

helped all Greeks to wear the badge of Greco-Romanism and to begin to throw off the veils of Hellenism.

University of Warwick

SIMON SWAIN

THE CAH ENLARGED

A. CAMERON, P. GARNSEY (edd.): *The Cambridge Ancient History: Second Edition: The Late Empire A.D. 337–425*. Pp. XVI + 889. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £90. ISBN: 0-521-30200-5.

This is the first of two volumes which will extend the coverage of the second edition of this series beyond its original completion date at A.D. 324 until A.D. 600. It consists of six parts, containing twenty-five chapters penned by twenty-one different contributors. It is a worthy addition to the series and one hopes that it will take its place upon the shelves of various public libraries to serve as one of the main instruments by which the wider public will be introduced to the fascinating world of late antiquity.

Some friendly criticisms are possible, however. One notes that the latest items cited in the bibliography of 'Frequently Cited Works' date to 1994, while Cameron uses her editorial advantage to squeeze in references to two of her own articles published in 1997 in the bibliography to the last of the six parts. Nevertheless, the weighting of the more recent citations towards works published in 1993 suggests that we should regard the spring of 1994 as the effective cut-off date for contributions to this volume. It would probably be somewhat unfair, therefore, to criticize Cameron's repetition of the tired claim that 'Ammianus is no pagan propagandist' (p. 688) on the basis that she had not read T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Ithaca, 1998), but Barnes had made his basic case at a much earlier date (*CPh* 88 [1993], 55–70), as had T. G. Elliott in his *Ammianus Marcellinus and Fourth-Century History* (Sarasota, 1983), neither of which are cited in her bibliography. Greater acknowledgement that there was a different understanding of such an important author would have been nice. Similarly, while one can excuse her claim that Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte* had been composed under Diocletian or Constantine (p. 684) on the basis that R. W. Burgess's demonstration otherwise probably came too late (*CPh* 90 [1995], 111–28), Burgess does point out that Enmann had himself come to favour a termination date of 357.

On the subject of the choice of contributors, the bias towards members of the anglophone world represents a missed opportunity. While appreciating that various factors may have dictated otherwise, one would have welcomed the views of A. Demandt, the author of the major study of the office of *magister militum*, on the Roman army, or of J. Szidat, the author of the major commentaries on Ammianus' account of Julian's reign, on that reign. Indeed, the choice of contributor sometimes seems deliberately humorous. Hence it is D. Hunt, a specialist in the growth of pilgrimage to the Christian city of Jerusalem, who contributes the chapter on the reign of Julian, the emperor who tried to reverse this process by rebuilding the temple of Solomon. Similarly, it is J. Curran, a specialist in late antique Rome (*Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century* [Oxford, 2001]), who contributes the chapter on Jovian, Valentinian I, and Valens (for the most part), three emperors who

never set foot in that city. In the latter case one might have preferred if R. S. O. Tomlin could have been persuaded to give us a taste of his current view on Valentinian I, given that he once wrote his doctoral dissertation on this subject (1975). This is a noteworthy omission from Curran's bibliography, presumably because it has not actually been published (I still live in hope that Routledge will offer Tomlin a large pot of gold to update it for inclusion in their series *Roman Imperial Biographies*, and that he will take the gold). However, A. D. Lee does refer to two unpublished dissertations in his chapter on the army (P. Brennan [1972] and D. Woods [1991]), so that it appears that strict guidelines were not laid down to ensure greater consistency in such matters. Finally, given the number and quality of his studies on the reign of Theodosius I (just too late for inclusion in this volume), one might also have preferred, in hindsight, R. M. Errington to have written the chapter on the dynasty of Theodosius. This is not to disparage the competence, or bravery, of those who have contributed these chapters: I merely outline my 'dream-team' at this point in time.

On broader issues of content, there is little to grumble about, although one might argue that the subject of the coinage ought to have received a small section to itself, preferably in Garnsey's and Whittaker's chapter on trade and industry. Otherwise, one notes that Heather's chapter on the senators and the senate is basically the same essay that he contributed to P. Magdalino (ed.), *New Constantines* (Aldershot, 1994). The republication of material in this manner is doubly annoying. It denies opportunity to those who might have something different to say, and wastes the money and bookshelf-space of those who possess the same item twice. Editors of both journals and collections of essays need to take a much firmer line on such recycling.

On matters of detail, no doubt every specialist will find something with which to quibble. I have. Hunt follows Mango (*BZ* 83 [1990], 51–61) in dating the translation of the relics of Saints Luke and Andrew to Constantinople in 357 (pp. 38–9), but fails to note that Mango published a separate *addendum* to his original paper in which he withdrew his support for this date in the face of evidence suggesting the year 336 also. In fact, as I have already argued in brief (*VigChr* 45 [1991], 286–92), and to which I will return at length elsewhere, the translation actually took place in late 359. Similarly, it is a common fallacy that the future emperor Valens had served as a *protector domesticus* (p. 81). No source says this. But undisputable errors also occur. The emperors Valentinian and Valens parted ways in the autumn of 364, not the spring of 366 (p. 82), the description of Palladius as a 'military tribune and *notarius*' (p. 87) betrays a serious misunderstanding of the title *tribunus et notarius*, king Pap was killed by a *scurra*, not a *scutarius* (p. 93), and the Arabs who fought the Goths before Constantinople in 378 were certainly not archers (p. 102). Also, Latin terms for various offices are tossed about with what once would have been called gay abandon, and those who try to cross-reference, for example, the military titles sprinkled throughout the narrative chapters against the chapter on the organization of the army will find their patience sorely tested, especially if they are Latinless (as most readers of this volume will presumably be).

Finally, there is the occasional misprint ('sprng' for 'spring', p. 86; 'invasions of 305–6' for 'invasions of 405–6', p. 505), but the context usually exposes these for what they are. Nevertheless, I had bought this volume before I was asked to review it, the best possible compliment surely to publishers, editors, and contributors alike.

University College, Cork

DAVID WOODS