



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Nino Luraghi – Anna Magonetto

The Controversy between Megalopolis and Messene in a New Inscription from Messene

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **42 • 2012**

Seite / Page **509–550**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/450/5058> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2012-42-p509-550-v5058.0

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

NINO LURAGHI – ANNA MAGNETTO

The Controversy between Megalopolis and Messene
in a New Inscription from Messene
(With an Appendix by CHRISTIAN HABICHT)

During the excavations of the agora of Messene, in the summer of 2004, a large square limestone foundation came to light near the northeastern corner of a Doric temple currently identified as the temple of the heroine Messene. On the foundation, four limestone orthostates of about one meter by two had originally stood supporting presumably some sort of slab that carried a multiple equestrian monument. Only two of the orthostates were still in situ, lying flat on their face on the ground near the foundation. Once they were lifted, one of them turned out to be completely covered by an inscription running for some 190 lines divided in four columns. The field director KLEANTHIS SIDIROPOULOS immediately recognized that the missing top left corner of the orthostate had been found in the same area the year before. It preserved the first words of the first six lines of the inscription.

The text includes a dossier of documents, in a format common in the Hellenistic period. The first and longest, running for 101 lines and taking up the first two columns, is a decree of the assembly of the Messenians summarizing an hitherto unknown territorial controversy between Messene and Megalopolis that constituted its historical background and mandating that the whole dossier be inscribed on the βάθρον ... ἧ οἱ ἰππεῖς ἐντί (lines 92–93), clearly our monument. The other three documents that compose the dossier are, in that order, a challenge from the polis of Megalopolis to the polis of Messene, a fine imposed on the Messenians by the magis-

In the process of preparing the present article, the authors have incurred many debts. PETROS THEMELIS has been insuperably liberal in sharing information on this text even before its publication and in allowing access to the inscription itself. KLEANTHIS SIDIROPOULOS, the field director of the Messene Excavations, has generously provided help and hospitality on multiple occasions. Countless discussions with CHRISTIAN HABICHT have contributed to the present publication in more ways than can be acknowledged. CHRISTOPHER JONES and MICHAEL WÖRRLE have allowed us to profit from their superior expertise. GERHARD THÜR, in an ongoing discussion of the legal aspects of the dossier, has been a continuous source of challenges, stimuli, and ideas. NL would like to thank him especially for a well-timed invitation to Vienna to present and discuss this document, as well as THOMAS HEINE NIELSEN for an invitation to Copenhagen which constituted a welcome stimulus to bring pen to paper. AM's research has been supported by funds of the European Union (7th PQ/2007–2013, PIEF-GA-2009–253582).

trates of the Achaian League, and finally an arbitration of a panel of Milesian judges in favor of the Messenians. In 2008, PETROS THEMELIS has published a preliminary text of the first two columns, based on a comprehensive decipherment of the inscription with the help of VOULA BARDANI and with contributions by other scholars. The present study represents a first attempt at illuminating the historical circumstances presupposed and/or referred to in this document. Since the text is still relatively little known, we begin by providing our own version of it with a few textual notes and an English translation.¹ Fig. 1.

Ψάφι[σμί]α

ἐπειδὴ κατασ[χόν]των τῶν Ἀχαιῶν
Ἐνδανίαν καὶ [Πυλ]άναν, τὰς δὲ πόλε-
ος ἀποκατασ[ταθείσ]ας εἰς τὴν συνπολι-
5 τείαν τῶ[ν Ἀχαιῶν], τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἠθέλη-
σαν Μεγ[αλοπολίτ]αι διὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἀφελέ-
[σθαι ἀμῖν τά]ς τε πόλεις καὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν
[Ἐνδανιαν καὶ Πυλαγιαν] πᾶσαν αἴτημα
[τε -- ca. 7 --]ο τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς, τῶν δὲ Ἀχαι-
10 [ῶν α]ὐτοῖς [ἀντ]ειπάντων μὴ κα περιθήμεν
[Με]γαλοπολίταις τὴν Μεσσανίων, πάλιν
[2–3]φαν ἐν ταῖ ἐν Ἄλει συνόδοι θέλειν κριθῆ-
[ῖμι]ν ἐν ποθ' ἀμέ, περί τε τὰς πρότερον χώρας
ἀντελέγασαν ἀμῖν καὶ περὶ τὰς Ἐνδανικᾶς
15 καὶ Πυλανικᾶς καὶ ἀμῶν συνελομένων κρι-
τήριον ποτ' αὐτοὺς ὃ καὶ αὐτοὶ συνευδόκη-
σαν τοὺς ἀγεμόνας Ἀπολλωνίδα Ἐτε-
άρχου, Ἀλέξανδρον Ἀλεξάνδρου, Κλέαν-
δρον Κλεάνδρου Σικωνίου, Ἄρχωνα Φιλο-
20 κλέος, Ἐξαίνετον Ἐξαινέτου Αἰγιδάτας, Φά-
λακρον Φαινολάου, Λαφείδη Ξενοκλέος,
Στιάπυρον Στιαπύρου, Δαμόξενον Κλεο-
ξένου, Ἄντανδρον Δαμοξένου Αἰγίει, Ἄν-
τανδρον Ὑπερβίου Δυμαῖον, Ἐπικράτη Καμ-
25 ψία, Γοργίδα Νικίδα, Ὑ Ἀρκαδίωνα Λέ-
οντος Φαραίει, Καλλικράτη Θεοξέ-
νου Λεοντήσιον, Νικόδρομον Φιλιστίδα,
Φίλωνα Σατύρου Ἀλείου, καὶ περὶ τούτων
ἐνστάλου γενομένου ἀμῖν, ἀποδόν-
30 τες οἱ Μεγαλοπολίται ὄρους Ἀπολλωνί-
δα τῷ στραταγῷ τὰς τε Ἐνδανικᾶς

¹ Beside the editio princeps, THEMELIS 2008, see also ARNAOUTOGLU 2009/10.

καὶ Πυλανικᾶς καὶ τᾶς Ἀκρειάτιος καὶ
 Βιπειάτιος, καὶ ἀμῶν ἀποδόντων τοὺς
 περιέχοντας ὄρους ἀπὸ Νέδας ἄχρι Κλε-
 35 ολαίας, καθὼς ἐστὶ ἀμῖν ἡ χώρα, παρα-
 γενομένων τῶν δικαστᾶν εἰς τὸ Καρ-
 νειάσιον καὶ ἀποδειξάντων ἀμῶν ἐ-
 χατέρων τὴν χώραν καθὼς καὶ τοὺς ὀ-
 [ρο]υς ἀπεδώκαμες, καὶ γενομένας
 40 [ἐν] τῷ Καρνειασίῳ δικαιολογίας ἐπὶ
 [δύο ἡ]μέρας μεθ' ὕδατος, ἀπὸ μὲν τᾶς
 [Ἀκρειά]τιος καὶ Βιπειάτιος ἀποστάντων
 [τῶν Με]γαλοπολιτᾶν, τοὺς δὲ Καλιά-
 [τας οὐ πα]υσάντων ἀντιποιήσασθαι
 45 [ἀμῖν ὅπως] ἄλλο κριτήριον μεταλα-
 [βόντων τῶν Κ]αλιατᾶν πάλιν κρίνωνται
 [ἐκάτεροι αὐτῶ]ν ποθ' ἀμέ, ἀμῶν δὲ συ-
 [--- ca. 9-10 -- κρι]σιν ποτί τε Καλιάτας
 [καὶ Μεγαλοπολίτ]ας περὶ τᾶς Ἀκρειάτιος
 50 [καὶ Βιπειάτιος καὶ συ]νελομένων δικασ-
 [τήριον τὴν πόλιν τῶ]ν Αἰγιέων καὶ δικαι-
 [ολογίας γενομένας] Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν
 [μὲν? --- ca. 11 --- ὅτι] Ἀκρειᾶτις *vacat*

Second column

καὶ Βιπειᾶτις Ἀρκαδία ε[ἴη καὶ] Με-
 55 γαλοπολίτις, ἀμῶν δὲ δι[δ]ασκόν-
 των ὅτι Μεσσανία εἶη, ὄντων ἑκατὸν
 τεσσαράκοντα ἑπτὰ τῶν κρινόντων
 καὶ ταυτᾶν μεταλαβόντων Καλια-
 τᾶν καὶ Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν ψάφους
 60 ἑπτὰ, ἀμῶν δὲ ἑκατὸν τεσσαρά-
 κοντα, κρινάντων Μεσσανίαν εἶ-
 μεν τὴν χώραν τὴν Ἀκρειᾶτιν καὶ
 Βιπειᾶτιν κατὰ τοὺς ὄρους οὓς ἀπε-
 δώκαμες τοῖς κοινοῖς δαμιοργοῖς,
 65 ὕστερον, ἐπεὶ ὑπεγραψάμεθα περὶ
 τῶν καρπῶν τῶν ἐκ ταύτας τᾶς χώ-
 ρας τᾷ πόλει τῶν Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν
 ταλάντου διπλασίου, ἐπεὶ λαβοῦ-
 σα μεσοκοίνους τοὺς καρποὺς οὐ-
 70 κ ἀπεδίδου, καὶ κεκριμένων ἀμῶν
 περὶ τᾶς χώρας πάλιν ἀμὲ προεκα-

λέσατο ἅ πόλις τῶν Μεγαλοπο-
 λιτᾶν περὶ τᾶς Ἀκρειάτιος χώρας
 ὡς κριτήριον συνελώμεθα ὡς οὐ
 75 κεκριμένων ποθ' ἄμέ, τῶν δὲ κοι-
 νῶν δαμιουργῶν ἐπακολουθησάν-
 των αὐτᾶι καὶ ζαμίαν ἀμῖν ἐπι-
 βαλόντων ὅτι οὐ συναιροίμεθα
 κριτήριον καὶ εἰσαγαγόντων εἰς τὸ
 80 δικαστήριον τῶν Μιλησίων ἐνικά-
 σαμεν πάσαις ταῖς ψάφοις καθότι
 εἶημεν κεκριμένοι περὶ τε ταύτας
 τᾶς χώρας ὕ καὶ τᾶς Βιπειάτιος πο-
 τὶ Μεγαλοπολίτας· ὅπως οὖν ὑπό-
 85 μαμα εἶ καὶ εἰς τὸν ὕστερον χρόνον
 ὅτι περὶ τε τᾶς Ἀκρειάτιος καὶ Βιπειά-
 τιος κρίμασιν ἐνικάσαμες τοὺς Με-
 γαλοπολίτας καὶ περὶ τᾶς ζαμίας
 ἅς ἐζαμίωσαν ἄμέ οἱ δαμιργοὶ ἐ-
 90 νικάσαμες ὕ δεδόχθαι τῶι δάμωι·
 ἀναγράψαι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τᾶς Μεσ-
 σάνας εἰς τὸ βᾶθρον τὸ παρὰ τὸ Βου-
 λεῖον ἢ οἱ ἰππεῖς ἐντὶ τάν τε πρόκλη-
 σιν τὰν γενομένην ὑπὸ τῶν Μεγα-
 95 λοπολιτᾶν καὶ τὰν ζαμίαν τὰν
 ἀπὸ τῶν δαμιουργῶν γενομένην
 ἐπὶ Αἰνητίδα καὶ τὰν κρίσιν τὰν γε-
 νομένην ὑπὸ τοῦ δικαστηρίου τῶν
 Μιλησίων Βίωνος, Βάβωνος, Αἰσχρου,
 100 Ἑραγόρα, Φιλίσκου, Ἀρτέμωνος, ὁμοί-
 ως δὲ καὶ τὸ ψάφισμ' α τοῦτο *vacat*
vacat (5 lines)

Notes

Unless otherwise indicated, supplements are from THEMELIS' editio princeps. Observations on the stone go back to NL's autopsy from October 30th, 2008, performed with kind permission of P. THEMELIS and with the help of K. SIDIROPOULOS.

8. αἴτηνα THEMELIS, but the stone has αἴτημα.

9. [--]ο THEMELIS. The omicron after the lacuna is confirmed. The context requires a finite verb in the middle which can take αἴτημα as its direct object and τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς as its indirect object. Possibly [τε ἠτήσαντ]ο.

10. π[ρο]ειπάντων THEMELIS; [ἀντ]ειπάντων CH. JONES (private communication), confirmed by autopsy.

12. [- -]φαν THEMELIS. There is space for 2 or 3 letters. [ν ξ]φαν (?) L-M. The lacuna is too small to allow for other supplements. The Doric form for the third person plural is frequent in poetry (Homer, Apollonius Rhodius, Theocritus); A. WILHELM, *Reisen in Kilikien*, no. 108 l. 36 [ἔφα]ν (Syll.³ 644; I.Byzantion 1) suggested it as a supplement for a decree of Byzantium dated 175–171 BCE. The surface of the stone appears to have been damaged before the inscription was cut, as shown by various points where the stonecutter was compelled to work around an existing hole or cut (this situation provoked the vacats marked in lines 2, 24, 96, 101). The same factor could be at play at the beginning of the following line, which, as preserved on the stone, begins precisely with a vacat.

13. [μεν μ]ν printed by THEMELIS is too long for the lacuna, which cannot have included more than 2 or maximum 3 letters (narrow letters that is: in the inscription *mu*, *nu* and especially *epsilon*s are instead rather broad); it is also syntactically awkward. [ν μ]ν πoθ' ἀμέ L-M. For the conditions of the stone at this point, cf. *supra* ad l. 12.

41. [τρεις] printed by THEMELIS appears too long; [δύο] THÜR (private conversation), which seems to have been THEMELIS' own view at some point, see THEMELIS 2008, 218.

45. [ἀμῖν καὶ] THEMELIS, but there is space for more letters and the subjunctive at the end of line 46 requires a conjunction; [ἀμῖν ὅπως] L-M.

47. The lacuna is 12–13 letters long. We propose [ἐκότεροι αὐτῶ]ν, cf. ἀμῶν ἐκατέρων (ll. 37–38), which however refers to Megalopolitans and Messenians. The supplement is compatible in terms of length and consistent with the Messenians' take on these developments as presented in the decree: here they have good reasons to underline that the proceedings in Aigion involved not only the Kaliaiai, who are their formal counterpart, but also the Megalopolitans; cf. *infra* section 2c.

Translation

Decree. Whereas, when the Achaians occupied Endania and Pylana and the polis was readmitted to the sympolity of the Achaians, at first the Megalopolitans wanted to take away from us, with the help of the Achaians, the poleis and the whole of the territory of Endania and Pylana and presented a formal request to the Achaians, and since the Achaians retorted that they would not transfer to the Megalopolitans land that was of the Messenians, again they declared in the σύνοδος at Elis that they wanted to call us to court and disputed with us regarding both the previous land and the territories of Endania and Pylana, and since we chose as a court in which to be judged against them that to which they too agreed, that is, the ἀγεμόνες Apollonidas son of Etearchos, Alexander son of Alexander, Kleander son of Kleander, of Sikyon, Archon son of Philokles, Exainetos son of Exainetos, of Aigira, Phalakros son of Phainolaos, Lapheides son of Xenokles, Stiapyros son of Stiapyros, Damoxenos son of Kleoxenos, Antander son of Damoxenos, of Aigion, Antander son of Hyperbios, of Dyme, Epikrates son of Kampsias, Gorgidas son of Nikidas, Arkadion son of Leon, of Pharai, Kallikrates son of Theoxenos, of Leontion, Nikodromos son of Philistidas, Philon son of Satyros, of Elis, and these decisions were officially agreed upon by us, and the Megalopolitans gave the στρατηγός Apollonidas the borders of the territories of Endania and Pylana and of Akreiatas and Bipeiatas, and we gave him the encompassing borders of the land as we own it, from the river Neda to Kleolaia, and after the judges came to the Karneiasion and we both showed them the land according to the borders we had

previously submitted, and after in the Karneiasion a debate took place over two days, with speakers' time measured by a water-clock, the Megalopolitans renounced Akreiatis and Bipeiatis, but did not restrain the Kaliatai from disputing with us, so that, by way of the Kaliatai obtaining a new trial, they both could again undergo a judgment against us, and since we agreed to be judged against the Megalopolitans and the Kaliatai regarding Akreiatis and Bipeiatis and cooperated in the choice of the polis of Aigion as our court, after a debate took place, in which the Megalopolitans [argued] that Akreiatis and Bipeiatis were Arkadian and Megalopolitan, and we showed that they are Messenian, in a court of 147 judges the Kaliatai and Megalopolitans obtained seven votes, and we 140, who judged that Akreiatis and Bipeiatis were Messenian according to the borders we had indicated to the common δαμιοργοί. Later, because we had sued the polis of the Megalopolitans regarding the produce from this territory for a double talent, because it (i.e. the polis), after having taken such produce under the condition of it being shared half and half, had not returned it,² and although we had already received a verdict regarding that land, the polis of the Megalopolitans challenged us again to undergo a judgment regarding the Akreiatis territory, as if they had not been already judged against us, and since the common δαμιοργοί heeded it (i.e. the polis of Megalopolis) and imposed on us a fine saying that we had refused to cooperate in choosing a court, and introduced us into the court of the Milesians, we won receiving all the votes, which confirmed that we had indeed already been judged regarding this territory and the Bipeiatis against the Megalopolitans. In order that there be a memorial for the future of the fact that we defeated the Megalopolitans regarding Akreiatis and Bipeiatis in multiple judgments, and that we won with regard to the fine inflicted upon us by the δαμιοργοί, let it be sanctioned by the people: let the formal challenge brought by the Megalopolitans, the fine decreed by the δαμιοργοί in the year of Ainetidas, and the judgment formulated by the court of the Milesians Bion, Babon, Aischros, Heragoras, Philiskos, Artemon, as well as this decree, be inscribed in the sanctuary of Messana on the base close to the council chamber, on which the knights stand.

1. Messene, Megalopolis and the Achaian League until the death of Philopoimen

The broad historical context can be easily identified. The references to the Achaians occupying Endania and Pylana and to the Messenians being restored to the Achaian League (lines 2–5) clearly point to the aftermath of the war between the Messenians and the Achaian League in 183/82. Most famously associated with the death of Philopoimen, this war constituted the culmination of decades of reciprocal suspicion and open struggle between Achaians and Messenians, motivated by the latent conflict between the League's aspiration to extending control over the entire Peloponnese and

² That is, «had not given us our due».

the Messenians' desire for independence, which usually involved enlisting the support of some powerful ally from outside the Peloponnese, who was not going to exert too invasive an influence over them – during the third century, mostly the Aitolians.³ Only during the Demetrian War Messenians and Achaians ended up on the same side, and only as a side effect of the alliance between Aitolians and Achaians. The pattern was briefly disturbed as a result of the Cleomenic War, when the Aitolians, possibly themselves nervous about the expansion of the Achaian League and anxious to rein in their remaining allies in the Peloponnese, launched raids in the territory of Messene, thereby pushing the Messenians into the arms of the Achaians and of Philip V.⁴ But the Achaians' attempt at detaching from Messene the smaller poleis of Messenia could not but generate hostility.⁵ By the time of the First Macedonian War, the Messenians were again allies of the Aitolians, and thereby of the Romans. An Achaian army campaigned in Messenia in the fall of 209, and the Messenians were *adscripti* to the Peace of Phoinike in 205.⁶ In the last years of the century, the alliance between Macedon and the Achaian League established by Aratos and Antigonos Doson at the time of the Cleomenic War finally collapsed, and by virtue of both being allies of the Romans, Messenians and Achaians fought on the same side in the Second Macedonian War – at least virtually, for there is no evidence that the Messenians were actually involved in the operations.

Understandably, for the Romans the Achaians were much more interesting as potential allies than the Messenians.⁷ Accordingly, at the end of the war they appear to have ignored the Messenians' claim over Asine and Pylos, both Achaian at that point.⁸

³ For a more detailed presentation of the history of the Messenians from the fourth century to the early second, see LURAGHI 2008, 252–66.

⁴ Polyb. 4.3–9.

⁵ Pylos was probably a member of the Achaian League at the time of the Social War: attacks against Pylos appear in the list of complaints against the Aitolians that the Achaians presented to Philip V in Corinth in 220 BCE; the Aitolians on their part claimed back Pylos for the Messenians during the First Macedonian War (Liv. 27.30.13), and the Messenians claimed it themselves after the Second Macedonian War (Polyb. 18.42.7). See esp. NIESE 1899, 411 n. 1 and the comments of AYMARD 1938a, 13 n. 6. Contrary to NIESE's opinion, it seems unlikely that Kyparissia, too, had joined the League around the same time as Pylos. The joint Aitolian-Spartan campaign against Messenia in the summer of 217 BCE involved attacking Kyparissia, and Polybios' narrative (5.92) gives the clear impression that the Achaians were not involved. AYMARD, followed by RIZAKIS 2011, 273 n. 6, takes 213 as a terminus ante based on Polyb. 11.18.2, but see ROEBUCK 1941, 94 n. 124, arguing for 191, in consequence of the war between Messene and the Achaian League. The first solid evidence for Kyparissia's membership in the League comes from a new inscription from Aigion, in all likelihood a list of Achaian νομογράφοι, published by RIZAKIS 2008, 168–70 and dated between 191 and 182 BCE.

⁶ StV 543. See Liv. 27.33.5 with ERRINGTON 1969, 59 and Liv. 29.12.14 respectively.

⁷ On the attitude of the Romans to the Messenians after the Second Macedonian War see now especially RIZAKIS 2011, 273–78.

⁸ Messenian protests over Pylos and Asine in 196 BCE are mentioned in Polyb. 18.42.7. For the chronology of Pylos' accession to the League, see above n. 5. Asine must have joined the

Thus, the Messenians joined the group of those discontented by the Roman policy, gathered around the Aitolians and looking hopefully towards Antiochos III – or at least, this is what our sources tell us, but we need always to keep in mind the pervasive pro-Achaian bias of the literary tradition.⁹ After Antiochos evacuated Greece in the spring of 191, the Achaians felt that the time had come to bring the few remaining recalcitrant Peloponnesian poleis into the fold of the League.¹⁰ Envoys were sent to Elis and Messene, both old friends of the Aitolians with more or less explicit sympathies for Antiochos. The Eleians replied that, now that Antiochos' army had left Greece, they would think about the request. The Messenians were less diplomatic: they sent away the envoys and prepared for war. Diophanes of Megalopolis, στρατηγός of the league for 192/91, invaded Messenia, devastated the northern Messenian plain and arrived in sight of Messene. At this point, the Messenians sent an embassy to T. Quinctius Flamininus, the liberator of the Greeks, who was then in Chalkis on a diplomatic mission, and announced that they were ready to surrender to Rome. Upon receiving the envoys, Flamininus hurried to Megalopolis and summoned Diophanes and the Achaian army away from Messene. Earlier in the spring of that same year, Diophanes and Flamininus had campaigned together against Sparta to check the first of a long series of Spartan attempts at breaking free of the Achaian League.¹¹ Accordingly, in the summer Diophanes may not have expected Flamininus to have any objections to his attempt at reducing the Messenians. At a meeting in Andania, after reprimanding Diophanes for having started the war without consulting him, Flamininus gave his verdict: the Messenians were to join the League and readmit their exiles, and to send envoys to him in Corinth if they had any complaint or objection.¹² Livy's summary of the terms the Messenians were given may be incomplete: most scholars think that Korone and Kolonides, on the western side of the Gulf of Messenia, were now detached from Messene and became members of the Achaian League. The same must be true of Kyparissia, unless it had already joined the League on a previous occasion.¹³ From the viewpoint of the Achaian League the campaign had been a success. A statue of Dio-

League before the Second Macedonian War, and possibly during the First: NIESE 1899, 646 n. 4 argues for a date between 208 and 206, which is likely but not certain, cf. AYMARD 1938a, 13 n. 6. Once Asine and Pylos had joined the League, it is unlikely that Mothone, isolated in the southwestern corner of the Akritas Peninsula, would remain Messenian.

⁹ Liv. 36.31.2, on which see LURAGHI 2008, 261 n. 49.

¹⁰ For what follows, see Liv. 36.31.

¹¹ Plut. Philop. 16.1–3 and Paus. 8.51.1 with GRUEN 1984, 467–68.

¹² The Messenians may have taken Flamininus up on this offer, see below n. 17. For contrasting interpretations of Flamininus' aims vis-à-vis the Achaians, see ERRINGTON 1969, 119–24; GRUEN 1984, 468–71; FERRARY 1988, 121–24.

¹³ Philopoimen's hurried ride into Messenia in 182 was provoked by the news of an attack on Korone (Liv. 39.49.1) or on Kolonides (Plut. Philop. 8.5); see ROEBUCK 1941, 94 and n. 124. The new inscription from Aigion published by RIZAKIS 2008, 168–70, probably a list of νομογράφοι of the Achaian League, includes the names of two men from Messene and one each from Kyparissia, Korone and Asine.

phanes was dedicated on the agora of Megalopolis, and the epigram that accompanied it praised the Achaian στρατηγός for having been the first to unify all the Peloponnesians under the aegis of the Achaian League: a clear reference to his στρατηγία in 192/91.¹⁴

The following years, especially after the conclusion of the Syriac War, were a complicated period for Peloponnesian politics. The Achaian League, under the leadership of Philopoimen of Megalopolis and Aristainos of Dyme, was mostly busy dealing with Sparta, where an intricate series of internal struggles was exacerbated by heavy-handed Achaian intervention. The situation was made even more intricate by what ERRINGTON aptly calls «the ineffective vagueness which had been characteristic of Roman policy towards Achaia since the defeat of Antiochus».¹⁵ Messenian discontent with the League was mentioned by Diophanes himself at a meeting of the magistrates of the Achaian League with Q. Caecilius Metellus at Argos in the summer of 185.¹⁶ Diophanes allegedly said that the discontent had been provoked by the amendment made by Philopoimen to the διάγραμμα of Flamininus regarding the exiles,¹⁷ most likely in 189/88, the same year in which Philopoimen, στρατηγός of the Achaian League for the sixth or seventh time, had tried to bring the Spartan question to an end allowing the massacre of a sizable number of Spartan leading politicians at Kom-pasion.¹⁸ In any case, it is unclear what his amendment to Flamininus' decisions amounted to. It seems reasonable to think of arrangements related to the restitution of

¹⁴ Paus. 8.30.5. On the actual import of Flamininus' decisions, see AYMAR 1938a, 348. On the importance of the successes achieved under Diophanes' leadership, *ibid.* 378; on Diophanes' political aims, ERRINGTON 1969, 120 and n. 1. In attributing the unification of the Peloponnesians under the leadership of the Achaians to Philopoimen, Polybios (2.40.2) can hardly have been unaware of Diophanes' claim, as ERRINGTON rightly underlines (see also GRUEN 1984, 468).

¹⁵ ERRINGTON 1969, 183. Similarly GRUEN 1984, 498 speaks of an «enframing gap between words and actions» of the Romans in these years.

¹⁶ Pol. 22.10.4–6; the στρατηγός was Aristainos. See ERRINGTON 1969, 154–57 and WALBANK 1979, 192–93.

¹⁷ ERRINGTON 1969, 157 thinks that Philopoimen's διόρθωσις, as Diophanes calls it, «removed the safeguards which Deinokrates had enjoyed in Messene by the terms of Flamininus' diagramma». See also WALBANK 1979, 193. As noted by ROEBUCK 1941, 93 and n. 121, the διάγραμμα of Flamininus may be interpreted as a reply to an appeal directed to him by the Messenians, according to the procedure he outlined in his decision at Andania. Note that Diophanes mentioned Messene as an additional reason for complaint alongside the treatment meted out on Sparta, which Metellus had already reproached the Achaians for. Personal animosity against Philopoimen is brought up by Polybios as motivation for Diophanes' intervention, and it is hard to resist seeing a parallel between Philopoimen's intervention at Sparta in 191, intended to prevent Diophanes from being responsible for bringing Sparta back into the League, and his rather more mysterious measures regarding Messene. The rivalry between these two politicians was clearly an important factor in Peloponnesian politics in the decade following the Syrian War, see GRUEN 1984, 498.

¹⁸ Liv. 38.33.4–11; Plut. Philop. 16.4 with ERRINGTON 1969, 144–45; CARTLEDGE – SPAWFORTH 2002, 78–79.

property to the returning exiles, a detail that Flamininus may not have clarified in his original pronouncement: this was usually the most controversial aspect of any return of exiles in a Greek polis.¹⁹

In Messene, discontent with the Achaian League was polarized around a leading Messenian politician, Deinokrates, who had personal ties with Flamininus dating back to his participation in Flamininus' campaign against Nabis in 196/95.²⁰ In 183, probably early in the year, Deinokrates travelled to Italy to enlist Roman support, and on learning that his old friend Flamininus had been appointed as a legate to Bithynia, and was therefore going to travel through Greece, his hopes concentrated on him. In the time he spent in Italy, he may also have secured supplies of food and weapons in preparation for a revolt²¹ – if this was really his aim. At the end of the summer of 183 he came back to Greece with Flamininus, who was en route to Bithynia. The Achaians had been complaining with the Senate about Deinokrates' activities, but the Senate had replied in an unfriendly and vague way, possibly allowing the Messenians to believe that the Romans would not tolerate an Achaian attack on them. The truth however seems to have been that the senators were not terribly interested in the squabbles between the Achaian League and its recalcitrant members. It must have been clear to the Achaians that, when the Roman legate Q. Marcius Philippus at a meeting of the League tried to prevent them from declaring war on Messenia without the approval of the Senate, his intimations had no teeth, for the Senate was not really going to intervene in the conflict. As a matter of fact, war may have been declared in that very same meeting, in the autumn of 183.²² Around that same time, Flamininus landed in Nau-paktos and asked for a meeting of the League to be summoned on his behalf, receiving a denial, probably by Philopoimen himself, στρατηγός for 183/82.²³

Both Plutarch and Pausanias talk about the course of the war, the latter in two different points, but it is difficult to extract from their reports a persuasive reconstruction – a state of affairs that is all the more puzzling since both depend ultimately on Polybios, whose own text is however preserved only from Philopoimen's death onwards. The most comprehensive narrative is found in Pausanias' summary of Mes-

¹⁹ As suggested already by NIESE 1903, 51. Later scholarship leaned towards a rather more extensive interpretation of this affair, assuming that what was at stake was constitutional change (e.g. NICCOLINI 1914, 157), but this seems less likely, see ROEBUCK 1941, 95 n. 126. For the problem of restitution of property and its importance in connection with the return of exiles, cf. the better-documented and contemporary case of the Spartan exiles as laid out by GRUEN 1984, 489–90.

²⁰ Polyb. 23.5.2 with WALBANK 1979, 220–21.

²¹ So ERRINGTON 1969, 244, based on Polyb. 23.9.12.

²² The declaration of war is mentioned retrospectively in Kallikrates' speech in Rome, Polyb. 24.9.12. On the mission of Q. Marcius Philippus to the Peloponnese, see Polyb. 23.4.16; 9.4–10. For the chronology, see WALBANK 1979, 27 and 262.

²³ Polyb. 23.5.15–18. On the date of Flamininus' arrival in Nau-paktos, we follow WALBANK 1979, 222.

senian history, and it appears to say that the Achaians invaded Messenia already before the spring of 183/82. Then, in 183/82 the invasion was led by Lykortas and took place at the time of the harvest, but failed because Deinokrates had managed to block every access to the region.²⁴ Talking about Arkadia, Pausanias offers a slightly different version, according to which Lykortas did manage to march into Messenia, but then went back without having achieved much.²⁵ All sources agree that Philopoimen, στρατηγός for that year, could not take immediate action because he was lying ill in Argos, far from the theater of the conflict, but upon hearing that the Messenian town of Korone (for Livy) or Kolonides (for Plutarch) was about to be attacked by Deinokrates, he decided to rush to the rescue with any forces he could muster. He rode to Megalopolis allegedly in one day, collected a band of Thracian and Cretan mercenaries and 60 young Achaian horsemen and ventured into Messenia, where he was ambushed by Deinokrates and captured.²⁶ Brought to Messene, he was paraded in the theater and then kept in security inside the subterranean treasure chamber, in all likelihood the one found by P. THEMELIS in 2006 south of the temple of Messene.²⁷ There he is supposed to have been poisoned by Deinokrates and, right before dying, to have pronounced words that amounted to an investiture of Lykortas as his successor at the head of the League. It was the late spring or early summer of 182.²⁸

Most scholars have accepted a modified version of Pausanias' narrative of the war, usually rejecting the chronological implications of his reference to the harvest,²⁹ but the resulting picture is puzzling. If the Achaian army had indeed already invaded Messenia and was on its way back when finally Philopoimen left Argos, it must have been roughly in the Stenyklaros plain or in the process of crossing the Derveni Pass, and it is hard to understand how, let alone why, Philopoimen coming from Megalopolis, that is, from the same route, and knowing that the army had to be somewhere in that area, could ride past it with his small task force – and this is only the most obvious problem, because it is also less than self-evident that news of the impending attack on Korone or Kolonides should reach Philopoimen back in Argos before reaching Lykortas who was only a few kilometers away. An alternative scenario, in which the army of the League did not invade Messenia until later in the year and Philopoimen's raid was the first hostile action might be more satisfactory – it would of course imply

²⁴ Paus. 4.29.11. The passage amounts to a concise overview that starts immediately after Nabis' attack on Messene in 201, which suggests that the first invasion Pausanias mentions should be Diophanes' campaign of 192/91; see ROEBUCK 1941, 98 n. 143.

²⁵ Paus. 8.51.5–6.

²⁶ For the story of Philopoimen's sudden ride into Messenia and his capture, see Liv. 39.49; Plut. Philop. 18; Paus. 4.29.12, 8.51.5–6.

²⁷ The first excavation report is published in THEMELIS 2006, 49–52 and plates 40–41.

²⁸ The chronology derives from the fact that the σύνοδος of the Achaian League that accepted the capitulation of the Messenians is said by Polybios (23.16.12) to have been the second of the year; on the dates of the four yearly σύνοδοι of the League, see AYMARD 1938b, 275–76.

²⁹ See ROEBUCK 1941, 98–99; ERRINGTON 1969, 189–90; GRANDJEAN 2003, 227.

that the League stood inactive while the στρατηγός was out of commission. The only thing that seems clear is that narratives of these events had to satisfy the need of making neither Philopoimen nor Lykortas look like fools or slackers, all of them deriving ultimately, as they do, from Lykortas' son.

The reaction of the Achaians to the news of Philopoimen's death was quick and decisive. A special meeting of the league in Megalopolis elected Lykortas στρατηγός for the rest of the year,³⁰ and he immediately invaded Messenia. He seems to have made of it scorched earth to the point that even Polybios felt motivated to criticize the excesses of the Achaian army led by his father.³¹ Among the Messenians, it must have become finally clear that, as far as the Romans were concerned, the Achaians were going to be allowed to do whatever they wanted with them. Surrender seemed the only way out, even though it was clearly not going to be painless. Polybios' description of the Messenians coming to their senses and then turning against their leaders, beyond its obvious bias, may point to the presence of a pro-Achaian faction in the city, which may have taken charge at this point. Two Boeotian ambassadors, who had come in order to facilitate a reconciliation with the League and happened to be in the city at that point, were apparently instrumental in persuading the Messenians to open negotiations.³² Lykortas imposed unconditional capitulation. A garrison was going to be stationed in the fortress on Ithome and the leaders of the revolt were to be delivered.³³ Deinokrates had already committed suicide. Others were executed, some apparently stoned during the burial ceremony for Philopoimen, which was held in Megalopolis soon thereafter.³⁴ As for the conditions of the readmission of Messene in the League, Lykortas deferred to the upcoming σύνοδος of the League, the second of

³⁰ Plut. Philop. 21.1; on the formal aspects of the meeting, see LARSEN 1955, 168.

³¹ Polyb. 23.15; see also the retrospective comments in 24.2.3 and 24.9.13 (Kallikrates' speech, on which see below).

³² Polyb. 23.16.2–5. Considering the previous history of the relations between the Messenians and the League and the references to exiles in connection with the events of 192/91, it is entirely likely that a pro-Achaian faction existed in the city. In the case of the Boeotian ambassadors, whose names, Apollodoros and Epainetos, he mentions, it is not entirely clear whether Polybios is saying that they had come to Messene already before, with the purpose of effecting a reconciliation, and in that moment happened to be back in Messene, or – as it seems more likely – that they had come to Messene only once and were still there. This would have implications for the length of the revolt. It stands to reason that they must have embarked on their mission before the hostilities started, and their presence in town at the moment of the capitulation is one more reason to exclude the possibility of two invasions of Messenia by Lykortas and to doubt that any invasion had taken place before Philopoimen's raid.

³³ Polyb. 23.16.6–11.

³⁴ The execution (or the suicide) of those held responsible for Philopoimen's death is mentioned in Polyb. 23.16.13; Plut. Philop. 21.2, almost certainly drawing on Polybios, adds that those who had been in favor of torturing Philopoimen were themselves tortured to death (see WALBANK 1979, 249 and cf. Polyb. 24.9.13). On the fate of Deinokrates, see Plut. Philop. 21.2 and Paus. 8.51.8. The stoning of the Messenian prisoners around Philopoimen's grave is mentioned only by Plutarch (Philop. 21.9). On the burial of Philopoimen, see also below, section 4.

the year, which was again going to take place in Megalopolis. But at this point, a Kom-pasion-like solution had already been implemented and all that remained were the details.

Even though Polybios says that, thanks to the generosity of Lykortas and of the Achaians, the Messenians were restored to their previous position in the League, in fact the conditions dictated to them in Megalopolis brought to completion the process of dismemberment of their regional setup that the Achaian League had started long before and possibly intensified in 191. The last three of the smaller poleis of Messenia that were still linked to Messene, namely Abia, Thouria, and Pharai, located on the northeastern side of the Gulf of Messenia east of the Pamisos river, were now detached, and each of them could put up its own stele, in Polybios' words, that is, become an independent member of the League.³⁵ Later, but possibly in the same year, a σύνοδος of the League gathered in Sikyon dealt with a border dispute between the now independent Thouria and Megalopolis, apparently entrusting the final decision to a πόλις ἔκκλητος.³⁶ Finally, apparently in a meeting of the following year, i.e. 182/81, the stele that regulated the admission of Messene to the League was drawn up and the Messenians were granted three years of exemption from the federal tributes in order to recover from the damages of the war.³⁷

2. *The territorial controversy between Messene and Megalopolis*

These events form the historical background to the decree published by THEMELIS. The opening lines refer to the situation at the time of the capitulation of the Messenians, but then the various phases of the controversy unfold over a period of at least

³⁵ Polyb. 23.17.2. The precise nature of the connection between these three cities and Messene before the war is unclear; see LURAGHI 2008, 266–68. The difference between their fate and that of Andania and Pylana (see below) suggests a difference in status vis-à-vis Messene, in the sense that it seems unlikely that Thouria, Abia and Pharai with their respective territories could have been regarded as part of the territory of Messene as Andania and Pylana clearly were.

³⁶ IPArk 31 II (which replaces the earlier edition IvO 46); for a discussion of the procedure, difficult to reconstruct because of the very lacunose state of the inscription, see most recently HARTER-UIBOPIU 1998, 65–71. The chronology of this controversy is rather elusive; as THÜR – TAEUBER 1994, 309–10 pointed out, the absence of Lykortas from among a group of representatives of Megalopolis that includes Diophanes, Polybios, and Polybios' brother Thearidas (IPArk 31 II B ll. 5–6), would be explained in the most natural fashion admitting that Lykortas was στρατηγός of the League in that moment. In light of our decree (see below), this would point to the part of 183/82 in which Lykortas had been chosen to replace Philopoimen. While it cannot be excluded that the dispute actually broke out at a slightly later date, the repeated mention of Messene in the first part of the inscription (IPArk 31 II A ll. 6, 10, 14, 15) seems to point rather to a moment close to the time when Thouria was separated from Messene. A date close to 180 BCE, probably in the early seventies if not a bit earlier, is recommended also by the new observations formulated by TAEUBER 2006, 343–44.

³⁷ Polyb. 24.2.3; for the date, see WALBANK 1979, 13–17.

two years, and very possibly more. As the text says (lines 79–101), the Messenians intend to outline the story of the controversy and, more importantly, to preserve the memory of their final victory – final up to that moment, that is, for this kind of controversies tended to have a very long history. In other words, the purpose of the document is celebratory and it is destined primarily to an internal audience, and accordingly tendentious.

2a. Megalopolis' request to the Achaian League (lines 2–11)

As mentioned above, the story told by the inscription starts when the army of the Achaian League was still in Messenia. We must be in the summer of 182, very soon after the death of Philopoimen. Clearly, the Messenians have surrendered not long before. At this point, the Megalopolitans try to exploit the situation and take possession of the cities and territories of Endania and Pylana, the two cities in Achaian hand at that point.³⁸

Behind the first name, Endania, THEMELIS has suggested recognizing the well-known town of Andania, attached to which was the sanctuary of the Karneiasion to which the famous inscription of the mysteries belonged. The alternate spelling is unexpected, but not without parallels: one may think of Orchomenos/Erchomenos.³⁹ THEMELIS has rightly pointed out that in a passage of Polybios that refers to an expedition in Messenia of the Spartan king Lycurgus in 217, the same spelling of this place-name may have originally appeared, before the text was corrupted in the process of transmission creating the nonsensical and clearly corrupted form ενδειαν.⁴⁰ Even though the site itself may not have been identified yet, the general location of Andania and of the Karneiasion has been ascertained with a very high degree of likelihood. Both were on the western side of the Stenykleros plain, on the hills immediately to the north of the passage that lead towards the Soulima Valley and Kyparissia, the area of the modern villages of Konstantini, Polichni, and Kallirroi.⁴¹

As for Pylana, a πόλις Πυλανέων shows up in an inscription usually dated to the late 1st century BCE that consists of a list of names accompanied by amounts of money and is generally thought to belong together with the famous ὀκτόβολος εισφορά from Messene.⁴² The provenance of the inscription has received scarce attention in research

³⁸ In the case of Andania and Pylana, the term πόλις appears to refer to a dependent community; for a typology of dependent poleis, see HANSEN 2004a, 87–94.

³⁹ See HANSEN 2004b, 446 (Boeotian Orchomenos) and NIELSEN 2004, 523 (Arkadian Orchomenos).

⁴⁰ THEMELIS 2008, 215 n. 4 and Polyb. 5.92.6.

⁴¹ That this was the location of ancient Andania has been proven decisively by VALMIN 1930, 89–98 and universally accepted since; cf. SHIPLEY 2004, 553. We follow the nomenclature of the 1:50,000 map of the Hellenic Military Geographical Service from 1990. Earlier maps, such as the one published in HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN – LATTERMANN 1911, Pl. I, call Kallirroi <Bouga> (Μπούγα).

⁴² SEG 11.979. The earlier edition in IG V 1, 1532 was incomplete; on the content of this inscription, see GRANDJEAN 2003, 208–12.

so far, and it is not immediately easy to establish due to changes in place names, but it seems clear that it originates from a location immediately to the north of Kato Melpia, on the northern edge of the Stenykleros Plain.⁴³ Needless to say, the place where the inscription was found can by no means be equated automatically with ancient Pylana. On the other hand, in the present state of our knowledge, the best candidate for a major ancient settlement in the Stenykleros Plain, apart from the area of Konstantini, is precisely Krebeni by Kato Melpia.⁴⁴

The true extent of the territorial curtailment that Messene would have undergone, had the Achaians acceded to the request of the Megalopolitans, remains difficult to estimate. In any case, the area of Andania is not immediately adjacent to the main route from Messene to Megalopolis, which ran in antiquity, as it does today, through the Derveni Pass, and the same would be true of Pylana, if the localization proposed above is accepted. One possible conclusion would be that, by demanding Andania, Pylana and their respective territories, the Megalopolitans were in fact claiming the whole northern part of the Stenykleros Plain.⁴⁵ This, however, is not the only possible interpretation. In order to discuss alternatives, we first need to consider the problem of ancient itineraries from Megalopolis to Messene. These observations will be helpful also for some further problems of topography posed by the decree of the Messenians.

As mentioned above, the main itinerary that connected the two cities in antiquity corresponded essentially to the modern highway that climbs from Paradisia on the Arkadian side up to Derveni and descends on the Messenian side reaching the Stenykleros Plain by the village of Ichalia.⁴⁶ Pausanias however, who describes this itiner-

⁴³ The inscription was found in 1905 in an area called Γρεμπενή in a district called Γαράντζα τῆς Ἀνδανίας, during construction works at the church of Saint Demetrios; see WILHELM 1914, 87–88 and TOD 1926/27, 151–52. It is rather unclear what was meant, at the beginning of the 19th century, with «Andania»: certainly, not the village that bears that name today, located to the north-northwest of Zefgolation and just off the highway that descends from the Derveni Pass into the Messenian plain. ADOLF WILHELM seems to imply that «Andania» was used as a general name (for the Stenykleros plain?). At any rate, Garantza, marked in a somewhat vague way in the map of HILLER and LATTERMANN, is called Melpia in modern maps. The lemma of SEG 11.979, while reproducing the edition provided by TOD, says that the inscription had been found «in vico Bougazi prope Andaniam», a precious indication that does not come from any of the authors quoted in the lemma. Bougatzi Garantzas is an alternate name of Kato Garantza, i.e. of Kato Melpia (E. BOURBOUHAKIS, personal communication; see also GRANDJEAN 2003, 208 n. 80). Immediately to the north of Kato Melpia, McDONALD – HOPE SIMPSON 1961, 234–35 discuss an archaeological site called Krebeni, close to a chapel of Ayios Dimitrios, which is clearly identical with our Γρεμπενή where the inscription had been found in 1905.

⁴⁴ McDONALD and HOPE SIMPSON's remarks on this site (McDONALD – HOPE SIMPSON 1961, 235) deserve to be quoted in extenso: «This must have been an important town in the Late Bronze Age and especially in Classical times. It will require serious consideration in any future discussion of the topography of the upper Messenian plain.» See SHIPLEY 2004, 558.

⁴⁵ In very rough terms, the portion extending to the north of the modern road from Ichalia to Basiliko, if not even further south.

⁴⁶ Paus. 8.34; see VALMIN 1930, 95 and ROEBUCK 1941, 10–11.

ary up to the Hermaion that marked the border to Messenia, knew also of a second itinerary, that connected Megalopolis with the Karnasion (as he calls it). In this case, too, Pausanias' description is limited to the Arcadian side. Along this itinerary, the border between Arcadia and Messenia was marked by another sanctuary of Hermes called «the Hermaion by the Despoina» and including statues of Demeter, Despoina, Hermes and Herakles.⁴⁷ Obviously, this crossing must have been in the general area of the sanctuary of Despoina at Lykosoura, and modern scholars agree in identifying it roughly with the modern road from Megalopolis to Isaris, which runs approximately two kilometers to the south of the sanctuary. Serious problems however start with the Messenian part of the itinerary, on which Pausanias says nothing except for the fact that its final destination was the Karnasion. VALMIN thought that, from Isaris, this itinerary turned sharply to the south to reach the Isari Gorge, following the route of the modern railroad and entering the Stenykleros Plain by Desylla.⁴⁸ This however would mean that the two itineraries entered the plain more or less at the same point, some three kilometers apart, and the northern one would hardly have offered a more direct connection to the Karnasion than the southern one. For this reason, it seems much more plausible to suppose that the northern itinerary proceeded westward from Isaris, either towards Vastas and thence, along the slopes of Mount Tetrazi, touching Syrrizo, Dimandra and finally Kato Melpia, or turning south towards Dasochori soon after leaving Isaris, and continuing possibly towards Ano Melpia. In both cases, the itinerary would have reached the Stenykleros Plain close to its western border, a sensible course if one was headed for the Karnasion. Most importantly for us, such an itinerary would have connected the area of Kato Melpia and Konstantini, that is, of Pylana (?) and Andania, directly to Megalopolis without crossing the Stenykleros Plain, opening the way to a somewhat less expansive interpretation of the territorial claims of the Megalopolitans.

The Megalopolitans submitted a request, called an αἴτημα in the inscription, to the Achaian League. The League replied that the Achaians were not prepared to give the Megalopolitans land that belonged to the Messenians – or at any rate, this is how the Messenians phrase the reply: the magistrates of the League may not have been as trenchant and the procedure may have been more complex. The most plausible occasion for the request and its rejection appears to be the σύνοδος of the League in Megalopolis mentioned by Polybios, which took place in the late spring or summer of 182, soon after the capitulation of the Messenians.⁴⁹ At that point, Polybios tells us that the army of the League was still in Messenia.⁵⁰ The way the situation is described in the in-

⁴⁷ Paus. 8.35.1–2.

⁴⁸ VALMIN 1930, 95–96; see also the description of the itineraries given by ROEBUCK 1941, 5.

⁴⁹ Notice the similarity between the words of lines 4–5 and Pol. 23.17.1: οἱ Μεσσηνιοὶ ... ἀποκατέστησαν εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατάστασιν τῆς συμπολιτείας διὰ τὴν Λυκόρτα καὶ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν μεγαλοψυχίαν.

⁵⁰ Polyb. 23.16.12 and 23.17.5.

scription is probably tendentious, in that it blurs the difference between the moment when the Messenians were promised readmission to the League, at the *σύνοδος* of Megalopolis, and the time when they were finally allowed to put in place their own stele detailing the conditions of their membership in the League, which does not appear to have happened until the following Achaian year, when the Achaian army was certainly not in Messenia any more.⁵¹ The Messenians had all the interest to suggest, or to underline, that the controversy had started at a time when they were again members of the League, which may be a half-truth, and in general to depict their return into the fold of the League in the least problematic terms.

It would be interesting to know what justification was adduced by the Megalopolitans for their claim. The text of the decree is silent on this, but the Megalopolitans must have thought they had sufficiently solid foundations if, after the first rejection by the League, they decided to ask for an arbitration, undergoing a regular process. Strabo quotes Demetrios of Skepsis, a younger contemporary of Polybios, to the effect that the mythic city of Oichalia was located in Arkadia and called Andania in his times.⁵² It is tempting to see here a trace of the claim of the Megalopolitans, but Strabo's passages offer no support to any attempt to formulate a more precise hypothesis.

On the other hand, the Messenians implicitly depict the dispute over Andania and Pylana as a recent development, in contrast with that over Akreiatis and Bipeiatis, which appears to have been going on for a while (see below, 2b). It is conceivable that the claim of the Megalopolitans over Andania and Pylana had more contingent foundations, linked to the disloyalty of the Messenians, to the murder of Philopoimen and to military conquest itself. Regardless of whether this conclusion appears persuasive, the fact remains that the Messenians intended to distinguish from one another the disputes regarding the two pairs of territories.

2b. *The arbitration of the ἀγεμόνες (ll. 11–43)*

In spite of the failure of their first attempt, the Megalopolitans did not give up. Their new request was brought forward in a *σύνοδος* that took place in Elis. Some time must have elapsed. The *σύνοδος* that accepted the capitulation of the Messenians, we are told by Polybios, was the second of the year, so two more regular meetings would have been available in 182, but we can exclude that the one in Elis was one of them. At the meeting, Messenians and Megalopolitans agreed to have their controversy adjudicated by a committee of prominent politicians of the League. The inscription desig-

⁵¹ See Pol. 24.2.3 (the Messenians finally put up their stele) and Plut. Philop. 21.3–9 (the Achaian army marches out of Messenia with the ashes of Philopoimen).

⁵² Demetrios ap. Strab. 8.3.6; Andania is called Arkadian also in Strab. 8.3.25, 8.4.5 (implicitly) and 10.1.10, always in connection to the identification with epic Oichalia (suggesting that all three passages ultimately go back to Demetrios, too). On Demetrios' work, a monumental commentary to the Trojan Catalogue in the Iliad, and its political implications, see GABBA 1974, 630–32 (Demetrios famously denied that Aeneas ever came to Italy).

nates them as ἀγεμόνες, and lists all their names, seventeen all in all. The list begins with Apollonidas, son of Etearchos, of Sikyon (ll. 17–18), and immediately thereafter we learn that Apollonidas was the στρατηγός of the League at that point (ll. 30–31), which must be the reason why he occupies the first place. In other words, at the time of the σύνοδος of Elis Apollonidas was already στρατηγός, and the σύνοδος cannot have taken place in the year of Philopoimen and Lykortas. The most likely date for the σύνοδος in Elis is the following Achaian year, corresponding to 182/81, as we will see more in detail below (see section 4).

This time, the Megalopolitans announce to the League their intention to obtain an arbitration against the Messenians over the possession of Andania and Pylana but also of another portion of land, at first called ἄ πρότερον χώρα (l. 13). This was constituted by the two areas whose borders were indicated to the judges together with those of Andania and Pylana, that is, Akreiatis and Bipeiatis (ll. 31–32). The extension of the scope of the dispute does not necessarily mean that the Megalopolitans had now gained new elements to support their claim over Andania and Pylana. It is conceivable that they thought that a formal arbitration, providing a more specific procedure than a vote of the federal assembly, could offer a better venue to display in a comprehensive way their arguments. Furthermore, they may have hoped the judges would be better disposed towards them.

There are no close parallels to the expression ἄ πρότερον χώρα (l. 13) in the corpus of Greek territorial disputes, but it seems to suggest that the two regions had been disputed already in the past, before the recent hostilities and the readmission of Messene to the League.⁵³ It would not be surprising if, in the case of Akreiatis and Bipeiatis, the Megalopolitans were indeed trying to reopen an old dispute. Famous examples of territorial controversies show that changes in the broader political framework and in the international balance of power could be taken as occasions to reopen old and never completely resolved disputes.⁵⁴ The option to invoke an arbitration was provided for in the rules that regulated the relationships between the members of the Achaian League, and for the Megalopolitans this was a chance not to be missed.⁵⁵

Akreiatis and Bipeiatis do not seem to appear elsewhere in our sources. Akreiatis may derive from the word ἄκρα, ‘summit’ or simply ‘hill’. The region must have been reasonably productive, though, since in a later phase of the controversy its produce (καρποί) will become the object of dispute (ll. 65–70, see below, 3d). The etymology of

⁵³ See THEMELIS 2008, 216. In other words, the expression would be the equivalent of something like ἄ πρότερον ἀμφιλεγόμενα χώρα (cf. IPArk 31, II B ll. 10–11).

⁵⁴ Examples of particularly long-lived disputes which flared up again and again in connection with changes in the balance of power include the dispute between Messenians and Spartans over the Dentheliatis, documented from the second half of the 4th century BCE to the age of Trajan (LURAGHI 2008, 16–27) and that between Samos and Priene (MAGNETTO 2008).

⁵⁵ The case of Epidaurous shows that the moment when a polis joined the League could be the right time to debate and settle old disputes opposing the new member to old members of the League itself (see HARTER-ΥΙΒΟΡΥΥ 1998, no. 3 and MAGNETTO 1997, no. 36).

the name Bipeiatis, by contrast, is obscure. All that can be said is that the initial beta represents the rendering of a digamma in the Doric orthography of the Hellenistic period and of the early Empire, as seen in the spelling Βωρθέα for the epithet of Artemis Orthia or in the name of the Argive politician and Achaian ambassador Bippos.⁵⁶ It seems as though Akreiatis and Bipeiatis were two typical borderlands between two Greek poleis, and the fact that they together were the object of a (probably long-lasting) dispute shows that they must have been bordering on one another. As for their location, it is difficult to go beyond speculation, but the slopes to the south of Mount Tetrazi, including Ano Melpia and Dasochori and possibly further to the south, seem the most obvious area where to look, especially since we later learn that the Messenians provided documentation regarding their borders starting from the River Neda: unless the territory of Pylana extended so far to the northeast, there would have been no reason to document that northern portion of the frontier unless Akreiatis and Bipeiatis had been in that general area. However, it is also possible to look in a completely different direction, and tentatively locate Akreiatis and Bipeiatis to the south of the Derveni Pass, on the slopes of the Vromovrissos Mountains, immediately before the border between Megalopolis and Thouria, which was itself under dispute in these same years. In any case, since the two pairs of territories could be claimed separately of one another, as both indeed were, at different stages of the dispute, they must have been located relative to one another so that any decision regarding either pair did not prejudice a decision on the other – i.e. it must have been possible for the Messenians to have access to Akreiatis and Bipeiatis even if they had lost Endania and Pylana, and the same must be true for the Megalopolitans. This is confirmed by the fact that the Megalopolitans appear to have provided two separate dossiers regarding the borders of the two pairs of territories they were claiming (ll. 29–33).

The Messenians accept to undergo an arbitration and propose a court of 17 men, many of whom were prominent politicians of the Achaian League and came from Elis, Sikyon, and Achaia, but none from Arkadia, in order to guarantee impartiality.⁵⁷ The Megalopolitans agreed and the agreement was formalized (ll. 28–29).⁵⁸ The procedure

⁵⁶ See e.g. BUCK 1955, 47. We thank TIMOTHY BARNES (Harvard) for advice on this point.

⁵⁷ For further prosopographic evidence on these people, see THEMELIS 2008, 217–18 and below, section 4.

⁵⁸ The word ἐνσταλον (-ος?) is not otherwise attested. An inscription of imperial date (IGUR 1295, l. 9) has the Doric form ἐνστάλωσεν (the corresponding Ionian/*koine* form is not documented), with the meaning 'inscribe on a stele', which is also the meaning of the verb στηλόω in OGI 221 l. 15 (ca. 275); cf. LSJ s.v.; CHANTRAINE, DELG, 1055 s.v. στηλή. In our decree, the verb refers to the conclusion of an agreement over the arbitration between the two litigants, and probably to the fact that such agreement had been inscribed on a stele (on the agreements preliminary to an arbitration, see now MAGNETTO 2008, 151 and 153 n. 5). Considering the context, it is possible that the Messenians were referring to an official document of the League which ratified the decision of the litigants and included specific procedural guidelines – something like the αἴνος τῶν Ἀχαιῶν mentioned in the arbitration of the Megarians between Corinth and Epidauros (HARTER-UIBOPUU 1998, no. 3 ll. 4–5 and 9–10; MAGNETTO 1997, no. 36.II).

that follows is typical for border disputes. At first, the two parties deliver to the στρατηγός Apollonidas, the leader of the panel, a description of the borders whose legitimacy they will try to prove during the trial (ll. 29–35). The panel of judges convene in the Karneiasion, the famous sanctuary of the Great Gods, near Andania,⁵⁹ inside the disputed territory. The judges begin with the περιήγησις, the autopsy of the borders, which was supposed to be performed twice, once under the guidance of either party (ll. 37–39).⁶⁰ This was the occasion for the litigants not only to show the borders but also to produce evidence in support of their claims. The dispute was over the possession of the four territories, but apparently not over their extension. Accordingly the two parties presented two different sets of borders. The Messenians pointed to the existing borderline, from the River Neda in the north to an area they call Kleolaia,⁶¹ implying that that line should remain valid, thereby leaving the four areas in their hands. The Megalopolitans indicated the borders of the four territories, which were all at that point inside the Messenian territory.⁶²

After the περιήγησις the judges come back to the Karneiasion, where the debate (δικαιολογία) takes place.⁶³ Both litigants illustrate their arguments and the discussion stretches over more than one day.⁶⁴ The time allotted to each party, as was usual in these procedures, was defined precisely and measured with a water clock (l. 41 μεθ' ὕδατος).⁶⁵ At this point, something unexpected happens. Following the reconstruction of the text, that in this point is damaged, the Megalopolitans withdraw their

⁵⁹ On which see now DESHOURS 2006.

⁶⁰ On the περιήγησις see MAGNETTO 2008, 169–70.

⁶¹ The name corresponds to that of one of the five tribes instituted in Messenia at the time of the liberation from Sparta. Named after descendants of Herakles, they are attested in Messene itself, Thouria and Korone; see LURAGHI 2008, 230–31. THEMELIS 2008, 218 says that Kleolaia was a kome of Messene of uncertain location and was also called Kleola.

⁶² Originating from Mount Lykaion, the River Neda flew initially through Arkadia, but after taking a sharp turn to the west, it marked the northern border of the Messenian territory towards Phigaleia (HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN – LATTERMANN 1911, 14–15 and Paus. 4.20.2). The northeastern border of Messene towards Megalopolis could be envisioned as a line that departed at an angle from the river. In that area, the steep hill to the south of the village of Kakaletri, probably identified with the Heira of the Second Messenian War, was protected by two fortifications, clearly meant to defend the Messenian border. The most detailed account remains that of HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN – LATTERMANN 1911, 13–29.

⁶³ In the vocabulary of diplomacy, δικαιολογία is a technical term, indicating either the parleys that happen on the occasion of a mediation (see AGER 1996, no. 52.II; MAGNETTO 1997, no. 51.II), or the debate between the parties in front of the court during an arbitration (see AGER 1996, nos. 129 l. 14; 158 l. 31); on how the latter was organized, see MAGNETTO 2008, 169–71.

⁶⁴ G. THÜR, in a private conversation, suggests that the process in the Karneiasion could have stretched over two days: presumably, one day for Endania, Pylana and respective territories, one day for Akreiatas and Bipeiatas.

⁶⁵ Cf. the arbitration of Cnidos between Calymna and Cos, TitCal 79 lines 39–41 (AGER 1996, no. 21; MAGNETTO 1997, no. 14); the arbitration of Miletos between Sparta and Messene, Syll.³ 683, ll. 55–59 (AGER 1996, no. 159).

claim over Akreiatis and Bipeiatis, but the Kaliatai, who appear here for the first time, demand a new judgment in which they themselves could participate. It is important to stress that the Messenians appear to represent the Kaliatai as if they were minions of the Megalopolitans. In any case, this unexpected turn of events opens up a new phase in the dispute, in which Megalopolitans and Kaliatai will try to assert their claims in front of a panel of judges provided by the polis of Aigion. Henceforth the decree describes this new phase, leaving more than one question unanswered.

The most obvious question regards the outcome of the proceedings in the Karneiasion. Akreiatis and Bipeiatis at any rate remained in Messenian hands, and even if we did not know this from the ulterior course of the dispute, in legal terms once the accuser withdraws his claims the defendant's line is automatically confirmed and the outcome is the equivalent of a victory of the defendant. Indeed, this is how the Messenians view the outcome of the procedure, implicitly presenting it as a victory. In lines 84–88 they proudly proclaim that, regarding Akreiatis and Bipeiatis, they have defeated the Megalopolitans in multiple judgments (l. 87 *κριμασιν*), a plural that cannot refer only to the arbitration in Aigion against Megalopolitans and Kaliatai, but must include the trial that had taken place in the Karneiasion, whose outcome had indeed been favorable to the Messenians. It is however rather unlikely that the judges in the Karneiasion also delivered a formal verdict in favour of the Messenians. This peculiar situation will in a later stage provide the Megalopolitans with a formally acceptable claim to the effect that on the dispute between them and the Messenians regarding Akreiatis and Bipeiatis no previous verdict existed (see 3d).

It is much more difficult to figure out what happened with Andania and Pylana, on whose fate the inscription says absolutely nothing. Based on the narrative of the Messenians, it would seem that the Megalopolitans had withdrawn their claim only in the case of Akreiatis and Bipeiatis, and only after the debate had been concluded. This would seem to suggest that, as far as Andania and Pylana were concerned, a verdict had actually been pronounced. However, we have no solid element that may indicate what was the verdict of the *ἀγεμόνες*. The fact that the decree is silent on the outcome of this side of the dispute is highly suspicious. Even considering that Andania and Pylana do not constitute the main topic of the dossier, unlike Akreiatis and Bipeiatis, it is difficult to explain why the Messenians should have resisted the temptation to mention such an important success. Long before our inscription became known, various scholars had thought, based especially on Strabo's reference to Demetrius of Skepsis mentioned above, that Messene had possibly lost Andania as a result of the war of 182.⁶⁶

On the other hand, some elements in the decree seem to point in the opposite direction. The claim of the Megalopolitans over Andania and Pylana is presented as more recent, and the Achaian assembly immediately dismisses it. The response of

⁶⁶ See already NIESE 1903, 55 n. 4 and more recently GRANDJEAN 2003, 228; SHIPLEY 2004, 553 (S86); LURAGHI 2008, 264 n. 57 with further references.

the Achaians is phrased in sharp and unambiguous terms, and it appears to confirm the Messenians' ownership (ll. 9–11 τῶν δὲ Ἀχαιῶν αὐτοῖς [ἀντ]ειπάντων μὴ κα περιθέμεν | [Με]γαλοπολίταις τὰν Μεσσανίων, scil. χώραν). The force of this statement, located at the very beginning of the text, seems hard to deny, and it gives the impression to the modern reader that the court of the ἀγεμόνες could hardly overturn this verdict.⁶⁷ It must also be pointed out that, in line 35, with reference to the description of their borders the Messenians delivered to Apollonidas, the decree specifies καθὼς ἔστι ἀμὴν ἡ χώρα. This specification is not necessary for the narrative of the procedure, and the present tense most naturally refers to the time when the decree was inscribed. On the face of it, it appears to be saying in so many words that the territories in question still belonged to the Messenians at the time of the decree.⁶⁸

Indirectly, such conclusion could be supported by a further observation, regarding the internal logic of the decree. It is strange, at least for a modern reader, that a text that is supposed to proclaim the victory of the Messenians in the dispute over Akreiatas and Bipeiatas should open by discussing a different pair of territories, even though these territories were also involved in the same dispute, if only in a marginal way. The decision of opening the decree with the first phase of the dispute over Endania and Pylana and their territories, which on the face of it was irrelevant to the fate of Akreiatas and Bipeiatas, would be all the more odd if those two territories had later gone lost to the Messenians. In such a case, they might as well have started the narrative directly with the arbitration in the Karneiasion and the run up to it. Especially in a document destined to a local audience, that would have been entirely possible. The decision to start the narrative with the capitulation of Messene and with the first, failed attempt by Megalopolis to obtain Andania and Pylana must have been a conscious and purposeful one. This would make much better sense if the Messenians in the end had retained Endania and Pylana. In this case, the decree would celebrate the preservation of a large area, composed of various interconnected regions, at a crucial time for the city – a time which, as we will see more in detail (section 2d) could acquire a particular importance for the further history of the dispute.

⁶⁷ On the general climate in the League at this point, which our inscription shows to have been less dominated by Megalopolis than we used to think, see below, section 4.

⁶⁸ We would like to thank G. THÜR for bringing this sentence to our attention, even though our interpretations of it do not coincide. It is worth pointing out that the fact that the Megalopolitans decided to withdraw their claim over Akreiatas and Bipeiatas would make perfect sense if they had lost the first part of the dispute.

2c. *The arbitration of Aigion* (ll. 43–64)

With l. 43, a new phase of the dispute starts. The initiative comes from the Kaliatai,⁶⁹ but later they and the Megalopolitans appear side by side. Now the dispute revolves only around Akreiatis and Bipeiatis. The request of the Kaliatai brings about a new agreement with the Messenians, who accept to undergo a new arbitration. This time, the decision is entrusted to a polis chosen from among the members of the League: the ancient Achaian capital of Aigion (ll. 50–51). The narrative of the arbitration in Aigion begins with the *δικαιολογία* and focuses on the contrasting views presented by the two parties: the Megalopolitans maintained that Akreiatis and Bipeiatis were Arkadian and belonged to their territory, while the Messenians replied that they were Messenian. The decree presents immediately the verdict of the court: 140 judges out of 147 voted in favor of the Messenians, confirming the border as the Messenians had presented it to the *δαμοργοί* of the League. The decree says nothing of a new inspection of the borderland.

The position of the Kaliatai vis-à-vis the Megalopolitans deserves attention. During the *δικαιολογία* only Megalopolis appears to have an active role,⁷⁰ and yet, even if we take the narrative at face value, rather than speculate that the Messenians may have simplified things in order to emphasize the role of the Megalopolitans, it is difficult to accept that the Kaliatai had a mere supporting role.⁷¹ On the contrary, the decree insists in describing them as litigants: it is they who request a new judgment, and the Messenians insist that they accepted an arbitration *ποτί τε Καλιάτας [καί Μεγαλοπολίτ]ας*. We know of other cases where two cities ally against a third one, and in those cases the sources underline the shared interest in the areas under dispute and the proximity of those areas. Our decree says nothing explicit on this, but it seems obvious that the Kaliatai, too, must have had a direct interest in the two regions, or else their requesting an arbitration would not have appeared plausible to the Messenians nor, more importantly, to the Achaian League.⁷² At the same time, the Messenians insist

⁶⁹ The verb *ἀντιποιεῖσθαι* shows up, with the meaning ‘contest the ownership of’ or ‘claim’ a territory in the treaty between Aitolians and Akarnanians, which, among other things, settles some border disputes between the two parties (see MAGNETTO 1997, no. 27, l. 8), in the judgment on a territorial controversy between the *κοινόν* of the Pharkadonioi in Thessaly and some private individuals (B. HELLY, BE 1995, 334), and in the controversy between Sparta and the Achaian League documented in Syll.³ 665, l. 6, on which see below, n. 88.

⁷⁰ There is not enough space in line 53 for a supplement that includes both a verb, which is necessary, and the ethnic of the Kaliatai.

⁷¹ The Thessalian city of Melitaia supported Pereia and Phyliadon in their dispute against Peuma, accompanying the representatives of Pereia during the *περιήγησις* but without being directly involved in the trial (cf. AGER 1996, no. 31; MAGNETTO 1997, no. 30); similarly, the Cretan city of Gortyn supported the Hierapytnians in the dispute against Itanos (I.Cret. III 4, 9, ll. 111 *συνπαρόντων ἐπὶ τῆς κρίσεως*; cf. AGER 1996, no. 158).

⁷² This is what happens in the two arbitrations that opposed the Thessalian city of Peuma respectively to Melitaia and Chalai, and to Pereia and Phyliadon (AGER 1996, nos. 30–31; MAGNETTO 1997, nos. 29–30). In both procedures, the borders of all litigants were involved and

that the initiative of the Kaliatai had the approval of the Megalopolitans ([οὐ πα]υσάντων l. 44), or possibly was instigated by them, who used the Kaliatai as an instrument in order to obtain a new judgment with the hope of a more favorable outcome.⁷³ Accordingly, the arbitration the Messenians had undergone was not only against the Kaliatai, but also against the Megalopolitans, and the same applied to their final victory.

The crucial question is the identity of the Kaliatai. From Plutarch we learn that, probably in 194/93, Philopoimen had caused the secession of some of the κώμαι that had previously been synoecized into Megalopolis.⁷⁴ It is obviously tempting to regard the Kaliatai as one of them, since in our text they seem to be able to act on their own initiative and the Messenians assert that they have accepted to undergo a new arbitration against both Kaliatai and Megalopolitans (ll. 47–49). On the other hand, [οὐ πα]υσάντων (l. 44) – which appears certain – seems to imply that, at least as the Messenians saw it, the Megalopolitans still had influence on the Kaliatai, which would not be surprising if the Kaliatai had themselves been Megalopolitans until a few years before.

An Arkadian polis by the name of Kallia is mentioned by Pausanias as one of those that were merged into Megalopolis,⁷⁵ but even ignoring the slight difference in name, the problem is that according to Pausanias Kallia was part of the so-called Tripolis together with Dipoina and Nonakris, which would point to an area to the northeast of Megalopolis, far away from the border with Messene and incompatible with the role of the Kaliatai in our controversy.⁷⁶ Either Pausanias' Kallia has nothing to do with our Kaliatai, or his topographical indications need to be revised in light of the decree, for one thing is for sure: our decree makes no sense unless the Kaliatai bordered on Akreiatis and Bipeiatis.

the territories under dispute were declared shared possession of the victorious party, Melitaia and Chalai and Peraia and Phyladon respectively. It seems plausible to assume that the Kaliatai were involved at least in the exploitation, if not directly in the ownership, of Akreiatis and Bipeiatis.

⁷³ That this is how the Messenians interpreted the episode is shown by the final clause in ll. 45–47, whose subject are the Megalopolitans. On the syntax of this passage see the notes to the text.

⁷⁴ Plut. Philop. 13.8; see especially WARREN 2007, 150–51 and for the date, see ERRINGTON 1969, 90. Possible evidence of this measure, apart from the bronze coins discussed by WARREN, includes Syll.³ 623, a proxeny decree of Thisoa (originally included in Megalopolis, Paus. 8.27.4); SEG 41.332, a honorary decree of Lykosoura (same as above). On the συνοικισμός of Megalopolis see MOGGI 1976, no. 45.

⁷⁵ Paus. 8.27.4. See also Steph. Byz., s.v. Καλλία, πόλις μία τῆς ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τριπόλεως, ὁ πολίτης Καλλιεύς, ὡς Πausανίας; cf. THEMELIS 2008, 218 n. 15.

⁷⁶ For some hypothesis of identification of the ancient sites of the so-called Tripolis cf. NIELSEN 2004, 506; ΠΙΚΟΥΛΑΣ 1983, 313–18 [= 2002, 219–24] identifies the site of ancient Nonakris with the hill of Ayios Thanasis, near Solos, at the junction of the streams Kratis and Styx.

Finally, it is necessary to explain how the judgment in Aigion was arrived at. In ll. 41 ff. the text proceeds briskly, lining up clause after clause and giving the impression that the events, too, followed hot on each other's heels. We are induced to think that the Kaliatai presented their request directly in the Karneiasion, turning to the 17 ἀγεμόνες, but this is far from certain. Such a scenario would presuppose not only that, although not mentioned by the decree, the Kaliatai were actually present in the Karneiasion, which is in itself not impossible, but also, and more importantly, that they could present their request there and then, and that such a move would have made sense in procedural terms. It is however utterly unlikely that the ἀγεμόνες would have been legally qualified to answer the request of the Kaliatai. The correct procedure required for this kind of requests to be addressed to the main organs of the League, as our inscription itself shows. The supposition that the arbitration in Aigion was arrived at with this same procedure is confirmed by the mention of the δαμοργοί of the Achaian League in l. 64.⁷⁷ To them the litigants gave the descriptions of the borders whose legitimacy they were going to defend during the trial, and in the phase of instruction of the cause they act as intermediaries between the litigants and the jury provided by the polis chosen to arbitrate. In other words, the intervention of the Kaliatai must have involved a formal request presented to the League, and the δαμοργοί of the League were in charge of organizing the whole process that culminated in the judgment of Aigion.

Even so, the interval between the two arbitrations cannot have been very long. The Messenians depict the intervention of the Kaliatai as an attempt, orchestrated by the Megalopolitans, at remedying some sort of setback that had taken place during the arbitration in the Karneiasion, convincing them to withdraw their request. They will hardly have waited years. It seems more reasonable to think that we are still in the aftermath of the reintegration of Messene into the League.

2d. The lawsuit of the Messenians, the πρόκλησις of Megalopolis, and the fine (ll. 65–78) Some time after the arbitration of Aigion (l. 65 ὕστερον), the dispute between Messenians and Megalopolitans flared up again. This time, the Messenians have taken the offensive. Object of the dispute is the produce from Akreiatis. The decree suggests that the two parties had previously reached an agreement according to which the Megalopolitans had reaped the produce from the region under condition of giving half of it to the Messenians.⁷⁸ They obviously had not, and the Messenians sued them asking for

⁷⁷ The attribute κοινοί is necessary in order to distinguish the federal δαμοργοί (see n. 90 below) from the local ones, see ARNAUTOGLOU 2009/10, 187.

⁷⁸ Based on the context, this seems the right interpretation of the term μεσόχοινος, which does not appear anywhere else. The decree appears to offer evidence on the well-known phenomenon of the shared exploitation of borderlands for agriculture and pastoralism, and of the disputes that could arise from this. To the examples collected by ARNAUTOGLOU 2009/10, 186 n. 21, add ROUSSET 1994, 1999 and 2010, 43–61, and CHANDEZON 2003, 331–49. As in our case,

reparations.⁷⁹ The response of the Megalopolitans was the *πρόκλησις*, a formal challenge to undergo an arbitration, which appears in the unpublished part of the inscription.⁸⁰

In ll. 70–75, the decree summarizes the line of argument of the Megalopolitans. Although the Messenians had already undergone an arbitration over the possession of the Akreiatis, faced with their request for reparation the Megalopolitans try to start a new procedure leading to an arbitration, arguing that no verdict on that point had been pronounced and the whole matter was still unadjudicated. The Messenians depict this as a ruse, based on false premises, with the purpose of taking advantage of the dispute over the produce in order to reopen the issue of ownership. Accordingly, they rejected the request of the Megalopolitans. For this reason, the *δαμιοργοί* of the League imposed on them a fine of 3000 drachms.⁸¹ Surely the arguments used by the Megalopolitans to convince the *δαμιοργοί* and the counterarguments of the Messenians were the same which soon thereafter were presented to the panel of judges from Miletos, whose arbitration represented the final stage of the dispute as narrated in the decree. This point has central importance for explaining the arbitration of the Milesians and the whole decree: we will return to it shortly (below, 2e).

In terms of chronology, the text tells us that the fine was decided by the *δαμιοργὸς ἐπὶ Αἰνητίδα* (l. 79). Most likely, this man was the *στρατηγός* of the League in office at that time, and he is mentioned here in order to date the decision.⁸² If we turn to the traditional chronology of the *στρατηγοί* of the League, the first year available for

such situations are often described in a vague way, without any clear reference to explicit agreements and their form. The land involved is usually part of the ‘public land’ (*δημοσία χώρα*) of the poleis involved, and disputes over it tend to end in one of two ways. Either the land is declared shared possession of the litigants (*κοινή χώρα*), and accordingly it is left undivided and the litigants keep exploiting it jointly, or the ownership of one party is acknowledged (which is what happens with the Akreiatis), and joint exploitation can continue under specific conditions. The agreement between the Lykian *κοινόν* and Termessos by Oinoanda, recently published by ROUSSET 2010 (ll. 27–31 and commentary pp. 43–61), is a good example. It includes an arrangement for the shared exploitation of Mount Masa whereby ownership was recognized to the people of Tlos, while those of Termessos were allowed to exploit it for grazing and collecting wood for free, but not allowed to cultivate the land or to settle there permanently.

⁷⁹ The compound *ὑπογράφομαι* is used here with the meaning ‘file a lawsuit’, for which the simple *γράφω* would be more usual.

⁸⁰ On the use of this term, see CASSAYRE 2010, 234.

⁸¹ The amount of the fine is indicated in the still unpublished part of the inscription; see THEMELIS 2008, 219.

⁸² See however ARNAOUTOGLU 2009/10, 187 n. 24, who suggests that Ainetidas might have been a federal *γραμματεὺς* like the Menandridas mentioned in SEG 40.394 ll. 4 and 7, precisely for the purpose of identifying a specific year. As CH. HABICHT points out to us, though, the fact that SEG 40.394 indicated explicitly that Menandridas was the *γραμματεὺς* makes it a potentially deceptive comparandum, and the mention of a magistrate by the simple name seems best understood as referring to the chief yearly magistrate of the League. On Ainetidas, see the note of CH. HABICHT here below.

Ainetidas is 179/78, but a later date is entirely possible.⁸³ It is clear that some time had elapsed between the arbitration of Aigion and the lawsuit of the Messenians, but ὕστερον (l. 65) is a very general term, which can indicate the immediate future as well as a distance of years. For the time being, the only thing that seems clear is that the reference to the καρποί from Akreiatis that the Megalopolitans refused to surrender implies that Megalopolitans had tilled the region for at least one year when the Messenians brought their lawsuit against them. On the whole, it is not unlikely that the Messenians filed their suit immediately after the judgment in their favor.

2e. *The arbitration of the Milesians (ll. 78–84)*

The final act of the dispute is again an arbitration, rendered by a panel of six judges from Miletos.⁸⁴ The object of this judgment is the fine imposed by the δαμιοργοί on the Messenians, and not ownership of the Akreiatis (ll. 88–90 καὶ περὶ τᾶς ζαμίας | ἃς ἐζαμίωσαν ἀμὲ οἱ δαμιοργοὶ ἐνικάσαμες). The verdict however was bound to have broader consequences. If the Milesians decided that the fine was unjustified, they would almost inevitably undermine the whole line of argument with which the Megalopolitans had convinced the δαμιοργοί to fine Messene in the first place, and in particular the notion that no judgment over the ownership of Akreiatis had yet been pronounced. The Messenians won with unanimous vote precisely because they were able to show that they had indeed already undergone an arbitration against Megalopolis over the ownership of Akreiatis, as also of Bipeiatis (ll. 80–84).

The narrative of this last phase of the dispute is concise, but the detailed narrative of the proceedings in the Karneiasion and of the arbitration in Aigion provide the reader with all the information necessary to understand both the reasons behind the fine meted out on the Messenians by the δαμιοργοί and the final verdict of the Milesians, and the implications of the latter.

In front of the δαμιοργοί of the League and then of the Milesian judges, the Megalopolitans maintained that they had never received a verdict that established who was the owner of the Akreiatis. This must imply that they also maintained that no verdict had been pronounced in the Karneiasion, because they had backed off beforehand, while in Aigion the dispute against the Messenians had involved only the Kaliatai. The Messenians, on the contrary, strove to prove that in the past there had been not only one but two arbitrations over Akreiatis, and in both cases the Megalopolitans had been directly involved. In this light, the emphasis on certain aspects of the dispute becomes perfectly understandable.

⁸³ See the synopsis in AYMARD 1967, 45, which leaves free the years from 179/78 to 176/75. ERRINGTON 1969, 263–65 dates Kallikrates' strategy to 179/78 rather than 180/79, thereby freeing up 180/79 (see the comments of WALBANK 1979, 264).

⁸⁴ The judges were again mentioned without patronymic at the end of the inscription, in the part that reported their verdict, according to THEMELIS 2008, 219.

Firstly, it becomes clear that the minute description of the first arbitration, starting with the request submitted by the Megalopolitans in Elis, continuing with the choice of the 17 ἀγεμόνες and the proceedings in the Karneiasion have a precise purpose, namely, to prove that on that occasion a veritable arbitration had taken place, with all its constitutive elements, including the preliminary agreement, the survey of the borderland, and a regular debate in front of the judges. It was the Megalopolitans who had chosen to withdraw their claim, and their move could not call into question the validity of the procedure as a whole and the legal implications of its outcome. In legal terms, what had transpired amounted to a victory for the Messenians.

As for the arbitration in Aigion, the Messenians, as noted above, focus on unmasking the underhanded strategy of the Megalopolitans, proving that the latter had exploited the Kaliatai for their own ends and that they had been directly involved in the procedure. Accordingly, the elements that are showcased are the fact that the initiative of the Kaliatai was de facto made possible by the Megalopolitans (the ambiguous [οὐ πα]υσάντων in l. 44), the Messenians' acceptance of an arbitration against Kaliatai and Megalopolitans, the role of the latter in the δικαιολογία, and of course the landslide majority in the verdict in favor of the Messenians.

While the arguments that persuaded the Milesian judges are embedded in the narrative part of the decree, for the purposes of our text the details of the procedure in this last phase are irrelevant, and accordingly omitted.⁸⁵ The verdict itself on the contrary is a key moment in the controversy, and its implications are wide-ranging. By accepting the Messenians' version, the Milesian judges confirm the legitimacy of the previous arbitrations and the validity of their outcomes. Thereby they also confirm that the Messenians owned Akreiatis and Bipeiatis at the time when they were defeated by Lykortas and brought back into the fold of the League. At that time, the Megalopolitans advanced no claims over those two regions. They waited until the following year, with the two territories still in Messenian hands. There is no doubt that the defeat and the readmission to the League were turning points for the Messenians. In the logic of Greek territorial disputes, this moment was bound to acquire an inaugural meaning and to function as a standard against which successive claims would be measured. The dossiers of many arbitrations show that it was common, especially in the Hellenistic age, for the litigants to claim that their rights went back to some key moment of their history or, even better, of the history of the region at hand.⁸⁶ Seen from this angle, the importance of the verdict of the Milesians appears in all clarity, explaining why the Messenians decided to put together this dossier and to display it in

⁸⁵ In the absence of any indication regarding the procedure (pace ARNAOUTOGLU 2009/10, 188), we have to imagine that it followed the pattern usual in this kind of cases. Since the judges had to pronounce on the legitimacy of a fine, no περιήγησις was necessary, unlike in the case of the 17 ἀγεμόνες.

⁸⁶ On the criteria on which interstate disputes were adjudicated, see CHANIOTIS 2004; MAGNETTO 2008, 173–77 and n. 18.

a prominent place in their city. As we will see below, a more specific legal situation contributes in explaining the decision of the Messenians to monumentalize these verdicts.

The text does not provide any specific indication on the date of the arbitration of the Milesians, but considering that it was the product of an appeal against a fine meted out by the *δαμιοργοί* in the year of Ainetidas, no long time can have elapsed between the fine and the arbitration. We are presumably still in the year of Ainetidas or in the following year.

3. *The resolution of disputes between members of the Achaian League*

The notion that the Achaian League favored the recourse to interstate arbitration as an instrument to peacefully resolve disputes between member states has been present in scholarship for a long time. Whether and how this was enforced in practice however is much less clear.⁸⁷ The decree from Messene offers important new elements on this issue.

We consider first the *πρόκλησις* submitted by the Megalopolitans, which includes a request to the Messenians to undergo an arbitration over ownership of the Akreiatis. When the Messenians refused, the *δαμιοργοί* of the League imposed a fine on them, which must have been the result of a federal law that imposed certain obligations on members of the League. This is confirmed by the reasons brought forward by the Messenians to justify their refusal: the Messenians do not claim the right to accept or reject the request of the Megalopolitans – which is a key principle of Greek interstate arbitration – but say that they had already in the past accepted an arbitration over that same region. We can reconstruct their line of argument based on the narrative of the following arbitration of the Milesians (ll. 81–84), in which such line of argument carried the day. In other words, the Messene decree shows that in these years there was a federal law in operation which, in case of territorial disputes and if one of the litigants asked for an arbitration, ordered the other party to accept it under penalty of a fine – and presumably with the obligation to undergo an arbitration in any case in the end. The *δαμιοργοί* fined the Messenians because they were persuaded the Messenians had never undergone an arbitration against Megalopolis over the Akreiatis. The verdict of the Milesians, by voiding the fine, confirms that the Messenians had no obligation to undergo an arbitration because they had already satisfied such obligation. In other words, the request of arbitration was binding for the litigant who received it only if no previous judgment had been emitted over the same matter and against the same opponent. Seen from this angle, the attempt of the Megalopolitans to enlist the support of the Kaliatai in order to obtain a second arbitration against the Messenians (2c) could reflect not only a tactical choice, but also a legal necessity, that of creating

⁸⁷ See HARTER-UIBOPUU 1998, 119–29.

conditions different from those in Karneiasion (2b), so that the Messenians would be obliged to accept a new arbitration.

The existence of federal laws that could be invoked in controversies internal to the Achaian League is documented, in these same years, by a small number of inscriptions that document also the imposition of fines in the course of controversies.⁸⁸ The evidence is fragmentary and difficult to interpret, and the decree from Messene adds many important details. The League was not content just to pursue the peaceful solution of disputes, it also attempted to formulate rules for such a process, based on which it was possible to decide whether a dispute was admissible to begin with, and obligations were defined for the members of the League, which conditioned their strategies.

In light of this, the Messenians' decision of putting together this dossier and displaying it in their agora acquires a further meaning: beyond the celebration of a victory, it eternalized on stone the verdicts on the land under dispute. By virtue of the Achaian law, the *ὑπόμναμα εἰς τὸν ὕστερον χρόνον* (ll. 84–85) becomes for the Messenians a protection against future claims by the Megalopolitans.

Another aspect our decree sheds light on is the role of the federal *δαμιοργοί* in the resolution of conflicts between members. In the case of the arbitration in Aigion, in the preliminary phase they act as intermediaries between the two litigants and the polis that is going to arbitrate, and collect and transmit to the jury the documents sub-

⁸⁸ The arbitration between Megalopolis and Thouria, very lacunose (IPark 31 A l. 13 and *HARTER-UIBOPUU* 1998, no. 9; see *supra* n. 36) and the one between Sparta and the Achaian League itself (Syll.³ 665, l. 14; see *HARTER-UIBOPUU* 1998, 123 and no. 11), usually dated after 164, for which *TAEBER* 2006 has tentatively proposed an earlier date, soon after 180. A fine is mentioned also in the arbitration between Megalopolis and Helisson, IPark 31 A II. 4. As noted by *ARNAOUTOGLU* 2009/10, 191–92, the text of the arbitration between Sparta and the Achaian League referred explicitly to the importance that the verdict of the arbitration be permanent, as a condition for the peaceful coexistence of the litigants and for peace in the Achaian League (Syll.³ 665 ll. 8–19 and 39–42). These are the very principles that lay at the foundation of the law that must have been applied in the dispute between Messene and Megalopolis, and it seems reasonable to connect such law to a broader reflection on international law carried out inside the League at this time. The connections between the two texts, however, could be even closer. In the inscription regarding the arbitration between Sparta and the League, the judges adjudicate two questions: the ownership of the land disputed between Spartans and Megalopolitans and the legitimacy of the fine imposed by the Achaian League on the Spartans *ὅτι ἀντιποεῖτ[αι] -- τῶι δάμωι τῶι | Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν ταύτας τᾶς χ[ί]ρας* (lines 6–7). The judges acknowledge the validity of two earlier verdicts in favor of Megalopolis and the legitimacy of the fine. *HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN* in Syll.³ 665 n. 1 saw in *ἀντιποεῖτ[αι]* a reference to a failed attempt by the Spartans to recover the land by force of arms (the same line of thought is followed also by *HARTER-UIBOPUU*), but the verb *ἀντιποιόμαι* here rather indicates an attempt by the Spartans to reopen the dispute with legal means (cf. *supra* n. 69). This means that Sparta was not fined for a military action, but for reopening with a formal challenge a controversy that had already been adjudicated by two previous arbitrations. This could imply that the same federal law that mandated arbitration over new disputes also tried to limit the recourse to arbitration in disputes that had already been adjudicated in the past.

mitted by the litigants (ll. 63–64). In the arbitration of the Milesians, they bring into court the litigants (ll. 79–80).⁸⁹ The fact that they do not feature in the proceedings of the arbitration in Karneiasion is explained by the peculiarity of the jury selected for that procedure. In this case their role is taken up by the στρατηγός, who is also the president of the jury.⁹⁰ On the other hand, they have a much more important role in the case of the πρόκλησις presented by the Megalopolitans. The decree describes them as the sole responsible of the decision to fine the Messenians – the only entity the Megalopolitans need to persuade of the legitimacy of their request for an arbitration (ll. 75–77 τῶν δὲ κοινῶν δαμιοργῶν ἐπακολουθησάντων αὐτῶν i.e. the polis of Megalopolis). No involvement of the federal assembly is mentioned. A question posed by our decree is then what were the respective roles of the δαμιοργοί and of the federal assembly in dealing with relations between members of the League, and if and how their competences completed each other in the process of resolving conflicts. It is conceivable that, if a member refused to comply with a request for an arbitration formulated in the assembly by another member, the δαμιοργοί had the task of assessing whether the request was admissible under the legislation of the League, and of imposing sanctions on recalcitrant members.⁹¹ There is however an alternative scenario. Considering that there were only four regular assemblies every year, it is conceivable that, for the rest of the year, members could address their requests directly to the federal δαμιοργοί, without having to wait for the next σύνοδος of the League.

The arbitration of the Milesians adds an important element regarding the jurisdiction that applied to the relations between the League and its members, showing that decisions taken by the League, in this case the fine imposed by the δαμιοργοί, could undergo scrutiny by a court that had been summoned for this purpose. Unlike what happens in the case of the ἀγεμόνες and of Aigion, here the decree makes no reference to any imput by the litigants in the choice of the Milesians judges nor to any procedure applied in order to entrust the Milesians with the judgment. This suggests that members of the League had a right of appeal against decisions of the organs of the League, and that for this purpose an external court was designated (regularly?).⁹²

⁸⁹ On the technical meaning of εἰσάγειν see WALSER 2008, 255–57; CASSAYRE 2010, 265–74.

⁹⁰ Δαμιοργοί of the League appear in the arbitration between Megalopolis and Helisson, HARTER-UIBOPUU 1998, no. 8, l. 30 (Ἀχαιῶν δαμ[ιοργ –]) and possibly also in ll. 9–10, extremely damaged, where the text reads ὄρους ἀπέδ[ωκαν – Μεγαλοπολι?]|τῶν τοῖς δαμιοργοῖς. It is usually assumed (THÜR – TAEUBER 1994, 318 n. 13, followed by HARTER-UIBOPUU) that the text refers to magistrates of Megalopolis, but it cannot be excluded that the reference here was again to magistrates of the League, to whom the representatives (?) of Megalopolis gave their description of the borders.

⁹¹ As formulated by ARNAOUTOGLU 2009/10, 191, the hypothesis that they provided a preliminary evaluation of the processes is problematic. No evaluation was necessary if both litigants immediately accepted the arbitration; the problem existed only in case one of them refused.

⁹² We thank M. WÖRRLE for bringing this point to our attention. Also in the case of the arbitration between Sparta and the Achaean League (Syll.³ 665) a decision of the League (a fine) underwent the scrutiny of a court of judges from outside the League, probably Rhodians (see n. 88).

In general terms, the decree from Messene confirms that, in these years, the League did encourage, or maybe even mandate, the use of arbitration, but it did not directly intervene in the choice of the court, leaving this up to the litigants. This course of action could result in peculiar courts, such as the 17 ἀγεμόνες (3b), proposed by the Messenians and accepted by the Megalopolitans, and selected, as we will see more in detail below, with an eye to the known political views of the leading politicians of the League.

4. *Messene, Megalopolis and the Achaian League*

Among its many fascinating aspects, the decree of the Messenians sheds new light on the relations between them and the Achaian League, and also on internal politics of the League after the death of Philopoimen. A first point of interest is the rejection by the League of the first request of the Megalopolitans, which was presented immediately after the capitulation of the Messenians. The League was at this point led by Lykortas of Megalopolis, who had been elected to replace Philopoimen for the rest of the year, and yet, apparently in a meeting that took place at Megalopolis itself, the assembly of the League voted down the request of the Megalopolitans.⁹³ The refusal is all the more striking if we consider more closely the historical background. Our literary sources agree in describing the moment as a highly emotional one, with Lykortas making of the retrieval of Philopoimen's remains a veritable show. The image of Polybios riding back to Megalopolis with the urn containing the ashes of Philopoimen, surrounded by the πρῶτοι τῶν Ἀχαιῶν and followed by the whole army of the League marching in parade, is familiar,⁹⁴ and further evidence on the funeral of Philopoimen in Megalopolis and the divine honors granted to him reinforces the impression that nobody at that point would speak against victimizing the Messenians.⁹⁵ More or less explicitly, scholars are used to think that, riding the emotional wave provoked by the assassination of the old leader, the Megalopolitans, and especially Philopoimen's associates, foremost among them Lykortas, essentially had control over the League for a while. And yet, a closer look at the evidence shows that, in the months after Philopoimen's death, his policy, continued by Lykortas, was by no means uncontroversial inside the League. The fact that Polybios' text is preserved only in excerpts makes it less easy to decipher the situation, but at least it is clear that Diophanes kept publicly op-

⁹³ See Polyb. 23.16.12–17.2: at the very time when the Messenians surrendered, the second σύνδοξ of the League for that year also happened to take place (again at Megalopolis, like the ad hoc meeting that elected Lycortas στρατηγός pro tempore, see above n. 30).

⁹⁴ «A theatrical show of emotion», ERRINGTON 1969, 193; see now the discussion of the sources in ΚΑΤÓ 2006b, 243–50.

⁹⁵ The honors granted to Philopoimen by the Achaian League and by Megalopolis are documented in a fragmentary inscription from Megalopolis, Syll.³ 624, to be compared especially with Diod. 29.18 (see also Liv. 39.50.9; Plut. Philop. 21.10); see ΚΑΤÓ 2006a, 45–46 and 2006b, 241–42.

posing the radical approach to the Spartan problem championed by Philopoimen.⁹⁶ This more nuanced image of the balance of power within the League after the surrender of the Messenians resonates with the response of the Achaians to the first attempt of the Megalopolitans mentioned in the decree of the Messenians, and it may be further reinforced by the text in an even more striking way, for one of the novelties that seem to emerge from it is that in 182/81 the στρατηγός of the League was not Lykortas, as generally assumed, but Apollonidas of Sicyon.

If we accept current chronologies of the στρατηγοί of the Achaian League, the first open slot for Apollonidas would seem to come either in 179/78, after Kallikrates, usually thought to have been στρατηγός in 180/79, or just possibly one year earlier, after Hyperbatos, universally held to have been στρατηγός in 181/80.⁹⁷ This would mean that the next step of the controversy between Messene and Megalopolis happened in 180/79 at the very earliest, at least two years and a half after Messene surrendered to the League. In other words, the πάλιν of line 11 would bridge a distance of more than two years if not more than three. This is not the impression one gets from the text of the inscription.

Now it has to be pointed out that no ancient source says that Lykortas was elected as a regular στρατηγός for 182/81 following his στρατηγία pro tempore. The argument in favor of this notion is quite indirect and conjectural.⁹⁸ It hinges largely on a passage of Polybios about an embassy from Ptolemy V Epiphanes to the Achaian League in 181/80, which announced the donation of a fleet of ten pentekontors to the Achaians. In response, the Achaians decided to send an embassy to thank the king, but later had to cancel it because Ptolemy died. The ambassadors that had been chosen were Lykortas, Polybios and Aratos the Younger, and Polybios tells us that his father had been chosen to lead the mission because he had been στρατηγός at the time when the alliance between Ptolemy and the Achaians had been renewed. Scholars have been unwilling to admit that this might refer to Lykortas' strategy in 185/84, because only the year before, in 186/85, Lykortas himself, acting as an ambassador, had negotiated a renewal of the alliance with Ptolemy, but when he reported back to the assembly of the League the στρατηγός Aristainos had frustrated the whole enterprise with procedural arguments, pointing out that neither Lykortas nor Ptolemy's ambassadors had taken care to make explicit just which one of the various treaties between the League and the Ptolemies they were renewing. It is doubtful,⁹⁹ so the argument, that the following year Lykortas could have been able to overturn the decision. Also, Ptolemy's embassy of 181/80 seems to come too late as a response to a renewal that had taken place in 185/84.

⁹⁶ Polyb. 23.17.12; see GRUEN 1984, 492.

⁹⁷ See above, n. 83.

⁹⁸ It is laid out in detail by AYMARD 1967, 39–42. WALBANK 1979, 258–59 follows AYMARD, but see below, n. 102.

⁹⁹ Or «très bizarre», as AYMARD 1967, 41 puts it; but note that AYMARD argues as if Aristainos' intervention amounted to a rejection of the renewal of the alliance, which cannot be the case.

This line of argument, however, cannot withstand scrutiny. On the contrary, if an alliance to which the League and Ptolemy had agreed had not been finally sanctioned in 186/85 because of Aristainos' intervention, it would be strange that Lykortas, στρατηγός the following year, had not proceeded to remedy the glitch as soon as possible in order to avert a more radical loss of face:¹⁰⁰ after all, oaths had already been exchanged and Ptolemy's embassy had been accompanied by lavish gifts of weapons and money,¹⁰¹ which the Achaians clearly did not turn back. Aristainos' intervention actually created a kind of limbo, by any standards a very embarrassing situation, and if we date the final renewal to 182/81 we must also accept that this awkwardness was allowed to stand unrepaired for three years. Considering this, a final sanction of the renewal in 185/84 is in fact extremely likely. Ptolemy's embassy of 181/80, on the other hand, promised further gifts, following a common pattern in royal embassies, with the purpose of keeping alive the good relations established a few years earlier. Its connection with the renewal of the treaty does not have to be more than indirect, and of course there is nothing strange if Lykortas was now chosen to lead the Achaian envoys because four years earlier he had been most directly involved in the renewal of the alliance.¹⁰²

It must be recognized that we have no real argument for assigning to Lykortas the strategy of the League in 182/81. Accordingly, nothing at all stands in the way of taking the evidence of this new document in the most natural way, admitting that the στρατηγός of that year was Apollonidas of Sikyon. This has some consequences for the way we reconstruct politics within the Achaian League after the death of Philopoimen.¹⁰³ Apollonidas appears for the first time in Polybios during a meeting of the Achaian League in 186/85, when he convinced the Achaians to reject an offer by Eumenes II to donate funds from whose interest the members of the federal council could receive a salary for the meetings.¹⁰⁴ We cannot tell much about the associations of Apollonidas with other politicians of the League,¹⁰⁵ but we know that he had been sent to Rome to assuage the senate after the encounter between Metellus and the leaders of the League in 186/85. According to Polybios, at the meeting Metellus had

¹⁰⁰ See ERRINGTON 1969, 164–65.

¹⁰¹ Polyb. 29.9.2–3.

¹⁰² WALBANK 1979, 259 may have misunderstood the issue. He writes: «it is hard to imagine why, if the renewal was in 185/4, the Achaeans waited until 180 to thank Ptolemy for his gifts», but the embassy decreed in 181/80 was not meant to thank for the gifts of 186/85, but for the ten ships promised in that same year 181/80.

¹⁰³ One is reminded of E. GRUEN's penetrating observation on the tendency within the Achaian League to prevent any one faction from holding power year after year; see GRUEN 1984, 496.

¹⁰⁴ Polyb. 22.8.1–7.

¹⁰⁵ ERRINGTON 1969, 159–63 implies that Apollonidas' speech against Eumenes' offer points to his being aligned with Aristainos, then στρατηγός of the League (in 188/87 according to ERRINGTON's chronology, see ERRINGTON 1969, 255–61); cf. however *ibid.* 173.

criticized Philopoimen's approach to the Spartan question, whereupon Aristainos had kept silent, signaling approval, while Diophanes had aligned himself with Metellus' criticism, adding that Philopoimen had acted in a similarly unsatisfactory way in the case of the Messenians.¹⁰⁶ In front of the senate, Apollonidas defended Philopoimen's actions, but this again does not tell us anything certain about his own political allegiances.¹⁰⁷

If indeed Apollonidas, and not Lykortas, was the στρατηγός of the League in 182/81, and keeping in mind that evidence on his political allegiances is not entirely straightforward, some pieces of information we already possessed acquire new meaning. As mentioned above, the stele in which the return of Messene to the League was finally sanctioned was put up in 182/81, i.e. in the year of Apollonidas, and it appears to have included more favorable conditions than those that had been dictated in Megalopolis one year before. In particular, the Messenians were exempted for the three coming years from paying their dues to the League in recognition of the damage to their territory caused by the scorched-earth campaign led by Lykortas.¹⁰⁸ Polybios observes, possibly not without sarcasm, that this way the Achaians were damaged by the devastation of the Messenian territory no less than the Messenians had been: clearly, this was a measure of some importance, which acknowledged that Lykortas had acted in too heavy-handed a way during his campaign in Messenia, a fact that even his son Polybios admits, thereby supporting the suspicion that Lykortas' behavior may have been controversial.

Another element of some importance derives from the prosopography of the judges selected to adjudicate the controversy in the Karneiasion. One of the judges, Archon of Aigira, three or four times στρατηγός of the League, had defended Philopoimen's policies at the meeting with Metellus in Argos in 185, and appears in general to have been closely associated with Lykortas.¹⁰⁹ Another one is the notorious Kallikrates of Leontion, Polybios' *bête noire*, who, during his mission to Rome in 181/80, allegedly criticized in front of the senate the harshness of the treatment inflicted on the Messenians, referring in particular to the devastation of the territory and the massacre

¹⁰⁶ Various modern interpretations of Aristainos' silence are discussed by THORNTON 1995, who settles for Polybios'.

¹⁰⁷ Note also Polyb. 28.6.2 (autumn 170), where Apollonidas appears in a list of Achaian politicians who were connected to Lykortas.

¹⁰⁸ Polyb. 24.2.3.

¹⁰⁹ See Polyb. 22.10.8 (Archon joins Philopoimen and Lykortas in opposing Diophanes); Polyb. 28.3.7–9 (170/69, there were rumors that Archon, together with Lykortas and Polybios, was about to be accused by Roman ambassadors of being an enemy of Rome); Polyb. 29.23.2 (winter 169/68, Archon agrees with Lykortas and Polybios, against Kallikrates, Diophanes, and Hyperbatos, on supporting the Ptolemies against Antiochus IV). During Archon's strategy of 170/69, Polybios was the *ἵππαρχος* (Polyb. 28.6.9). Archon was probably the στρατηγός of 184/83, who rejected Flamininus' request to summon a *σύνοδος* to discuss the Messenian problem, see AYMARD 1967, 31–32 and WALBANK 1979, 209–10 on Polyb. 22.19.

of the political leaders, that is, the actions that Lykortas had undertaken of his own initiative.¹¹⁰ Once he was elected στρατηγός of the League, in 180/79 according to the commonly accepted chronology, Kallikrates was responsible for the return of Messenian exiles.¹¹¹ The highly negative image of Kallikrates sketched by Polybios, who owed him his exile to Rome after Pydna, has made it difficult for scholars to appreciate his policies in terms other than moral, but there is no reason not to see that Kallikrates, just like Aristainos and Diophanes before him, pursued senatorial approval as a way of sidelining his competitors for leadership in the League. It is just possible that, when he was called to adjudicate between Messenians and Megalopolitans, his views on the issue were not known yet, but this is not very likely. Having him and Archon serving alongside on the panel, just like the absence of judges from Arkadia, looks like an ostentation of impartiality.

In conclusion, while presumably no politician of the Achaian League approved of the secession of the Messenians, there appear to have been disagreements, even after Philopoimen's death, on how to deal with them. Polybios alone already gave us reason to suppose that this might have been the case, but our inscription speaks even more eloquently to that situation. To be sure, the fact that there was resistance to allowing the repression of the Messenian revolt to become a private affair of Lykortas and of Megalopolis is after all no more surprising than the fact that the Megalopolitans tried their best in order to profit from the situation. More interestingly, the interpretation of the events referred to in our document, however, makes it possible to broach a more general problem relating to the Achaian League. While documents like ours show poleis as collective political actors, the literary sources, especially but not only because of the influence of Polybios, give the impression that League politics was characterized by competition between influential politicians whose agendas were not necessarily dictated by the polis they came from, the contrast between Diophanes and the faction of Philopoimen being the clearest example.¹¹² The way that these two levels were interwoven is a fascinating if overlooked topic, one that would deserve and repay further research.

¹¹⁰ Polyb. 24.9.12–13; on Kallikrates' embassy, see especially DEROW 1970, and more briefly KOEHN 2007, 215–16 and n. 130 with perceptive comments and further references. On the limits of an approach to Achaian politics that classifies individual politicians as 'patriots' or 'pro-Roman', see the comments of GRUEN 1984, 331–34.

¹¹¹ Polyb. 24.10.15.

¹¹² A comprehensive study of the political leadership of the Achaian League is a desideratum; for some preliminary observations, see O'NEIL 1984–86, 33–44.

CHRISTIAN HABICHT

Appendix: Ainetidas

Ainetidas served as στρατηγός of the Confederation in the year in which the δαμοργοί slapped the city of Messene with the fine mentioned in line 97: ἐπὶ Αἰνητίδα. The name is so far attested only in Sparta, and extremely rare there too. It is missing in the 1875 edition of PAPE – BENSELER'S Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen and appears in BECHTEL'S Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit of 1917 with just one testimony from Sparta: Ἀντίλας Αἰνητίδα γλυ[φεύς], member of a θίασος (IG V 1, 208, line 3 [SGDI 4443]) from the second or first century B.C. This is also the only entry of the name in BRADFORD'S A Prosopography of Lacedaemonians from the Death of Alexander the Great 323 B.C., to the Sack of Sparta by Alaric, A.D. 396, 1977, p. 21, and in the volumes of LGPN published so far (March 2012).

Another instance of the name became recently known from the base of an equestrian statue found at Megalopolis and published in 1995 by ULLA KREILINGER.¹¹³ The monument was erected by Kallistokleia, daughter of Xenogenes of Megalopolis in honor of her husband Xenainetos, son of Kraugis. The name of his father reveals that he was a brother of the famous Philopoimen, who lost his life in 183 BCE.¹¹⁴ This statue was the work of Αἰνητίδας Ἀντίλα Λακεδαιμόνιος. The artist must have been a direct ancestor of the just named sculptor. He is, without a doubt, the στρατηγός of the League during the year in which the δαμοργοί punished Messene with the fine, since the year of his service must be one of the earliest years after 180 BCE, and certainly not later than 175. As U. KREILINGER has aptly observed, the working on stone seems to have been a tradition in this family.¹¹⁵

The name of his father occurs in Sparta once again in a not yet clearly recognized case. In a catalogue of names, *catalogus Taenariorum*, dated to the first century BCE (IG V 1, 210), appears in line 33 [Α]ντίλας Ἀριστομένεος. In the Index to the volume the editor, W. KOLBE, says on page 216: «nonne Ἀντίλας?», but where he comments on the text he says «33 scripsi [Α]ντίλας, quod est pro Ἀνυσίλας». In this he is followed by O. MASSON.¹¹⁶ But KOLBE had the right instinct, when he proposed to see in Antilas the correct form of the name for the son of Aristomenes, and this has been corroborated by a decree of Eretria in honor of judges from Sparta, in which one of the

¹¹³ KREILINGER 1995 with plate 84.1. I am indebted to the author for her kindness in sending me a large copy of her photograph. The text of the inscription can be found also in SEG 45.341.

¹¹⁴ This new piece of evidence opens the possibility that his name, instead of that of his more famous brother, could be restored in another base from Corinth, where [---- Φιλοποίμενα] Κραύγιος was restored by HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN 1932, 364, although the latter remains more likely.

¹¹⁵ KREILINGER 1995, 376.

¹¹⁶ MASSON 2000, 514.

judges bears the name of Ἀντίλα[ς Ἀριστο]μένεος¹¹⁷ and is therefore an earlier namesake of the man of IG V 1, 210, line 33.

Department of Classics
Princeton University
 141 East Pyne
 Princeton, NJ 08540
 USA

Scuola Normale Superiore
 P.zza dei Cavalieri, 7
 I-56126 Pisa

Institute for Advanced Study
School of Historical Studies
 Einstein Drive
 Princeton, NJ 08540
 USA

Bibliography

- AGER, S. L., 1996, Interstate Arbitration in the Greek World, 336–90 B.C.
- ARNAOUTOGLU, I., 2009/10, Dispute Settlement between *poleis*-Members of the Achaean League. A New Source, *Dike* 12/13, 181–201.
- AYMARD, A., 1938a, Les premiers rapports de Rome et de la Confédération achaienne.
- AYMARD, A., 1938b, Les assemblées de la Confédération achaienne.
- AYMARD, A., 1967, Études d'histoire ancienne.
- BUCK, C. D., 1955, The Greek Dialects.
- CARTLEDGE, P. – SPAWFORTH, A., 2002, Hellenistic and Roman Sparta: A Tale of Two Cities, 2nd ed.
- CASSAYRE, A., 2010, La justice dans les cités grecques. De la formation des royaumes hellénistiques au legs d'Attale.
- CHANDEZON, CH., 2003, L'élevage en Grèce, fin V^e s. – fin I^{er} s. a.C. L'apport des sources épigraphiques.
- CHANOTIS, A., 2004, Justifying Territorial Claims in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: The Beginning of International Law, in: E. M. HARRIS – L. RUBINSTEIN (ed.), *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece*, 185–213.
- DEROW, P., 1970, Polybios and the Embassy of Kallikrates, in: *Essays Presented to C. M. Bowra*, 12–23.
- DESHOURS, N., 2006, Les mystères d'Andania. Étude d'épigraphie et d'histoire religieuse.
- ERRINGTON, R. M., 1969, Philopoemen.
- FERRARY, J.-L., 1988, Philhellénisme et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique.
- GABBA, E., 1974, Storiografia greca e imperialismo romano (III–I sec. A.C.), *RSI* 86, 625–42.
- GRANDJEAN, C., 2003, Les Messéniens de 370/369 au 1^{er} siècle de notre ère. Monnayages et histoire.

¹¹⁷ WOODWARD – ROBERT 1927–1928, 65: «the form Ἀντίλας must be a mistake by engraver or copyist», with reference to IG V 1, 210, 33, and with the additional remark: «the bearer may well be a descendant of the judge.»

- GRUEN, E. S., 1984, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. I–II.
- HANSEN, M. H., 2004a, A Typology of Dependent Poleis, in: M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN (ed.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 87–94.
- HANSEN, M. H., 2004b, Boiotia, in: M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN (ed.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 431–61.
- HARTER-UIBOPUU, K., 1998, Das zwischenstaatliche Schiedsverfahren im achäischen Koinon: Zur friedlichen Streitbeilegung nach den epigraphischen Quellen.
- HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, F., 1932, Besprechung von B. D. Meritt, *Corinth*, VIII.1, *Greek Inscriptions 1896–1927*, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 52, 361–64.
- HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, F. – LATTERMANN, H., 1911, Hira und Andania.
- KATÓ, P., 2006a, Rituale und Politik in Megalopolis am Ende der 180er Jahre, in: G. NÈMETH – P. FORISEK (ed.), *Epigraphica*, III. *Politai et cives*, 43–51.
- KATÓ, P., 2006b, The Funeral of Philopoimen in the Historiographical Tradition, in: E. STAVRIANOPOULOU (ed.), *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World*, 239–50.
- KOEHN, C., 2007, *Krieg – Diplomatie – Ideologie. Zur Außenpolitik hellenistischer Mittelstaaten*.
- KREILINGER, U., 1995, Neue Inschriften aus Megalopolis, *MDAI(A)* 110, 373–85.
- LARSEN, J. A. O., 1955, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*.
- LURAGHI, N., 2008, *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory*.
- MAGNETTO, A., 1997, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci. Vol. II dal 336 al 196 a.C.*
- MAGNETTO, A., 2008, *L'arbitrato di Rodi fra Samo e Priene. Edizione critica, commento e indici a cura di A. Magonetto*.
- MASSON, O., 2000, *Onomastica Graeca selecta*, vol. 2.
- MCDONALD, W. A. – HOPE SIMPSON, R., 1961, Prehistoric Habitation in Southwestern Peloponnese, *AJA* 65, 221–60.
- MOGGI, M., 1976, *I sinecismi interstatali greci. Vol. I: dalle origini al 338 a.C.*
- NIELSEN, T. H., 2004, Arkadia, in: M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN (ed.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 505–39.
- NIESE, B., 1899, *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea. II: Vom Jahre 281 v. Chr. bis zur Begründung der römischen Hegemonie im griechischen Osten 188 v. Chr.*
- NIESE, B., 1903, *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea. III: Von 188 bis 120 v. Chr.*
- O'NEIL, J. L., 1984–86, The Political Elites of the Achaian and Aitolian Leagues, *AncSoc* 15–17, 33–61.
- PIKOULAS, G. A., 1983, in: *Πρακτικά β' τοπικού Συνεδρίου Αρχαϊκών σπουδών*, 1983, 313–18 [= *Ἀρχαία. Συλλογή μελετών*, 2002, 219–24].
- RIZAKIS, A., 2008, *Achaïe III. Les cités achéennes: Épigraphie et histoire*.
- RIZAKIS, A., 2011, Η Real-Politik της Ρώμης και η θλιβερή τύχη της Μεσσηνίας μετά τον Β' Μακεδονικό Πόλεμο (196–182 π.Χ.), in: *Ταξιδεύοντας στην κλασική Ελλάδα. Τομός προς τιμήν του καθηγητή Πέτρου Θέμελη*.
- ROEBUCK, C. A., 1941, *A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 BC*.
- ROUSSET, D., 1994, Les frontières des cités grecques. Premières réflexions à partir du recueil des documents épigraphiques, *CCGG* 5, 97–126.
- ROUSSET, D., 1999, Centre urbain, frontière et espace rural dans les cités de Grèce centrale, in: M. BRUNET (ed.), *Territoires des cités grecques*, 35–78.
- ROUSSET, D., 2010, *De Lycie en Cabalide. La convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos près d'Oinoanda*.
- SHIPLEY, G., 2004, Messenia, in: M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN (ed.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 547–68.

- ΤΑΕΥΒΕΡ, H., 2006, Rhodische Schiedsrichter im Achäerbund. Eine neue Einordnung von IvO 46 und 47 in die Geschichte der römisch-griechischen Beziehungen im 2. Jh. v. Chr., in: P. AMANN – M. PEDRAZZI – H. ΤΑΕΥΒΕΡ (ed.), *Italo-Tusco-Romana. Festschrift für Luciana Aigner Foresti zum 70. Geburtstag am 30. Juli 2006*, 341–44.
- ΤΗΜΕΛΙΣ, P., 2006, Ανασκαφή Μεσσήνης, ΠΑΕ 31–67.
- ΤΗΜΕΛΙΣ, P., 2008, Κρίμα περί χώρας Μεσσηνίων και Μεγαλοπολιτών, in: 'Ιστορίες για την αρχαία Άρκαδία. Πρακτικά/Proceedings of the International Symposium in Honour of J. Roy. 50 χρόνια Άρχας (1958–2008), 211–22.
- ΤΗΟΡΝΤΟΝ, J., 1995, Il silenzio di Aristeno: nota a Polibio 22, 10 e 24, 11–13, RCCM 27, 261–72.
- ΤΟΔ, M. N., 1926/27, Further Notes on the Greek Acrophonic Numerals, BSA 28, 141–57.
- ΒΑΛΜΙΝ, N. S., 1930, Études topographiques sur la Messénie ancienne.
- ΒΑΛΒΑΝΚ, F. W., 1979, A Historical Commentary on Polybius III.
- ΒΑΛΣΕΡ, A. V., 2008, Bauern und Zinsnehmer. Politik, Recht und Wirtschaft im frühhellenistischen Ephesos.
- ΒΑΡΡΕΝ, J. A. W., 2007, The Bronze Coinage of the Achaian Koinon: the Currency of a Federal Ideal.
- ΒΙΛΗΕΛΜ, A., 1914, Urkunden aus Messene, JÖAI 17, 467–586.
- ΒΟΥΟΥΑΡΔ, A. M. – ΡΟΒΕΡΤ, L., 1927–28, Four Hellenistic Decrees, ABSA 29, 57–74.



Fig. 1: The inscription (courtesy of Petros Themelis)



Fig. 2: The territory involved in the dispute