

## ORCHOMENUS AND CLITOR

PROFESSOR ANDREWES has recently been kind enough to refer in his commentary on Thucydides to a suggestion of mine.<sup>1</sup> This present note seeks to expand the idea, and to relate it to north Arcadian politics of the early fourth century B.C.

Tradition gave some prominence in the archaic period to Orchomenus in eastern Arcadia;<sup>2</sup> and genealogy supported this prominence, since, apart from a belief that Arcas himself was a son of the eponym Orchomenus, there was a continuing belief that this Orchomenus founded not only Orchomenus itself but also Methydrium.<sup>3</sup> This prominence was over by the early fifth century, at the latest;<sup>4</sup> but a relic might be seen in Pausanias' report that when Megalopolis was founded in 368<sup>5</sup> Methydrium, Teuthis, and Thisoa were linked by *synteleia* to Orchomenus. What Pausanias meant by *synteleia* is not clear, though it does not sound like a survival of archaic power; but it may fairly be assumed that Orchomenus dominated the three smaller communities, especially since an Arcadian federal commission had to check the boundary between Orchomenus and Methydrium when the three small communities were incorporated in Megalopolis.<sup>6</sup> The obstacle to believing in continuous Orchomenian domination of Methydrium from the archaic period, represented by the genealogical tradition, until 368 occurs in the Delphic list of *thearodoci* of the late fifth or very early fourth century, since Methydrium is included.<sup>7</sup> Methydrium was therefore at that time an independent state. Moreover Methydrium lay between Orchomenus (to the east) and Teuthis and Thisoa (to the west);<sup>8</sup> it thus separated Teuthis and Thisoa from Orchomenus, and, if Methydrium was wholly independent of Orchomenus *c.* 400, Teuthis and Thisoa must also have been. A dedication, probably to be dated in the earlier part of the fourth century, before the foundation of Megalopolis, was made at Delphi by a 'Thisoan Arcadian' who was a Delphic *proxenus*.<sup>9</sup> This man could possibly have been from the community Thisoa belonging to the Cynurian tribe in southwest Arcadia, but virtually nothing is known of Cynurian Thisoa's history beyond its subordinate status;<sup>10</sup> it is altogether more likely that he belonged to the more northerly Thisoa near Teuthis and Methydrium.<sup>11</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, iv. 485.

<sup>2</sup> See J. Hejnic, *Pausanias the Perieget and the Archaic History of Arcadia*, 70-1.

<sup>3</sup> Duris fr. 9 Jacoby, cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Thalpusa; Paus. 8. 3. 3, 36. 1; see E. Meyer, *RE* xviii. 896.

<sup>4</sup> Hejnic, op. cit. 91, dates the decline of Orchomenus' power *c.* 500, but D. M. Leahy, *Phoenix*, xii (1958), 162-3, after the second Messenian War, which seems more likely.

<sup>5</sup> 368 is here assumed as the date of the foundation, but a difference of a year or two would not affect the present argument.

<sup>6</sup> Paus. 8. 27. 3; Schwyzler, 664.

<sup>7</sup> G. Daux, *REG* lxii (1949), 4-12, ll. 5-8. Cf. the use of the ethnic 'Methydrian' in Xen. *Anab.* 4. 1. 27, etc., referring to the same period.

<sup>8</sup> For the topography of Methydrium see E. Meyer, *Peloponnesische Wanderungen*, 31-3; for Teuthis see *RE* va. 1158, for Thisoa see *RE* via. 292.

<sup>9</sup> *SEG* xiv. 455, on which see Bousquet, *BCH* lxxvi (1954), 432-3.

<sup>10</sup> See *RE* via. 292-3.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the existence in Hellenistic times of the more northerly Thisoa as an independent polis, attested by its inscriptions *IG* v. 2. 510 and 511.

that case Thisoa, having a *proxenus*, was an independent state like Methydrium. Such independent status might conceivably have been compatible with the *synteleia* reported by Pausanias; but this is unlikely if the *synteleia* amounted in effect to Orchomenian domination. It is much easier to believe that Methydrium and Thisoa (and necessarily Teuthis also) were wholly independent of Orchomenus *c.* 400, and then came under Orchomenian domination at some time in the period *c.* 400–368. One may compare the incorporation in Orchomenus in the fourth century of another small neighbour, Euaemon.<sup>1</sup> Such Orchomenian expansion in the earlier fourth century could explain the otherwise obscure war of 378 between Orchomenus and Clitor.

Clitor in northern Arcadia, some way north-west of Orchomenus, also extended its territory, and was of some importance in the Hellenistic period.<sup>2</sup> Its expansion had certainly reached the River Ladon by 219/18,<sup>3</sup> but must have begun very much earlier. The Clitorian dedication at Olympia with a title of the spoils 'from many cities' probably represents an early stage of this expansion *c.* 500.<sup>4</sup> Clitor was evidently of some significance in the Arcadian League set up in 370, since it provided two of the ten oecists for the foundation of Megalopolis.<sup>5</sup> That Arcadian League arose mainly through the work of democratic anti-Spartan circles in Mantinea and Tegea,<sup>6</sup> and it is therefore likely that Clitor shared these sentiments. Orchomenus, however, is known to have been firmly pro-Spartan both in 418 and in 370.<sup>7</sup> Thus in the early fourth century these two states, not adjacent but at no great distance from each other, and each the most important in its own area, would be opposed both by their conflicting political attitudes and by their desires for expansion.

It has been argued above that Orchomenus extended its power westwards over Methydrium, Teuthis, and Thisoa at some time in the period *c.* 400–368. This could have been seen as a threat to Clitor's sphere of interest in north central Arcadia, and so have given rise to war between Clitor and Orchomenus in 378.<sup>8</sup> The circumstances of the war are otherwise quite unknown, for it receives only an incidental mention from Xenophon. The only certain thing about this war is that it was indecisive, since the Spartans stopped it peremptorily in order to borrow Clitor's mercenaries.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, if, as suggested

<sup>1</sup> Schwyzler, 665; cf. Theopompus fr. 61 Jacoby. On the interpretation of the inscription see F. Gschnitzer, *AAHG* xviii (1965), 73–4. Orchomenus also at an unknown date attached to itself the once independent Amilus (Paus. 8. 13. 5), and Elymia perhaps underwent the same process (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 6. 5. 13–14).

<sup>2</sup> See *RE* xi. 661–4.

<sup>3</sup> Plb. 4. 70. 2, on which see E. Meyer, *op. cit.* 73.

<sup>4</sup> Paus. 5. 23. 7; G. M. A. Richter, *AJA* xliii (1939), 200. Cf. also the spear-butt of the early fifth century, Richter, *ibid.* 194–201; L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, 210.

<sup>5</sup> Paus. 8. 27. 2. It is notable that Clitorian *damiorgoi* appear on the federal Arcadian decree *IG* v. 2. 1, from which most states of north Arcadia are missing, but it is dangerous to draw conclusions from the list of

*damiorgoi*. The decree apparently belongs to the years 370–61 (F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *MDAI(A)*, xxxvi [1911], 349–60), in which case it is difficult to see why so many states are missing, since Xenophon says that all Arcadians took part in the invasion of Laconia in 370/69 (Xen. *Ages.* 2. 24). The simplest solution is to suppose that for some reason, possibly constitutional, not all members of the Arcadian League had *damiorgoi* when the decree was passed.

<sup>6</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6. 5. 1–11; D. S. 15. 59, 62 (sadly confused). I hope to analyse the origins of the League at more length elsewhere.

<sup>7</sup> Thuc. 5. 61. 3–5; Xen. *Hell.* 6. 5. 10–11.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the war between Mantinea and Tegea in 423 caused by Mantinea's expansion westwards in the preceding years (Thuc. 4. 134).

<sup>9</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 5. 4. 36–7.

above, the war was due to Clitor's reaction against Orchomenian expansion in the earlier fourth century, it cannot have resolved the conflict. It may be conjectured, however, that Clitor found political methods more successful ten years later. In 368 Megalopolis was founded, and Clitor supplied two of the ten oecists, while Orchomenus, which had attempted to support Sparta in 370, must still have been in bad odour with the new Arcadian League. It may well have been due to Clitor's prompting that the new foundation included not only the tribal territories of south-west Arcadia but also Methydrium, Teuthis, and Thisoa, all three detached from Orchomenus.

*University of Sheffield*

J. Roy