

## WHEN DID CLEONYMUS LIBERATE ALIPHERA?

J. Roy

Sheffield

An inscription of considerable importance for the history of Aliphera in southwestern Arcadia has recently been edited and published, more or less simultaneously, by its finder Orlandos and by te Riele.<sup>1</sup> They have each suggested a different historical context for the events recorded on the inscription, but it is the purpose of this article to propose that yet a third context is more apt than either of the two already suggested. For this purpose a survey of the known history of Aliphera is first necessary.<sup>2</sup>

Aliphera, a settlement of the Cynurian tribe in southwestern Arcadia, was one of the communities to be incorporated in Megalopolis on the latter's foundation.<sup>3</sup> It probably was so incorporated, for in 199/8 the Megalopolitans claimed that this had been done, and Polybius believed that Aliphera belonged 'from the beginning to Arcadia and Megalopolis'.<sup>4</sup> Against this Pausanias records an

<sup>1</sup> G.-J.-M.-J. te Riele, *Revue Archéologique* 1967, 209-224, 'Le grand apaisement d'Alipheira'; slightly revised text by Te Riele, *Acta of the fifth international Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy*, Cambridge 1967 (published Oxford 1971), 89-90; A. K. Orlandos, 'Η Ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλῖφειρα καὶ τὰ μνημεῖά της. (Athens 1967-8) 133-151. There are major differences in the texts offered, but these do not on the whole affect the present argument. These works are referred to hereafter in the forms e.g. te Riele, RA 209 and Orlandos, 133. Cf. also te Riele, *Mnem.* 21 (1968), 337-346; G. Daux BCH 92 (1968), 631-2; J. and L. Robert, REG 82 (1969), 463-4, Bulletin épigraphique no. 267; SEG XXV, 447 + 1164 (=addendum to 447).

<sup>2</sup> On the history of Aliphera cf. Hirschfeld, RE 1 (1894), 1494, art. 'Alipheira'; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, IG V2 (1913) p. 105; J. Hejnic, *Pausanias the pereget and the archaic history of Arcadia* (Prague 1961), 12-13; Orlandos, 13-23; S. Dušanić, *Arkadski savez IV veka* (Belgrade 1970), 327 (this reference, and all others in this article to Dušanić's work, are to the English summary of the Serbian text given in pp. 281-345). These works give references to the ancient sources and to other modern literature; even Orlandos, however, who of recent writers gives the fullest treatment, does not examine closely all problems of Alipheran history, which is why some of these problems are reconsidered in detail here.

<sup>3</sup> Paus. VIII, 27, 3-4.

<sup>4</sup> Livy, XXXII, 5.4; Plb. IV, 77.10.

Alipheran tradition of his own day that the community had been 'from the beginning' a polis (and so presumably independent)<sup>1</sup>; but, apart from the general liability to error of such traditions, this one was certainly wrong at least in part, since Aliphera was under Megalopolitan control by c. 244 at the latest, and so Pausanias' report does not justify correcting Polybius' statement. In any case after the 360s nothing more is known of Aliphera until c. 244; it then belonged to Megalopolis, but the Megalopolitan tyrant Lydiadas handed it over to the Eleans.<sup>2</sup> While a part of Megalopolis Aliphera cannot have been a polis, but under Elean control it was constituted as one.<sup>3</sup> The Eleans retained control of Aliphera until 219; we have no evidence that their control was ever interrupted, and Polybius' words on the matter suggest that it was not.<sup>4</sup> No Elean garrison was permanently stationed in Aliphera, if we may judge from the fact that in 219 500 mercenaries in Elean service were sent to defend Aliphera against Philip V of Macedon.<sup>5</sup> Nonetheless in 219 Macedonian troops led by Philip in person captured Aliphera, which thus passed under Philip's control.<sup>6</sup> We have no direct evidence of Aliphera under Philip's control, although it is unlikely that this control was ever shaken, since Philip still held the town in 208 and in 199/8. In 208, according to Livy, Philip restored Heraea and Triphylia to the Achaeans, and Aliphera to the Megalopolitans, who proved satisfactorily that it had been part of their

<sup>1</sup> Paus. VIII, 27.7. It should also be noted that Dušanić, *op. cit.*, 327, suggests that Aliphera could have come under Megalopolitan control during the Chremonidean War or, more probably, in 331-0; his argument rests on the 'Phylarchus-decree' (Tod, GHI. II, no. 132), in which Cynurian damiorgoi appear beside Megalopolitan; this may however have happened in the 360s before Megalopolis was securely established (Dušanić, *op. cit.*, 336-7, does not seem to me to have shown beyond reasonable doubt that the decree is later than the 360s; Megalopolis' apparently modest role in the 360s, from which Dušanić argues, is mainly due to Xenophon's extreme reluctance to mention the new city), and in any case we do not know that Aliphera still belonged to the Cynurians on the decree rather than to Megalopolis.

<sup>2</sup> Plb. IV, 77.10; cf. Walbank, *A historical commentary on Polybius*, I, 531 (this work is cited hereafter in the form *e.g.*, Walbank, Comm. I, 531).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Orlandos, 151-7, inscription no. 2, lines 3, 5; the dialect of this inscription is clearly Elean, and so the text must belong to the period of Elean domination of Aliphera.

<sup>4</sup> Plb. IV, 77.10.

<sup>5</sup> Plb. IV, 77.6-7, 78.1.

<sup>6</sup> Plb. IV, 78.

territory; it has long been recognised that Philip did not in fact restore these places, and so Philip presumably made a promise which he did not fulfil.<sup>1</sup> Again in winter 199/8, according to Livy, Philip restored Orchomenus, Heraea, and Triphylia to the Achaeans, and Aliphera to the Megalopolitans, who claimed that Aliphera was one of the communities incorporated by Arcadian federal decree in the foundation of Megalopolis.<sup>2</sup> It has been doubted whether on this occasion Philip did restore the places mentioned.<sup>3</sup> The question may be left open for the moment, but three points merit consideration. Firstly, in 196 at the end of the Second Macedonian War rival claims to various places in the Peloponnese were made before the Roman senate, and the disputes were settled by Roman commissioners; although Heraea and Triphylia, both of which were, like Aliphera, in question in 208 and 199/8, were again involved, there was no mention of Aliphera in these disputes.<sup>4</sup> Secondly, if Aliphera did become Megalopolitan in 199/8, we are left without an explanation of how it fairly quickly became independent again. It is true that in 194 or 193 several (unspecified) Megalopolitan communities seceded at Philopoemen's instigation and became independent members of the Achaean League<sup>5</sup>; but Aliphera is unlikely to have been one of these, since Philopoemen based his action on the claim that the communities concerned had not belonged to Megalopolis from the beginning, whereas the Megalopolitans had claimed Aliphera in 199/8 precisely on the ground that it had been incorporated in the foundation of Megalopolis.<sup>6</sup> Lastly, there is no explicit evidence, other than the passages of Livy already cited, that Aliphera was ever under Megalopolitan control after c. 244. In any event Aliphera, at some time before

<sup>1</sup> Livy, XXVIII, 8.6; cf. Walbank, Philip V, 97, 339.

<sup>2</sup> Livy, XXXII, 5.4; cf. Walbank, Philip V, 148, 341.

<sup>3</sup> Hiller von Gaertringen, IG, V, 2, p. 105, doubted whether Aliphera was then returned to Megalopolis. On the other hand Walbank, *Comm.* II, 606, recently argued that Philip did restore these places, citing Livy XXXII, 19.7 (198 B.C.) on the Achaeans' recent benefits from Macedon; this passage certainly makes it likely that the Achaeans received Orchomenus, Heraea, and Triphylia, but is less conclusive on Megalopolis and Aliphera.

<sup>4</sup> Plb. XVIII, 42. 6-8; Livy, XXXIII, 34.1. It is unlikely that Aliphera was included within the disputed Triphylia, having been expressly distinguished from it in 208 and 199/8.

<sup>5</sup> Plut. *Phil.* 13.5; cf. Errington, *Philopoemen* (Oxford 1969), 91.

<sup>6</sup> Plut. *Phil.* 13.5; Livy, XXXII, 5.5.

146, was an independent member of the Achaean League, as its coins show.<sup>1</sup> An Alipheran proxenus of an unknown state in the late second century<sup>2</sup> shows that Aliphera was also then independent. It was also a polis in Pausanias' day, by which time Alipherans believed that their community had always been a polis.<sup>3</sup> Our evidence of Aliphera after the 190s, meagre though it is, thus shows it consistently as an independent polis.

It remains to fit the inscription published by Orlandos and te Riele into this historical framework. The situation in Aliphera, as revealed in the inscription, was as follows. A certain Cleonymus had secured the departure from Aliphera of a garrison commanded by one Aristolaus,<sup>4</sup> had driven out 'the pirates', and had made the city free. (It is not clear whether or not the garrison and the pirates were in some way associated). Various measures had then been taken to quash previous subjects of dispute and litigation among the citizens of Aliphera. While these measures are of interest, our hope of finding a context for the inscription depends mainly on fitting Cleonymus' actions into Aliphera's known political history.

<sup>1</sup> Head, HN<sup>2</sup>, 418. Aliphera had a Delphic thearodocus very roughly about 200 (col. II, 80 of the inscription published by Plassart, BCH, 45 (1921), 4-31; on the date cf. Daux, REG, 62 (1949), 21-7, J. and L. Robert, REG, 63 (1950), 166, Bulletin épigraphique no. 127), but that could have been under Macedonian domination provided that Aliphera then retained the status of a polis (as it did under the Eleans). Inscriptions relating to arbitrations roughly of the same period between Aliphera and Heraea (*Inscr. Olympica*, 48) and Aliphera and Lepreum (Orlandos, 158-162, inscription no. 3) cannot be dated with enough precision to be useful in this present discussion.

<sup>2</sup> IG, XII Suppl. page 198.

<sup>3</sup> Paus. VIII, 26.5-8, 27.7. The gravestone at Athens of an Alipheran woman (IG, II<sup>2</sup> 8046, 1st century B.C. or A.D.) proves nothing about the constitutional status of Aliphera. It is also dubious what conclusions about Aliphera's status can be drawn from Pliny, NH, IV, 22; but Kahrstedt's deduction that Aliphera was not a polis under Augustus seems unsound (Kahrstedt, *Symbolae Osloenses*, 28 (1950), 69-70; cf. J. and L. Robert, REG, 66 (1953), 135, Bulletin épigraphique no. 67; Kahrstedt maintained his view in *Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit* (Berne, 1954), 139).

<sup>4</sup> In line 3 both Orlandos and te Riele read ἐξάγαγε but in line 7 Orlandos reads ἐπάταξε whereas te Riele (followed by SEG, XXV, 447) again reads ἐξάγαγε; the latter seems the true reading on the photographs of the stone, and is anyway more likely since lines 7-8 clearly repeat much of lines 3-4. The variation matters because ἐπάταξε would show that Cleonymus expelled the garrison by force, which ἐξάγαγε does not.

The lettering indicates the approximate period to which the inscription belongs; Orlandos considers that the style of the letters fully agrees with a dating such as he proposes on other grounds, namely c. 235-230, while te Riele describes the lettering as of the end of the 3rd century.<sup>1</sup> Two other points may be noted. Firstly, the language of the text shows a marked use of Arcadian dialect,<sup>2</sup> in contrast to the clearly Elean features of another Alipheran inscription also published by Orlandos and clearly belonging to the period of Elean domination.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, the inscription evidently remained in place, where it was set up, until it was reused very much later in the construction of a small Christian church on the same site,<sup>4</sup> and it was obviously never smashed in antiquity; these facts suggest that the text does not record a temporary liberation from a foreign domination that was later reimposed, whether Elean, Macedonian, or Megalopolitan.

Orlandos dates the inscription to c. 235-230. He identifies the garrison as Macedonian (arguing that its commander's name, Aristolaus, is of a type in -laus common among Macedonians), identifies the pirates as Illyrians, and suggests that Cleonymus was perhaps the Phliasian tyrant of that name who abdicated in 229/8 and joined the Achaean League.<sup>5</sup> This reconstruction seems unlikely. It is especially difficult to understand why there would be a Macedonian garrison in Aliphera in the middle of the period of Elean domination. Nor is the name Aristolaus particularly Macedonian; on the contrary it is found in several areas of the Greek world.<sup>6</sup> In addition the absence of Elean dialect contrasts with the one Alipheran inscription clearly dating from this period. Finally, since our evidence is against any interruption of Elean domination before 219, an alternative hypothesis, that the text records the departure of an Elean garrison c. 235-230, is no better;

<sup>1</sup> Orlandos, 140; te Riele, RA, 210.

<sup>2</sup> te Riele, RA, 213 and Mnem. 21 (1968), 340-1; cf. Orlandos, 146-151.

<sup>3</sup> Orlandos, 151-7, inscription no. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Orlandos, 133-6.

<sup>5</sup> Orlandos, 137-40.

<sup>6</sup> The indices of SEG, I-XXV, taken as a random sample, produced the following cases: I, 330, B. 72; III, 355.9; IV, 243. 3(?), 294.2; XII 275.3.5; XIX, 266.2(?), 386.8; XXIV, 1105, ii, 20; XXV, 445.25. These cases range from central Greece to Istria and Caria, but none is a Macedonian.

and the Eleans, if they ever lost control of Aliphera, certainly regained it by 219, in which case they would hardly have left this inscription standing. Altogether any date within the period of Elean domination seems excluded.

Te Riele dates the inscription to 219, immediately after the capture of Aliphera by Philip V. He identifies the garrison as Elean and the pirates as Aetolians (then allied to Elis), and suggests that Cleonymus was either in Macedonian service or was an Alipheran who negotiated (with Philip V) the safety of his fellow-citizens and the withdrawal of Elis' mercenary garrison, and then drove out of the area bands of Aetolians.<sup>1</sup> The great weakness of this theory is that the inscription gives all credit for the liberation of Aliphera to Cleonymus but nowhere mentions Philip V, who directed in person both the operations against Aliphera and the final negotiations for its surrender,<sup>2</sup> and moreover controlled Aliphera from 219 until 199/8, so that it would have been indiscreet, to say the least, to ignore him in a text like that under discussion. After 219 we know of no interruption of Macedonian control until 199/8, and it is unlikely, for reasons given above, that the text records a temporary liberation from Philip.

It thus appears that neither of the contexts proposed by the editors of the inscription is satisfactory, and that in general the inscription is unlikely to belong to the period when Aliphera was controlled successively by the Eleans and by Philip V. The period before Elean domination is also excluded, since the inscription shows Aliphera as a polis, which it would not be when incorporated in Megalopolis. The only remaining possibility is the period from 199/8 onwards, which does not seem excessively late for the style of lettering.

In 199/8 Aliphera was held by Philip V; in that year Philip gave it to Megalopolis according to Livy (but Livy was wrong about Aliphera in 208); thereafter all our meagre evidence shows Aliphera as an independent polis. The most obvious combination of the

<sup>1</sup> te Riele, RA, 222-224.

<sup>2</sup> Philip at Aliphera in 219, Plb. IV, 78; cf. lines 3-4, 7-8, 16 of the inscription (in either edition). Though parts of the inscription are illegible and the lower right-hand corner is lost, it is clear that we have the text from the first to the last line (Orlandos, 136, and plate 104); it is difficult to see how any mention of Philip could be included in the remaining gaps in our text.

inscription with these facts is to suppose that Cleonymus was the man who gave Aliphera its independence, and moreover at a date in the 190s, since in that period the 'pirates' can readily be explained as associates of the Spartan ruler Nabis, whether Cretan sea-raiders or (taking 'pirates' in a more general sense) bands who operated by land.<sup>1</sup> In that case the garrison mentioned in the inscription can be explained in two ways. Either Megalopolis did in fact receive Aliphera from Philip and instal a garrison, which it soon afterwards withdrew, giving Aliphera independence in order that the united citizen-body of Aliphera, untroubled by the dissension which clearly preceded the measures listed on the inscription, could effectively resist Nabis' men (who also threatened Megalopolis<sup>2</sup>). Or else, assuming that Livy was mistaken about Aliphera in 199/8 as in 208 and that Megalopolis never received it from Philip, we may suppose that Cleonymus (presumably an Alipheran) persuaded Philip's garrison to leave, at a time when Philip in any case contemplated giving up Aliphera, and so achieved independence for Aliphera, an independence which Megalopolis accepted because of Cleonymus' effective action against the associates of Megalopolis' enemy Nabis. The latter hypothesis, save that it supposes a second error in Livy about Aliphera, is the less cumbersome and on that account the more plausible. It would mean that Aliphera achieved independence in 199/8 and that Megalopolis accepted the situation more or less immediately, not disputing possession of Aliphera in 196 when various claims to different places in the Peloponnese were put before the Romans. If this reconstruction is accepted, the inscription can be dated between winter 199/8 and 196, most probably in 198.

<sup>1</sup> On Nabis' 'piratical' associates by sea and by land, cf. Plb. XIII, 8.2. On Nabis generally cf. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Munich 1967) I, 408-411, II, 715.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g., Errington, *Philopoemen*, 78; Walbank, *Comm.* II, 421.