

Zeitschrift: Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 61 (2004)

Heft: 1

Artikel: An endowed peace

Autor: Sosin, Joshua D.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-47107>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 24.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

An Endowed Peace

By Joshua D. Sosin, Durham, NC

In 1938 E. Schweigert published a fragmentary fourth-century Athenian inscription concerning a public festival on the occasion of a peace (EM 12896). Observing palaeographic similarities with *IG II²* 333 and 334, Schweigert dated the stone to the Lycurgan period. He assumed that the festival was the Greater *Panathenaia* and the reason for celebration the peace with Philip of Macedon¹. Roussel objected that peace with Philip was no cause for jubilation and that the occasion must have been the peace concluded between Athens and Sparta in 374². The earlier date has emotional appeal. Peace at the cost of freedom seems unworthy of fanfare and expense. But thanks to the efforts of Stephen Tracy we know that EM 12896 was cut in the Lycurgan period³. Roussel's suggestion cannot stand, but if the gesture seems politically odd, it can in fact be shown to be consistent with Lycurgan economic and religious behavior.

EM 12896. E. Schweigert, "Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis", *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 264–310, at 294–296 no. 20 (photograph at fig. 22) [SEG XVI 55; L. Robert, "Une fête de la paix à Athènes au IV^e siècle", *ArchEph* (1977) 211–216 (lines 3–13) = *OMS* VII 781–788]. Date: 345–320, S. V. Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition: Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.* (Berkeley 1995) 67–81, at 77f. Stoichedon.

Cf. P. Roussel, "Sur quelques inscriptions Attiques", *RevArch* (1941) 209–232, at 215f.; A. G. Woodward, "Notes on Some Attic Decrees", *ABSA* 51 (1956) 1–8, at 3–5; J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* (1959) 130; R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford 1996) 230 n. 46, 246 n. 100. M. Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro: Problemi politici, economici, finanziari* [MemLinc ser. 92] (Rome 1992) 359f.

¹ Schweigert, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 296; cf. *IG* II² 236 and [Dem.] 17.10.

2 Roussel, *RevArch* (1941) 215f.

³ Give or take a few years: Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition* 67–81, at 77f., dates EM 12896 to 345–320; *IG* II² 333 and 334 = Cutter of II² 334; Tracy, 82–95.

2: [Άντιδωρος Παιανιεὺς] Woodward. 3: Robert p. 213 : Τάδε προσαναγράψαι Robert p. 216
 π. 4 : [δεδόχθαι τῷ δίμῳ, ἀναγράψασθαι παρὰ τῇ] Woodward. 4: θεῖναι ἵπποδομίαν
 ὑπὲρ ὅρματα τέ] Woodward. 5: [γυμνικὸν — — ἀπὸ τοῦ] Robert p. 213, 214 : γυμνικὸν
 καὶ ἀγώνα ἀπὸ τοῦ] Robert p. 216 n. 4. 6: Τ I O stone. 7: ἄν τὰ Woodward : Ἀντα-
 Schweigert. 8: or Ἐλευσίνια τὰ πενταετηρικά(?) Woodward. 8-9: περὶ τὰς πρός τῷ Κερ-
 αμεικῷ πύλας Robert p. 216 : περὶ ἀπασαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα Woodward. 9-10: ἐκεχειρίαν δὲ |
 [εῖναι (ou un verbe plus long?) καὶ ἀσφάλειαν καὶ ἀσύλίαν Robert p. 216 n. 4. 10-11: ἀφι-
 κνουμέν[οις πᾶσιν εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας καὶ] τὴν πανήγυριν Robert p. 216 n. 4 : ἀφικνουμέν[οις
 Ἀθήναζε Woodward. 12: ἡμερῷ] γ Robert p. 215 :]ι ΔΕΚΑΜΕΝΙΟΥ[Schweigert : κληρῶσαι
 δὲ ἀθλούθέτας εἶκοσι] Woodward; MENIOY stone : μὲν <τ>οῦ Woodward. 12-13: τριετ[ηρι-
 κοῦ (?) δέκα δὲ τοῦ πεντετηρικοῦ(?) ἀγῶνος -] Woodward.

As Robert showed, we are dealing here with the creation of a new festival for Peace, not an enhancement⁴. In the Lycurgan period at Athens, 338–324 B.C.⁵, tremendous resources were devoted to the creation of new festivals and the expansion of old. The *Hephaistia*, purported to have been added to the roster of penteteric festivals under Lycurgus, may be a ghost, as may the *agon* of Poseidon that Lycurgus is said to have founded at Piraeus⁶. But a horse-race was apparently added to the *Eleusinia* in 329/8 and it has been suggested that the *Nemeseia* at Rhamnous, first attested in 333/2, were also a creation of the period⁷. A large but very badly damaged inscription attests the enhancement of an unnamed festival and is certainly Lycurgan⁸, and Lycurgus is said to have helped revive an abandoned comic competition ([Plut.] *X Orat.* 841F). The

⁴ J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* (1959) 130; L. Robert, *ArchEph* (1977) 214.

⁵ The dates are conventional: Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro* 199–207.

⁶ *Hephaistia: Ath. Pol.* 54.7; Parker, *Athenian Religion* 149 n. 109; Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro* 366 n. 48; D. Knoepfler, “Adolf Wilhelm et la pentéteris des Amphiaraias d’Oropos: Réexamen de *A.P.* LIV 7 à la lumière du catalogue *IG VII* 414 + *SEG* I 126”, in: M. Piérart (ed.), *Aristote et Athènes* (Paris 1993) 279–302, at 301; Piraeus: [Plut.] *X Orat.* 842A; Parker, *Athenian Religion* 246 n. 100 (ghost), but cf. J. D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley 1998) 23, 30.

⁷ *Eleusinia*: *IG II²* 1672.261; *Nemeseia*: Parker, *Athenian Religion* 246, 254; *IG II²* 3105 + SEG XXXI 162; *Praktika* 1989 [1992] 31 no. 15.9.

8 M. B. Walbank, "Regulations for an Athenian Festival", in: *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History, and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool* [= *Hesperia* suppl. 19] (Princeton 1982) 173–182 [SEG XXXII 86]. Walbank thought the festival was the *Amphiarai*a. S. Humphreys, "Lycurgus of Butadae: An Athenian Aristocrat", in: J. W. Eadie/J. Ober (eds), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr* (Lanham 1985) 199–252, at 227 n. 33, prefers the *Epitaphia*; followed by Parker, *Athenian Religion* 246 n. 100. Stroud's proposal, [$\tau\eta$]v $\bar{N}\acute{e}\alpha\gamma$?, at line 34 (cf. *Agora* XVI 75) would be attractive but is unwarranted; date: Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition* 96–103, at 101, attributes the inscription to cutter of *IG II²* 244 (340/39–ca. 320).

statesman was famous for piety but also fiscal ingenuity⁹. He created the *dermatikon*, a standing fund to which Athens deposited revenues from the sale of victims' skins after public sacrifices. The *dermatikon* earned nearly a talent in 334/3 and continued in operation at least down to 331/0¹⁰. The Lycurgan ethos married religious scruple with fiscal ingenuity.

Three Lycurgan festal initiatives are remarkable for the mechanisms by which they were funded. A recent pronouncement holds that the endowment as an “institution never flourished [at Athens], as elsewhere in the Greek world”¹¹. It did. In 335/4 Alexander delivered Oropus to Athens¹² and Aristonicus, an associate of Lycurgus, proposed to endow the Lesser *Panathenaia* by entailing the *pentekoste* in the Nea, Athens' newly acquired Oropian chora¹³. In 332/1 an Eleusinian named Philocomus proposed to endow the Eleusinian *Her-*

- 9 [Plut.] *X Orat.* 852B; C. J. Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander: The Dated Laws and Decrees of 'The Lykourgan Era'* 338–332 B.C. (Chicago 1985) no. 21; Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro* 368–372.
- 10 *IG* II² 1496.68–92, esp. 90–92 (334/3): κεφάλαιον δεοματικοῦ | ἐπὶ Κτησικλέους ἀρχοντος· | ΠΡΔΔΔΔΔΓΗΗΗΙΙΙ; the total for 333/2 must have been comparable (123–125): [κεφάλαιον δεοματικοῦ | ἐπὶ Νικ]οκάτο[υς ἀρχοντος]· ...⁶ ... ΗΗΗΗΓΗΗΗ; the smallest number that could precede ΗΗΗΗ is Γ; the first five numbers can only have been thousands; the totals for 332/1 (after line 136) and 331/0 (after line 151) are lost; for discussion of the sacrifices see Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (above n. 6) 36–39; Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro* 373–377.
- 11 P. Millett, *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens* (Cambridge 1991) 236.
- 12 Alexander delivered Oropus to Athens in 335, not Philip in 338: D. Knoepfler, “Oropos colonie d’Érétrie”, *Histoire et Archéologie* 94 (May 1985) 50–55, at 53; idem, *Chiron* 16 (1986) 74 n. 8; idem, “Adolf Wilhelm et la pentétèris des Amphiaraia d’Oropos” (above n. 6) 295; 335 B.C. followed by W. Ameling, “Das neue attische Dekret für Oropos: Ein Datierungsvorschlag”, *ZPE* 77 (1989) 95–97, at 95; P. Gauthier, “Grandes et petites cités: hégémonie et autarcie”, *Opus* 6–8 (1987–1989) 187–202, at 194 with 202 n. 37; idem, *Bull. épigr.* (1990) 221; idem, *Gnomon* 63 (1991) 650–652, at 652; Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (above n. 6) 33.
- 13 Associate: in 335/4 the two proposed to combat piracy: *IG* II² 1623.276–285; endowment: Woodhead, *Agora* XVI 75 (D. M. Lewis, *Hesperia* 28 [1959] 239–247 [= *Selected Papers* 252–262] + *IG* II² 334); for restorations see J. Sosin, “Two Attic Endowments”, *ZPE* 138 (2002) 123–128, at 123–125. V. J. Rosivach, “The Panathenaic Hekatomb”, *PP* 46 (1991) 430–442, holds, against consensus, that the endowed sacrifices were new; Nea: location first suggested by L. Robert, “Sur une loi d’Athènes relative aux petites Panathénées”, *Hellenica* XI–XII (1960) 189–203. I cannot confirm the iota in χωρὶς (A. 15) in the squeeze at the CSAD in Oxford. Lewis’ excellent photo (pl. 43) shows but faint traces of the top of a centered letter; the stone breaks diagonally so that Lewis’ *iota* might be an *alpha*; if so then Robert’s hunch that “Nea” modified an elliptical “*chōra*” might have been correct in sense and fact; restore A. 14–15: τῆς πεντηκοστῆς τὴν πρᾶσιν τῆς ἐν τῇ Νέᾳ χώρᾳ; Other locations for Nea have been proposed: M. K. Langdon, “An Athenian Decree concerning Oropos”, *Hesperia* 56 (1987) 47–58, at 55–58; O. Hansen, “On the Site of Nea”, *Eranos* 87 (1989) 70–72; nevertheless, Oropus remains the most likely candidate: M. Fargauna, “Intorno alla nuova legge ateniese sulla tassazione del grano”, *Dike* 2 (1999) 63–97, at 67–68 n. 7; C. Habicht, *Athens, from Alexander to Antony*, transl. by D. L. Schneider (Cambridge 1997) 23; Parker, *Athenian Religion* 245; Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro* 218 n. 21; Rosivach, *PP* 46 (1991) 436–439.

akleia with revenues from the god's quarry¹⁴. The first quarry-contractor was Moerocles, another peer of Lycurgus. Moerocles had been one of the Athenians, including Lycurgus, whose surrender Alexander demanded after the destruction of Thebes in 335, and he would later propose honors for Lycurgus' friend and proxy, Xenocles of Sphettus¹⁵. Also in 332/1 Phanodemus, the Attidographer (*FGrHist* 325) and close associate of Lycurgus, proposed to crown Amphiaraus and to establish the penteteric *Amphiaraia*¹⁶. Like Aristonicus and Philocomus, Phanodemus proposed both cult and funding (*I.Oropos* 298.15–16): πόρους πεπόρικεν. The phrase is striking but does not tell us how the festival was funded. Around 330 B.C., however, two pairs of Attic tribes were involved in disputes concerning land, which they contended belonged to them, not to Amphiaraus¹⁷. Perhaps Phanodemus proposed to endow the *Amphiaraia* with Oopian land, the partitioning of which led to one or both of the disputes¹⁸. The creation of three endowed festivals in four years looks like a trend.

14 S. Coumanoudis/D. Gofas, “Deux Décrets d’Éleusis”, *REG* 91 (1978) 289–306 [SEG XXVIII 103; Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander*, above n. 9, no. 43].

15 Moerocles: S. B. Aleshire, *Asklepios at Athens* (Amsterdam 1991) 244–246; Faraguna, *Atene nell’età di Alessandro* 233–234; S. N. Koumanoudès/A. P. Matthaiou, “Κατάλογος Ἀθηναίων διαιτητῶν”, *Horos* 5 (1987) 15–23; C. Ampolo, “Tra finanza e politica: Carriera e affari del signor Moirokles”, *RivFil* 109 (1981) 187–204; perhaps the same Moerocles of Arist. *Rh.* 1411a.16–18; surrender: A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian’s History of Alexander* (Oxford 1980) 93–95, at 94; Jacoby ad Douris, *FGrHist* 76 F 39; Arr. I 10.4; Dem. 23.3; Xenocles: *IG* II² 1191 (330/29); [Plut.] *X Orat.* 841C; *SEG* XIX 119.7–9 with Faraguna, *Atene nell’età di Alessandro* 204–209, 228–229.

16 Associate: *I.Oropos* 298.22–24; *Syll.*³ 296; Jacoby ad *FGrHist* 325 p. 172; S. Humphreys, “Lycurgus of Butadae: An Athenian Aristocrat” (above n. 8) at 214–216; crown: *I.Oropos* 296.9–17 (*IG* VII 4252); *Amphiaraia*: *I.Oropos* 298 (*IG* VII 4254); inaugurated in 330/29: *I.Oropos* 520 (*IG* VII 414 + *SEG* I 126), with Knoepfler, “Adolf Wilhelm et la pentétèris des Amphiaraia d’Oropos” (above n. 6) 279–302.

17 Dispute 1: Hyp. *Eux.* 14–17, dated to 330–324: Lycurgus (d. 324), was *synegoros* for the prosecution (Hyp. *Eux.* 12); the speech mentions letters in which Olympias claimed Molossian Dodona as hers (Hyp. *Eux.* 25), which implies a date after the death of its client-king Alexander (331/0). For literature on the date see D. Whitehead (ed.), *Hypereides: The Forensic Speeches* (Oxford 2000) 155–157. Dispute 2: Langdon, *Hesperia* 56 (1987) 47–58 (photographs pls 9, 10) [SEG XXXVII 100]; M. B. Walbank, “The Property of Aiantis and Aigieis”, *ZPE* 84 (1990) 95–99 (ll. 2–16) [SEG XL 125]; Langdon, *Agora* XIX L8; Woodhead, *Agora* XVI 84; dated 330 B.C. on letter forms and similarity of circumstances to those of Hyp. *Eux.*: Langdon and Woodhead; Ameling, *ZPE* 77 (1989) 95–96, proposes 294/3 or 293/2, against which see Walbank, *ZPE* 84 (1990) 96; Gauthier, *Bull. épigr.* (1990) 221; Petrakos, *I.Oropos* p. 498.

18 The phrase πόρους πορίζειν occurs elsewhere only at Hyp. *Eux.* 37, where the defense attacks those who would strip resources from the people while claiming to furnish them (ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐργαζομένων ἀφαιρούμενοι πόρους φασὶ τούτους πορίζειν, ἀπορίαν ἐν τῇ πόλει παρασκευάζοντες); note the triple repetition and the brilliant auditory if not syntactic collocation, πορίζειν ἀπορίαν. Lycurgus spoke on the prosecution’s behalf, against Hypereides (Hyp. *Eux.* 12). Perhaps Hypereides was leveling a subtle attack on Phanodemus, and by extension Lycurgus, for claiming to furnish *poros* for the *Amphiaraia*, while stripping land from landowners.

There is reason to think that the festival for Peace belonged to this trend. It has escaped scholarly comment that this festival was funded at the considerable level of five talents (ἀπὸ πέντε ταλάντων τι<θ>|[ένα], 6–7). The phrase is formulaic: *IG XII.5 647.20–21* (Coresia, early III B.C.): τιθέναι δὲ καὶ ἀγῶνα τῇ έορτῇ τοὺς προβούλους ἀπ[ὸ] | δραχμῶν ΠΔΓ; *IG XII.9 189.4–6* (Eretria, after 340 B.C.): ἔδοξεν τεῖ βουλεῖ καὶ τοῖ δήμοι· | [...] τιθεῖν τὴμ πόλιν ἀγῶνα μουσικῆς ἀπὸ χιλίων | δραχμῶν. The numbers here are telling. The festivals from Ceos and Euboea were not funded on the same order of magnitude as the festival for Peace. The agonothete for the penteteric *Sarapieia* at Tanagra enjoyed an operating budget of 3000 drachmas, but this festival was endowed, capitalized at around one and two-thirds talents¹⁹. The endowed Lesser *Panathenaia* enjoyed capital of at least two talents²⁰. Numbers alone, then, suggest that Peace's festival, like the *Panathenaia*, *Herakleia*, and *Amphiaraia*, was endowed. Context concurs. It would run contrary to what we know about Athens' approach to sacred finance under Lycurgus if the state sanctioned the creation and funding of a new festival, at more than twice the level of the Lesser *Panathenaia*, with no provision for the money but that it be spent down until it was gone. This would have been no way to honor the goddess and no way to handle so much money. Known Lycurgan policy²¹ and the huge sum of money at Peace's disposal thus suggest that the new festival was endowed and that the five talents did not represent the outlay of a given year, but the principal from which running expenses were to be generated.

Another aspect of the festival for Peace seems to be consistent with at least two of the other endowed festivals. The schedule of the Lesser *Panathenaia* was dependent on that of the Greater, a fact which may have helped to determine the financial mechanics of its endowment²². The newly established *Amphiaraia* also found a model in the Greater *Panathenaia*: the order in which events were held and victors recorded in the new festival followed that of the Greater *Panathenaia*²³. The festival for Peace was intended from its creation to be cali-

19 Budget: M. Calvet/P. Roesch, “Les Sarapieia de Tanagra”, *RA* (1966) 297–332, at 298–300 lines 19–21: ἀπολογία ἀγωνοθέτου τῶν Σαραπιείων Γλαύκου τοῦ Β[ουκά]άττο[υς]. | ἔλαβον παρὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς Καφισίου τοῦ Βουκάττους ἀττικοῦ κ(εφαλὴν) Γ' [δραχμὰς ἀ[ργυροῦ]ρίου; endowed: lines 57–58: [ἀρχῆς τῆς κατασταθείσης ἐπὶ τὸν ἔγδανεισμὸν τῶν ὑπὸ Χαριλάο[υ] ἀνατεθ]έντων Καφισίου τοῦ Βουκάττους ἀπολογία; capital: lines 57–73; the inscription is dated ca. 90 B.C.: A. G. Gossage, “The Comparative Chronology of Inscriptions relating to the Boiotian Festivals in the First Half of the First Century B.C.”, *ABSA* (1975) 115–134.

20 Woodhead, *Agora XVI* 75.16–18: [ὅταν δὲ ἡ πρόσοδος γένηται δυοῖν ταλάντοιν ἀπὸ τῆς | μισθώσεως τ]ῶν κτημάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ Νέα[ι] κ[αὶ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς, ὑπά]ρχειν τῇ Αθηνᾶι τοῦτο [τὸ ἀρχαῖον, with Sosin, *ZPE* 138 (2002) 123–125.

21 Parker, *Athenian Religion* 242: “In the case of Lycurgus, as of almost no other Athenian politician, one can speak of a religious policy.”

22 Sosin, *ZPE* 138 (2003) 125.

23 *I.Oropos* 298.15–19 (*IG VII* 4254); *I.Oropos* 520 (*IG VII* 414 + *SEG I* 126); Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition* 92 n. 22; S. V. Tracy/C. Habicht, “New and Old Panathenaic Victor Lists”,

brated chronologically with the Greater *Panathenaia* or another major Attic festival (7–8): ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐν ᾧ ἀν τὰ | [Παναθήναια τὰ μεγάλα ἄγωσιν(?)]. These look like three iterations of the same religious sentiment: the Greater *Panathenaia* were the festival clock by which others were to be set.

Two decades before the creation of these endowments Xenophon had argued (*Poroi* 5.1–13) that economic development was driven by peace not war, that only under conditions of peace would Athens be able to realize maximal revenue-potential²⁴. Few Athenians in the 330s could contend that Athens had suffered economically from the terms of Philip’s peace. Under Lycurgus annual revenues apparently soared to 1200 talents, construction projects thrived, and general economic conditions were robust²⁵. Xenophon was right, and if political realities after Chaeronea led Roussel to conclude that Athenians had no cause for joy, economic conditions proved otherwise. One might venture that in such an environment of relative peace and extraordinary prosperity Athenians needed no special moment to prompt the endowment of Peace with her own festival.

But if 338/7 might have been an awkward year for celebrating peace, 335/4 was a different matter. In the immediate aftermath of the sack of Thebes tensions at Athens ran high. Little was certain, least of all whether war would rain down from the north. Alexander knew that Athens had offered quiet support to Thebes in rebellion and he requested that Athens hand over eight of its most prominent leaders²⁶. An initial attempt to mollify Alexander failed, but then Athens sent Phocion and Demades, who convinced the king to relent. Plutarch reports that Alexander “not only admitted his (Phocion’s) petition and request,

Hesperia 60 (1991) 187–236, at 196–202; E. Preuner, “Amphiarai and Panathenaia”, *Hermes* 57 (1922) 80–106.

24 Date of the *Poroi*: P. Gauthier, *Un commentaire historique des Poroi de Xénophon* (Paris 1976) 4–6; Xen., *Poroi* 5.1.1, asked, Εἰ δὲ σαφὲς δοκεῖ εἶναι ὡς, εἰ μέλλουσι πᾶσαι αἱ πρόσοδοι ἔκπλεω προσιέναι, ὅτι εἰσήνην δεῖ ὑπάρχειν, ἃς ὁὐκ ἄξιον καὶ εἰσηνοφύλακας καθιστάναι; peace as a pre-condition for economic growth: Thuc. I 12; profits and costs of war in antiquity: P. Brun/ R. Descat, “Le profit de la guerre dans la Grèce des cités”, in: J. Andreau et al. (eds), *Economie antique: la guerre dans les économies antiques* (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges 2000) 211–230.

25 Revenues: [Plut.] *X Orat.* 842F; cf. 841B with E. M. Burke, “Lycurgan Finances”, *GRBS* 26 (1985) 251–264, at 251–252 n. 5; Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* 23: “[T]he figure [1200 talents] is clearly documented and trustworthy”; construction: B. Hintzen-Bollen, *Die Kulturpolitik des Euboulos und des Lykurg: die Denkmäler- und Bauprojekte in Athen zwischen 355 und 322 v.Chr.* (Berlin 1997); J. Engels, “Zur Stellung Lykurgs und zur Aussagekraft seines Militär- und Bauprogramms für die Demokratie vor 322 v.Chr.”, *AncSoc* 23 (1992) 5–29; W. Will, *Athen und Alexander: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Stadt von 338 bis 322 v.Chr.* [= MünchBeitr 77] (Munich 1983) 77–93; general conditions: Faraguna, *Atene nell’età di Alessandro*.

26 Antiquity knew competing traditions for the number and identities of the men demanded by Alexander: Arr. I 10.4; Plut. *Dem.* 23.4; Plut. *Phoc.* 17.2; Suda s.v. Ἀντίπατρος. The list at Dem. 23.4 seems to be authoritative, as was recognized more than a century ago: Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary* 93–95, at 95; for the lists see also Jacoby ad Douris, *FGrHist* 76 F 39.

but even listened to him as he counseled. Phocion counseled that if he (Alexander) aimed at calm he should put aside war (θέσθαι τὸν πόλεμον), but if at reputation then he should transfer war, directing it against the barbarians and away from the Greeks.²⁷ The lives of Demosthenes, Lycurgus, and Polyeuctus of Sphettus, to name just three, had been on the line. Failure might have been disastrous. But in the wake of success we see celebration. All of the major Lycurgan festal initiatives mentioned above were enacted after the détente with Alexander, after Thebes' destruction in 335. War was averted and peace restored²⁸. Whether we feel that the Athenians ought to have celebrated after peace was concluded with Alexander, they did.

If Roussel's date was wrong, his instinct was right. The moment to celebrate was not immediately after Chaeronea (338/7), but three years later, after Thebes (335/4). Athens' most important statesmen were rescued from the brink. Alexander agreed to turn war elsewhere. Athens received the rich territory of Oropus. The Lesser *Panathenaia*, Eleusinian *Herakleia*, and probably the *Amphiarai* were richly endowed. New festivals were created and old ones enhanced. The new *dermatikon* and other innovations in sacred finance made piety profitable as never before. This was the hour in which the benefits of Peace shone brightly on the Athenians. This, I suggest, is when Athens created and endowed the new festival for Peace.

Correspondence:

Prof. Joshua D. Sosin
 Duke University
 Department of Classical Studies
 236 Allen Building
 Box 90103
 Durham NC 27708-0103 USA

27 Plut. *Phoc.* 17.6–7: τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον ψήφισμα λέγεται <τὸν> Ἀλέξανδρον ὡς ἔλαβε δῖψαι, καὶ φυγεῖν ἀποστραφέντα τοὺς πρέσβεις: τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἐδέξατο κομισθὲν ὑπὸ Φωκίωνος, τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀκούων ὅτι καὶ Φίλιππος ἐθαύμαζε τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, καὶ οὐ μόνον τὴν ἔντευξιν ὑπέμεινεν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν δέησιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμβουλεύοντος ἥκουσε. [17.7] συνεβούλευε δ' ὁ Φωκίων, εἰ μὲν ἡσυχίας ὀρέγεται, θέσθαι τὸν πόλεμον: εἰ δὲ δόξης, μεταθέσθαι, πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τραπόμενον; cf. Plut. *Dem.* 23.6; Diod. XVII 15.3–5.

28 Perhaps even officially renewed. According to one argument Alexander renewed not only the alliance that Philip arranged between Macedonia and the Greek states but also the common peace that members of the League of Corinth were obliged to swear: A. J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks: The Epigraphic Evidence* (Norman 1980) 3–26, esp. 19; Just. IX 5.4 (*symmachia*); *IG II²* 329 (renewal); *IG II²* 236 (common peace); [Dem.] 17 (terms of renewal). It is tempting to speculate that “the stele concerning the peace” (τ]ὴν στήλην τὴν περὶ τῆς εἰρ||ήνης), to which the newly proposed festival was attached, was Alexander's renewal itself. Cf. A. Tronson, “The Relevance of *IG II²* 329 to the Hellenic League of Alexander the Great”, *AncW* 12 (1985) 15–19, who dates *IG II²* 329 to the early 360s, associating it with a putative treaty between Alexander II of Macedon and Athens.