McDONALD INSTITUTE MONOGRAPHS

Boeotia Project, Volume II: The city of Thespiai

Survey at a complex urban site

By John Bintliff, Emeri Farinetti, Božidar Slapšak and Anthony Snodgrass



Boeotia Project, Volume II:
The city of Thespiai



McDONALD INSTITUTE MONOGRAPHS

Boeotia Project, Volume II: The city of Thespiai

Survey at a complex urban site

By John Bintliff, Emeri Farinetti, Božidar Slapšak and Anthony Snodgrass

with contributions from
Philip Bes, Margherita Bonanno Aravantinos, Oliver Dickinson, Lorenzo Gentili, Catherine Grandjean, Machiel Kiel, Uroš Kirn, Chrystalla Loizou, Christel Müller, Robin Osborne, Jerome Poblome, Kalliope Sarri, Vladimir Stissi and Athanasios Vionis

Published by:
McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research
University of Cambridge
Downing Street
Cambridge, UK
CB2 3ER
(0)(1223) 333538
(0)(1223) 339336 (Production Office)
(0)(1223) 333536 (FAX)
eaj31@cam.ac.uk
www.mcdonald.cam.ac.uk

Distributed by Oxbow Books
United Kingdom: Oxbow Books, 10 Hythe Bridge Street, Oxford, OX1 2EW, UK.
Tel: (0)(1865) 241249; Fax: (0)(1865) 794449; www.oxbowbooks.com
USA: Casemate Academic, P.O. Box 511, Oakville, CT 06779, USA.
Tel: 860-945-9329; Fax: 860-945-9468

ISBN: 978-1-902937-81-6
ISSN: 1363-1349 (McDonald Institute)

© 2017 McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research

All rights reserved. No parts of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Cover design by Dora Kemp and Ben Plumridge.
Typesetting and layout by Ben Plumridge.
GIS map illustrations prepared by Emeri Farinetti.

Cover images: (*front*) View of the site of ancient Thespiai (the greener patch in the middle distance) from the south-east; (*back*) The site of ancient Thespiai (middle distance), looking south from the modern village of Thespiés.

Edited for the Institute by Simon Stoddart (Series Acting Editor).

Printed and bound by Short Run Press, Bittern Rd, Sowton Industrial Estate, Exeter, EX2 7LW, UK.

Contents

Contributors viii
Figures ix
Tables xv
Preface xvii

Chapter 1 Introduction: the survey of the city of Thespiai 1

Chapter 2 The site of ancient Thespiai and the early travellers 5

Chapter 3(a) Interpreting the density and period map series: methodology 19
- Introduction: the site in its setting 19
- Choosing the methodology of the Thespiai city survey 23

Chapter 3(b) Interpreting the density and period map series: the analysis 35
- Data recovery and diagnosticity 36
- Summary pie-charts: initial considerations of their significance, with charts and keys in chronological order 39
- The sector analysis 44
- The question of sample size in urban survey 48
- Making a virtue out of error: lessons from duplicated collections 48
- Investigating the structure of the Greco-Roman city 51
- Re-reading the maps 56
- Preliminary observations on the distribution of finds 63
- The categories 'Weathered' [W], 'In' [I], 'Out' [O] and 'Slope-wash' [SW] 63

Chapter 3(c) Interpreting the density and period map series: the final period maps 65
- The prehistoric sequence 66
- The historical Greek periods 85
- The Roman and later periods 114

Chapter 4 The architectural survey 141
- Part I: the architecturally diagnostic fragments 143
- Part II: the evidence for the city's defences 165
- The Thespian theatre: by Uroš Kirn 174
  - Methodology 176
  - The study area 176
  - Applications of the three-dimensional model 178
  - Conclusion 181
- Part III: other discoveries made by the University of Ljubljana team (with an Addendum by members of the 9th Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities) 183

Chapter 5 A brief history of independent Thespiai 199
- Boeotia and Thespiai in Archaic times 201
- Boeotia and Thespiai after the Persian Wars, 479–379 BC 205
- The period of the 'Theban League', 378–338 BC 210
- The period of the 'Hellenistic League' 213

Chapter 6 Thespiai: the epigraphic city down to 171 BC 219
Robin Osborne

Chapter 7 The Roman fate of Thespiai (171 BC – fourth century AD) 231
Christel Müller
- Thespiai in the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War (after 168 BC) 231
- Thespiai and the representatives of Rome 234
- The people: Greek Romans and Roman Greeks 236

Chapter 8 The history of Thespiai and Boeotia from Late Antiquity to the Frankish period 241
Athanasios K. Vionis and Chrystalla Loizou
Late Antiquity (fifth to mid-seventh centuries AD) 241
The Byzantine Early Middle Ages (mid-seventh to early ninth centuries) 244
The Middle Byzantine period (mid-ninth to early thirteenth centuries) 247
The Late Byzantine/Frankish era (early thirteenth to mid-fifteenth centuries) 250

Chapter 9 Thespia – Zogra Kobila – Erimokastro – Kaskaveli in the Ottoman Period, according to unpublished or little-known Ottoman Administrative Sources 255
Machiel Kiel
Dara 264
Tatize 264

Chapter 10(a) The Neolithic site at the Thespiai Magoula 267
Kalliope Sarri
Survey seasons and collections 267
Distribution 267
Pottery classification 272
Methodology 273
Neolithic pottery groups 273
The pottery sequence 277
The Neolithic figurines 279

Chapter 10(b) The Bronze Age pottery 281
Oliver Dickinson

Chapter 11 The pottery of the Early Iron Age to the Hellenistic periods 287
Vladimir Stissi
Data quality, possibilities and difficulties 290
Chronological overview 292
Conclusions 315

Chapter 12 Urban Thespiai: the Late Hellenistic to Late Roman pottery 317
Philip Bes and Jeroen Poblome
Methodology, chronology and terminology 317
The data: quantitative and qualitative dimensions 320
An outline of ceramic trends 322
Functional zoning: ceramic assemblages and use 338
Conclusion 348
Acknowledgments 349

Chapter 13 The Byzantine to Early Modern pottery from Thespiai 351
Athanasios K. Vionis
Chronology and terminology 351
Pottery fabrics and production 356
Functional categories by period 363
Concluding remarks 374

Chapter 14 The coins of Thespiai 375
Catherine Grandjean
Coins of the Boeotian Survey: Thespiai, Haliartos and Hyettos 375
Other coins discovered at Thespiai 378
The monetization of Thespiai 381

Chapter 15 Conclusion 387

Bibliography 391

Index 413

Appendices on CD

1. Remaining period maps (Ch.3)
2. 1985 pottery database spreadsheet (Ch.3)
3. 1986 pottery database spreadsheet (Ch.3)
4. The 'Rome Catalogue' (Ch.4)
5. Pottery catalogue to accompany Chapter 12
6. Catalogue of Byzantine to Early Modern pottery to accompany Chapter 13

Additional appendix on CD:

7. Table of artefact density and visibility measurements for Thespiai City (Ch.3b)

Contributors

John Bintliff was Professor of Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology at Universiteit Leiden NL, and is now Honorary Professor in the Department of Archaeology, at the University of Edinburgh (School of History, Classics and Archaeology, Old Medical Building, Teviot Place, Edinburgh EH8 9AG, UK; johnlbintliff@gmail.com).

Emeri Farinetti is a Faculty Member of the Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Università di Studi Roma Tre (Via Ostiense, 234, 00146 Roma, IT; emerif@tin.it).

Božidar Slapšak is Professor in the Department of Archaeology, University of Ljubljana (Cankarjeva 9, 1000 Ljubljana, SI; bslapsak@yahoo.com).

Anthony Snodgrass is Laurence Professor Emeritus of Classical Archaeology of the University of Cambridge (Faculty of Classics, Sidgwick Avenue, Cambridge, CB3 9DA, UK; ams1002@cam.ac.uk).

* * * * *

Philip Bes completed his Doctorate at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven BE, and has since held a research appointment at the Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden, NL (Mariastraat 69, 2595 GM Den Haag, NL; philipmbes@gmail.com).

Margherita Bonanno Aravantinos is Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Università Tor Vergata, Rome (Lettere e Filosofia a Tor Vergata, Via Columbia n. 1 – 00133 Roma, IT; margherita.bonanno@uniroma2.it).

Oliver Dickinson is Reader Emeritus in Greek Archaeology of the University of Durham, UK (12 The Village, Haxby, York YO32 3HT, UK; otpkdickinson@googlemail.com).

Lorenzo Gentili is Docente in the Facoltà di Lettere at the Università Tor Vergata, Rome (Lettere e Filosofia a Tor Vergata, Via Columbia n. 1 – 00133 Roma, IT; lorenzo.gentili@uniroma2.it).

Catherine Grandjean is Professeur d'histoire ancienne at the Université François-Rabelais, Tours (Responsable du CeTHiS EA 6298, Universiité François-Rabelais, 3 rue des Tanneurs, F 37000 Tours; catherine.grandjean@univ-tours.fr).

Machiel Kiel was Professor at Universiteit Utrecht, NL, then Director and now Senior Research Fellow of the Netherlands Institute in Turkey (Rhodosstr. 14, D-53177 Bonn; machiel.kiel@googlemail.com).

Uroš Kirn studied at the University of Ljubljana, SI and now runs a digitalisation company in Delft (Kirn Tech Support, Raamstraat 101, 2613RX Delft, NL; ukirn@kirntechsupport.nl).

Chrystalla Loizou is a PhD candidate at the Department of History and Archaeology in the University of Cyprus (Department of History and Archaeology, P.O. Box 20537, Nicosia 1678, CY; loizou.chrystalla@gmail.com).

Christel Müller is Professeure de l'Histoire grecque at the Université Paris Ouest Nanterre (UMR 7041-ArScAn, Maison de l'Archéologie et de l'Ethnologie, 21 allée de l'Université, F 92023 Nanterre Cedex; christel.muller@mae.u-paris10.fr).

Robin Osborne is Professor of Ancient History at the University of Cambridge (King's College, Cambridge, CB2 1ST, UK; ro225@cam.ac.uk).

Jeroen Poblome is a Professor in the Faculty of Arts, University of Leuven and directs the Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project (Blijde-Inkomststraat 21 – Box 3314, 3000 Leuven BE; jeroen.poblome@kuleuven.be).

Kalliope Sarri is Marie Sklodowska-Curie Fellow at the Saxo Institute, University of Copenhagen (Centre for Textile Research, Saxo Institute, University of Copenhagen, Karen Blixensvej 4, DK-2300 Copenhagen S; kalliope.sarri@gmail.com).

Vladimir Stissi is Professor of Classical Archaeology at the University of Amsterdam (Turfdraagsterpad 9, 1012 XT, Amsterdam, NL; V.V.Stissi@uva.nl).

Athanasios Vionis is Assistant Professor in Byzantine Archaeology and Art at the University of Cyprus (Department of History and Archaeology, P.O. Box 20537, Nicosia 1678, CY; vionis@ucy.ac.cy).

Chapter 7

The Roman fate of Thespiai (171 BC – fourth century AD)

Christel Müller

The literary sources for the late Hellenistic and Imperial Periods are scarce, scanty, and scattered in respect of the broader historical picture, offering many more lacunae than continuous narratives. We have bits and pieces from Polybius and Livy, an extract from Pausanias about the Achaian War, a few allusions here and there in Cicero. On the other hand, the two books on Boeotia by Strabo (ix) and Pausanias (ix) are full of interesting information about landscapes, topography and toponyms. To these one should add the works by the Boeotian Plutarch, especially the *Erotikos*, which is set in the Valley of the Muses. Overall, the partial nature of the literary evidence makes the epigraphical material all the more indispensable.

The total number of inscriptions for Thespiai is one of the highest in Boeotia (more than 1300), but this is not necessarily a direct reflection of the expansion and wealth of the city. That we have so many Thespian inscriptions is first and foremost the result of the 'excavation' by a member of the French school of Athens, Paul Jamot, who dismantled the *Kastro* at the end of the nineteenth century. A by-product of their inclusion in the *Kastro* is that for a lot of documents we know where they were found, but not where they were originally erected. This affects our understanding of the spatial organization of inscriptions in the city and the outer sanctuaries. But I shall still be referring both to inscriptions dealing with the Valley of the Muses and inscriptions concerning the urban centre (*astu*): the city is as much a whole for historians as it is for archaeologists.

This abundant corpus, as Robin Osborne has already mentioned (Chapter 6), has been recently published in an electronic version by the Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen in Lyon, and I shall use the numbering of this temporary opus (*IThesp*); but the chronology of many inscriptions in this corpus is either too vague ('III-II a.C.' is a very common feature), or inaccurate.[1] One example will suffice. Roesch (1982: 399) considered that the Boeotians did not use their regional dialect after 171 BC, which has proved to be mistaken: the dialect is still in use in the region down to the middle or even second half of the second century BC. Vagueness in chronology especially affects the funerary material. Tombstones are very numerous, about 900 in total for the whole history of Thespiai, but the dates are so poorly established that the material is hardly usable, so it will not be touched on here.

What will be done here is to glance through this remarkably dense material, pointing out the main dossiers in accordance with the following theme: what is Roman about Roman Thespiai? I shall focus on three main points:

- Thespiai in the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War and its subsequent history during the late Hellenistic period
- Thespiai, the Roman power and its representatives
- Thespiai and its élites: Italians, Romans and Romanized Greeks

Thespiai in the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War (after 168 BC)

The behaviour of the Thespians during the Third Macedonian War (171–168 BC) had consequences. This period witnessed the fierce and consistent opposition to the Romans on the part of three cities (Haliartos, Koroneia and Thisbe) (Müller: 1996a). But in the other Boeotian cities we can see no clear 'pro-Roman' group: Thebes was more or less on the Roman side, along with probably a few other *poleis*, including Thespiai. Kreusis, the port of Thespiai (see Pernin 2011: 308–14) was used at least three times by the Romans to get into Boeotian territory, during the Second and Third

wars: in 191 (Livy xxxvi. 21), in 171 (Livy xlii. 56), and in 169 (Livy xliv. 1). Two ambassadors, Lases and Kallias (Polybius xxvii. 1), were sent to the Romans to surrender in the name of their homeland (*patris*), that is their city of origin. Yet equally we find the Thespians welcoming the newly elected Boeotarchs, who belonged to the other party (Livy xlii. 43). Overall, the Thespians are at this time rather favourable to Rome, or display at least a benevolent neutrality.

The biggest consequence of the Third Macedonian War for Boeotia was the dissolution of the *koinon*, the Confederacy. In this Hellenistic *koinon*, Thespiai had been quite powerful: as Knoepfler has shown (Knoepfler 2002, with a summary in Müller 2001a: 261–3), out of the seven districts (*telè*) forming the territorial framework of this *koinon* Thespiai, like Thebes and Tanagra, had held a whole one for itself, which means that it had a population able to support the demands of the *koinon*, especially in terms of young soldiers ready for enrolment.

In turn, the consequences of the dissolution are multiple:

– There was no longer a federal government or magistrates. There was to be no revival of the *koinon* before, at least, the end of the Mithridatic War; and in my view, later still, at the end of the first century BC (Müller 2014). When it did reappear, Thespiai was not directly involved (it concerned mainly Lebadeia and Koroneia). After 171, we know only about local and civic magistrates. The civic organs include the *synedrion*, the council, which is the new name of the *boulè* after 167 – providing a reliable chronological landmark for epigraphical documents (Müller 2005: 114–6) – and probably implies a different way of recruiting the councillors, with the introduction of a property qualification (as conceded by Hamon 2007: 87), which anticipates the measures taken for Greece by Mummius after 146, according to Pausanias (vii. 16. 7–10). Although not many Thespian decrees are preserved after 171, there is a fragmentary one (*IThesp* 41) mentioning *synedroi* (councillors) and concerning the election of *sitônai* (commissaries for grain) during an *archèresiè* (the assembly for the election of magistrates). This decree, which may have been a measure taken against a food crisis, would fit nicely in the years 170–150 BC, as the Boeotians seem greatly concerned with such matters after the Third Macedonian War.[2]
– There was no longer federal administration of justice, which explains why the cities had to appeal to foreign judges: in Thespiai, we know of one such judge coming from Troizen at a date just before 140/39 BC (*IG* II², 971: see Müller 2013: 272–3 on this topic).
– There was no longer a federal army; but the local, civic armies did not disappear, as is shown by the catalogues of conscripts: see Plassart 1946: 482–7 on the Thespian catalogues. There are at least 12 such catalogues in the new corpus (*IThesp* 109–120) dating from the second century BC to the first century AD, with numbers of names that are not negligible (for instance *IThesp* 113, which is complete, shows 28 names in the mid-second century BC), even though some of the lists are much shorter than their predecessors (Etienne and Knoepfler 1976: 203 and n. 688). In fact, any catalogue in which there is no mention of a federal archon and no patronymic adjective (e.g. *IThesp* 108) could post-date 171, since the presence of the regional dialect is no longer a relevant chronological criterion (Müller 2005: 97–8).
– There was no longer an overall territorial organization with intermediary structures and networks. Life was now based on cities, *kata polin* as Polybius says (xxviii. 1). Yet there may have been some trace of such an organization, what I have called a 'federal memory' (Müller 2014), visible in the *apologia* of an *agonothetes* (festival organizer) of the Basileia in Lebadeia in the mid-first century BC: here we see that the designation of his successor will be in the hands of the people of two *telè*: that of the Thespians and that of the Plataeans (*Nouveau Choix* 2005²: n°22, B, 36–7).

In the Achaean War of 146 BC, Thespian behaviour is again not very clear. Thanks to Cicero (*Verr*. ii. 4. 4), we learn that Mummius had taken all the statues from the city, except for the marble Eros made by Praxiteles for Phryne or Glykera in the fourth century BC.[3] Among the statues stolen were those of the Muses and also, mentioned not by Cicero but by Dio Chrysostom (xxxvii. 42), a statue of Philip II that he had reinscribed as being of Zeus, so that he could resell it at a better price! The theft of statues from a wealthy sanctuary should not always be seen as a punishment; certainly when, later on, Gaius stole the Eros from the city (Pausanias ix. 27. 3), Thespiai was not on bad terms with the Emperor. More interesting is the fact that Mummius, at Thespiai as at Thebes and Tanagra, at least once took the liberty of re-dedicating some statues under his own name (*IThesp* 396: see Knoepfler 1991: 270–1 on the re-use of bases in Boeotia). The practice was certainly not a novelty in Greece, but this almost systematic application of the process is no chance affair and must reveal an ideological appropriation

of the bases and, at the same time, of the space that they occupy.[4]

It is a real historical problem to know what should or should not be inferred from such a gesture: it seems probable that Thespiai, like most Boeotian cities, had stood with the Thebans and the Achaeans against the Romans (cf. Knoepfler 1991: 269), which would imply that Thespiai was among the cities that were placed '*sub imperium populi Romani dictionemque*', 'under the rule and jurisdiction of the Roman people', as Cicero (*Verr*. ii. 1. 55) notes for those *poleis* that had supported the Achaeans. But there is no certainty about this and especially, there is no evidence whatever of a province of Achaea in existence already at that time; the mention of a Roman governor of Achaea having been appointed from 145 'down to my own time' by Pausanias (vii. 16. 7) is an obvious mistake (see Plutarch, *Cimon* 2.1). The only possibility, according to the *communis opinio*, would have been that these parts of Greece that had rebelled against Rome during the Achaean War would have been made subject to the governor of Macedonia. But, as Gruen (1984: 524) has shown, it is difficult to imagine a patchwork system where some bits and pieces of Greece would have been under the authority of the Romans, while their neighbours would have remained free. It might be better to think of an informal control over Greece by the governors of Macedonia (Fournier 2010: 8).

The next step occurs during the Mithridatic war. At this time, contrary to its earlier behaviour, Thespiai stood clearly against Rome's enemy. As Appian (*Mithridateios* 29) relates, during the winter of 88/87 BC Archelaos, Mithridates' general, managed to overcome the reluctance of the Boeotians and made them his allies, with one notorious exception: the Thespians alone resisted the Pontic army before the arrival of Sulla. Archelaos besieged the city, but without success. The city dedicated two statues, one of Sulla (*IThesp* 397) as *autokratôr* (*imperator*) after his victory in Chaironeia in 86 BC; the other of Quintus Braetius Sura, *legatus* of the governor of Macedonia (*IThesp* 34), who had been sent against the Mithridatic troops. This heroic conduct is probably the reason why Thespiai was granted the status of *liberum oppidum*, 'free city' (Pliny, *NH iv*. 7. 25). At any rate, there is no way of demonstrating that this privilege could have been granted before Sulla, as a few historians have implied (Plassart 1926: 438; Accame 1946: 199; Bernhardt 1971), believing that the province of Achaia had been established in 146 BC and that this was implicated in the free status (that is, by Thespiai's exclusion from the province). The definition of such a 'freedom' is problematic: the one thing we really know is that such a status, as attested in Pliny, concerns only two cities in Boeotia, at least for the Augustan period: Thespiai and Tanagra. Roesch (1965: 73) held that Caesar was responsible for the award of this status, but the author of the grant, for the reasons already mentioned, must surely have been Sulla.

If Sulla was responsible for the grant of freedom, this would fit well with the fact that the Thespians showed gratitude to Sulla by establishing, probably after 86, the new athletic competition of the *Erotideia* (on this festival, see Manieri 2009: 341–6). The cult of Eros is well attested from the Classical period onwards in the town itself, but the competition appears only much later. The first local agonistic catalogue (of winning competitors) is to be dated around 60 BC (*IThesp* 186), but the earliest mention of this competition is in an Athenian decree (*IG* II^2, 1054), dated after 86 BC by Knoepfler (1997: 36–7). It gives its title as being the *Erôtideia kai Rhômaia*, which must mean that it bore the double name from the beginning. The other catalogues (*IThesp* 187–193) are mostly of imperial date and record only athletic games, which fits both Plutarch's essay *On Love* and Pausanias' testimony (ix. 31. 3), when the latter says that, thanks to both the *Mouseia* and *Erôtideia* (which took place at different times), there were prizes not only for musicians but also for athletes. Ideologically, the connexion of the *Erôtideia* with Sulla, who in Greek contexts styled himself Epaphroditos, fits well with the *imperator*'s wish to establish a link to Venus-Aphrodite: Eros is the servant of the goddess and was worshipped in her sanctuary at Thespiai.

The Sullan period was a flourishing one also for the *Mouseia*.[5] After 171 and the disappearance of the *koinon*, they were still celebrated as a musical festival that was penteteric (every four years) and stephanitic (with prizes in the form of a simple wreath). The Thespians organized the festival, now without any federal support, but with the deep involvement of the companies of artists, the *technitai*, who were taking part in *agônes* all over Greece (e.g. *IThesp* 165 and 172). The Sanctuary of the Muses and the *Mouseia* themselves became a very important space for the Thespians to express their links with the new Roman power, especially after the Mithridatic war. For instance, the crown given to Q. Braetius Sura after 86 BC (*IThesp* 34), already mentioned, was to be proclaimed in the theatre, thus in the Valley of the Muses, during the festivals, including the *Mouseia*, organized by the Thespians. Finally, Sulla did something else for the Thespian Sanctuary of the Muses, as related by Pausanias (ix. 30): he re-dedicated there a statue of Dionysos by Myron that he had taken from Orchomenos; as Pausanias writes, this was 'worshipping the gods with other people's incense'. As has been seen with

Mummius, this was quite a common practice and should not be over-interpreted.

As for the province, Achaia seems to have had a governor once in 81 BC (*RDGE* 105–11, no. 18, l. 110–111); but the most conspicuous attempt to reduce the freedom of the *civitates liberae* came between 58 and 55 when L. Calpurnius Piso (consul in 58), was given the province of Macedonia by a plebiscite of the tribune Clodius, the famous *Lex Clodia de provinciis consularibus*,[6] and the limits of the province were extended far beyond Macedonia and those Greek territories that had been under the surveillance of the proconsul since 146. It was extended to free cities including Athens, and will therefore certainly have included Thespiai and Tanagra. The first real attempt to create a province of Achaia, however, was Caesar's in 46–44 BC. Caesar sent Ser. Sulpicius Rufus and then M. Acilius Caninus as governors of Achaia, as is made clear in Cicero's correspondence (*Fam*. vi. 6. 10; vii. 30. 3; xiii. 17–28; xiii. 50). To the former, Cicero wrote in 46 a letter of recommendation for one of his friends (Cicero, *Fam*. xiii. 22), Titus Manlius '*qui negotiatur Thespiis*', 'who is doing some business in Thespiai'. This Sulpicius certainly visited Boeotia, '*ut (…) reliquam(que) juris dictionem absolvere(t)*' ('to discharge his other judicial duties': Cicero, *Fam*. iv. 12 [31 May, 45 BC]), but we have no proof that Thespiai was itself placed under the authority of the governor, just as we do not know much about Thespiai's fate under Augustus, when he finally set up a senatorial province of Achaia in 27 BC (Dio liii. 12).

We then reach the end of the Hellenistic period with Strabo, who gives quite a precise account of Thespiai and its territory in his own time (ix. 2. 25), although his testimony has not always struck historians as highly reliable (Knoepfler 1997: 23, is among those who think that Strabo knows little of Hellenistic Boeotia). The geographer enumerates in order the town itself, the port (i.e. Kreusis), and the citadel of Askra. There follows a geographical description of the westward extension of Helikon as far as Phokis, and the calculation of the distances between Kreusis and two Phokian sites, Mychos and Holmiai. The author then goes back to the Sanctuary of the Muses and the Hippokrene spring, as if he had never left Thespian territory. The biggest problem therefore is to establish, from the text, clear territorial boundaries. In the middle of the region lies Thisbe, which is mentioned a few paragraphs later (ix. 2. 28) not as a *polis*, but as a *chorion* 'adjacent to the Thespians and to the territory of Koroneia'. Strabo does not say explicitly that Thisbe lay in Thespian territory, but this is highly probable, as the term *chorion* is frequently used to designate dependent places.[7] Moreover, the extended geographical description of the *Thespiake* probably shows that the author includes Thisbe in it. The epigraphy of Thisbe does not contradict this hypothesis, as there is no inscription available beyond the last third of the second century, after the famous *Senatus Consultum de Thisbensibus* of 170 BC (*RDGE* 26–31, no. 2).

If there is one conclusion to be drawn for this period (Late Hellenistic), it must be that Thespiai has progressively imposed itself as the leading city in Boeotia, alike in terms of territory, status and excellent relations with the Romans. The only possible comparison is with Tanagra, but even Tanagra fails to shine as brightly in what may be called 'the new political order'. As Strabo concludes (ix. 2. 25), Thespiai, with Tanagra, is 'the only one to have maintained its existence (*monè sunestèke*) among Boeotian cities; of the other ones are left only ruins and names'.

Thespiai and the representatives of Rome

From the second half of the first century BC, Thespiai seems therefore the most 'Romanized' of all Boeotian cities. A good example of the links established with the Roman power is the last Thespian decree of the late Hellenistic period (*IThesp* 35, last third of the first century BC?[8]), in honour of a proconsul Futius Longus (*Brill's New Pauly*, *s.v. Futius* (2)), proposed by a Polykratides son of Anthemiôn, a character belonging to a family closely linked to the new rulers (see below). This Roman promagistrate is said 'to have been informed in Rome about our *patris* by those who take care of us', which tells a lot about the close relationship between Thespiai and the Roman power, even if we can only make assumptions about the identity of those taking care of the city's interests. We know of other Roman promagistrates honoured by Thespiai in the Late Hellenistic Period (in other words, the late Roman Republic), including for instance the *quaestor* Marcus Junius Silanus (*PIR*^{2} I 830), for whose wife Crispina and mother Sempronia the Thespians erected around 34–30 BC an arc-shaped monument (*IThesp* 400 and 401). The Thespians are known to be the only ones, apart from the Tanagraeans, to engage as a body of citizens in a relationship of *patrocinium* (patronage) with Roman promagistrates, among whom one can identify Caesar in 46 (*IThesp* 420; *MRR* II 293 and *MRR* III 107; Eilers 2002: C25), Lucius Caninius Gallus (*IThesp* 399; Eilers 2002: C24), contemporary of Cicero and perhaps praetor of Achaia, and Marcus Licinius Crassus (*IThesp* 403; *PIR*^{2} L 186; Eilers 2002: C26), consul in 30 BC and proconsul of Macedonia and Achaia in 29.

Of all these patrons, one is more prominent than others, although he is the patron not of the community but of an individual, a unique case in Boeotia: Titus Statilius Taurus. Here, the biggest problem is

to establish which member of the family is involved: our man is most probably the consul suffect of 37 BC and ordinary consul in 26 BC (*MRR* 2, 422; *PIR* vii.2, 318–23, no. 853; Thériault 2009), commander of Octavian's land forces at Actium, a role that may explain his standing in Thespiai, rather than one of two brothers who were consuls in AD 11 and 16 (*PIR* vii.2, nos. 851 and 855), much less known than the great Taurus. He is the patron of a Thespian already mentioned, Polykratides, son of Anthemiôn (*IThesp* 412), who belongs to the most prominent local family. He, or another Taurus, is also the patron of four freedmen with Roman onomastic formulae (*IThesp* 425). Finally the wife of a Taurus, Cornelia, is given a statue by the city (*IThesp* 413). But the most striking feature about Taurus is that he receives a cult: nine little *cippi* bearing the inscription *Theou Taurou* provide evidence for this cult (*IThesp* 72–80). According to Roesch (1982: 181 and n. 180), they are not altars (for which this would be an excessive number), but *horoi* (boundaries) for a sanctuary. There is also an *agôn* (competition) called the 'writing of an *enkômion* for Tauros' during the *Mouseia*, around AD 20 (*IThesp* 174), and the same Polykratides appears to be the priest of his cult (*IThesp* 412).

That leads to my second point: that the Thespians are the champions in Boeotia of the cult of Rome and, later on, of the civic version of the imperial cult in Boeotia (see Kantirea (2007), *passim*). It is not possible to cite all the inscriptions, but the cult of Rome appears in the agonistic catalogues of the *Erôtideia kai Rhômaia*, through the existence of an *archiereus* (chief priest) (Lysandros son of Polykratides: *IThesp* 374), and through the dedication of buildings (*IThesp* 426–7). The climax of the cult is reached between 20 BC and AD 20, and is associated with the very important local family of the *Phileinoi* (as one could call them, from the *cognomen* born by members of the family: see below).

As for the imperial cult, one must consider this alongside the celebration of the festivals, both the *Erôtideia* and the *Mouseia* (Manieri 2009: 313–433). After a decline during Augustan times, the latter competition flourished again during the Imperial period, when some eminent members of local circles took on the role of *agonothetes*, organizer of the festival: the importance of the position is visible in the fact that the *agonothetes* is mentioned before the eponymous *archôn* himself in some agonistic catalogues of the second half of the second century AD (*IThesp* 176; 178; 184). But one of the most striking facts is that the *Erôtideia* were originally associated with the *Rhômaia*, then with the *Kaisareia*; while the *Mouseia* were progressively linked with the *Sebasteia*, the *Traianeia* and the *Hadrianeia*, depending on the period (*IThesp* 358, first century AD: *Mouseia Sebasteia* and *Erôtideia Kaisareia*; *IThesp* 177, second half of the second century AD: *megala Traianeia Hadrianeia Sebasteia Mouseia*).

Another manifestation of Thespiai's relationship with the Emperors is the dedication of buildings: two *stoai* (porticoes) and perhaps a *bouleuterion* (council house), which are neither reused nor associated with another god, and which were probably built in the town itself. The first *stoa* was dedicated to the *genos Sebastôn* (*IThesp* 427). The second *stoa* and the *bouleuterion* were for the *theoi Sebastoi* and the *oikos Sebastôn* (*IThesp* 426). Also worth mentioning is a probable altar (rather than simply the *horos* of a sanctuary, as for *Taurus*) which is quite large (0.89 h. x 0.53 l.) and dedicated to the *theoi Sebastoi* (*IThesp* 81). As for who was in control of all this, involvement in the imperial cult was very strong among individuals coming from the wealthy Romanized families; yet the city, at least officially speaking, is the one dedicating statues, although the local *euergetai* (that is, private benefactors of the state) are probably making significant financial contributions. One exception is a document recently discovered and published that records the restoration of a public building by the emperor Domitian in AD 86 or 87 (Schachter and Marchand 2012: 292–4): the inscription may have suffered from the *damnatio memoriae* of that Emperor as it was found broken into pieces but, before that, Thespian coinage seems to have celebrated the Emperor's gesture (*RPC* ii: 66–7, nos. 266–74).

Beside the imperial cult, one must also mention the dedication of statues of Emperors. It should be noted that 40 per cent of the documents concerning Emperors in Boeotia come from Thespiai. They cover a huge time-span, from Augustus to Valentinian at the very end of the fourth century AD (*IThesp* 421–52), with special prominence for Hadrian (5 dedications: *IThesp* 433–7): the Emperor probably visited the city during the year 125, organized an Impeerial hunt on Helikon, perhaps took part in the local contests, and took the time to have an epigram engraved in honour of Eros, alluding to his beloved Antinoös (*IThesp* 270). Such a concentration of documents gives us some idea of the spatial renewal of the place from the Imperial period onwards. Judging by the find-spots of all these inscriptions, the two main places in which they were put up were the Sanctuary of the Muses, the *Mouseion*, and the agora of the city: we have to imagine these locations crowded with statues. As already mentioned, Augustus himself had his own bronze statue in the Thespian *Mouseion* (*IThesp* 421), but the city is one of the rare Boeotian *poleis* to have erected 'dynastic monuments', like the huge curved base in honour of Augustus's family (*IThesp* 422–3) that was placed there between 17 and 12 BC. That base supported six statues: of Livia, wife of Augustus, of Agrippa, his

wife Julia (Augustus' daughter), and their daughter Agrippina the Elder, and finally of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, the adopted sons of Augustus. This monument was obviously linked with cult of the *Domus Augusta* (Hurlet 1997: 440–1). Another very large monument is the base related to Emperors of the fourth century AD (*IThesp* 448–50) that was probably erected on the agora, since the pieces were found in the *Kastro*. This base was probably originally dedicated to the Muses and was then reused, first for Constantine, then for his sons, and then for Valentinian and Valens: each statue would replace the other.

The most intense phase of dedication and consecration in general is, however, the Augustan one. This is a very dynamic period for the city, in contrast with other Boeotian *poleis*. Slightly later, around the middle of the first century AD, the Thespians even had a copy of the famous Eros made with an epigram written on it by a wealthy poetess from Thessalonike, Herennia Procula (*IThesp* 271): that copy could have been either a replacement for the missing statue (taken away by Nero: so Gutzwiller 2004: 387) or a miniature of it (Knoepfler 2006: n°205). According to the epigraphic evidence, there is also a great deal of wealth in this city during the first two centuries AD, which could be linked one way or another to the fact that Thespiai maintained its freedom: under Hadrian, in AD 125, we know of P. Pactumeius Clemens, *legatus divi Hadriani Athenis Thespiis Plateis item in Thessalia*, 'at Athens, Thespiai and Plataia as well as in Thessaly' (*CIL* viii 7059), who is a *corrector* in charge of the free cities (Fournier 2010: 392 n. 648; 480–1). This culminates, as a famous decree records (*IThesp* 37), in the participation of the young people of the city in a military expedition under Marcus Aurelius around AD 170 against either the Costoboci or, more probably, the Germans, a war for which enormous levies were necessary (Jones 1971). This decree gives them, and their parents while they are away, the right to receive distributions and honours of bouleutic rank, at a time when the *boulè* (the Council) has been reduced to the equivalent of an order,[9] and the real political power lies in the hands of a few people, including the *prôtoi* ('first men') of the city mentioned in the text, even though the *demos* is still associated in the decision with the *boulè* and the magistrates (*archontes*).

The people: Greek Romans and Roman Greeks

The first point under this heading concerns individuals and communities from Rome and Italy installed in Boeotia (Müller 2002). The major phase of settlement of Italians or Romans in Thespiai is between 50 BC and AD 30, as in the rest of Boeotia, although the presence of Italians is sporadically attested in other cities well before the middle of the first century BC. One must underline the fact that there is a link between the names of the *negotiatores* (large-scale businessmen) attested on Delos at the end of the second and the beginning of the first century BC, and those attested in Thespiai after the middle of the first century BC; it is probable that some of them moved to Boeotia after the fall of Delos.

The first *negotiator* we know about in our city has already been mentioned: Titus Manlius, recommended by Cicero to Ser. Sulpicius Rufus in 46 BC (*Fam* xiii. 22). We cannot tell what kind of business he was involved in, nor whether he was actually living in Thespiai. In all likelihood, he did not reside there, as the city was surely insufficient for a man whom Cicero describes as a *bonus vir* (of high standing). Titus Manlius probably had freedmen working for him. Later, under Tiberius, one can probably identify some of his family in Corinth (Spawforth 1996: 172). Soon after this episode, one can talk of a real community of *negotiatores* established in Thespiai. In two dedications (*IThesp* 352 and 373), dating to the last third of the first century BC, we find the phrase *Rhômaioi hoi pragmateuomenoi en Thespiais*, a translation of the Latin: *Romani qui negotiantur in Thespiis*. But the most important evidence for this community is the Latin inscription dated to December AD 14 (*IThesp* 425), listing a series of 19 people, most of whom are Romans. This inscription is a dedication, probably of an altar, and should be connected to the deification of Augustus. In terms of business, what is interesting in this inscription is that the individuals are in groups of two or three from the same family, bearing the same *nomen*. That could indicate that they form little family businesses where the freedmen and probably the slaves act for their patron, whether resident or not. In this list two groups especially attract attention: the *Statilii* and the *Castricii*.

The *nomen Statilius* is linked with the famous *Statilii Tauri* about whom we have already spoken: the four people bearing this name in the Latin inscription (*IThesp 425*) are all freedmen of a Statilius Taurus. That suggests that they may have chosen to settle down in Thespiai while visiting the city with their patron. The *nomen Castricius* is the second prominent group; it is especially well attested in Boeotia, always in Thespiai, with two exceptions. The family seems to be organized around a free-born Aulus Castricius Auli filius Modestus. This *nomen* is well attested in Rome, in Campania (around Puteoli, Pompei, Naples and Capua), and in the eastern Mediterranean, especially in Delos in the first century BC, but also in Asia Minor. In Cicero's writings, bearers of the name seem

to specialize in lending money. This might have been the case in Thespiai too. But their *negotium* could also be connected with the geographical situation of Thespiai, which had a good port, Kreusis, often used by Roman commanders. In any case, the phrase *Rhômaioi hoi pragmateuomenoi en Thespiais* certainly means that these people had a special status among other foreign residents, one that could be useful in case of a judicial problem with the local Greeks and allowed them to appeal to the Roman governor (Fournier 2010: 314–18). There is a probable link between this community and an *agoranomos* (clerk of the market) whose name, Ingenuus, is recorded on a measure clay for liquids that shows a Hermes in a small stamped medallion (Schachter and Marchand 2012: 295–9, dated to the 'Early Imperial Period'). They also had their own *gymnasion*, built for them (*IThesp* 373) by a member of one of the leading local families, Polykratides. The Romans appear here as having their own private place of training, but also as dependent on the generosity of the local Greek *euergetes*.

This *gymnasion* might well be identified with another, referred to in a list of men as the 'upper gymnasion' (*IThesp* 136), where three people named *archontes* are seen directing the institution. One interesting problem is to know why this *gymnasion* is called the 'upper' one; it was perhaps situated in the later extension of the city (see Chapter 4, p. 183). Probably also from one of the Thespian *gymnasia* come different lists of names, including Roman names, from the end of the first century BC and beginning of the first century AD, which can be called 'ephebic lists', and are the later avatar of the military catalogues. I will give only two examples, one written on eight different blocks (*IThesp* 143–150) belonging to the crowning member of a unique monument (Plassart 1958: 165) and the other, recently reassembled by Y. Kalliontzis[10] and dated by him to the first century AD.

The subsequent development, from the first century AD onwards, is a little different in terms of geography. Now the link is between Thespiai and Corinth, following the re-foundation of that city in 44 BC. People move from one city to another, settle easily, and keep the links they established inside a macro-regional network. The first interesting example is the huge dedication to the Muses, on a base in nine parts erected in the Augustan period (*IThesp* 288–97). It bears a series of epigrams written by Honestus, who is known from the Palatine Anthology (9. 216, 225 and 230: on the links between Honestus and Thespiai, see now Jones 2004: 93–5). The poet came from the *colonia* of Corinth and wrote another dedication in Thespiai, mentioning Livia, wife of Augustus (*IThesp* 424). Another example is case of the *Vibullii*. Four bearers of this name are attested in Thespiai, three in a first century dedication to Egyptian Gods (*IThesp* 319) and a fourth in an agonistic catalogue of the second century AD (*IThesp* 192). Spawforth (1995) has shown that the patron Lucius Vibullius belonged to the well-known colonial family of the L. Vibullii, established in Corinth, who might have acquired their citizenship from L. Vibullius Rufus, a *praefectus* for Pompey during the civil war of 49–48 BC (*MRR* II 271). The main difficulty lies in identifying the kind of economic business the *Vibulii* were undertaking in Boeotia: Spawforth suggested that it could be linked with the trading of fish, because this early Imperial dedication is also made at the village of Hyle; this is not, however, the Hyle linked with the lakes Kopaïs and Iliki (former Kephisis), but is to be located in the south-western vicinity of Thespiai (Schachter 2007: 374).

Relations between Thespiai and Corinth are even better attested in the second century AD. A not negligible number of Roman citizens from Corinth are present in the agonistic catalogues of the *Erôtideia* and *Mouseia*. These competitions boomed in the second and early third centuries AD. At some point during the second century, both festivals turned into thematic competitions, in which the winners were given money prizes instead of a leaf-crown. This was a device to attract the big stars, contrary to any previous agonistic rules! (Strasser 2003: 271–3). The links between Thespiai and Corinth are not so surprising, as the Isthmian and the Thespian competitions have quite a similar profile. Some of the victors even have a double ethnic: they are said to be Corinthian *and* Thespian.

The second point under this heading concerns the Greek elites integrated in the *civitas Romana*, a phenomenon that completely overlaps the previous point in terms of chronology. The phenomenon is visible through a certain type of gentilicial (or middle) names (Müller 1996c), *nomina* that are taken either from eminent Roman generals, or from imperial *gentilicia*.

In the first centuries BC and AD, before the principate of Claudius, very few Greeks get Roman citizenship. One of these freshly Romanized individuals is a *limenarchos* of Kreusis, Thespiai's harbour, around the beginning of the first century AD: Dekmos Stertinios Eisiôn (*IThesp* 266 & 426). In Thespiai, we can establish a link between Marcus Licinius Crassus, honoured with a statue just after 29 BC (*IThesp* 403) and the presence of a man bearing the same *nomen* in the ephebic list of the 'upper *gymnasion*' (*IThesp* 136); there may also be a relationship between two Markoi Antonioi who appear as *archontes* in the same list, and the name of the famous triumvir. But nothing can be held for sure here. Some of the *nomina* (*Vipsanii*, *Pompeii*, *Cornelii*) are still present in the second century AD, which is

merely a sign of the transmission of the names through different branches of the families. For the early period (first century BC and first half of the first century AD), however, the leading Greek families display neither the *duo* nor *tria nomina* of Roman form; on the contrary, they seem to prize other Greek citizenships more. A really striking feature is that even the members of those families who establish firm and precocious links with the Romans, e.g. the *Phileinoi*, do not acquire the *civitas Romana* until quite a late date, in fact under the Flavians. Generally speaking, from the time of Claudius until Caracalla's edict giving citizenship to all free men in the Empire (AD 212), each of the imperial *gentilicia* are abundantly represented, with the exception of the *Ulpii*. Most frequently represented here are the *Flavii* (27) and the *Aurelii* (12). The latter *nomen*, unlike that of the Flavii, presents no special profile in Thespiai. One could explain this by a particularly generous policy on the part of the Flavian emperors; but in fact the most honoured emperors in Thespiai are not the *Flavii*, but the Julio-Claudians. The large number of bearers of this *nomen* is mostly due to the transmission of citizenship within prominent families.

Let us look now more closely at a particular family already mentioned: the *Flavii Phileinoi*. There are three important phases in the history of this family. The first falls between the first century BC and the 70s of the first century AD: during this period, the most important character is Polykratides son of Anthemiôn, who is close to the Romans and a strong link between the community of *negotiatores* and the city. He is the one who had Statilius Taurus as a patron. The second step comes in the acquisition of Roman citizenship by Mondôn, father of Phileinos, the friend of Plutarch; at that time, the family was prominent in Thespiai and in Boeotia at large. The most important family member is Titos Flavios Phileinos, Plutarch's friend, who lived at the end of the first and the beginning of the second century AD. As we can see from Plutarch's writings and especially the *Dialogue on the Pythia's oracles* (394e), he was a member of his circle. Finally, and this is the third step, the first member of the family to enter the senatorial order is another Titos Flavios Phileinos, at the end of the second century AD: he is said in the sources to be *kratistos* and *lamprotatos* ('highest and most illustrious'). His career took him far beyond his original city, mostly to the East: he was a *quaestor* in Asia, a tribune of the *plebs*, a *praetor*, a legate of the proconsul of Cyprus and a proconsul in Lycia-Pamphylia some time after AD 180. With this Phileinos, the family definitely gets beyond the bounds of Boeotia. This is shown by the marriage of his daughter Flavia Phileina with Markos Aurelios Olympiodoros, who is a descendant of the sophist Hippodromos of Larissa (see H. Müller 1968 for a thorough study of these two people). With this same Phileinos, the family becomes settled in Athens: his wife, Flavia Amphikleia, is the daughter of a Flavios Amphikles, whose origin, as between Thespiai and Athens, is not totally confirmed. At the least, this man served as archon of the Hadrianic *Panhellenion* in Athens (*IG* II-III^2 2957); but in fact, for this period, it is difficult to say that a family comes from this or that city. For instance, the maternal ancestry of Flavia Amphikleia has roots in different places in Greece and the East, such as Thera, Asia and Boeotia. Finally, at the end of the third century AD, in an ephebic catalogue from Athens, we find the great-grandson of this Titos Flavios Phileinos: he is called Titos Flavios Mondôn son of Phileinos, registered in the deme of Phlya, *archôn kratistos* and priest of Athena *Polias* and the *Homonoia* of the Greeks.

It is worth adding some final words concerning Pausanias' testimony for Thespiai in the second century AD. It is of limited use in defining Thespian territory and Strabo, at least for his own time, seems more useful in this respect. Pausanias gives a few indications about historical events of the Roman period, especially those involving Sulla, but nothing else. He also indicates a few public buildings or spaces in the town, which are supposed to be in contemporary use: an *agora* and a theatre. Finally, he gives a good impression of what could be called the religious correspondences between the town and the extra-urban sanctuary, the *alsos*. The best example of this is probably the reference to a small *Mouseion* in the town, which appears as a 'double' of the big *Mouseion*, this time with a temple, as is not the case with the one in the *alsos*. This small temple has unfortunately not been found, since it can hardly be the one that Jamot 'excavated' (see Müller 1996b).

Notes

1 Some effort has been devoted, mainly by D. Knoepfler but also by myself, to correcting some of the major chronological points in respect of Boeotian inscriptions, but these improvements have not been recorded in the online corpus. So the dates given there should not be trusted without further checking.

2 There are examples of this at Chorsiai, not far from Thespiai: cf. the Chorsieian decree (Migeotte 1984: n°10), which should be dated after 171 (see most recently Müller 2011b: 353).

3 Exempted, according to Cicero, 'because it was a dedication': '*ille L. Mummius, cum Thespiadas (…) ceteraque profana ex illo oppido signa tolleret, hunc marmoreum Cupidinem, quod erat consecratus, non attigit*'. Knoepfler 1997 has argued that, contrary to what Cicero says, Mummius had in fact stolen this statue, although

Pausanias writes that Gaius was the first to steal it, before Claudius gave it back and Nero stole it again. I am not completely convinced by this argument, resting as it does mostly on a text of Strabo (ix. 2. 25), who uses the past tense to describe the situation in Thespiai and therefore should refer to a situation around the mid-second century BC.

4 See Shear 2007 for parallel examples in Athens, although the context there is argued to be different in that, for the Romans (and the Athenians bestowing honours), the reuse of bases was a way of suggesting that 'the Romans were, in fact, Athenians of some sort', that they had 'Roman fortunes', but were 'Greek characters'. In this case, anyway, it is the Athenians themselves who are granting the honours. On statues and bases, see most recently Ma 2013.

5 On the *Mouseia*, see Manieri 2009: 313–40 and 347–423. For the most recently discovered catalogue of the Late Hellenistic Period: Schachter and Marchand 2012: 287–92.

6 Cf. Rotondi 1912: 393–4. On this law, see Habicht 1997: 338–42, who gives an account of the situation created for Athens by Clodius.

7 This is also the case with Salganeus, a *chôrion* in Tanagra's territory (ix. 2. 9). In each case, the word could even designate a fortified location used as a defensive outpost on the territory, but without excluding the possibility of a small settlement at the same location.

8 The date here proposed derives from the *stemma* that can be established for the family.

9 According to Hamon (2001: xx), this is a phenomenon that starts in Late Hellenistic times, mostly from the first century BC on, and grows during the Imperial Period.

10 Kalliontzis 2011: 316–22, who also provides (322–7) a concise synthesis of all these late Hellenistic and Early Imperial monuments.



Boeotia Project, Volume II: The city of Thespiai

Few major Classical cities have disappeared so completely from view, over the centuries, as Thespiai in Central Greece. Only the technique of intensive field survey, carefully adapted to a large urban site and reinforced by historical investigation, has made it possible to recover from oblivion much of its life of seven millennia.

Authors:

John Bintliff was Professor of Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology at Universiteit Leiden NL, and is now Honorary Professor in the Department of Archaeology at the University of Edinburgh.

Emeri Farinetti is a Faculty Member of the Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Università di Studi Roma Tre.

Božidar Slapšak is Professor in the Department of Archaeology, University of Ljubljana.

Anthony Snodgrass is Laurence Professor Emeritus of Classical Archaeology of the University of Cambridge.

Published by the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research,
University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3ER, UK.

The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research exists to further research by Cambridge archaeologists and their collaborators into all aspects of the human past, across time and space. It supports archaeological fieldwork, archaeological science, material culture studies, and archaeological theory in an interdisciplinary framework. The Institute is committed to supporting new perspectives and ground-breaking research in archaeology and publishes peer-reviewed books of the highest quality across a range of subjects in the form of fieldwork monographs and thematic edited volumes.

Printed by Short Run Press. Distributed by Oxbow Books.
Cover design by Dora Kemp and Ben Plumridge.

ISBN-13: 978-1-902937-81-6

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

9 781902 937816