(pp. 401–18) and reaches the comforting conclusion that philosophers were normally respected and active members of the communities in which they lived.

Almost all the essays in the volume do thus both inform the reader and challenge by provoking reflection. What are its defects? There are, of course, the inevitable misprints and minor errors, of which let me note here only '*praefectus color*' for '*praefectus urbi*' in the caption to p. 54, Fig. 1 and 'the Antiochene Patriarch Gamaliel' for the Jewish patriarch resident in Tiberias (p. 383). But there are some seriously misleading statements of general import, including the passing assertion that lands owned by the Christian church were exempt from taxation (pp. 176–7: 'its increasing property holdings enjoyed freedom from tax'). Anyone who wishes to deny A. H. M. Jones's assertion that church lands 'paid the regular land tax' (*Later Roman Empire* [Oxford, 1964], p. 898) needs to document his dissent properly. Moreover, an important new theory receives no serious discussion. Twenty years ago metrological analysis of trace metals in the Roman imperial coinage led C. Morrisson, C. Brenot, J.-P. Callu, J.-N. Barrandon, J. Poirier, and R. Halleux, *L'or monnayé* 1: *Purifications et altérations de Rome à Byzance* (Paris, 1985), pp. 81–111, to the conclusion that 'à partir de 346, le stock d'or monnayable s'est enrichi d'un apport d'or nouveau en quantité importante' (p. 105). Unless I have missed something, this study is cited only for the debasement of gold coinage in the third century (p. 44 n. 110). But if the thesis just quoted is correct, then the exploitation of this postulated new source of gold, presumably in the Balkans, may do much to explain why after 395 the eastern Roman Empire, unlike the western, had adequate funds to pay subsidies to barbarians and to raise armies with relative ease.

University of Toronto T. D. BARNES
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni347

THE LATE ROMAN ARMY

Y. Le Bohec, C. Wolff: *L'armée romaine de Dioclétien à Valentinien Ier. Actes du Congrès de Lyon (12–14 septembre 2002)*. (Collection du Centre d'Études Romaines et Gallo-Romaines, NS 26.) Pp. 540. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 2004. Paper. ISBN: 2-904974-25-3.

This volume collects forty papers from a conference at Lyons in September 2002. The topic is the later Roman army from the Tetrarchy to Adrianople, limits which ensure that the volume focuses on this organization during a period of considerable strength when imperial forces had recovered from the critical threats of the mid-third century but before the losses of Adrianople and the Theodosian civil wars undermined their effectiveness. Thus the common thrust is an investigation of reasonably successful responses to diverse challenges, with the older rhetoric of inexorable decline largely banished. Papers are split into four main sections: Sources; Geographical Areas; Organisation; and Role (economic, social, religious). Half the papers are in French, a reflection of the impressive quantity of recent French work on the third and early-fourth centuries as well as of the conference's location, with the remainder split between Italian, Spanish, English, and German. This reflects the international nature of the original occasion, though it must also be noted that the English, and to a lesser extent the German, contributions are not provided by the most significant scholars currently working on the field. For anglophone readers this increases the value of the volume as a digest of primarily continental scholarship, with a number of different

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni348 Published online by Cambridge University Press

insights being presented, but the possibilities for dialogue at the conference itself have been missed.

In the Sources section papers range from a general overview (Sabbah on literary texts) to the very specific (Jouffroy on tribunes in Ammianus; Heidenreich on inscriptions from Lambaesis); here Palme's survey of papyri is particularly useful as an introduction to this material. One regret is that Christian evidence is virtually ignored (apart from two pages in Sabbah's chapter, pp. 36–7), although there is much in the ecclesiastical historians relevant to the Christianization of Roman warfare, a vital topic for the chosen period on which little is said. In the Regional section there is a similar combination of broad survey (Lewin on *comitatenses* and *limitanei* in the East) and specific topic (Fellmann on the *Prima Martia* legion); North Africa receives most attention, with four of the eleven papers devoted to its troops, whereas the middle and lower Danube are scarcely mentioned and the Rhine only treated indirectly. The most informative papers are those which can engage with the particular evidence for their region (e.g. Le Bohec on North Africa). The Organisation section opens with the volume's longest paper, fifty pages by Wheeler on the Legion as Phalanx, which may be only the first part of a longer work; unfortunately, although it is characteristically provocative and pugnacious, almost the entire paper is devoted to the classical Greek and Roman Republican antecedents of later Roman arrangements, and more space is allocated to the evidence of Agathias and Maurice in the sixth century than to fourth-century material. By contrast, Janniard makes several important points on fourth-century troop organization in less than ten pages. Carrié provides a further instalment in his study of recruitment processes, arguing for considerable continuity during the period, while Cosme and Yébenas devote papers to some of the essential administrative underpinnings of the operational troops. The final section on the army's varied non-military rôles is the briefest, with seven papers which can only touch on isolated aspects of very diverse topics. Wesch-Klein is interesting on the phenomenon of desertion, Todisco usefully surveys the economic significance of veterans, and Haensch has sensible things to say about the spread of Christianity in the army, but the quality of these offerings only increases the desire for a wider coverage here.

One theme which unites many papers is the diversity of the late Roman army. The point is made succinctly in Reddé's contribution on archaeological evidence, and is picked up in many of the geographical studies. Although constraints of evidence make some reliance on general developments inevitable, e.g. in Le Roux's study of the exiguous material from Spain, the fundamental message is that we should be discussing late Roman armies rather than a homogeneous army. It would have been interesting to see this thesis applied to the legal evidence, for which Magioncalda offers a thorough survey without ever considering the sorts of questions about context, origin, and impact which have been raised in recent British writing on the Theodosian Code: it may well not be right to treat this material cumulatively to construct an empire-wide assessment of particular military problems and practices.

The volume's chronological focus is, in general, a strength. Where appropriate, contributors do extend their discussion through to the end of the fourth century to analyse the evidence of the *Notitia Dignitatum* (e.g. Hassall on Britain), without becoming bogged down in the complex changes of the early-fifth century when the Roman world in the West was falling apart. The manifold military issues of the third century are reviewed in Le Bohec's introductory chapter, which allows other contributors to take the Tetrarchy as a firm point of departure. Wheeler's indiscipline is uncharacteristic, and called for editorial intervention.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni348 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Any conference, of course, is dependent on what participants have been prepared to discuss, and gaps in this volume suggest themes for future events. The editors are to be thanked for their efforts in assembling this stimulating collection. An index is promised in a separate volume, and it will help users track down specific issues more quickly, but this will be a substantial undertaking. I am glad that the editors have opted for a reasonably rapid publication of the conference contributions, through which all those interested in late Roman military affairs will browse with profit.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni348

ROME UNDER CONSTANTINE

R. R. HOLLOWAY: *Constantine and Rome*. Pp. xvi + 191, map, ills. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-300-10043-4.

In his thirty-three years as emperor, Constantine was in Rome for a total of less than a year. Under Constantine, indeed, Rome would soon become the second city of the empire, overshadowed by the emperor's pet project, the New Rome which would come to be known as Constantinople. The subject of R. Ross Holloway's *Constantine and Rome*, therefore, is not the personal impact of the emperor on the city but what H. calls 'the Constantinian moment' (p. ix). This neatly avoids many complex questions of attribution, but it also implies a serious question: the Roman empire changed significantly in the reign of Constantine, but did the same apply to the city of Rome? H.'s answer is mixed: Rome remained 'a stronghold of paganism' (p. 16) despite 'revolutionary' (p. 115) changes in urban planning. Constantine's lack of interest in Rome perhaps ensured that there was no overall plan, and no pattern to the city's development.

This view is reflected in the slightly haphazard design of the book itself. A brief historical introduction is followed by chapters on the Arch of Constantine; on Roman basilicas; and on the supposed tomb of the apostle Peter at S. Pietro in Vaticano. The latter seems an odd inclusion, and it is given a surprising amount of space—not least when H.'s conclusion is that 'Archaeology cannot settle the so-called Petrine question' nor, apparently, advance it very far from sectarian squabbling (p. 155). Nevertheless, this final chapter is characteristic of the rest of the work. H. makes a marked effort throughout to connect Constantinian archaeology to modern Rome and its concerns, which are frequently and unavoidably those of the Catholic church. He is also consistently reluctant to go beyond the established secondary literature, providing a clear guide to the issues at stake but rarely attempting to resolve them.

The chapter on the Arch of Constantine is an excellent example. The vast majority of the chapter is taken up by a fine summary of the recent excavations and investigations by Melucco Vaccaro and by Pensabene and Panella, concentrating on the date and physical structure of the arch. This is followed by a brief attempt to shut down the whole controversy over the arch's contemporary friezes, famously condemned by Bernard Berenson as evidence for the demise of classical art. H. principally argues that because Constantine's arch seems to have been largely improvised out of an arch originally intended for Maxentius, there are therefore 'no subtleties of program to discover' (p. 52). This seems a little too sweeping, for even if the style of the arch was indeed heavily influenced by 'physical limitations', there

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni348 Published online by Cambridge University Press