

for each of their works, which gives its titles (ancient and modern) and then itemises its genre, language, state of preservation, date and place of composition, length (in books), coverage, and finally the sources and users of the work. For most entries, some brief ‘remarks’ follow, then lists of the manuscripts, editions and translations, and finally relevant secondary literature. The layout of each entry (and the generous quantity of white space on each page), make *CHAP* a pleasure to browse. It is difficult not to admire a volume which assembles so much useful information in such a convenient format, especially at a time when the work of building this sort of scholarly infrastructure is not hugely in favour. *CHAP* will certainly help to make late-ancient historiography much more legible to scholars and it ought to make comparison between historical writing in different languages much easier. It is particularly welcome that V.N. and V.H. chose to include the lists of manuscripts and that they have taken seriously the titles by which works were known in antiquity, information too often overlooked or dismissed in the scholarly literature.

Like any other vast compilation, *CHAP*'s entries inevitably include mistakes, inconsistencies and infelicities, and their true value will emerge only through long use. Some points, however, stand out from perusing a very large number of them. In general, the entries are accurate and helpful, the outright errors few relative to the size of the project. In the areas I know best, I noted only the reference to the *Epitome de Caesaribus* being part of the so-called *Corpus Aurelianum* (they are transmitted separately, but have been edited together) and the identification of *De breviario rerum gestarum populi Romani* as the title of Festus' *Breviarium*, rather than a crucial part of its preface (see Reeve in *Gnomon* 69 (1997), 508–9). There were a frustrating number of misprints in some of the bibliographic information I followed up, but nothing that is likely seriously to impede the curious. The brief commentary included on each work varies from the completely gnomic to the very helpful. The way that state of preservation is recorded seems to me occasionally slightly misleading. Besides ‘full’ and ‘partial’, which are self-explanatory, V.N. and V.H. use the category ‘fragmentary’. In this, they include both works of which actual fragments have been transmitted and those which are simply mentioned by a later author. In contrast to *FHistLA*, hypothetical works are here admitted. The entries for these are often reassuringly sceptical, but it is hard not to feel that including them in a work of reference at all might solidify the existence of some phantoms long overdue for exorcism (like Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte*).

These are minor blemishes on a such a colossal work. Scholars of Late Antiquity will wish to consult *CHAP* whenever they begin working on any late-ancient historical text. The hefty price of this hefty volume will certainly deter private purchases, and even some institutions might balk at it. It is welcome, therefore, that much of the information is also freely available online at <https://www.late-antique-historiography.ugent.be/database/>. Users of that database should be aware, however, that its entries seem generally to omit the lists of manuscripts, the date and place of composition and the length of the work, as well as the social status of the author. That most late-antique of things, the physical codex, remains the indispensable format.

University of Nottingham  
[george.woudhuysen@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:george.woudhuysen@nottingham.ac.uk)  
 doi:10.1017/S0075435822000946

GEORGE WOUDHUYSEN

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

RANDOLPH B. FORD, *ROME, CHINA AND THE BARBARIANS – ETHNOGRAPHIC TRADITIONS AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF EMPIRES*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. xx + 369. ISBN 9781108463010. £90.00.

In 449 C.E., the Greek sophist and historian Priscus of Panium was invited by his friend and mentor Maximinus to join him on an official delegation to the ‘court’ of Attila. During the visit he was surprised by someone ‘whom I took to be a barbarian from his Scythian dress’ but who greeted him in Greek: ‘χαῖρε’ (Hello!). It turned out that the Greek-speaker was not a captured Roman soldier but a merchant who, after the fall of Viminacium in 442, was assigned to the household of Hunnic chieftain Onegesius and had served his new master well by fighting valiantly for the Huns (Frag. 2). This story highlights many of the problems and fascinations in the depiction or stigmatisation of the stereotypical ‘other’ in Classical historiography. The volume under review

tackles the subject on a grand scale by comparing Greco-Roman and Chinese ethnographic traditions and how they manifested themselves in two major historical sources. Ford's work is not built on comparison of generalisations but is an experiment in parallel research in depth and as such the volume demands to be taken seriously by scholars of both Classical and Sinological studies.

One would expect a comparative study of alterity in two cultures with long civilising influences to begin at the fountain-head, viz. by comparing the depiction of the foreigner in Herodotus with that of Sima Qian 司馬遷 — the fathers of historical writing in Greece and China respectively, but this task has to a large extent been undertaken by the seminal work of Hyun Jin-Kim, *Ethnicity and Foreigners in Ancient Greece and China* (2009). Ford bases his comparison on two historiographical sources, the *De Bellis* of the Greek historian Procopius from the Early Byzantine period (500–565) and the *Jinshu* 晉書 (hereafter *JS*), the Official History of the Jin Dynasty (266–420).

Procopius wrote in the tradition of Thucydides in the mid sixth century C.E. when Greek was beginning to take over as the main language of Roman historiography. He also inaugurated a near unbroken tradition which would continue to the end of the Byzantine Empire with classicising historians like Laonicus Chalcocondylas. To examine how much Procopius owes to earlier writers, both Greek and Latin, in the field of ethnography, Ford has to go back to the pre-Ciceronian era as the attitude of the Romans towards the Greeks has to be assessed along with those towards Sabines, Samnites and Gauls. This Ford does by citing a number of key texts, some well known and some less so. Ford, however, pays little attention to the parts of the Roman Empire which continued to espouse non-Greco-Roman cultures such as Syria, Palestine and Egypt. The important and highly relevant work of N. J. Andrade (*Syrian Identity in the Greco-Roman World*, 2013) is conspicuous by its absence from the bibliography of Ford's work. Malalas, a contemporary of Procopius, interestingly describes the Mesopotamian city of Edessa as of 'mixed-barbarian' heritage (μιζοβάρβαρος) — there is certainly more than one shade of grey in using the term 'barbarian'.

Ford's survey of pre-Late Antique Greek and Latin sources on ethnography is paralleled by a detailed examination of similar material in Chinese sources, drawn mainly from the Chinese Classics and Han historians. The introductory discussion is exhaustive and could have been more succinct for the sake of the non-specialist reader. The latter is confronted from the outset by a plethora of names for different types of barbarians and how they were stereotypically depicted but with little explanation as to whether they were 'othered' because they were unassimilable or seen as culturally inferior or as existential threats.

E. A. Thompson once said that for every reader of the work of Ammianus Marcellinus 'there are a thousand readers of Sallust, Livy or Tacitus' (*The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus* (1969), vii). The same would have been true ten times over of readers of the *JS* compared to those of the better known *Shiji* (Historical Records) of Sima Qian. The *JS* is a work of no special literary merit and is read mainly by specialists on the three centuries after the fall of the Han Dynasty. The *JS* was commissioned by Emperor Tang Taizong 唐太宗 (r. 626–49 C.E.) who was partly descended from the Sārbi (Xianbe 鮮卑) Huns (probably identical with the Sabiri Huns of Procopius' time). Hence there was a paramount need to show that the Tang rulers were culturally Han-Chinese. The members of the Tang Bureau of Historiography resorted to established ethno-genealogical tropes and literary devices to vilify the non-Han-Chinese rulers and blamed their misrule, uncivilised behaviour and inevitable dynastic decline on their racial origin with predictable regularity, as Ford well demonstrates from numerous passages cited from the *JS* (238–56).

Procopius, who used the words βάρβαρος 634 times and βαρβαρικώς ten times in his extant works, did not hesitate to label Persians as 'barbarians', although they were always seen as the equal of Romans in civility and military prowess. However, the complete absence of any discussion of Procopius's depiction of the Sasanian Persians to which the first two books of the *De Bellis* were devoted deprives F.'s study of an obvious historical and literary connection with Herodotus and Thucydides. In the passages of the *De Bellis* cited by F. from the Vandalic and Gothic Wars, we have a historian who espouses a view of foreign rulers which is vastly different from that of the Confucian compilers of the *JS* and also from the Graeco-Roman ethnographic tradition which would have been part of Procopius's rhetorical training. F. is at pains to point out that Procopius was not interested in their ancestral origins and showed that in some cases they were capable of moral improvement through 'Roman' education. For Procopius, the foreign kings who ruled the Western Empire were illegitimate because they were usurpers and not because they were 'barbarian' or uncivilised invaders.

Ford's main observation also highlights a problem of comparative ancient historiography. Procopius was a contemporary to the events he wrote about as he was 'embedded' in Belisarius' army of re-conquest between 533 and 540. He would have had first-hand knowledge of events and was most probably on familiar terms with some of the Vandalic and Gothic kings and chieftains mentioned in his work. As an admirer and imitator of Thucydides, *Machtpolitik* would have dominated his reasoning rather than ethnography. The compilers of the *JS*, on the other hand, undertook their task a century and a half after the events described in the work they were compiling and they were unlikely to have any personal knowledge of non-Han Chinese rulers.

Ford has done the Sinological reader a great service by providing Chinese characters along with their Pinyin transcriptions. However, the famous historical work *Zouzhuan* 左傳 (lit. 'The Left Chronicle') from the Chinese Classics is given quite wrongly as *zuozhuan* 左轉 (lit. 'a left turn') (1; see also 116 and 337). The character for the title of the Sui 隋 Dynasty (581–618 C.E.) is rendered by the homophone *sui* 隨 ('to follow') throughout the main text (11, 138, etc.). At 246, line 25, the personal name 'Shi Hu' should be given as 'Shi Jilong 石季龍' as per the Chinese text.

Robinson College, Cambridge  
[samuel.lieu@mq.edu.au](mailto:samuel.lieu@mq.edu.au)

SAMUEL N.C. LIEU

doi:10.1017/S007543582300059X

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

STEFAN REBENICH and HANS-ULRICH WIEMER (EDS), *A COMPANION TO JULIAN THE APOSTATE* (Brill Companions to the Byzantine World). Leiden: Brill, 2020. ISBN 9789004414563. €188.00.

Bibliography for the reign of Julian 'the Apostate' has expanded considerably in recent years and as such the appearance of a volume which brings together the findings of historic and contemporary research into Julian's life, writings and legacy is clearly to be welcomed. The editors have assembled an impressive team of (overwhelmingly male) commentators whose contributions range widely over a variety of topics including Julian's military campaigns (Heather; Bleckmann; McLynn), Julian's writings including his legal constitutions (Nesselrath; Riedweg; Schmidt-Hofner; Vossing), his religious renovations and reforms (Wiemer; Bradbury) and his historic legacy and wider cultural influence (Marcone; van Nuffelen; Rebenich).

The opening chapter by Rebenich and Wiemer highlights the polarised responses of commentators concerning the significance of Julian's life and reign. In this regard, Julian continues to be judged by scholars either as a dynamic figure, a reformer of imperial government guided by the highest standards of Hellenic culture, or as an imperial usurper who behaved haphazardly in matters of the empire's military security and religious well-being. One reason for this historic division of opinion is that a biographical approach has dominated the study of Julian, an inevitability in light of the fact that Julian left behind a body of literature in which his thoughts and motivations were ostensibly disclosed to his audience. Commentators have therefore nearly always passed judgement on Julian even when they have sought to evaluate him objectively. The opening chapter offers a useful survey of modern scholarship on Julian, and the editors make the case for eschewing a biographical approach in favour of examining Julian according to recent trends whereby his identities as emperor, author, legislator, philosopher and commander are discussed (29). The *Companion* broadly achieves its stated aim to explain Julian's actions according to 'their respective contexts' (29) and in this regard the more successful chapters in the volume avoid 'the spectre of incomparability' (29) which has so often accompanied work on Julian. The arrangement of the following chapters feels a little awkward: their order appears to have been determined by the accepted chronology for Julian's life, which highlights that biography cannot be entirely avoided.

Heinz-Günther Nesselrath's chapter comprises a helpful survey of Julian's principal philosophical writings, namely his *Letter to Themistius*, the two invectives against the Cynics (*Against Heraclius* and *Against the Uneducated Cynics*) and the *Hymn to the Mother of the Gods* and the *Hymn to King Helios*. The chapter unpicks Julian's idiosyncratic interpretation of certain philosophical currents circulating during the mid-to-late fourth century, although it is somewhat surprising in light of the avowed editorial aim of the volume that more was not said about how these texts