

T E I R E S I A S

A Review and Bibliography of Boiotian Studies

Volume 48 (part 1), 2018

ISSN 1206-5730

Compiled by Fabienne Marchand

CONTENTS

News

Pages 1	48I.0.01:	The myths and history of ancient Thebes
Page 1-2	48I.0.02:	<i>The Dancing floor of Ares II</i> international workshop

Work in Progress

Pages 2-8	48I.0.03:	Elke Close, <i>Megalopolis and the Achaean koinon: local identity and the federal state</i>
-----------	-----------	---

Bibliographies


Pages 8-12	48I.1.01-56:	Historical
Pages 12-16	48I.2.01-89:	Literary

NEWS

48I.0.01 The myths and history of ancient Thebes

Paul Cartledge, Sam Gartland, and Edith Hall discuss with Melvyn Bragg the myths and history of ancient Thebes and its depiction in Athenian drama. BBC4, 23 November 2017: Listen to the programme here: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b09fj9mt>

48I.0.02 The following international workshop took place at the University of Fribourg on 24 May 2018



The Dancing Floor of Ares II: Local Conflict and Regional Violence in Central Greece

08.45 *Welcome and introduction*, Fabienne Marchand & Hans Beck

09.00 *The End of a World: Local Violence and Regional Conflicts in Mycenaean Boeotia?*, Laetitia Phialon (Paris I & Fribourg)

09.45 *Federalism and Local Violence: the Battle of Koroneia revisited*, Hans Beck (McGill)

10.30 Break

- 11.00 *The Liberation of Thebes (379 BC) as a Theban Revolution: Theban Politics As a Closed Framework*, Salvatore Tufano (Rome & Fribourg)
- 11.45 *Kai polemou kai eirēnēs: Military Magistrates At War and at Peace in Hellenistic Boiotia*, Alex McAuley (Cardiff)
- 12.30 Lunch Break
- 14.15 *Genealogies and Violence. Central Greece in the Making*, Elena Franchi (Trento)
- 15.00 *The Making of a Fetter of Greece: Chalcis in the Hellenistic Period*, Fabienne Marchand (Fribourg)
- 15.45 Break
- 16.15 *La guerre ou la paix? Pouvoir s'affronter sans violence. A propos de SEG XIII 327 (IG VII 187+188)*, Marcel Piérart
- 17.00 Discussion & concluding remarks

WORK IN PROGRESS

481.0.03 Elke Close, *Megalopolis and the Achaean koinon: local identity and the federal state*

Introduction

The primary goal of my doctoral thesis was to bring the Arcadian polis of Megalopolis back into the academic limelight. I felt this was a necessity since, as a general rule, Megalopolis has mostly been looked at as part of broader studies into research topics. Scholars tend to see the polis solely as the historian Polybius' hometown or as yet another member of the Arkadian and Achaian *koina*. Yet through a detailed analysis of the early history of the polis and particularly its membership of the aforementioned federal states, the thesis shows that Megalopolis certainly was a city with its own distinct local identity that merits a closer look than it has previously received.

In the thesis I therefore wanted to identify the different components of this Megalopolitan identity, i.e. a deep and traditional hatred for Sparta, longstanding relations with the Macedonian kings, a clear understanding of the mechanisms of a federal state and multi-ethnic politics, and, by Polybius' time, a connection to both Arkadia as well as Achaia. Secondly and more importantly, I wanted to see what their influence was on the politics of the Achaian *koinon*. I argued that this identity was a continuing and complex process which underwent several profound changes that started with the foundation of entirely new city by the Arkadians in the 360s BC and was shaped throughout the polis' membership of the Arkadian and Achaian *koina*.

With the creation of Megalopolis a new step was taken in the approach of Greek cities to their own ethnic identity as Megalopolis looked for a broader way of uniting the different communities that were now part of this brand new polis. Since this new attitude was more in line with the open and federal attitude of the *koina* and poleis in the Hellenistic period, Megalopolis was looking forward and should as an early example of a typical Hellenistic polis, something that is also seen in the archaeology of the polis. The open outlook of the city was undoubtedly the

result of Megalopolis' early connections and experiences with federalism; it was what made polis unique and what allowed it to flourish as well as it did in the federal framework of the Achaian *koinon* after 235 BC.



Figure 1: The theatre and Thersilion at Megalopolis. Author.

Megalopolis: A (Very Brief) History




Figure 2: Close-up of the Philippeion on the Megalopolitan agora. Author.

The polis was founded by the Arkadian *koinon* in 368 BC. The main reason for the city's foundation was the Arkadian need to protect the southern part of the region against the looming threat of Sparta and its frequent invasions of the border areas. As a result of this, the Megalopolitan identity was characterised throughout its history by a strong antagonism towards Sparta which was only fuelled by its close geographical proximity to Sparta and the countless attacks on the city, one of which was so severe in 227 BC that it took several years to rebuild the polis and can still be detected in the archaeological remains.¹ Due to its size – in 227 BC, the city walls were estimated to be fifty stades and the city has the largest theatre in the Peloponnese with a seating capacity of around 20,000 people² – it was easy for the city to become an influential member of the Arkadian *koinon* to which it contributed ten of the fifty federal *damiorgoi* (IG V 2.1, l. 23-33).

After the dissolution of the Arkadian federation in 363 BC, the city remained politically active in its native region and the Peloponnese. In fact, the polis' decade-long alliance with the Macedonian kings was formed in this period after Philip II of Macedon gave several Spartan regions to Megalopolis soon after the battle of Chaeronea in 338 BC.³ The

¹ Lauter (2005), 237.

² Gardner et al. (1892), 78-81.

³ The border areas in question, i.e. Skiritis, Aigytis and Belminatis, would become a frequent point of contention between Sparta and Megalopolis throughout the Hellenistic period. See also *IvO* 47; *Syll.* 665; Harter-Uibopuu (1998) n. 11; Ager (1996) n. 135-137; Mackil (2013) n. 45; Shipley (2000) and Roy (2009), 207-208.

Megalopolitan loyalty to Macedon is a second characteristic of the city's local identity that had a far-reaching influence on Megalopolitan politics. For one, it was strong enough for the citizens to dedicate one of the biggest buildings on their agora, a monumental stoa of ca. 160 meters, to Philip II.⁴ Moreover, it allowed the polis' two only tyrants to come to power in the 270s and 250s BC: Aristodamos the Good and Lydiadas. While only a handful of literary sources talk about the two tyrants, one of them played a crucial part in the history of Megalopolis.

By 235 BC, the Achaians had become a genuine threat to Megalopolis and the tyrant Lydiades as well as the citizens most likely thought that joining the *koinon* was a good course of action. This decision proved beneficial, as the polis quickly rose to a prominent position within the federation and was also responsible for the addition of an Achaian component to the Megalopolitan identity by the middle of the second century BC. The polis remained a member of the Achaian *koinon* until its destruction by the Romans in 146 BC and was inhabited well into the Roman period. However, when Pausanias visited the city in the second century AD, a lot of the buildings and sanctuaries had fallen into ruin (Paus. 8. 30-32).

Megalopolis and the Arkadian *koinon*

One of the most important arguments that the thesis made, was that because of the context in which the polis of Megalopolis was founded, i.e. by a federation, it was aware early on of the benefits that membership of such a federation could bring. This becomes clear when one looks at the Megalopolitan pantheon which was deliberately created to promote a shared Megalopolitan identity. After all, the polis was founded through a synoicism of many different communities that now found themselves forced to live in the polis and which needed to come together as one city. Clearly, the best way to make sure that the communities felt at home was to incorporate typical Arkadian deities like Pan, Zeus Lykaïos and others that were known in different variations throughout the region into the religious life of the polis.⁵ Undoubtedly, the magistrates would have drawn their inspiration from the way in which the bigger organisations that the polis had interacted with like the Arkadian and Boiotian *koina*, dealt with the same problem.

However, Megalopolis' early connections to federalism has led some scholars to believe that the polis was founded as the capital of the Arkadian *koinon*.⁶ While the federal Arkadian assembly called the *myrioi* is said to have assembled in *Thersilion* (Paus. 8. 32. 1.), both James Roy and Thomas Heine Nielsen have correctly pointed out that there is no consistent evidence for Megalopolis enjoying a special status within the *koinon* that would equal that of a capital as we know the term today.⁷ What is more, looking at Megalopolis' foreign politics in the decades after the dissolution of the Arkadian *koinon*, it is clear that the city also felt the need to show that it was an individual unit that should be considered more than just another Arkadian city. The polis was consistently asking for outside help against other Arkadians (Pol. 4. 33. 8; Diod. 15. 94. 1-3) or Sparta (Dem. *Meg.* 16; Diod. 16. 39. 1-3), interacted with these outsiders through the establishment of treaties (with Argos, Sikyon, Messene, Thebes and Orneai: Diod. 16. 39. 1-4), received ambassadors (both from Athens: Dem. *Meg.* 19. 10; Aeschin. 2. 157).

⁴ Gardner et al. (1890), 140-141; Lauter and Spyropoulos (1998), 445; Verfenstein (2002), 57-60. Whether the Philip mentioned by Pausanias (8. 30. 6.) and on the inscriptions on roof tiles found inside the building (IG V² 469 6a and 6b) is Philip II or Philip IV, as Caitlyn Downey Verfenstein has tried to argue, is not relevant. The building remains the only physical evidence of the Megalopolitan connection to Macedon.

⁵ Jost (1985), 225-235.

⁶ Among others, Bury (1898), 15; Larsen (1968), 187; Brauner and Pedersen (1972), 73; Verfenstein (2002), 9; Donati (2015), 207.

⁷ Roy (2007), 291; Nielsen (2015), 266-267.

Megalopolis and the Achaian *koinon*

Once Megalopolis joined the Achaian *koinon* (235 BC), the interaction between the polis and the federal state was one that had a profound influence on both parties: by the middle of the second century BC Megalopolis had added a distinct Achaian element to its complex, local identity and Achaian political life was soon overflowing with prominent Megalopolitans whose personal agenda and hatred for Sparta helped shape the federal government and its actions more than once. Thus, once I had established the core elements of the Megalopolitan identity, I then looked the the way these characteristics influenced the Achaian politics, both internally and externally.

Megalopolis and internal Achaian politics

In many ways Megalopolis was a typical member of the Achaian *koinon*: it minted federal coinage, was represented in the federal institutions, hosted assembly meetings after 188 BC and a considerable number of influential Achaian statesmen were Megalopolitan.⁸ Moreover, from the available source material an important conclusion can be drawn: given the chance, Megalopolis would not hesitate to take part in federal politics or express its affinity with it. This eagerness is shown in the city's inclusion on both of the Achaian *nomographoi* lists. Despite many problems with their interpretation as one of the inscriptions is incomplete, these – one from Epidauros dated between 210 and 207 BC (*IG IV.F* 73) and one from Aegion dated after 182 BC (Rizakis (2008), no. 116) – both list Megalopolitan representatives that took part in these meetings.⁹ If a theory posed by Sergey Sizov is true in which he argues that the only a portion of the board of *nomographoi* had to be present in Epidauros since the meeting was not compulsory, while the one in Aegion was due to the city's central position within the federal state, then it seems as though Megalopolis purposefully made an effort to send its *nomographoi* to Epidauros.¹⁰ After all, the city was a considerable distance from Megalopolis. This eagerness is also visible in the bronze federal coinage minted by Megalopolis which the city seems to have been one of the first members to have minted based on die comparisons done by Jennifer Warren.¹¹ This commitment of the polis to the federal institutions and procedures is also a typical example of the Megalopolitan identity and is also exemplified by Polybius in his comments on the superiority of the Achaian constitution.

The interactions of the polis with other Achaian member states shown yet another side of the relationship between the *koinon* and Megalopolis. In the majority of the five disputes between the city and other members such as Messene, Thouria, Helisson and Sparta, show that Megalopolis actively sought the involvement of the federal state.¹² While these overall support my thesis that Megalopolis held a special position in the Achaian *koinon*, the specifics of each of the five boundary disputes provide a more nuanced result. In the first place, the *koinon* intervened to secure the internal status quo of the federation as was the case in boundary disputes between Megalopolis and Messene (SEG 58.370) and Megalopolis and Sparta (Mackil n. 45) where the difficult relationships of both poleis with the Achaians complicated matters. This does not mean that Megalopolis did not try to use its position within the federation to its own advantage, particularly as all of the inscriptions have some sort of reference to the federal *damiorgoi* or a fine imposed by the federal magistrates when one of the disputant did not listen. The city also shows this through their repeated and varied appeals in the boundary dispute with Messene where they try different approaches to get control over the disputed areas, but they

⁸ O'Neil (1984-86), 55-57.

⁹ Rizakis (2008), no. 116, 168-170.

¹⁰ Sizov (2016), 107.

¹¹ Warren (2007), 31; 125-126.

¹² See Harter-Uibopuu (1998) for a general discussion of the disputes of Achaian members and the role of the federal states.

remain unsuccessful in the end.¹³ In the boundary dispute with Thouria (Harter-Uibopuu n. 8.), the polis has a different tactic which is successful: they sent their most influential and famous citizens to represent Megalopolis at the arbitration (B. l. 5-6).¹⁴

Megalopolis and Achaian foreign politics

The way in which Megalopolis influenced the Achaian foreign politics can be deduced throughout the polis' federal membership. In the 220s BC, Megalopolis as a city was responsible for the first connections between the Achaians and the Macedonian king Antigonos during the Kleomenean War. However, after the Achaian *synodos* of 198 BC, the *koinon* abandoned their alliance with Philip V of Macedon in favour of Rome, and the nature of the Megalopolitan influence shifted from the civic level to the individual one as a result of the rise of important individuals from Megalopolis within Achaian federal politics, including like Philopoimen and Lykortas. Therefore, because the Megalopolitan role in Achaian foreign politics was very different in the second century BC from what it had been in the decades after they first joined the Achaian *koinon*, I chose to separate the third and second century BC.

The first major Megalopolitan influence on the Achaian foreign politics expressed itself most notably in the establishment of the Achaian-Macedonian alliance of the 220s BC. In the thesis, I argue that this alliance was not the result of Aratos' scheming and planning, but only came about after a first Megalopolitan embassy to Antigonos Gonatas in 227 BC. This was sent to the Macedonian king on behalf of the polis but with the approval of the federal state, on account of their inability to shield Megalopolis from the Spartan attacks and the city's previous connections to the Macedonian kings (Plut. 23. 2-3). Contrary to what Polybius (Pol. 2. 40. 2) and subsequent other sources report, Aratos was thus not the mastermind behind this alliance but did use the initial contacts between Megalopolis and Antigonos as the basis for his own polity later on.¹⁵

About three decades after they first joined forces with Antigonos Doson in the Kleomenean War (225 BC), the Achaians found themselves on the verge of yet another important political decision. The Achaians dutifully stood by their ally during the following decades, albeit with increasing reluctance but when Philip IV got himself involved in yet another conflict with Rome, the Achaians had an important decision to make at their *synodos* in 198 BC: would they remain loyal to their old ally or join the war on the Roman side (Livy 32. 19-25)? After a lot of commotion and resistance from the Megalopolitan contingent, the Achaians voted to break their alliance with Philip and become a Roman ally which they would remain until the Achaian War of 146 BC. While the Megalopolitan opposition came as no surprise there might be an indication that within the polis there was a faction that was slowly moving away from the traditional loyalty to Macedon and had replaced it with a vehement Achaian patriotism as there are some indications that the Achaian strategos Aristainos who strongly advocated a move towards Rome, was a Megalopolitan.¹⁶

¹³ Luraghi and Magnetto (2012), 510-521. This boundary dispute between the two poleis provides not only provides an interesting insight into the internal relations of the Achaian *koinon* but also shows a different side of the interaction between the local and federal level within the federal state. Additionally, it is an interesting addenda to the Messenian rebellion of 182 BC in which the polis attempted to secede from the *koinon* and ended up killing the great Megalopolitan and Achaian statesman Philopoimen. Incidentally, the latter's death could be an explanation for Megalopolis' determination to get to win the boundary dispute with Messene.

¹⁴ Harter-Uibopuu (1998), 53-62.

¹⁵ Gruen (1972), 609-625, closely followed by Urban (1979), 117-155; Le Bohec (1993), 366-367.

¹⁶ Both Plutarch (Phil. 17. 3) and Pausanias (8. 51. 4) mention that he was a Megalopolitan, while several epigraphical sources (FD III, 3. 122; Achaie I 629) give the impression he was a Dymaian. Because of the fragmentary evidence of the the sources, nothing can be said with certainty, although it remains an interesting theory for my present argument. For more information on the discussion, see Deininger (1966), 376; Errington (1969), 276-279; Rizakis (1995), 352; Niccolini (1913), 194.

This new Achaian patriotism together with the tradition Megalopolitan antagonism towards Sparta are the two elements that seem to have dominated the Megalopolitan influence on the Achaian politics after the *synodos* of 198 BC. More than before, it was the individual Megalopolitan leader like Philopoimen, Lykortas and Aristainos that shaped and steered Achaian foreign politics through their local interests and were in part responsible for the *koinon*'s overt focus on forcing Sparta to become a member of the federation. The interactions between Achaia and Rome were heavily dominated by this local conflict; this is evident from the plethora of Spartan envoys to Rome concerning Achaian conduct and the Roman intervention in the boundary dispute between the two states. Furthermore, any big problems between the two states seems to have been connected to this Spartan problem, including the Achaian War and the subsequent abolition of the *koinon*, which was caused by the greed of the new generation of Megalopolitans who had lost the realism displayed by their predecessors during the Third Macedonian War.

Polybius, the Megalopolitan?

A final theme of the thesis is connected to the historian Polybius. As a Megalopolitan and an Achaian federal leader in the second century BC, Polybius is an excellent embodiment of the interaction between the local and federal identity. However, the Megalopolitan context of Polybius' identity and his narrative is often forgotten by Polybian scholars.¹⁷ Throughout the thesis I pay particular attention to this as I wanted to establish a new context for Polybius to be read in. When analysing Polybius' narrative and passages in which he speaks about Achaia (2.38-42), Arkadia and Megalopolis (Pol. 2. 55; 2. 61; 4. 20-21 and 4. 32-33), it is clear that Achaia was not the only region that he held in high esteem. In these passages, Polybius not only praises the Achaian *koinon* but also Megalopolis as for him it embodied the best qualities of the region. This is the reason why the historian criticizes the historian Phylarchus so heavily when he does not mention the Megalopolitan bravery against Kleomenes during the destruction of the city in 227 BC and refusal to join him (Pol. 2. 56. 6-8). Aside from the many other critiques expressed in the Histories about Phylarchus and his historical method, it seems that his silence on the bravery of the Megalopolitans was extremely offensive to Polybius as both a Megalopolitan and a historian. After all, he considered this behaviour to be a typical characteristic of his hometown and it deserved the necessary respect and attention since it was a benchmark for him which each and every one of his readers should aspire to learn from. Obviously, Polybius is an Achaian, Megalopolitan and Arkadian, thus perfectly exemplifying the complex and layered identity of Megalopolis as a whole.

Select bibliography

- Ager, S. L. (1996), *Interstate arbitrations in the Greek World, 337-90 B.C.*, Berkeley.
 Braunert, H. and Pedersen, T. (1972), 'Megalopolis: Anspruch und Wirklichkeit', *Chiron* 2, 57-90.
 Bury, J. B. (1898), 'The Double City of Megalopolis', *JHS* 18, 15-22.
 Champion, C. (2004), *Cultural Politics in Polybius' Histories*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
 Deininger, J. (1966), 'Aristaenos von Megalopolis und Aristaenos von Dyme', *Historia* 15(3), 376-380.
 Donati, J. C. (2015), 'The Agora in its Peloponnesian Context', in D. C. Haggis and C. Antonaccio (eds.), *Classical Archaeology in Context: Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World*, Berlin, 177-218.
 Eckstein, A. M. (1987), 'Polybius, Aristaenos, and the Fragment 'on Traitors'', *CQ* 37(1), 140-162.
 Eckstein, A. M. (2013), 'Polybius, Phylarchus, and Historiographical Criticism', *Class.Phil.* 108.4, 314-338.
 Errington, R. M. (1969), *Philopoemen*, Oxford.
 Gardner, E. A., et al (1890), 'The Theatre at Megalopolis', *JHS* 11, 294-298.

¹⁷ For example Although Craig Champion has looked at Polybius' views on the Achaian *koinon* and their virtues, Megalopolis is omitted from the analysis. However, Polybius' bias towards his native city and his obvious disdain for certain Spartan figures such as Kleomenes and Nabis, is a direct result of his origins. Arthur Eckstein clearly states this in articles from 1987 and 2013; yet in his book *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius*, he only needs the first four pages to see how growing up in Megalopolis influenced Polybius' views of the world and how these manifested itself in the development in his aristocratic ethos.

- Gardner, E. A., Loring, W. et al (1892), *Excavations at Megalopolis 1890-1891*, London.
- Gruen, E. (1972) 'Aratus and the Achaean Alliance with Macedon', *Historia* 21, 609-625.
- Harter-Uibopuu, K. (1998), *Das zwischenstaatliche Schiedsverfahren im Achäischen Koinon. Zur friedlichen Streitbeilegung nach den epigraphischen Quellen*, Köln-Weimar-Wien.
- Jost, M. (1985), *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*, Paris.
- Larsen, J. A. O. (1968), *Greek Federal States: Their History and Institutions*, Oxford.
- Lauter, H. (2005), 'Megalopolis: Aufgraben auf der Agora 1991-2002', in E. Ostby (ed.), *Ancient Arcadia: Papers from the third international seminar on Ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002*, Athens, 235-248.
- Lauter, H. and Spyropoulos, T. (1998), 'Megalopolis 3: Vorbericht 1996-1997', *AA*, 415-451.
- Le Bohec, S. (1993), *Antigone Dôsôn, Roi de Macédoine*, Nancy.
- Luraghi, N. and Magnetto, A. (2012), 'The Controversy between Megalopolis and Messene in a New Inscription from Messene', *Chiron* 42, 509-550.
- Mackil, E. (2013), *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon*, Berkeley.
- Niccolini, G. (1913), 'Aristeno e Aristeneto', *Studi storici per l'antichità classica* 6, 194-198.
- Nielsen, T. H. (2015), 'The Arkadian Confederacy' in H. Beck and P. Funke (ed.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge, 250-268.
- O'Neil, J. L. (1984-1986), 'The Political Elites of the Achaean and Aetolian League', *Ancient Society* 15-17, 33-62.
- Rizakis, A. D. (1995), *Achaïe I. Sources textuelles et histoire régionale*, Athens.
- Rizakis, A. D. (2003), 'Le collège des nomographes et le système de représentation dans le koinon Achéen', in K. Buraselis and K. Zoumboulakis (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History: Conference proceedings, Volume II: Aspects of connecting poleis and ethne in Ancient Greece*, Athens.
- Rizakis, A. D. (2008), *Achaïe III. Les cités achéennes: épigraphie et histoire*, Athens.
- Roy, J. (2007), 'The urban layout of Megalopolis in its civic and confederate context', in R. Westgate, N. Fisher & H. Whitley (eds.) *Building Communities: house, settlement and society in the Aegean and beyond: Proceedings of a conference held at Cardiff University, 17 - 21 April 2001*, London, 289-295.
- Roy, J. (2009), 'Finding the limits of Laconia: defining and redefining communities on the Spartan-Arkadian frontier', in W.G. Cavanagh, C. Gallou & M. Georgiadis (eds.), *Sparta and Laconia from prehistory to pre-modern: proceedings of the conference held in Sparta, organised by the British School at Athens, the University of Nottingham, the 5th Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities and the 5th Ephoreia of Byzantine Antiquities 17-20 March 2005*, London, 205-211.
- Shipley, G. (2000), 'The Extend of Spartan Territory in the Late Classical and Hellenistic Periods', *ABSA* 95, 367-390.
- Sizov, S. (2016), 'Two Lists of the Achaian nomographoi', *ZPE* 198, 101-109.
- Urban, R. (1979), *Wachstum und Krise des achäischen Bundes: Quellenstudien zur Entwicklung des Bundes von 280 bis 222 v. Chr.*, Wiesbaden.
- Verfestein, C. D. (2002), *Architecture of the Greek Federal Leagues: Fourth through Second Centuries B.C.*, Ann Arbor.
- Warren, J. A. W. (2007), *The Bronze Coinage of the Achaian Koinon: The Currency of a Federal Ideal*, London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY I: HISTORICAL (see also 48I.2.18; 48I.2.24; 48I.2.26; 48I.2.50; 48I.2.66)

BOOKS

- 48I.1.01 A. Bartoněk, *Chrestomathy of Ancient Greek Dialect Inscriptions* (Munich 2015) viii & 259pp. [ISBN 9783862886074], esp. pp. 111-121.
- 48I.1.02 A. Chaniotis & others, edd., *SEG 63: 2013* (Leiden & Boston 2017) [ISSN 0920 8399; ISBN 978-90-04-326279-6], esp. pp. 102-113 (no. 331-366); 521 (no. 1545); 548 no. 1639.
- 48I.1.03 A. Charami et al., edd., *Cultural Walks in Thebes* (Thebes 2017).
- 48I.1.04 X. Duffy, *Commemorating Conflict. Greek Monuments of the Persian Wars* (Oxford 2018) viii & 206pp. [ISBN 978-1-78491-839-2] esp. p. 59-60 (Plataean Burial Mound); 102-103 (epigram for the Thespians at Thermopylae), 126-157 (Plataea).
- 48I.1.05 M. Foster, *The Seer and the City. Religion, Politics, and Colonial Ideology in Ancient Greece* (Oakland 2017) xii & 217pp. [ISBN 9780520295001], esp. ch. 5

- (Hagesias as *Sunoikister*: Mantic Authority and Colonial Ideology in Pindar's *Olympian* 6) & ch. 6 (Amphiaraos, Alkmaion, and Delphi's Oracular Monopoly).
- 48I.I.06 L. Godart & A. Sacconi, *Supplemento al Corpus delle iscrizioni vascolari in lineare B* (Pisa, Roma 2017) 218pp. [ISBN: 9788862279475], esp. pp. 12-13, 35-41, 101-107, 155-157, 161-163, 168, 172-173, 177-182, 184-186, 189, 192, 1905-204, 207-211.
- 48I.I.07 R. Osborne & P. J. Rhodes, edd., *Greek Historical Inscriptions 478-404 BC* (Oxford 2017) xxxii & 628pp. [ISBN 978-0-19-957547-3], esp. nos. 111, 112, 117, 131.
- 48I.I.08 E. Tsota & S. Dreni, *Αρχαιολογική Συλλογή Διστόμου. Σύντομος οδηγός έκθεσης* (Thebes 2017) [ISBN 978-960-386-347-2].
- 48I.I.09 S. R. Zanovello, *From slave to free: a legal perspective on Greek manumission* ([unpublished PhD thesis](#), University of Padua 2016), esp. ch. 3 (Manumission and consecration in Central Greece: the case of the Chaironeian inscriptions).

ARTICLES

- 48I.I.10 E. Anson, "The Rise of Macedon, 359-336 BC", in M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, edd., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 480-495, esp. 487-488 (Third Sacred War), 491-494 (battle of Chaironeia) [ISBN 9781405186452].
- 48I.I.11 V. Aravantinos, "The Palatial Administration of Thebes Updated", in J. Weilhartner & F. Ruppenstein, edd., *Tradition and Innovation in the Mycenaean Palatial Politics* (Vienna 2015) 19-49 [ISBN 978-3-7001-7791-3].
- 48I.I.12 M. Calderón Sánchez, "[Dioniso y el toro: fuentes literarias y epigráficas](#)", *Synthesis* 24 (2017) e021.
- 48I.I.13 A. Charami, P. Kalamara, K. Daly & S. Larson, "23η Εφορεία Βυζαντινών Αρχαιοτήτων", *ADelt* 67 (2012 [2016]) 360-363 (American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Ismenion and Herakleion Sanctuaries of Thebes).
- 48I.I.14 F. Echeverría, "The First Peloponnesian War, 460-446 BC", in M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, edd., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 279-285, esp. pp. 282-283 (battle of Tanagra), 283-284 (battle of Oionophyta), 284 (battle of Coroneia) [ISBN 9781405186452].
- 48I.I.15 F. Echeverría, "The Second Peloponnesian War, 431-404", in M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, edd., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 296-407, esp. pp. 311-315 (siege of Plataia), 317-319 (battle of Tanagra), 331-335 (battle of Delion) [ISBN 9781405186452].
- 48I.I.16 S. Fachard, "Studying Rural Fortifications: A Landscape Approach", in S. Müth, P. I. Schneider, M. Schnelle & P. D. De Staebler, edd., *Ancient fortifications: a compendium of theory and practice* (Oxford 2016) 207-230 [ISBN 978-1-78570-139-9].
- 48I.I.17 S. Fachard, "The resources of the borderlands: control, inequality, and exchange on the Attic-Boeotian borders", in P. Derron, ed., *Economie et inégalité. Ressources, échanges et pouvoir dans l'Antiquité classique* (Vandoeuvres 2017) 19-74 [ISBN 978-2-600-00763-4].
- 48I.I.18 Y. Fappas, "[Archaeology Through Archives: The Early History of the Archaeological Research in Boeotia Through Original Historical Archives](#)", *CHS Research Bulletin* 5 (2017).
- 48I.I.19 M. Germani, "The Theatre of Chaeronea and Rectilinear Koila", [Hypothekai. Journal on the History of Ancient Pedagogical Culture](#) 2 (2018) 97-105.
- 48I.I.20 F. Giovagnorio, "[Dedications for the Hero Ptoios in Akraiphia, Boeotia](#)", *Rosetta* 22 (2018) 18-39.

- 48I.I.21 J. P. González, “Commanders and Warlords in Fourth Century BC Central Greece”, in N. del Hoyo, T. & F. López Sánchez, edd., *War, warlords, and interstate relations in the ancient Mediterranean* (Leiden 2017) 89-112 [ISBN 9789004354043].
- 48I.I.22 C. Hassan & M. Brosius, “The Persian Wars, 492-450 BC”, in M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, edd., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 207-276, esp. pp. 237-249 (Central Greece and Attica), 249-261 (battle of Plataia) [ISBN 9781405186452].
- 48I.I.23 D. Heilmann, “Contextualising bow fibulae with Boeotian shield plates: cultural transfer processes during Early Iron Age in the Central Balkan Area”, *Starinar* 66 (2016) 9-25.
- 48I.I.24 G. A. Karatzoglou, “Παρατηρήσεις στην αρχιτεκτονική του καθολικού της Μονής Οσίου Σεραφείμ Δομπού Βοιωτίας”, in M. Korres, S. Mamaloukos, K. Zampas & F. Malouchou-Tufano, edd., *ΗΡΩΣ ΚΤΙΣΤΗΣ Ι. Μνήμη Χαράλαμπου Μπούρα* (Athens 2018) 499-512 [ISBN 9789602043745].
- 48I.I.25 Ch. Koilakou, “Ο ναός του Αγίου Γρηγορίου Θεολόγου στη Θήβα. Νεότερα στοιχεία”, in M. Korres, S. Mamaloukos, K. Zampas & F. Malouchou-Tufano, edd., *ΗΡΩΣ ΚΤΙΣΤΗΣ Ι. Μνήμη Χαράλαμπου Μπούρα* (Athens 2018) 569-580 [ISBN 9789602043745].
- 48I.I.26 E. Kountouri & N. Petrocheilos, “Sepulcrum gentis Chaeroniensis: ένας οικογενειακός τάφος στη Χαιρώνεια Βοιωτίας και η συμβολή του στη μελέτη των ταφικών εθίμων της αυτοκρατορικής εποχής”, *ADelt* 67-68 (2012-13) 483-508.
- 48I.I.27 E. Kountouri & N. Petrochilos, “Trofeo contro il re Mitridate: osservazioni introduttive sul trofeo di Silla ad Orcomeno”, in A. Pontrandolfo & M. Scafuro, edd., *Dialoghi sull'Archeologia della Magna Greci e del Mediterraneo. Atti del I Convegno Internazionale di Studi. Paestum, 7-9 settembre 2016* (Paestum 2017) 61-60 [ISBN 978-88-87744-76-7].
- 48I.I.28 M. Matyszak, “The Mithridatic Wars, 89-66 BC”, in M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, edd., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 877-889, esp. pp. 881-882 (battle of Chaironeia), 882-883 (battle of Orchomenos) [ISBN 9781405186452].
- 48I.I.29 S. Murray, S. Fachard, A. R. Knodell, K. Papangeli, M. Berenfeld & E. Svana, “New and traditional methods for thorough documentation and analysis of architectural features in the Greek landscape: a case study from the Mazi Archaeological Project (Western Attica)”, in G. Vavouranakis, M. Katsianis, Y. Papadatos, M. Mouliou & P. Petridis, edd., *Digital pasts for the present. Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology. Greek Chapter (CAA-GR). Athens, 20-21 December 2016* (Athens 2017) 3-10 [ISBN 978-618-81101-8-2].
- 48I.2.30 N. Papazarkadas, “Pindaric reverberations: an unpublished inscription from the Museum of Thebes”, in F. Camia, L. Del Monaco & M. Nocita, edd., *Munus Laetitia. Studi miscellanei offerti a Maria Letizia Lazzarini. Volume I* (Rome 2018) 19-32 [ISBN 978-88-9377-073-6].
- 48I.I.31 É. Piguet, “Du *hērôs* au *theos*. Étude comparée de la double nature et de la diffusion du culte d'Amphiaraos et d'Asclépios”, *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 43.2 (2017) 55-90.
- 48I.I.32 F. de Polignac, “Détroits, isthmes, passages: paysages ‘sous le joug’ de Poséidon”, *Kernos* 30 (2017) 67-83.
- 48I.I.33 V. Sabetai & C. Avronidaki, “The Six's Technique in Boiotia: Regional Experiments in Technique and Iconography”, *Hesperia* 87 (2018) 311-385.
- 48I.I.34 S. Scharff, “[Improving the Public Image Through Athletics: Young Victors in Hellenistic Thebes](#)”, *CHS Research Bulletin* 5 (2016).

- 48I.I.35 S. Sprawski, "Campaigns of Thebes, 379-362 BC", M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 447-466 [ISBN 9781405186452].
- 48I.I.36 M. Tentori Montalto, "Erodoto e due epigrammi di recente scoperta (BE 2015, nr. 306; SEG 56, 430): la dedica di Creso ad Amphiaraios e la battaglia di Maratona", in F. Camia, L. Del Monaco & M. Nocita, edd., *Munus Laetitia. Studi miscellanei offerti a Maria Letizia Lazzarini. Volume I* (Rome 2018) 125-154 [ISBN 978-88-9377-073-6].
- 48I.I.37 M. Trundle, "The Corinthian War, 395-387 BC", in M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, edd., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 417-427, esp. pp. 420 (battle of Haliartos), 422-423 (battle of Coroneia) [ISBN 9781405186452].
- 48I.I.38 A. K. Vionis, "Sacred Townscapes in Late Antique Greece: Christianisation and Economic Diversity in the Aegean", *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 30 (2017) 141-165.
- 48I.I.39 H. van Wees, "Early Greek Wars, 750-450 BC", in M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, edd., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 165-199, esp. pp. 190-192 (early Athenian wars) [ISBN 9781405186452].
- 48I.I.40 I. Worthington, "Campaigns of Alexander the Great, 336-323", in M. Whitby & H. Sidebottom, edd., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Battles* (Malden, Oxford 2017) 503-573, esp. pp. 506-508 (battle of Chaironeia), 513-515 (siege of Thebes) [ISBN 9781405186452].

REVIEWS

- 48I.I.41 H. Beck & P. Funke, edd., *Federalism in Greek Antiquity* (452.I.01)
- [r] R. M. Errington, *Gnomon* 90 (2018) 86-88.
- 48I.I.42 J. Bintliff & K. Rutter, edd., *The Archaeology of Greece and Rome. Studies in Honour of Anthony Snodgrass* (471.I.02)
- [r] C. P. Trainor, *CR* 68 (2018) 197-200.
- 48I.I.43 Y. Duhoux & A. Morpurgo Davies, *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World* 3 (451.I.05)
- [r] A. Blanc, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 109 (2014) 135-143.
- 48I.I.44 S. D. Gartland, ed., *Boiotia in the Fourth Century B.C.* (471.I.06)
- [r] A.-C. Oddon-Panissié, [Sehepunkte 18 \(2018\) no.1.](#)
- 48I.I.45 - [r] T. Van Damme, [BMCR 2018.01.32.](#)
- 48I.I.46 S. Kaczko, *Archaic and Classical Attic Dedicatory Epigrams* (462.I.07)
- [r] A. Alonso Déniz, [BMCR 2018.06.13.](#)
- 48I.I.47 - [r] S. Oswald, *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft* 69 (2016) 204-209.
- 48I.I.48 L. Migeotte, *Économie et finances publiques des cités grecques II. Choix d'articles publiés de 2002 à 2014* (461.I.05)
- [r] A. Bresson, *Phoenix* 70 (2016) 196-199.
- 48I.I.49 L. Migeotte, *Les finances des cités grecques aux périodes classique et hellénistique* (442.I.05)
- [r] D. Rohde, *Historische Zeitschrift* 305 (2017) 494.
- 48I.I.50 L. Migeotte, *Économie et fonctionnement publics des cités grecques I. Choix d'articles publiés de 1976 à 2001* (121.I.03)
L. Migeotte, *Les finances des cités grecques aux périodes classique et hellénistique* (442.I.05)
L. Migeotte, *Économie et finances publiques des cités grecques II. Choix d'articles publiés de 2002 à 2014* (461.I.05)
- [r] A. Carrara, *REA* 119 (2017) 639-660.
- 48I.I.51 I. Pernin, *Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne* (452.I.04)

- [r] E. M. Harris, *JHS* 167 (2017) 241-242.
- 48I.1.52 - [r] T. Prussin, *RPhil* 90 (2016) 241-242.
- 48I.1.53 G.H. Renberg, *Where dreams may come* (472.1.07)
- [r] H. von Ehrenheim, *Opuscula* 10 (2017) 193-195.
- 48I.1.54 M. Tentori Montalto, *Essere primi per il valore* (472.1.08)
- [r] J. W. Day, *CR* 68 (2018) 20-22.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- 48I.1.55 *L'Année épigraphique* 2014 (2017) 517-518 nos. 1212-1215.
- 48I.1.56 A. Chaniotis, "Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion 2014 (*EBGR* 2014)", *Kernos* 30 (2017) 273-311. See p. 274 (Selected Topics: Geographical areas).

BIBLIOGRAPHY 2: LITERARY (see also 48I.1.01; 48I.1.05; 48I.2.30; 48I.1.32)

BOOKS

- 48I.2.01 R. Andújar, T. R. P. Coward & T. A. Hadjimichael, *Paths of Song. The Lyric Dimension of Greek Tragedy* (Berlin, Boston 2018) x & 456pp. [ISBN 978-3-11-057331-2]
- 48I.2.02 S. Briguglio, *Fraternas acies: saggio di commento a Stazio, Tebaide, I, 1-389* (Alessandria 2017) 454pp. [ISBN 9788862748032].
- 48I.2.03 P. Donini, (ed., trans., comm.) *Plutarco. Il demone di Socrate* (Roma 2017) 215pp. [ISBN 9788843089284].
- 48I.2.04 M. Erler & M. A. Stadler, edd., *Platonismus und spätägyptische Religion: Plutarch und die Ägyptenrezeption in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Berlin 2017) 335pp. [isbn: 9783110531404].
- 48I.2.05 D. Fearn, *Pindar's Eyes. Visual and Material Culture in Epinician Poetry* (Oxford 2017) x & 318pp. [ISBN 978-0-19-874637-9].
- 48I.2.06 P. Finglass (ed., trans., comm.), *Sophocles. Oedipus the king* (Cambridge, New York 2018) xiv & 708pp. [ISBN 9781108419512].
- 48I.2.07 J. G. Fitch (ed., trans.), *Seneca: Hercules. Trojan Women. Phoenician Women. Medea. Phaedra* (Cambridge, MA 2018) xlviii & 523pp. [ISBN 9780674997172].
- 48I.2.08 J. G. Fitch (ed., trans.), *Seneca: Oedipus. Agamemnon. Thyestes. Hercules on Oeta. Octavia* (Cambridge, MA 2018) 663pp. [ISBN 9780674997189].
- 48I.2.09 C. J. P. Friesen, *Reading Dionysus. Euripides' Bacchae and the Cultural Contestations of Greeks, Jews, Romans, and Christians* (Tübingen 2015) xi & 331pp. [ISBN 978-3-16-153813-1].
- 48I.2.10 G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo & P. Filos, edd., *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects: from Central Greece to the Black Sea* (Berlin, Boston 2018) xvi & 599pp. [ISBN 9783110530810].
- 48I.2.11 S. G. Jacobs, *Plutarch's pragmatic biographies: lessons for statesmen and generals in the Parallel Lives* (Leiden 2017) xv & 471pp. [ISBN 9789004276604].
- 48I.2.12 A. Kirk, "[Swelling Women: Formulaics in the Hesiodic Catalogue](#)", *CHS Research Bulletin* 5 (2017).
- 48I.2.13 A. Lagièrre, *La Thébaïde de Stace et le sublime* (Bruxelles 2017) 300pp. [ISBN 9789042935587].
- 48I.2.14 H. Liebert, *Plutarch's Politics: Between City and Empire* (New York 2016) 264pp. [ISBN 9781107148789].
- 48I.2.15 R. M. Liparotti, [Plutarco. A Fortuna ou a Virtude de Alexandre Magno.](#)

- [Tradução do grego, introdução e comentário](#) (Coimbra and São Paulo, IUC and Annablume 2017) 147pp. [ISBN 978-989-26-1471-7].
- 48I.2.16 M. Sans Morales, R. González Delgado, M. Librán Moreno & J. Urena Bracero, edd., *La (inter)textualidad en Plutarco: Actas del XII Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Plutarquistas, Cáceres, 8-10 de octubre de 2015* (Coimbra 2017) 397pp. [ISBN 9789892614434].
- 48I.2.17 R. Palmisciano, *Dialoghi per voce sola. La cultura del lamento funebre nella Grecia antica* (Rome 2017) 414pp. [ISBN 9788871407944], esp. pp. 161-214 (ch. 4, *Cultura de lamento funebre in Pindaro e Simonide*), 224-230 (*Eschilo, Sette contro Tebe, 961-1004*).
- 48I.2.18 D. W. Roller, *A Historical and Topographical Guide to the Geography of Strabo* (Cambridge 2018) xvi & 1165pp. [ISBN 978-1-107-18065-9], esp. pp. 513-538 (Boiotia), 538-550 (Phokis), 550-560 (Lokris).
- 48I.2.19 C. Semenzato, *A l'écoute des Muses en Grèce archaïque. La question de l'inspiration dans la poésie grecque à l'aube de notre civilisation* (Berlin, Boston 2017) xi & 395pp. [ISBN 978-3-11-0533-84-2], esp. ch. 2 (*La vie des Muses chez Hésiode*), ch. 5 (*Relation bilatérale des Muses chez Pindare*).
- 48I.2.20 H. Spelman, *Pindar and the Poetics of Permanence* (Oxford 2018) xvi & 356pp. [ISBN 978-0-19-882127-4].
- 48I.2.21 D. Stuttard, *Looking at Antigone* (London, Oxford, New York 2017) x & 247pp. [ISBN 9781350017115].
- 48I.2.22 S. Tor, *Mortal and divine in early Greek epistemology: a study of Hesiod, Xenophanes, and Parmenides* (Cambridge, New York 2017) xiii & 406pp. [ISBN 9781107028166].
- 48I.2.23 G. A. Xenis, *Scholia vetera in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum* (Berlin, New York 2018) xxiii & 252pp. [ISBN 978-3-11-044733-0].

ARTICLES

- 48I.2.24 E. Almagor, "[Plutarch and the Persians](#)", *Electrum* 24 (2017) 123-170.
- 48I.2.25 A. Athanassakis, "Intertextuality and Ideological Shift in Hesiodic Poetry", *Class.Phil* 113 (2018) 67-74.
- 48I.2.26 M. L. del Barrio Vega, "Remarques sur le suffixe -ωνδᾶς", in A. Alonso Déniz, L. Dubois, C. Le Feuvre & S. Minon, edd., *La suffixation des anthroponymes grecs antiques (Saga). Actes du colloque international de Lyon, 17-19 septembre 2015, Université Jean-Moulin-Lyon 3* (Geneva 2017) p. 579-590 [ISBN 978-2-600-05735-6].
- 48I.2.27 W. Brockliss, "Olympian Sound in the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue of Women*: Sweet Music and Disorderly Noise", *CJ* 113 (2018) 129-149.
- 48I.2.28 P. Christoforou, "'If He Is Worthy': Interactions between Crowds and Emperors in Plutarch and Tacitus' Accounts of A.D. 69", *Rosetta* 21 (2017) 1-16.
- 48I.2.29 C. S. Chrysanthou, "Plutarch's Rhetoric of *periautologia*: Demosthenes 1-3", *CJ* 113 (2018) 281-301.
- 48I.2.30 M. V. Classe Colonnelli, "Pathos: entre ação e carácter no Édipo Tirano de Sófocles", [Humanitas](#) 71 (2018).
- 48I.2.31 M. V. C. Colonnelli, "Pathos: entre ação e discurso no Édipo Tirano de Sófocles", *Humanitas* 71 (2018) 9-37.
- 48I.2.32 J. B. DeBrohun, "Tragic *Contaminatio* and Polluted Sacrifice in Seneca's *Oedipus*", *Ramus* 46 (2017) 35-57.
- 48I.2.33 M. Dorati, "Fato, oracoli e maledizioni nell'*Edipo a Colono* di Sofocle", *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 60 (2018) 103-138.
- 48I.2.34 M. de Fátima Silva, "Mujeres, fugitivas, suplicantes. El coro de las Suplicantes de Esquilo", in J. V. Bañuls & F. De Martino, edd., *Teatro y sociedad en la*

- antigüedad clásica. *El coro dramático, un personaje singular* (Bari 2017) 223-240 [ISBN 978-88-7949-681-0].
- 48I.2.35 J. A. Fernández-Delgado, “The Plutarchan Reception of the Choral Lyric”, *Hermes* 146 (2018) 187-198.
- 48I.2.36 M. Finkelberg, “Lesbian and Mainland Greece”, in 48I.2.10: 447-456.
- 48I.2.37 T. D. Frazel, “Lycophron, ἄρδις, and the Death of Paris”, *Mnemosyne* 71 (2018) 497-503.
- 48I.2.38 L. D. Ginsberg, “*Vt Et Hostem Amarem*: Jocasta and the Poetics of Civil War in Seneca’s *Phoenissae*”, *Ramus* 46 (2017) 58-74.
- 48I.2.39 M. Glénisson, “[La Vieillesse des héros des Vies de Plutarque](#)”, *Cahiers des études anciennes* 55 (2018) 217-234.
- 48I.2.40 M. Habaj, “Plutarch, *Moralia* 505c: Some notes on the discovery of the Pisonian conspiracy”, *Acta Antiqua* 56 (2016) 341-350.
- 48I.2.41 K. Jazdzewska, “Plutarch’s ‘Greek Questions’: Between Glossography and *Problemata*-Literature”, *Hermes* 146 (2018) 41-53.
- 48I.2.42 D. Kovacs, “Pindar as *laudator equorum* in Horace, *Carmina* 4.217-20 and *Ars Poetica* 83-5”, *CQ* 67 (2017) 659-662.
- 48I.2.43 V. Lewis, “[Place and Identity in Pindar’s Olympian 2](#)”, *CHS Research Bulletin* 5 (2017).
- 48I.2.44 C. A. J. Littlewood, “*Hercules Furens* and the Senecan Sublime”, *Ramus* 46 (2017) 153-174.
- 48I.2.45 B. López Saiz, “[Ares y Dionisos: discurso político y poesía trágica en Fenicias de Eurípides](#)”, *Synthesis* 24 (2017) e019.
- 48I.2.46 M. E. de Luna, “Due frammenti ‘di seconda mano’ nel libro IX di Pausania”, *Quaderni Urbinati* 118 (2018) 65-75.
- 48I.2.47 F. J. Meister, “Hieron at Pi. O. 6.12-18”, *Mnemosyne* 71 (2018) 315-321.
- 48I.2.48 J. Méndez Dosuna, “Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 869: What on earth befell the Theban merchant and his pennyroyal flowers?”, in A. Panayotou & G. Galdi, edd., *Ελληνικές διάκεκτοι στον αρχαίο κόσμο. Actes du VIe Colloque international sur les dialectes grecs anciens* (Nicosie, Université de Chypre, 26-29 septembre 2011) (Leuven 2017) xxvi & 391pp. [ISBN 978-90-429-3193-0] p. 271-289.
- 48I.2.49 T. Mojsik, “Alexandria as ‘Pi(m)pleian Thebes’? A Commentary on Posidippus 118 A.-B. (P. Berol. 14283)”, *ZPE* 205 (2018) 68-76.
- 48I.2.50 A. Y. Mozhaysky, “The rivers and the gates of Thebes in the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, as the educational landscape of the city”, [Hypothekai. Journal on the History of Ancient Pedagogical Culture 2 \(2018\)](#) 79-96.
- 48I.2.51 P. Nieto, “Coros femeninos en Píndaro”, in J. V. Bañuls & F. De Martino, edd., *Teatro y sociedad en la antigüedad clásica. El coro dramático, un personaje singular* (Bari 2017) 183-207 [ISBN 978-88-7949-681-0].
- 48I.2.52 N. Pantelidis, “Boeotian and its Neighbors: A Central Helladic Dialect Continuum?”, in 48I.2.10: 167-188.
- 48I.2.53 M. Pavlou, “Hesiod in Plato’s *Theaetetus*”, *Class. World* 111 (2018) 177-205.
- 48I.2.54 T. Phillips, “Pindar’s Voices: Music, Ethics and Reperformance”, *JHS* 137 (2017) 142-162.
- 48I.2.55 T. Phillips, “Pindar’s Dithyrambs and Their Hellenistic Reception”, *Trends in Classics* 9 (2017) 420-450.
- 48I.2.56 V. K. Pichugina, “Pedagogical Dreams of the Past in the Tragedies by Aeschylus, Euripides and Sophocles about Eteocles and Polyneices: Paradoxes of Brotherly Hatred”, [Hypothekai. Journal on the History of Ancient Pedagogical Culture 2 \(2018\)](#) 34-53.
- 48I.2.57 E. M. Prodi, “Dancing in Delphi, Dancing in Thebes: The Lyric Chorus in Euripides’ *Phoenician Women*”, in 48I.2.01: 291-314.

- 48I.2.58 R. Rawles, "Theoric song and the Rhetoric of Ritual in Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*", in 48I.2.01: 221-238.
- 48I.2.59 L. Reitzammer, "Sightseeing at Colonus: Oedipus, Ismene, and Antigone as *Theôroi* in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*", *Classical Antiquity* 37 (2018) 108-150.
- 48I.2.60 S. Rodríguez Piedrabuena, "El 'Diégema' en *Moralia* de Plutarco: el relato de Arión (*Sept. Sap. Conv.* 160D-162B)", *Exemplaria Classica* 21 (2017) 81-123.
- 48I.2.61 P. Sfyroeras, "Pindar at Colonus: A Sophoclean Response to *Olympians* 2 and 3", in 48I.2.01: 65-86.
- 48I.2.62 A. Skouroumouni Stavrinou, "Staging the Dislocated Female. Space, *Hypokrisis*, and *Skeue* in Euripides' *Iphigenia Taurica*", *Eranos* 108 (2014-2015) 73-90.
- 48I.2.63 Z. Stamatopoulou, "[Constructing Periander in Plutarch's *Symposium of the Seven Sages*](#)", *CHS Research Bulletin* 5 (2016).
- 48I.2.64 I. E. Surikov, "What did Sophocles' 'Dilogy' about Oedipus teach?", [Hypothekai. Journal on the History of Ancient Pedagogical Culture](#) 2 (2018) 17-33.
- 48I.2.65 P. Van Den Broek, "The narrative of Adrastus in Statius' *Thebaid* as a case study of intratextual poetics", *Acta Antiqua* 56 (2016) 43-63.
- 48I.2.66 G. Vottéro, "Suffixes caractéristiques dans l'onomastique personnelle de Béotie", in A. Alonso Déniz, L. Dubois, C. Le Feuvre & S. Minon, edd., *La suffixation des anthroponymes grecs antiques (Saga). Actes du colloque international de Lyon, 17-19 septembre 2015, Université Jean-Moulin-Lyon 3* (Geneva 2017) p. 590-624 [ISBN 978-2-600-05735-6].
- 48I.2.67 G. Vottéro, "Textes antiques et lecteurs/chercheurs d'aujourd'hui un nouveau type d'édition? Deux exemples hésiodiques, *La Théogonie*, v. 1-21, et *Les Travaux et les Jours*, v. 1-101", in J. Dion & G. Vottéro, dir., *(Re)lire les poètes grecs et latins* (Nancy 2018) 7-25 [ISBN 978-2-913667-53-2-3-18].
- 48I.2.68 N. A. Weiss, "Performing the Wedding Song in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*", in 48I.2.01: 315-342.
- 48I.2.69 R. Xian, "A Note on ἀγοράν in Pindar *N.* 3.14", *Mnemosyne* 71 (2018) 169-172.

REVIEWS

- 48I.2.70 N. Bernstein, *Seneca: Hercules furens* (47I.2.04)
- [r] E. Wilson, *CR* 68 (2018) 95-97.
- 48I.2.71 S. M. Braund, *Seneca, Oedipus* (46I.2.05)
- [r] M. Billerbeck, *Latomus* 77 (2018) 231-233.
- 48I.2.72 S. Hornblower, ed., transl., comm., intro., *Lykophron: Alexandra* (452.2.06)
- [r] A. Sens, *JHS* 167 (2017) 234-235.
- 48I.2.73 H. Liebert, *Plutarch's politics: between city and empire* (48I.2.14)
- [r] S. Ledwith, *Political Studies Review* 16 (2018) NP9-NP9.
- 48I.2.74 B. Maslov, *Pindar and the emergence of literature* (452.2.08)
- [r] T. Phillips, *Class.Phil.* 113 (2018) 83-87.
- 48I.2.75 C. McNelis & A. Sens, *The Alexandra of Lycophron. A Literary Study* (462.2.06)
- [r] T. R. P. Coward, *CR* 68 (2018) 43-45.
- 48I.2.76 M. Meeusen, *Plutarch's Science of Natural Problems* (47I.2.13)
- [r] C. Tolsa, [BMCR 2018.01.42](#).
- 48I.2.77 K. A. Morgan, *Pindar and the construction of Syracusan monarchy* (45I.2.11)
- [r] V. Lewis, *Phoenix* 70 (2016) 401-403.
- 48I.2.78 E. Occhipinti, *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia and Historiography* (472.1.06)
- [r] V. Gray, [Histos](#) 11 (2017) ci-ciii.
- 48I.2.79 J.-R. Opsomer & F. Geert-Titchener, edd., *A Versatile Gentleman* (47I.2.14)
- [r] C. S. Chrysanthou, *CR* 68 (2018) 51-54.
- 48I.2.80 T. Phillips, *Pindar's Library. Performance Poetry and Material Texts* (46I.2.15)

- [r] B. Maslov, *CJ-Online* 2017.07.02.
- 481.2.81 J. Roisman, I. Worthington & R. Waterfield, *Lives of the Attic Orators: Texts from Pseudo-Plutarch, Photius, and the Suda* (461.2.18)
- [r] G. Martin, *Gnomon* 90 (2018) 82-84.
- 481.2.82 - [r] J. Trevett, *Phoenix* 70 (2016) 215-217.
- 481.2.83 A. C. Sigelman, *Pindar's poetics of immortality* (462.2.08)
- [r] T. Phillips, *CR* 68 (2018) 18-20.
- 481.2.84 P. A. Stadter, *Plutarch and his Roman Readers* (451.2.12)
- [r] P. Desideri, *Histos* 11 (2017) i-xiii.
- 481.2.85 Statius, *Thebaid* 8, ed., intro., transl., comm. A. Augoustakis (461.2.19)
- [r] L. Bennardo, *Phoenix* 70 (2016) 419-421.
- 481.2.86 - [r] A. Bonadeo, *Latomus* 77 (2018) 219-222.
- 481.2.87 D. Stuttard, *Looking at Bacchae* (471.2.19)
- [r] *CJ-Online* 2017.06.05.
- 481.2.88 M. Trédé-Boulmer, Kairos. *L'à-propos et l'occasion* (462.2.12)
- [r] L. Raphals, *CR* 68 (2018) 3-5.
- 481.2.89 S. Xenophontos, *Ethical education in Plutarch: moralising agents and contexts* (462.2.13)
- [r] D. Lateiner, *CJ-Online* 2018.02.09.

Teiresias is distributed by Electronic Mail and is available on request from
fabienne.marchand[at]unifr.ch

Teiresias is also available from its website: <http://www.teiresias-journal.org>

DÉPÔT LÉGAL 2ème trimestre 2018/LEGAL DEPOSIT 2nd quarter 2018
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada/National Library of Canada