

12 Crisis as Opportunity

Intra-federal Disputes between Religion, Politics and Economy*

Elena Franchi

1. Border Disputes and the Crisis of Intra-federal Relations

The history of many Greek *koina* is marked by border conflicts between members of the same *koinon*, and scholars have long questioned the presumed and real centrality of the *koinon*'s role in managing the resolution of these conflicts and the objectives and effects that such a resolution had and/or could have had: a final pacification resulting from an ultimate resolution of conflicts lasting centuries?

This chapter proposes a shift in perspective at several levels. First, the intra-federal conflict is conceived as a moment of crisis¹ in the federal alliance where crisis is seen as an opportunity. Second, the opportunity triggered by the crisis of alliance is not interpreted as the possibility of reaching a final resolution of the conflict, but rather as the possibility of reshaping the balance of power between the different members. Third, the question arises as to whether the interest in seizing this opportunity should be ascribed only to the *koinon* itself or whether there are, in fact, other actors who may have benefitted from a resilience of the intra-federal alliance resulting from the transformation of a moment of crisis into an opportunity for adaptation. In what follows, I will analyze three cases in which it seems very likely that tensions in intra-federal relations turned out to be opportunities to reshape these same relations to the benefit of the *koinon*, especially in terms of its stability and resilience.

2. Epidauros and Corinth

It is not only the fact that intra-federal border wars clearly represent a moment of crisis in relations between members of the same *koinon* and that a decision must be

* This research has been developed within the framework of the ERC Project FeBo: Federalism and Border Management in Greek Antiquity funded by the European Union (ERC FeBo, ERC 2021 Cog PR. No. 101043954). Hosted by the University of Trento, Project FeBo aims to shed light on the strategies and policies adopted by Greek federal states for the management, control and protection of internal and external borders. The views and opinions expressed in this chapter are exclusively those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. I am grateful to Claudio Biagetti, Sebastian Scharff, Angela Ganter and Felix Maier for their valuable suggestion.

made (i.e. that it is necessary – literally – to separate, to distinguish, to choose²). There is more to it than that: border disputes are linked to crisis far beyond the semantic level, and this despite the fact that the ancient Greeks did not use words with the root *κρίν- to indicate moments of crisis.³ In fact, the word κρίνω and related terms occur very often in inscriptions reporting arbitral decisions on border disputes. Arbiters have to κρίνειν,⁴ in some cases the judges who have to decide are called κριταί⁵ or the very dispute is called κρίσις περὶ χώρας.⁶ Where there is a crisis, decisions have to be made.

This singular (yet somehow consistent) conjunction of the semantic and lexical levels is also to be found in one of the two inscriptions⁷ of our first case study: the dispute between Epidauros and Corinth. In this dispute, the Megarians served as judges⁸ and attributed the territory to the Epidaurians.⁹ The inscription concludes with the names of the judges who delivered the verdict.¹⁰

As it is well known, Epidauros and Corinth were both members of the Achaian *koinon* in the second half of the third century BC,¹¹ and it is not by chance that the *koinon* intervened in the dispute several times: first when Epidauros joined the *koinon*, then again by appointing arbitration to a member of the *koinon*: the city of Megara.¹² What is at stake here are clearly territories and their borders, which are addressed in two independent inscriptions, both found in the Asklepieion of Epidauros (it is not clear, however, if the disputed area alluded to in the first inscription is the same as that mentioned in the second one: see below).¹³

The first inscription is usually considered a formal document relating to the entry of Epidauros into the Achaian League.¹⁴ If this is true, it must be dated to the year 243 when Epidauros (as well as Troizen and Megara) joined the Achaian League¹⁵ (while Corinth had become a member the year before).¹⁶ In the text, several issues are referred to; from line 15 onwards, one or more regions, including the Epidaurians, Achaians, Corinthians and possibly also the Argives (if Peek's restoration in l. 15 is correct)¹⁷ are mentioned. The second inscription is dated to a period from 242 to 238, based on general considerations as well as the reference to Achaian and Epidaurian magistrates.¹⁸ It refers to a dispute over Speraion and Sellas, most probably both overlooking the Saronic Gulf, maybe coinciding with the *chora* mentioned by the first inscription.¹⁹ While the river Sellas cannot be easily located, a harbour on the Saronic Gulf might be identified as part of Speraion. If this is the area described by Thucydides, it is not only characterized as *eschatia* (i.e. land integrated but still on the margins), but also as *methoria* (i.e. land beyond the *horoi* of Epidauros or between the *horoi* of Epidauros and that of another community – Corinth?):

[3] and afterwards [the Athenians] manned thirty-seven vessels in all and chased him on his passage along shore into Spiraecum, a desert Corinthian port on the edge of the Epidaurian frontier. After losing one ship out at sea, the Peloponnesians got the rest together and brought them to anchor.²⁰

Even if the reading of the manuscripts Πειραιόν (as favoured by Felix Bölte) were not to be corrected to Σπείραιον (as suggested by Georg Müller and most other scholars)²¹ and the passage in Thucydides referred to an area different from that

of the inscription, it remains remarkable that both Plinius and Ptolemy mention a promontory called Speraion in close proximity to which there were harbours;²² and even more importantly, the inscription refers to a chariot road leading there, which testifies to its significance. If the identification with today's Gulf of Korphos is correct, it represented a natural harbour that offered protection by its very conformation, was suitable for accommodating ships of various sizes, provided excellent access to the hinterland and guaranteed freshwater springs.²³

The above-mentioned elements indicate that the disputed area between Corinth and Epidauros was of strategic importance. The outcome of the dispute therefore inevitably had a significance for the political and spatial dynamics of power in the eastern Peloponnese. The second inscription records the decision over these territories given by a board of Megarian judges who had been appointed by the Achaian League. As has been noted, the Achaians chose the Megarians most likely because their geographical proximity allowed them to carry out the necessary inspections of the territory²⁴ and because of the established Megarian practice of a functional or practical neutrality.²⁵ It is not only the second reason that may have convinced the Corinthians to accept the arbitration of the Megarians despite the uneasy relations between both cities; the Achaians most likely supervised the Megarians: in both inscriptions, they seem to play a relevant role in matters concerning the disputed territories.²⁶ With regard to the role of the Achaians in the second inscription one cannot but notice that reference is made to a 'decree' by the Achaians both in a first phase, when the Achaians appointed 151 judges,²⁷ and in a second phase, when the Corinthians contested the boundary and the Achaians appointed 31 judges.²⁸

The role of the Achaians behind the Megarians seems likely to explain the outcome of the arbitration. The territory was adjudged to the Epidaurians, and the Corinthians, even if objecting to the precise details of the boundary demarcation, generally accepted the verdict. That the decision by the Megarians, which was related to the influence of the Achaians, favoured the Epidaurians seems to respond to a need for a rebalancing of power in the area. It is known, in fact, that in previous centuries the Corinthians appear to have expanded their control as far as the gates of Epidauros on several occasions. This is evidenced by the passage from Thucydides quoted above.²⁹ With regard to the problem we are analysing, it does not matter so much whether the amendment is appropriate or not. What is of interest here is not that the same disputed land as in the inscription is at stake, but that it is about borderlands between the two cities on a more general level. The supremacy of Corinth over Epidauros is then evidenced, for the earlier periods, by a passage from Herodotus recounting the affairs of Periander.³⁰

But again, there is more to it. As mentioned above, the arbitration between Epidauros and Corinth most probably took place between 242 and 238, when Argos had not yet joined the Achaian League (it entered in 229). The dispute therefore concerns intra-federal borders that are very close to the outer borders of the *koinon*, outer borders that are, however, destined to shift shortly thereafter. The favouring of Epidauros in the dispute cornered Argos, not yet a member of the league. This might make even more sense if Markellos Mitsos is right in integrating ἀργυ into Ἀργεῖοι at line 15. Boundary disputes became an opportunity for the

koinon to rebalance the powers in the eastern Peloponnese, limiting the hegemonic thrusts of cities such as Corinth and Argos and fostering the growth of cities that less threatened the centrality of the *koinon* such as Epidaurous.

3. Koroneia and Lebadeia

There are few cases of intra-Boiotian disputes for which the intervention of the *koinon* is documented. One of these is the well-known dispute between Koroneia and Lebadeia.³¹ At some time between the fourth and third centuries BC, the two cities competed for control of a “[Troph]onian (?) land” ([Ὅρια τᾶς Τροφ]ωνιάδος γᾶς) bordering an “altar of Zeus”.³² The syntax of the first three lines of the inscription suggests that the Boiotians made a decision (Βοιωτοὶ ὥριπται) in favour of the Lebadeians.³³ As Sheila Ager observes,³⁴ even if the word Κορωνεΐας is restored, it seems quite likely that Koroneia was the second party to the dispute, since the stone bearing the inscription, a round pillar, was found at Granitza, approximately 4 km southeast of Lebadeia, in the direction of Koroneia. Similar arguments can be made with reference to the altar of Trophonian Zeus given that Τροφ]ωνιάδος is a restoration, too: as far as I know, experts in Boiotian history follow Roesch³⁵ in maintaining that it is the Trophonian land which is in dispute.³⁶

Already known to Herodotus as an oracular shrine of international importance, the Trophoneion must have been a reference shrine for the Boiotians on a more regional level too since the Archaic age.³⁷ It is here that the Pan-Boiotian festival of the Basileia, established in the aftermath of the Theban victory at Leuktra (371),³⁸ took place. Several cities aspired to control the oracular sanctuary, Thebes in particular. If ποτ Τροπονίοι inscribed on a bronze tablet from Thebes that records owner, location and size of landed properties³⁹ refers to the Trophoneion, then we must admit that sometime between the late sixth and early fifth centuries BC (the tablet is dated on palaeographic grounds) an individual from Thebes owned land at the oracular sanctuary that became the subject of the dispute between Lebadeia and Koroneia a few centuries later. Unfortunately, there are no arguments to support Yannis Kalliontzis’s idea that this property should already be placed in a federal context.⁴⁰ However, the tablet could indicate the interest of Theban individuals in that area in the Archaic period. Mythical traditions document that Theban ambitions were not only long standing but also long lasting.⁴¹

On the other hand, the traditions about the construction of temples at Mantinea (of Poseidon) by Trophonios and Agamedes⁴² and a treasury of Hyrieus⁴³ (probably at Hyria)⁴⁴ testify to the interest of other Boiotian communities in the Trophonion, while the Homeric tradition that makes him the son of Erginas King of Orchomenos⁴⁵ refers to Orchomenos’s ability to control Lebadeia and the Trophoneion.⁴⁶ Lebadeia, however, must have been able to maintain control over the long term. According to Herodotus,⁴⁷ to gain access to the Trophoneion one had to be accredited to Lebadeia, while some inscriptions from the Classical and Hellenistic periods confirm the role of the city,⁴⁸ as do some allusions by Herakleides Pontikos⁴⁹ and Kallisthenes.⁵⁰ Some scholars have been led to believe that a reorganization of the sanctuary following the victory of Leuktra and the downsizing in terms of

political weight of Orchomenos is highly plausible.⁵¹ Moreover, it has been pointed out with good reason that the wording of the inscription itself suggests that the sanctuary's land is considered the prerogative of Lebadeia, as if it were equivalent to its public lands.⁵²

With regard to the later period, it should be noted that the oracle was in Lebadeia according to Strabo.⁵³ The same is true for Pausanias,⁵⁴ who repeatedly emphasizes the mythical connection between Trophonios and Lebadeia.⁵⁵ On the other hand, there are no known sources that, like our inscription, refer to claims by Koroneia. However, if we consider where the inscription was found and that Koroneia (as Lebadeia) developed into a significant urban centre with an important population,⁵⁶ claims to the Trophoneion by the latter are not surprising. Things get even more interesting, if we have a look at them from a federal perspective.

Evidence on the Boiotian *koinon* for the period to which this inscription can be dated is scarce, but there is some,⁵⁷ and Βοιωτοὶ ὄριτται in our inscription indeed suggests that this text should be included in the dossier. There is no reason to think that from the point of view of intra-regional organization the relationship between Lebadeia and Koroneia is very different from the one described in the famous passage in the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*,⁵⁸ where it is stated that Koroneia and Lebadeia were part of the same administrative sub-unit of the *koinon*⁵⁹ and shared the quota of federal councillors, which was divided among the cities of this district.⁶⁰ The territorial organization of the *koinon* between 446 and 387 and after 338 may have been very similar, especially if our inscription dates to a period after 280 rather than to previous decades.⁶¹ It was convenient for the *koinon* to promote agreement and a balance of power between the two. This was achieved by regulating the balance through intervention in the religious sphere. Koroneia already had control of the Itonion, from the end of the fourth (or the beginning of the third) century onwards an important federal centre of worship in honour of the goddess Athena Itonia⁶² where also, from the second century onwards at the latest, the Pamboiotia took place,⁶³ participation in which was on a federal basis.⁶⁴ To grant Koroneia control of the Trophonian land would have increased its power,⁶⁵ which, in turn, would have destabilized the balance of the *koinon*. Economic factors also come into play in this regard. We know that in Greek antiquity sanctuaries sometimes pertained to several levels at the same time (civic, federal, Panhellenic)⁶⁶ and that they attracted a lot of visitors.⁶⁷ Favouring the power of one city and its control over a sanctuary to the detriment of the other implies favouring her economic growth. And the evidence suggests indeed that the Trophoneion was a pole of attraction:⁶⁸ when the *koinon* decided where to draw the border line (Βοιωτοὶ ὄριτται) and thus who to assign control to, it made a decision (κρίνειν – κρίσις) that had relevant economic implications.

4. Melitaia and Pereia

Our third case refers to the many local conflicts in which the city of Melitaia in Thessaly was involved and whose management was entrusted to the Aitolian *koinon*,⁶⁹ which at the time was able to control a large part of Central Greece and

therefore also Achaia Phthiotis⁷⁰ (a region that had already experienced phases of autonomy from the Thessalians in the past).⁷¹ Here again we are dealing with a crisis in federal relations, and this crisis manifests itself in a conflict in which judges are called upon to decide (ἐκρίναν). The conflict involved Melitaia and Pereia, whose relations probably deteriorated at some point and were regulated by the *koinon*: its provisions are preserved in an inscription dated to the years 213–212 BC.⁷²

It seems clear that the crisis was an opportunity for the *koinon* to recalibrate the balance of power between its members on two different levels: the one pertaining to the relationship between the different cities in Achaia Phthiotis, the other to the specific relationship between Melitaia and Pereia.

As for the first level, it has already been noted that Melitaia had previously been involved in conflicts with other centres in the region and that the *koinon* took into account the outcome of the resolution of these conflicts. In these resolutions, undertaken by others (the Aitolians did not yet control the region), Melitaia was favoured; in the case of the conflict with Pereia, the *koinon* favoured the latter to the disadvantage of Melitaia, as if to redress the balance.⁷³ And so while judges from Kassandreia had endorsed Melitaia over Peuma in the seventies or the sixties of the third century BC⁷⁴ and a certain Pyllos (or Pyrrhos according to Berard's correction) again had favoured Melitaia over NARTHAKION in a dispute going back to the beginning of the third century BC (depending on the correction),⁷⁵ in the dispute with Pereia, the *koinon* supported the latter: the typology of provisions seems to imply specific demands of Pereia that the *koinon* met by looking into the local institutional and economic grammar, and this leads us to the second level.

Melitaia and Pereia were united by a *sympoliteia*, which represented at that stage one of the many types of sub-units of the Aitolian *koinon* but probably predated the *koinon*'s control of the area (Ager 1996). The implications of the *sympoliteia* between Melitaia and Pereia for the structure of the *koinon* are first and foremost political and are addressed in the inscription: they shared the number of councillors to be sent to the council. However, there are also economic implications: Melitaia and Pereia shared federal taxes. When there were disagreements between the two cities (which may have led to the secession of one of them, Pereia, from the *sympoliteia*), the *koinon* had to intervene on several levels: regulating the number of council members and the amount of federal contributions that each should send, separately in the event of secession, to the federal council and defining the territorial boundaries, which are then disputed. In short, a genuine case of border management, not only because the borders between Melitaia and Pereia are at stake, but also because the entire region constituted the outer border area of the Aitolian *koinon* in this period.

So far scholarship has been investigating this dispute from a *koino*-centric, top-down perspective, to deduce the number of councillors in the *koinon*'s federal council or the mechanism for defining the taxes that went into the centrally managed finances.⁷⁶ If we reverse the perspective, from top-down to bottom-up, and delve into the area where the dispute took place and into its specific economic

landscape, we can grasp an important aspect. In fact, in lines 12–16 of the inscription reference is made to the renting of common lands (located in Karandai and Phyladon) whose profit was to be divided between the two cities united in the *sympoliteia*. The *koinon* must also intervene in this regard: it required the Melitaeis, as long as the Pereis remained politically united with them (πολιτευόντων Πηρέων μετὰ Μελιταιέων),⁷⁷ not to sell these common lands, but rather to continue to rent them. It is commonly agreed that each of the common lands originally belonged to a different community⁷⁸ and that they had been united into a single complex of land called *damusia* common to both after the *sympoliteia*-agreement. Clearly, the prohibition to sell such public lots was intended to allow the city that originally occupied a part of them, whichever city it was, to regain possession of it in the event of division. Even more interestingly, at closer look the prohibition is mainly addressed to Melitaia, as political authority for the sale (or lease) of public lands, to protect Pereia, which is related as a subordinate community to Melitaia (πολιτευόντων μετὰ Μελιταιέων). In its provisions, the *koinon* is careful not to over-advantage Melitaia, which already had an advantage in the region in the past, and rather to protect Pereia. The crisis between the two offered a rare chance to restore equilibrium in a region where control remained uncertain, and to secure its stability. In all this, the regulation of the *koinon*'s internal and external borders played a major role.

5. Crisis and Its Alliance-Maintaining Potential

The relationships between Epidauros and Corinth, between Koroneia and Lebadeia and between Melitea and Pereia went into crisis. As in the acute moment of an illness, decisions had to be made. The wrong decision could lead to the decline of the *koinon* they were part of, in the sense that it could destabilize it. The right one could, instead, enhance its stability; it had the potential to adjust the crisis to the extent of enhancing the resilience of the alliance that resulted from resolving the crisis. This resilience seems to have been based above all on a balance of power. Corinth had expanded in the past to the detriment of Epidauros, so the Achaeans needed to restrain Corinth. Koroneia already controlled the Itonion, so the Boiotians left the Trophoneion to Lebadeia. Melitaia had already been favoured in some past disputes, her rights needed to be limited now. Beyond that, an economic balance had to be ensured as well. Common land could not be sold for Melitaia's profit. Both Melitaia and Pereia needed to continue to be able to profit from the lease of those same lands. If Pereia was not annulled, Melitaia did not grow too large. The crisis between the two became an opportunity to stabilize an area that for the Aitolians was, in its entirety, a frontier area. Manipulating the balance of powers by manipulating borders may have been effective: a mechanism that worked if that boundary definition was not definitive. A dynamic boundary definition that reflected a balance of power that was temporary, suitable for certain historical circumstances but not necessarily for others, represented an opportunity for the *koinon* and its members to face crises, overcome them and be resilient in the future.

Notes

- 1 As already pointed out by many scholars, *crisis* was originally understood as an exacerbated, life-threatening, almost clinical pattern that will develop either for the better (recovery) or for the worse (death) in the immediate aftermath: for this reason, the moment of decision and of judgement ending a conflict is originally inherent in the term (κρίνω means *to separate, to distinguish, to judge, to decide*; κρίνομαι *to compete, to argue, to fight, to decide* – also and often with reference to battles, athletic competitions or trials, where a decision is taken to settle a dispute and thus restore order; see Goeze and Strobel 2012: 511; Kōiv 2023: 43; Piepenbrink 2020; Fink and Rollinger 2023a: 2–4, 7 with literature). While the ancients did not use the term to refer to political or social crises, for which they had a different and diverse vocabulary (Kōiv 2023: 43; Goeze and Strobel 2012), modern scholars did, and many remarks concerned the ways in which, from a historical point of view, a crisis can be overcome through a reconfiguration (more than a restoration) of the system, especially in those parts that are problematic, precisely in crisis (Liebeschütz 2007: 16; Fink and Rollinger 2023b: 2–4). This is also the perspective of this chapter, which starts from a conception of crisis as a moment of necessary adaptation and change, and not from that of a crisis without an alternative (a notion elaborated by Meier 1966 in reference to the fall of the Roman republic) (cf. in this regard the remarks of Jehne 2006: 8 and the studies collected in Hölkeskamp 2009). See also Ganter, Introduction to this volume, with discussion and further literature.
- 2 See above, n. 1.
- 3 Cf. Kōiv 2023; Colozzi 2015 and above, n. 1.
- 4 Cf. e.g. *IvO* 52 l. 63.
- 5 Cf. e.g. *IG* IX.2 521 ll. 9–10 and, again, *IvO* 52, *passim*. See Rousset 1994: 105–6; Matijašić 2022: 401.
- 6 Cf. again *IvO* 52.
- 7 *IGIV*.1² 71: see below, n. 13.
- 8 ἐκρίναν τοὶ Μεγαρεῖς, l. 2.
- 9 κρίνάν[τω]ν Ἐπιδαυρίων εἰμεν τὰν χώραν, ll. 6–7.
- 10 δικασ[ταὶ τ]οὶ κρίναντες τοῖδε, ll. 31–2; cf. also l. 19.
- 11 See below and n. 15.
- 12 See below and n. 15.
- 13 *IGIV*.1² 70, 71; Ager 1996, nr. 38, I; II; Harter-Uibopuu 1998, nr. 3; Magnetto 1997, nr. 36, all with further evidence and previous literature. See also Harter-Uibopuu 2014: 5–6; Economou 2020: 123–4, 134–5.
- 14 Niccolini 1914: 34; Mitsos 1937: 713; *StV* III 489; *BE* 1940, nr. 53 (vs. Hiller von Gaertringen 1925–6, nr. 7); see Harter-Uibopuu 1998: 17 and 21 with literature and discussion.
- 15 Plut. *Arat.* 24.3; Paus. 2.8.5, 7.7 (as well as Polyb. 2.43.5–6 with regard to Megara) with Magnetto 1997: 216 and 220, n. 4. See also Will 1966: 329–33; Urban 1979: 192–3 (but also 51); Bastini 1987: 20.
- 16 Plut. *Arat.* 21.2; 23.1–4 with Walbank ad Polyb. 2.43.4 and 1933, 45–7, 168, 1957, 236; Pédech 1964: 458; Urban 1979: 48–54.
- 17 Ἀργεῖοι supplementing ἀργ. The restoration is accepted by Magnetto 1997.
- 18 Some precision in dating can be achieved based on general considerations and the indication of the *strategos* Aigialeus in the first line of the second inscription. As has been rightly noted, it is (a) highly probable that the arbitration was rendered after Epidaurus, Corinth and Megara had joined the league (243, see above) and (b) unlikely to have taken place in the period when Megara was part of the Boiotian League (224–192: cf. Polyb. 20.6.8 with Hennig 1994: 327–9 including further reading). What is more, the epigraphic features suggest a date before 192 (Magnetto 1997: 216), and Aigialeus's name is absent from the list of known *stratego*i for the years 234 to 224 (Sonne 1888: 30–2, amending what was proposed by Droysen 1877, 32–79). Therefore, the arbitration

- must be placed between 243 and 234. Given that the *strategos* of the years 242/1, 240/39 and 238/7 is unknown (Dioetas's strategy in 236/5 is fairly certain: Beloch 1927: 434; Niccolini 1914), it is to these years that the arbitration should be placed. It is possible, but not necessary, that it is close to the year of the entry into the league of those involved in the dispute. See Ager 1996: 116; Magnetto 1997: 217, and, more recently, Massinelli forthcoming b.
- 19 1.15; Harter-Uibopuu 1998: 21 (vs. Daverio Rocchi 1988: 157–61).
- 20 ἀλλ' ὕστερον ἄλλας προσπληρώσαντες ἐς ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα παραπλέοντας αὐτοὺς καταδιώκουσιν ἐς Σπείραιον (Πειραιὸν MSS, corr. Müller) τῆς Κορινθίας: ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν ἐρῆμος καὶ ἔσχατος πρὸς τὰ μεθόρια τῆς Ἐπιδαυρίας. καὶ μίαν μὲν ναῦν ἀπολλύασι μετέωρον οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι, τὰς δὲ ἄλλας ξυναγαγόντες ὁρμίζουσιν (Thuc. 8.10.3, transl. J. M. Dent and E. P. Dutton).
- 21 Bölte 1929; Magnetto 1997, nr. 28 (p. 223).
- 22 Plin. *N.H.* 4.18; Ptol. *Geog.* 3.16.12–13.
- 23 Harter-Uibopuu 1998: 22.
- 24 Ager 1996: 117; Harter-Uibopuu 1998: 19.
- 25 Smith 2018: 211.
- 26 ll. 16 and 19 in the first inscription; ll. 4 and 92 Πειραιὸν MSS, corr. Müller 10 in the second one.
- 27 ll. 4–5: κατὰ τὸν αἶνον τὸν τῶν Ἀ[χαί]ων.
- 28 ll. 9–10: κα[τὰ] τὸν αἶνον τὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν; see Massinelli forthcoming a.
- 29 Thuc. 8.10.3.
- 30 Hdt. 3.52.7.
- 31 The only other document that attests the intervention of the Boiotian *koinon* is *IG VII* 2792, the dispute between Akraipheia and Kopai.
- 32 ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ τῷ Δι[ὸς] (perhaps the oracular shrine of the god/hero Trophonios). See Vollgraff 1902: 570; Wilhelm 1911: 13–19 nr. III; *SEG* 23.297 (= 44.412), cf. Schachter 1981–1994, 3: 106–8 and n. 3 on p. 108; Ager 1996: nr. 16; Magnetto 1997, nr. 15; Bonnechere 2003: 25. On the cultic context, see more generally Kanellopoulos and Partida 2021, esp. 384.
- 33 Roesch 1965: 61
- 34 1996: 70.
- 35 Roesch 1965: 61–2 (vs. Pappadakis 1916: 259, n.1); Sartre 1979: 216 n. 26; Roesch 1982: 398.
- 36 Followed by Schachter 1981–1994, 3: 78.
- 37 Hdt. 1.46.
- 38 Cf. Schachter 1981–1994, 3: 111–12; Kühr 2006: 284.
- 39 *SEG* 60.507.
- 40 Matthaiou 2014: 218–20; Kalliontzis's interpretation would support a rather early existence of the *koinon*; for discussion and literature, see van Wijk 2017: 191–2; Beck 2025: 36–8.
- 41 Cf. e.g. Hes. fr. 157 Most; *schol.* Aristoph. *nub.* 508 with comments by Kühr 2006: 278–9.
- 42 Paus. 8.10.2.
- 43 Paus. 9.37.5–6; Bonnechere 2003: 75.
- 44 Located near Euripos southeast of Aulis, the city Hyria is already mentioned in Hom. *Il.* 2.496. Cf. Kühr 2006: 278–9; Moggi and Osanna 2010 ad l. [p. 423].
- 45 Hom. *h.* 3.295–7; cf. also Paus. 9.37.4 with Bonnechere 2003: 71.
- 46 Schachter 1981–1994, 3: 75 and n. 7; Kühr 2006: 278, n. 23 and 297.
- 47 Hdt. 8.134.
- 48 *IGVII* 3055 (mid-fourth century), 3086, 3087 (mid-third century) with commentary by Bonnechere 2003: 27 with nr. 2 and 3.
- 49 Fr. 155 Wehrli.

- 50 (*FGrH* 124 F 11 [τὸ δὲ Τροφώνιον ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ]; cf. also 22a); Schachter 1981–1994, 3: 77 n. 2. Nafissi 1995, 162.
- 51 Schachter 1981–1994, 3: 77. See, most recently, Tufano 2024: 89 with further sources and literature.
- 52 See Müller et al. 2023: 574.
- 53 Str. 9.2.38.
- 54 Paus. 1.34.2: Lebaeia dedicated to Trophonios.
- 55 Paus. 4.16.7: ἐς τὸ ἄδυτον ἱερὸν τοῦ Τροφωνίου τὸ ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ; 9.37.4. See Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 325–31; Moggi and Osanna ad l. (p. 423).
- 56 Fossey 1988: 322; Hansen 2004: 444.
- 57 See esp. *StV* III 463 (cf. Müller 2011: 268; Scharff 2023: 178 and 184 with literature); *FD* III 3.102 with Müller 2021: 20; *IG* VII 2716, 2723, 2724, 2724a (all pre-280, although it is not clear how much earlier); 2724b (t.p.q. 272: Müller 2011: 268); *CID* IV 47; and Pausanias's account on the festival of Daidala (9.3.5–8 with Knoepfler 2001: 347) and their organization on a federal principle (by *tele*): “The combined evidence from Pausanias and the inscriptions implies that the Boiotian League operated on seven subdivisions, or federal telē” (Beck and Ganter 2015: 153). Cf. Busolt and Swoboda 1920–1926: 1432–42; Roesch 1965: esp. 282–411; Larsen 1968: 178–80; Étienne and Knoepfler 1976: 263–350; Gullath 1982: 49–55; Buck 1993; Corsten 1999: 38–47; Müller 2011: 275–6; Beck and Ganter 2015: 152–6; Müller 2020: esp. 62–4.
- 58 Cf. *SEG* 3.354; Lauffer 1976: nr. 8 with Roesch 1979: 247; *IG* VII 2723, 2724, 2724a, 2724b; *SEG* 15.282 with Larsen 1968: 179; Corsten 1999: 42–3; Müller 2011: 272.
- 59 *Hell. Oxy.* 19.3.
- 60 Müller et al. 2023: 591.
- 61 See Beck 1997: 92–3; Corsten 1999: 27–47 (and 39 on the similarity with the districts of the period 312–270 ca); Cartledge 2000; Müller 2011: esp. 262, 268; Beck and Ganter 2015: 143; Kalliontzis 2020.
- 62 Schachter 1981–1994, 1: 117–27, esp. 123, and, most recently, Tufano 2024: 95 with literature. See esp. *IG* IX.1² 170 recording a treaty among the Boiotians, Aitolians and Phokians. In the inscription, dating to the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the third century BC, it is established that copies should be placed in sanctuaries, and in the case of the Boiotians these are the sanctuaries of Onchestos, Alalkomeneion and Koroneia (ll. 4–6).
- 63 Schachter 1981–1994, 1: 123; Kühr 2006: 286 commenting on Pol. 4.3.5. See also Str. 9.2.27–8; Plut. *Narr. Am.* 4. Quite how far back the festival stretched is difficult to determine, though a fragment of Pind. (fr. 94b.41–9 S–M) refers to the “celebrated victories with swift-footed horses [...] by the famed shrine of Itonia”.
- 64 *IG* VII 1764, esp. l. 8 (if the integration is to be considered correct), 2871 l. 17; *SEG* 3.354 with comment by Roesch 1965: 107.
- 65 On the relationship between city and territory of a sanctuary on the margins see, most recently, McNerney 2006.
- 66 Cf. e.g. McNerney 2006: 53; Müller 2020: esp. 63, 65, both with previous literature.
- 67 The “religious economy of sanctuaries”: cf. esp. Dignas 2002.
- 68 Roesch 1965: 63 commenting on *IG* VII 3055; Str. 9.2.38; Paus. 9.37.4–6; 39, 5–14.
- 69 Larsen 1968: 209–10.
- 70 Cf. *IG* XI.4 643 and *SIG*³ 444/5, n. 10 on a possible Melitaian Aitolian *hieromnemon* supporting a Melitaian membership around 260/59 (but note Klaffenbach's scepticism: *IG* IX.1², XXI; a date around the 30s seems more safe: see Ager 1989: 110 with literature). See Flacelière 1937: 198–200; Hammond and Walbank 1988: 289; Piccirilli 1973, nr. 35; 51; Ager 1996, nr. 30, 32, 55, 56; Magnetto 1997, nr. 29; 31; 54; 55 with sources and bibliography. On the Aitolian control of that part of Thessaly, see most recently Grainger 1999: 100–12; Scholten 2000: 164–70; Helly 1995: 263, 2001: 245–8, 254–6, 2009 *passim* and fig. 3 on p. 368; Haagsma et al. 2019: 300–1; Aston 2024: 343.

- 71 Hdt. 6.72 with comment by Sordi 1958: 101–3; Diod. 15.80.6 (on Alexander the tyrant) with the comment of Westlake 1935: 151–2; Dem. or. 18.211 with comment of Westlake 1935: 192–3 and 211 (on Philip II).
- 72 IG IX.1² 188 + IG IX 2 add. p. XI 205 III B. The first inscription is the copy found in modern Avaritza, on the site of ancient Melitaia, and is preserved in a less fragmentary form; the second is the copy found in Delphi. Cf. Ager 1996, nr. 57; Magnetto 1997, nr. 55.
- 73 As already suggested by Magnetto 1997: 336 and 346.
- 74 FD III 4, 351 (= IG IX 2 add. p. XI 205 II). Cf. Ager 1989: 109; 1996, nr. 30; Magnetto 1997, nr. 29.
- 75 IG IX 2, 89 (Ager 1996, nr. 32; Magnetto 1997, nr. 31). The evidence on the outcome of the dispute with Xyniai in the previous year (214 BC), on the other hand, is unclear and therefore not conclusive; if it was favourable to Melitaia, as seems to be indicated (Ager 1989: 111; Magnetto 1997: 336), this would further support the thesis presented here.
- 76 See, e.g., Ager 1996; Magnetto 1997; Lasagni 2019: 141–7.
- 77 Il. 14–15.
- 78 The lands near Phyladon most probably belonged to Pereia: FD III 4.351 Il. 16–38.

Bibliography

- Ager, S. L. 1989. “Judicial Imperialism. The Case of Melitaia.” *The Ancient History Bulletin* 3: 107–14.
- Ager, S. L. 1996. *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.* Berkeley/Los Angeles/London.
- Aston, E. 2024. *Blessed Thessaly. The Identities of a Place and Its People from the Archaic Period to the Hellenistic.* Liverpool.
- Bastini, A. 1987. *Der achäische Bund als hellenistische Mittelmacht. Geschichte des achäischen Koinon in der Symmachie mit Rom.* Frankfurt.
- Beck, H. 1997. *Polis und Koinon. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Stuttgart.
- Beck, H. 2025. “Land and Law in Archaic Thebes.” In H. Beck and K. Harter-Uibopuu (eds), *Ancient Greek Law. Vectors of Unity and Local Idiosyncrasy.* Cologne: 15–42.
- Beck, H. and Ganter, A. 2015. “Boiotia and the Boiotian League.” In H. Beck and P. Funke (eds), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity.* Cambridge: 132–57.
- Beloch, K. J. 1927. *Griechische Geschichte* IV, 2. Berlin/Leipzig.
- Bölte, F. 1929. “Speiraion.” In *RE* III A 2, cc. 1592–99.
- Bonnechere, P. 2003. *Trophonios de Lébadée.* Leiden/Boston.
- Buck, R. J. 1993. “The Hellenistic Boiotian League.” *The Ancient History Bulletin* 7: 100–6.
- Busolt, G. and Swoboda, H. 1920–1926. *Griechische Staatskunde.* Munich.
- Cartledge, P. 2000. “Boiotian Swine F(or)ever? The Boiotian Superstate 395 BC.” In P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen and L. Rubinstein (eds), *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History.* Copenhagen: 397–419.
- Colozzi, I. 2015. “Il concetto di crisi nella cultura antica e in quella contemporanea.” In A. M. Mazzanti (ed), *Crisi e rinnovamento tra mondo classico e cristianesimo antico.* Bologna: 104–11.
- Corsten, T. 1999. *Vom Stamm zum Bund. Gründung und territoriale Organisation griechischer Bundesstaaten.* Munich.
- Daverio Rocchi, G. 1988. *Frontiera e confini nella Grecia antica.* Rome.
- Dignas, B. 2002. *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor.* Oxford.
- Droysen, J. G. 1877. *Geschichte des Hellenismus* III, 1. Hamburg.
- Economou, E. M. L. 2020. *The Achaean Federation in Ancient Greece. History, Political and Economic Organisation, Warfare and Strategy.* Berlin.

- Étienne, R. and Knoepfler, D. 1976. *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 avant J.-C.* Paris.
- Fink, S. and Rollinger, R. 2023a. "Einleitung – 'Krisen' und 'Untergänge' als historisches Phänomen." In S. Fink and R. Rollinger (eds), "*Krisen*" und "*Untergänge*" als historisches Phänomen. Wiesbaden: 1–14.
- Fink, S. and Rollinger, R. 2023b (eds). "*Krisen*" und "*Untergänge*" als historisches Phänomen. Wiesbaden.
- Flacelière, R. 1937. *Les Aitoliens à Delphes. Contribution à l'histoire de la Grèce centrale au IIIe siècle av. J.-C.* Paris.
- Fossey, J. M. 1988. *Topography and Population of ancient Boeotia*. 2 Vols. Chicago.
- Goeze, A. and Strobel, K. 2012. "Krisenrhetorik." In G. Ueding (ed), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* 10. Berlin: 511–30.
- Grainger, J. D. 1999. *The League of the Aitolians*. Leiden.
- Gullath, B. 1982. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Boiotiens in der Zeit Alexanders und der Diadochen*. Frankfurt am Main/Bern.
- Haagsma, M., Surtees, L. and Chykerda, M. 2019. "Ethnic Constructs from Inside and Out. External Policy and the ethnos of Achaia Phthiotis." In H. Beck, K. Buraselis and A. McAuley (eds), *Ethnos and Koinon*. Stuttgart: 285–319.
- Hammond, N. G. L. and Walbank, F. W. 1988. *A History of Macedonia*, Vol. III. Oxford.
- Hansen, M. H. 2004. "Boiotia." In M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford: 431–61.
- Harter-Uibopuu, K. 1998. *Das zwischenstaatliche Schiedsverfahren im Achäischen Koinon. Zur friedlichen Streitbeilegung nach den epigraphischen Quellen*. Cologne/Weimar/Vienna.
- Harter-Uibopuu, K. 2014. "Streit um Land oder Streit um Grenzen? Überlegungen zur zwischenstaatlichen Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit." In W. Eck und P. Funke (eds), *Öffentlichkeit – Monument – Text, XIV Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae, 27.–31. Augusti MMXII*. Berlin: 592–95.
- Helly, B. 1995. *L'État thessalien. Aleuas le Roux, les tétrades et les tagoi*. Lyon.
- Helly, B. 2001. "Un décret federal des Thessaliens méconnu dans une cité d'Achaïe Phthiotide (IG IX 2, 103)." *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 125: 239–87.
- Helly, B. 2009. "La Thessalie au 3e siècle av. J.-C." In A. Mazarakis Ainian (ed), *Αρχαιολογικό Έργο Θεσσαλίας και Στερεάς Ελλάδας* 2, 2006, Vol. I, Volos: 339–68.
- Hennig, B. 1994. "Immobilienwerb durch Nichtbürger in der klassischen und hellenistischen Polis." *Chiron* 24: 305–44.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1925–6. "Επιγραφαὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἐπιδαύρου." *Archaiologike Ephemeris*: 67–86.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 2009 (ed). *Eine politische Kultur (in) der Krise? Die "letzte Generation" der römischen Republik*. Munich.
- Jehne, M. 2006. "Methods, Models, and Historiography." In N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx (eds), *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. Oxford: 3–28.
- Kalliontzis, Y. 2020. *Contribution à l'épigraphie et l'histoire de la Béotie hellénistique de la destruction de Thèbes à la bataille de Pydna*. Paris/Athens.
- Kanellopoulos, C. and Partida, E. 2021. "The Temple of Zeus at Lebadea. The Architecture and the Semantics of a Colossus." *Opuscula* 14: 363–400 at <https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-14-17> [accessed 17 December 2025].
- Knoepfler, D. 2001. "La Fête des Daidala de Platées chez Pausanias. Une clef pour l'histoire de la Béotie hellénistique." In D. Knoepfler and M. Piérart (eds), *Éditer, traduire et commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000*. Geneva: 343–74.
- Köiv, M. 2023. "Crises in Archaic and Classical Greece: The View of the Ancients." In S. Fink and R. Rollinger (eds), "*Krisen*" und "*Untergänge*" als historisches Phänomen. Wiesbaden: 43–90.

- Kühr, A. 2006. *Als Kadmos nach Boiotien kam: Polis und Ethnos im Spiegel thebanischer Gründungsmythen*. Stuttgart.
- Larsen, J. A. O. 1968. *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History*. Oxford.
- Lasagni, C. 2019. *Le realtà locali nel mondo greco. Ricerche su poleis ed ethne della Grecia occidentale*. Alessandria.
- Lauffer, S. 1976. "Inschriften von Boiotien." *Chiron* 6: 11–51.
- Liebeschuetz, W. 2007. "Was there a Crisis in the Third Century?" In O. Hekster, G. de Kleijn and D. Slootjes (eds), *Crises and the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Nijmegen, June 20–24, 2006)*. Leiden/Boston: 11–20.
- Magnetto, A. 1997. *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci*, Vol. II. Pisa.
- Massinelli, R. forthcoming a. "Reconsidering Interstate Arbitration as an Institutional Tool for Inter-Polis Relations within the Achaian Koinon." *SAEG Papers* 1, 2025.
- Massinelli, R. forthcoming b. "Aree di confine e confini lineari come esito di dispute territoriali nel Peloponneso ellenistico." In *Frontiere del Mediterraneo Antico / Frontiers of the Ancient Mediterranean. Convegno dottorale dell'Università degli Studi di Roma "Tor Vergata"* 30–31 gennaio 2025.
- Matijašić, I. 2022. "Common Sense Geography nelle iscrizioni greche di età ellenistica. Rappresentazione e definizione dello spazio geografico." In S. L. Sørensen (ed), *Sine Fine. Studies in Honour of Klaus Geus on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Stuttgart: 393–412.
- Matthaiou, A. P. 2014. "Four Inscribed Bronze Tablets from Thebes. Preliminary Notes." In N. Papazarkadas (ed), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia*. Leiden/Boston: 211–22.
- McInerney, J. 2006. "On the Border: Sacred Land and the Margins of the Community." In R. Rosen and I. Sluiter (eds), *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: 33–59.
- Meier, C. 1966. *Res publica amissa. Eine Studie zur Verfassung und Geschichte der späten Republik*. Wiesbaden.
- Mitsos, M. 1937. "Εἰς IG IV² 1,70." *Archaiologike Ephemeris*: 708–14.
- Moggi, M. and Osanna, M. 2010. *Pausania. Guida della Grecia. Libro IX. La Beozia*. Milan.
- Müller, C. 2011. "Περὶ τελευτών. Quelques réflexions autour des districts de la Confédération béotienne à l'époque hellénistique." In N. Badoud (ed), *Philologos Dionysios. Mélanges offerts au Professeur Denis Knoepfler*. Geneva: 261–82.
- Müller, C. 2020. "Le concours des Ptoia à l'époque hellénistique. Une affaire civile, pambéotienne, fédérale ou panhellénique?" *Revue des Études Grecques* 133: 57–88.
- Müller, C. 2021. "Mort d'une confédération. Qu'est-il (vraiment) arrivé au koinon béotien en 172/171 av. J.-C.?" *Ktêma* 46: 323–42.
- Müller, C., Lucas, Th. and Buffet, J. 2023. "Frontières internes, frontières externes. Les négociations territoriales au sein du koinon béotien d'époque hellénistique." In A. Esposito and A. Pollini (eds), *Cités nouvelles, villes des marges. Fondations, formes urbaines, espaces ruraux et frontières de l'archaïsme à l'Empire*. Pisa: 567–606.
- Müller, G. 1912. *Thukydides. Geschichte des Peloponnesischen Krieges*. Munich/Leipzig.
- Nafissi, M. 1995. "Zeus Basileus di Lebadea. La politica religiosa del koinon beotico durante la guerra cleomenica." *Klio* 77: 149–69.
- Niccolini, G. 1914. *La confederazione achea*. Pavia.
- Pappadakis, N. 1916. "Περὶ τὸ Χαροπτεῖον τῆς Κορωνείας." *Archaiologikon Deltion* 11: 217–72.
- Pédech, P. 1964. *La méthode historique de Polybe*. Paris.
- Piccirilli, L. 1973. *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci dalle origini al 338 a.C.* Vol. I. Pisa.
- Piepenbrink, K. 2020. "'Resilienz' im klassischen Athen. Krisenbewältigungskompetenz in zeitgenössischen Narrativen." *Frankfurter elektronische Rundschau zur Altertumskunde* 42: 46–59.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2008. *Retour à la source. Pausanias et la religion grecque*. Liège.
- Roesch, P. 1965. *Thespies et la confédération béotienne*. Paris.

- Roesch, P. 1979. "La cavalerie béotienne à l'époque hellénistique (338–172)." In D. M. Pippidi (ed), *Actes du VIIe congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, Bucharest: 243–51.
- Roesch, P. 1982. *Études béotiennes*. Paris.
- Rousset, D. 1994. "Les frontières des cités grecques. Premières réflexions à partir du recueil des documents épigraphiques." *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 5: 97–126.
- Sartre M. 1979. "Aspects économiques et aspects religieux de la frontière dans les cités grecques." *Ktèma* 4: 213–23.
- Schachter, A. 1981–1994. *Cults of Boiotia*, 4 Vols. London.
- Scharff, S. 2023. "Federal Treaty Cultures in Hellenistic Greece." *Hormos* 15: 169–95.
- Scholten, J. B. 2000. *The Politics of Plunder. Aitolians and Their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279–217 B.C.* Berkeley/Los Angeles/London.
- Smith, P. J. 2018. "Megarian Local Adjudication. The Case of the Border Dispute between Epidauros and Corinth in 242–240 BCE." In H. Beck and P. J. Smith (eds), *Megarian Moments. The Local World of an Ancient Greek City-State*. Montreal: 209–16.
- Sonne, E. 1888. *De Arbitris Externis, Quos Graeci Adhibuerunt Ad Lites Et Intestinas Et Peregrinas Componendas, Quaestiones Epigraphicae*. Göttingen.
- Sordi, M. 1958. *La Lega Tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno*. Rome.
- Tufano, S. 2024. "The Local Games of Lebadeia and Koroneia." In S. Scharff (ed), *Beyond the Big Four. Local Games in Ancient Greek Athletic Culture*. Münster: 79–116.
- Urban, R. 1979. *Wachstum und Krise des achäischen Bundes. Quellenstudien zur Entwicklung des Bundes von 280 bis 222 v. Chr.* Wiesbaden.
- Van Wijk, R. 2017. "Athens, Thebes and Plataia and the End of the Sixth Century BCE." *Journal of Ancient History* 5: 179–204.
- Vollgraff, W. 1902. "Inscription de Béotie. Deux stèles de Thèbes (pl. VII–VIII)." *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 26: 554–70.
- Walbank, F. W. 1933. *Aratos of Sicyon*. Cambridge.
- Walbank, F. W. 1957. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I. Oxford.
- Westlake, H. D. 1935. *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.* London.
- Wilhelm, A. 1911. *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde I*, Vienna [= *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 1, Leipzig 1974: 1–64].
- Will, E. 1966. *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*, Vol. I. Nancy.