



Seneca Dialogues by J. D. Duff

Review by: H. J. Cunningham

The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 5 (1915), pp. 257-258

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/296314>

Accessed: 13/06/2014 03:02

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>

has given serious offence to many Spaniards. Though traces of it are plain in the book before us, that is not a matter which can be entered into here, nor shall we attempt to define the precise shares in the discovery of the ancient Numantia to be allotted to the various scholars who have concerned themselves with it. It is more important to notice the extent to which Dr. Schulten's results are accepted or rejected by Spanish writers. Señor Santacruz is an archaeologist resident in Soria and perfectly familiar with the locality, who (starting, it must be confessed, without any prejudice in favour of Dr. Schulten) passes some rather sweeping criticisms on the interpretation of the encampments round the town offered by the latter.

Schulten, working on the assumption that Appian's description of the siege was derived entirely from Polybius, who was himself present at it, and that it was therefore correct in all respects, set out to identify the whole series of fortifications and positions referred to in the *Iberica*. Appian mentions two camps and seven forts as occupied by the Roman forces, and Schulten fixed upon seven fortified positions which he claimed to have been garrisoned by Scipio's men, together with others held by earlier generals, Marcellus, Q. Pompeius and Fulvius Nobilior. Further, portions of a wall apparently connecting some of these places were identified with the colossal enclosing wall described by Appian.

In reply Sr. Santacruz urges that most of the positions were much too close to the city to have commended themselves to Scipio, who wished to avoid battle and starve out the enemy, and would not subdivide to this extent an army numbering at first less than 10,000 men; while some of the forts were separated from Numantia by the rapid river Duero. Also, he declares, the masonry of the walls is purely Iberian, and the pottery, arms and coins found within them are largely of native origin. This suggests that those nearest the city (which was naturally strong only on the west) were outposts used for its defence, and the places beyond the river were mere suburbs. The supposed camp of Nobilior on the other hand, on the Atalaya of Renieblas, was very probably Scipio's chief position, for it was the only point to which a hostile army could attain without crossing pathless mountains, and the African elephants be brought by Jugurtha, while it gave facilities for crushing the hill-tribes to the east and north-east.

Sr. Santacruz then proceeds to criticise Appian's account on topographical grounds, and suggests that Polybius, or whoever was his authority, wishing to glorify Scipio, and finding that irregular fighting with obscure hill-tribes was little appreciated at Rome, exaggerated the difficulties of the actual siege, which did not last more than three or four months, and invented the construction of the immense enclosing wall, no sure traces of which have been found.

It can hardly be maintained, however, that after eighty years of guerrilla warfare the Romans could not realise the hardships of the Celtiberian *πύριμος πόλεμος* as Polybius calls it; and the omission of references to extensive siege-works, on which Sr. Santacruz lays stress, in epitomists like Florus and Orosius, is not a strong argument.

The book is written in a popular manner and, being designed for inhabitants of the district, assumes considerable local knowledge, lacking maps or plans. Though its conclusions are chiefly negative, it shows that the reconstruction of an ancient site in such irregular country requires prolonged study of the ground and complete freedom from a priori theories.

E. S. BOUCHIER.

SENECA DIALOGUES, x, xi, xii. Edited by J. D. DUFF. 7×4½, lix+312 pp. Cambridge: University Press, 1915.

This book contains the 'de Brevitate Vitae,' the 'de Consolatione ad Polybium' and the 'de Consolatione ad Helyiam' with introductions, critical notes and commentary. It is not entirely free from minor omissions and inaccuracies: thus Mr. Duff still writes of the grant of the *ius honorum* by Claudius to the Gallic chiefs, treats the *praefectus annonae* as though he were mainly concerned with gratuitous corn-doles, and calls the

famous libertus a rationibus Claudius *Etruscus*. He does not mention the view that the Paulinus of the 'de Brevitate Vitae' was the father of the legatus of Germany mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann.* 13, 53), and his claim to be the first commentator on these dialogues since Ruhkopf curiously ignores the edition of Bouillet (Paris, 1827-1832). Students of Seneca will, however, find in this book much that is useful.

H. J. CUNNINGHAM.

THE ROMANISATION OF ROMAN BRITAIN, third and enlarged edition. By F. HAVERFIELD. 9 × 5 $\frac{3}{4}$, 91 pp. 27 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. 3s. 6d. n.

Three editions in ten years are significant figures in relation to a monograph on a subject of classical antiquity, and this success is the best proof of the usefulness of the volume which Mr. Haverfield has devoted to the Romanisation of Britain. After each revision the book has left its author's hands amplified, corrected, improved, the text recast and expanded, the illustrations enriched by new plates; thus the original merits of the work have been brought to perfection. Mr. Haverfield knows the Roman empire in no superficial fashion, by the mere reading of Tacitus and Suetonius; he has lived in long and intimate contact with its monuments, even with the most insignificant-looking. More thoroughly than any one else, he has gone back to the sources, epigraphic, archaeological, literary, for the history of Roman Britain. His greatest merit is, perhaps, never to have begun, as so many of his predecessors have begun, with preconceived ideas; he has set out from tangible realities and has accepted no theory without subjecting it to the incessant test of facts. His research, clothed in a style which is at once lucid and alive and indeed picturesque, has overthrown many views previously assumed; for the passion to build up systems is always strongest where the data to control them are rarest. Each new edition has profited by fresh finds, fresh examination of the facts, new enquiries, rigorous logic. No book can make the reader realise more distinctly the complicated nature of this idea of 'Romanisation,' and how the medley of native and Italian and even oriental elements reveals itself in the architecture and plastic arts, the laws, the language and the religion of the western provinces. Let us hope that this model work will find imitators in all other regions of the Roman empire.

F. CUMONT.

THE PLACE-NAMES OF ENGLAND AND WALES. By the Rev. J. B. Johnston. 10 × 6, 532 pp. London: Murray, 1915. 15s. n.

Mr. Johnston has made an attempt to issue a dictionary of English and Welsh place-names, giving for each name the oldest traceable spellings and the probable derivation; in all he treats about 6,000 names. With the largest part of these names Roman students have no concern, and the reviewing of the volume in general must be left to other journals than the present one. But as the work also includes some Romano-British names, and as it may be consulted by students of Roman Britain, it is necessary to say that this is certainly not its strong side. Mr. Johnston handles Romano-British place-names in a manner which seems to us unsatisfactory, and he makes awkward mistakes about Roman Britain. Thus he alleges that 'no Roman inscriptions have yet been found in Wales' (p. 69), and that in Wales the Antonine Itinerary contains only three identifiable names. Thus he avers that Gateshead on the Tyne was originally Goat's Head, equates it with Gabrosentum, and refers that to the Celtic *gabar*, goat, forgetful of the fact that Gabrosentum was pretty certainly on the west coast of Britain, and that Gateshead forms the end of an old highway dating from Roman days. It is, however, interesting to note that a writer who is very free with Celtic etymologies, nevertheless concludes that few of our modern English place-names can be traced to Celtic sources; 'over a large area of England' (he says, p. 8) 'there are next to no Celtic names at all.'

W.