

THE FORMATION OF THE BOEOTIAN LEAGUE

R. J. BUCK

THE Boeotian League makes its earliest appearance in the sources at the time when the Thebans unsuccessfully attempted to force the Plataeans to join. The latter, however, allied themselves to Athens. After various negotiations, the Athenians and Plataeans defeated a Theban assault.¹ Commonly the Athenian-Plataean alliance is dated to 519, although some authorities prefer 509.² Clearly the Boeotian League (in the sense of an association with more than religious functions) was in existence earlier than the Theban pressure on Plataea. The question is, how much earlier? The few early League coins prove nothing, since their dating depends upon the numismatists' interpretation of history, and, in the light of recent arguments, these coins may have been dated far too early.³ There is also a tradition of a Thessalian invasion of Boeotia that ended with a defeat at Ceressus and the death of the Thessalian ruler Lattamyas, a victory which, like Leuctra, "set the Greeks free."⁴ The battle is variously dated between 571 and 486.⁵

The purpose of this paper is to argue that the Thessalian invasion and the formation of the Boeotian League must

be closely associated, that both happened about 520, that the quarrel between Thebes and Athens over Plataea should be regarded, at least in part, in terms of the relations between Boeotia and Thessaly, and that the defeat of the Thessalians in Athens at the end of the Pisistratid tyranny had important repercussions in central Greece.

It is generally accepted that the Thessalians overran Phocis at a fairly early stage of the sixth century. The Phocians were finally subdued, their cities were placed under the rule of pro-Thessalian tyrants, and hostages were taken, at the latest by the middle of the century.⁶ The Thessalians proceeded to extend their influence as far as Athens. The fact that Pisistratus named one of his sons Thessalus indicates a close relationship between the tyrant and Thessaly; the Thessalian alliance known to exist with the Pisistratids probably goes back to his time.⁷

As for the Boeotian cities, Orchomenus had a close and friendly relationship with Thessaly, to judge by the numerous legends and myths linking the two (many of which may have been given their classical form somewhat later).⁸ If, on the one hand, the

1. Thuc. 3. 61. 2 and Hdt. 6. 108.

2. Thuc. 3. 68. 5. For the dating see below.

3. For recent attempts to lower the dates of Greek coinage, especially Athenian, see C. M. Kraay, *NC*, Ser. 6, XVI (1956), 43-68; *idem*, *NC*, Ser. 7, II (1962), 417-23. See also W. P. Wallace, *NC*, Ser. 7, II (1962), 23-42, esp. 38 and n. 1, in regard to Boeotian coins; and Kraay, *JHS*, LXXXIV (1964), 76-91, esp. 80; R. T. Williams, *NC*, Ser. 7, VI (1966), 9-13. R. M. Cook, *Historia*, VII (1958), 257, argues that the original purpose of coinage was to pay mercenaries, an idea not widely accepted. J. A. O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States* (Oxford, 1968), p. 37, n. 5, puts the problem aptly, though for a different context.

4. Plut. *Cam.* 19. 2 and *De Hdt. mal.* 33 (*Mor.* 866F); Paus. 9. 14. 2.

5. For discussion see below.

6. For Thessalian-Phocian warfare: Hdt. 8. 28; Paus.

10. 1. 3; Polyæn. 6. 18. 2 (Battle of the Amphoras). Paus. 10. 1. 5-10; *De mul. vir.* 2 (*Mor.* 244); Polyæn. 8. 65; Polyb. 16. 32. 1-2 (Battle of Desperation). Hdt. 8. 27; Paus. 10. 1. 11 (Battle of the Whiten Bodies). Hdt. 7. 176. 4 (Phocian Wall). Paus. 10. 13. 7 (Phocian victory monuments).

For modern comments: G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, I (Gotha, 1893), 699 f.; G. Macan, *Herodotus* (London, 1908), II, 393-95; M. Sordi, *La lega tessala* (Rome, 1958), pp. 78-89; L. Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche* (Rome, 1962), pp. 111 f.; J. A. O. Larsen, *CP*, LV (1960), 231 f., and *Greek Federal States*, pp. 108-14.

7. Thuc. 6. 55. 1. Sordi, *La lega tessala*, p. 55, and Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, p. 112, draw the inference that the alliance originated in Pisistratus' time.

8. On archaic mythopoesis, see M. P. Nilsson, *History of Greek Religion*² (Oxford, 1949), pp. 237-42, and his *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*³ (Munich, 1967), I, 711-14.

legends were ancient, their survival would speak for continuing contact, to keep them fresh and vigorous; if, on the other hand, the legends were modified in archaic times, the changes would imply that there was some reason to link Orchomenus and Thessaly. In either case, the tone of the legends speaks for amiable relations. Furthermore, the route to Boeotia and Athens from Thermopylae by way of Hyampolis led through Orchomenian territory;⁹ it would be much more readily traversed if Orchomenus were friendly.

The Thebans co-operated with Cleisthenes of Sicyon, an ally of Thessaly,¹⁰ and they aided Pisistratus when he was attempting to return from one of his exiles.¹¹ In fact, their relations with him appear to have been cordial throughout his reign.¹² At the least, then, the Thebans were the friends of Thessalian allies for much of the sixth century, and one may conclude that good relations, if not an alliance, existed between Thebes and Thessaly for a considerable time.

At some stage, however, the Thessalians invaded Boeotia under the command of Lattamyas, gaining control as far as Thespieae, according to Plutarch (*De Hdt. mal.* 33, *Mor.* 866F). In one place (*Cam.* 19) he dates the invasion and the consequent battle to "more than two hundred years earlier" than Leuctra (πρότερον ἔτεσι πλείοσιν ἢ διακοσίοις), i.e., earlier than 571; in another (*De Hdt. mal.* 33, *Mor.* 866F), to "shortly before" (ἐναγχος) the invasion of Xerxes, i.e., close to 480.

Clearly these two accounts are not reconcilable. Since numbers are more easily altered in transmission than general phrases, and since there are other good reasons to suspect it, many authorities have rejected the first date, sometimes emending it to "one hundred years" earlier than Leuctra.¹³ Several, therefore, have placed the expedition in the 490's or 480's. But ἐναγχος is an elastic term, though not elastic enough to stretch to 571. Furthermore, certain difficulties arise if the Thessalian attack is placed too close to the Persian Wars, difficulties associated with Lattamyas.

The rare name Lattamyas, or a by-form of it, as a Thessalian inscription makes clear,¹⁴ is found in the Echekratid family, which provided several *tagoi* for the Thessalian federation. Plutarch (*De Hdt. mal.* 33) says that Lattamyas was ἄρχοντα Θεσσαλῶν, which should mean that he was a *tagos*, not a subordinate official, a ruler, not simply a local commander. As a *tagos* Lattamyas cannot be dated after 500, since the Aleuad Thorax and his brothers held power from 498 to 476.¹⁵ There is no place for him between 511 and 498, since Cineas ruled in 511, and, presumably, for several years afterward,¹⁶ and time should be allotted to Aleuas, son of Simus and father of Thorax.¹⁷ It is also difficult to set Lattamyas between 520 and 511, since Antiochus, son of Echekratides I, fits best in this decade, especially from 516 on.¹⁸ Therefore, if Lattamyas had been *tagos*, he would not have fitted much after 520, at the latest. A dating around 520 would

9. The route through Hyampolis is argued for by Larsen *CP*, LV (1960), 232 f., and *Greek Federal States*, pp. 109–11.

10. *Hdt.* 5. 67.

11. *Hdt.* 1. 61 and Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 15.

12. Offerings by Pisistratus and the Pisistratids at Ptoŭm, L. Bizard, *BCH*, XLIV (1920), 237–41; *SEG*, I (1923), 143; Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche*, pp. 104 f.

13. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, I. 2, 205; Sordi, *La lega tessala*, p. 87, who adopts the change to "one hundred years" followed by Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche*, pp. 111 f. and 167, n. 27; Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, pp. 113 f., and *CP*, LV

(1960), 236 f. But cf. N. G. L. Hammond, *History of Greece*², p. 137.

14. *IG*, IX. 2. 469, a dedication calling on Λάτταμε Ἐχεκράτιδου; Sordi, *La lega tessala*, p. 87. It is a rare name: Pape-Benseler, *Gr. Eig.*, II, 777, mention only the Lattamyas killed at Ceresus.

15. *Hdt.* 7. 6, 9. 1, 9. 58; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, I. 2, 206.

16. *Hdt.* 5. 63.

17. Sordi, *La lega tessala*, pp. 87–90, would have Aleuas a *tagos*; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, I. 2, 206, does not think so, but has Cineas ruler to the end of the century.

18. As Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, I. 2, 203, argues cogently.

make it necessary for him to be a son of Echecratides I and brother of Antiochus, a not unreasonable hypothesis in light of the Thessalian inscription mentioned above.¹⁹

A date of 520 or so may seem too remote to be described by Plutarch's "shortly before," but the passage in which *ἐναγχος* occurs is rhetorical and hyperbolic. Plutarch is, as usual, attacking Herodotus. According to the latter, the Thebans had been spared at Thermopylae, because they pleaded that they had previously medized and had been compelled to come to Thermopylae. Their plea was supported by the Thessalians. Plutarch takes violent exception to all this, especially to the very idea of Thessalian support:

Just imagine such a plea being heard in such a situation, amid the barbarians' shrieks and the confused shouting of flight and pursuit! And imagine the witnesses being questioned. With men being killed and trampled underfoot all around them in the narrow pass, the Thessalians support the Thebans' plea by saying: "Until recently we controlled Greece as far as Thespieae, but they defeated us in battle and drove us back, killing our commander Lattamyas." That was how Boeotians and Thessalians stood towards one another at the time; there was nothing warm or friendly in their relationship.²⁰

In this context, *ἐναγχος* could easily refer to events forty years before—and probably does.

Lattamyas can only be dated after 500 if he was not a *tagos*. But the testimony of Plutarch is clear. *Archon* is the later Thessalian term for the supreme ruler, virtually synonymous with *tagos*. Therefore it is best to regard Lattamyas as an Echecratid *tagos*, killed sometime about 520 and succeeded by his brother Antiochus.

There are several possible reasons for the Thessalians' decision to invade Boeotia. Most commonly, they are considered to have aided the Thebans against Thespieae and other Boeotian cities in the cause of Theban domination.²¹ But Herodotus (5. 79), while dealing with the Aeginetan-Theban alliance (*ca.* 500), says that Thebes and Thespieae were good friends and allies and had been so for a long time. Plutarch in his two citations (*De Hdt. mal.* 33 and *Cam.* 19) implies Theban participation at Ceressus; indeed, his remarks are pointless unless the Thebans were in the fight against the Thessalians at Ceressus. The idea that the Thessalians were helping the Thebans gain domination may be rejected.

A second possibility may have more substance: that the Orchomenians were aided by the Thessalians against the other Boeotians. Certainly, the Thessalian invasion route via Hyampolis passed through Orchomenian territory and would be more easily traversed if Orchomenus were friendly or at least passive. There is evidence of a long-standing friendship between Orchomenus and Thessaly (as mentioned above) which might provide a pretext for Thessalian intervention in Boeotia. Orchomenus, to judge by the coin types, stood apart from the Boeotian League for some time after the League was finally formed. Therefore it is likely that Orchomenus, in fear of a Theban-dominated political federation, sought the aid of Thessaly to withstand its pressure, much in the same way that Plataea sought the aid of Athens. A Boeotia reduced to the status of a Phocis under Thessaly seemed preferable to the Orchomenian leaders—since, no doubt, Orchomenus

19. This dating is considerably lower than Beloch's date of 540 for Lattamyas, but he made Lattamyas a predecessor of Echecratides I, though in the same family. Beloch paid too much attention to Plutarch's date of 571 in *Cam.* 19, and so put Lattamyas too high. My own view is that Echecratides I had two sons, Lattamyas and Antiochus, with the

latter succeeding the former.

20. Plut., *De Hdt. mal.* 33, trans. L. Pearson in *Moralia* XI (LCL).

21. Sordi, *La lega tessala*, p. 86; followed by Larsen, *CP*, LV (1960), 236 f., and *Greek Federal States*, pp. 30 f.

would be in a premier position—to a Boeotia ruled by Thebes.

A third possibility is simply that Thessaly decided to take over Boeotia in much the same way that it took over Phocis, and that Orchomenus acquiesced. This does not seem so likely as the previous possibility, since it does not provide an explanation of continued Orchomenian independence for many years afterward.

Most probably, then, an eager Thessaly, already concerned by Theban efforts to form a military league, readily seized upon a request for aid from Orchomenus as a pretext for invading Boeotia. Under their *tagos* Lattamyas, in 520 or early 519, the Thessalians marched on eastern Boeotia.

The invasion was opposed by "the Boeotians," a term which means, presumably, the members of the Theban-led military league. This league must be carefully distinguished from any previous religious amphictyony that embraced all the Boeotians, cared for Onchestus and the shrine of Itonian Athena, and sent delegates to the Delphian assemblage.²² The statement in Herodotus (5. 79) about Thebes and its long-associated allies points to an original membership of Coronea, Haliartus, Thespieae, Tanagra, and Thebes for the military league. It should be these members that struck the earliest League coinage, with the shield but no cities specified, about 520 or very shortly before.²³

It is impossible to do more than guess why the League came into existence about or just before 520. Perhaps an increasing suspicion of Thessalian intentions after the reduction of Phocis played its part; or

perhaps it was simply a matter of Theban—and Boeotian—aggressiveness, favored by the reasonable prosperity evidenced by the ability and willingness to coin.

The Thessalians got as far as Ceressus, a location in Thespian territory. Although its exact site is unknown, it lay near the main route south of Lake Copaïs between east and west Boeotia.²⁴ The Thessalians, striking from Phocis by way of Orchomenian territory, were proceeding toward Thebes, skirting Lake Copaïs and bypassing Haliartus to the south. The Boeotians concentrated their forces at a defensible spot close to the route; the Thespians, to judge from Pausanias (9. 14. 1), provided supplies and bivouacking materials. The Thessalians turned to deal with the enemy forces and were smartly repulsed, losing Lattamyas in the process. They withdrew from Boeotia, and the victory marked a "beginning" of freedom for the Greeks, a beginning only, since the liberation of various territories took some time to effect.

As long as the Thessalians held Phocis, and as long as Orchomenus was their friend, there was danger. Athens on the other side was a Thessalian ally. Boeotia was surrounded. Some of the Boeotian states were uncommitted: Plataea and probably Lebadea, Thisbe, Hysiae, and Oropus. Clearly, it would be to the advantage of the League to recruit as many Boeotian states as possible.

The attempt was made and perhaps had some success. A new coinage was issued, with the name of the town minting (or, more likely, sponsoring) the coinage on the reverse. From the issue it appears that

22. On an early religious league, see Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatskunde*, II, 1410 f.; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, I. 1, 209. For the Pamboeotian shrine at Onchestus, Strab. 9. 2. 33 and cf. II. 2. 506; at Itonian Athena, Strab. 9. 2. 29 and cf. *IG*, VII. 2858 ff., 3087, 3172. Site of Itonian Athena in W. K. Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography*, II (Berkeley, 1969), 85–88.

23. Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche*, p. 103, for the earliest coinage and a lowered date. For coins, see C. Seltman,

*Greek Coins*² (London, 1955), pp. 55–57; for illustrations, see B. Head, *BMC*, VIII ("Central Greece"), plates 5 f.

24. The site of Ceressus has been set by most modern authorities at Palaivoro or Pyrgaki, sites northwest of Thespieae with a view over the Copaic plain. Bölte, *s.v. Keressos*, *RE*, XI (1921), 286–87; and Kirsten-Kraiker, *Griechenlandkunde*⁵, p. 232. Older authorities, such as Leake, favored Neochorion, due west of Thespieae at the junction of the Permessus and Kanavari valleys.

Acraephium (or Aulis), Pharae, and Mycalessus had joined. The modification of the coinage implies some sort of reorganization of the League; the use of town names may mean that local autonomy was more clearly defined, in an effort to render the League more attractive to the holdouts.

Plataea was one of the most important of these. The League put on pressure, but the Plataeans, on Spartan advice, reacted by allying themselves to Athens and, with the aid of Athens, defeated an attempt to enroll them by force.²⁵ Thucydides (3. 68. 5) gives a date of 520/19 to the alliance.²⁶ Herodotus (6. 108), however, has Cleomenes, with an army in the vicinity of Plataea, playing a crucial part in persuading the Plataeans to ally themselves with the Athenians. The presence of a Spartan army on the border of Boeotia in 519 seems unlikely to many authorities, who therefore transfer the whole incident to 509 and emend Thucydides' date.²⁷ But there is no strong evidence of textual difficulties in that section of Thucydides, nor is there anything improbable in a Spartan force near Boeotia in 519; and there are strong reasons from epigraphical evidence for maintaining the date.²⁸ Spartan persuasion and the presence of Cleomenes are two different things, but Herodotus and Thucydides bear out one another so well that several scholars have argued that Thucydides was following Herodotus.²⁹ It may well be that Cleomenes, who seems to have been friendly to Thessaly,³⁰ was bringing up a Peloponnesian force to aid his associates. They arrived in the neighborhood of Plataea after Ceressus and took the

opportunity to make things awkward for Thebes, while avoiding Spartan involvement in a losing cause for absent partners. Or it may be that the Peloponnesian army was coming to the aid of the Boeotians but, after Ceressus, returned home without intervening. Thebes, however, may have seemed to need some counterpoise, a role that Athens was able to fill. At any rate, the date of 519 for the Plataean-Athenian alliance is reasonable.

A state of comparative quiet lasted until 510 or so. The erosion of Thessalian power and prestige in this decade is indicated by the difficulties its government was having with the Delphic Amphictyony.³¹ The Thebans were hostile to the Pisistratids and gave aid to their Athenian rivals, the Alcmeonids. They permitted them to use Boeotian territory as a base for the abortive raid on Leipsydrium.³² The Alcmeonids, to judge by the offerings at Ptoium, courted the Boeotians, too.³³ It may be during this period that Thisbe and Lebadea joined the League. The League also remained hostile to Thessaly.

The Thessalians were able to pass cavalry down to Athens during this decade, but this movement does not imply any lessening of hostility between the Thessalians and the Boeotians. It is always possible to run a cavalry force through open, though hostile, territory, especially if no cavalry is ready to oppose it, as any student of the American Civil War can testify. This ability became vital to the Pisistratids, especially after the disarmament of the Athenian hoplites by Hippias in 514.³⁴ The importance attached to this

25. Hdt. 6. 108; Thuc. 3. 55 and 61.

26. For the date, see N. G. L. Hammond, *Historia*, IV (1955), 389.

27. Grote, II, 442, n. 54, followed by Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, II, 399, n. 4, and several others. A variant found in Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche*, pp. 105–8, holds for Thucydides' date but rejects the Herodotean story as a fabrication. This neglects Thuc. 3. 55. 1, where Spartan advice is mentioned.

28. Hammond, *Historia*, IV (1955), 383 f., gives strong support for the date 519 from epigraphical evidence.

29. A. W. Gomme, *Commentary*, II, 358.

30. Cleomenes when exiled stayed in Thessaly, Hdt. 6. 74. 1

31. As Sordi, *La lega tessala*, p. 56, has noted.

32. Hdt. 5. 62. 2 and Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 19.

33. Bizard, *BCH*, XLIV (1920), 242–44.

34. Thuc. 6. 58. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 15. 3–4, dates the disarmament to Pisistratus' time, but see Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, p. 112. The Boeotians had cavalry by 480, and it is possible that the force was originally raised to counter Thessalian passage. I do not think that the Boeotian cavalry was an effective force, however, before 506, if then.

alliance by the Thessalians can be measured by the presence of the *tagos* Cineas with a thousand horse in Athens in 510. The presence of Thessalians in Athens in 510 also means that they still controlled Phocis; for a cavalry movement through Phocis in the face of Phocian hostility would be very risky indeed. The favorite Thessalian route via Thermopylae and Hyampolis would be impassable.

In 510 the Thessalian force, after initial successes, was defeated by the Spartans, apparently as the result of new anti-cavalry tactics.³⁵ Cineas and his forces withdrew, and Hippias fell. It is not necessary here to describe the intrigues, quarrels, and Spartan interventions that followed the expulsion of the Pisistratids, but it is clear that Athens was militarily weak for a few years and in no condition to have any coherent foreign policy or to engage in foreign wars. Furthermore, the Athenians had to reorganize their tribal levies and get their forces into fighting trim.

It is surprising that Thebes and the Boeotian League delayed taking any action against Athens and Plataea until 506. In the absence of clear ancient evidence, at least two plausible reasons can be put forward. First, the Boeotians were not sure of the policies of Sparta or of the new Athenian state, and they did not want to precipitate a conflict. On the one hand, the oligarchs seemed to have the support of an important Spartan faction, and Spartan allies were dangerous to attack; on the other hand, the Alcmeonids, who by 508/7 were emerging as victors in the power struggle, had been friendly to Boeotia. The Plataean alliance had been contracted by the Pisistratids and so, if things went well, might not be honored by the new government. The Boeotians

were making alliances with neighboring states like Chalcis;³⁶ the new Athenian state, be it oligarchic or democratic, had no reason to be fond of the Thessalians; the Boeotians had been helpful; a network of central Greek alliances might be useful; the Athenians might be willing to let Plataea go for the benefits accruing from Boeotian friendship. All in all, from the Boeotian point of view, nothing would be gained by moving on Athens, and much might be lost.

Second, and perhaps more to the point, the Boeotians probably had their attention turned elsewhere, and so could not deal effectively with Athens and Plataea at the time. The most obvious direction for any such activity is against the other holdout, Orchomenus. This town was part of the Boeotian League by the time of the Persian Wars.³⁷ The Boeotians were able to put forth in 506 a "united force" against Athens, according to Herodotus (5. 74. 2); this should mean an army of all the Boeotians (except Plataea) and so should include Orchomenus. The most appropriate time, then, for Orchomenian adherence to the League would be between 510 and 507. If this is so, then Thessaly was no longer in a position to support its Boeotian ally effectively at the time of its joining the League. This, in turn, should mean that Thessalian forces could not pass through Phocis to aid Orchomenus, and so would put the Thessalian defeat in Phocis after the debacle at Athens but before the Boeotian invasion of Attica in 506.

If the argument has validity, it is clear that the defeat of Cineas by the Spartans had important effects far beyond the boundaries of Athens. The Phocians, encouraged by the report and adopting the new tactics, rose in revolt shortly after

35. Larsen, *CP*, LV (1960), 236.

36. Or so it is sometimes believed on the evidence of Hdt. 5. 74 and coin types, as in Seltman, *Greek Coins*², p. 57. But

see Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, pp. 98 f., for hesitation in affirming a formal alliance.

37. Hdt. 8. 34.

the downfall of Hippias and defeated the Thessalians in two battles, the Battle of Phocian Desperation, fought near Cleonae of Hyampolis,³⁸ and the Battle of the Whitened Bodies, also near Hyampolis.³⁹ The Phocians' obtaining of independence may be set no later than 509. Such a date is given a rough chronological check by the presence of Telliads of Elis on the Phocians' side. Since Telliads are present in the Persian Wars,⁴⁰ Telliads should be at least one generation earlier, i.e., sometime before 500, say about 510. The Thessalians, held beyond Thermopylae, simply could not intervene in Boeotia after the loss of Phocis. The Orchomenians joined the League by 507.

By that date it did not seem to matter much to the Boeotians whether Athens was friendly or not. Sparta under Cleomenes had turned hostile and was determined to crush the new democracy. It must have seemed folly to the Boeotians to do anything but join the Peloponnesian attack and get what pickings were available, including Plataea. By prior agreement,⁴¹ the forces of the Peloponnesians under Cleomenes, the Boeotians, and the Chalcidians invaded Attica simultaneously. Cleomenes, however, had overestimated his support, and the Peloponnesian contingent dissolved and went home. The Boeotians and Chalcidians were left to face Athens by themselves and were defeated piecemeal. As a result, Chalcis received an occupying garrison and, not unnaturally, dropped its alliance with Boeotia; Plataea and other trans-Asopid areas, like Hysiae and Oropus, were left under Athenian protection; Boeotian ambitions were sharply checked. It would not be surprising if Boeotian, and particularly Theban, confidence in Spartan leadership

ebbed, and if the leaders of the Theban oligarchy felt that Sparta could not be trusted in grave situations. Such a Theban attitude may well have had its effect on Theban, and Boeotian, policy and plans during the Persian Wars.

To summarize: the Thessalians occupied Phocis during the sixth century, at the latest by the middle of the century. They then had an entry into central Greece. The Boeotians were at first friendly to the Thessalians, like Orchomenus, or neutral, like Thebes, while Athens under Pisistratus and his sons was allied to Thessaly. About 525/520 some of the Boeotians, under the leadership of Thebes, and on the basis of the existing religious association, began to form a new military federation, suspicious, perhaps, of Thessalian intentions. The nucleus consisted of Thebes, Coronea, Haliartus, Tanagra, and Thespieae. They issued a federal coinage. Orchomenus and Plataea declined to join. In late 520 or early 519, the Thessalians decided to occupy Boeotia as they had Phocis, probably using their friendship with Orchomenus as a pretext. The invaders were defeated at Ceressus and lost their *tagos* Lattamyas. The new League attempted to draw in the remaining Boeotian cities. Some change was made in constitutional arrangements, a change symbolized by the placing of the name of the sponsoring city on the new issue of League coinage. Orchomenus, with Thessalian support, was able to withstand the pressure, and it issued its own coinage. Plataea, thanks to Spartan advice and Athenian help, also stayed aloof.

The Thessalian reverse in Athens in 510 had wide repercussions. The Phocians were emboldened to attempt a rebellion that turned out successfully. Orchomenus, thereupon isolated, was constrained to join

38. Plut. *De mul. vir.* 2 (*Mor.* 244); Paus. 10. 1. 8.

39. Hdt. 8. 27; Paus. 10. 1. 11. See also Larsen, *CP*, LV (1960), 232. The melodramatic titles are established by usage,

and no one has invented better ones.

40. Hdt. 9. 33–35 and 37. 1.

41. Hdt. 5. 74. 2.

the League by 507. In 506 the Boeotians, in agreement with the Chalcidians, opportunistically joined Sparta in an attack on Athens in the hopes of gaining Plataea. The dissolution of the Peloponnesian force enabled Athens to defeat Boeotia and Chalcis. Plataea and the regions across the Asopus remained outside the League. The

Boeotians, the Thebans in particular, learned that Sparta could be very unreliable in action, a lesson that doubtless played a significant part in forming Boeotian policy a few years later in the Persian Wars.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA