The Roman Forts at Castleshaw by F. A. Bruton

Review by: P. Newbold

The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 1 (1911), pp. 242-243

Published by: [Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/295876>

Accessed: 21/06/2014 00:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Roman Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

It may be that in the present state of our knowledge this plan is the only one available. Franz Wickhoff on the other hand claimed to have discovered in the mass of material at hand a specific character peculiar to Roman art and distinct from the characters found in other contemporaneous or just preceding classes of work. The possibility of such a theory depends upon the existence of specific differences in the region of art parallel to those which in the animal world permitted the formulation of the Linnaean system. And in Greek art, Gothic art, oriental art, and Egyptian art there is at least some justification for the attempt.

Were Wickhoff's claim to be conceded, it would be possible to give an homogeneous series of examples with a growth and character of their own. Without such an hypothesis a treatise on Roman art is bound to be like a Roman museum or the Roman section of a general archaeological museum. In these we find, inextricably mingled, blind copies of Greek work, or works so impregnated with Greek or Egyptian influences that what does not depend upon these is negligible.

But Wickhoff's theory is hardly more than a courageous attempt. The criterion he chose was not general enough to include certain groups which appear Roman in spirit as well as in provenance, nor were the elements in his definition logically connected. There is no real connexion between "illusionism," and continuous narration. But the time has surely come when Augustan works with marked Atticising tendencies and Pompeian decoration saturated with Greco-Egyptian influence should be left out of a treatise primarily dealing with Roman art.

This suggestion, however, should not be taken as a sign of disapproval of Mr. Walters' book. Taken with Mrs. Strong's *Roman Sculpture*, his book forms a most valuable collection of the art of the Roman empire in its western section. The illustrations are numerous and good. After a rapid survey of Etruscan art, the author deals in successive chapters with architecture, sculpture, painting and mosaic, gem-engraving, metal-work, and fictile work. He concludes with a chapter on Roman art in the provinces, mainly those of Gaul and Britain.

A. M. DANIEL.

THE ROMAN FORTS AT CASTLESHAW: *Second Interim Report*. Prepared by F. A. BRUTON. 45 plates, 93 pp. Manchester: University Press, 1911.

The First Interim Report published in 1908 described the excavations at Castleshaw during 1907. This volume, giving the results of the work done in 1908, since when apparently the exploration has been abandoned, adds nothing to our knowledge of the history of the site and little to the details of its plan. The half-dozen coins found during the two years range from Vespasian to Hadrian, and Mr. J. Curle, who describes the pottery, reports that it appears to indicate an occupation towards the end of the first century and during the early years of the second; the bulk of it may be somewhat earlier than the reign of Hadrian, though a few pieces may date from a Hadrianic occupation. With regard to structural details, the second season's work revealed certain alterations in the hypocaust, the only building of stone yet brought to light, and six or seven parallel rows of postholes in the inner fort. It is difficult to understand the buildings which these represent, and the details, as given on page 32, are somewhat confused: the numbers do not correspond with those laid down on the plan (plate v). The question of the relation of the inner to the outer fort was not settled, though the scanty evidence seems to show that the ditch of the inner fort ran completely round it. Among the small finds an interesting discovery was that of two examples of the supposed *pila muralia*, which have turned up on more than one Roman military site in Germany.

The total results of the excavations form somewhat slender material to bear the weight of the two appendices written round them by Mr. Bruton. The first, of ten pages, deals with the possible limits of the occupation of the fort, and arrives, as the author admits, at no more definite conclusion than that given in a few lines by Professor

Haverfield in the *Jahrbuch* of the German Imperial Institute (1909, p. 245) and quoted on page 15; while the second treats in twenty-one pages of some points in the history of the Brigantian territory and, being addressed to persons "with no special interest in archaeology," might with even more reason have been omitted.

The report is abundantly illustrated by forty-five plates, of which ten appeared in the First Interim Report, including the large-scale plan on which the discoveries made in 1908 are not plotted. Of Mr. Ammon Wrigley's verses, to which six pages are devoted, this is not the place to speak.

P. NEWBOLD.

DAS KASTELL NIEDERBIEBER. Ausgrabungsbericht von EMIL RITTERLING. Bonn: 1912.

This brief "Sonderabdruck" from the *Bonner Jahrbücher* deserves the attention of all students of Roman military arrangements. Niederbieber, which lies a couple of miles north-east of Neuwied and about the same distance from the Rhine, is the most northerly of the German frontier forts. It is also one of the largest, covering within the walls a trifle over thirteen acres. It was established very late and occupied only for a definite period, about A.D. 190-260: its finds therefore can be dated and help the dating of other finds. It was garrisoned not by the usual cohort or *ala* but by two *numeri*. As yet, it has not been fully uncovered, and of the two-thirds which have been examined, no account has yet been given to the learned world. Dr. Ritterling's sketch, a sketch which one need not say is most excellent and masterly, is therefore of importance. Among other things, I note that the "Praetorium" has no vault and only one court, and therefore resembles rather the earlier type of these structures than that which we should expect about A.D. 190. In front of it was an "Exercier-Halle" which seems, like that of Newstead, and no doubt like most of such spaces, to have had no roof. A granary, a *fabrica* which looks at first sight like a second granary but contained iron slag, etc. a commandant's house, baths, and wooden barracks with strange hearths for warming or cooking, fill up the list of the buildings as yet explored. The ramparts offer the feature of large square projections at the gateways and turrets, which are perhaps remarkable at such a date. Among the smaller finds are a bronze head of Gordian III, some silver dishes and some fibulae. The pottery and much else is not published here. When it is published it should be important for us in this country, since we have few sites, if any, in England which we know to have been first occupied about A.D. 190.

F. H.

A COMPANION TO LATIN STUDIES. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by JOHN E. SANDYS, Litt.D. F.B.A. 6 x 9, xxxv + 891 pp. Two maps, 141 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1910. 18s. n.

This book does not call for a lengthy notice in these columns. It is written by twenty-five specialists, but they have for the most part contrived to divest themselves of that character. It seems to be intended (like the *Cambridge Companion to Greek Studies*) for candidates for the Classical Tripos; but we hope that their intellectual *pabulum* consists of something more appetising than the rather jejune summaries contained in this volume. The best sections are those written by Prof. Bosanquet on industry and commerce, roads and travel, and by Mr. Wace on Roman sculpture; the last is well illustrated, which cannot be said of the book as a whole. This is a somewhat serious defect in a work of this kind; we may point out that though there are two plans (of Rome and the Forum) there are no maps, and that the section on war is poorly illustrated with cheap blocks borrowed from Lindenschmidt, etc. including one of a