest against the widespread contemporary tendency of historians to assume that the phenomenon they do not much appreciate or sympathize with is just a concealed case of something else which they do appreciate and sympathize with.

The most battered volumes of Jones in the university libraries (apart from *Documents*) are the two collections of papers, *Athenian Democracy* and *Studies in Roman Government and Law*, for they deal with the central topics of undergraduate study: the Athens of Pericles and Demosthenes, and Augustus and the early Principate. But it is not only upon undergraduates that they have had immense influence. The Athenian studies inaugurated a new generation of favourable accounts of Athenian democracy, dispelling old clichés about its inefficiency, its parasitic dependence on the spoils of empire, and its decline into laziness and apathy. The Roman studies dealt, feature by feature, with the constitutional roles of the emperor; and in this context again Jones was proof, in spite of his practical approach to things, against the temptation to suppose that the structure of the state is a mere figment or cloak and that the 'realities of power' can be studied without reference to the interpretative rules within the framework of which they operate. Especially he tackled—which was of the highest importance—the neglected and ill-understood problem of the constitutional basis of the imperial jurisdiction, as well as giving new accounts of various parts of the bureaucratic organization of the Roman empire.

How can one put one's finger on the characteristic quality of these splendid papers? Jones is not always right, or always definitive; but there *is* always something deeply satisfying in the way he goes about his business. For one thing, he is economical, going directly to each point in turn. For another, he is scrupulously fair to the reader: he offers the arguments and proposes the conclusion, never sweeping inconvenient evidence under the carpet in a footnote or turning what was a 'perhaps' on page *x* into a certainty on page *x* plus ten. Finally (which is

difficult to express briefly but is one of the most important qualities of first-class history-writing) the *scale* of Jones's argumentation is always appropriate; like the rules of Gaelic vowel-harmony it is always 'slender with slender, broad with broad': one is never given the feeling of being pressed into acceptance of a big generality on the basis of a small detail or two or bullied into accepting airy assertions as warrant for conclusions about particular situations.

About *The Later Roman Empire* the first thing to keep clearly in mind is its full title: *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*. (Jones allowed the one-volume version published in 1966 to be called *The Decline of the Ancient World*: that is liable to mislead.) Unlike Ernst Stein, that great and modest historian who nevertheless called his *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches* a 'nichts Wesentliches ausser Acht lassende . . . Darstellung', Jones most carefully informs the reader what his book is not, in the Preface:

This book is not a history of the later Roman empire . . . I have little to say about wars, but much about the organisation, recruitment and conditions of service of the army. I do not concern myself much with politics, but discuss the character of the governing class, the administrative machine and the structure of the civil service. Again I have little to say about doctrinal controversies, but much about the growth of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. I ignore the two major intellectual achievements of the age, theology and law, . . . similarly there is little about literature and education, art and architecture.

It is to be feared that people will judge Jones's masterpiece as if it *were* a 'history of the later Roman empire' and deplore the missing dimension of *Geistesgeschichte* (and fail to notice it even when it is there). On the contrary, the book should be estimated not in comparison—still less in rivalry—with books that had different purposes, those of Bury, Seeck, Piganiol, Ernst Stein, Mazzarino or Joseph Vogt, but in the light of what its author stated in the sub-title to be its theme. It is a book, fundamentally, about *how things worked*.

Jones had a struggle about the presentation of this theme. As can be seen from the Preface (and from his posthumous *Augustus*) he held the salutary view that as events occur in a time sequence the historian ought to present them in that sequence; on the other hand, 'how things worked', more than any other kind of historical question, demands an answer in analytical rather than chronological sequence. Jones also felt that his

readers were unlikely to be familiar enough with the political events of the fourth to sixth centuries A.D. to be safely plunged unassisted into 'rubrics'. His 'compromise', as he himself called it, was to begin with 300 pages of narrative history. He may have been right in deciding that that course was inevitable, but it is a pity, because for a narrative of so vast a period 300 pages was not a large enough canvas to allow for variety and vividness; the effect is too linear and uniform, and the sardonic wit so fugitively expressed as to escape the notice of all but the very alert. In any case the narrative chapters themselves enshrine important passages of analysis: almost the whole of 'Diocletian', for example, the parts of 'Constantine' about the army, administration and finance, the parts of 'Theodosius' about the barbarians, the army and finance, and most of the 'Justinian'. (Incidentally, what we have most notably—and totally—lost by Jones's premature death is a definitive study of Justinian. He had been lecturing on the age of Justinian as a special period in the Cambridge Historical Tripos, and had accepted a commission to write a book on it; and if there was anything he knew better than any scholar since Ernst Stein it was probably that.)

It is the analytical chapters of *The Later Roman Empire* which are *aere perennius*, and what they have to tell is how things worked, how they were organized, structured, paid for. This is the cumulative evidence for the strengths and weaknesses of the empire, eastern and western, as a *system* of government and society; and the analysis has an inexorable forward movement, modulating finally through 'Religion and Morals' and 'Education and Culture' to the coda and culmination, Chapter xxv on 'The Decline of the Empire'. That final chapter derives its authority from the massive substructure of evidence on which Jones has founded it; nowhere else can one find the materials for judgement set out like this. As is well known, Jones's conclusion, as far as the western empire is concerned, tallies with that of Piganiol, that after all it was essentially the barbarians who destroyed the empire; but few pages in the work are more interesting than those in which he opens up an analysis of the 'decline of morale'. Now in doing that he had moved into the sphere of *Geistesgeschichte*; and the fact is relevant if one is to try to come to a value-judgement on *The Later Roman Empire*.

For of the concept of 'decline' itself Jones gave no analysis; it seems plain that he meant and assumed it to be understood, like the whole book, in the light of the sub-title, 'A Social,

Economic and Administrative Survey'—in other words he was talking of the decline of a *system* of government and society. But a 'decline of morale', though of course intimately interconnected, is a different sort of decline, whose background, to achieve the same degree of massiveness and authority, would need to be illuminated by those sorts of study which Jones expressly excluded from his terms of reference. What he has to say about 'decline of morale', while pertinent and important, is hardly enough; and to complete it Jones would not have been the man, for the limitations he imposed on his theme did indeed correspond with the limitations of his vision. We must not balk those limitations.

He was not interested in ideas but in institutions. He was oddly and paradoxically (in spite of Jerash, in spite of all the travelling and topographical curiosity) indifferent to the real potential contribution of archaeological evidence: he wanted a text, a 'passage'. He was indifferent also to politics, in the sense in which the Roman Republic or fourth-century Athens had politics; hence he used his prosopographical gift simply as a necessary tool for correctly sorting out who did what—he was not interested in its use as a way of explaining political events through the personal relationships of individuals, because he was not really interested in the political events, only the political structures. His study was of institutions as working models, like the great presses that, as a little boy, he stole down-stairs from the flat above the Calcutta printing-house to watch: what the parts were, how they were put together, and what happened when they went round. In lectures on ancient democracy, not long before his death, he was exploring the structures of city-states: what size of council and assembly did such-and-such a city have? What were its rules for office-holding? Similarly on Sparta: who could speak in the Spartan assembly? Did there exist a system of inalienable land-holdings? And in the posthumous *Roman Criminal Courts*: how were substitute jurors enrolled? How long did a trial take? What happened if the accuser did not turn up?

This is very scientific history, in so far as that term is in contrast to transcendental or anecdotal or biographical history (and, incidentally, it has the huge merit that the questions posed are always such as are susceptible of answers: there is no attempt to grasp the intangible or dash after the will-o'-the-wisp); but Jones was not a historicist in any way. He does not seem to have believed in any laws of history, or to have sought to

establish any general propositions except such as applied to the period or institution under study, nor did he approach his material from the standpoint of any particular conceptual system. Not merely did he never discuss such matters; one would be hard put to it to deduce any philosophical stance from his writings. His work has not imposed on his successors any new trend or theory of historiography; it is just what it is, the answers to the questions he asked.

After the appearance of *The Later Roman Empire* there could hardly fail to be some anticlimax. Not that Jones's pace slackened much. There were many entries to write for the *Prosopography*. There was sabbatical leave and a renewal of old acquaintance with Cairo; and there, needing to crystallize his views on the history of Sparta for the next year's lectures, he succumbed to the temptation to dash off a book—his 'Gizeh Nights', as it were—which was arctically received.

In 1968 R. G. Goodchild died, leaving the archaeology of Cyrenaica in jeopardy. Jones had attended the Congress of Libyan History and Archaeology held by the University of Libya at Benghazi in March 1968, and he accepted chairmanship of the committee founded that summer to raise a memorial fund for Goodchild, a committee from whose activities there ultimately arose the Society for Libyan Studies.

Jones's last years were marked by a rush of further publication and writing. He selected the passages in translation for a survey of Roman history 'through the sources' in two volumes, called *A History of Rome Through the Fifth Century*, commissioned by an American publisher. He completed an *Augustus* just before his death, again a brief book, supplying a need, but just a little lacking in excitement, and so failing to bring out his great admiration for Augustus; that is probably because Jones was best when he was arguing, whereas in the *Augustus* he is mostly just stating. Finally, he got on to paper a full first draft of a more substantial (because more argumentative) study of the Roman criminal courts—examining, once again, 'how things worked', in loving detail.

One characteristic of Jones's approach to writing history began now to be almost (and almost harmfully) obsessional. He had always held that, having chosen your problem, you must put the primary sources to the question and exercise your judgement on them; and that sounds no more than what every history teacher exhorts his pupils to do (without, as a rule, though, practising it rigidly himself; for he, the professional,

is allowed and even required to 'know the bibliography'). Typically, Jones did not care for the great modern editions of ancient authors; he thought they had 'messed about with the texts', and preferred to read his sources in old volumes undefiled by the Higher Criticism, taking a cheerful pleasure even in Migne. One such volume contained between its unprepossessing covers the whole of Cicero—

pellibus exiguis artatur Tullius ingens;

but into that volume Jones could pounce and pull out a plum every time, to the discomfiture of pupils and colleagues whose memory for Cicero was less than total recall. Now the consequence of his genuine adherence to the doctrine he proclaimed was that he did not particularly care whether he was up to date with the secondary literature of the subject. Not that he did not read a great deal of it, and take what he read carefully into consideration; but he took no pains to do so systematically—bibliography was for him the dustiest of activities—and certainly not before he had reached a clear point of view of his own. His writings in general, therefore, but especially his later writings, contained very little reference to the works of others; that was not arrogance, but it was in the end a rather over-rigid adherence to principle.

Geography (if not archaeology) was for Jones emphatically part of the primary evidence to be combed as systematically as possible. He had begun his career by going out and looking, and he continued to do so in the thirties and again on reacquiring a car from 1956 onwards. Hence the pleasant boast in the Preface to *The Later Roman Empire*: 'I have visited 94 of the 119 provinces of the Roman empire', followed by the comically and perhaps ironically meticulous set of excuses for the omissions: 'Iron Curtain', 'recent troubles', and so on. And who but Jones could have told us that there were 119? Apparently not even Ernst Stein, whom Jones, in a warm-hearted review in *Historia* 1954 of the *Histoire du Bas Empire*, gently reproached because he 'omits the little province of Theodorias in Syria'. In Jones's travels it was not only the traces of antiquity that he studied: he was passionately interested in architecture, especially ecclesiastical (and not exclusively Christian—a great man for a mosque), and he loved to conduct his friends round buildings, with learned and eager discourse.

Discourse with him was always serious in intent, even when conducted gaily. For small-talk he had no taste, and in gossip

(even academic gossip, which most academics covertly or openly adore) no interest. Most of the business of academic boards and committees also left him cold: in things not close to his concern he let others have their say and way, and doodled or dozed, though he was quick, decisive, and efficient when the ball came into his court. On the other hand he had a surprising liking for congresses, and attended and read papers at many. In fact, though a quiet and unassertive man, he did not at all mind becoming internationally celebrated, for he took proper pride in his achievement and enjoyed the academic distinctions as they came—F.B.A. 1947, F.S.A. 1957, LL.D. Cantab. 1965, D.D. Oxon. 1966, Hon. L.H.D. Chicago 1969, and an honorary Fellowship of New College. About the Cambridge and Oxford degrees he admitted to a touch of mischievous glee: a mere Doctorate of Letters he could have collected years before, but he thought that degree an upstart, and it tickled him to have an LL.D. for his contributions to the history of Roman law and a D.D. for his contributions to the history of the Church.

The physical image of the man, at the time when we came to know him in Cambridge, was something like this: he was of slight build, with a little stoop or hunch or, almost, prowl, sandy hair, a light tenor timbre of voice, and a crinkly face. He was formidable, mainly because shy, but partly because you felt that his expectations of you were higher than you could live up to. Undergraduates found him daunting, precisely because he did *not* treat them any differently from anybody else. He enjoyed lecturing, and would always volunteer to do more than he need have done; but he was not one of the popular kind, for there was in his make-up a total absence of the slightest trace of the histrionic: he made the points he had come to make and then just stopped. But the wiser men stayed on, for it did not take long to appreciate that one was getting newly-minted coin of unadulterated metal. It was no different from what he would have given to a colloquium of professional colleagues; for Jones had in all his dealings an entirely unhierarchical spirit and was incapable of behaving *de haut en bas*. What he wanted was serious argument, and he would engage in that with Professor or freshman (which could, indeed, sometimes be hard on the freshman).

On his research pupils Jones imposed a regular and arduous discipline, but few of them failed to get through to his fundamental kindness and patience. He never established a 'school'; that is quite different from saying—for it would be very untrue—that he did not have distinguished pupils whose approach to

history was influenced by his. But a *schola Hugoniana* there is not, because he would not bully or dominate, and because he had no special idiosyncratic master-key for the opening of all historical doors to pass on, nor any desire for satellites or to sit at the centre of a web of influence. A very pure man.

The admiration and affection which so many had for him could not be told, because one felt that its expression would be a breach of his defensive armour and only cause him discomfort. It was the greater because what he achieved was not won without battle. Health was not always on his side: he had a period of severe gastric illness, and several stretches of crippling depression alternating with shorter bursts of over-energy. A year before retirement was due he was looking his age—a little more crinkled and hunched. But there was prospect, before his final year's teaching, of a sabbatical term, and it was to be Greece in the spring; and on the evening of 8 April 1970 he embarked, with Mrs Jones, on the car-ferry at Brindisi for the crossing to Patrai. It turned out to be a severely rough passage, and Hugo was very sick; and in the morning when the vessel docked he seemed to be sleeping. But he did not awake. He is buried in Athens.

ECCE ENIM VERITATEM DILEXISTI: QVONIAM QVI FACIT EAM
VENIT AD LVCEM.

JOHN CROOK