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/bni349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

might still be some subtle programme to discover: why, after all, would it have been deemed acceptable to offer such a rush-job of an arch to the emperor? This is the order of question confronted by works such as Jas Elsner's 'Culture of Spolia'.[1] Scrupulous and detailed though H.'s chapter is, it makes little original contribution—although with its plentiful illustrations, it certainly helps rectify the genuine problem which he identifies, that the arch is 'intensively studied but imperfectly published' (pp. 160–1 n. 1).

It must be acknowledged, too, that H. makes few claims to originality on his own part. In the case of the longest chapter here, on Roman basilicas, he freely confesses (pp. x–xi) his dependence on Richard Krautheimer's *Corpus Basilicarum Christianorum Romae*; and, if considered as a popularization of Krautheimer's work, the chapter succeeds admirably. H.'s own contribution notes what seems to be a genuine Constantinian phenomenon of apse-ended basilicas such as the Via Labicana complex, which was built up around Constantine's own planned mausoleum and which has developed into the present-day church of SS. Marcellino e Pietro. Rightly in my view, and following Krautheimer, H. dismisses the suggestion that the apse-ended form was intended to imitate the shape of the Roman circus. Nor does he wish to see this style as descended from 'the Roman secular basilica' (p. 115) or the rectangular-basilica-with-apse as seen at S. Giovanni in Laterano. Instead, he prefers to see the Via Labicana complex as inaugurating an entirely new form based not on the basilica but on the traditional domed mausoleum: 'What was this apse-ended basilica but an amplified mausoleum?' (p. 114). It is certainly an attractive idea that these buildings should represent a hybrid between mausoleum and basilica; but I am unconvinced by H.'s further claim that in thus sharing his intended burial place on the Via Labicana, Constantine must be seen as engaging in 'an act of Christian charity' and therefore as 'contemplating the Christian road to salvation' (p. 114). I prefer the more careful formulation offered in the preface, in which the emperor is described as being by 326 'significantly Christian, but . . . also overwhelmingly pagan' (p. ix). This tension should perhaps have remained unresolved; firm answers to this question, especially when founded on archaeology, are always likely to be overstated.

Sure as his judgements usually are when picking a path through the archaeological literature, it seems that H.'s style can let him down when he strays too far from this remit. The first chapter's historical survey is thorough and judicious, but there are signs that H. is less confident with late-antique texts than he is with the archaeology. His decision to quote Tertullian from the CCEL online library is understandable, but seems rather strange when the translation (p. 8) has been silently altered from the online version referenced: indeed, it seems to have been almost entirely retranslated but in the same archaizing style, retaining 'thees' and 'thous' at the cost of readability. Elsewhere, he makes quietly controversial decisions, such as referring to bishops of Rome as early as the second century as 'popes' (pp. 9–10) and, in a footnote, to an 'antipope' (p. 159 n. 40). In the same footnote, Samosata becomes 'Samasota'; similarly trivial but rather more surprising errors occur repeatedly in the bibliography.[2]

[1]J. Elsner, 'From the Culture of Spolia to the Cult of Relics: The Arch of Constantine and the Genesis of Late Antique Form', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 68 (2000), 149–84; see also a work not in H.'s bibliography: P. Peirce, 'The Arch of Constantine: Propaganda and Ideology in Late Roman Art', *Art History* 12 (1989), 387–418.

[2]For example: A. H. M. Jones loses his first initial, as does H. A. Pohlsander; T. G. Elliott becomes T. C. Elliott; J. Curran is cited as R. Curran; and S. G. MacCormack has become S. McCormick; there are also occasional mistakes in the titles of Italian works.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

None of this detracts significantly from the quality of the work, but it all adds up to the impression, reinforced by the obtrusive use of modern parallels and personal reminiscence ('I have always had a soft spot in my heart for the Arch of Constantine', begins Chapter 2), that H.'s book is intended as a scholarly and meticulous guidebook. As such, it is indeed useful: it is ultra-reliable in its command and use of the secondary literature; and the stunning illustrations matched with clear exposition have made a lot of things clearer to me than they were before. I would certainly recommend it to undergraduates interested in familiarizing themselves with the Christian archaeology of Rome; and it will be invaluable as a handbook for when Krautheimer's *CBCR* is out of reach—which for me is most of the time. Nothing more than that, however, is to be expected.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth MICHAEL STUART WILLIAMS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni349

CONFORMED TO THIS WORLD?

G. CLARK: *Christianity and Roman Society*. (Key Themes in Ancient History.) Pp. xii + 137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Paper, £15.99, US$24.99 (Cased, £45, US$75). ISBN: 0-521-63386-9 (0-521-63310-9 hbk).

Succinct histories of early Christianity gain coherence from their authors' professional skills and characteristic preoccupations. Professor Clark's focus is sharp and honest. She wants to explain the roots of a faith she subscribes to: in a 'pluralist "post-Christian" society', education tells 'the majority of students . . . very little about what it might mean to call oneself Christian' (pp. 1–2). At the same time, 'this is a historian's, not a theologian's, book' (p. 8); and history here means the history of late classical antiquity.

Coherence comes at a price. The author knows the company she must keep: 'classicists and medievalists, historians and art historians, anthropologists and archaeologists, theologians and legal historians, papyrologists and epigraphers'. She knows the importance of linguistic breadth and sympathy for other religions (Judaism and Islam). She admits that scholars today 'prefer to talk in terms of diversity and pluralism, shifting frontiers and blurred boundaries' (p. 14). Yet, the book remains 'a historian's . . . book', and a classical historian's at that.

Even so, it is remarkable for its integration of narrative and reflection. Both the author's judgement and the practices of contemporary scholarship become, without compromise or condescension, essential to the story. And she can clothe her objective modernity in a humour that never robs her observations of their point. She is particularly astute in her scrutiny of the modern fascination with the body (in respect to both sex and diet), and is ready to censure past extremes.

The main argument is straightforward and convincing: early Christianity, at least to the time of Justinian, bore all the marks of classical culture. In response to Ramsey MacMullen's notorious question, 'What difference did Christianity make?', C. asks simply, 'What difference would you expect?' (p. 107). There *were* differences, of course, and she describes them; but Christianity is presented as neither destructive nor parasitic, neither a substitute nor a forgery: it was the religious face of late Roman classical tradition. It constantly rubbed shoulders, in the author's account, with established views on the structure and destiny of the cosmos and the human person,

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni349 Published online by Cambridge University Press