the crusaders (1204), became with Athens a fief of the feudal empire. In 1311 it was again plundered by the Catalan Grand Company, a body of Spanish mercenaries, and appears to have had no return of prosperity.

Of more lasting effect than the politics of Thebes have been its legends. Bceotia, or rather the Cadmeis (Thucyd., i. 12), was a land of poetry from extremely ancient times, and the stories of Thebes are in Greek literature as important as those of Troy. The legends of the five chief groups will be found under the names indicated in the following division :—(1) the foundation of the Cadmea by Cadmus ; (2) the foundation by Amphion,—to this belong originally the “seven-gated” wall, the name of έπτπυλo*s Θήβη,* and the legends of Zethus, Antiope, and Dirce ; (3) war of tho “Seven” (under Adrastus of Argos) ; war of the Epigoni, or “ descendants ” of the Seven ; the story of Œdipus ; (4) legends of Bacchus,—at Thebes as elsewhere this religion was comparatively late, but became characteristic of the town ; (5) legends of Heracles (commonly found with those of Bacchus ; Thebes was reputed the birthplace of both). From the epic poems, of which little but titles remain, these tales descended to the Attic tragedians ; upon them are founded the *Seven against Thebes* of Æschylus, the *Œdipus Tyrannus, Œdipus Coloneus,* and *Antigone* of Sophocles, the *Phœnissæ, Supplices,* and *Bacchæ* of Euripides, &c., with innumer­able plays not extant. Apart from direct imitation of these works, the stories themselves, through Statius, Boccaccio, and others, have exercised a great influence on modern literature. In historical times the Thebans were not conspicuous for intellectual accom­plishments, but their reputation is sufficiently sustained by Pindar, perhaps the most distinctively Hellenic of all the national poets.

The most famous monument of ancient Thebes was the outer wall with its seven gates, which even as late as the 6th century b.c. was probably the largest of artificial Greek fortresses. The names of the gates vary, but four are constant,—the Proetides, Electræ, Neistæ or Neitæ, and Homoloides ; Pausanias gives the others as Ogygiæ, Hypsistæ, Crenææ. There is evidence that the gate Electræ was on the south, and near it was the tomb of the Thebans who fell at the capture by Alexander. The gates shown to Pausanias as Neistæ and Proetides led respectively north-west and north-east. Two of the springs have been identified with some probability,—that of St Theodore with the (Edipodea, in which Œdipus is said to have purged himself from the pollution of homicide, and the Paraporti with the dragon-guarded fountain of Ares (see Cadmus). Dicæarchus, referring to the town of Cassander, gives two measurements for the circuit, equal to about 9 miles aud 5½ miles, but even the smaller is impossible for the wall, and they probably refer to the territory proper of the town, or γή Θηβaίs*.* Beyond this the topography is wholly uncertain. From the interest of the site in history and still more in literature, as the scene of so many dramas, the temptation to fix details has been specially strong. Conjectural plans or descriptions, differing widely, are given by Leake, Forchhammer, Ulrichs, Bursian, and others (references below). All are based on the assumption that the description of Pausanias and the allusions of the Attic trage­dians may be read together and combined, and that the result will give the plan as it existed in the 5th and 4th centuries B.c. But to this two objections must be taken. (1) The account of Pausanias, even when clear in itself, is very uncertain evidence for anything earlier than the destruction by Alexander. It is said indeed that the restored town occupied the same area, but this is consistent with great disturbance of tradition ; and we have further to allow for inaccurate transmission through 450 years of decad­ence, and finally for the quality of Pausanias’s information, given apparently by casual guides to a traveller extremely uncritical. (2) It may be doubted whether the tragedians had accurate know­ledge of Theban topography, and they had certainly no reason for introducing it in their plays. Their plots are laid in a remote past ; and it is difficult to suppose them on the one hand so careful as to fit their scenes to the actual Thebes, and on the other hand so careless as to presume that it had suffered no great change between the times of Cadmus or of Œdipus and their own days. Indeed they did not make this mistake. The plays which contain most references to topography are the *Seven against Thebes* and the *Phœnissæ.* In the *Seven* the name of “ Thebes ” does not occur at all (the title is a misnomer, probably not given by the author) ; the town is called by its ancient name “The Cadmea” (Kαδμεία πόλιs), and the whole play assumes that the “city of Cadmus” was much smaller than the Thebes contemporary with Æschylus can have been. In the *Phœnissæ* the circuit of the walls is said to be so small that a person within must necessarily know all that had taken place in a general attack (v. 1356). None of the con­jectural plans would approximately satisfy this, nor can it have been true for the time of Euripides. After this, it is not surprising to find that the attempt to use the plays as evidence is involved in unanswered difficulties, a few of which are given below.

In itself, however, and as relating to the ruins of the restored town merely, the description of Pausanias is curious and interesting. The principal buildings were at that time (2d century) the temple of Apollo Ismenius, which must have stood somewhere about the present church of St Luke, the theatre, near the gate Proetides, the Heracleum, with a gymnasium and race-course, and the temples of Artemis Eucleia, of Ammon, and of Fortune (Τύχη). Besides these Pausanias was shown all the gates, all the legendary sites, the house of Pindar (north-west beyond the Dirce), statues, &c., dedicated by him, several statues of immense antiquity, others attributed to the greatest artists, and in fact much more than it is easy to believe.

1. *Apollo Ismenius* and *Apollo Spodius.—*Sophocles (*Œ. T.,* 21) mentions, as one of the Theban sanctuaries, “ the oracular ashes of Ismenus,” 'Iσμηvoύ *μavτείa σπόδos.* Pausanias, who calls the river not Ismenus but Ismenius, describes (1) a temple of Ismenius or Apollo Ismenius (ix. 10, 2), and (2) an altar of Apollo Spodius, made of ashes and used in a peculiar manner as an oracle (ix. 11,7). We should suppose from Sophocles that both observations related to the same sanctuary ; and Sophocles clearly identified the two. But in Pausanias they are in different places and have no connexion at all. Either therefore the topography and ritual of the one period differed from those of the other, or, which is equally probable, the poet used Theban names without regard to accuracy.
2. *The Fountain of Ares.—*Euripides, in the *Supplices* (v. 650 *sq.),* describes an army advancing on Thebes from the south as having its right at the Ismenian hill, its left at the fountain of Ares, and “the chariots below the monument of Amphion.” Pausanias also places the Ismenian hill on the right of the southern gate. But the fountain of Ares he places on the same side, a de­scription quite inconsistent with this and other allusions. Ulrichs, while insisting on the agreement about the hill, merely observes on this that Pausanias is unintelligible. Of a still greater difficulty he says nothing. The tomb of Amphion is placed by Æschylus north of the town, and there or in that direction was shown to Pausanias. The topographers accordingly 'suppose that the “chariots ” of Euripides were in the plain to the north. But there is no suggestion in the passage that any part of the advancing army was separated from the rest, and the observer expressly says that *he was at the place where the chariots fought and had a particularly good view of this part of the battle* (v. 684). Now he stood on the gate Electræ, *i.e.,* as far as possible from the tomb of Amphion, as placed by Æschylus and Pausanias. It is impossible to make a consistent account of this, and it seems plain that Euripides took up the name “ tomb of Amphion ” at hazard, and ignored or forgot that the real tomb could not be brought into his picture.
3. *The Altar of (Athena) Onca.—*This was shown to Pausanias (ix. 12, 1), who was told that it marked the place where the lying down of a cow indicated to Cadmus the site destined for his city (εδει έvταύθα oίκήσ*a*ι). “It is said,” he continues, “that in tho acropolis there was formerly the house of Cadmus (Κάδμου *oίκίa).',* No other indication is given as to the place of the altar, and the natural inference is that it was shown in the Cadmea. But Æschylus (*Septem,* 501) places it outside the walls. Accordingly it is suggested that the oracular sign only indicated the neighbour­hood of the destined site, and that the altar shown to Pausanias was near that of Apollo Spodius, which is mentioned last before it, and may have been outside the wall. But this juxtaposition proves nothing about the place of Onca, for Pausanias himself shows that mention of Onca here is suggested by a reference to “ oxen ” in connexion with the altar of Spodius, which brought to his mind the "cow ” of the other legend.
4. *The Tomb of Amphion and Zethus.—*Apart from the con­fusion of Euripides already noticed, there is a difficulty about the mention of this monument in Pausanias and Æschylus. Pausanias, after describing several buildings near the gate Proetides, conclud­ing with some in the market-place, mentions next (without further indication of place) the tomb of Amphion and Zethus, and con­tinues thus,—“the way from Thebes to Chalcis (north-east) is by this gate Prœtides, &c.” Æschylus places the tomb of Amphion outside the wall opposite the north gate (*Septem,* 527), and the Prœtides elsewhere. Ulrichs concludes that Pausanias “ evi­dently ” went out by the north gate to view the monument and then returned to the Prœtides. Of course this is possible, but it is useless to draw exact inferences from documents which require such an hypothesis. It is equally probable that Pausanias identified the tomb with a monument called the Ampheion, which seems (Ulrichs, p. 17) to have been somewhere near the market-place. Indeed, there is no proof that they were not identical, for the only evidence that the tomb was outside the wall (and therefore different from the Ampheion) is that of Æschylus and Euripides, whose imaginary cities were not much larger than the Cadmean hill, and must have excluded the Ampheion itself.

On the history, see references under Greece; on the topography and legends, Ulrichs, *Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland,* ii. 1 *sq.* ; Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece,* ii. xiv.; Bursian, *Geographie von Griechenland,* i. 225 *sq.;* and the “ *Seven against Thebes,”* ed. by A. W. Verrall, “ Introduction.” (A. W. V.)