

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

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

uncertainty due to his well-known unpredictability and cruelty once his anger was aroused. Against this background she analyzes Cicero's testing of the limits of the permissible in *Pro Roscio*. She is right, in my view, to insist, against those who have denied it, that this speech required a lot of courage from Cicero. Cicero's courage in 80 is perhaps all the more worthy of notice because he was not invariably courageous throughout his career. (Incidentally, it is more likely, in my view, that Sulla was still holding the dictatorship in 80, but this cannot be argued here.)

Chapters 3 (Part One), 4 and 5 (Part Two: "Counterrevolution") deal with Lepidus, from his election to the consulship of 78 and the start of his anti-Sullan agitation to his end in the wake of a defeated rebellion. R. is surely right in regarding this affair as an important though neglected part of late-republican history, and Sallust's *Historiae* (including the orations of Lepidus and Philippus) as a valuable and often underappreciated source. Her reconstruction of the chain of events, including the development of Lepidus' position on various issues, is well-argued and plausible. She makes a good case for regarding Lepidus, beyond his personal ambitions, as a serious political figure and would-be reformer, who gave expression to real political cleavages in society — contrary to what is often assumed (73).

Chapter 6 ("After Sulla, After Lepidus") presents the case for regarding the following decades, until the outbreak of civil war in 49, as massively influenced by the destructive ramifications of the Sullan exclusions that continued to plague the republic. Part Three, "Sallust and the Political Culture in Rome after Sulla", is focused on the *Historiae*. A detailed analysis of the speech given by Sallust to Lepidus and of the various messages contained in it (including, as R. suggests, an implied comparison with Caesar) is given in Chapter 7; Chapter 8 demonstrates the insincerity and duplicity consistently attributed by Sallust to Pompey.

Chapters 9 and 10 argue that the poisonous legacy of Sulla, with his treatment of opponents as enemies, gave rise, in the following decades, to a rhetoric of "Hostile Politics", in which opponents were systematically presented as *hostes* rather than *inimici*. This is reflected in the radical *popularis* speeches cited by Sallust: of Lepidus and Macer in *Historiae* and Memmius — anachronistically, as R. suggests — in *Bellum Jugurthinum*. These, she argues, are qualitatively different from earlier *popularis* rhetoric — including what remains from that of Gaius Gracchus. This kind of rhetoric was produced the violently conflictual political culture "after Sulla". The arguments of the book are summarized in the epilogue, and various aspects of the affair of Lepidus and of the speech attributed to him are dealt with in two appendices.

All in all, R. is surely right to emphasize importance of the "Sullan watershed" (122) in Republican history, and has presented a strong and well-argued case for this view. The republic would never be the same again after the traumatic experience of civil war and its horrors. These horrors, it should be noted, included also the actions of Sulla's enemies; but the whole chain of events was set off by Sulla's march on Rome in 88 — an action whose unprecedented gravity she rightly stresses (141), and ended in the reign of terror instituted by Sulla during his dictatorship. The direct implications of this terror as regards the descendants of the proscribed stretched to the third generation; the problem of confiscated property (that ended up in the hands of the *Sullani*) and land rights was insoluble. The memory of this past, with unsettled accounts, was still vivid till the end of the republic; the atmosphere of this period must have been more poisoned, on this account, than what is often realized.

R. argues that it was "the Sullan watershed in political discourse", as opposed to "the conventional idea of a Gracchan watershed" (122), that produced the rhetoric of "hostile politics" reflected in Sallust's writings, which consisted in treating opponents as enemies and regarded

civic strife as analogous to a foreign war. However, political opponents had actually, and repeatedly, been treated as enemies, on a fairly wide scale, long before the “Sullan watershed”. It was as an enemy of the state (a potential tyrant), rather than as a political opponent or personal *inimicus*, that Tiberius Gracchus was murdered, together with, allegedly, hundreds of supporters; this was followed by the consular *quaestio* of 132, which executed some and drove others to exile. Following a so-called *senatus consultum ultimum* Gaius Gracchus was treated as an enemy together with, allegedly, thousands of his followers, and Saturninus and Glauca were murdered after surrendering.

In all those cases, the only possible justification was that these men were full-fledged public enemies. The rhetoric, reflecting the reality, of “hostile politics” had certainly been employed by *optimates* against their more radical opponents, and the rhetoric of the opposite side could not have lagged far behind. It is interesting that, as R. notes (122) the surviving evidence from Gaius Gracchus’ speeches does not include such language, but of course this evidence is very partial, and Gaius’ own murder contributed to further violent polarisation. Scipio Nasica, the slayer of Tiberius, was, according to Plutarch, called a tyrant by “the people” on the streets of Rome (*Tib.* 21.3), and the pro-Gracchan passage describing Tiberius’ murder in *Rhetorica ad Herenium* (4.55.68), while not calling Nasica either a tyrant or a *hostis*, denotes rhetorical “hostility” rather than “civility”. The significance of the “Gracchan watershed”, that first introduced the treatment of opponents as enemies into Roman politics, should not be minimized. While Sallust may have been influenced by later experience, Memmius’ speech in 111 BCE as reported in *Jug.* 31.1-29, with its “hostile” rhetoric, does not have to be anachronistic, as R. suggests (115).

Moreover, in what exact sense can Sulla’s “untenable exclusions” (4) be regarded as having powerfully contributed to the post-Sullan republic’s illegitimacy and instability, and hence, to its eventual downfall? The political exclusion of the plebs cannot be said to have persisted beyond the restoration of the tribunes’ powers in 70 BCE, and the festering wound of injustice inflicted on individuals and their descendants, including children of the proscribed and communities in Italy robbed of their land, does not appear, sadly, to have been an issue of decisive political significance. According to R., while “the full restoration of the rights of the tribunes and the rearrangement of the jury-panels are undoubtedly significant changes”, they did not constitute “an overthrow of an entire system” (9). However, these changes did amount to overthrowing the specifically Sullan political exclusion of the plebs and, to some extent, of the equestrian order. I still believe that P. Brunt’s thesis on “the army and the land in the Roman revolution” offers the most convincing explanation for the principle direct cause of the republic’s collapse: it had to do with the character of the late-republican army. The main contribution of the trauma of the 80s was, I would suggest, the one that R. also draws attention to in her fine, instructive and important study: what had surely been regarded as inconceivable even after political murder had become part of Roman politics — a military coup d’état and a dictatorship in a modern rather than the traditionally-Roman sense — became definitely conceivable after Sulla.