Abstracts

MARTIN DINTER (King's College London)

"Conflict Resolution in Latin Epic"

"Conflict exists when one person has a need of another and that need is not being met."

Latin Epic sings of arms and men and inundates its audience with many a conflict. Whilst battle techniques and manners of dying have elicited ample interest my paper in turn shall focus on how conflicts are resolved or even avoided all together. This seems counterintuitive in a genre that feeds much of its narratological energy from conflict and whose epic code of honor can only work when a sufficient number of fatalities has been achieved. My paper shall map conflict resolution strategies below onto Virgil's *Aeneid* one of the central texts of Roman culture.

There are seven main conflict resolution strategies:

1. **Avoiding**: Someone who uses a strategy of "avoiding" mostly tries to ignore or sidestep the conflict, hoping it will resolve itself or dissipate.
2. **Accommodating**: Using the strategy of "accommodating" to resolve conflict essentially involves taking steps to satisfy the other party's concerns or demands at the expense of your own needs or desires.
3. **Compromising**: The strategy of "compromising" involves finding an acceptable resolution that will partly, but not entirely, satisfy the concerns of all parties involved.
4. **Competing**: Someone who uses the conflict resolution strategy of "competing" tries to satisfy their own desires at the expense of the other parties involved.
5. **Collaborating**: Using "collaborating" involves finding a solution that entirely satisfies the concerns of all involved parties.
6. **Appealing:** One party imploring/ asking the other to meet their needs and end the conflict
7. **Commanding:** One party which is of a higher rank/status orders the other to do what they have asked and the lower status party complies.

By applying the framework above to the *Aeneid* I intend to establish what norms for conflict resolution the Aeneid aims to project and shall tease out instances in which categories overlap or in which conflict resolution remains unsatisfactory. A (very brief) look at Virgil's Epic Successor will showcase epic's response to the model set by Virgil.

AMIT SHILO (UC Santa Barbara)

"Over-Reconciliation as Political Program in the *Eumenides*"

A reaction to stasis—individual, state, and divine—is the focus of the Oresteia's ending. Much has been written about the positive transformations in the Eumenides, from acquitting Orestes of murder to restoring corrupted rituals, from reconciling the Erinyes to creating a new law for Athens (Sommerstein 2010). *Peitho, timē,* Athena as mediator, and a change of heart in the Erinyes are commonly discussed. Many aspects of personal and political reconciliation have also been questioned, focusing on their exclusions (Zeitlin 1996, Goldhill 1984) and violence (Cohen 1986). Yet the harmony of human and divine in newly blessed Athens is generally seen

as positive in political analyses of the Oresteia, since it ostensibly supports strengthening democracy after a series of historical crises (Meier 1993).

The actual extremes to which the Eumenides takes political reconciliation have received far too little attention. In this talk I argue that the Oresteia contributes an ideal of total unanimity to early Athenian political thought. Athena and the Erinyes explicitly call for the Athenians to "love with one mind … hate with one heart" (*koinophilei dianoia… stugein mia phreni*, 985-6) as the cure for stasis. They focus this harmony on military expansion, divinely blessed and eternal (903, 913-5, 996). It is crucial to probe the warping effects of such unanimity on both the democratic city and its justifications for violence. How does total same-mindedness without internal conflict relate to Athenian democratic ideals and practices? What does this over-reconciliation tell us about the limit points of reactions to political conflict?

HEIKO WESTPHAL (University of Fribourg)

"Valerius Maximus on Reconciliation"

In the fourth book of his *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, following an extensive discussion of the virtue of *moderatio* (self-restraint), the Tiberian author Valerius Maximus dedicates an entire chapter to the topic of reconciliation between well-known political antagonists (4.2.*praef.*: *transgrediamur ad egregium humani animi ab odio ad gratiam deflexum*). Interestingly, the historical *exempla* he discusses are taken exclusively from Rome's Republican past, which raises the question of what relevance Valerius' material would actually have had during the early Principate. If the exemplary cases examined by Valerius were meant to serve as moral precedents (and there is evidence that they were), what would his early imperial readership have made of them? Might it be necessary to consider Valerius' discussion of the topic of public reconciliation as a direct comment on the personal rifts caused by Rome's civil wars? Did the historical episodes perhaps even highlight specific aspects of early imperial ideology? Or did Valerius' *exempla* serve a far more pragmatic purpose, for instance by providing a blueprint for the resolution of conflicts among the senatorial élite during the Principate? It is the aim of this paper to read Valerius' material against the backdrop of Tiberian Rome and to examine the significance of his examples of public reconciliation within the political discourse of the late 20s and early 30s CE.

JULIUS GUTHRIE (University of Exeter)

"The Highest of Stakes: Political Networks, Ruling and Reconciliation"

When Dion, son of Hipparinus, arrived in Syracuse in 355/4BC, he sparked off a conflict that was to engulf the entire Greek portion of the island for over a decade. Our sources (primarily Diodorus and Plutarch), however, suggest that it did not need to be this way: Dionysius II, who Dion was trying to remove, offered terms at least once and both men offered to reconcile with the other on an occasion. The terms, however, were never acceptable, and even after both of these men had been driven from power in Syracuse, the war continued between Dion's successors and others. It is to this period that the pseudo-Platonic epistles belong, with *Ep. 8* calling for the compromised reconciliation to solve the dispute. The failure of the two factions to come to terms seems an obvious case of power-politics and rivalry, yet, by placing the moments of potential reconciliation at the centre of the discussion we can explore the conflict in new ways: why could peace never be agreed? Were there other factors at work beyond the rivalry between the two men – there are always unnamed or undervalued backers pulling the

strings. This paper, by concentrating on (non-)reconciliation intends to re-examine the values at work in this conflict, elucidate key players and question the historicity of the peace offers themselves.

SPYRIDON TZOUNAKAS (University of Cyprus):

"Reconciliation Rhetoric in Seneca's *Troades*"

In Seneca's *Troades* the ghost of Achilles demands that Polyxena be sacrificed to him at his tomb as his bride. While his son Pyrrhus asks that this demand be satisfied, Agamemnon disagrees, enters into a quarrel with him and argues for clemency for the defeated Trojans. As I shall try to demonstrate in this paper, in his quarrel with Pyrrhus, Agamemnon employs arguments that point to the rhetoric of reconciliation. In contrast to his established image in the previous literature, now the leader of the Greeks at Troy is presented as a wise person and a dutiful and responsible commander who has learned from the past and focuses on the future. This depiction of the Greek leader will be discussed in conjunction with Seneca's philosophical prose writings (especially *De Clementia*) as well as with other relevant Latin texts, such as the *Aeneid* and the famous *parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* (Verg. *Aen*. 6.853). Finally, a special emphasis will be put on the various implications of the gods' decision that Polyxena must be sacrificed, which seems to undermine the validity of Agamemnon's argumentation. In my view, the defeat of the Greek leader's appeal for clemency should be interpreted in the broader context of the triumph of *nefas* and the *amor mortis* that prevail in Seneca's tragedy and not be regarded as a flawed argumentation.

NOAM RITBO (Tel-Aviv University)

"*Nondum tecum in gratiam redii* (Suet. *Tib*. 61.5): Reconciliation and Compromise in the Tiberian Reign of Terror"

In a famous anecdote written by the biographer Suetonius to emphasize Tiberius' extreme cruelty, the second Roman emperor is said to have been so cruel as to not only inflict death upon multitudes of people, but also prevent it from others wishing to die. The latter were imprisoned and sustained by the smallest rations of food, just enough to keep them alive and suffering. When one such victim begged to be put to death, the emperor famously replied that he had not yet made his peace with him. Unbelievable as this anecdote may be, it begs the question of whether, and on what terms, was reconciliation with this seemingly unforgiving emperor possible.

The ancient authors were eager to present Tiberius as a cruel tyrant. This is especially so in their depiction of his reign in the years following the death of his all-powerful praetorian prefect Sejanus in AD 31. According to our sources, Sejanus' fall was followed by a reign of terror which saw the persecution of many friends and followers of the prefect. Nonetheless, some notable individuals managed to escape the fate of their comrades. Did Tiberius simply forgive the likes of Lentulus Gaetulicus and M. Terentius for their support of Sejanus, or did he rather compromise and come to terms with them? In my paper I wish to argue that despite Tiberius' image as a merciless and vindictive ruler, his ability to compromise was crucial in maintaining the peace throughout his reign, most notably when he reconciled with the most powerful of Sejanus' adherents.

LORENZO VESPOLI (Université de Genève)

"Telamon's Reconciliation with Jason in Ap. Rhod. *Arg*. 1.1286-1344 and the Reading of Valerius Flaccus"

In the first book of Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*, the Argonauts leave Heracles behind on the coast of Mysia and resume their sea voyage to Colchis. Telamon accuses Jason of deliberately abandoning Heracles for fear of being overshadowed (1.1289-1295), but Glaucus appears as *deus ex machina* to reveal that Heracles will not participate in the Argonautic expedition at the behest of Zeus (1.1315-1331). Telamon, repentant for having unjustly slandered Jason, apologises to him (1.1332-1335) and the latter forgives him because he understands that Telamon aimed to help Heracles (1.1337-1344).

As is well known, Apollonius Rhodius' poem is the main model for Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*. The scene of the reconciliation between Telamon and Jason, as described by Apollonius Rhodius, is absent in the third book of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*, where the departure from the coast of Mysia is described (3.598-740): that scene is replaced with the quarrel between Telamon and the other Argonauts, which ends with a different kind of reconciliation (3.613-725).

This article aims to compare the scenes described by Apollonius Rhodius and Valerius Flaccus in order to understand how they present Telamon's reconciliation with his disputants. What are the values on which, in Apollonius' scene, the reconciliation between Telamon and Jason is based? How does Valerius Flaccus describe the conflict between Telamon, Jason, and the other Argonauts? Should we talk about reconciliation or forced appeasement? I will try to answer these and other questions through the analysis of the scenes under examination and through an intertextual interpretation of them.

YUKIKO SAITO (University of Liverpool/Kyoto Seika University)

"Presenting the Development of Reconciliation in *Iliad* 24 through Sight and Touch"

This paper aims to illuminate the aspect of viewing reconciliation in *Iliad* 24 in the course of sensory experience, casting a new light on the use of colour and motion as active mediators. Emotions associated with colour and tactile recognition play a decisive role in harmonising the relationship between two parties. Focusing on examining how Achilleus and Priam interact, I seek to distil a deeper nexus of the reconciliatory tendencies that open their minds toward each other, within which I believe some subtle functions of senses are interwoven. As the climax, intense, emotionally-charged scenes are portrayed successively in which colour-hues are entangled ubiquitously; e.g., λευκός, χρυσός, αἴθων, etc., for parts of gifts; πολιός twice for Priam (516), who grasps Achilleus' knees and even kisses his hands! (477-479); αἶθοψ for the first wine Priam takes after Hektor's death (642). Other gestures such as Achilleus holding Priam's hand and gently pushing him away (508), weeping together (509-512), and marvelling at the sight of each other (629-633) are explored, simultaneously θάμβος is revealed as significant for dispelling discontent. A sense of respect is perceived by viewers, including us. After clarifying how the poet composes his *Iliad* 24, I offer my viewpoint, which hopefully provides fresh suggestions on how to *see* reconciliatory progress, even temporarily. The poet elaborately blends into his description visual and tactile perceptions related to emotive phases, which are vital to advance reconciliation, and shows that the interrelationship between characters' movement, vision, and tactility is of great importance in allaying conflict.

NIALL W. SLATER (Emory University)

"Role-Playing, Reconciliation, and Repetition: Parodies of Peacemaking on the Petronian Ship of State"

The action on board Lichas's ship in Petronius's *Satyrica* presents a rich, repetitive, and multilayered parody of mediation, treaty-making, and the role of emotion in conflict and its aftermath, played out on the most personal level. When Encolpius and Giton are discovered, having accidentally taken passage with Lichas and Tryphaena whom they have egregiously betrayed, the poet Eumolpus seizes the role of mediator and attempts to defend them with an entirely fictitious account of their actions and motivations. His rhetoric only enrages Lichas and produces open warfare on shipboard. Ingenious role-playing by Giton (staging an attempted self-castration) drives Tryphaena to desperate pity and epic parody in appealing for peace, allowing Eumolpus to dictate and conclude a formal treaty among the parties.

Initial performances of the actions and emotions of peacemaking amidst a halcyon calm at sea seem successful, but jealousies quickly reemerge, requiring further efforts by Eumolpus to restore harmony. His poetic efforts during the banquet failing, Eumolpus then narrates the story of the Widow of Ephesus, whose misogynistic comedy elicits laughter from all—except for Lichas and Tryphaena. Crosscurrents of jealousy reemerge, and Eumolpus seems to resort to new diplomacy and oaths (*iurat Eumolpus verbis conceptissimis*, 113) as the text becomes more fragmentary—and the ship is suddenly overwhelmed and wrecked by storm.

Prospects for reconciliation founder with the ship (of state?) and its captain, while the perpetually inventive manipulators of language survive to perform again.

DAVID KONSTAN (New York University)

"The Limits of Reconciliation"

In my talk, I examine the tension between Cyrus and Cyaxares in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, and the ways in which Cyrus succeeds in mollifying the Median king (and his maternal uncle), who is angry because Cyrus has usurped his authority. I argue that, although Cyrus has been charged with deceit in his effort to conciliate Cyaxares, in fact such dissembling is ineliminable where there is a genuine offense to another's honor. I suggest further that the episode is a deliberate rejoinder to the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon, as described in the *Iliad*, and is intended to show how properly to resolve a clash between a king and his more warlike subordinate.

JOHN HALL (University of Otago)

"*Bathutēs* and Personal Reconciliation in Cicero's Letters"

This paper examines the role of *bathutēs* ("self-restraint" or "forbearance") in Cicero's handling of personal disputes and grievances. As he suggests in one letter to Atticus, such forbearance – the deliberate ignoring of another's injurious behaviour – is the appropriate stance to be adopted by those in privileged positions of responsibility (*Att*. 5.10.3). The powerful aristocrat should refrain from getting involved in countless bad-tempered disputes (cf. *Off*. 1.88 on *altitudo animi*).

But there were subtle social complexities involved in adopting this kind of high-minded stance, as Cicero recognized in his troubled dealings with Hortensius Hortalus. The strategic avoidance

of direct confrontation could be interpreted by onlookers as a sign of weakness (see *stulte* at *Att*. 4.6.3). At the same time, a pose of forbearance arguably brought with it a certain *gravitas* – something that Cicero is unwilling to give up when Atticus suggests forging a reconciliation with Hortensius in a more energetic manner (*Att*. 4.6.3).

The final part of this paper attempts to reconstruct a detailed example of *bathutēs* in action. In a letter to Atticus, Cicero reports details of a recent conversation that he has had with his estranged nephew Quintus (*Att*. 13.42). As we shall see, the orator's skill in avoiding an emotionally charged confrontation helps to create at least the chance of a reconciliation.

YELENA BARAZ (Princeton University)

"Breaking up is hard to do: *amicitia* after Caesar"

This paper will look at texts in Cicero's corpus from the period following Caesar's assassination and examine how the contemporary discourse around *amicitia* was shaped by the fact that many of the assassins were Caesar's *amici* and that many other relationships were strained as a result of this event. I will focus especially on reasons given to justify breaking such a relationship and strategies tried and proposed for reconciliation.

FRANCESCA CAU (Università di Trento)

"Plutarch and Reconciliation: A Study in the Origins of the Civil War between Caesar and Pompey"

'μισῶ τὸν δεῖνα καὶ βούλομαι ποιῆσαι κακῶς, ἀλλὰ πατρίδ' ἐμὴν μᾶλλον φιλῶ' (*Mor*. 809D)	"*I hate this man, and desire to do him a diskindness,* *but the love of my country has greater power over me*" (transl. Goodwin)

In recent studies, *reconciliation* has been mainly considered as a mechanism enacted by two countries or groups following a conflict. However, if we take the term in its broader sense, *reconciliation* can also be a means for avoiding fights, and individuals play a key-role in it.

As regards Roman History, Plutarch offers a large pool to analyse the phenomenon from this perspective: in line with his biographical approach, he conceives late-republican politics as relationships between leading figures, which can be built as easily as they can be destroyed. Therefore, Plutarch's *Lives* display a wide range of reconciliation (διαλλᾰγή, διάλῡσις) instances, which differ from each other in motifs, purposes, methods, and outcomes.

This paper intends to examine some case-studies, aiming to highlight their connection with the outbreak of civil war in 49 BC. The emerging picture is quite complex: Plutarch ascribes to reconciliation a crucial role in preserving peace – thinking that a statesman should reconcile with his enemies for the sake of his country –, although some friendships ultimately prove to be dangerous for the republic.

An attempt will be made to answer these questions: when is reconciliation good and when is it bad for the State? Why do some of these rapprochements fail and others succeed? How far is Plutarch following his sources and how much is he expressing his own opinion? Is his narrative reliable or is it mainly the result of 'fictionalization'? Most importantly, which lesson do these reconciliations offer to Plutarch's contemporaries?

XIYUAN MENG (University of Oxford)

"Praising Caesar for *clementia*: Persuasion and (self-) reconciliation in Cicero's *Pro Marcello*"

Cicero's panegyrical speech *Pro Marcello* constitutes a *gratiarum actio* for Caesar's marvellous pardon for M. Claudius Marcellus, who was previously on the Pompeian side in the Civil War and took his voluntary exile from Rome after the battle of Pharsalus. Having vouched safe for Marcellus' return and having decided his restoration, Caesar is praised for his *clementia* in Cicero's oration, a core moral concept that contributes to this reconciliation between Caesar and Marcellus.

Pardon and *clementia*, a pair of notions which are closely related to each other, testify and rely on the hierarchy of power, as well as autocratic power in the Roman world. (see Morton Bruand 2012). Two layers of reconciliation, in this sense, can be attested in Cicero's *Pro Marcello* and its emphasis on Caesar's *clementia*: one is Caesar's pardon; the other is subtler, and gives rise to the question of self-reconciliation under the changing political climate. This paper takes a historical perspective to Cicero's speech and examines the role which *clementia* plays in Cicero's speech. On the one hand, how does Cicero claim his sincerity and deliver his persuasion where there is limited room for free speech? On the other hand, how does Cicero (uncomfortably) justify the emergence of autocracy at his own times in his own speech? Answer to these questions will shed on how *clementia* bridges these two layers of reconciliation in Cicero's speech and how it interrogates the new political changes in its contemporary times.

GABRIEL EVANGELOU (University of Cyprus)

"Pompey and the Significance of his Role as a Mediator in the Reconciliation Process"

Throughout his career, Cicero reconciled with several men from his private and public life. In some cases, he desired to reconcile with persons who, according to his claims, had abandoned him, offered him pernicious counsel, or caused him grave harm. In other instances, he did not desire to reconcile with certain men either because of his low opinion of them and of their treatment of him, or because of his very public quarrel with them or with members of their family. Having fully realised that his political career was closely intertwined with Pompey's and that, if he desired to exert influence in politics uninterrupted, he would have to respect Pompey's wishes, upon his return from exile in 57 he finally appears to have been ready to compromise his morals. After the conference at Luca, Pompey put considerable pressure on him to reconcile with several men, despite Cicero's fear of accusations of *inconstantia*.

This paper investigates Pompey's involvement in Cicero's reconciliation with Crassus and Appius Claudius, in order to shed light on the role that many prominent men -such as Pompey and Caesar- assumed in an effort to strengthen their alliances. Through an examination of Cicero's letter to Lentulus Spinther and of his letter(s) to Crassus and Appius Claudius, it aims to demonstrate how the language that he uses and the statements that he makes to his former enemies about them and -in Appius' case- about Pompey suggest that they were shaped by Pompey's expectations of him. Thus, he had to convince Pompey, who was closely monitoring their interactions, that he had done everything in his power not only to restore his *amicitia* with them in the public, but also to maintain a cordial relationship with them throughout the years.

SABIRA HAJDAREVIĆ (University of Zadar)

"Reconciliation Attempts in Aristaenetus' *Erotic Letters*"

Even though scholars are yet to agree on the authorship of the epistolary collection Erotic Letters, it is usually ascribed to Aristaenetus and was probably written in 5th or 6th ct. AD.

The letters of the Collection depict mostly extramarital affairs (with *hetairai*, slaves or married women), often accompanied by conflicts fuelled by (sometimes justified) jealousy or either partner's lack of interest due to better offers: e.g. a *hetaira* lands a richer client, a client is seduced by a younger or better-looking girl etc. Therefore, most reconciliation efforts in the Letters are in fact lovers' attempts to either get back together and improve their relationship or to end it, in a civilised manner or otherwise.

The focus of my research is the analysis of the protagonists' reconciliation strategies (verbal persuasion, letter-writing, the use of male or female mediators etc.) and their effectiveness. The final goal is to point out the most common reconciliation methods employed, to investigate whether or not men and women use similar methods, to check which gender is more likely to choose indirect reconciliation methods, such as the use of mediators or writing and sending letters, to examine which gender is generally more successful at reconciliation (and to explain why is that so), to estimate the success rate of all reconciliation attempts in the Collection, and to assess the effect of their success/failure on the overall atmosphere of the Collection (optimistic/pessimistic).

MANOLIS SPANAKIS (University of Crete)

"Servius' Exegesis of *(Re)concilio* in Virgil's *Aeneid*"

In the fourth century CE., Servius wrote his scholia on Virgil that were structured upon the expanded philology of Virgilian criticism and express the subtleties of Servius' own times, while his etymological and linguistic comments upon Virgil were based on historical or mythological sources. Within this context, I propose Servius' exegetical approach of reconciliation as an aspect of ancient literary criticism on Virgil; more specifically, I intend to show how reconciliation is structured upon Servius' *explanatio* of narrative, time, and characterization in the *Aeneid* with blurred mythical and historical intertexts.

Let me briefly present my argumentation; first, I shall present Servius as a pagan grammarian of Symmachus' circle and the Christian audience of his commentary. Students in late antiquity had to reconcile their readings of Virgil and this is achieved within the allegorical use of pagan gods and Roman cults (note the past tense in many comments of Servius e.g. *ad Aen*. 8.641 or the allegorical phrase *ex Romano ritu*). Second, I will present the famous reconciliation of Juno and Jupiter in the twelfth Book, which, according to Servius, is not an eternal, but a permanent peace; Servius recalls the authority of Ennius' *Annales* and the leading role of Juno at the side of Carthago against Rome (cf. *ad Aen*. 12.841). Third, I will present Servius' treatment of what Parry (1963, 110) calls "a reconciliation of local Italian people and the civilized Trojans that came to found the new Troy. For example, Servius comments upon the origins of Roman identity arguing about reconciliation among Latium and the Latini with Aeneas (cf. Serv. ad Aen. 1.6.27-8 *volens sibi favorem Latii conciliare nomen Latinum … Troianis inposuit*). In conclusion, we may observe that reconciliation is constantly present in the commentary as a means to unify the past with the present within the context of culture (pagan and Christian), history and myth, divine and mortal realm.

FEDERICA IURESCIA (University of Zurich/Catholic University of the Sacred Heart)

"Faked Reconciliations in Roman Tragedy"

The paper proposed intends to analyse reconciliation in Roman dramatic dialogues from a specific angle, that is its fake.

More precisely, the focus will be on cases where one party actively promotes the reconciliation, and strives for persuading the other to hail the rupture in their relationship. Yet, the party more actively engaged in the reconciliation has no genuine intentions to fulfil this aim. In taking faked reconciliations as a case study, I am relying on the general assumption that a deception only works if the would-be deceiver acts according to the patterns typical of the behaviour he or she pretends to enact. Thus, studying successfully faked reconciliations can help to track the essential features of reconciliation.

In order to study how reconciliation is practiced in dialogue, I will make us of insights from several theoretical realms: Common Ground theories (Clark 1996), Conversational Analysis (e. g. Schegloff 2007), im/politeness theories (Brown, Levinson 1987 [1978], Watts 2003, Culpeper 2011). I will apply the analytical tools provided by these frameworks, which all share a focus on different aspects of pragmalinguistics, to the ancient texts, with the final goal of grasping how Roman tragic dialogues represented reconciliations.

Interpersonal reconciliation has not been investigated so much in the ancient world, with some exception (e. g. Konstan 2012); taking Roman tragedies (ten works from the 1st CE) as a corpus, the paper proposed intends to contribute to the discussion on the topic which the conference 'The Art of Reconciliation in Classical Antiquity' aims to foster.

LUCA GRILLO (University of Notre Dame)

"Depictions of Caesar's Strategies of Reconciliation"

I plan to look at Caesar's (self-serving) depictions of his attempts at reconciliation with the Gauls in the Bellum Gallicum and with fellow citizens in the Bellum Civile; then I will compare these depictions and place them against a. Cicero's theory of the bellum iustum; b. Cicero's praise of Caesar's clemency in the Caesarian speeches; and c. other contemporaries' perceptions. I will argue that Caesar maintains a consistent interest in projecting a reconciliatory persona, but that the specifics of this projection vary, sometime in predictable and sometime in unpredictable ways.

GIUSEPPE LENTINI (Sapienza - Università di Roma)

"The Logic of Reconciliation in the Arbitration Scene on the Shield of Achilles (Hom. *Il.* 18.497-508): The *polis* between Competition and Cooperation"

The theme of reconciliation is fundamental in the plot of the *Iliad* (cf. the Embassy in book 9 and the Reconciliation in book 19); but it is also at the heart of the famous and controversial arbitration scene on Achilles' shield in *Iliad* 18, where a quarrel between two men in a civic space is depicted. By simply naming the speech acts performed by the two litigants (a proud offer of compensation by the first man; a resolute refusal by the second one), the poet highlights the emotions at play and the communicative logic of the conflict (Lentini 2020). The

description of the two opposing groups of supporters shows that the community runs the risk of a *stasis* (civil war); the two litigants, however, strive to reach an agreement with the help of an arbiter. The reconciliation of the two men needs to take place through mediation (Cozzo 2014), according to a logic that can be observed also in the narratives about archaic lawgivers, like, for example, Solon of Athens (Lentini 2016). The specific procedure to achieve this reconciliation is remarkable in its own right: the Elders take part in a competition in justice, by pronouncing verdicts in turn, until the 'straightest' judgement is found. In the Elders' procedure (something very similar to a contest among rhapsodes, the very performers of epic poems like the *Iliad*!), competition is, then, at the service of cooperation: this is a necessary move if the *polis* really wants 'to go on together'.

SUSAN O. SHAPIRO (Utah State University)

"The Seven Sages of Archaic Greece as Reconcilers"

The Seven Sages of archaic Greece were famous for their proverbs (such as "know thyself" and "nothing in excess") and their practical wisdom. According to legend, they were the wisest men of their day. But the Seven Sages were also historical figures who were prominent personalities during the sixth century BC. The most frequently cited list includes: Solon of Athens, Chilon of Sparta, Periander of Corinth, Thales of Miletus, Bias of Priene, Cleobulus of Lindus, and Pittacus of Mytilene.

When the Seven Sages are seen as historical figures, it is noteworthy that four of them — and possibly five — were chosen as arbitrators or mediators to reconcile two hostile parties. Solon, Pittacus, and possibly Chilon reconciled opposing factions within their poleis, thus settling or preventing civil war (stasis), at least temporarily. Bias represented Priene in negotiations with Samos that ended a war between the two poleis, and Periander was chosen by Athens and Mytilene to settle a long-running dispute over the territory of Sigeum.

In this paper I will first explain how each of the five sages acted as a reconciler, and point out the common patterns to their activities. I will argue that the reconciliations that these men achieved (even when they did not last) likely contributed to their being included on the list of the seven wisest men. Finally, I will demonstrate that these reconciliations can give us greater insight into the political conditions of the late archaic period.

CAMILLA TOSI (Università di Bologna)

"*Sibi sua habeant regna reges* (*Curc*. 108): The Relationship with Foreigners in Plautus' Comedies"

The historical focus is on the conservative political dimension and the Roman society between 3rd and 2nd cent. BC. The key role enacted by Roman law appears inevitably influenced by the Eastern world, in particular the Greek one.

Plautine's comedies are an example of the political literature of that republican era characterised by conflicts and clashes with foreign realities. Although there are elements of comic fiction, it is also presumable that there are historical references to real people, places and events.

In particular, it is through Roman law that we can understand the difference in mentality and sensitivity between the Roman public and the playwright's foreign characters.

The conflict, which often originates from a different perception, is resolved through reference figures such as judges and magistrates, who operate both through Roman law and through exceptions aimed at sensitising the enemy, rendering him to the Roman mentality.

This historical research provides new cognitive elements capable to promote additional investigations into the history of Roman law. Starting from the historicization of the juridical institutes, the purpose is to accurately establish the relation between the *ius Romanum* and traditions of the populations in conflict with Rome between the third and second centuries BC.

GIACINTO FALCO (Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici "B. Croce")

"Public arbitrators as mediators: a case study from classical Athens"

Greek *poleis* had several institutional 'devices' aimed at reducing enmity among fellow citizens so as to safeguard concord in the civic body. Included in these were private and public arbitration, which provided citizens with an opportunity to reconcile before bringing their cases into a courtroom. During the Hellenistic Age, a similar function was performed by the foreign judges, who had to try to reconcile the parties before taking on the role of a full-fledged court of law. Thus far, scholars when addressing these two kinds of reconciliation have overlooked or misinterpreted their cultural significance. Furthermore, they have failed to describe the specific actions through which arbitrators and foreign judges effectively played their mediation role. My paper will take into account Classical Athens for the arbitrators and Hellenistic Priene for the foreign judges, as these two *poleis* provide the largest amount of sources and data. Relying on these two case studies my research pursues a twofold objective: a) to shed light on the arbitrators' and foreign judges' prerogatives during the reconciliation stage, thereby revealing how their mediation role followed precise procedural rituals and, far from being merely accessory, it was as important as the function of judging and delivering a verdict; b) to demonstrate that the civiccultural values to which the function of reconciliation was deeply connected (such as *homonoia philanthropia* or *pistis*) were clearly reflected in the body of law of the cities, and consequently there was no dichotomy at all between mediation and *justice d'État,* as Louis Gernet erroneously argued.