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The Region

Aὕτη δ'(ἡ θάλατταν) ἐκ τῶν Σικελικῶν πελάγων προσπεσοῦσα τῇ μὲν ἀναχεῖται πρὸς τὸν Κορινθιακόν κόλπον, τῇ δ' ἀποτελεί χερρόνησον μεγάλην τὴν Πελοπόννησον, ἱσθμῷ στενῷ κλειομένην. ἔστι δὲ τὰ δύο μέγιστα συστήματα τῆς Ἑλλάδος τό τε ἐντὸς Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ τό ἐκτὸς μέχρι τῆς ἐκβολῆς τοῦ Πηνειοῦ: ἔστι δὲ καὶ μείζον καὶ ἐπιφανέστερον τὸ ἐντὸς Ἰσθμοῦ: σχεδὸν δὲ τι καὶ ἀκρόπολίς ἔστιν ἡ Πελοπόννησος τῆς συμπάσης Ἑλλάδος […]

Map of the Peloponnese. Courtesy of Dr. Daniel Stewart.
Now this sea, issuing forth out of the Sicilian Sea, on one side stretches to the Corinthian Gulf, and on the other forms a large peninsula, the Peloponnesus, which is closed by a narrow isthmus. Thus, Greece consists of two very large bodies of land, the part inside the Isthmus, and the part outside, which extends through Pylae as far as the outlet of the Peneius but the part inside the Isthmus is both larger and more famous. I might almost say that the Peloponnesus is the acropolis of Greece as a whole [...]  

Strabo, 8.1.3
Programme

Venue: Charles Wilson Fourth Floor, Rutland & Gartree (Seminar Rooms 403, 404).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title of Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30-09:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Production/Consumption (Chair: Dr. Daniel Stewart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-09:40</td>
<td>Opening Lecture: Dr. Daniel Stewart (University of Leicester)</td>
<td><em>Inventing the Hellenistic Peloponnes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:40-10:00</td>
<td>James Lloyd (University of Reading/Exeter)</td>
<td><em>The End of Lead Figurines in the Early Hellenistic Period at the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia: Pb Isotope Analysis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:20</td>
<td>Jane Ainsworth (University of Leicester)</td>
<td><em>Herakles on the Edge: Artistic Choices in Hellenistic Elis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20-10:40</td>
<td>Dr. Gabriel Zuchtriegel (Archaeological Park of Paestum)</td>
<td><em>Early Hellenistic Economies: Comparing the Peloponnes with Southern Italy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40-11:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:20</td>
<td>Tea/Coffee Break</td>
<td>Power (Chair: Professor Graham Shipley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20-11:40</td>
<td>Roumpini-Ioanna Charami (University of Nottingham)</td>
<td><em>The Hellenistic Perioikoi: a Preliminary Insight into the Life and History of Perioikic Communities</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40-12:00</td>
<td>Chares Chrysaftis (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens)</td>
<td><em>Garrisons and ‘Tyrants’: Preliminary Remarks on the Antigonid Rule in the Peloponnes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:20</td>
<td>Richard Evans</td>
<td>Shock and Awe: Violence, Resistance and Terror within the Achaean Koinon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20-12:40</td>
<td>Charlotte van Regenmortel</td>
<td>The Consultant General: Spartan Military Leaders Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40-13:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-13:50</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong> (Chair: Professor Stephen Hodkinson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:50-14:10</td>
<td>Professor Luigi Gallo</td>
<td>The Transformations of the Spartan Royalty in the Second Half of the Third Century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10-14:30</td>
<td>Andrea Scarpato</td>
<td>A de facto king: Cleonymus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-14:50</td>
<td>Krzysztof Zimny</td>
<td>Burden of the Past: Sparta in the Face of the Achaean Resurgence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:50-15:10</td>
<td>Dr. Stefania Gallotta</td>
<td>Argos in the Third Century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10-15:30</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-15:50</td>
<td><strong>Tea/Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td><strong>Memory</strong> (Chair: Professor Andrew Meadows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:50-16:10</td>
<td>Maciej Daszuta</td>
<td>Sparta in the Early Hellenistic Period: Backward or Well-Adjusted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:10-16:30</td>
<td>Manolis Pagkalos</td>
<td>The Histories of the Achaean League: Constructing Identities in the Early Hellenistic Peloponnese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## International Ph.D. and Early Career Researchers Conference: The Hellenistic Peloponnese: New Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker/Presenter</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:30-16:50</td>
<td>David Weidgenannt (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main)</td>
<td>ὑπόμνημα τῆς οἰκειότητος. A present past in Epidaurus and Athens (2nd – 1st century BC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:50-17:30</td>
<td>Closing Lecture: Professor Andrew Meadows (University of Oxford)</td>
<td>Polybius and the Peloponnese: New Perspectives and Old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:00</td>
<td>Discussion/Remarks</td>
<td>End of Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:30</td>
<td>Dinner (Optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstracts

The End of Lead Figurines in the Early Hellenistic Period at the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia: Pb Isotope Analysis

James Lloyd

University of Reading/Exeter, United Kingdom

This paper will present the results of lead isotope analysis undertaken on 150 lead figurines (currently in the Ure Museum) from the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia. The last phase of these figurines (Lead VI) ends in the early Hellenistic period (c.250 BCE). This analysis makes use of the Oxford Archaeological Lead Isotope Database http://oxalid.arch.ox.ac.uk/.

The conclusions that are drawn from this analysis will engage with recent scholarship on manufacturing (Acton, Poeisis, 2014), and question previous suggestions as to Sparta’s sources of lead, particularly what happened to that supply of lead in the Hellenistic period.

In 2001 Gill & Vickers undertook isotope analysis of 12 figurines, concluding that the lead used to make these figurines came from Laurion. However, their findings were not universally accepted, and neither did their study analyse any figurines dating to the Lead VI period. Since theirs was the only such study, a larger study is called for that looks to understand the data from a fresh perspective.

Current scholarly opinion regarding the lead figurines (to dichotomise the debate) is divided between those who still maintain that the lead was sourced locally (and that the figurines bear witness to Spartan austerity), and those who accept Gill & Vickers’ study as highlighting a unique facet of continued Spartan-Athenian trade. In this regard the lead isotope data presented in this paper will better illuminate the ‘where’ of the Spartan lead figurines. Nevertheless, the more
pertinent question is, ‘why’. Why were the lead figurines no longer produced from the early Hellenistic period onwards? The answer (which concludes the paper) is informed by the internal and external socio-economic factors that were affecting Sparta in the early Hellenistic period.

Lead VI ‘cymbal’: Reading, Ure Museum, 23.11.31 gg.
Herakles on the Edge: Artistic Choices in Hellenistic Elis

Jane Ainsworth
University of Leicester, United Kingdom

Objects depicting the figure of Herakles are found across the ancient world. Herakles can represent both an aspirational and an everyman figure, providing insights into the artistic choices made when selecting and producing this image. Traditional interpretations of Hellenistic art emphasise its inferiority to the perfection of classical pieces and the movement of artists away from Greece to the Successors’ capitals. At the same time, models of Hellenization and cultural emulation presuppose a unidirectional movement of ideas and techniques with Greece at the centre. What really happened to Peloponnesian craftsmen in the Hellenistic age and what does a consideration of artistic choices and object biography reveal about the realities of their lives?

Through detailed consideration of objects depicting the story of Herakles and Auge, I consider the choices available to and made by creators, traders, commissioners and buyers in Hellenistic Elis, an area itself often overlooked. By investigating objects made and/or used during a period of socio-political change I draw conclusions about the different identities sought or rejected as civic and state identities were re-negotiated in accordance with the new trends introduced by the Hellenistic kings. By considering the different cultural inspirations and contexts for provincial art, traditionally dismissed as non-classical, emulative, or simply ‘bad art’, I draw conclusions about communities on the periphery both of the Peloponnese and modern scholarship.
Early Hellenistic Economies: Comparing the Peloponnese with Southern Italy

Dr. Gabriel Zuchtriegel
Archaeological Park of Paestum, Italy

In both the Peloponnese and Southern Italy, archaeological fieldwork of the last decades has contributed significantly to our understanding of Late Classical and Early Hellenistic economic and social change. Especially archaeological field surveys, e.g. in Laconia, Kleonai, Halieis, Metaponto and Taras have played a crucial role in reassessing the impact of rural economies on social and cultural transformations going on between the 4th and the 3rd century BC.

A new project in Siris-Heraclea on the Ionian Coast, started in 2012, has shed new light on the question of how local economies were transformed during the second half of the 4th and the early 3rd century BC. As has been argued, early Hellenistic change depended heavily on the way non-Greek communities acted.

The paper asks how new data from Siris and Southern Italy as well as Sicily may be read on the backdrop of data from intensive field surveys on the Peloponnese. To what extent are early Hellenistic economic transformations comparable? How may differences or similarities be explained?

I would like to argue that there are actually some important differences, and that they might find an explanation in the larger political and socio-economic context in which local communities acted on the Peloponnese and in Southern Italy.
During the turbulent Hellenistic period, the Peloponnese became the theatre of a great number of wars and military expeditions resulting in a constant power struggle between dominant city-states, whilst also radically affecting smaller communities such as the *perioikoi*. The *perioikoi*, or ‘dwellers-around’, were the inhabitants of the settlements and communities of Lakonike during the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods. Their history is inextricably associated with the history of Sparta culminating in the formation of the ‘Koinon (League) of the Lakedaimonians’ (early 2nd c. BC). The ‘Koinon’ was formed by the liberated perioikic communities in the aftermath of the decline of Spartan control and the constant alteration of the geographical and political boundaries of Laconia during Hellenistic times. So far the research questions for this period have focused on Sparta, and not on the role of the *perioikoi*.

The emphasis of this paper will be on the perioikic populations and will highlight the way they were affected by all the changes and the decline of the power of Sparta. For this reason archaeological evidence will be presented and comparatively assessed, supplemented with ancient literary sources, in an attempt to investigate the life and history of the *perioikoi* from an internal perspective rather than from a Spartan-centred point of view. The examination of the evidence such as fortification works and xeny decrees, will contribute to the reconstruction of internal and external structures and relationships directly associated with the cultural, social, political and economic history of the *perioikoi* during the Hellenistic period. Finally, preliminary insights will be proposed into long-debated issues such as the status of the perioikic populations, the political and social identity of their communities, the organisation of their settlements, the nature of the relationship with Sparta and the use of a Lakedaimonian identity.
Garrisons and ‘Tyrants’: Preliminary Remarks on the Antigonid Rule in the Peloponnese

Chares Chrysafis
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece
[CHARES.CHRYSAFI@GMAIL.COM]

In this paper I will present a part of my doctoral research on the external possessions of the Antigonids in mainland Greece and the Aegean, with particular emphasis on the problems raised by the study of the Macedonian garrisons in the Peloponnese. This region constituted a valuable and sensitive area for the Antigonids’ rule from 307 B.C. and the invasion of Demetrios Poliorketes in mainland Greece until the defeat of Philip V in the 2nd Macedonian War. Even in their darkest hours, the Antigonid dynasty constantly maintained its military presence in the Peloponnese; Corinth especially was considered an ancestral possession and was a royal residence. First of all, there will be an attempt to determine the extent of the Macedonian-ruled cities in the Peloponnese in the course of the 3rd century B.C., along with some general observations on the administration and financing of the garrisons. Moreover, the case of the so-called pro-Macedonian ‘tyrants’ will also be examined in order to clarify their relationship with the Macedonian kings, the extent of the phenomenon and the nature of their rule. Particular emphasis will be given to the way the Macedonian kings supported their ‘allies’ and how independent the latter might have been. Jointly, the garrisoned cities and the pro-Macedonian regimes were the two key ingredients that formed the Macedonian sphere of influence in the Peloponnese.
Shock and Awe: Violence, Resistance and Terror within the Achaean Koinon

Richard Evans

University of Leicester, United Kingdom

[RIGE2@LEICESTER.AC.UK]

The traditional presentation of the Achaean koinon, by both Polybius and modern scholars, is one of a democratic federal state, where each member polis was united through their shared liberties and legal rights. Although this presentation holds several truths, it is but half the picture. For several poleis communities, a different story of the Achaean koinon existed: for them, the Achaean koinon represented a violent, brutal hegemonic power. The Achaeans forced several poleis into koinon membership through threats, the destruction of economic resources, open warfare and even the massacre of key political individuals if they so dared to rebel. One polis community to suffer all of this was the Messenians in 183/2, due to their attempted separation from the koinon.

Reassessing the rhetoric of Polybius’ accounts, combined with the later evidence provided by Plutarch, Livy and epigraphic stelai, this paper demonstrates how violence and terror were key methods of the Achaeans’ enrolment of other poleis into the koinon. Furthermore, it highlights how this bloody policy can be traced back to Aratos of Sikyon, who, using such methods, began the Achaeans’ dramatic increase in power and influence in the late 3rd century BC, eventually leading to the Achaeans’ complete domination of the Peloponnese under Aratos’ successor, Philopoemen.

What this paper aims to expose is that, despite the koinon’s promise of freedom for all member states, the Achaeans only grew to dominate the Peloponnese through their ability to exploit terror tactics, sometimes backed up with extreme brutality, destroying what remained of any polis’ ability to revolt from Achaean control. It is this violent story that, as a counter argument to the traditional one, needs to be told.
The Consultant General: Spartan Military Leaders Abroad

Charlotte Van Regenmortel
University of Leicester, United Kingdom
[cvr1@leicester.ac.uk]

In 363/2 BCE, the Spartan King Agesilaos and a group of Spartan soldiers served as mercenaries in Egypt. The outsourcing of Spartan military power occurred at various stages. The sources, such as Diodorus Siculus’ Histories, are in fact filled with references to Spartans fighting on behalf of foreign powers, often in the Western Mediterranean. However, Plutarch’s Agesilaos and Moralia, point out that Agesilaos took this opportunity as a way to increase Spartan funds (36.3 and 214d respectively). His expedition abroad, therefore, appears to have been sanctioned by the Spartan state with an eye on income. Sparta indeed appeared to struggle financially during the time of Agesilaos, and some credence should therefore be given to Plutarch’s statement. During the Hellenistic period, the presence of Spartan generals abroad remains attested. While most of these were kings themselves, others were of less prestigious ranks. The question is whether the Spartans’ previous exploits in this sphere can shed light on their actions in the early Hellenistic period.

This paper will look at the backstory of these military consultations. An important question to be raised is whether these expeditions were stipulated by the state, or private initiatives. Similarly, we should ask why Spartan generals were attractive to foreign employers, in particular whether this was a matter of skill, or prestige. By evaluating various cases of foreign employment of Spartan generals, I will compare the motivations and agency behind these expeditions, and see whether this can lead to a new perspective on Hellenistic Sparta.
The Transformations of the Spartan Royalty in the Second Half of the Third Century B.C.

Professor Luigi Gallo

Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”, Italy

[LGALLO@UNIOR.IT]

This paper will highlight the significant changes occurring to the Spartan royalty in the third century BC. I shall analyse the characters of King Areus I and of other royal personalities who ruled in an autocratic manner, by de facto abrogating the traditional diarchy. These personalities are portrayed by the ancient sources as tyrannoí: the well-known Cleomenes III and Nabis will be the object of this analysis along with the poorly documented royal character of Lycurgus.

Through the assessment of literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence, this paper will explore the institutional position of the aforementioned kings. The lastest evidence for the Spartan diarchy, which is particularly scanty and uncertain for the period after the foreign and domestic policy of Cleomenes III, along with the causes of such phenomena will occupy a central place in this paper. The analysis will be undertaken not only by underlining the internal dynamics of Sparta, but also by pointing out the influence exerted by the Hellenistic royalty.
The latest studies on Spartan foreign policy of the mid-third century have consistently underlined the role of a single individual in salient episodes of this poorly documented period; Areus (Christien 2002; Shipley 2009; Millender 2009). King Areus’ role in issuing the first Spartan coinage, his predominance in the Chremonidean decree and the dedications of statues from states situated both inside and outside the Peloponnese constitute compelling evidence of his importance in Spartan foreign relations. However, a broader assessment of the evidence shows that another personality of royal lineage was asked to intervene in Spartan foreign expeditions and carried out duties of the utmost importance; Cleonymus (Areus’ uncle). The predominance of this personality and his leadership in significant military and diplomatic undertakings of the early third century represent issues that have not been fully addressed by the latest studies. The preference towards Cleonymus from the Spartan authorities instead of the de iure kings of Sparta, Areus I and Archidamus IV, generates a fertile ground for discussion in order to broaden our knowledge of Spartan diarchy and the ways in which the Spartan authorities leveraged outstanding individuals in order to convey more authority to foreign expeditions.

Through a combination of literary and epigraphic evidence, this paper will highlight the consistent presence of Cleonymus on the international stage of the early third century BC and, above all, the esteem in which he was regarded by the Spartan government and some states situated outside the Peloponnese. Evidence from significant expeditions from across the Mediterranean will be used – such as Italy, Corcyra, Crete and the Peloponnese – to argue for a more nuanced reading of the history of Spartan royalty. As we shall see, the holistic assessment of the evidence will show the image of a powerful personality with significant prerogatives operating on the new international stage.
Burden of the Past: Sparta in the Face of the Achaean Resurgence

Krzysztof Zimny

University of Warsaw, Poland

[KZIMNY@STUDENT.UW.EDU.PL]

The present paper reconsiders the Spartan foreign policy towards the Achaean League from the reign of Areus I down to the reign of Nabis. I will not only discuss how relationships between the two states changed during the 3rd century, but also analyse the impact Achaean had on the Spartan political thinking, both the short-term decision-making and the long-term strategies (if any). Deficiencies of a source base for a history of the era must be acknowledged here, but nevertheless it seems possible to discern some characteristic features of Achaean-Spartan relations. It is not surprising that during the Chremonidean War the League, consisting of but a few poleis, might be counted among the allies of Sparta, the relationship starting perhaps with the very rebirth of the League around 280. Up to this point Lakedaimon had enough power to assert its influence throughout the Peloponnese in the traditional form of hegemonic alliance (witnessed by Iustinus and the so-called Chremonides’ decree). The death of Areus in another defeat at the hands of Macedonians seriously undermined Spartan prestige. The military defeat, coupled with the accession of Sikyon to the Achaean League and the further expansion of the latter under the leadership of Aratos, quickly forced the Spartans to abandon the old ways and to seek cooperation with the Achaeans on terms much more equal than they would wish. Growing Achaean ambitions prompted Cleomenes to rethink alliance as a tool of hegemony and turned him to supplement it with the politics of annexation, attempts at more direct rule and at the countering of Achaean federal propaganda at one time. The crushing defeat in the battle of Sellasia does seem to have altered neither Spartan ambitions (as attested by Polybios) nor that new way of political thinking. Still, the post-Sellasia troubles finally forced Nabis to enrich the Spartan Achaean policies
with social elements and established the destruction or subjugation of the League as Sparta’s most immediate goal.
Argos in the Third Century BC

Dr. Stefania Gallotta

*Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”, Italy*

[SGALLOTTA@UNIOR.IT]

This paper aims to analyse Argos’ relationships with foreign powers in the third century BC, before it became absorbed into the Achaean League. Following Alexander’s death, the historical sources at our disposal enable us to reconstruct both the Argive domestic policy and the position occupied by the polis in the complex political game created by the Diadochs; however, it is harder to reconstruct the history of Argos in the third century BC. In this regard, the fragmentary and problematic evidence at our disposal does not paint a clear picture of Argive foreign and domestic policy. Nonetheless, two significant factors, which appear clear enough, will emerge from the broader assessment of the evidence: the privileged relationship that Argos enjoyed with the Antigonids and their unequivocal support for the Argive tyranny. The tyrants, instead of being perceived as oppressors of the Argive rights, were seen as their protectors.
Sparta in the Early Hellenistic Period: Backward or Well-Adjusted?

Maciej Daszuta

*University of Wrocław/Liverpool, Poland/United Kingdom*

The ancient polis of Sparta is often perceived as backward in many respects. Throughout the classical period she was to remain with one foot in the archaic realities and, accordingly, also many Hellenistic novelties were to reach this polis much later than they were adapted in other parts of Greece. However, even if the former assumption may be partly legitimate, the latter seems to be much more dubious. First of all, speaking of the Hellenistic period appears to be problematic in the case of Sparta in general, especially if understood in the Droysenian manner. For Cartledge has already observed that for this age ‘an alternative conception is needed for the history of a state in Old Greece like Sparta’. Also the traditional chronological boundaries do not fit to Sparta precisely, since the truly epochal change occurred in the polis across the Eurotas almost a half century earlier than the death of Alexander the Great. Moreover, it can even be suggested that in some aspects Sparta had anticipated what a bit later turned out to be the hallmarks of the new Hellenistic times. For among the characteristic features of the period used to be rated e.g.: the appearance of large territorial states governed by more or less authoritarian rulers or the increasing role of females in the society; and it could be suggested that Sparta was marked by some versions of these and other traits long before. The author of this paper intends to point out and discuss such features of the Spartan society attempting to answer the question, to what degree Sparta was adjusted to the Hellenistic realities or how much she was lacking and needed to make up for in the beginning of new period.
The Histories of the Achaean League: Constructing Identities in the Early Hellenistic Peloponnese

Manolis Pagkalos

University of Leicester, United Kingdom

[MP482@LEICESTER.AC.UK]

In the changes occurring in the political landscape after Alexander the Great’s campaign and the formation of the Hellenistic kingdoms, the Achaean League rapidly evolved to become a protagonist in Peloponnesos. As an alternative to the larger kingdoms of the Successors, on the one hand, and on the limited poleis, which cannot cope with the new structures of political organisation in resources, political or military strength, on the other hand, the League – a political union of several Peloponnesian poleis – quickly developed hegemonial aspirations. In his account of the formation of the League, Polybios (Histories, 2.37-2.38) pictures an ideal ‘first’ Achaean League. The re-born Achaean League is then connected to a constructed past, where a unified Achaean identity is presented and projected. This unified identity created a stable backstory in order to solidify the Hellenistic reality of the Achaean League. The role ascribed to the League is twofold: not only does it denote Polybios’ own origins, but it also occupies a pivotal role in his Histories and the idealization and promotion of Rome. The consciously united and democratic League is constructed as a meritorious precursor to the great Republic.

This paper aims to demonstrate the power of the use of the past; a power greatly augmented by the writings of a prolific historian, who enjoyed an elevated status within the Achaean and Roman societies. By investigating and evaluating the existence and dynamics of several different identities – some created by the persona of the historian, other derived by complex social and historical processes – Polybios’ agenda will become clearer. More importantly, the need for a strong, imaginary, past will be highlighted. In the end, Polybios’ Achaean League is exactly what its elite wants to be seen as, masking a not so radiant picture with the guise of history.
My paper aims to show how the local elites of late Hellenistic Greece (2nd – 1st century BC), despite often being portrayed as weak subjects of their Roman rulers, still controlled and made use of their (recent and local) past, thereby maintaining a field of ideal autonomy and self-assertion.

In my presentation, I will discuss selected Hellenistic inscriptions from the Asclepeion in Epidaurus and the Acropolis in Athens. In a comparative approach, I will not only examine inscriptions and statue bases but also the monumental environment of these inscriptions. So far, research has mostly focused on reused statues and statue bases in the context of the Roman hegemony in Greece (Krumeich 2010, Melfi 2013, Griesbach 2014). As part of a project on the use of the past as a political strategy in Roman Greece (led by Dr. Muriel Moser), I want to shift the focus away from a Roman perspective in favour of the activities of the local Greek elites and their epigraphical habits in relation to other statues, inscriptions and monuments. In two case studies I will show that especially in public places with a long historical tradition every interaction entailed a dialogue with the past. Therefore, changes in the actual epigraphic landscape also meant a semantic change of these public spaces. Public space, understood as a social construct, defines not only a topographical area but also has a distinctly temporal quality. In fact, topographical areas can become chronotopoi with a narrative quality. Borrowing the term from Mikhail Bakhtin’s literary theory, I will argue that public space is characterized by “the inseparability of space and time”. So, inscriptions and their topographical setting provide a means by which polis history can be written and/or perceived. Thus, inscriptions and their
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commemorative function became a resource of power, as controlling them meant controlling polis history and memory.