

In three case studies from late Imperial Rome (the Audience Hall on the Sacra Via, the Maxentian Templum Romae and the Arch of Constantine), Elisha Ann Dumser (ch. 5) addresses the pertinent point of whether viewers would have understood the intended message, or whether it might have been enough to know that there had been re-use. She notes that meaning is conveyed through the physical material of the object, the act of appropriation and the reference to the original context, with the implication that there can be a lack of clarity in the intended message should any of these three elements be missing. Esen Ogus (ch. 6), through her examination of the transformation of Aphrodisias, uses four examples of late antique engagement with existing monuments to highlight different levels of intentional re-use. She outlines the tensions between the respect for the glorious past of the city with the need for material or change in religious focus. In her examples (the city walls, the temple of Aphrodite, the Sebasteion and the South Agora Gate and ‘Gaudin’s Fountain’) she highlights the individuality of treatment of different spaces through intentionality and strategic re-use in practical and sacred contexts.

One of the great merits of this collection is that the individual papers make no fixed assumptions: instead the material and context is explored and the rationale behind choices made to re-use are questioned. A good example of this is Brenda Longfellow’s carefully presented detail on the re-purposing of a statue of Octavian/Augustus into Constantine (ch. 1). She questions whether the appropriation was one of practical value (due to the likeness of the hair), but counters this with the fact that the hair had also been re-carved. This enables good consideration of the reasons for appropriation, ranging from practical (e.g. economic or resource-driven) to ideological (intentional appropriation to draw on the objects’ past meanings).

Throughout, the volume is impressively well illustrated. It is wide ranging, informative, challenging and thought provoking. It is one of the best edited volumes I have read for some time. While each paper has a specific aim, sight of the bigger picture and wider context is never lost. Moreover, the fact that the papers communicate with each other throughout the volume is indicative of both careful editing and collaborative participation by the contributors in the overall process. The success of this volume means that there is good scope to broaden the contributions to include extra-urban regions and more provinces in future endeavours.

University of St Andrews

rs43@st-andrews.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435820000246

REBECCA J. SWEETMAN

SIMON JAMES, *THE ROMAN MILITARY BASE AT DURA-EUROPOS, SYRIA: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL VISUALISATION*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. xxxiii + 347, illus., maps. ISBN 9780198743569. £125.00.

As recently emphasised by Ted Kaizer, its richness of textual and archaeological remains makes Dura-Europos a unique and fascinating source for day-to-day life in the Roman East (T. Kaizer in N. Purcell (ed.), *Roman History: Six Studies for Fergus Millar* (2017), 74–5) or — as Michael Sommer put it — a laboratory for a study of the stunning diversity of the Roman World (M. Sommer in T. Kaizer (ed.), *Religion, Society and Culture at Dura-Europos* (2016), 64). Of course, this also applies to the presence of the Roman army and its impact on civic life in Dura. Moreover, the question of how life in Roman Dura-Europos was shaped by the presence of Rome’s soldiers is a crucial one, since in modern research there are at least two entirely different points of view. M. I. Rostovtzeff and C. B. Welles blamed the Roman soldiers for a strangulation of civic and economic life in the city, whereas others — first and foremost Michael Sommer and Oliver Stoll — have underlined the positive impact of the Roman military (22–5, with a detailed discussion of earlier research on the topic, and 33–4). Simon James discusses in particular the conclusions which Oliver Stoll drew in his study of the relations between soldiers and civilians in the Roman Near East, which he argued to be characterised by *concordia/homonoia* (*Zwischen Integration und Abgrenzung: Die Religion des römischen Heeres im Nahen Osten* (2001)).

J.’s study is divided into three parts. In the first part, comprising four chapters, the author gives an accurate and detailed introduction to the history of research at and about Dura-Europos, the aims of the project, i.e. a new evaluation of the impact of the Roman garrison and base on civic life by means of an analysis of the archaeology of the Roman base, and an overview of the history of the site

between the Parthian and Roman Empires (3–58). The second part is dedicated to the presentation and study of the archaeological remains of the Roman base and the presences of Roman soldiers outside the base (61–236). The third and final part establishes a basis for a discussion of the question of how life in the town was framed by the presence of the Roman soldiers (239–316). The book finishes with a short chapter about the damages caused to the site during the Syrian civil war (317–18). As J. himself underlines, his new evaluation of the evidence led to three outcomes which are important for answering the main question of the volume (315): first, the Roman base came into being in the last decades of the second century A.D.; second, the population was much more extensive than previously estimated; and third, the extended military community — what Stoll would call the ‘Militärgesellschaft’ or ‘Garnisationsgesellschaft’ (*Ehrenwerte Männer. Veteranen im römischen Nahen Osten der Kaiserzeit* (2015), 39–52) — has to be regarded as a city within the city.

Now, J.’s splendid and detailed analysis does indeed provoke a re-interpretation of the evidence regarding the question of the cohabitation of soldiers and civilians in Dura-Europos. This applies firstly to the population figures. Contrary to earlier views, J. allows a population of 10,000–15,000 individuals (300), a figure which is in line with other recent estimates (J. A. Baird, *Dura-Europos* (2018), 90). Secondly, contrary to earlier studies, but in accordance with Stoll, he underlines that one has to focus not only on the soldiers, but also on their wives, children, slaves and other relatives, which is why the group in question has to be conceptualised as an extended military community (250–5, 299–300). Working with a number of 2,000 Roman soldiers at the garrison’s height (250), J. assumes that this community comprised 3,000–6,000 individuals, which would mean a ratio of roughly 3:1 between the civilians and the military (300). Furthermore, the Roman military base evidently comprised a quarter, if not a third, of the intramural area, as J. underlines (258). Accordingly, the impact of the military presence has to be thought of as having been much higher than assumed in earlier studies (300–1). J. acknowledges that the archaeological and textual evidence gives every reason to believe that — as underlined in earlier studies — the garrison had a positive economic effect on the city and that the co-existence of the military community and civilians was harmonious (301–3). However, his generally quite negative perception of Roman soldiers, which is best exemplified by his interpretation of the Roman camps as ‘wolf-cages’ (276), causes J. to think about the negative consequences of the Roman military presence for different social groups within the city, which applies especially (according to J.) to the lower social strata of Dura’s society (295–313). All in all, J. does not draw a black-and-white picture of the impact of the base and garrison on civic life, but one which is characterised by a lot of different shades, or — as he puts it — by the *chiaroscuro* of the Italian Renaissance (315).

J. has written a wonderful study, which without any doubt will be a point of reference for any future study of Roman Dura-Europos and the relations between soldiers and civilians in the Roman world more generally. It is characterised by a scrupulous interpretation of the sources, a high level of methodological sophistication, and the awareness that every attempt to reconstruct the past is framed and biased by the present of those who undertake this endeavour.

Universität Kassel
kai.ruffing@uni-kassel.de
doi:10.1017/S0075435820000209

KAI RUFFING

JANE DEROSE EVANS, *COINS FROM THE EXCAVATIONS AT SARDIS: THEIR ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC CONTEXTS. COINS FROM THE 1973 TO 2013 EXCAVATIONS* (Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 13). Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 2018. Pp. xxi + 305, illus., maps, graphs. ISBN 9780674987258. £64.95.

In recent years, there have been significant increases in the number of publications concerning the coins unearthed during archaeological excavations in Anatolia. Every publication is important for the light it sheds on the economic history of ancient Anatolia, but this importance varies according to the duration of the excavations. Longer-term excavations with supporting stratigraphic studies make numismatic documents more meaningful. Among excavations carried out in Anatolia, the place