**האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים**

**The Hebrew University of Jerusalem**

**הכנס הארבעים ואחד של**

**האגודה לקידום הלימודים הקלאסיים בישראל**

**The 41st Conference of the Israel Society for**

**The Promotion of Classical Studies**

**Session I**

**A bilingual horse—or bilingual hero: Homer and the uncanny**

Ioannis Petropoulos

Professor of Ancient Greek Literature, Democritean University of Thrace; Director, Center for Hellenic Studies-Greece, Harvard University; yiannis@chs.harvard.edu

Monsters and talking horses are among the major exceptions to Homer’s adherence to comparative normality: this paper will be concerned with Achilles’ talking horse Xanthos. In *Iliad* 19.407 Hera, ever capable of overturning the natural course of events, ‘made it [the horse] articulate [*audeenta*].’ A horse, even one of immortal pedigree, that talks and does so almost in the manner of a king and a prophet is an uncanny combination of human and animal traits; ‘reshuffling familiarity’ through hybrid conduct, as a social anthropologist might say, the poet turns the creature into a veritable monster, albeit a well-meaning one. But is the sententious quadruped Homer’s invention? Because Hera endows it with articulateness the creature is presumably speaking Greek. Certainly Achilles has just berated Xanthos in flawless Greek, and so the horse must be responding in human language. But before Xanthos can put in another word, the Erinyes check his ‘speaking voice’ /*aude* (418).

 In Tibetan, Tartar and Kazak epic poems talking, often prescient horses are common, and in Kazak poems the hero’s horse is expressly said to speak in human language, as M. Bowra has shown. Outside Central Asia one is tempted to look at earlier evidence from the Hebrew *Book of Numbers*. There Balaam’s ass—admittedly a humbler comparandum than Achilles’ immortal horse—sees the angel of the Lord and tries helpfully to divert her mount from his erroneous course. Balaam, irate, beats the animal, whereupon ‘The Lord made the ass speak, and she said to Balaam, “What have I done, etc.?” ’ The two engage in full conversation after that (*Numbers* 22.28ff.) This episode may, I suggest, offer comparative insight into the *Iliad* passage cited.

 Because of Achilles’ affinity with folktale, the address by one of his horses may be just another of the various familiar *Marchen* motifs that agglomerated around him. Indeed, if the hero possessed magical weapons in some epic accounts which however Homer ‘rationalised’, he can also have horses endowed with human speech. Or to tread further into the area of fanciful tales, on account of his tutelage in Pelion under the half-equine Chiron he may, like other heroes in ancient Greek myth (e.g., Melampous), have had *passive* knowledge of animalese, especially of the prophetic kind. If so, in these epic tales no divine dispensation (for instance, from Hera) was needed, for Xanthos spoke in his native language to a comprehending Achilles. Yet such a version was too far-fetched for Homer the relative ‘rationalist’. He therefore adopted the less absurd version of myth (a temporarily bilingual horse) and through the agency of the regulatory Erinyes implicitly commented on it.

**Rituality and Dramatization in the dithyrambic odes of Pindar and Bacchylides**

Smaro Nikolaidou-Arabatzi

Department of Greek Philology, Democritus University of Thrace, Komotini, Greece

The Dithyramb, the original cultic hymn for Dionysus, stood separately from drama, although from its *exarchontes* birth was given to Attic tragedy according to Aristotle(*Poetics* 1449a 10-11). In particular, some decades after the establishment of tragedy, dithyrambic contests were firstly introduced in the program of the City Dionysia, and they held in parallel to the dramatic ones throughout the fifth and fourth centuries. And although the innovations by Arion in an earlier phase of the dithyrambic genre are the most famous, the surviving dithyrambs belong only to the fifth century phase (till *~*440 BC), and are odes composed by Pindar and Bacchylides.

From what extant, only the dithyrambs of Pindar are pure ritual and dionysiac. Instead, the dithyrambs of Bacchylides are mostly narrative, with myths of non-Dionysiac character and moments of vivid dramatization; and one of them, *Ode* 18 (*Theseus*), is entirely dramatic (a dialogue between two persons). Mimesis is also attested for the later New Dithyramb; but it is not that of acting persons, because it imitates voices, sounds or natural phenomena by means of tunes and rhythms.

By considering rituality and dramatization in the extant dithyrambs, my paper argues that, since ritual gave birth to drama and although the dithyrambic contests were separate from the dramatic ones, a tension between ritual and dramatic character gradually increased in favour of mimesis of acting persons. Being thus alienated from its ritual function (by playing a role more than singing and dancing), the dithyrambic chorus faced crisis. From this point of view, the musical innovations, so much criticized –in contemporary (comedy, Plato) and modern (Nietzsche) time- as extraordinary modes of the New Dithyramb, may reflect the efforts of the poets to validate the ritual destination of their odes with powerful instrumental accompaniment and foreign, Dionysian-like melodies.

**Political and Apolitical Electra**

Hanna Roisman

Department of Classics, Colby College, hroisman@colby.edu

Sophocles’ and Euripides’ *Electra*s are situated in diametrically opposed settings; the action of Sophocles’ play takes place in front of the royal palace in the city of Argos, that of Euripides’ play in the country in front of a farmer’s cottage. Each playwright chose the location most fitting to his treatment of the myth and availed himself of conventional conceptions of the place. The city was conceived of as a place of education and culture and of government, law, and civic engagement, but also of sophistry, immorality, and political conniving and betrayal. The country was associated with ignorance and uncouthness, but also with honest simplicity. In each play, the location is most fitting to the author’s particular treatment of the myth.

In both plays, as in other Greek tragedies, the setting is established both visually and verbally. The *skēnē,* stage-building, the wooden structure where the props were kept and the actors changed their costumes, would have represented the two types of abodes. The nature of the abode would have been indicated either by painted cloths draped over the stage-building or by painted wooden panels in front of it (Arist. *Poetics* 1449a 16-17). Since most of the 8,000 strong audience sat too far away to see the stage scenery very well, the playwrights also "painted" their settings verbally.

This talk considers two issues. The first is the relation between the tragedians’ choice of location — city or country — and their treatments of the myth. The second is how the abodes the audience see in their mind’s eye might affect their understanding of the events and their feelings towards the characters, and how what they hear might affect their feelings about and understandings of what they see.

**Session II**

**Ancient Ethnosexuality**

Joseph Roisman

Department of Classics, Colby College, jsroisma@colby.edu

The paper discusses Greeks’ and Romans’ views of other people’s sexuality: what will here be termed “ancient ethnosexuality.” It focuses on the nature of the evidence for the topic and its modern interpretations. Classical authors regarded aliens’ sexual practices as only one piece (and rarely the most important) of a greater ethnographic puzzle. This led some ancient authors to try to match people’s sexual practices with their more salient characteristics, (as in the case of the nomadic Huns, who were said to copulate in wagons). Looking at sex as part of a greater whole also opened the door to common perceptions and stereotypes of barbarians. With that said, the paper suggests that modern views of the ancient evidence for ethnosexuality as biased or distorted beyond repair are too deterministic, if not misguided. Scholars have analyzed depictions of barbarian sexuality out of context, and the thesis that the ancients ranked barbarian sexuality on the scale of savagery according to its distance from the Greco-Roman center has its share of problems. The paper similarly questions recent applications of Edward Said’s theory of “Orientalism” to Greek and Roman views of alien sexuality. A case study of ancient depictions of allegedly lustful male barbarians illustrates the nuanced classical views of ethnosexuality and some of the difficulties with modern assessments of it.

**Councils in Greek oligarchies**

Robert Wallace

Professor of Classics, Northwestern University

On the consensus view, councils dominated Greek oligarchies. In *Greek Oligarchies* Whibley stated that the council “was the sovereign power”; “its powers were unlimited.” Ehrenberg, Andrewes, Rhodes, and Hansen/Nielsen are similar.

The sources do not support this conception. In particular, having researched the constitutional histories of 158 *poleis*, Aristotle (*Politics*) almost never mentions *boulai* in oligarchies; he considers them democratic (1299b30-38). Citizen assemblies decided (*Pol*. 1278b10-11) but citizens’ numbers were limited, notably by wealth (1294a12-14, 1290a30-b21).

The historical record confirms Aristotle. Homeric leaders advise Agamemnon and debate before the assembled army, but typically disagree (Agamemnon and Achilles). No Homeric council makes a decision.

Sparta’s *Gerousia* was not “sovereign master.” “Major decisions … were taken in full assembly, the *Gerousia* played a relatively inconspicuous part” (Andrewes).

Aristotle says “some” thought Solon founded Athens’ Areopagos Council; for Plutarch, “most” agreed Solon founded it. The Areopagos was an early venue for homicide trials (Orestes). No source says it governed pre-Solonian Athens.

Similar claims are made for Knidos. Crete, and Thessaly, without foundation. No government is said to have been run by a council. Brock and Hodkinson (*Alternatives to Democracy*) almost never mention councils. Gehrke says, “there is no doubt that the formal power of decision-making rested with the Popular Assembly” in archaic Greece.

Unlike Rome’s oligarchic Senate, an elite Greek’s goal was not a united upper-class front against the *kakoi*, but to be on top. Otherwise he might refuse to cooperate, like *Iliad*’s Achilles. Alkaios, Theognis, and Solon document intra-elite competition and violence at Mytilene, Megara, and Athens. Dareios says (Hdt. 3.82), “In oligarchies … violent personal feuds arise, because everyone wants to have his own views prevail.” Elite rivalries compromised the effectiveness of oligarchic councils. Oligarchies were essentially restricted democracies: citizenries, limited by wealth, decided (but with limited free speech); executive officials were potent. Councils debated major issues before they reached the assembly, and came to exercise administrative, executive, and judicial functions.

**“East of Suez” - Roman Sea Power in the Eastern Mediterranean**

Jorit Wintjes

Julius-Maximilians-Universität, Würzburg; jorit.wintjes@mail.uni-wuerzburg.de

By the middle of the 1st century AD, the Eastern Mediterranean was by and large a pacified area. Even so, Roman naval forces of – as is usually assumed – considerable strength operated there and are thought to have been involved both in major military events and in day-to-day operations off the Levantine coast. Of all these activities however, little tangible evidence survives; the available sources are few and far between and as a consequence scholarly interest in Roman naval units operating in the Eastern Mediterranean has been rather limited; only in very recent years has the *classis Syriaca* started to gain some attention.

However, with the discussion mainly concentrating on the epigraphic and numismatic evidence for the units, operational matters – particularly the purpose of day-to-day-operations – are often only mentioned in passing. This is to some degree surprising – as with any permanently established military unit, Roman naval units in the Eastern Mediterranean can only be properly understood when their actual purpose is known; after all, the Roman army was not known for creating military capabilities where there was no need for it.

The paper will therefore focus on three key questions: one, in which way was Roman naval power in the Eastern Mediterranean organized and what changes did this organization undergo throughout the imperial period; closer observation will reveal both a surprising variety in the nature of Roman naval units and the continuing existence of organized naval power well into the 4th and 5th centuries AD. Two, what was the actual purpose of these units; here, a fairly clear distinction will appear between units operating on the high sea and others used for inshore work. And three what military capabilities did the naval units stationed in the Eastern Mediterranean have at their disposal. Although little evidence has survived on personnel strength, ship numbers and ship types, the function of the naval units in question will allow some deductions on the composition of these units.

**Session III**

**Proclus on Epistemology, Language, and Logic**

Christoph Helmig

Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, (christoph.helmig@hiw.kuleuven.be)

Nowadays we are used to distinguish between different philosophical disciplines. In Proclus' time such a distinction was less evident, but I may be found to a certain extent in the well known discussions of the parts of philosophy. Taking my departure from these widespread classifications, I seek to examine the points of contact between the fields called nowadays: epistemology, philosophy of language, and logic. In the course of my discussion, I shall raise several questions regarding the role of dialectic / logic in Platonic and Aristotelian circles, the correctness of language first approached in Plato's *Cratylus*, and the relation between epistemology and language (words and thought). While for Neoplatonists logic was conceived of primarily as a useful instrument for interpreting Plato’s dialogues, epistemology and the theory of language can only be understood, I argue, against the background of the complex metaphysics of the Athenian school of Neoplatonism.

**Proclus on Immobile Light**

Antonio Luis Costa Vargas

Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, (antoniov@gmail.com)

Proclus of Lycia, the late Neoplatonist, defended the rather unconventional view that place is itself a body, namely a sphere of immobile light. This view combines two distinct philosophical discussions: the physical discussion of place and the metaphysical discussion of the luminous vehicle of the soul and the luminous manifestations of the gods. Immobile light is therefore a mediator between the physical and the metaphysical and there are thus many facets from which this doctrine can be approached and understood. In this paper I propose to address the issue from a phenomenological perspective, elucidating Proclus' theory within lived experience. Proclus himself brings physics closer to sense perception, since he rejects the Aristotelian definition of natural bodies in terms of their movement towards natural places in his *Commentary on the Timaeus*, preferring to define them by means of their sensible qualities. Furthermore, he finds a description of the immobile sphere of light in a luminous vision described by Plato in the myth of Er, and in his interpretation the Lycian underlines the visible and corporeal nature of the light described by Plato. Third, the body of immobile light is supposed to be the sense organ of the world-soul, whereby it sees and touches itself, meaning that the light must not be interpreted only as an object of experience, but also subjectively, as a mode of sense-perception. Such a richly phenomenological topic is a privileged entry point into the philosophy of a thinker, normally held to be excessively abstract and systematical.

**Poetry as an Expression of Neoplatonic Philosophy: Proclus’ *Allegoresis* of the ‘Theologian Poets’**

Patrizia Marzillo

The Buber Society of Fellows, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, (patrizia\_plv@yahoo.it)

Plato regarded Homer’s myths as not suitable for youth’s education. Poetry was banished from his ideal state since being an artistic expression, it is an imitation of an imitation, hence is not conducive to knowledge.

Plato’s attitude to poetry was, however, not one-sided. He was himself a poet in his young years and expounded in his works the doctrine of the *enthousiasmos*, by which poetry is infallible if the poetical creation results from divine inspiration. Further, in *Phaed.* 95a he considers Homer a divine poet and appeals to his authority in reinforcing his own thought.

With this in mind, the sixth essay of Proclus’ commentary on Plato’s *Republic* focuses on the relationship between Homer and Plato. Attempting to find a solution to Plato’s banishment of poetry in *Republic* 10, 595a-608b, Proclus perfected the neo-Platonic *allegoresis* system by dividing poetry into three categories: divinely inspired, didactic, and mimetic. In his opinion, Plato’s criticism addressed only mimetic poetry and not the divinely inspired poetry which hides a superior truth that has to be revealed by allegorical exegesis. In this way Plato’s banishment of poetry could be reconciled with Neoplatonists’ commentaries on Homer, Orpheus, and Hesiod on the ground that Plato nowhere expressly condemns allegorical interpretation.

An analysis of Proclus’ exegesis of these ‘theologian poets’ will show how *allegoresis* transformed them into Neoplatonic philosophers *avant la lettre*.

**Session IV**

**הולדתו של כורש הגדול ב-*Philippus* לאיסוקרטס: רטוריקה, מיתוס ונטישת תינוקות בשיח הדרמטי האתונאי**

פאיה האוסקר

האוניברסיטה הפתוחה, ישׂראל

סיפור הולדתו וילדותו המוקדמת של כורש הגדול מופיע לראשונה במקורות היווניים בחיבורו של הרודוטוס (Hdt.1.107-122). גרסה זו, המשלבת ככל הנראה מרכיבים מיתולוגיים מסורתיים מיוון ומהמזרח הקדום, מציגה בפני הקורא מאפיינים ביוגראפיים בולטים באשר למוצאו ולקורותיו של גיבור מיתולוגי יווני ממוצא מלכותי, לעתים מייסד שושלת או אומה: תינוק שננטש למוות עם לידתו במטרה להרחיקו מהגה השלטון, שורד בדרך נס, נאסף וגדל הרחק מביתו ומאדמת מולדתו, חוזר לעירו בזהות שונה, מתוודע למוצאו האמיתי ותופס את מקומו כיורש עצר טבעי. התייחסות נוספת בספרות היוונית למסורת מיתולוגית באשר למוצאו והולדתו של כורש אנו מוצאים ב*Philippus*-, מסה שחיבר איסוקרטס בשנת 346 לפסה"נ, ובה הוא פונה לפיליפוס ה-II מתוך כוונה לשכנע את השליט המקדוני לאחד את העולם היווני תחת מנהיגותו ולצאת למסע צבאי נגד ממלכת פרס. במסגרת חיבור זה, הנתפס כאחד החשובים מבין יצירותיו, מתייחס איסוקרטס פעמיים לעניין הפקרתו של כורש התינוק (Isoc.5.66, 132). הוא עושה זאת באופן תמציתי ביותר, מבלי להתעכב על סיבות הנטישה, על השתלשלות האירועים שהובילו לעצם הגילוי ועל מעמד ההתוודעות של הילד האסופי לזהותו האמיתית. בנוסף, פרטים שמציג איסוקרטס בכל הנוגע לזהות הנוטש, למיקום הנטישה ולדמות המאמצת שונים מאלה שבחיבורו של הרודוטוס, כמו גם הטרמינולוגיה להגדרת אקט הנטישה עצמו. זו אינה זהה למינוח בו משתמש הרודוטוס, שהוא גם המינוח המקובל במקורות של המאות החמישית והרביעית לפנה"ס.

ההרצאה תעסוק בסוגיית מקורה של גרסת איסוקרטס למיתוס לידתו ונטישתו של כורש הגדול ובמשמעותם הרטורית של השינויים הנרטיביים והלשוניים שבה לעומת גרסתו של הרודוטוס. דיון ביקורתי במאפייני מיתוס הולדת גיבור במקורות היווניים, במעמדו החוקי של הצאצא באתונה הקלאסית ובפרקטיקת נטישת תינוקות בשיח הדרמטי עשויי להאיר את מהות ההבדלים בין שתי הגרסאות החולקות ביניהן מסורת מיתולוגית משותפת ובכך להציע מענה לשאלת עצם קיומה של הגרסה האיסוקרטית.

**The birth of Cyrus in Isocrates’ *Philippus*: rhetoric, myth and infant exposure in Athenian dramatic discourse**

Fayah Haussker

Open University, Israel

The story of the birth and early childhood of Cyrus the Great first appears in Greek sources in Herodotus (Hdt.1.107-122). This version, which may be a mixture of oriental and Greek traditional legends, includes biographical elements characteristic of the life and origins of a royal Greek mythological hero, quite often the founder of a dynasty or nation. Among these is the motif of the baby prince exposed to death in order to remove him from the succession to the throne, who miraculously survives, nursed in a place far away from his homeland. The prince then returns to his birthplace as a stranger, his true origins are recognized and he takes his place as a legitimate heir to the throne.

The second reference in Greek sources to the mythical tradition about the origin and birth of Cyrus is found in the *Philippus* of Isocrates. In this very important treatise Isocrates calls on Phillip II to take on the leadership of the united Hellenes, and to head the military campaign against the Persian Empire. Isocrates mentions the exposure of Cyrus the infant twice in this work (Isoc.5.66, 132). On both occasions the account is very concise, almost in the form of short comments, which do not specify the reason for the act, and avoid mentioning the actual sequence of events that led to the discovery of the status of the foundling child and his introduction to his real identity. The identity of the person who exposes the infant prince, the place where he is exposed and the character who adopts him are all different from those in Herodotus' version. Furthermore, the terminology which Isocrates uses to define the act of exposure is not the same as that which appears in Herodotus or is conventionally used in the sources of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE.

 My paper will focus on the question of Isocrates’ sources for his version of the myth of the birth and exposure of Cyrus the Great and the rhetorical meaning of the narrative and linguistic changes between his version and that of Herodotus. I shall analyse the characteristic motifs of myths of the birth of the hero in Greek sources, the legal status of the child in classical Athens and the practice of infant exposure in dramatic discourse. Thus I hope to cast light on the nature of the differences between these two texts which share a common mythological heritage, and offer an answer to the question of why Isocrates wrote his version.

**של מי הקבר הזה?**

רחל צלניק-אברמוביץ

אוניברסיטת תל-אביב

מחקרים בארכיאולוגיה ובהיסטוריה הקדומה של יוון הדגישו את חשיבות חקר מנהגי הקבורה, סגנונות מצבות הקבורה והחקיקה הנוגעת לקבורה להבנת מבנה החברה היוונית העתיקה והתפתחותה, תפיסת המוות, הריבוד החברתי-כלכלי והמבנה הפוליטי ששררו בה. מחקרים שהתמקדו באטיקה ובמקומות אחרים בעולם היווני, העלו ממצאים, שעל אף שזכו לפירושים שונים, תרומתם להכרת התפתחות הפוליס והתפתחותו של רעיון מדינת האזרחים (שלדעת איאן מוריס ואחרים אירעו באמצע המאה השמינית לפסה"נ) אינה מוטלת בספק.

אבל השאלה, "מי היו הבעלים של חלקת הקבר", זכתה לתשומת-לב מעטה ביותר, אף שהשאלה הזאת קשורה קשר הדוק להגדרת ההבדל בין התחום "הציבורי" ל"פרטי", ומכאן – להתפתחות הפוליס. שאלה זו ראויה שתידון הן בהקשר של הממצאים החומריים והן בהקשר של המקורות הספרותיים והחקיקה העוסקת בקבורה, חקיקה המצביעה על האינטרס שגילתה המדינה היוונית בפיקוח וניתור מנהגי הקבורה של אזרחיה.

יש עדויות לכך שקברים נחשבו רכוש פרטי. גם אגודות, דתיות ואחרות, קנו אדמות והקימו בתי-קברות משלהן. במקרים אחדים, ובמידה גוברת והולכת בתקופה ההלניסטית ובתקופה הרומית, קיבלו עליהן כמה פולייס את האחריות להגנה על קברים ועל בעלי הקברים, מה שאולי מעיד על הכרה בבעלות הפרטית על חלקות קבר, לפחות במקומות אחדים.

אבל כיצד בחרו היוונים היכן לקבור את מתיהם? דעה רווחת היא שבערך בשלהי המאה השמינית לפסה"נ פסקה הקבורה בין חומות הערים או בין בתים, והתפתחו בתי קברות מחוץ לחומות. בקולוניות החדשות דומה שבתי הקברות תוכננו מראש ונקבעו מחוץ לתחום המגורים. אבל אם חלקות קבר נחשבו לרכוש פרטי, מה היה מעמדם של בתי הקברות האלה? האם הם היו ציבוריים? במקרה כזה היינו מצפים למצוא עדויות להליכים שהסדירו רכישה או קבלה של חלקות קבר מרשות מוסמכת – ואין לכך כל עדות. האם הם היו בבחינת common land? אם כך, האם פעל כאן עקרון "כל הקודם זוכה", ותושבי הפוליס תפסו חזקה על אדמות לצורך קבורת מתיהם? האם התערבה הפוליס כדי למנוע השתלטות פרטית "פיראטית" על אדמות שיכלו לשמש לצרכי הציבור?

שאלת המעמד הלגאלי של חלקות קבר נוגעת לנושא סבוך נוסף: חוקרים טענו שהקבורה הרשמית בתוך בתי קברות מוגדרים סימלה את הקבוצה החברתית, שרק חבריה היו בעלי השתייכות מלאה לקבוצה בזכות קרבת דם למתים. אבל אם הבעלות על קברים, כמו הבעלות על נכסי דלא ניידי בכלל, הייתה הפריבילגיה האקסקלוסיבית של מי שהשתייך לקבוצה, של האזרח, כיצד נסביר את העובדה שתושבים חסרי אזרחות נקברו אף הם על אדמת הפוליס וזכו לציון קבר?

הרצאה זאת תדון בשאלות אלה ובאחרות, ותציע פתרונות אפשריים.

**Whose Grave Is This?**

Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz

Tel-Aviv University, Rachelze@post.tau.ac.il

Recent studies of the archaeology and early history of the Greece have stressed the importance of the study of burial practices, the forms of grave marks and the funerary legislation to the better understanding of ancient Greeks: their concepts of death, their social and economical stratification, and their political structure. Studies which focused on Attica and other places in the Greek world have yielded evidence which has been diversely interpreted in several points, but its significant contribution to the history of the emergence of the polis, or of the idea of a state of the citizens (argued by Ian Morris and others to have taken place in mid-8th century B.C.), is nevertheless undeniable.

Yet the basic question, ‘who owned the grave plot’, has scarcely attracted attention, although the question is closely related to the concept of ‘public’ and ‘private’, hence to the development of the polis. This question should be explored both in the context of the physical findings and the funerary laws, which imply that the state had an interest in monitoring the sepulchral practices of its private citizens.

Evidence implies that graves plots were considered private property. Private associations, too, whether religious or other, bought land and established their own cemeteries. In some cases, and increasingly from the Hellenistic period onward, some poleis seem to have assumed responsibility for the protection of graves and their ownership, thus implying that, at least in some places, private ownership of grave plots was legally recognized.

But how did the Greeks choose where to bury their dead? It has been widely held that about the end of the eight century B.C. intra-mural burial, or burial within a settlement and between houses, ceased, and extra-mural cemeteries developed. In the newly founded colonies, such cemeteries seem to have been pre-planned. But if grave plots were private property, what was the status of such cemeteries? Were they public? In such a case we would expect to find a defined and formal procedure for acquiring plots – for which there is no evidence. Were they ‘common land’? If so, was it a case of ‘first comes first wins’? Did the polis intervene in order to prevent “pirate” appropriation of reserve land?

The question of the legal status of grave plots concerns another thorny issue. It has been argued that formal burial within spatially defined cemeteries was considered a symbol of the social group, which monopolised full membership of the community through lineal descent from the dead (e.g. by Morris, 1987). Yet, if the ownership of grave plots, like the ownership of real estate in general, was the exclusive privilege of the citizen, how can we explain the burial of non-citizens within the territory of the polis?

This paper proposes to examine these issues by looking at the evidence and suggesting some tentative answers.

"אם נקרא בדברי הימים אשר ספרו לנו סופרים נאמנים": על ראשית הופעתה של ההיסטוריוגרפיה הקלאסית בתרבות היהודית

**יותם כהן**

**אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב,** cohenyot@bgu.ac.il

במרכז ההרצאה יעמוד ראשיתו של תהליך קבלתה של התרבות הקלאסית לתוך עולמם של היהודים בעולם המודרני, תוך התמקדות באימוצה של ההיסטוריוגרפיה הקלאסית בתפיסה ההיסטורית. ההרצאה תבחן כיצד שימשו ההיסטוריונים הקלאסיים מקור של סיפורים, ואף של תבניות חשיבה, עבור כותבים יהודים. במרכז ההרצאה יעמוד התיאור ההיסטורי של ארצות העולם העתיק: מצרים, אשור, מדי, בבל, פרס, קרתגו, סיציליה, וכמובן יוון ורומא עצמן, כפי שהופיע בכתב-העת העברי 'המאסף', אשר יצא במרחב הגרמני בין השנים תקמ"ד-תקע"א (1783 עד 1811), ונפוץ בעולם היהודי-אירופי שבין וילנה ללונדון.

הדיון במקומה של התרבות הקלאסית בתרבות היהודית ניצב בליבו של צומת רב חשיבות בגיבוש זהותו של היהודי המודרני : שאיפתו לשמור על המסורת היהודית מכאן, ומאמציו לאמץ את תרבות אירופה מכאן. בניגוד לאירופה הנוצרית, שהגדירה את זהותה על ידי המתח שבין "אתונה" ו"ירושלים", התרבות היהודית, מאז ימי הבית השני והמפגש ההיסטורי בין היהודים לתרבויות יוון ורומא, תפסה עצמה כמנוגדת לתרבות הקלאסית. התמודדות של כותבים יהודים עם העולם הקלאסי, אם כן, מדגישה את הברירות שעשו יהודים אשר ביקשו לקחת חלק בתרבות המערבית, החל מסוף המאה הי"ח ועד לימנו.

בהרצאה אראה כי כותבים שונים בכתב העת המאסף הציגו את ההיסטוריה של העולם העתיק בהתאם להיסטוריוגרפיה הקלאסית, ובכך, תמונת העבר שקיבל הקורא היהודי היתה קרובה יותר לזה של הנוצרי בן זמנו. ציטוטים מליוויוּס והֵרוֹדוֹטוֹס, למשל, הוסיפו "ידע חדש" למסורת היהודית על בבל ורומא, והציטוטים מפּלוּטַרכוֹס ואַריסְטוֹ, לעומת זאת, הניחו בפני הקורא ידע שלא היה יכול לשאוב משום מקור עברי אחר. לטענתי, השימוש והציטוט מהיסטוריוגרפיה הקלאסית לא היו "טכניים" בלבד, והם היו משולבים עם תפיסות חדשות על ההיסטוריה. בחינת המדור ההיסטורי ב'המאסף' תראה כי התפיסה הקלאסית השפיעה על כתיבת ההיסטוריה בשלושה תחומים: בהצגת הלגיטימציה ואף החשיבות שבלימוד ההיסטוריה והתועלת שניתן להפיק ממנה; במבנה תנועת ההיסטוריה, ממצרים, דרך ארצות המזרח הקרוב עד ליוון ורומא, ובאימוץ ההיסטוריוגרפיה הקלאסית כמקור מהימן להכרת העבר. רעיונות וערכים של ההשקפה הקלאסית, אם כן, שולבו עם אלה של המסורת היהודית, ובכך יצרו סינתיזה אשר משקפת את שני היסודות בעולמו של היהודי המודרני, התרבות היהודית והתרבות האירופית.

**"Im nikra be'divrey ha'yamim asher sipru lanu sofrim ne'emanim":**

**The Initial Appearance of Classic Historiography in Jewish Culture**

Yotam Cohen

Ben-Gurion University

In my presentation I will address the initial process of acceptance of classical culture into the Jewish world in the modern era, while focusing on the adoption of Classic historiography into Jewish historic perception. The lecture will examine how classical historians served as a source of stories as well as thinking frameworks for Jewish writers. These issues will be probed through the description of the ancient worlds of Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, Media, Persia, Carthage, Sicily, and of course Greece and Rome, as they appeared in "*Hame'asef*", the first Hebrew periodical journal that was published in German from 1783 to 1811, and was circulated throughout the Jewish-European world between Vilna to London.

The discussion on the status of Classic culture in Jewish culture is positioned at a highly important junction in the construction and consolidation of the Jew’s modern identity: his ambition to preserve Jewish tradition, on one hand, and his efforts to adopt European culture, on the other hand. In contrast with Christian Europe, which defined its identity through the tension between "Athens" and "Jerusalem", Jewish culture had been opposed to Classic culture ever since the Second Temple period and the historic meeting of the Jews with Greek and Roman cultures.

In my lecture I will demonstrate how different writers in "*Hame'asef*" presented the history of the ancient world in accordance with Classic historiography, and as such the picture of the past presented to the Jewish reader was nearly the one that was presented to the contemporary Christian. Quotations from Herodotus and Livy for example, added ''new knowledge'' to accepted Jewish tradition regarding Babylon and Rome, and quotations from Plutarch and Aristotle, provided the reader with knowledge that he could not have obtained from any other Hebrew source. I claim that the use of and quotations from the Classic historiography were not only technical, but rather were integrated with new perceptions about history. An examination of the historic section in "*Hame'asef*" will show that the Classic perception influenced the writing of history in three areas: in presenting the legitimacy and importance of studying history and the benefits that can be gained from it; in structuring the movement of history from Egypt, through the lands of the middle east up to Greece and Rome; and in adopting Classic historiography as a reliable source for learning about the past. Thus, the ideas and values of the Classic views were combined with those of Jewish tradition and thus created a synthesis that reflects two of the basic elements in the world of the modern Jew: Jewish culture and European culture.

**Session V**

**בין חוק לנוהג: פיקדונות נושאי ריבית באימפריה הרומית בשלוש המאות הראשונות לספירה**

מירב חקלאי רוטנברג

אוניברסיטת אוקספורד

**Between law and practice: Interest-bearing deposits in the Roman empire during the first three centuries CE** (in Hebrew)

Merav Haklai-Rotenberg

Oxford

The question of whether or not deposits can yield interest may hold far-reaching economic implications. In cultures where money deposits cannot yield interest the primary outcome of deposits is their safekeeping. In cultures where money deposits regularly yield interest deposits may offer an investment channel, with the potential of leveraging other economic activities.

In many ancient societies deposits were entrusted primarily for the purpose of safekeeping. A depositor-depositary relationship was perceived in terms of trust, with the depositary morally obliged to return the deposit intact. These outlines also applied to Roman deposits, which were considered as a favour, entrusted for safekeeping and not for use. Since depositaries were not intended to use the deposit, and depositors benefited by its mare acceptance, Roman deposits officially were not supposed to yield any interest. However, depositors could give explicit permission to depositaries to use the deposit, allowing them potentially to profit from it. Why then should not depositors, too, profit from the use of their own property? Thus, a tension existed between official procedure and actual practice, which also applied to the interest-bearing potential of deposits.

Despite legal formalities, evidence there is suggests that interest-free deposits were not the only custom in the Roman empire. In fact, some deposits certainly yielded interest. In the scholarship such interest-bearing deposits are known as *depositum irregulare*. The vast literature on the topic has to do with the problematic nature of the evidence. The relevant legal material, both imperial rescripts and *Digest* excerpts, spring much suspicion of interpolations and sometime contain internal inconsistencies. Further complications arise from the documentary material, where the Greek παραθήκηor παρακαταθήκηare often used as equivalents to the Latin *depositum*. However, whereas *depositum* was a *contractus*, primary aimed at custody, παρα(κατα)θήκηwas a contractual formula, applied also in circumstances which surpass that of safekeeping.

This paper offers an overview of the relevant evidence. It strongly supports the existence of interest-bearing deposits, and explains inconsistencies in legal evidence as attempts to reconcile legal strictures with actual practice.

**בקכוס בגן הרומי – עניין אזרחי**

שׂרה גלבוע-קרני

החוג לארכיאולוגיה, אוניברסיטת חיפה

הגנים הרומיים היו משופעים בדימויים דיוניסיים, תופעה שלא נעלמה מעיני החוקרים, ואולם מחקר שיטתי המנסה לעמוד על משמעותם של דימויים אלה טרם נעשה. המחקר הנוכחי ניסה לברר סוגיה זו על ידי עיון שיטתי בסוגה אחת מעיטורי הגן, ה*אוסקילה* (*oscilla*). המחקר הקיף כ- 450 פריטים מרחבי העולם הרומי, המהווים את כל ה*אוסקילה* שזכו לקטלוג עד כה. הדימויים על כל *אוסקילום* מוינו לקבוצות איקונוגראפיות.

דימויים דיוניסיים נמצאו על גבי 88% מן הפריטים. על גבי 73 תבליטים (17%) נמצא תאור של מזבח, תמיד בקונטקסט דיוניסי. ממצא זה כיוון את המחקר לברורה של שאלת הפולחן. ארבעה פולחנים רומיים הקשורים בליבר-פאטר (Liber-Pater), הוא בקכוס, נידונו. הראשון שבהם הוא המובן מאליו: הבציר והפקת היין – ואולם, נמצאו רק 27 פריטים (6%) המאזכרים ענבים או יין. הפולחן השני שנבחן הוא ה*אמברוואליה* (*Ambarvalia*), טכסי הטיהור שהתקיימו בסוף חודש מאי – ואולם, רק בשני פריטים נמצאו דימויים העשויים לרמז על ה*אמברוואליה*. הפולחן השלישי שנבדק הוא המיסטריות הדיוניסיות. ואכן, נמצאו 19 פריטים (5%), שאפשר היה לפרשם כמציינים את המיסטריות. ועדיין נותרו דימויי פולחן מרובים שאי אפשר היה לשייכם אף לא לאחד משלושת הפולחנים הללו.

נותרה אפוא ה*ליברליה* (*Liberalia*), חגו העיקרי של ליבר/בקכוס. ה*ליברליה* ציינה את כניסתם של הנערים לעולם החובות והזכויות של המבוגר הרומי. היום שבו פשטו הנערים את הטוגה *פרייטקסטה (praetexta)*, ועטו לראשונה את הטוגה *ויריליס (virilis)*, הטוגה של הגברים. באותו היום הובלו הנערים אל הפורום, נרשמו ברשומות של ה*גנס* (*gens*) שאליו השתייכו, והתגייסו לצבא הרומי כ*טירונס (tirones)*.

הגן הרומי ביטא את האידיאלים של בעליו. לחסותו של ליבר/בקכוס, המנצח הארכיטיפי, היה בו לפיכך מקום מרכזי. ברצוני לטעון כי בשל פטרונותו האזרחית זכה ליבר/בקכוס למעמד בכורה בין אלוהויות הפריון הרומיות האחרות. תחת חסותו של האל של "כל הזרע הנוזל" (אוגוסטינוס), שגשגו הגנים, והנערים היו לגברים.

**Bacchus in the Roman Garden – A Civic Matter**

Sarah Gilboa-Karni

Dept. Of Archaeology, University of Haifa

Although the predominance of Dionysian imagery in Roman gardens has often been noted, its significance has not been thoroughly researched. I propose to show that a systematic iconographic analysis of one genre of garden decoration, marble *oscilla*, could shed light on this issue. The present study comprised some 450 items from across the Roman world, encompassing all the catalogued *oscilla*. The images on each *oscillum* were sorted into iconographic groups.

Dionysian images were found on 88% of the *oscilla*. An altar, appearing on 73 items (17%) made cult issues a key to the interpretation. The *Liberalia*, Liber-Pater/Bacchus’ chief holiday is the most likely cult alluded to. Three other cults connected with Liber/Bacchus were considered but were not supported by the imagery. Firstly, allusions to vintage and wine making were rather scarce, appearing on only 27 items (6%). Second, only 2 images could be interpreted as alluding to the *Ambarvalia*, the lustration ritual that took place in May. Third, only 19 items (5%) could be clearly interpreted as alluding to the Dionysian mystery cult.

The *Liberalia* was the most important festival related to Liber/Bacchus according to Ovid and St. Augustine. The festival marked the public introduction of Roman youth into the adult Roman society. On that day young boys discarded their toga *praetexta* and donned the toga *virilis* for the first time. They were then escorted into the forum, enrolled in their *gens*, and enlisted in the Roman army as *tirones*.

I argue that it was this civic tutelage that gave Liber/Bacchus his primacy over other vegetation deities in the Roman garden. Under his tutelage as god of “all liquid seed” (St. Augustine) gardens thrived and boys came of age. Moreover, under Liber/Bacchus' tutelage as the archetypical victor, the boys would join the victorious Roman army.

**"הנערה מארל" : על הסרקופג של פומפיה היהודייה ועל היהודים בדרום צרפת תחת האימפריה הרומית**

רחל פייג וישניא

אוניברסיטת תל-אביב

לפני שנתיים נחשף בארל סרקופג כפול (עם שני שלדים) שעליו הכתובת "לפומפייה היהודייה וקוסוטיוס אאוטיקלס" (POMPIEAE IUDEAE ET COSSUTIUS EUTYCLES). זוהי כתובת מרתקת משום שהיא מהווה עדות מוצקה ראשונה לנוכחותם של יהודים בארל בסביבות המאה השלישית לספירה. עדויות נוספות שעלו ממימי הרון בשנים האחרונות המכילות משקולות זעירות שעליהן סמל המנורה, כמו גם קריאה מחודשת של כתובות על מצבות בערים שבמעברי האלפים הימיים הנושאות שמות שיכולים אף הם להעיד על יהדותם של אלה שלכבודם נכתבו ההספדים --זורות אור חדש על הקהילות היהודיות של דרום צרפת תחת האימפריה הרומית, שידיעותינו עליהן כמעט אפסיות. בהרצאה ארכז את העדויות החדשות והישנות, ובשילוב עם מקורות כתובים, בעיקר כנסייתיים, אעמוד על מקורותיה של הקהילה, עיסוקיה, יחסיה עם האוכלוסייה המקומית ואבדוק אם ממנה צמחה הקהילה היהודית המפוארת של ימי הביניים באזור.

**The “Arlesienne: On the Sarcophagus of Pompeia the Jewess and on Jewish Presence in Southern France under the Roman Empire**

Rachel Feig Vishnia

Tel-Aviv University

Some two years ago a double sarcophagus with two skeletons was excavated in Arles. It bears the inscription *Pompeiae Iudeae et* *Cossutius Eutycles*. This is an exciting find since it consists the first solid proof of Jewish presence in Arles in the third century CE. Other items such as tiny weights engraved with the “Menorah” that were brought up from the Rhone , and epitaphs from towns in the Maritime Alps that include what could very possibly be Jewish names – shed a new light on the Jews in southern France under the Empire – a community about which, nothing is practically known. Based on archaeological finds and written sources (mainly patristic), I will attempt to shed light on the community’s possible origins, its occupations, its relations with the local populations, and to examine whether it was the source of the thriving Jewish medieval community of Southern France.

**Session VI**

Keynote Address:

**In the Beginning: stories of origins in Greek culture**

Richard Hunter

Regius Professor of Greek, University of Cambridge

**Closing Session**

**Looking at Creation Myths from Greek and Near Eastern Perspective:**

Sam Newington

School of Classics, University of St Andrews

As a point of departure, this paper will focus on Hesiod’s *Theogony* within the context of a creation myth. In establishing the narrative concerns of this 8th century BCE text a comparative analysis will be given to Near Eastern narratives and select biblical texts (such as 1Enoch), and in doing so, (re)open the debate to what extent there exists a synthesis between East and West literary forms. In order to detail such a synthesis central to the paper’s argument will be methodological approaches. With recent and extended interest by modern scholars in the transmission of Near Eastern and Greek literature, it is important that assumptions are not made between the identified literary nuances; instead firm focus needs to be given to the literary and cultural framework to which these creation myths emerged.

**Recalling Remus: Propertius, civil strife and Rome’s maculate mythic history**

Johan Steenkamp

University of North West, South Africa

The paper proposes that Propertius used the myth of Remus and Romulus through his poetic career for different purposes and that his use of the myth reflects a changing attitude towards the myth of the founding of the city and its authoritative in the *Aeneid*.

The myth of Remus and Romulus, the legendary founders of Rome, received attention in Augustan poetry before Vergil, after Actium, started to redesign the mythic history of the city and use it in the interest of peace and reconciliation. However, earlier, in the Propertian corpus, before the politically correct reading of the myth became unofficially sanctioned by the *Aeneid*, the myth was used in a different way. Propertius refers to Remus by name five times and to his brother four times. Until recently commentaries on Propertius have assumed that for metrical reasons “Remus” was used as an equivalent for Romulus. This assumption is evidently false. Neither can Propertius’ use of the myth, especially before the *Aeneid*, be judged according to how Vergil employed it. Propertius, unlike his contemporaries, personally suffered the horrors of the civil war and in his first book he singles out the siege of Perusia, where his family lived. In his earlier books the myth of Remus and Romulus and the sibling strife it represents are not used to promote reconciliation or peace, but rather form part of a network of mythical allusions designed to deplore the horrors of the civil war and the excesses of those who waged it. In Propertius’ last book, written after Vergil’s death, his use of the myth is more in line with that of the *Aeneid*, yet not completely devoid of cynicism.

**Alexander's friends in the *Alexander Romance***

Corinne Jouanno

Professor of ancient Greek literature at the university of Caen

In ancient Greek and Latin texts dealing with Alexander the Great (historical, biographical, and anecdotal tradition) an important place is given to the question of the king's relationship with his "friends", either to enhance his generosity, confidence, fidelity towards them, and his high estimation of friendship proper (motif of the "treasure of friends"), or to denounce his cruelty against close companions such as Clitus (motif of the friends' murder, much worked out by Alexander's detractors). Several reasons contribute to the interest of ancient writers to the thematic of friendship : an institutional one (role of the *hetairoi* in the Macedonian monarchy) ; a mythical one (influence of the epic motif of heroic friendship, and of the exemplary pair formed by Achilles and Patroclus in the *Iliad*) ; a social reason (importance of friendship in the moral values of Antiquity, well reflected in the theoretical thought of philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch or, in the Latin field, Cicero – and particularly in their political thought, with a special emphasis put upon the distinction between friends and flatterers, and the aptitude for frienship as a dividing line between king and tyrant). The focus of my paper will be to explore the recycling of the friendship motif in the *Alexander Romance*, a largely fictional biography of the Macedonian conqueror, presented in a rather encomiastic way. I shall examine the dealing of the motif in the successive rewritings of the *Romance*, with a special emphasis upon the original *alpha* recension (3rd c. AD ?) and the christianized *epsilon* recension (8th-9th c.) : in the *alpha* recension, the investigation will focus upon the choices made by the redactor among the material inherited from the historical tradition (censorship, amplification...) ; in the *epsilon* recension, which offers a great number of innovating elements (new characters and episodes), the influence of Christian, and Byzantine views about friendship will be questioned, and the *epsilon* material compared with the relevant chapters of contemporary mirrors of princes.