

BOOK REVIEW

Boiotia in the Fourth Century B.C. Edited by SAMUEL D. GARTLAND. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016. Pp. vii + 240. Hardback, \$65.00. ISBN 9780812248807.

Studies of Boiotia as a regional unit have become increasingly popular, as seen in the recent publications of Emily Mackil's *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon* (2013), Nikolaos Papazarkadas's edited volume *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects* (2014) and Albert Schachter's *Boiotia in Antiquity: Selected Papers* (2016). They offer an alternative perspective to previous works concentrated solely on Thebes. This new volume edited by Samuel Gartland follows in the same vein. "This collection," Gartland announces in the Introduction, "seeks to place this traditional focus on hegemony and great men in a wider context" (1). To do this, the contributions to the volume expand the traditional geographical focus, to include small and large poleis, and diversify their source material, employing documentary and archaeological evidence. The result is an interdisciplinary work that will be of great interest to scholars in different fields.

Samuel Gartland (Introduction) opens the volume with a justification for its spatial and temporal boundaries. Boiotia, of course, consisted of more than Thebes, and a study of the collective experiences of the Boiotian poleis sheds light on the interactions between center and periphery within Boiotia, as well as Boiotia's relation to the rest of Greece. Moreover, the volume's chronological limits—roughly from 395 (the beginning of the so-called Corinthian War) to 316 (the restoration of Thebes after its destruction in 335)—highlight the significance of a period often described in terms of decline.

Anthony Snodgrass (Chapter 1) uses data from survey archaeology (pot sherds, taphonomical material, and fortification walls) to challenge the impression left by the Athenian orators that after the battle of Leuctra in 371, Thebes completely ruined Thespiiai. Instead, as Snodgrass shows with careful argumentation and numerous maps and figures, Thespiiai experienced a peak in its population during the mid-4th century.

John Ma (Chapter 2) problematizes the matter of Boiotian autonomy, whether for the collective unit (“autonomy 1”) or for individual poleis (“autonomy 2”). He points out the essential paradox of autonomy: because autonomy 2 left the Boiotians, without Theban protection, at risk from exogenous threats, autonomy 1 was possible only by falling under Theban domination. This distinction adds clarity to the issues surrounding autonomy in the King’s Peace and the Theban hegemony of the Boiotian League.

Albert Schachter (Chapter 3) reviews Robert Hepworth’s die study of the Theban magistrate coinage and offers a revised chronology for the issues.¹ By identifying the abbreviations of the magistrates’ names with the historical figures, Schachter moves back the origins of the coinage from 395 to the late 5th century—thus associating it with the end of Athenian interference in Boiotian affairs—and its termination from 338 (or 335) to the Third Sacred War, when the Thebans could no longer afford to continue their production.

Peter Rhodes (Chapter 4) argues that there is no basis in the sources for the common opinion that the Boiotians adopted an Athenian style democracy after their liberation from Sparta in 378. Rather, Rhodes makes clear that the Boiotians maintained some form of an oligarchic constitution (an “*oligarchia isonomos*”).

Thom Russell (Chapter 5) examines Epameinondas’s naval expedition in the Aegean in 364 and follows those who interpret it as a subtle success. At Byzantion, at least, Russell contends, Epameinondas inspired a break with, if not a complete revolt from Athens, and set Athens’s Aegean allies on the path toward the Social War.

Samuel Gartland contributes two chapters (besides his Introduction). His first contribution (Chapter 6) analyzes Pausanias’s literary style in Book IX of the *Periegesis*. The descriptions of great men (Epameinondas), events (foundation of Messene, exile of Plataians in 373), cults (Daidala festival) and other aspects of Boiotia in the 4th century are, Gartland suggests, tied together by Pausanias’s interest in the theatrical. Gartland’s second contribution (Chapter 9) is about the changing Boiotian landscapes after the battle of Chaironeia and the destruction of Thebes. He points out the difficulties inherent in the integration of returning exiles and new citizens into restored communities, and what impact this had on Boiotian identity.

¹ Robert Hepworth, “The 4th Century BC Magistrate Coinage of the Boiotian Confederacy,” *Nomismatiká Chroniká* 17 (1998) 61–96.

Michael Scott (Chapter 7) explores the monumental expressions of Boiotian identity at Delphi, in particular the Theban treasury erected after Leuctra, and shows how their spatial arrangement articulated the conflicting themes of communal identity and of Theban hegemony.

Nikolaos Papazarkadas (Chapter 8) surveys the 4th-century inscriptions of Thespiiai, Oropos and Thebes. He emphasizes that the Boiotians looked to democratic Athens for their epigraphic styles (e.g., Ionic script, casualty lists) but adapted them to advertise their distance from Athens and at the same time to promote a new Panhellenic identity centered on Boiotia and Thebes.

Robin Osborne (Epilogue) summarizes the volume and emphasizes that the Boiotian communities in the 4th century “actively shaped their futures and did not merely react to outside forces” (172), an important counter-narrative to histories centered on the great powers and their direction of geopolitics.

The back matter contains endnotes, an exemplary references section, a list of the volume’s contributors, a general index, an index of sources and an acknowledgements page. The superior scholarship displayed in the volume is matched by the text, which is almost free of typographical errors. Anyone interested in Boiotian studies will find this work to be a valuable resource and a stimulation to further work on the region.

NICHOLAS D. CROSS

Queens College, City University of New York, nicholas.cross@baruch.cuny.edu