

THUCYDIDES 1. 113 AND THE LEADERSHIP OF ORCHOMENUS*

CLIFFORD J. DULL

THE reconstitution of the Boeotian Confederacy after the defeat of an Athenian force under Tolmides and the leadership of the victorious Boeotians in that battle became an open question in 1960,¹ when J. A. O. Larsen made the suggestion "that Orchomenus, not Thebes, took the lead in the liberation of Boeotia in 447 and the subsequent formation of the Boeotian Confederacy, and that for over twenty years Orchomenus had as large a representation on the board of Boeotarchs and in the federal council as Thebes and probably even larger."² Larsen is quick to point out that this is only a suggestion but insists that "it is clear that it is necessary to discard the normal picture of Boeotia as continuously under the domination of Thebes throughout the fifth century and recognize a period of leadership by Orchomenus extending from 447 probably all the way to 431."³ He relies almost exclusively on two passages to demonstrate his two main points—Thucydides 1. 113 to show that Orchomenus led in the liberation of Boeotia in 447, and the account of the constitution of Boeotia given in the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* to show that Orchomenus once had three Boeotarchs on the federal council.⁴

Larsen's theory generally has found acceptance, at times enthusiastically so.⁵ His primary interest has been the study of institutions, and his approach to this problem has been largely from that vantage point. Indeed, he states

* This article is a revised version of part of my doctoral dissertation, "A Study of the Leadership of the Boeotian League from the Invasion of the Boiotoi to the King's Peace," © 1975 by Clifford John Dull.

1. J. A. O. Larsen, "Orchomenus and the Formation of the Boeotian Confederacy in 447 B.C.," *CP* 55 (1960): 9–18. I wish to thank Charles F. Edson, N. G. L. Hammond, Eugene Vanderpool, and E. L. Bennett for their criticisms and encouragement. Paul L. MacKendrick has given aid in stylistic matters, and William M. Calder III has made useful comments on publications and saved me from many errors. A special debt is owed to Professor Robert Buck, who read an earlier draft and made helpful suggestions. Although he was not always in agreement with the views expressed in this paper, he nevertheless placed valuable evidence at my disposal, which has greatly helped the process of revision.

2. "Orchomenus," p. 9.

3. *Ibid.*

4. The constitution is given in section 11 of the Oxford edition of B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (1909), which is section 16 of V. Bartoletti's Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1959). Both numbers will be given in this paper in referring to that document.

5. Larsen, *Greek Federal States* (Oxford, 1968), p. 34, n. 3, gives the opinions of some scholars. F. W. Walbank, in a review of *Greek Federal States*, *CR* 18 (1968): 324, finds Larsen's presentation of the preponderant role of Orchomenus "convincing." R. Buck, "The Athenian Domination of Boeotia," *CP* 65 (1970): 226, n. 64, has made the most positive statement: "This view seems now to be gaining wider acceptance, in my opinion correctly." Most recently D. Hennig, s.v. "Orchomenos," *RE*, suppl. 14 (1974): 346, 347, believes that Orchomenus "bei der Befreiung Boiotiens von der athenischen Vorherrschaft in der Schlacht bei Koroneia eine entscheidende Rolle gespielt hatte." The most negative statement to date is that of P. Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération béotienne* (Paris, 1965), p. 42, n. 1: "Aucun document ne vient étayer cette hypothèse, pas plus d'ailleurs que l'hypothèse de modifications que l'auteur croit nécessaire d'introduire dans la composition des districts du Kopais." See also M. Sordi, "Aspetti del federalismo greco arcaico: autonomia e egemonia nel κοινὸν beotico," *A & R* 13 (1968): 66–75, who probably makes the best application of Larsen's theory; and M. Amit, "The Boeotian Confederation during the Pentekontaetia," *Rivista Storica dell' Antichità* 1 (1971): 55.

that his method was to check by "an analysis of the distribution of votes and districts within the Confederacy" what "seemed clear" from Thucydides. Moreover, the greater force of his argument lies in his discussion of the constitution rather than in the passage in Thucydides; he adds that it is difficult not to argue in a circle given the scarcity of evidence.⁶

To determine whether Orchomenus led in the liberation of Boeotia, the passage in Thucydides is crucial. Larsen's discussion of Thucydides 1. 113 is at times perplexing. In fact Thucydides says nothing about Orchomenus leading the liberation of Boeotia—only about the activities of exiles using it for a base for the liberation.⁷ At one point in his article, Larsen states, "The Athenians were attacked at Coronea by the Boeotian exiles from Orchomenus—obviously those who had occupied the city—some Locrians, some Euboean exiles and others who shared their point of view" (p. 10). Yet one page later, Larsen says that this great victory "came under the leadership of Orchomenus and returned exiles operating out of Orchomenus." A transition from the first statement to the second, to explain the addition of the phrase "the leadership of Orchomenus," is crucial, but there is none.

It is obvious that the nature of the exiles' "occupation" is central. If the Orchomenians opened their gates to others of similar purpose or persuasion, one can speak of the leadership of Orchomenus; if the exiles took Orchomenus, it is a quite different matter. Grammatically the passage in Thucydides is uncomplicated. The participle in the genitive absolute *Βοιωτῶν τῶν φευγόντων ἔχόντων* clearly governs *Ὀρχομενὸν καὶ Χαιρώνειαν καὶ ἄλλ' ἅπτα χωρία*, which indicates that the exiles, not the Orchomenians, controlled Orchomenus. The phrase *οἱ τε ἐκ τῆς Ὀρχομενοῦ φυγάδες Βοιωτῶν* may cause difficulty, since words for exile may take either the genitive or an *ἐκ* phrase.⁸ The construction with the genitive is more common, and, judging from the first mention of the exiles in 1. 113. 1, one must prefer that construction here. It is very likely that the purpose of the *ἐκ* phrase in this passage is to distinguish the Boeotian exiles who had taken Orchomenus from those who had taken Chaeronea and the other places. These are not men exiled from Orchomenus as more than one scholar has stated.⁹ The present tense of *φευγόντων* shows that those who controlled Orchomenus were still in exile; so does *κατελθόντες* (1. 113. 4), which indicates that the victors of Coronea did not return from exile until *after* the battle.¹⁰

The scholia to Thucydides, which generally are considered more valuable

6. Larsen, "Orchomenus," pp. 16, 17.

7. Sordi, "Aspetti," p. 67, rightly remarks: "In effetti, nel 447, Tucidide attribuisce il merito agli esuli beoti che avevano occupato Orcomeno e le città vicine . . ."

8. E. A. Bétant, *Lexicon Thucydideum* (Geneva, 1843–47), s.v. *φεύγω, φυγή, φυγάς* (2:488, 489, 497, 498). See Thuc. 4. 76. 2, 3 for an example of each type, one about Orchomenian exiles.

9. A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1945), pp. 339, 340; L. Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche* (Rome, 1962), p. 130; Obst, s.v. "Sparton (4)," *RE* 6A (1929): 1543; G. W. Bowersock, "Pseudo-Xenophon," *HSCP* 71 (1966): 35; and M. Amit, "The Boeotian Confederation," p. 55; possibly R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 176–77. It is often difficult to ascertain whether some of these scholars actually believe the exiles were exiled from Orchomenus or are reflecting the apparent ambiguity of Thucydides in their own language.

10. Compare the use of *φεύγοντας* in Lysias 14. 33.

grammatically than historically, interpret *ἐχόντων* in a hostile sense—*τινὲς γὰρ τῶν Βοιωτῶν, μὴ θέλοντες ὑπακούειν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, κατέλαβον ταῦτα τὰ χωρία ταχέως*.¹¹ The scholiast, who undoubtedly derives in part from sources that are not now extant, clearly views the exiles as an occupying force. Fortunately, there is a nearly verbatim parallel in Thucydides (5. 62) in an account of Arcadian Orchomenus. The passage, a description of the events of 418, reads thus: *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἔχοντες ἤδη τὸν Ὀρχομενὸν ἐβουλείοντο οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἐφ' ὅτι χρὴ πρῶτον ἰέναι τῶν λοιπῶν*. In this context Arcadian Orchomenus has just capitulated, and the allies are deliberating over which city should be attacked next. A glance at the preceding lines quickly confirms this:

The allies were won over by these arguments and immediately marched against Orchomenus in Arcadia, all except the Argives, who, in spite of having agreed with the rest, stayed behind at first, though later they also joined the expedition. The whole allied force now took up its positions before Orchomenus, besieging the place and making assaults upon it. One of their chief reasons for wanting to have Orchomenus was that inside the city there were hostages from Arcadia, put there by the Spartans. The people of Orchomenus were alarmed by the weakness of their own fortifications and by the size of the enemy army; there was no sign of any help coming to them, and they were afraid that, before it did, they would be destroyed. They therefore surrendered on condition that they should join the alliance, give hostages of their own to the Mantineans, and give up also the hostages left there by the Spartans. Now that they had taken Orchomenus, the allies discussed which of the other places to attack next.¹²

The meaning of *ἐχοντες* is clearly that of a military occupation, and E. A. Bétant classes both this participle and *ἐχόντων* in 1. 113 under the heading, “habere in sua potestate, armis obtinere, potiri.”¹³ On this analogy, one must conclude that the position of Boeotian Orchomenus in 447, after the exiles took control, was not much different from the position of Arcadian Orchomenus in 418, after its capture by the allies. That Thucydides, whose knowledge of military tactics ranks among the best in antiquity and whose use of words is among the most precise among ancient writers, should use the same word in two accounts of military activity—contexts surely similar if not nearly identical—and not mean the same thing is hardly credible. Therefore, under these circumstances it is difficult to conceive of the Orchomenians exercising leadership in 447 since they did not control their own city.¹⁴

11. In his edition of Thucydides (Oxford, 1821), I. Bekker connects this comment with *παρέδοσαν Φωκέισι* in section 112, but *ταῦτα τὰ χωρία* clearly refers to the next section, as is understood by E. F. Poppo and C. Hude. Hude does not print *ταχέως*, which both Poppo and Bekker give without reservation, and he has no critical note to explain the deletion. Hude, p. 83, lines 9–11, prints the reading of Parisinus (suppl. Gr. 255), Vaticanus 126, Augustanus (Monacensis 430), Monacensis 228, Britannicus (mus. Brit. 11,727) and the second hand of Laurentianus 69.2. There seems to be some correlation with the absence of *καὶ ἀνδραποδίσαντες* in the text of Thuc. 1. 113. 1: Parisinus, Vaticanus, Palatinus (Heidelbergensis) 252, Augustanus, and Britannicus omit these words.

12. Thuc. 5. 61. 3–62. 1 in the Penguin translation of Rex Warner.

13. Bétant, *Lexicon*, 1:430, 431.

14. See also Thuc. 3. 61. 2, 4. 76. 5, 4. 95. 3 for similar uses of the same verb in reference to Boeotian affairs.

Other evidence that has been cited as showing the leadership of Orchomenus in 447 is *SEG*, 11. 1208.¹⁵ It is a bronze helmet found at Olympia with the following inscription as restored: 'Ερχομένοι ἀνέθειαν τῷ Δι τῷ 'Ολυμπίῳ Φορόνεια[ν ἡλώντες]. Those who cite this as evidence do so largely on the basis of G. P. Oikonomos' restoration Φορόνεια[ν ἡλώντες] and his conclusion that the inscription refers to the events of 447 B.C. There are good reasons to doubt both. Most of the examples cited by Oikonomos that contain ἡλώντες refer to booty taken from cities or peoples.¹⁶ In virtually every case the source of the booty is noted either by a genitive alone or by the preposition ἀπό with the genitive. Oikonomos obviously intends to say by his restoration that this helmet is booty seized from Coronea, but his restoration of the accusative forces the inscription to say that Coronea, not the helmet, was taken from someone and then dedicated to Zeus. If he is to be consistent, he should restore a genitive or some grammatical equivalent such as the -θεν ending.¹⁷ However, even if the restoration is changed, the inscription still appears irrelevant to the events of 447, since there is nothing in the sources to indicate a sack of Coronea at that time. As A. A. Papagiannopoulos-Palaios has pointed out, the battle was not generally known among the ancients as "the battle of Coronea" but was apparently fought on the fringes of Coronean territory.¹⁸ The best description of the location of the battle site is given by Plutarch (*Agesilaus* 19. 2), who says that the trophy stood in front of the temple of Athena Itonia, which was located between Coronea and Alalcomenae.¹⁹ But the attack on Tolmides was the

15. The latest bibliography of the epigraphic articles is found in Hennig, s.v. "Orchomenus," cols. 337–38. Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche*, p. 168, n. 40, also cites most of the articles. See especially L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 93, 95 (no. 11). The inscription was first published by G. P. Oikonomos, "Ἀναθηματικὸν κράνος τῶν 'Ορχομενίων," *Arch. Eph.*, 1925–26, pp. 87–94. Buck, "Athenian Domination," p. 225, n. 59, again comes out in support of Larsen's theory: "This is supported by the dedication of a bronze helmet to Zeus by the Orchomenians from Coronea." Sordi, "Aspetti," p. 68, though not convinced by Larsen's interpretation of Thuc. 1. 113, is convinced by the helmet inscription.

16. Oikonomos, "Ἀναθηματικὸν κράνος," p. 89.

17. A. A. Papagiannopoulos-Palaios, "Κράνος χαλκοῦν ἐξ 'Ολυμπίας ἐνέπιγραφον 'Ορχομενίων ἀνάθημα Κορωνεία[θεν]," *Polemion* 6 (1956–57): 4, restores Φορόνεια[θεν] and is followed by Jeffery. The other example of a helmet inscription cited by Oikonomos, "Ἀναθηματικὸν κράνος," p. 89 (no. 5), appears to support this restoration although a genitive Φορόνεια[s] would be equally acceptable. See also W. Bannier, "Zu griechischen Inschriften," *RhM* 70 (1915): 395–96.

18. Papagiannopoulos-Palaios, "Κράνος χαλκοῦν," p. 4, n. 1. Xen. (*Mem.* 3. 5. 4) says the battle took place ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ; Thuc. (1. 113; 3. 62. 5, 67. 3; 4. 92. 6), Isocr. (16. 28), and Plato (*Alc.* 112C)—Alcibiades' father died in the battle—say ἐν Κορωνείᾳ; Plut. (*Per.* 18. 2, *Alc.* 1. 1) and Diod. (12. 6) περὶ Κορώνειαν. Paus. (1. 27. 5) says that Tolmides was attacked ὡς ἐς τὴν 'Αλιαρτίαν προῆλθε. If the maps printed in W. R. Roberts (inside the front cover of *The Ancient Boeotians* [Cambridge, 1895]), J. G. Frazer (facing p. 110 of *Pausanias's Description of Greece* [London, 1913], vol. 5), F. Pfister (Karte III in the back of *Die Reisebilder des Herakleides* [Vienna, 1951]) and Papagiannopoulos-Palaios, "Κράνος χαλκοῦν," p. 6, are correct, it appears likely that Tolmides had Thebes as his destination when he was attacked, which must mean that Thebes had not yet revolted. Thus there would be no need to assume that Theban oligarchs had already returned home following the fall of the democracy after Oenophyta (Arist. *Pol.* 1302b29). However, Paus. (9. 32. 5) went overland from Thespieae to Haliartus, so perhaps Tolmides intended to go to Thespieae from Haliartus and from there to Plataea and Athens, which appears a much more difficult way to go than directly from Coronea to Thespieae.

19. N. Papachatzēs, *Πανσανίων Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις*, vol. 5 (Athens, 1969), pp. 201–2, n. 7, states that this temple is still not located with certainty. Papagiannopoulos-Palaios, "Κράνος χαλκοῦν," p. 6, n. 2; and W. K. Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography*, vol. 2 (Berkeley, 1969), pp. 85–88, are more optimistic. Paus. (9. 34. 1) says it is πρὶν δὲ ἐς Κορώνειαν ἐξ 'Αλαλκομενῶν

ambush of an invader, not a pillaging of enemy territory. The enemies of the Orchomenians recorded in *SEG*, 11. 1208 were Coroneans, not Athenians, and Miss Jeffery is undoubtedly right in assigning this inscription to a local conflict.²⁰ Her study of the letter forms gives the coup de grâce to Oikonomos' argument, since the letters belong to the previous century.²¹ What the helmet indicates is that Orchomenus probably was not a member of the Federation when the helmet was inscribed.²²

The evidence that argues most for Orchomenian leadership is found in Stephanus of Byzantium. Under the article *Χαιρώνεια* he cites Aristophanes or Hellanicus or possibly some other source who represents the enemy of the Athenians as the *Ὀρχομενίζοντας τῶν Βοιωτῶν*, "those of the Boeotians who are pro-Orchomenus" or simply the Orchomenizers.²³ The Medizers certainly reflected support for the leadership of the Medes (i.e., the Persians); the Atticizers either were or were alleged to be supporters of Athenian policies. Thus it would appear that the Orchomenizers were supporters of Orchomenus, but in what sense? Buck's opinion that "the Orchomenizers were primarily Orchomenians" is suspect;²⁴ were the Medizers Persians or the Atticizers Athenians? According to the formation of the word, they could be anything but Orchomenians. M. Sordi identifies them with the *ἄσσοι τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης ἦσαν* of Thucydides 1. 113.²⁵ The *-ίζω* ending is appropriate for designating sympathizers. The designation, however, refers only to Boeotians and so probably is another way of denoting the Boeotian exiles. The value of this passage is considerably diminished by the corrupt text,²⁶ but it does raise the possibility of a party centered around Orchomenus, although perhaps only in a geographical sense because it was the place for a government-in-exile.²⁷ The followers of Thrasybulus in 399 were often

ἀφικέσθαι, and Strabo (9. 2. 29 [411]) locates it *ἐν τῷ πρὸ αὐτῆς [Κορωνείας] πεδίῳ* if the conjecture of Pletho—*Ἰωνίας* for *Ἰωρίας*—is correct.

20. Jeffery, *Local Scripts*, pp. 93, 95.

21. *Ibid.*

22. Cf. Jean Ducat, "La Confédération béotienne à l'époque archaïque," *BCH* 97 (1973): 66.

23. Both Aristophanes of Boeotia (*FGrHist* 379 F 3) and Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 4 F 81) are mentioned in the passage, although Gomme, *Commentary*, 1:338, thinks the wording does not suggest that Hellanicus was the author. K. O. Müller, *Orchomenos und die Minyer* (Breslau, 1844), p. 410, n. 6, postulates a lacuna before this phrase and assigns the quotation to Theopompus (*FGrHist* 115 F 407).

24. Buck, "Athenian Domination," p. 223.

25. Sordi, "Aspetti," pp. 67–68.

26. The text as printed by A. Meineke (*Stephani Byzantini "Ethnicorum" quae supersunt* [Berlin, 1849]) is as follows: *Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ (οἱ) μετ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς Ὀρχομενίζοντας τῶν Βοιωτῶν ἐπερχόμενοι καὶ Χαίρωνειαν πόλιν Ὀρχομενίων εἶλον*. Müller adds *οἱ; μετ' αὐτοῖς* is a variant reading for *μετ' αὐτῶν; ἐπερχόμενοι* (or *ἐφορμώμενοι*) is an emendation of *ἐπὶ Ὀρχομενοῖς*; and *Ὀρχομενῶν* is corrected to *Ὀρχομενίων*.

27. Unfortunately, such a use of a verb in *-ίζω* is unprecedented. Nevertheless, the logic of Larsen, "Orchomenus," p. 10, is specious. He excludes Thebans on the ground that "[Thucydides'] account is sufficiently detailed so that the failure to mention the Thebans must mean that they did not take part, unless there were a few Thebans among the unnamed men who turned up to join in the attack at Coronea." But the same logic, systematically applied to all the Boeotian cities, would mean that none of them took part except those who did not control their own fortunes—Orchomenus and Chaeronea. The exiles had to come from somewhere in Boeotia. They certainly did not come from Orchomenus since they were in exile at Orchomenus; Plataea undoubtedly did not provide them; Thespieae, often pro-Athenian, would not be a logical choice. That really leaves

called τοὺς ἀπὸ Φυλῆς,²⁸ and this could easily be misunderstood as meaning that his followers were natives of Phyle, if we did not possess other evidence to clarify the matter. The same is probably true here. At any rate the Orchomenizers could not have been Orchomenians, which agrees with the interpretation given above of the passage in Thucydides. It is also highly dubious that the leader of the Orchomenizers could have been an Orchomenian, if the leaders of the Medizers are indicative. Furthermore, from Thucydides' account of the events of 447, one must infer that the Orchomenizers at one time did control Orchomenus, which is a striking departure from the normal practice. According to other verbs of this type having the meaning "to side with," one would expect the Orchomenizers to be a faction in another city that was sympathetic to the policies of Orchomenus, not a group controlling Orchomenus itself.²⁹

Since an acceptance of the traditional translation of Ὀρχομενίζω leads to an impasse, another translation should be considered. The only other acceptable translation is "to act like an Orchomenian." It is generally accepted that Orchomenus became part of the Boeotian Confederacy later than most of the other members.³⁰ Orchomenus and Aspledon are listed apart from the Boeotians in the Homeric Catalog of Ships (*Iliad* 2. 494, 511). The helmet discussed above indicates hostility between Orchomenus and Coronea, according to Herodotus (5. 79) an early member of the League,³¹ in the sixth century. Plutarch (*Malice of Herodotus* 33) states that

only Thebes and Tanagra of the larger cities. Thebes, since it was the most populous and had traditionally been a leader of the Boeotian states, would be a prime candidate.

28. Lys. 16. 4, 31. 8; Xen. *Hell.* 2. 4. 3, 10, 11, 12; *AthPol* 38. 1, 2.

29. Ἀρκαδίζω is used of an Elean (Polyaenus 6. 36); Ἀργολίζω of Corinthians (Xen. *Hell.* 4. 8. 34) and of Mantineans (Xen. *Hell.* 5. 2. 6); Ἀττικίζω of Plataea (Thuc. 3. 62), of Tissaphernes (Thuc. 8. 87. 1), of Methymnians of Lesbos (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 6. 13), of Athenian allies (Xen. *Hell.* 6. 3. 14), of Thebans—most of the word is restored (*Hell. Oxy.* 12[17]. 1); Βοιωτίζω of Athenians (Xen. *Hell.* 5. 4. 34; Aeschin. 2. 106, 3. 139; Plut. *Pel.* 14. 1, *On the Sign of Socrates* 1) and of Spartans (Plut. *Nic.* 10. 7); Λακονίζω of Corinthians (Xen. *Hell.* 4. 4. 2; Plut. *Cleom.* 19. 1), of Spartan allies (Xen. *Hell.* 6. 3. 14), of Sicyonians (Xen. *Hell.* 7. 1. 44), and of Persians (Plut. *Ages.* 23. 2); Μακεδονίζω of Boeotians (Polyb. 20. 5. 5, 13), of Athenians (Plut. *Dem.* 14. 1, 24. 2), of Teireos, a Persian eunuch (Plut. *Alex.* 30. 4); Μηδίζω—both for states which did and states which did not cooperate with the Persians—refers to Hellespontines (Hdt. 4. 144. 3), Aeginetans (Hdt. 6. 64), Athenians (Hdt. 6. 109. 5, 8. 144. 1, 9. 8. 2), most Greeks (Hdt. 7. 138. 2, 9. 17. 1, 9. 106. 3), Thesalians (Hdt. 7. 172. 1, 7. 174. 8. 30. 2), Thebans (Hdt. 7. 205. 3, 7. 233. 1, 9. 15. 2, 9. 40, 9. 67, 9. 86. 1, 9. 87. 2; Dem. 59. 95), Greeks with Leonidas (Hdt. 7. 206. 1), Phocians (Hdt. 8. 30. 1, 9. 17. 1, 9. 31. 5), Doris in central Greece (Hdt. 8. 31), Boeotians (Hdt. 8. 34), Thespieae (Hdt. 8. 50. 5), Plataea (Hdt. 8. 50. 5; Thuc. 3. 62), the seven *ethnē* in the Peloponnesus (Hdt. 8. 73. 2), Andros (Hdt. 8. 112. 2), Gongylus the Eretrian (Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1. 6), and Spartans (Plut. *Ages.* 23. 2); Ρωμαίζω is used of Carthage (App. *Pun.* 68), of Achaeans (App. *Mac.* 7), of Jews (Jos. *BJ* 2. 20. 3 [562]), and of subject peoples allied to Antony (Dio Cassius 51. 1. 5). Likewise verbs having as their stem the name of the person leading a faction usually denote followers outside the leader's own state: Κασσανδριζω of Demetrius of Phalerum (Polyaenus 4. 7. 6); Περισίζω of Epirotes (Diod. 30. 5a); Φυλιππίζω of the Pythia (Aeschin. 3. 130) and probably of Thebans (Dem. 18. 176). Most -ίζω verbs of this type can be found in P. Kretschmer and E. Locker, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen, 1963). Ἀλεξανδριζω (Athen. 6. 251D) is one that cannot.

30. For the literature on the entrance of Orchomenus into the Confederacy, see Hennig, s.v. "Orchomenus," cols. 336–38.

31. Most who argue that Orchomenus was a member of the League before the Persian Wars cite Hdt. as a source. He is unreliable, because he reflects Boeotia as it existed about 428. This is strikingly illustrated by his calling Thersander of Orchomenus a Theban (9. 16). The overlapping of the terms "Theban" and "Boeotian" could hardly have taken place until at least 447 (see B. V. Head, *On the Chronological Sequence of the Coins of Boeotia* [London, 1881], pp. 4, 30 ff.; this monograph

Thessaly expanded as far as Thespieae in the sixth century and, we must assume, controlled Orchomenus during this period, which ended in 571 at the earliest, and probably much later.³² Indeed, if one bears in mind the helmet discussed above and the evidence of mythology,³³ Orchomenus may well have maintained its position outside the Confederacy by force. The first Orchomenian coins with the Boeotian shield, the sign of the Confederacy, appear in the fourth century, if the traditional interpretation of the numismatic evidence is correct.³⁴ Generally speaking, Orchomenus in the fourth century was not only a late, but a reluctant, member of the renewed Confederacy.³⁵ Therefore, to Boeotians especially, "to act like an Orchomenian" would have meant "to resist annexation," "to be independent" or even "to revolt."³⁶ Furthermore, Boeotians, especially Thebans, who had been frustrated by Orchomenus' ability to resist their control, certainly would have been aware of the strategic value of the site. The seizure of the site would enable them to do to the Athenians what had been done to them for a considerable period by the Orchomenians.

Having discussed the evidence relating to Orchomenus, let us turn to the evidence for Thebes and Larsen's criticisms of it. The traditional interpretation begins with speeches Thucydides puts in the mouths of Thebans.³⁷ Many have expressed views like E. M. Walker's: "The concise narrative of Thucydides I, 113 must be read in the light of the Theban speech at Plataea (*ib.* III, 62), in which Coronea is claimed as a Theban victory."³⁸ Larsen

originally appeared in *Num. Chron.*, ser. 3, 1 [1881]: 176-275). When Hdt. states (5. 79. 2) that Thespieae, Coronea, and Tanagra were "nearest" (ἀγχιςτα) Thebes, he must mean it literally, since the literal meaning is the basis for a later metaphorical interpretation. This situation could not have existed until Haliartus was absorbed by either Coronea or Thebes, which could not have taken place before 447 (Head, *Coins of Boeotia*, p. 27); and Tanagra did not become a neighbor of Thebes until the *synoikismos* (*Hell. Oxy.* 12[17]. 3) of smaller towns between Tanagra and Thebes at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War.

32. On the date of Cereus, see Buck, "The Formation of the Boeotian League," *CP* 68 (1972): 19, n. 13, and Ducat, "Confédération béotienne," pp. 65, 66-67, 70.

33. See R. Engelmann, s.v. "Erginos (1)," Roscher *Lex.*, 1: 1301-2; S. Lauffer, s.v. "Orchomenos," *RE*, suppl. 14 (1974): 331-33.

34. Head, *Coins of Boeotia*, pp. 48-50; idem, *Historia Numorum*² (Oxford, 1911), pp. 346 f.

35. See Hennig, s.v. "Orchomenus," cols. 339-43.

36. If the author was Aristophanes the Boeotian, he would also have his conception of Orchomenus affected by its actions in the fourth century, especially the revolt in 394. See E. Schwartz, s.v. "Aristophanes (13)," *RE* 3 (1895): 994. There does appear to be some support statistically for the translation "to act like," since the majority of -ίζω verbs with stems that are the name of a city, not an *ethnos* nor a geographical area, have this meaning. They include Κορινθιάζομαι, Μεγαρίζω, Ῥωμαίζω, Ταραντινίζω, Συβαρίζω, and Χαλκιδίζω. Ἀργολίζω is the only one which does not have this meaning; Ῥωμαίζω also means "to side with the Romans" (see n. 29). Μεγαρίζω may seem an exception from a reading of the LSJ article, but that opinion is shared by few, ancient or modern. See especially W. J. M. Starkie, "The Acharnians" of Aristophanes (London, 1909), p. 169. In response to the argument that the verbs having this meaning are always pejorative and socially connected, there is one exception, which is both concerned with military affairs and found in Stephanus. Under the article Τάρας he gives the following definition: ταραντινίζειν τὸ τὴν ἐνόπλιον καὶ ἐς τὰς μάχας χρήσιμον ἱππασίαν ποιεῖσθαι.

37. Thuc. 3. 62. 5, 67. 3, the speech at the Plataeans' trial; 4. 92. 6, Pagondas' speech to his troops at Delium.

38. Walker, *CAH*, 5: 88, n. 2, who is cited by Larsen, "Orchomenus," p. 17, n. 2. J. Classen and J. Steup (eds.), *Thukydides*⁵, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1919), p. 293, use the same reference and the same argument; Moritz Müller, *Geschichte Thebens von der Einwanderung der Boioter bis zur Schlacht bei Koroneia* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 64, n. 3, does likewise. Larsen also cites Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*², 2.1: 180, who affirms the traditional view.

thinks that this claim should be overlooked for two reasons: (1) the trial speech is hardly the kind of speech in which a high standard of veracity can be expected; and (2) this claim contradicts the narrative of the earlier account.³⁹ He further states that "certainly this account in which Thucydides speaks in his own name is to be preferred to the claim later attributed by him to the Thebans."⁴⁰ Admittedly the trial speech of the Thebans is self-serving, but distorting the facts to the Lacedaemonians, who presumably knew who had led the liberation in 447, would certainly not have helped their case. The Plataeans had listed the benefits they had provided the Spartans in the past when they spoke, and the purpose of the Theban speech was to do likewise for the Thebans. We do know that Thucydides made every attempt to reflect accurately, at least in a general way, the sentiments of his speakers.⁴¹ Thus it is significant that Thebans considered themselves the victors at Coronea as early as 427, either because they actually had been originally, in some sense, or because they had become the leader of the federation that had overcome the Athenians in 447.

If the account in Thucydides 1. 113 derives from a different source than the speeches,⁴² it is not necessarily to be preferred, since it involves events much further removed in time from the Peloponnesian War in general and Thucydides' exile in particular. Although the historian states (1. 1 f.) that he conceived the idea for his history before the war, it seems unlikely that serious work could have begun until his exile; and these speeches, or at least the events surrounding them, took place not long before his exile. Thucydides either would have had to rely on a less diligent researcher than himself for the material in the excursus in his first book (1. 89–118. 2), compiled some years after the events, or would have taken his material from the same source or informants for both the speeches and the excursus. If the second course was not taken, the material in the excursus may well be suspect. The sentiment of Meiggs, that "Thucydides' brief summary of this period [i.e., between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars] is one of the least satisfactory parts of his work," is shared by other scholars.⁴³ Furthermore, Pagondas in his address to the troops at Delium is not addressing only Thebans but all Boeotians, as his salutation $\omega\ \alpha\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma\ \text{Βοιωτ}\alpha\iota$ (Thuc. 4. 92. 1) bears witness,⁴⁴ and it is possible that he was speaking to some men who had themselves fought at Coronea, even though he himself attributes the

39. Larsen, "Orchomenus," p. 10.

40. Ibid.

41. Thuc. 1. 22. 1; F. Solmsen, "Thucydides' Treatment of Words and Concepts," *Hermes* 99 (1971): 393, calls $\xi\gamma\mu\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\ \gamma\nu\omega\mu\eta$ "a rather elastic formula."

42. The scholia to Thuc 1. 113 note that the word Orchomenus is feminine in Thuc, masculine in Dem. However, the other times Boeotian Orchomenus is mentioned, the word is masculine (3. 87. 4, 4. 76. 3). Perhaps the scholia caused the word to remain feminine in the first passage, while the other passages were regularized either by the later tradition or by Arcadian Orchomenus, which is always masculine in Thuc; possibly the change may reflect a different source.

43. Meiggs, *Athenian Empire*, p. 2; R. Sealey, "The Great Earthquake in Lacedaemon," *Historia* 6 (1957): 396, states that "[Thucydides] is not so reliable an authority on events which occurred before the Peloponnesian War"; Gomme, *Commentary*, 1:361 ff., comments about the excursus that "[Thucydides'] narrative too is 'scrappy'; and, if he does not get his events in the wrong order, his chronology certainly lacks precision."

44. Sordi, "Aspetti," p. 68, makes the same point.

victory to the previous generation.⁴⁵ The frequent mention of the battle in the Theban speeches and the statement of Xenophon (*Mem.* 3. 5. 4) that Coronea and Delium marked a turning point in the morale of the Boeotian army indicate that Coronea must have been a memorable event for Boeotians, much as Waterloo was for the British or Normandy and Stalingrad were for the Allies in World War II. Indeed the victory at Coronea is the only benefit cited by the Thebans in their speech before the Lacedaemonians at the Plataeans' trial. It appears very dubious that the credit for such an important event could change in less than a generation.

An argument from etymology is often hazardous, but it may prove useful here. Plutarch (*Agesilaus* 19. 2) does give the name of the victorious commander at Coronea, Sparton. The name is relatively rare: it is cited four times in Pape-Benseler and five times in Pauly-Wissowa. Its rarity makes it worth attempting to trace its likely provenance. The root of the word is *σπαρτός*,⁴⁶ a word that among Boeotians has meaning only in Thebes, where the legendary Spartoi sprang to life. Epaminondas was descended from the Spartoi, a fact indicated on his tomb.⁴⁷ Thus we know that descendants of the Spartoi, who may have included Pindar, were alive and active in Theban politics at least up to the time of Epaminondas.⁴⁸ Therefore, since the Spartoi were a distinctly Theban group with no real ties to the rest of the Boeotians, it is quite reasonable to connect this man with Thebes, even if it is not absolutely conclusive. The name Ismenias, which owes its origin to the river in Thebes named Ismenus, logically would belong to a Theban. Generally this is true, although the name does occur elsewhere.⁴⁹ The name Pagondas, however, is found only among Thebans.⁵⁰ Likewise we should expect Sparton to be a Theban, although a connection with another city in Boeotia is not ruled out.

45. Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche*, p. 164, makes a good case for a Thespian who could have fought in both battles; Pagondas (Thuc. 4. 92. 6, 7) talks about the glory of their "fathers," but Gomme, *Commentary*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1956), p. 560, thinks Pagondas himself may have been rather advanced in years.

46. F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle, 1917), p. 594. One might infer that the name is connected with a Spartan proxenus, but the name is absent in Sparta. The nearest approximation in P. Poralla, *Prosopographie der Lakedaemonier* (Breslau, 1913), Spartiacus (Stob. 40. 13), is from a more complex root. Obst, s.v. "Sparton (4)," col. 1543, calls him a "Thebaner" but cites no evidence for his identification. Paus. (2. 16. 2 ff.) suggests that Spartans would be surprised to hear the name, but that probably refers to a specific "Sparton."

47. Paus. 8. 11. 8; *Suda* s.v. Ἐπαμινώνδας. Cf. the scholia to Soph. *Antig.* 126.

48. According to the scholia to Pind. *Pyth.* 5. 75 (101), Pindar may have been descended from the Spartoi; a good general statement on his ancestry is found in G. Huxley, *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast, 1975), pp. 10, 11.

49. Under "Ismenias," *RE* 18 (1916): 2136-41, there are seven men named; four are Thebans, one is a polemarch from Hyettus, one a man from Tyndaris in Sicily, and one a painter from Chalcis. Pape-Benseler add the slave mentioned in *Ar. Ach.* 861, who is the slave probably of a Theban, if the scholia are correct. In *SEG* the name is also found for four Thespians (3. 332. 2; 15. 282. 3; 23. 271. 7 and 46), two of whom have sons named Thebangelus, which certainly can argue for connections in Thebes. Otherwise it is found only for a Boeotian (*SEG* 18. 161. 7). With this example it would seem that the least that can be said for Sparton would be that he must have had Theban connections.

50. Aside from the victor at Delium, there is an early Olympic victor (Paus. 5. 8. 7), and it is given as a possible name for Pindar's father (see C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* [Oxford, 1964], pp. 99 f., for references).

Xenophon (*Mem.* 3. 5. 4) also hints that Coronea was a Theban victory. He puts into the mouth of the younger Pericles a statement that, as a result of the misfortunes of Tolmides at Lebadia and Hippocrates at Delium, the glory (δόξα) of the Athenians was diminished and the pride of the *Thebans* (τὸ τῶν Θηβαίων φρόνημα) was exalted. Grammatically the two defeats are clearly coordinate, as the τε . . . καὶ construction shows. Therefore, since Delium was almost completely a Theban victory, it is logical to conclude that Coronea was also.⁵¹ If one bears in mind Xenophon's intense personal hatred of Thebes, his dissembling in favor of that city appears extremely unlikely.

In conclusion it is apparent that there is reason to accept Theban leadership in the events of 447. This accords well with the traditional interpretation of the numismatic evidence, which has been at variance with Larsen's view; and another explanation must be sought for the irregularities Larsen deals with that are found in the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*.⁵²

Madison, Wisconsin

51. Paus. (9. 6. 3) calls Delium a Θηβαίους νίκη; and Larsen, "Orchomenus," pp. 15 ff., agrees.

52. Head, *Hist. Num.*², pp. 349 ff.; idem, *Coins of Boeotia*, pp. 30 ff.; P. Gardner, *A History of Ancient Coinage, 700-300 B.C.* (Oxford, 1918), pp. 357, 358; E. Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines* (Paris, 1907), 2.1:946-47 and 3.2:211 ff.; C. T. Seltman, *Greek Coins*² (London, 1955), p. 156; M. O. B. Caspari, "A Survey of Greek Federal Coinage," *JHS* 37 (1917): 172 f.; see also Roesch, *Thespiens et la Confédération béotienne*, p. 43. Larsen replies in "Freedom and its Obstacles in Ancient Greece," *CP* 57 (1962): 234, n. 11, and in a review of Moretti's *Ricerche sulle leghe greche*, *CP* 59 (1964): 138, n. 1. Concisely stated, the problem is that, not only does Orchomenus not mint either a special issue claiming leadership of the Boeotians or one celebrating a great victory, but it also does not monopolize the coinage as Thebes later does. The alternative seems to be to date earlier Orchomenian coins later, but they show no sign of being part of the Confederacy. Head finds no Orchomenian coins from 456 to 387. Furthermore, there is a change in the coins of Thebes in 446, which is appropriate for such a great event as Coronea; and, as I shall argue elsewhere, the representations of Heracles on Theban coins from Coronea on are a tribute to the role he was thought to have played in the battle itself, as is indicated by the reference in the so-called Epigram on the Fallen of Coronea (*SEG*, 10. 410) to "one of the demigods." The argument often leveled against interpreters of coins, that they are heavily dependent on literary evidence, seems to be less true in Head's work. He thought there was a period of Tanagran hegemony sometime between 479 and 457 that had no support in the literary sources; and, although he believed the statement of Paus. (9. 32. 5) that Haliartus was destroyed by the Persians, he assumed that it was rebuilt immediately, because the coinage shows no break. On the date of the destruction, see M. Holleaux, "Pausanias et la destruction d'Haliarte par les Perses," *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecque*, ed. by L. Robert, vol. 1 (Paris, 1938), pp. 187-193 (= *RPh* 19 [1895]: 109-115). There is also a major flaw in Larsen's argument from the votes and districts, because he accepts the common identification of the Ἱστιαίου of the constitution with Hyettus, which has both linguistic and paleographic difficulties; it may equally, as with Chaeronea, be a case of gerrymandering.