



---

El Solar Numantino by Don Santiago G. Santaacruz

Review by: E. S. Bouchier

*The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 5 (1915), pp. 256-257

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/296313>

Accessed: 05/01/2015 01:49

---

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>

the city's unique position in history, and of supplying a convenient guide both to the excavations and to the collection of antiquities which has been installed in the Renaissance castle. The publishers also deserve a word of commendation for their share in producing a volume serviceable, attractive and inexpensive.

A few lines by way of comment and amplification may prove helpful to those using the book. The important problem of the ancient position of the Tiber and the quays along its bank is receiving welcome light from investigations which Signor Finelli, the able superintendent of the excavations, is at present conducting; I trust I am not guilty of an indiscretion in quoting him as of the opinion that the ancient bed of the river at Ostia lay much further to the north than the present one. Our conception of the growth of Ostia in republican times (no remains anterior to the third century B.C. have been found in situ) seems destined to undergo modification in view of the recent discovery (see Calza, in *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1914, pp. 426-429) of a portion of a city wall anterior to that published by Vaglieri (p. 48), and apparently belonging to an earlier and smaller town-plan, which occupied only the seaward part of the site. The watering-trough described on page 51 is of special interest, as Dr. Ashby has pointed out to me on the occasion of a recent visit to Ostia; it probably reproduces the type of the original 'lacus Iuturnae' in the Roman forum, which (to judge from Commendatore Boni's discovery at that site of traces of an earlier 'lacus' paved with slabs of tufa, reported by Dr. Ashby in the *Classical Review*, xv, 1901), seems to have been a rectangular watering-trough, accessible for horses by means of a paved ramp at one end.

A slight inaccuracy may be corrected in the account of the tombs of the Claudii (p. 116): what is described as a pavement is in reality the stucco surface of a low triclinium of the usual form. To the literature on Ostia may now be added L. R. Taylor, *The Cults of Ostia*, Bryn Mawr dissertation, 1912.

The Italian authorities are to be congratulated both on the inception of these extensive and important excavations and on their prosecution, despite the loss sustained in Professor Vaglieri's death and the uncertainties incident to the present European situation.

A. W. VAN BUREN.

EL SOLAR NUMANTINO. Por DON SANTIAGO G. SANTACRUZ. 7½ × 5, 209 pp. Madrid: Imprenta de la Revista de Arqueología, Bibliotecas y Museos. 1914. 28 gd.

The Celtiberian stronghold of Numantia, as is well known, was destroyed by the Romans in 133 B.C. The Antonine Itinerary shows that it was rebuilt subsequently, and during the period of the Roman empire was a town or village on the road from Caesar-Augusta to Asturica. In post-Roman days its site was forgotten, and became a matter of some dispute. Various arguments, literary and topographical rather than antiquarian, pointed, however, to its identification with Garray on the Duero, in the province of Soria.

The first attempt to confirm this by excavation was made by Don E. Saavedra between the years 1861 and 1863, but his finds belonged to, or at least were taken as belonging to, the Numantia of the imperial period rather than that of the republic.

In 1905, with the added knowledge of nearly half a century, further excavations were undertaken by Dr. A. Schulten, and additional discoveries were made, confirming more completely the identification of the site. Since 1906, yet further work has been done. The Spanish archaeologists have carried out a very thorough examination of Numantia itself, and have published their results in a detailed and beautifully-illustrated report. At the same time Dr. Schulten has been at work in the neighbourhood of the town, excavating sites which he regards as the encampments of Roman armies acting against Numantia in and before 133 B.C. The first part of his conclusions appeared, in their definitive form, only in the early summer of 1914, but they have been described in various German and other periodicals and indeed in this *Journal* (i, 181-186).

The work has not been done without antiquarian and national friction; Dr. Schulten

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 Helviam' 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