**Wednesday May 28th**

SESSION ONE: 10:45-12:15

CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM IUDAEAE/PALAESTINAE

Chair: Hannah Cotton, The Hebrew University

hannah.cotton@mail.huji.ac.il

**Brief Introduction to the CIIP.**

Walter Ameling (University of Köln)

walter.ameling@uni-koeln.de

**Greek Language in Palestina up to the Times of Herod the Great**

Many languages were spoken in Iudaea/Palaestina during antiquity. By late antiquity Greek had become the dominant language in Iudaea/Palaestina, even though it was not one of the indigenous languages. The Greek language arrived with the Hellenistic armies und bureaucracies, but became more than simply a language of power, which is indicated by the way it spread. But since there are almost no literary works in Greek from Hellenistic times, our most important tool to assess the process of the use and spread of Greek in Hellenistic Iudaea/Palaestina is epigraphy, and to be more precise: the Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae Palaestinae!

Benjamin Isaac: Tel Aviv University

isaacb@post.tau.ac.il

**Roman Roads, Physical Remains, Organization and Development**

This paper will describe what historical and geographical information may be derived from the Roman milestones discovered in the Province of Judaea/Palaestina and describe various problems of interpretation.

Werner Eck (University of Köln)

Werner.eck@uni-koeln.de

**Honorary Statues as Means of Public Communication in the Province of Iudaea/Syria Palaestina**

Publicly displayed statues constituted an important element of Rome’s presence in the life of a province. Until quite recently this form of communication has hardly been attested in the province of Iudaea/Syria Palaestina giving the impression that it was not practiced. However, large scale excavations in various regions in Israel and the intensive “hunt” for inscriptions and their systematic collection carried out by the CIIP yielded a corrective: there is no doubt left that this form of public communication was widely practiced here as well. Where and by whom would be discussed in this paper.

Jonathan Price (Tel Aviv University)

price@post.tau.ac.il

**Synagogue Communities in Iudaea/ Palaestina: The Evidence of the Inscriptions**

Who formed, built and funded synagogues in antiquity? How did those communities define themselves in ethnic and religious terms? What were the differences between the multiple synagogue communities in one city? Inscriptions provide information not contained in any other source, and the synagogue texts in the CIIP — the largest concentration of synagogue inscriptions from the ancient world — hint at especially interesting answers.

SESSION TWO: POETICA 12:30-13:30

Chair: Daniela Dueck (Bar-Ilan University)

Anna Novokhatko (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg)

anna.novokhatko@altphil.uni-freiburg.de

**Literary Criticism in Epicharmus’ Comedy**

Sicilian comedy actively used the discourses of rhetoric and literary criticism. Further it provides information on these discourses during a period when they were being formed, and so represents a moment of intense interactive dialogue between literary genres. The present paper will discuss some fragments of Epicharmus. These show that intellectual exertion, linguistic innovation and the study of rhetoric were at the centre of his attention.

In the first part of the paper a number of fragments (136, 144, 145, 146, and 147 (PCG) and two fragments 76 and 77 (PCG) belonging to the comedy Logos kai Logina) will serve as an entry point for a discussion of the metalinguistical and metapoetical connotations found in his comedy. His use of the literary criticism, of early linguistic theories of rhetoric, and of their function and contribution to the genre of comedy will be analysed on syntagmatic level.

In the second half of the paper, the focus will be on testimonia and on the context of in which these fragments are quoted. Attention will therefore shift to the reception of these plays in the scholia starting from Aristotle and working through to Hellenistic and Late antiquity, as also in the compilers and grammarians such as Demetrius, Plutarch, Hephaistion and Athenaeus. The technical vocabulary and referential context employed in the genre of comedy constitute a significant contribution to a fuller understanding of the reception of drama on a paradigmatic level. This approach allows for a reinterpretation of the broader meanings of the metalinguistic discourses as a whole.
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Andrea Rotstein (Tel Aviv University)
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**Literary History on Hellenistic Paros**

The island of Paros yielded most impressive examples of ancient Greek monumental historiography: the Parian Marble (FGrH 239; Rotstein forthcoming a) and the Mnesiepes inscription (SEG 15.517). Both belong to the mid-3rd cent. BCE (Rotstein forthcoming b) and are among the earliest representatives of their kinds. By comparing the two inscriptions I shall explore how literary history was practiced on Hellenistic Paros.

The Parian Marble is a chronological list without narrative, written in a compressed, impersonal and paratactic style. In contrast, the biography of Archilochus is a scholarly text that combines narrative with citations from Pythian oracles and Archilochus’ poems. While the Parian Marble offers a snapshot of panhellenic history, the Mnesiepes inscription deals with the life of an individual. However, in spite of their different generic frameworks and different levels of resolution, both inscriptions seem to belong to a similar project, namely linking past and present, a project in which poets play an important role. Wheareas the Mnesiepes inscription focuses on Archilochus, the most famous Parian poet, the Parian Marble mentions 31 Greek poets and musicians, a number unprecedented in ancient Greek chronography. What could have been the location of such inscriptions dealing with literary history at local (Mnesiepes inscription) and panhellenic (Parian Marble) levels? The Mnesiepes narrative was inscribed on the walls of the Archilocheion, possibly a mouseion and thus a site of literary activities. It is certainly possible, as Kontoleon (1952, 1956, 1964) suggested, for the Parian Marble to have been set there too. If so, the combined study of the two inscriptions may reveal the various modalities of literary history as it may have been practiced not only on Hellenistic Paros, but at other local shrines honouring poets in Hellenistic Greece (e.g. Homer, at Delos, Notion, Chios, and Smyrna; Hesiod, at Thespiae and Tanagra; Mimnermos, at Smyrna; cf. Clay 2004, Kimmel- Clauzet 2013).
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SESSION THREE: KEYNOTE ADDRESS 14:30-15:30

Chair: Margalit Finkelberg (Tel Aviv University)

Denis Feeney (Princeton University)

dfeeney@princeton.edu

**OVID AS A LITERARY HISTORIAN**

SESSION FOUR: 15:45-17:15

Chair: Youval Rothman (Tel Aviv University)

Egidia Occhipinti (independent researcher - https://independent.academia.edu/EgidiaOcchipinti)

egidia.occhipinti@gmail.com

**Classical Greece and Slavery: Ancient and Modern Terminology**

This paper points out some issues pertaining to ancient slavery and its definitions, as given in ancient and modern times. This proposal arises from the need of reconsidering a few aspects of modern scholarly view, that today appears as outdated. The study case is offered by Chian slavery.

This research starts from the examination of a fragment of Theopompus of Chios, which focuses on Chian slavery (Theop. F 122 = Athen. 6.88). It comes from the sixth book of Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophists*. Athenaeus reports that, according to Theopompus, ‘chattel slavery’ originated in the island of Chios, where non-Greek slaves were purchased with money. Differently, other Greeks, such as Spartans and Thessalians, enslaved those Greek peoples who lived in close proximity to them, and, in so doing, they gave life to a kind of slavery that was called ‘helotic’. From this passage scholars became convinced that in antiquity there were two different types of slavery, the ‘chattel’ and the ‘helotic’. Moreover, they assumed that only ‘chattel slavery’ was attested in Chios. Now, in book 6 Athenaeus hints at several authors who dealt with the subject of ancient slavery. A broad literary examination of this book (esp. chapters 84-109) would show that the customary distinction between ‘chattel slavery’ and ‘helotic slavery’ is unsatisfactory. Furthermore, our evidence would suggest that, besides the so-called ‘chattel slavery’, an oldest type of slavery was practiced in Chios as well. This kind of subjection was, moreover, very similar to the ‘helotic’ system.
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**Half Slave, Half Free: Partial Manumission and Its Legal, Economic and Social Significance**

This paper discusses the peculiar phenomenon of partial manumission and its possible meaning and ramifications. Three Greek papyri from Roman Egypt mention partial manumission. In the first, two brothers jointly manumit one-third of a female slave whose other two-thirds had already been manumitted. In the second papyrus, the guardians of three minor brothers apply for permission to put on auction their wards’ two-thirds share in their inherited slave; the remaining third had been manumitted already by their half-brother. In the third case a woman manumits her share in three slaves she inherited from her mother.

Joint ownership is attested in many parts of the Greek world, usually within the framework of the household and in consequence of inheritance. Evidence from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt also shows parents and children, or siblings, holding unequal shares in undivided ownership of slaves. This situation poses important legal, social and practical questions, the most immediate of which is how the work of a slave owned by more than one person in unequal shares was divided among the owners. In some cases, probably to bypass such difficulties which might lead to legal disputes (of which we have ample evidence) and to put an end to the joint ownership, owners sold their shares to their co-owners or all the joint owners decided to sell the slave together.

But partial manumission raises even more intricate questions: What were the motives for partial manumission? How could an enslaved human being be partly alienated? What in real life was the position of a slave of whom two-thirds were free and the other third was still in slavery? How can we understand the status of a slave one-third free whose other two-thirds were sold at auction — and what could have been the motives of potential buyers to purchase only a part of a slave? Can economic factors, both on “national” level and in the sphere of the private family, explain this phenomenon? For instance, some scholars working on slavery in Greco-Roman Egypt have associated partial manumission with the under-developed economy and with the general scarcity of slaves and their dominance in households. Another related question is whether these papyri reflect local, Greek or Roman practices and laws.

In this paper I try to answer these questions by means of texts from other places and periods. Although the evidence from Roman Egypt is meager, similar phenomena are attested in geographically and chronologically dispersed cultures such as Eretz Israel during the Second Temple, Sassanid Iran, medieval India and Portugal, and sixteenth-century Cuba. Comparing these sources might help us understand this curious practice.

Juan P. Lewis (University of Edinburgh)

juan.lewis@ed.ac.uk

**The purpose of Domitian’s Prohibition of Emasculation**

This paper discusses the aims of Domitian’s decree banning emasculation and other pieces of legislation related to it. Some scholars have seen these provisions as part of a wider imperial policy to protect slaves against abuses (e.g. Guyot 1980, Boulvert and Morabito 1982, Watson 1987). Others have seen them as a manifestation of the Roman moralistic repulsion against eunuchs (Scholz 2001, Tougher 2008). As castration survived after the decree was passed and the prohibition was later either reenacted or enforced, most scholars agree that such legislation was, in Buckland’s words, ‘ineffective’ (Buckland 1908). I will argue that these analyses overlook Domitian’s immediate purposes and are based on a misunderstanding of how the Roman law machinery worked. In the first part of the paper, I will propose a reconstruction of the wording of the original decree, and, drawing upon this text restoration, I will argue that the banning of castration was not introduced with slaves’ welfare in mind. In fact, far from protecting slaves against abuses, the ban closed off one of the few paths available to slaves to acquire prominence and power. Instead, the prohibition was mostly prompted by a desire to limit profiteering by the slave owning classes, which was part of Domitian’s struggle to consolidate his authority among the upper echelons of Roman society. In the second part of the paper, I will argue that the existence of post-Domitianic imperial rescripts punishing the castration of males in the provinces should not be construed as proof of the ineffectiveness of the ban. Instead, these imperial interventions were part of the procedure through which Domitian’s decree was made effective even in the remotest corners of the empire.
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SESSION FIVE (HEBREW): 17:30-19:00

THE TRANSLATION PROJECT OF AHARON SHABTAI

Chair: Avi Avidov (Beit Berl College)

Aminadav Dykman (Hebrew University)

adykman@mscc.huji.ac.il

**The *Opus* of Aharon Shabbtai: an Appreciation**

Nurit Yaari (Tel Aviv University)

yaari@post.tau.ac.i

Aharon Shabtai, poet and translator

**Updating in Hebrew translations of Greek Poetry**

**THURSDAY 29 May**

SESSION SIX (HEBREW) 9:30-11:00

Chair: Miriam Ben Zeev (Ben Gurion University)

Moshe Blidstein (Ben Gurion University)

**Behind the Temple: the Form and Function of Back Rooms in Ancient Sanctuaries**

moshe.blidstein@univ.ox.ac.uk

Ancient temples – whether Greek, Roman, Egyptian, Israelite, or of other cultures – typically operated around spatial axes or foci of sacredness, defined by cult statues, altars, sacred ways or paths and the structures, walls or fences around them. One typical arrangement (well-known from Egyptian temples and the Jerusalem temple) is a direct, ascending axis, going from courtyards to the ‘holy’ to the ‘holy of holies’; Greek and Roman temples had different arrangements, but here too we find a pronaos, cella/naos and adyton. However, relatively little attention is paid to the back rooms and to areas directly behind the ‘holy of holies’/adyton (sometimes known as opisthodomos in Greek temples). If in fact there is a “sacred axis” to the temple, what happens in the ambiguous spaces which are just beyond it – but yet inside the temple precincts? Who was allowed into these spaces? What was done there? How did they fit into the general structure and function of the temple?

A survey reveals that these spaces served two opposite functions. Most commonly, they served as areas or rooms for specialist temple functions (such as treasuries) or for accessory services for priests or other temple personnel. In these cases, the activity in the space beyond the temple reinforced the authority and hierarchy of the temple personnel. In other cases, however, such spaces allowed non-priests to glimpse or eavesdrop (even if not to enter) the holiest parts of the site, circumventing the usual sacred axis and hierarchy, and creating an alternative means to approach the gods. A comparison of temples from different periods and cultures may provide indications to the factors controlling these different scenarios.

Nurit Shoval-Dudai (Ben-Gurion University and the Academy of the Hebrew Language)

 nurit.shoval@gmail.com

**Greek and Latin Loanwords in the Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language**

The identification of Greek and Latin loanwords in the Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language was recently accomplished. Each lexeme was identified and examined in all its occurrences in the literature written between 200 B.C. and A.D. 1050. I will hereby describe the contribution and implications of this research.

Greek and Latin lexemes were marked in the computerized corpus of texts by a distinctive note. Their inclusion in the database enables various investigations which were hardly possible to attain hitherto. I will demonstrate some of these options in the texts and point out how this work advances the revision of Samuel Krauss' dictionary of Greek and Latin loanwords.

Cofman-Simhon, Sarit

Kibbutzim College, Emunah College

saritcofman67@gmail.com

**The Hellenistic Play *Exagoge*: From "Not Too Jewish" to "Jewish Enough"**

 Howard Jacobson opens his treatise of Ezekiel’s play, *Exagoge*, with the following statement: "Ezekiel the tragedian is a writer of major importance. The fragments of his *Exagoge* represent the most extensive remains of any Hellenistic tragedy—or indeed tragedian. Consequently, Ezekiel is our most significant source of evidence for Hellenistic tragedy" (Jacobson, 1).

 Ezekiel (Ezechielus), a Jewish tragedian, who lived in Alexandria probably during the second century BCE, was the author of the first known Jewish playtext. His *Exagoge*, originally written in Greek, has not survived in its entirety, but the seventeen scenes that have reached us are of incomparable value. Despite its obvious historic importance, the play has had no presence in Jewish culture (considered "not Jewish enough"), and it was Hellenic, Roman, and Christian scholars who translated, interpreted, preserved, and put the play to their own use. Only in the nineteenth century did German Jewish intellectuals reclaim *Exagoge* as a Jewish work.

In this presentation I aim to examine the various readings of *Exagoge*, to explore the metamorphosis it underwent from Alexandria en route to Berlin, and, ultimately, to explore how the readers’ respective agendas determined the reading and the identity of the text. The intentions of the different readers generated a variety of meanings, ranging from Christian apologetics during the Roman period, anti-Jewish propaganda during the Renaissance, theater apologetics in the French Baroque, to its ultimate comeback as a “Jewish enough” text.

*Exagoge*’s unique status and multiplicity of usages indicate its liminal, fluid, and transcultural nature. It may be that this very special malleability guaranteed its survival, while the texts of other Hellenistic tragedies have not survived the vicissitudes of time.
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**The Source of the Gods' Immortality in Archaic Greek Literature**

Many scholars, including W.H. Roscher, R. Janko, N.J. Richarson, F. Graf, and most recently and emphatically, M.L. West, believe that the gods' immortality is strongly related to their divine diet, i.e. ambrosia and nectar. This notion is supported by four central arguments: 1. One instance in the Iliad (5.340-2) and one in Aristotle's Metaphysics (1000a9-13), which are understood as alluding to the fact that ambrosia and nectar are the cause of the gods' immortality. 2. Stories of gods who bestow immortality on their favored mortals using ambrosia and nectar (Pind.Pyth.9.62-4, Ol.1.59-64; Hymn.Hom.Cer.233-44; Hes.fr.23a.21-24 M-W). 3. Three cases in the Iliad in which ambrosia and nectar prevent the decay of corpses (16.670-70, 19.37-9, 23.184-7). 4. Etymological arguments positing a connection between 'immortality' and ambrosia and nectar.

In this paper I shall argue that the archaic evidence strongly suggests that this connection between ambrosia and nectar and the gods' immortality is highly overstated.

As is well known, the motif of the god's immortality is one the most fruitful motifs in archaic literature, yet we cannot find even one explicit statement that the food of the gods is the source of their immortality. More importantly, unlike other Indo-European religions, in which the connection between gods' immortality and special aliments is manifested in various stories, the archaic sources provide no story resulting from this belief, e.g. a god becoming immortal or deprived of immortality by eating divine food or abstaining from it. On the other hand, there are stories in which divine food does not bestow immortality and its absence does not abolish it (e.g. Hes.Th.639-42; Hymn.Hom.Ven.257-272.) The weakness of this causal relationship is further supported by the notion that a union between gods will always result in an immortal offspring.

What, then, by archaic belief, is the cause of the god's immortality? Numerous stories in the archaic sources indicate that the ancient poets share one basic assumption: the gods are immortal in their very nature. The abundance of stories resulting from this belief stands in sharp contrast with the scarcity of stories depicting divine food as the cause of the gods' immortality. Thus it seems that we should turn the table: instead of arguing that divine immortality results from ambrosia and nectar, we should see the connection between the two as a marginal expression of the immortality motif, an expression which the poets do not tend to emphasize, alongside a far more dominant belief in the gods' innate immortality.

Ariadne Konstantinou (Tel-Aviv University)

ariadne\_kon@yahoo.com

**Tradition and Innovation in Greek Tragedy’s Mythological *Exempla***

Greek tragedy’s mythological comparisons, commonly called mythological *exempla* or *paradeigmata*, are an indispensable source of information on otherwise poorly attested myths from the Classical period. They also form a coherent corpus to study how tragedians appropriate from mythical tradition, not in the larger scale of the plot—especially since the dramatization of myths in tragedy is a well-trodden field of study—but in the microcosm of rather brief and often elusive retellings, that focus on a specific point of comparison.

In this paper, I argue that some mythological *exempla* in tragedy contain innovative elements, in the sense that a certain mythological ‘fact’ of the analogy is created ad hoc, particularly when the detail is unattested elsewhere or contains a close literary and thematic equivalence to the embedding myth. Particularly relevant to my discussion are the debates on tradition and innovation in epic mythological *exempla* (Willcock, Nagy, Scodel) and in lyric poetry (Köhnken, Nagy, Collins, Edmunds), as well as the more recent debate on innovation in Euripidean aetiologies (Scullion, Seaford).

I focus on innovative aspects in four mythological *exempla*. First, the reason that brought about Acteaon’s punishment (Eur. *Bac*. 337-40); second, the detail that Ino killed both her children (Eur. *Med*. 1282-92); third, the transformation of Tereus into a hawk (Aes. *Suppl*. 58-76); and fourth, the agent responsible for the blinding of the Phineids (Soph. *Ant*. 966-87). While I do not think that every mythological *exemplum* in tragedy is necessarily or inherently innovative in its details, I hope to show that innovation on the level of details, within a broadly traditional framework, was a possibility that all three tragedians explored in shaping the microcosm of comparisons that draw from the realm of myth.
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**Our Medusa: Gluttony in Hedylus 8**

Hedylus is a Hellenistic epigrammist who might be better known if more than a dozen of his epigrams had survived. In Epigram 8 (Gow & Page), he addresses an overeater named Clio and encourages her to gorge herself as she pleases on a conger-eel and to leave collateral instead of paying. “You are our Medusa,” he tells her, turning her poor observers to stone by the plate not of a Gorgon, but of a gongros. The six lines would perhaps be more amusing if we could read them all; but two loci desperati force editors to obelize two half lines, without so much as a reasonable conjecture. Basing myself, among other matters, on modern fishermen, I propose an approach to solving these two cruces according to which the poet is making fun of the fish no less than the eater.

SESSION EIGHT: 15:30-17:00

Chair: Donna Shalev (Hebrew University)

Keely E. Heuer (The State University of New York at New Paltz)

heuerk@newpaltz.edu

**A Motif With Many Faces: the Janiform Head in Pre-Roman Italy**

The isolated head is the most common subject on the red-figure wares produced in southern Italy and Sicily between ca. 440 and the early third century BC. The motif, as primary and secondary decoration, occurs on more than 7,000 of the approximately 21,000 extant South Italian vases. Relatively infrequent in mainland Greece, the isolated head became widespread in vase-painting during the course of the fourth century, adopted in Etruria and along the Adriatic coast. The majority of the isolated heads are female, although others, like those of youths or bearded males, can be found. Despite their vast numbers, the lack of inscriptions or clear attributes that could specifically distinguish the heads is remarkable. Even when the heads are given features, such as wings, a Phrygian cap, or a polos crown, they are too indeterminate to afford more specific conclusions. Only the heads of satyrs may be securely identified by modern viewers.

Past concentration on identification has proven relatively fruitless, but my close observation of patterns in the motif’s application has revealed that the isolated head was an important funerary symbol that resonated with a Greek and an Italic clientele. Indigenous beliefs were certainly major motivation behind the motif’s frequency, and I believe even influenced the types of heads drawn, including the rarest, the janiform head.

Heads with conjoined faces are rare in Greek visual culture, but are much more familiar in the pantheons of central Italy, particularly the deity Janus, whose temple with its famous doors in the Roman Forum served as the public barometer of Rome’s martial status. However, indigenous interest in janiform heads appears much earlier on the Italian peninsula and has clear ties to the sepulchral realm, likely explaining the occasional selection of such heads in South Italian vase-painting, which are among the earliest surviving examples of the motif produced in Italy.

Kenneth Atkinson (University of Northern Iowa)

Kenneth.Atkinson@uni.edu

**The Conflict Between Lucullus and Tigranes the Great: Its Causes and Effects**

The Mithridatic Wars led to the expansion of the Roman Republic throughout the Middle East. Although much has been written about this conflict, little attention has been paid to how it affected one of its major participants, namely Lucullus. This paper focuses on his little studied invasion of the kingdom of the Armenian monarch Tigranes II the Great (95-56 B.C.E.), the son-in-law of Mithridates VI. It explores the importance of Lucullus’s route of travel to Armenia and how the prior actions of Tigranes in the region created the favorable conditions for the eventual Roman annexation of much of Armenia. This paper suggests that Lucullus’s invasion of Armenia was a rash venture that was not planned in advance, but that he undertook it in reaction to unexpected political events in the Seleucid Empire.

The first part of this presentation explores the relationship between Lucullus and Tigranes during the Third Mithridatic War. It focuses on new historical, numismatic, and archaeological discoveries from Armenia that shed light on Tigranes’s actions and policies at this time, which would later encourage Lucullus to invade Armenia. These include Tigranes’s construction of Tigranocerta, archaeological evidence of his forced movement of local populations, and his invasion of Syria. The second portion proposes that Lucullus took advantage of the Syrian campaign of Tigranes to make a surprise invasion of Armenia. It retraces Lucullus’s route of travel to show how he used his prior visit to the region to his advantage to reach Tigranocerta. Although Lucullus was unprepared for this expedition, archaeological and historical evidence suggests he knew that much of Armenia was undefended at this time. This presentation suggests that Lucullus was successful because he used both his knowledge of the region and stealth to reach Armenia before Tigranes and the Senate knew about his expedition.

Lewis, Orly (Humboldt Universität zu Berlin)

orly.lewis@hu-berlin.de

**Marcellinus *On Pulse*: a Forgotten Treatise on the Deontology of Measuring the Pulse**

Among the vast corpus of Greco-Roman writings on the pulse we find a short treatise entitled *On Pulse* (περὶ σφυγμῶν) composed by a second- or third- century AD physician named Marcellinus. This treatise seems to have been intended as a handbook for physicians and its first part is dedicated not to theory, but to practice, namely, practical and deontological guidelines on how to examine the patient whose pulse must be measured. Marcellinus explains, for instance, which part of the body should be palpitated, how many fingers to use and how much pressure to apply. In addition, he stresses, for example, that the physician must chat with the patient before examining his or her pulse, and advises on the means by which the patient’s modesty may be maintained during the examination, noting the need for special care in the case of female and young patients.

Despite the importance of this treatise for the study of ancient medical practice and of the relation between ancient physicians and their patients, it has received little scholarly attention. The only edition was published in 1907 by Η. Schoene, who did not consult all the extant manuscripts (a new edition is currently being prepared by H. von Staden) and scholars have more or less ignored its first part, referring mostly to its theoretical part, i.e. on the definitions and distinctions of the pulse.

The aim of my paper is to bring to light the invaluable information offered by this treatise. Through a close examination of its first part and with the aid of other sources, such as Celsus, Galen and some anonymous works, I shall argue (i) that this treatise was part of a broader tendency, in which the patients and their treatment, and not only medical theory, became a central topic in the professional discussions among ancient physicians and (ii) that although this tendency served as a rhetorical tool in the professional rivalry among the physicians, it was also rooted in an understanding that the success of the treatment and the establishment of the physician’s reputation was dependent not only on his theoretical knowledge, but also on his manner and attitude towards his patients.

CLOSING SESSION: 17:15-19:15

Chair: Iris Sulimani (Open University)

Bernd Steinbock (University of Western Ontario)

bsteinbo@uwo.ca

**Coping with Defeat: Athenian Responses to the Sicilian Expedition**

In light of the enormity of the Athenian disaster in Sicily (cf. Thuc. 7.87.5-9) scholars have tried to explain the reasons for the Athenians’ uncanny ability to resist their enemies for nine more years. Most of these studies focus on the Athenians’ changes to their governmental structure and the effective mobilization of their remaining resources. This paper explores a rather neglected aspect of the Athenians’ reaction, i.e. their psychological and commemorative responses to this devastating defeat.

I make the case that the Athenian demos reacted to this loss in two ways that are typical for communities trying to come to terms with devastating defeats, as research in social psychology and modern examples show. First, the Athenians eschewed the responsibility for this disaster by blaming scapegoats – the pro-expedition orators and oracle mongers (Thuc. 8.1.1) and the general Nicias (Paus. 1.29.12). Second, they transformed – in various ways – this utter defeat into a moral victory, which made the enormous loss bearable for the survivors. This is largely due to the role of the Athenian funeral orations in manifesting and transmitting a sanitized and highly idealized version of Athenian history, which conforms to the Athenians’ self-image as brave and selfless champions of Greek liberty (Loraux 1986; Thomas 1989; Gehrke 2001; Arrington 2011; Steinbock 2012). Both in the logoi epitaphioi and in the funeral epigrams, the fallen of each war – and thus also the thousands of the Sicilian expedition (Pl. Menex. 243a; Eur. T92 Kannicht) – were celebrated as manifestations of this timeless Athenian national character. Stories of individual acts of heroism in the hour of defeat fulfilled a similar function (Paus. 7.16.4-6; [Lys.] 20.24). Yet the past was not entirely at the disposal of the present; on the private and personal level, the losses were too great to be forgotten, which limited the malleability of this collective memory, as later oratorical references show (Aeschin. 2.75-76).

Christy Constantakopoulou (Birkbeck College, London)

c.constantakopoulou@bbk.ac.uk

**The Social Dynamics of Dedication: The Delian Inventories of the Third Century.**

This paper will explore the social dynamics of dedication, as they are reflected in the dedications recorded in the Delian inventories during the third century BC. The Delian practice of annually producing inventories of dedications is quite exceptional. Very few sanctuaries produce regular publication of their inventories; the practice is restricted to Athens and Attica, Delos, and to a lesser extent Didyma. The inventories of Athenian and Attic sanctuaries have attracted considerable attention in modern scholarship. However, the same kind of analysis has not been applied to the Delian inventories. While the Delian inventories have been studied in order to discuss their purpose (Linders, Hamilton), issues of literacy (Linders), commodities (Reger, Chankowski), history of objects (Prêtre), the overall structure of the administration of the sanctuary (Vial, Chankowski), and the date of establishment of festivals, especially royal festivals (Bruneau), no one has ever attempted to use them in order to examine the social dynamics of dedication. The inventories of the period of Independence provide us with a great amount of information about the objects dedicated to the Delian deities: we get the name of the object, and in some cases we get additional information, such as the name of the dedicant, the patronymic, the ethnic, a description of the object, the material of the object (gold, silver, ivory etc.), the weight, the state of preservation (broken, partially incomplete etc.), any inscriptions on the object itself, the deity to whom it was dedicated, and the purpose of its dedication. Through an analysis of the records of dedication of the third century, I shall aim to reconstruct the social, gender, and community/ethnic background of the dedicants. In addition, I shall explore individual and collective dynamics: how many individuals as opposed to collective communities or groups are dedicating objects; distance as a factor for the creation of the cult network: how many dedicants come from Delos or neighbouring islands as opposed to those from further away; and finally, class/status dynamics and the overall profile of the dedicants: how many belonged to royal circles, or were closely associated to royalty as opposed to virtually unknown dedicants? Beyond the history of the Hellenistic kings and officials, the Delian inventories allow us a rare opportunity to glimpse everyday men and women engaging in an act of pilgrimage and piety.

Grzesik, Dominika (University of Liverpool / University of Wroclaw)

D.Grzesik@liverpool.ac.uk

**The Most Prominent Honorands in Delphic Decrees**

The aim of my paper will be to present the most prominent people honoured in Delphic decrees in Hellenistic and Roman periods. The main purpose and intention toward which the efforts were directed was to analyze the status of the honoured persons – citizens, foreigners or freedmen; and the categories of recipients – kings, emperors, senators, military commanders, magistrates, artists, athletes, and intellectuals. After examining over 1000 decrees it is apparent that the Delphians honoured people from many areas of the ancient world. Among the honorands were people who represented various professions and they were all classified as the elites of the ancient world.

The most prominent figures that were honoured by the Delphic polis were undoubtedly the following kings: Eumenes II king of Pergamon (FdD III 3.237), Nikomedes III of Bithynia (FdD III 4.77) and king  Areus II from Sparta (FdD III 4.418). Other significant honorands include Kl. Achaikos (FdD III 1.213 Early Empire) who was an Asiarch – a priest of the Imperial cult in the province of Asia. Another decree of the Roman period honours Asinius Rufus (FdD III 4.48), a Roman praetor. Caristanius Iulianus (FdD II 4.47), a Roman proconsul was honoured with a bronze statue. All of the aforementioned people were foreigners. Among Delphic citizens that were honoured, the most prominent was Memmios Neikandros  (FdD III 1.466), a secretary of the Amphictyony and the president of the athletes association. Delphians honoured him with heroic worship, an extremely rarely attested privilege.  In this paper I will also briefly discuss artists who participated in the Pythian Games, as well as prominent poets and philosophers. Finally, I will turn my attention to the categories of people who surprisingly do not appear in the decrees of Delphi - such as the Roman emperors.

Dr. Oetjen, Roland (Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel)

roetjen@email.uni-kiel.de

**Greek Euergetism: Some Thoughts on its Nature and Origin from an Economic Perspective**

My paper will use economic analysis to explain the nature and origin of euergetism. The modern term describes different types of financing of public and other goods by rich citizens, but also by rich foreigners, Hellenistic kings, and Roman magistrates on the basis of voluntariness. Voluntariness here means freedom from coercion such as taxes or liturgies. The most common types were individual payments, contributions to public subscriptions, and the discharge of liturgical offices, with the "benefactions" consisting of either gifts or loans at regular, reduced or no interest. Ancient historians maintain that in the Hellenistic period the "benefactions" of the rich developed into a revenue source impoverished cities were increasingly dependent on for their survival.

The Hellenistic period exhibits a significant increase in public expenditures. The cities began, to a larger scale than before, to construct temples and public buildings, hold festivals, contests, and banquets, operate schools and gymnasia, and supply cheap grain to their citizens. Additionally they increasingly had to provide for their defense and send embassies to the Hellenistic kings. The paper will discuss the different "laws" of increasing state activity (Wagner, Popitz, Brecht) and show that economic, social, and demographic developments similar to those in the 19th century accounted for a higher demand for public goods in the Hellenistic period. The paper will use transaction cost theory (Levi and Lyttkens) to explain why politicians chose to finance the new expenditures with "benefactions" rather than taxes or liturgies. It will be demonstrated that the political and administrative system of the Greek cities and the economic developments of the late classical period would have rendered the application of the existing tax and liturgy system, let alone the creation of a new one so expensive that politicians opted for transaction cost-saving "benefactions".

The motives of "euergetic" behavior are traditionally recognized in love of reputation and honor. This paper will model the "benefactor" as a homo oeconomicus. Applying theories of collective action (Olson, Hardin, Axelrod), it will examine the different types of "euergetic" revenues for the ways politicians used to solve the free rider problem and motivate rational and self-interested individuals to contribute to the provision of public goods without exercising coercion. As in public choice theory the relationship between citizens and politicians will be depicted as a principal-agent-relationship. It will be suggested that the “benefactions" were a device for politicians (agents) to credibly commit to the citizens (principals) that once elected they would not act opportunistically as well as a compensation for the citizens in the event that politicians did act opportunistically. The honors a "benefactor" was awarded served as certificates signaling his suitability to hold office. Since time in office was limited to one year and politicians were up for election again and again, the differences between ex ante and ex post conflict-minimizing measures were blurred. Thus performing "benefactions" turns out to be rational and self-interested behavior. The paper will also provide a new interpretation of the "benefactions" performed by rich foreigners, Hellenistic kings, and Roman magistrates. To protect politicians from opportunistic behavior of the citizens and stabilize the relationship between citizens and politicians, the citizens also had to commit themselves, but since they were unable to, they encouraged rich foreigners, Hellenistic kings or Roman magistrates (themselves interested in stable conditions in the cities) to give or lend them money. It will finally be shown that it was individual rulers with a need for funds (e.g., Lykourgos and Demetrios of Phaleron in late fourth-century Athens) who changed (i. e., had an incentive to change) the institutional order to motivate "euergetic" behavior (e. g., by strengthening the magistracies, weakening the popular assembly, and creating new honors) and that system competition brought about the spreading of the new more efficient institutions over the entirety of the Greek world.