

For the Greeks, they appeared to be a less immediate threat, though theoretically intriguing, as attested both by Herodotus and the Hippocratic *Airs, Waters, Places*. It may be noted that Kim expresses quite a lot of scepticism towards the Hartogian reading of Herodotus' Scythians (113–15), not all of it justified by the simple expediency of buttressing Kim's own comparison between the broadly coeval Xiongnu and Scythian societies.

Even as it was quite easy for the Chinese to project into international relations the Confucian notion of filial piety that younger siblings or children owed to their elders, the Greeks of the classical era would have found themselves in the unflattering circumstance of being those youngsters, even if such a mentality had prevailed among them (cf. Kim 45–9, 55–8). But while this mentality probably did not prevail, the technique of explaining differences between Greeks and Chinese by differing mentalities or cultural analogies (criticised by G. E. R. Lloyd) does constantly loom within works of this comparative type. It is more conducive and less essentialist to rather focus upon explaining the differences. In a very interesting section Kim notes that a decisive (and dismissive) polarisation between the *Huaxia* and 'barbarian nations' arose in China only after most of the surrounding societies had been conquered (64). So while the Greek exacerbation of intergroup perceptions stemmed from an outgroup threat, the corresponding phenomenon during the Zhou dynasty (or possibly a back-projection under the Han dynasty) had more to do with a lessening of outsider threats. His observations about the notion of barbarians 'becoming *Huaxia*' through corrective acculturation are also instructive and this tied into the discourse on ideal rulership in a way that saw full-fledged parallels in the West only during the Roman Imperial period, though the possibility of barbarians 'becoming Hellenes' was already recognised in some Hellenistic thinking. As implied by Stuurman (2009, 2, 24), the focus of Chinese literature was that of an empire looking outward, whereas for the Greeks of the classical era the empire was the enemy.

What, then, can Kim's comparison of Chinese and Greek material tell us about xenological writing? The danger of postulating a kind of 'Axial Age' of literature is present, though luckily avoided in this particular contribution. Neither historiography nor geography, the principal registers through which Greek description of foreign peoples was propagated developed along identical lines in China, and hence there are clear differences in the literary modalities involved. Structurally, however, some striking similarities emerge. Moralising evaluations of the strange customs of foreign groups are common and often topical. Since ingroup bias as an almost universal factor in intergroup relations has been reasonably demonstrated, the final import of a comparative study in this vein, however, will certainly stem from debunking the possibly lingering scholarly presuppositions of exceptional or teleological qualities in any cultural process of ancient civilisations.

*Antti Lampinen*

JORGE LÓPEZ QUIROGA: *Gentes Barbarae. Los Bárbaros, entre el mito y la realidad*. Antigüedad y cristianismo 25. Universidad de Murcia, Murcia 2011. ISSN 0214-7165. 303 pp. EUR 40.

Ancient ethnography – i.e., both the barbarians inhabiting the confines of Greco-Roman literature and those who actually led lives in diverse parts of the classical world – is something of a fashionable topic at the moment. This has become evident from a veritable deluge of recent

studies, rivalling in scope and determination the fabled oceanic inundations that some ancient writers believed to have set in motion the wanderings of suspiciously diverse northern groups. No doubt the drive to better understand the peoples called 'barbarians' by Greeks and Romans is part of the more general, by now no longer particularly recent, wish to construct less biased narratives for those on behalf of whom the classical urban patriarchy originally volunteered for this task. This 'new barbarology' accommodates a wide variety of approaches from studying the form of the narratives themselves to actually reaching, where possible, towards the ostensible objects of those narratives; thus, its subjects range from the portrayal of barbarians in literary works and physical works of art to archaeologically documented non-classical cultures, in connection with whom the use of the term 'barbarian' is perhaps less easy to justify.

Aware of the great intellectual activity currently taking place throughout this broad field, a reader will thus no doubt be eager to peruse the recent Spanish contribution for the subject of barbarians, the monograph of Jorge López Quiroga. The title itself is inviting, promising a balance between the extremes of *mito* and *realidad*. As comes clear from the Contents, the book is mostly concerned with Late Antique contexts, with 'ethnicity' and 'ethnogenesis' and their relation to realities being afforded the pride of place. The interpretational paradigm of 'ethnogenesis' has been making waves in the field of Late Antique barbarian studies for a couple of decades now: practically ever since the original contribution by Wenskus (*Stammesbildung und Verfassung*, 1961) began to be paraphrased and adapted into more accessible forms. In its basic form, the theory imagined political or professional groups of Late Antiquity coalescing into something more 'ethnic' under their leaders and the constructed, identity-building historical narratives these leaders emphasised. While there is much to recommend this complex of theories in the context of Late Imperial 'barbarian' *regna*, it has subsequently been headily applied in contexts where we have in fact no independent sources to the forms of the barbarian identity-building (such as Karl Strobel on the Galatians). Moreover, the latent assumptions and occasionally misplaced emphasis of many ethnogenesis theories have come under reassessment and critique, for which Gillett (ed., *On Barbarian Identity*, 2002) is a useful starting point.

Chapter 1 is mostly occupied with reviewing previous scholarship and giving brief accounts of the different groups of source material. The question incorporated in its title ("Did the barbarians know they were barbarians?") is revealed to be rhetorically posed in the first place, and is not in fact reflected upon in much detail (35). This is a pity. While López Quiroga is absolutely correct in saying that the barbarian world was a construction of the Greco-Roman imagination, it is nonetheless clear that Late Antique 'barbarian' strongmen who mostly (but not exclusively) forged their careers in the Roman army, would have become quite aware of their 'barbarity' by being reminded of their status by the Roman elite. They may not have internalised the category, but they would have become aware of the box circumscribing them and many of their colleagues and – in the case of 'Arians' – coreligionists. But neither would it be correct to expect only incomprehension or condescension from the Roman sources: as Amory (*People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy*, 1997) has shown, individual adaptations among both 'Romans' and 'barbarians' seem to have been the rule.

Chapter 2 ("¿Invasiones y/o migraciones?") recounts in concise form some of the earlier and most of the current scholarly explanations for the character of the 'Migration Age', but has not much new to present. Chapter 3 examines the interplay of ethnicity, identity, and

'otherness' through a selection of categories that are familiar from previous scholarship regarding the 'barbarian *regna*'. The point-of-view of the ethnogenesis school is pervasive, though the methodological problems of the approach and of Wenskus' original contribution, and the views of its opponents are explicated. Chapter 4 gives thought to the role of the barbarians in the Late Roman army – a subject that has seen significant contributions by such scholars as Liebeschuetz, Pohl and Kulikowski, among others. The conclusions accordingly encapsulate well the current scholarly understanding regarding the 'barbarity' of Roman armies in the west. Chapter 5 ("*In habitu barbaro*") looks at the evidence that burials can offer about ancient barbarian identities, with the emphasis on archaeological cultures consequently becoming even more pronounced. Even so, the recapitulation of the typology of 'barbarian' burials within the empire is useful.

The examination of "Danubian barbarians" in Chapter 6, the lengthiest section in the monograph, is structured around the familiar ethnonyms of Goths, Suebi, Vandals, and Alans. The selection is conditioned by the Spanish focus (17): all groups held parts of Hispania at one time or other. Tracing the ethnonyms back to archaeological cultures outside the empire and to later burial practices within the empire takes a lot of space, but is overall well condensed and reliable. Attempts to harmonise the archaeological data with the classical ethnonyms has led to graphics whose explanatory power is compromised by their layout (see, e.g., pp. 120, 142) as well as by the treatment of each Greco-Roman ethnonym as a self-standing entity with a real-life referent group. But such systematic juxtaposition of archaeological cultures with ethnic names from literature is arguably exactly the thing that has plagued 'barbarian studies' for so many decades. Finally, "Conclusions" again engages with methodological issues; the oppositional pairing of 'Romans' and 'barbarians' is usefully called into question and qualified.

Is the balance between myth and reality – foregrounded in the title of López Quiroga's book – achieved in the end? If it does, the myths meant are those of the later scholarly tradition, which are frequently debated. López Quiroga's call for genuine interdisciplinarity in studying Late Imperial barbarians is certainly welcome, but in practice he still seems to attempt a synthetic narrative based on a varied range of sources, the divergent parts of which cannot in fact be interrogated through the same questions. Moreover, his heavy emphasis on ethnogenesis leads to some issues of balance, especially the increasingly archaeological contents of the work. The ethnogenesis model has nearly always worked better with archaeological sources than written evidence, given the wider latitude granted by such essentially 'mute' data. López Quiroga's clear desire is to go on using the old established ethnonyms the way they have been used, but this leads him to brush aside such criticism as Goffart's (*Barbarian tides*, 2006) in favour of arguments which seem headstrongly to endorse the old usage, despite its heuristic lack of value (see p. 14 fn. 3; cf. 62); hence no doubt his reliance on the 'Vienna school' (he is aware of its criticism, 62f., but does not make much of it) and its Spanish proponent, L. A. García Moreno.

The work comes across as more like a textbook than a study creating new understanding of the Late Imperial 'barbarians'; it is a fine introduction to the subject in Spanish, strong in explaining and showcasing the scholarly tradition on the barbarian *gentes*, as well as the archaeological cultures outside the empire usually associated with these groups. But the book seems disinclined to draw new conclusions from its summary of vast amounts of information. Quite a few typographical errors mar the whole; some depriving the works cited from all of

their meaning (see e.g. the introductory citation from Geary 2001 on p. 19, unwittingly changing 'Germanic' to 'Roman'). Appended to López Quiroga's study is also a rather handy Lexicon (171–99) as well as a Chronology (201–4), both of which are on the whole reliable: throughout the text, asterisks link terms to their respective entries in the Lexicon. In addition to the monograph under review, this volume also contains a number of articles from various contributors on diverse topics, as well as book reviews (235–96).

*Antti Lampinen*

KARELISA V. HARTIGAN: *Performance and Cure. Drama and Healing in Ancient Greece and Contemporary America*. Duckworth, London 2009. ISBN 978-0-7156-3639-8. XIV, 124 pp. GBP 14.99.

Hartigan's book has been published in the series Classical Inter/Faces which deals with Classical subjects focused on "issues of contemporary interest", as stated in the publisher's website ([www.bloomsbury.com/uk/series/classical-interfaces/](http://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/series/classical-interfaces/)). In line with the series, the book under review is written for the so-called general public. It presents the ancient sources on its subject in a concise form and compares ancient Greek and contemporary North American approaches to curing illnesses by "mainstream" health care.

The book is divided into four main chapters followed by a concluding fifth chapter. Chapter one deals with drama and healing in (Western) contemporary medicine (pp. 5–17); in this chapter, the author briefly discusses the relationship between mind and body as well as the relationship between art and medicine, or, to be more precise, drama and healing.

Chapter two is dedicated to the ancient world (pp. 18–80). This section forms the core of the book, at least in the number of pages: it takes up half of the book. In the beginning, this chapter focuses rightly on the cult of Asklepios. The author expounds the myths regarding Asklepios, also pointing out that there were several differing stories going around in the ancient Greek world and that Asklepios was not the only god of healing. The author goes on to describe what we know, on the basis of our evidence, of the process of healing and presents some of the major sites for the cures. The section where the sites are discussed would perhaps have benefited from another way of organizing the material. Epidauros is discussed on its own whereas other sites are presented under "Other major sites" and "Regional sites". The section on "Regional sites" seems to include three sub-categories: local sites, Pausanias and Asklepios, Athens, which, however, do not appear in the table of contents. This may indicate that the book was finished rather in a hurry.

Chapter three has some personal touches, dealing as it does with drama and healing in the contemporary American hospital (pp. 81–91). For someone not familiar with this approach to healing, the chapter is probably an interesting read. It is also refreshing to read about personal experiences of an ancient phenomenon that is studied by classical scholars.

Chapter four discusses Asklepios within the Christian framework (pp. 93–99). As it is, the discussion seems too brief. This is an important and interesting subject, and if a chapter is dedicated to such a topic it should definitely be more thorough. Instead of a short overview of this kind, a better solution would have been to include the fourth chapter in the epilogue and conclusion.