

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME XXXIX

2020

The appearance of this volume has been made possible by the support of

Bar-Ilan University
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
The Open University
Tel Aviv University
University of Haifa

PUBLISHED BY
THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
<http://www.israel-classics.org>

Manuscripts in the form of e-mail attachments should be sent to one of these e-mail addresses:
scripta.classica.israelica@gmail.com or isaacb@tauex.tau.ac.il. For reviews, contact
Daniela.Dueck@biu.ac.il. Please visit our website for submission guidelines. All submissions are
refereed by outside readers.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor at the following address: The Editors,
Scripta Classica Israelica, c/o Department of Classics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan 5290002,
Israel.

Price \$50

© 2020 The Israel Society for the Promotion of Classical Studies
All Rights Reserved

Camera-ready copy produced by the editorial staff of *Scripta Classica Israelica*
Printed in Israel by Magnes Press, Jerusalem

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE
PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

Editor-in-Chief: BENJAMIN ISAAC

Editorial Board:
AVI AVIDOV
GABRIEL DANZIG
DANIELA DUECK

Editorial Assistant: Naama Earon

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD
OF *SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA*

François de Callatay, Brussels and Paris
Hubert Cancik, Berlin
Averil Cameron, Oxford
Hannah M. Cotton, Jerusalem
Werner Eck, Köln
Denis Feeney, Princeton
John Glucker, Tel Aviv
Erich Gruen, Berkeley
Benjamin Isaac, Tel Aviv

David Konstan, New York
Jaap Mansfeld, Utrecht
Doron Mendels, Jerusalem
Ra'anana Meridor, Jerusalem
John North, London
Peter J. Rhodes, Durham
Hannah Rosén, Jerusalem
Greg Woolf, London

THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION
OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

OFFICERS 2019-2020

President:	Jonathan Price
Secretary:	Lisa Maurice
Treasurer:	Shimon Epstein

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Adi Erlich
Merav Haklai
Lisa Maurice
Andrea Rotstein
Iris Sulimani
Uri Yiftach

HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

Hannah Cotton
Ranon Katzoff
Ra'anana Meridor

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ROBERT A. KASTER, Cicero's Economy of Praise	1
EVA ANAGNOSTOU-LAOUTIDES AND BART VAN WASSENHOVE, Drunkenness and Philosophical Enthusiasm in Seneca's <i>De Tranquillitate Animi</i>	15
FAYAH HAUSSKER, Plut. <i>Them.</i> 10.5: Generosity and Greek Public Education in Historical Memory	35
CARLO DELLE DONNE, Time and Time-Before-Time: An Ancient Puzzle	55
MERON PIOTRKOWSKI, On the Origin of the Jewish Historian Artapanus	73
RIVKA GERSHT, The Caesarea Maritima Asklepios and the Question of Glykon	85
MAREN R. NIEHOFF, From the "Theater of the World" to the "Mask of Christ" — and Back Again: Insights from Origen's Newly Discovered Homilies on Psalms	117
NOGA EREZ-YODFAT, The Inscribed Gold <i>Lamellae</i> from Roman Palestine: Old Questions, New Evidence	137
EMMANUEL NANTET, The Public Boats of Olbia: Warships or State Merchantmen?	149
REVIEW ARTICLES	
DAVID F. GRAF, A Major Catalogue of Toponyms for the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Periods	163
GUY D. STIEBEL, What Have the Romans Ever Done for Us?	175
BOOK REVIEWS	
Hallvard Fossheim, Vigdis Songe-Møller and Knut Ågotnes (eds.), <i>Philosophy as Drama: Plato's Thinking through Dialogue</i> (by Ivor Ludlam)	183
Lisa Maurice, <i>Screening Divinity</i> (by Adele Reinhartz)	186
Altay Coşkun and David Engels (eds.), <i>Rome and the Seleukid East: Selected Papers from Seleukid Study Day V, Brussels, 21-23 August 2015</i> (by Joshua Schwartz)	189
J. Alison Rosenblitt, <i>Rome after Sulla</i> (by Alexander Yakobson)	191
Miriam T. Griffin, <i>Politics and Philosophy at Rome. Collected Papers</i> (by Joseph Geiger)	194
Katelijn Vandorpe (ed.), <i>A Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt</i> (by Haggai Olshanetsky)	197
OBITUARIES: DAVID GOLAN (by Ephraim David)	
FERGUS MILLAR (by Hannah M. Cotton)	201
LISA ULLMANN (by Jonathan Price)	204
LISA ULLMANN (by Jonathan Price)	207
DISSERTATIONS IN PROGRESS	
PROCEEDINGS: THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES	211
	215

Altay Coşkun and David Engels (eds.), *Rome and the Seleukid East: Selected Papers from Seleukid Study Day V, Brussels, 21-23 August 2015*, Leuven: Peeters; Collection Latomus 360, 2019. 512 pp. ISBN 9789042939271.

The volume under review includes revised and extended versions of papers given at the “Rome and the Seleukid East” workshop (Seleukid Study Day V), hosted by the Université libre de Bruxelles in August 2015, as well as a number of additional original studies solicited to enhance the value of the book as a reference work for Roman-Seleukid relations. The workshop and study days are the fruits of a rebirth of interest in the Seleukid realm with scholars working in relative isolation from one another. The Seleucid Study Group (<http://seleucid-genealogy.com/ssg.html>) was formed to bring together Seleukidists with diverse methodologies and approaches to foster collective endeavors of study, such as those in the present volume. New approaches and research was especially stressed.

Previous study days and subsequent volumes dealt with such issues as the creation of royal personae, the construction of dynastic bonds and loyalties and the importance of the Mesopotamian and Iranian territories. Two additional study workshops have already taken place, one on reactions to Seleukid claims to territorial rule (2017) and another on warfare, military and society in the Seleukid kingdom (2019).

Since the earlier workshops had focused on developments through the third century BCE, for the fifth meeting, the group decided move the focus to the second century BCE. Seleukid Study Day V questioned the premise that the defeat of the Seleukids at the hands of the Romans at Magnesia (190 BCE) and the severe conditions imposed by the Romans on Antiochos III at Apameia (188 BCE) doomed the Seleukid Empire to collapse. After all, his son, Seleukos IV managed to stabilize the kingdom after the death of his father, and his other son, Antiochos IV was considered the most powerful king of his time. Succeeding kings also managed, to a great extent, to control the Empire. The working hypothesis of both conference and book is that it was not Roman military prowess and the conditions of Apameia that brought down the Empire. The Empire maintained a consistent appeal long after Apameia. What then were the factors that weakened the Seleukids? What were the aims of the Romans, how influential were the rulers of Asia Minor and Egypt, how long did vassal kings maintain their loyalty? These are just some of the issues examined in this work to help determine what maintained the Seleukid Empire and what contributed to its downfall.

The book has fifteen chapters (of which three are in French), an introduction and epilogue. I briefly describe the structure of the book and some of the major issues studied. The work is divided into five parts. Part I presents aspects of the Seleukid Empire under Antiochos III and has four chapters dealing with such issues as the beginning of friendly relations between the Seleukid court and the Roman Republic, understanding how Seleukid literature during the reign of Antiochos related to imperial politics, and how intellectual traditions came to exert a strong influence on the king. It also examines echoes of the Persian Wars in the propaganda warfare of Rome and Antiochos III, and royal women in Seleucid cult documents. Part II deals with the recovery of Seleukid Empire after Apameia and its subsequent disintegration in the shadow of Rome and also has four chapters. Among the issues discussed here is the Seleukid Elephant Corps after Apameia. Although Antiochos III had to give up his elephants as part of the conditions imposed by the Romans at Apameia, elephants are found in the Seleucid army of Antiochos IV. How is this inconsistency to be explained? Another study asks whether Antiochos IV was conducting or preparing to conduct a policy of imperial restoration aimed not only at Iran and

central Asia but also at Asia Minor and Greece? Also discussed are how the role of Rome should be understood? Did Antiochos' years as a hostage in Rome where he might have been witness to episodes of religious persecution perhaps influence how he related to insurrection in Judaea decades later? Finally, was the impact of Roman involvement in Seleucid affairs in the second and first century BCE less than imagined and might it have even been more favorable than imagined in the past?

Part III is devoted to Asia Minor in the transition from Seleukid to Roman hegemony. This section has three chapters. One deals with the declining status of Seleukid influence in Anatolia after Apameia. Another chapter argues that one of the most prominent consequences of Apameia in Asia Minor was not Roman dominion there, but the emergence of local dynastic networks of former Seleukid vassals. The last chapter in this section examines the status of the Attalid Kingdom in Asia Minor, which might be less exceptional in comparison to the other Hellenistic Kingdoms there than previously thought. Part IV discusses Judaea's way to independence in light of the fading power of the Seleukids and Roman diplomacy. There are two articles in this brief section. One examines the mechanism of Judaeian ties and diplomacy vis-à-vis Rome in which ambassadors were sent from Judaea to the Roman Senate to express their concerns and to receive letters that told third parties, often Seleukid kings, what to do. The second discusses the nature and extent of the mutual relations of the rulers of Judaea with the Seleukids and Rome during the reigns of John Hyrkanos, Alexander Jannaios and Alexandra Salome (134-76 BCE). The last part of the book, Part V, is devoted to perspectives on Babylonia and has two articles. The first is devoted to the question of whether Babylonian soldiers served in the Seleukid army and the second studies the day-to-day royal administration of Babylonia when Seleukid rule ended and power reverted to Parthian kings. There were apparently significant continuities of administration and particularly regarding the regional leaders known as the four generals.

The work concludes with an epilogue in which one of the editors, Altay Coşkun re-iterates some of the major themes of the work. For example, the heterogeneous nature of the Seleukid kingdom was not a weakness *per se*, the negative impact of Apameia has been exaggerated, and Roman diplomacy after 188 BCE may have been harmful, but was rarely decisive in determining the fate of the Seleukids. The worst enemies of the Seleukids were the Seleukids themselves with their inter-dynastic rivalries.

In a work like under review, it is impossible, of course, to relate in detail to each article. I shall cite just one example of the positive approach of the volume, presenting ideas on the same subject that seemingly clash. Both Altay Coşkun and Edward Dąbrowa examine the end of Roman diplomacy vis-à-vis the later Hasmonean rulers and Seleukid rulers. Dąbrowa ("The Selukids, Rome and the Jews [134-76 BC]") asks why Alexander Jannaios and Alexandra Salome, who faced serious threats at times from the Seleukids, did not appeal to Rome for help. The answer according to Dąbrowa is that they were simply not interested in doing so. They realized that contacts had been superficial and that Rome really was not all that interested or did not care about what they were doing or had to face. This attitude was not interpreted by Rome as anti-Roman animus but rather reflected a joint shrug of the shoulders, acceptable to both sides. Altay Coşkun ("Triangular Epistolary Diplomacy with Rome from Judas Maccabee to Aristobolos I") sees the Romans as far more involved and concerned with events, in keeping with the theme of the book. That did not mean that their diplomacy in all cases required physical presence. According to Coşkun, the diplomacy was epistolary. In the unipolar order of the Mediterranean world of the mid-second century BCE, when Rome had the status of a superstar in the region, Rome could rely on this type of diplomacy to show her willingness and capacity for action. But Rome was being

tugged at from different directions far from the Near East and was not able to make a clear show of determination to back up the epistolary diplomacy. There is no cynical imperialism or disregard for the Judaeans, but rather a realization that Rome could not do it all; if they could have, however, they would have. The two authors present two diametrically opposed views to Roman diplomacy re Judaea so that the reader can be aware of the different views as well as decide. These comments relate to just one section of two articles. They do not do justice to a work which makes every effort to offer the reader a glimpse into the richness of interpretations on aspects of the post-Apameia Seleukid world, even if sometimes the topics are somewhat arcane at times.

The “Rome and the Seleukid East” workshops (Seleukid Study Days) and volumes represent an important contribution to the study of the Seleukid Empire. The present volume is no exception. There is always a theme and the editors and participants stick to it. The research is of high quality and there is generally an attempt in each of the contributions to examine accepted views and methodologies in new light and often to come up with fresh and innovative new theories. While some may push logic or interpretation to the limit, every study here is an important contribution to Seleukid study and invites more research. Two more Study Days have already taken place. We eagerly await the volumes to follow.

Joshua Schwartz

Bar-Ilan University

J. Alison Rosenblitt, *Rome after Sulla*, Bloomsbury Academic: London and New York, 2019. 240 pp. ISBN 9781472580597.

J. Alison Rosenblitt’s book is a study of Rome after Sulla both in the immediate sense — the end of Sulla’s rule and the years 79-77 associated with the insurrection of M. Aemilius Lepidus — and in a larger sense. The latter relates to the long-term repercussions of the “social trauma” inflicted by Sulla on the Roman republic. She argues that “coming ‘after Sulla’ was constitutive and defining part of politics, political culture and society until Rome’s next experience in autocracy. After Caesar, it changes; Augustus was more meaningfully ‘after Caesar’ than ‘after Sulla’” (82).

The Republic, according to R., never recovered from this trauma. The system created by Sulla was based on “untenable exclusions” (4) — of its immediate victims, including, notoriously, the children and grandchildren of the proscribed who were deprived of political rights, as well as of the plebs as a whole, subjected to senatorial domination. This system was never accepted as legitimate and thus could not bring stability. Ultimately, as Sallust saw, “Sulla was the seed of the end of the republic” (144). Sallust is at the centre of R.’s study: she adopts a “Sallust-centred approach” instead of the more usual “Cicero-centric reading of the late republic” (1) — both because Sallust’s *Historiae* deal with the immediate aftermath of Sulla’s dictatorship to which much of the book is devoted (as well as with the 70s), and because generally, in R.’s view, “Sallust’s dangerous and conflictual Rome is a more realistic reading of the late republic than Cicero’s consensual Rome” (1).

Chapter 1, the Introduction, presents the book’s main arguments: the regime of exclusion created by Sulla lacked legitimacy and failed to produce stability; this crucial fact is reflected in Sallust’s work (especially the now-fragmentary *Historiae*) better than in the Ciceronian corpus. Part One, “Negotiating the End of Sulla”, consists of two chapters. Chapter 2 deals with the year 80, the last year of Sulla’s rule. R. accepts that in that year Sulla was “merely” a consul, having resigned dictatorship by the end of 81, but argues that he was still an autocrat inspiring fear and