

SVENSKA INSTITUTEN I ATHEN OCH ROM
INSTITUTUM ATHENIENSE ATQUE INSTITUTUM ROMANUM REGNI SUECIAE

Opuscula

Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome

15
2022

STOCKHOLM

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Prof. Henrik Gerding, Lund, Chairman
Dr Lena Sjögren, Stockholm, Vice-chairman
Mrs Kristina Björkstén Jersenius, Stockholm, Treasurer
Dr Susanne Berndt, Stockholm, Secretary
Prof. Denis Searby, Stockholm
Prof. Christer Henriksén, Uppsala
Prof. Sabrina Norlander-Eliasson, Stockholm
Dr Lewis Webb, Gothenburg
Prof. Gunnel Ekroth, Uppsala
Ms Emelie Byström, Uppsala
Dr Ulf R. Hansson, Rome
Dr Jenny Wallensten, Athens

EDITOR

Dr Julia Habetzeder

SECRETARY'S & EDITOR'S ADDRESS

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies
Stockholm University
106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
secretary@ecsi.se | editor@ecsi.se

DISTRIBUTOR

Eddy.se AB
Box 1310
621 24 Visby, Sweden

For general information, see <http://ecsi.se>
For subscriptions, prices and delivery, see <http://ecsi.bokorder.se>
Published with the aid of a grant from The Swedish Research Council (2020-01217)
The English text was revised by Rebecca Montague, Hindon, Salisbury, UK

Opuscula is a peer reviewed journal. Contributions to *Opuscula* should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee before 1 November every year. Contributors are requested to include an abstract summarizing the main points and principal conclusions of their article. For style of references to be adopted, see <http://ecsi.se>. Books for review should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee.

ISSN 2000-0898

ISBN 978-91-977799-4-4

© Svenska Institutet i Athen and Svenska Institutet i Rom

Printed by PrintBest (Viljandi, Estonia) via Italgraf Media AB (Stockholm, Sweden) 2022

Cover illustrations from Peter M. Fischer & Teresa Bürge in this volume, p. 48

Cicero lists different categories of jokes, and explains how they work through ample examples. The categorization is clear and to the point. A few examples:

(*De Oratore*, book 2, 281): “*Ridentur etiam discrepantia: ;Quid huic abest—nisi res et virtus?*”

“Inconsistencies also get laughs. ‘That guy has it all—except money and redeeming qualities.’”

(Book 2, 284): “*Bellum etiam est, quom quid cuique sit consentaneum dicitur; ut quom Scaurus nonnullam haberet invidiam ex eo quod Phrygionis Pompei locupletis hominis bona sine testamento possederat, sederetque advocatus reo Bestiae, quom funus quoddam duceretur, accusator C. Memmius, ‘Vide (inquit), Scaure! Mortuus rapitur, si potes esse possessor.’*”

“Also cute is when you point out someone’s quirks. For example, people really envied Scaurus because he’d wound up in possession of a wealthy guy’s property, and there hadn’t been a will. When he came to a trial in an unrelated case, a funeral parade came passing by. As it did, the prosecutor, Memmius, quipped, ‘Check it out, Scaurus—a dead man’s being hustled off! Go see if you can get possession!’”

Fontaine aims at making his translations reflect the wit and pun intended as far as possible. He also includes a different and non-traditional punctuation in rendering the Latin text, including Spanish punctuation with question and exclamation marks both at the start and ending of a question, and diacritical marks—a tradition in later, Renaissance manuscripts, also included in the Early Modern editions that Fontaine primarily has seen them in. On the one hand this is laudable since this type of diacritical mark does make the reading easier, which was exactly why the Renaissance Latin copyists made use of them, even though the use was not consistent. On the other hand, however, earlier Carolingian manuscripts did not include diacritical marks, and certainly not the contemporary manuscripts in antiquity; thus, the use only reflects later manuscript traditions (and the first editions in Early Modern times). In that way, it is an anachronism, especially since it is all mixed with the more modern Spanish punctuation. It would have been good, even though this series is more “popular science”, to include more information about this in the introduction; this type of mix is unorthodox.

Quintilian was born 80 years after Cicero’s death. His treatise was written in his role as the first chair of Latin rhetoric in Rome. Everything that Cicero wrote, including the collections of jokes that are not available to us today, was known to him. It is interesting to see in Quintilian’s mentioning of Cicero how he was regarded—also concerning the question about

the use of wit and humour. In the beginning of the section on humour in Quintilian’s treatise, he says: “I wish his (i.e. Cicero’s) freedman Tiro (or whoever it was that published his three books on the topic) had been stingier about the number of quips and used a little more judgment in selecting than enthusiasm for collecting them! Then Cicero would’ve been less of a target for his critics, who will, as with every other area he was good at, nevertheless even now more easily find something to reject than to add in.” Most of what Quintilian has to say is filtered through Cicero’s previous work. Quintilian adds another layer: since his presentation is a treatise, there is more discussion on a metalevel compared with Cicero’s work. Still, both Cicero and Quintilian allow the readers to judge for themselves on the character and effectiveness of different jokes and puns exemplified, by giving ample examples of different types. Quintilian categorizes even more than Cicero, and also towards the end lists the type of jokes that are related to rhetorical figures, also adding what he considers to be the funniest wisecracks of them all—the ones fooling expectations or misunderstanding words.

Even though much of what Cicero said and wrote on humour is lost to us, we do get a good picture of different aspects in the parts of *De Oratore* included in the book under review, and even more filtered through Quintilian, who has also a lot of his own experience to add to the discussion. It is a pity that the book is not titled correctly as being an ancient guide to the art of humour through the lenses of *both* Cicero and Quintilian. Leaving that aside, this is indeed a nice book to have in the library. The translations are skillfully made and the reader is provided with many perspectives on the art of humour—which is indeed independent of time or genre.

ELISABET GÖRANSSON

Department of Languages and Literature
& Department of Theology and Religious Studies
Lund University
LUX, Helgonavägen 3, 223 62 Lund, Sweden
elisabet.goransson@ctr.lu.se

G. Cifani, *The origins of the Roman economy. From the Iron Age to the Early Republic in a Mediterranean perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2021. 450 pp., 68 ills. ISBN 9781108478953 (hardcover), 9781108781534 (ebook)
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108781534>

<https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-15-09>

This is an interesting book that successfully combines both archaeological and historical source material. It also presents an overview of the latest archaeological field research in central Italy, concentrating on Rome and Latium Vetus. Studies

of early Roman history concentrating purely on economy are few, so this book fills a niche. Even in general readers in Roman history, such as Tim Cornell's 1995 *The beginnings of Rome*, economy is mentioned sparingly, concentrating on agriculture, debt, and the consequences of conquest. Kevin Greene's 1986 *The archaeology of the Roman economy* takes a more thematic approach, but Early Rome *per se* is not mentioned. However, Guy Bradley's 2020 *Early Rome to 290 BC* has a whole chapter devoted to economy and society that emphasizes manufacture and trade in Rome's economy alongside agriculture from the 6th century BC. Since Gabriele Cifani's book is more archaeological than historical, the emphasis is on archaeological evidence, agriculture, and trade.

This book is openly Rome-centred and presents in 18 mainly chronologically arranged chapters an account of early Roman economy from the Iron Age to the 4th century BC. The book starts with a chapter on the geographical context of the city and another on the background in the Bronze Age, taking a long-term perspective. Then follow five chapters arranged by archaeological period (Early Iron Age or Latial phases II and III, Latial phases IV, IVA, IVB, and the Archaic phase). In each of these five chapters, the author presents the funerary patterns, local production and importation and extra-regional importation. Thus, Cifani joins Bradley in emphasizing the importance of production and trade in Rome's early economy. These chapters are followed by four more thematic ones on modelling demography and consumption, economic institutions, the early calendar, and the early Latins overseas. After these broader chapters, the remaining ones resume the chronological order, covering the 5th and 4th centuries BC and their developments. Overall, the main focus stays predominantly on Rome. Nevertheless, it covers the place of Rome in the Mediterranean networks, really making its mark when discussing the implications of the treaties between Rome and Carthage in the latter part of the book.

The main argument of the book is that everything less than 200 km from Rome is local to Rome and I find this problematic, since the claim is used as a way to impose Roman hegemony over central Italy also during the early periods, when this is inaccurate—or at least arguable. It is unlikely the Romans themselves conceptualized their territory in this way, considering the city's *pomerium*, the sacred boundary, did not include even the Aventine Hill. Cifani dates the hegemony to the Early Iron Age and counts neighbouring cities, such as Ficana and Crustumium, as frontier settlements guarding Rome's boundaries. This view is controversial and, for example, Crustumium had material culture that had some unique qualities and showed its independent identity.

This book has a strong interpretative narrative and the book tells the story of a Great Rome as opposed to the Great Rome under the Etruscans as it has sometimes been presented. The book presents a city subject to no one and the most

powerful from its beginnings. The strong narrative is slightly problematic considering that the book seems to be intended to be a reader, aimed at undergraduate students and the general public. However, it leaves critical and opposing opinions unmentioned or considers them reductionist in describing early Rome as a small village and being like the other centres in central Italy. Due to his dating of the hegemony over the neighbouring centres, Cifani does not discuss the expansion of Rome where it is normally discussed in relation to the 6th century BC (e.g., as Bradley does). Thus, the disappearance of both Crustumium and Ficana are not discussed at this point. This is a pity, since these disappearances have many economic and demographic consequences.

The overwhelming majority of research on central Italy has concentrated on Rome and how its eminence was primary. Rome's position along the Tiber gave it an upper hand in relation to those centres further upstream, but it may not have had the early hegemony over the large Etruscan cities, such as Veii, Caere, Tarquinia and Vulci, as the author seems to imply. In this book the standing of the large Etruscan coastal city-states is hinted at, when presenting the iron processing on Elba and other economic processes before the Orientalizing period, but everything is measured with distances from Rome and the likely controller of the metal-rich Tolfa Mountains is not stated clearly.

When looking at the hierarchy of the centres in central Italy, the geographical area of the settlement area is used by researchers commonly as a proxy for relative importance during the prehistoric and protohistoric periods. Since the hegemony is related to the size, the estimates used matter. For example, Cifani uses the area of seven hectares for the Final Bronze Age settlement of Rome that is still smaller than for example the estimated settlement area at what became Vulci (*c.* 27 ha.) or Narce (*c.* 30 ha.) in the Faliscan area. Whilst recent research has revealed new find-spots, Rome was still relatively average on a regional scale. More moderate estimates suggest that Early Iron Age Rome could have been *c.* 74 ha. large, smaller than all main Etruscan coastal cities (Veii, Caere, Tarquinia and Vulci) and smaller than Fidenae (*c.* 117 ha.) and Gabii (*c.* 81 ha.), but larger than Crustumium (*c.* 58 ha.). Luca Alessandri, to whom Cifani refers when suggesting that the unified Iron Age Rome was 150 ha. large, actually placed estimates between 67 and 150 ha. (Alessandri, *Latium Vetus in the Bronze Age and Early Iron Age*, 2013). Thus, Cifani has chosen the largest possible extent at the earliest possible date. At that size Rome was still smaller than Veii and Caere. However, during the Orientalizing period the city reached over 350 ha. and became truly the largest centre in central Italy. That said, the proper comparison with the Etruscan cities is lacking and many maps only represent the distribution in Latium Vetus, which enhances Rome's position in extra-regional discussions.

The most productive and innovative parts of the book are the discussions of the Mediterranean context. Cifani uses pot-

tery as a proxy for the trade contacts with Greek centres, and even if this is sometimes taken as evidence for considering “pots as people”, the discussion here is measured. However, apart from Carthage the other trade partners do not receive much discussion and Greek colonies get less discussion than they should. There is no map of the location of the nearest Greek colonies or Etruscan expansion in Campania. Early literacy is discussed as being of importance, but what is not emphasized is that the first writing in Rome may not have been Latin but Faliscan. Another point left unmentioned is how Osteria dell’Osa at Gabii was the find-spot of the two oldest inscriptions in the area. These kinds of omissions lessen the value of this important study.

At the beginning of the book Cifani lists some of the most important scholars writing about the Early Roman economy. However, he fails to mention Francesca Fulminante, who in her treatise on Early Rome presented a demographic and agricultural model of production and a discussion on the extent of Rome in Archaic times that provide the core piece of evidence for Cifani’s discussion on the matter. Similarly referred to in the end notes but also left without mention in the text are Gilda Bartoloni on public building works in early Rome and Saskia Roselaar on her study on *ager publicus*. These scholars deserved a mention alongside Anna-Maria Bietti Sestieri and the numerous male scholars.

The book is well-written and fluent. However, some concepts could be rephrased: “cinerary tombs” are usually called cremations and “depurated pottery” fine wares. Even if the book is apparently meant as a general reader it in places reads like a more specialist study. This is especially clear when the so-called regal period is discussed. Even if the text uses the reigns of the kings as a dating measure, the approximate traditional dates are not presented anywhere in the book. A clear chronological table at the beginning of the book would have been appreciated. The illustrations are relatively numerous and well chosen. The text is followed by many appendices; these cover 80 pages of the book and present material from Latium Vetus. These are of great value and will be reused by other scholars.

All in all, this book is a success for those who believe in a larger early Rome. For those who think that Rome was still one among the many Final Bronze Age and Early Iron Age villages, it is slightly flawed and biased. Nonetheless, Cifani like Bradley emphasizes the importance of manufacture and trade from early on as an integral part of Roman economy, not just the agricultural base. This expands the discussion from Moses I. Finley’s traditional Roman landed economy. The book also works as an easily approachable reader on the latest archaeological finds from Rome.

ULLA RAJALA

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies
Stockholm University
106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
ulla.rajala@antiken.su.se | rajalauam@gmail.com

C. Prescott, A. Karivieri, P. Campbell, K. Göransson & S. Tusa, eds., *Trinacria. ‘An island outside time’. International archaeology in Sicily*, Oxford: Oxbow Books 2021, 192 pp., 16 pls. ISBN 9781789255911

<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv24q4z4h>

<https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-15-10>

The archaeology of ancient Sicily began on a grand scale after the Second World War. In 1948, the superintendent at Syracuse, Luigi Bernabò Brea invited the École française de Rome to excavate the site of Megara Hyblaia. His aim with this invitation was that the area of the ancient city should thus be protected from the expansion of oil refineries along the eastern coastline of Sicily. The excavations at Megara Hyblaia became a great success, and today every book discussing the subject of early Greek colonization contains an analysis of the Archaic city plan of Megara Hyblaia. Fortunately for the study of the later history of Greek cities, in 1955 Princeton University initiated excavations on a long mountain ridge called Serra Orlando, which clearly housed the ruins of a large city. The research of Kenan Erim suggested that the unknown city on the ridge was Morgantina. Erim noted the discovery at the site of a large number of coins with the legend *HISPANORUM* and this he connected with Livy’s notation that the city of Morgantina was given by the Romans to Spanish mercenaries. Erim’s theory was confirmed by the later discovery of coins with the legend *Morgantinon*. In connection with the renewed archaeological activity in Sicily, in 1955 Palermo University began the publication of the journal *Kokalos*, which became the main forum for the presentation of new archaeological projects on the island.

The volume under review is the publication of a conference with the title *Archaeology in Sicily. International collaborative missions*, which was co-organized in April 2019, by the Swedish, Norwegian and Finnish Institutes in Rome together with the British School at Rome. The Sicilian part was represented by Professor Sebastiano Tusa, then Assessore regionale ai Beni Culturali e dell’Identità Siciliana. Tusa is a well-known Sicilian archaeological researcher who, together with his father Vincenzo Tusa, had published extensively on Sicilian prehistory. The untimely death of Sebastiano on 10 March, just a month before the start of the conference, turned the conference into a memorial event for this very much appreciated scholar. Thus the volume starts with a description of Tusa’s scientific work by his widow, Valeria Li Vigni Tusa, and another note on Tusa’s career is added by Paola Pelagatti.

The book contains 17 contributions. It is interesting to note that eight of these discuss colonial Greek archaeology. Furthermore, there are two articles with Roman topics, one on Punic Lilybaeum, one on the Iron Age, one on epigraphy, and finally four with a *longue-durée* perspective.