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

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

VOLUME XXXIX **2020**

CONTENTS

Miriam T. Griffin, *Politics and Philosophy at Rome. Collected Papers*, edited by Catalina Balmaceda, Oxford University Press, 2018. xvi + 775 pp. ISBN: 9780198793120.[1]

This hefty volume consists of 50 papers published (and some unpublished) over more than half a century.[2] The two parts of the first half deal with Roman History and Historiography, the second with Philosophy and Politics. The influence of her mentor Syme is evident in the meticulous assessing of the evidence, in the thoroughness of the investigation and in often demonstrating the weight of seemingly minor issues — but not in mannerisms of some simiae Symis. Syme also stars in a number of papers, remarkably in '"Lifting the Mask": Syme on Fictional History' (325-338). This influence, as well as the Oxford curriculum, focus the historical papers on the political history of the last two generations of the Republic, and on the Early Principate, and the historiographical interest on Tacitus.

Two early major papers (both 1973) in the section on Republican history grasp thorny questions. 'The "Leges Iudiciariae" of the Pre-Sullan Era' (26-42) is a painstaking examination of a complicated and oft discussed problem,[3] and 'The Tribune C. Cornelius' (43-63) examines the significance and impact of a rather minor figure on policy and legislation in the fateful years between the first consulate of Pompey and Crassus and the year of Cicero's consulate. However, more general subjects were handled with no less care and scrutiny. 'Urbs Roma, Plebs and Princeps' (73-89) surveys in a wide sweep a subject discussed to greater or lesser extent by every historian of the Principate, but does so without repeating old clichés or maintaining views without strict adherence to the evidence. The most interesting conclusions are the insistence on the significance of Republican traditions in the relations between plebs and Princeps, and the importance of the appearance of the urbs to foreign dignitaries and visitors, as well as its reflexion in the provinces as can be learned from the display of copies and translations of the Res Gestae there. Some papers discuss at greater detail issues in later books: 'The Elder Seneca and Spain' (90-112), a thorough biography, but not a discussion of the extant works, must have been written while preparing the book on Seneca, as was 'Imago Vitae Suae' (379-401), and 'Nero's Recall of Suetonius Paulinus' (113-121) anticipates the much later book on Nero.

In a brilliant paper ('Tacitus, Tiberius and the Principate', 134-148), G. tackles a problem that has vexed countless scholars. In a balanced verdict on both the historian and his subject she claims that the Princeps was made to represent the Principate and its framework: hypocrisy was the benchmark of the regime. Tacitus was aware of what he was doing, while Tiberius was not an unwilling executor of his policies. Notably, the admiration for Syme does not exclude occasional disagreements with the ultimate authority on the historian, as the one on the starting date of the Annals. This paper was included in the section 'Imperial History', and its course flows naturally into that on 'Roman Historiography' — in both Tacitus is the protagonist. Here 'Claudius in Tacitus' (209-228, in memoriam Ronald Syme) is a masterly pendant to the paper on Tiberius: both the complex personality of the Princeps and the historian's adroit exploitation of his speeches

1 I first met Miriam when attending her lecture course 'Philosophy and Politics at Rome' in Trinity Term 1970; I hope that this appreciation of her collected papers will do justice to a highly respected scholar and friend. It is small consolation that she did see the volume before her death.

2 Three of the papers appeared originally in this journal.

3 This reader notes with some satisfaction, that the solution of mixed courts in the legislation of M. Livius Drusus (pp. 33-37) has been anticipated, alas not in a prominent place, by A. Fuks and J. Geiger, 'The "Lex Iudiciaria" of M. Livius Drusus', *Studi in onore di E. Volterra* ii (Milan 1969), 421-7.

and other sources get their due: 'Tacitus makes use of Claudian utterances in building up his complex portrait of the Emperor' (226). Both old, established questions ('The Lyons Tablet and Tacitean Hindsight', 172-186) and new discoveries ('The Senate's Story', 229-247, on the S.C. De Cn. Pisone Patre) get meticulous and original discussions; and the paper on the new Livy papyrus ('Un frammento del libro XI di Tito Livio?', 187-208, with Benedetto Bravo) testifies, that despite the focus on the end of the Republic and the Early Principate, and on Tacitus, G. is equally at home in the early third century BCE and in Livy. 'Pliny and Tacitus' (249-262) is a delightful comparison and character analysis of the two friends. Remarkably, as is apparent also in a number of other essays, notably in 'The Younger Pliny's Debt to Moral Philosophy' (611-27), G. could muster more sympathy for Pliny than her mentor. (The unphilosophical uncle with sympathies for the Roman sect of the Sextii gets his due in 'The Elder Pliny on Philosophers', 648-61).

Yet it is the second half of the book that gave it its title and that was the main distinguishing feature of G. the Roman historian. The editor of a collection of essays on Roman Philosophy, published in 1976 (the essays date between 1899 and 1968)[4] still saw as his main task to discuss in an apologetic tone the extent one can speak of Roman philosophy. In the meantime it is commonplace that Roman art does not equal Greek copies, and that some later authors relying on earlier sources are independent and original writers, and likewise Roman philosophy has come into its own. G's education and interest led her to a very specific approach to that subject, the approach of 'a mere historian' (693 n *), in her own words: 'the overlap between philosophy and politics has been the principal focus of academic interest throughout my career' (viii). Her appraisal of the relations between the two is lucid: 'philosophical doctrines did not provide those actions, but provided the vocabulary and the argumentative skill to make and justify the decisions that gave rise to them' (ibid.). G. has published an excellent book on Seneca[5] and edited (with Jonathan Barnes) two important collections on Roman philosophy[6], yet the bulk of her work is gathered in the present volume.

A central subject is the development of political thought between the end of the Republic and the Principate — basically between Cicero and Seneca. Thus 'Clementia after Caesar. From Politics to Philosophy' (570-586) pursues the changed meanings of this virtue, the word applied and made stick by Cicero, rather than by Caesar's own usage; the Pro Marcello and De Officiis — this last gets separate treatment in 'The Politics of Virtue. Three Puzzles in Cicero's De Officiis' (662-75) — on the one hand and the De Clementia and De beneficiis on the other share 'a concern with the contemporary political situation and with the author's own position in that situation' (571) though of course they present 'entirely different perspectives on society' (584).

It is very rarely that G. writes in a polemical vein. However, the author of Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics could hardly accept Momigliano's thesis that by Seneca's time a life according to philosophy became incompatible with politics. In 'Philosophy for Statesmen. Cicero and Seneca' (420-431) she maintains that given the changes in the political system the distance between the two men was less than would appear to some observers. It was not so much according to the specific doctrines of the various schools, but 'that one was to act according to what one's reason told one was right' (431). Consequently, in 'De Beneficiis and Roman Society' (587-610) G. discusses how Seneca's treatise, paralleled later by Pliny's letters, prescribes, but also

4 Gregor Maurach, 'Einleitung', in id. (ed.), *Römische Philosophie* (Darmstadt 1976), 1-12.

5 *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford 1976), reviewed in *SCI* 3 (1976-7), 177-181.

6 *Philosophia Togata. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society* (Oxford 1989), reviewed in *SCI* 10 (1989-90), 146-8; *Philosophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome* (Oxford 1997).

describes, a code of social conduct for his equals (and betters) very much like Cicero's De Officiis did for his time, and is thus also an indicator for the changing social values. And there towers the figure of the emperor, and the benefits only he could, and those only he was allowed, to bestow, though also maintaining with his ostensible peers a show of Republican equality and civilitas. Indeed it seems that she maintains a considered view on the connexion between philosophy and politics: In several places she denies Hegel's verdict that in the Hellenistic age 'philosophy became apolitical and morals became divorced from politics' (570; cf 486, 562).

Another main concern is the spread of philosophy among Cicero's familiares, beyond the well known cases of Brutus, Cato, Varro, and of course Atticus, and the depth of its penetration. G. succeeds in mining the letters in 'Philosophical Badinage in Cicero's Letters to his Friends' (461-474) to show that indeed not a few of them possessed a considerable philosophical education and took their doctrines seriously — a man like Cassius even could have the better of his correspondent. To be sure, philosophical argument was at the heart of the celebrated exchange of letters with Matius on friendship (fam. 11.27; 28) — and this probably Epicurean correspondent leads on to Atticus and other professed followers of the sect so often disapproved of in Cicero's writings: the need for sophisticated exchange on literature and learning was greater than the adherence to a certain creed ('From Aristotle to Atticus: Cicero and Matius on Friendship', 494-509).[7] A most interesting case is that of Piso, the butt of Cicero's invective. From 'Piso, Cicero and their Audience' (551-561) we learn that contrary to Cicero's charges Piso, an honourable and highly respected man, took his Epicureanism seriously and acted in matters of importance according to its doctrines; the assumption of the audience's familiarity with them G. ascribes to flattery. A good example of this interaction between philosophy and politics is 'Philosophy, Cato, and Roman Suicide' (402-419). It makes the most of the fine balancing act between the feat of the Stoic hero of the Republic and the staged theatricality of some of his would-be followers, the image of Socrates in the Phaedo always implicit with actors, viewers and reporters.

Though G. is good at distinguishing between the attitudes of individual Romans, like Cicero, Seneca, and the two Plinys, she also recognises general characteristics, like those discussed in 'Cynicism and the Romans. Attraction and Repulsion' (475-485). Cynic anaideia, lack of verecundia, and unseasonable parrhesia could not appeal to Romans. In contrast, strains of the Cynic way made Stoicism more palatable: while Stoic ethics appealed to the Romans, their insistence on metaphysics and logic seemed too intellectual; they also preferred men who would be exempla (e.g. in frugality) to the unattainable sapiens, and admired the rhetorical skills of some Cynics. '[I]t was the Cynic strain in Stoicism that enabled that creed to retain its critical function as the conscience of society' (485).

Given the rhetorical education of the Roman upper classes (the recruiting ground of Roman philosophers) it is surprising that so little attention has been accorded to the influence of Roman law on Roman philosophy. 'Latin Philosophy and Roman Law' (692-706), in a wide sweep, discusses such issues as legal terminology and metaphors in philosophical essays, Cicero's and Seneca's awareness of the differences between legal and philosophical standards of conduct, and, most importantly, their approaching philosophy imbued with legal training, and showing other Romans how this could be done.

---

7 Cf. most recently G. Evangelou, 'Reconciling Cicero's Anti-Epicureanism in *De Amicitia* with his friendship with Atticus', *Latomus* 77 (2018), 991-1012.

Not all the riches of this meticulously edited and skillfully produced volume could be sampled in the confines of a review; still, this reader would have been grateful for a division of the almost 800 pages into two less unwieldy volumes, with pages containing less than some 650 words.

Joseph Geiger The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Katelijn Vandorpe (ed.), *A Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt*. Malden, MA-Oxford-Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell 2019. 664 pp. ISBN 9781118428474.

This book is the latest in the series *Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*, and is focused on Egypt, from the death of Alexander the Great (323 BC) until the Arab conquest of Egypt in the middle of the 7th century AD. This massive project includes 39 chapters written by 45 authors and co-authors. The authors are very diverse, not only by their origin and affiliation but also by their expertise and experience. It is possible to find scholars with many decades of experience alongside PhD students and recent PhD recipients. This diversity, especially the inclusion of young scholars who are researching new aspects, is most welcome and should be seen more often.

This is not the first companion in this series that concentrates on Egypt, as in 2010, the *Blackwell Companion to Ancient Egypt* was published. It was also a huge project, released in two volumes, covering the entire history of Egypt, from the old Egyptian dynasties until, and including, the Roman period. Each chapter was split in two with the first part describing the dynastic periods and the second part the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Vandorpe is well aware of the contents of the previous book and the influx of many companion books on Egypt appearing in the last two decades, especially ones concentrating on the Roman and Hellenistic periods. Accordingly, with this companion, she tries to bring a fresh and different view of the subject. The current companion has a more sociological approach. We can see this not only in the titles of many chapters, but also in the content of some chapters which have parallels in similar books, especially the companion from 2010. For example, chapter eleven, "Security and Border Policy: Army and Police", not only has an extensive and well-written explanation for the formation of the Hellenistic and Roman armies in Egypt, it also includes an extensive section on the social function of the army and the sources of its manpower. Furthermore, this chapter has a unique and rare reference to the police in Ptolemaic Egypt and in the later Roman period. Another example of the social issues that are rarely discussed, can be found in chapter twenty-one, "Family and Life Cycle Transitions". In this chapter, there is a section which deals with infanticide and the exposure of babies, titled "Shaping Families: Sex Preference, Infant Exposure, Adoption and Endogamy" (335). Because of her awareness of the other companions, especially the one from 2010, Vandorpe deliberately omitted subjects already touched on in the previous companion, such as the reception of Greco-Roman Egypt.

A main feature in the current companion is the usage of in-text citations. Unfortunately, this not only limits the contents of the citations, but also causes them to be too general and to refer to entire articles or books. Only a minority of the citations refer to specific pages. Therefore, many readers would find it difficult to read up on particular topics referred to in the book.

Another interesting issue in the book are the discrepancies in the authors' opinions on whether we should call the Roman Empire since 284 AD the Byzantine Empire. This issue is not only relevant to Egypt, where archaeologists and papyrologists describe the period from 284 AD until the Arab conquest as the Byzantine period, but also to Israel where archaeologists use the same