

THE PEACE OF CALLIAS: ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT

C. L. MURISON

THE PROBLEM of the so-called Peace of Callias claims the attention of most students of Athenian history in the fifth century B.C. at one time or another, and since the mid-1950's especially there has been a veritable spate of articles on this topic.¹ H. B. Mattingly has summed up the modern position succinctly: "Scholars seem unable either to leave the problem alone or to solve it satisfactorily."² One reason, perhaps, for the perennial attraction of this topic is that it is completely typical of the fifth century, and it is probably true to say of this period in general, and especially of the Pentecontaetia, that everything for which we do not possess unimpeachable and datable fifth-century evidence is suspect or, at best, floating in a sort of chronological limbo: our view of the period is today more fluid than it has been at any time in the present century.³ In this paper I propose to re-examine in chronological order the literary references to the Peace, since this is the only unequivocal evidence which exists: by this means we should be able to establish the correct historical context for it. And since the existing data for the Peace are of the fourth century in origin, I shall leave fifth-century considerations until later.⁴

¹R. Sealey, "The Peace of Callias Once More," *Historia* 3 (1955) 325-333; J. H. Oliver, "The Peace of Callias and the Pontic Expedition of Pericles," *Historia* 6 (1957) 254-255; R. Sealey, "Athens and the Archidamian War," *PACA* 1 (1958) 61-63; D. Stockton, "The Peace of Callias," *Historia* 8 (1959) 61-79; R. Sealey, "Theopompus and Athenian Lies," *JHS* 80 (1960) 194-195; A. Andrewes, "Thucydides and the Persians," *Historia* 10 (1961) 1-18; C. Habicht, "Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege," *Hermes* 89 (1961) 1-35; H. B. Mattingly, "The Athenian Coinage Decree," *Historia* 10 (1961) 161-162; R. Meiggs, "The Crisis of Athenian Imperialism," *HSCP* 67 (1963) 1-36; A. E. Raubitschek, "Treaties between Persia and Athens," *GRBS* 5 (1964) 151-159; K. Kraft, "Bemerkungen zu den Perserkriegen," *Hermes* 92 (1964) 158-171; H. B. Mattingly, "The Peace of Kallias," *Historia* 14 (1965) 271-281; S. K. Eddy, "On the Peace of Callias," *CP* 65 (1970) 8-14.

²H. B. Mattingly, "The Peace of Kallias," *Historia* 14 (1965) 271.

³Especially because of Mattingly's paper, "The Athenian Coinage Decree," *Historia* 10 (1961) 148-188; see also R. Meiggs (above, n. 1) 24-30, B. D. Meritt and H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Dating of Documents to the Mid-Fifth Century," *JHS* 82 (1962) 67-74 and 83 (1963) 100-117, and R. Meiggs, "The Dating of Fifth-Century Attic Inscriptions," *JHS* 86 (1966) 86-97.

⁴Among existing literary comments on the Peace I make no subsequent reference to either Aristodemus 13 or to the "Suda" s.vv. *Κάλλιας* and *Κίμων*: the remarks contained in both these works are not ascribable to any specific source; the works themselves are very late; and their comments are of no value for the analysis of data of the fourth century B.C. Furthermore, methodologically there is no point in counting scholarly heads or in appealing to some variant on the Law of Citations, such as: "That there was a treaty has long been the verdict of those writers most highly distinguished by common sense . . ." (A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* [London 1962] 564, n. 66.)

The earliest information about a Peace is in sections 118 and 120 of Isocrates' *Panegyricus* of ca. 380 B.C.⁵ In section 118 the position of the Persians at the time of Xerxes' invasion of Greece is contrasted with that obtaining later, when the Athenians laid waste their land and brought them to such a low condition ὥστε, μακρὸν πλοῖον ἐπὶ τάδε Φασήλιδος μὴ καθέλκειν, ἀλλ' ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς περιμένειν ἀλλὰ μὴ τῇ παρουσίᾳ δυνάμει πιστεύειν. The time when this happened is far from clear: the remark about laying waste Persian land may refer to the Eurymedon campaign, though there are, of course, other possibilities. What is especially striking, however, is that there is no suggestion of a Peace or even of any sort of agreement: the Persians simply did not bring ships west of Phaselis; instead, they remained quiet and waited for more favourable times—surely not the language which one would use to describe a formal Peace. If it is, τοὺς καιροὺς περιμένειν argues a singularly cynical view of treaty obligations.

However, section 120 does give a definite reference to συνθήκας; but beyond that, all is vague. No definite terms are given, and the only indication of date is τὰς ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενομένας, which could be almost any time in the fifth century. The remarks about the Athenians setting bounds to the Persian Empire and assigning tribute and keeping the King off the sea (presumably the Aegean is meant here primarily) could apply equally to the situation after the Eurymedon campaign and after Cimon's last expedition to Cyprus. The main impression left by section 120 is that Isocrates is painting an essentially rhetorical picture of the greatness and power of Athens vis-à-vis Persia in the "good old days," but that he has virtually no hard facts underlying it. It may even be that we are here seeing the actual concept of a Peace coming into being: such terms as might seem reasonable for an Athenian peace with Persia are quoted in an unsatisfactory context (118, above) while the Peace itself is mentioned only to provide oratorical ammunition against the King's Peace, and the vague details given are used to point a contrast between Athenian grandeur then and Persian arrogance now (τότε μὲν γὰρ ἡμεῖς . . . νῦν δ' ἐκέλευοι . . .); that is, they are more relevant to 387 B.C. than to anything in the fifth century.⁶

⁵I shall leave on one side for the present the comments made by Andocides in his speech *On the Peace with Sparta*, delivered in 391 B.C. (Andoc. 3.29), because, whatever he is referring to, it does not seem to be the "Peace of Callias"; see below, 24 ff.

⁶If this analysis is correct, the precise meaning of the phrase τῶν φόρων ἐνίοις τὰπτοντες is probably not important: it may well be as vague as the general context. However, there is perhaps a point of principle involved: if Athens was in a position to dictate to Persia the amount of tribute which Persia was to receive from her own subjects, then surely she was also in a position to dictate that there should be none. The Greek here means simply "assigning some of the tributes;" i.e., as G. Norlin translates (Loeb Edition), "Levying tribute on some of his subjects," as members now of the Delian symmachy; cf. H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Peace of Kallias," *Essays in Greek*

At this point we should consider the comments made by Plato in the *Menexenus* (241e–242a). The date of this work is uncertain—perhaps 386/367—and it is easy to make light of the evidence it affords.⁷ After mentioning the Eurymedon campaign, the expedition to Cyprus, and the Egyptian campaign, the author says *εἰρήνης δὲ γενομένης* and then goes on to mention the outbreak of war and the battle of Tanagra. In other words this peace, of which no details are given, is *subsequent* to 454 (and possibly 450) and *prior* to the outbreak of the first Peloponnesian War in 460! We may observe, however, that the order of events given in the *Menexenus* is the same as that found in Diodorus (11.71–80). Furthermore, Diodorus records that at the end of the Egyptian expedition (which he places in 460/459) a truce was made by the Persian generals Artabazus and Megabyzus whereby the Athenians were allowed to depart unharmed from Egypt (11.77.4–5). We may therefore conclude that Ephorus (Diodorus' source) and the author of the *Menexenus* are both using a tradition which included some sort of cessation of hostilities between Athens and Persia before the outbreak of the first Peloponnesian War⁸ (but not, apparently, as an immediate consequence of the Eurymedon campaign), and that source is presumably the *Atthis*.

The next reference to a Peace in chronological sequence is in section 80 of Isocrates' *Areopagiticus* of ca. 357 B.C.⁹ This is reminiscent of the first passage we examined in the *Panegyricus* (= Isoc. 4.118)—with the addition of the Halys River as the western limit for any Persian land advance; but again, it is a state of affairs without any time reference which appears to be described: "so far did the Persians refrain from interfering in Greek affairs . . . that they kept very quiet."

We now turn to Demosthenes' speech *On the Liberty of the Rhodians*, which was delivered, according to Jaeger, ca. 352 B.C.¹⁰ Section 29 refers to *συνθήκαι . . . διτταὶ* made by the Greeks with the King: no details of either are given, but we are told that everyone praises the one made by the Athenians, while everyone condemns the one made by the Spartans. We may note that apparently the Peace has become something of an ora-

History (Oxford 1958) 212–213 (hereafter, *Essays*); M. Cary, "The Peace of Callias," *CQ* 39 (1945) 87–91; *ATL* 3.275.

⁷Cf. R. Sealey, "The Peace of Callias Once More," *Historia* 3 (1955) 329; D. Stockton (above, n. 1) 61 reminds us that it may not be by Plato. Mattingly (above, n. 2) 276, n. 17 regards it as spurious. It is still, however, evidence for fourth-century ideas about the Peace.

⁸I thank M. J. Moscovich for drawing my attention to this possibility.

⁹For the date of Isoc. 7 (*Areopagiticus*) see W. Jaeger, *Athenian Studies presented to W. S. Ferguson* (= *HSCP* Suppl. Vol. 1. [Cambridge, Mass. 1940]) 409–450, esp. 433, 439.

¹⁰Dem. 15.29; cf. W. Jaeger, *Demosthenes* (Cambridge 1938) 230.

torical commonplace, but there are, as yet, very few details regarding date or terms in our sources. We are entitled to ask why this should be.

The problems raised by the version of events given in Plutarch's *Cimon* 13.4–5 are considerable. After a long and detailed account of the Eurymedon campaign, Plutarch gives us details of the famous (περιβόητος) peace, which he definitely sees as a consequence of the Eurymedon campaign.¹¹ However, Plutarch's chronological indications are not sufficiently precise that we must understand him to say that the Peace was an *immediate* consequence of the victory; we should probably therefore be justified in concluding that any date in the 460's after ca. 467 would satisfy Plutarch's indications.

The terms of the Peace are given in summary form: the King is to stay one day's horse-ride away from the Aegean coast of Asia Minor and to keep his warships east of the Cyanean and Chelidonian Islands.¹²

Plutarch then tells us that Callisthenes denied the existence of an agreement *in these terms*—Καλλισθένης οὐ φησι ταῦτα συνθέσθαι τὸν βάρβαρον.¹³ We must insist on precise translation here: “and indeed Callisthenes says that the barbarian did not make *such an agreement*”—ταῦτα does not equal τοιαῦτα—will not do.¹⁴ Nor will “. . . Callisthenes denies that the Barbarian made *any such terms*”—ταῦτα does not equal τοιαῦτά τινα either.¹⁵ We must realise that Plutarch is here recording Callisthenes' dissent from *these precise terms*.

From Plutarch's remarks it is clear, then, that Callisthenes favoured a *de facto* type of peace (see below, p. 28 and n. 62), and that he too regarded it as coming about because of the Eurymedon campaign. Thus his reference to a naval expedition led by Ephialtes makes perfectly good sense within the context of the 460's, and in fact gives us a *terminus ante quem* of 462/461, the year of Ephialtes' death, for the *de facto* Peace which he envisages.

We should now consider the date and context of Callisthenes' remarks, and here we must admit that we have only guesswork to guide us. It is often assumed that these comments come from the opening section of the *Hellenica*, where there was either a summary of Graeco-Persian relations down to the Peace of Antalcidas, in the manner of Thucydides' Pente-

¹¹Plut. *Cim.* 13.4: τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον (=Eurymedon) οὕτως ἐταπείνωσε τὴν γνώμην τοῦ βασιλέως, ὥστε συνθέσθαι As for the date of the Eurymedon campaign, I simply accept the traditional “ca. 467.”

¹²If we assume that there really was a “Peace of Callias” we should expect there to have been both northern and southern sea-limits; accordingly, I take Κυνάεων to refer to the Blue Rocks near the mouth of the Bosphorus, a point well argued by J. H. Oliver (above, n. 1) 254–255.

¹³Plut. *Cim.* 13.4.

¹⁴W. R. Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens* (Washington, D.C. 1968) 84.

¹⁵B. Perrin, *Cim.* 13.5 (Loeb Edition).

contaetia digression, or else there was a comparison between Graeco-Persian relations in 387 and those of the mid-fifth century.¹⁶ These are certainly attractive suggestions, and they make good, logical sense, but there is not a wisp of evidence to support them. Both Jacoby and Wade-Gery further assume that it was under the influence of Theopompus' criticism of the Peace (see below, pp. 22–24) that Callisthenes denied its formal existence, but without, as Jacoby observes, Theopompus' anti-Athenian prejudice.¹⁷ In other words, Theopompus attacked the Peace, and Callisthenes replied that perhaps there was no peace but that this in no way detracted from the greatness of Athens' achievement. But there is simply no reason to connect Theopompus and Callisthenes, since there is no evidence that Theopompus' arguments against the Peace were known at the time when the *Hellenica* was written.¹⁸ This led Schwartz to argue that Callisthenes' comments on the Peace do not come from the beginning of the *Hellenica* but from some later work, perhaps the Alexander history.¹⁹ For the present, then, we can conclude that while the *Hellenica*, written between ca. 343 and ca. 335, seems the most likely source for Callisthenes' remarks about the Peace, we have no reason to connect these with Theopompus' denial of the Peace.

To return to Plutarch—we note that at *Cim* 13.5 he says, “But in the collection of decrees which Craterus made, there is duly ranged a copy of the treaty, which he accepted as genuine.” Plutarch presumably saw the text of this treaty in his copy of Craterus.²⁰ If Plutarch was able to refer to the collection, it is surely possible, if not probable, that in summarizing the terms of the treaty he would use Craterus' text as a source. This would then mean that at *Cim*. 13.4–5 the Callisthenes section is a sort of parenthesis or footnote. Structurally, this seems wholly unexceptionable: Plutarch first summarizes the treaty; he then says, “And yet Callisthenes denies these terms,” and finishes by saying, “But Craterus quotes the

¹⁶For details of the scope of the *Hellenica*, see *FGrHist* 124 T 27; for the context of F 16, see Jacoby *ad loc*; cf. Wade-Gery, *Essays* 202–205; W. R. Connor (above, n. 14) 86.

¹⁷*FGrHist* 115 (Commentary on F 153–155).

¹⁸As to the date of the *Hellenica*, L. Pearson's conclusion that it was published before 334 seems unexceptionable (*The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* [APA Monographs 20, Cleveland, 1960] 29); it seems equally possible, however, to accept Jacoby's estimate that the work was written between ca. 343/342 and ca. 335 (*FGrHist* 124 [Commentary on F 8–13]). In his introductory comments on Ephorus Jacoby seems to indicate that a writing period of 343 to 338 is possible for Callisthenes' *Hellenica* (*FGrHist* 70 [Commentary, 24]). For Theopompus' writing date see below, n. 40.

¹⁹E. Schwartz, “Kallisthenes Hellenika,” *Hermes* 35 (1900) 109; Connor (above, n. 14) 86 points out that there may also have been a work of Callisthenes dealing with embassies, which might provide a possible context for a denial of a formal Peace of Callias; however, this is extremely dubious: cf. Pearson (above, n. 18) 29.

²⁰The date of Craterus' collection, while not clear, is almost certainly later than 300 B.C., and is not important for this discussion.

treaty and regards it as genuine.” This then means that what Sealey has called “Protocallisthenes”²¹ is in fact a decree of the Athenian people, which was presumably set up in public, and set up before Callisthenes voiced his objections to it; and as we have seen, the earliest suggested date for Callisthenes’ remarks is ca. 343/342.

That we may be correct in assuming that “Protocallisthenes” is a stele set up in Athens some time before ca. 343 perhaps receives confirmation from the next datable reference to a Peace, in Demosthenes’ *De Falsa Legatione*, delivered in the late summer of 343.²² Demosthenes begins by saying that he is sure the Athenian people remember the story of how their forefathers had almost put Callias the son of Hipponicus to death because he had apparently taken bribes while serving on an embassy. And then, as if to remind people of who this Callias was (which surely accords ill with *ὡς ἅπαντες εὖ οἶδ’ ὅτι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἀκηκόατε*), he gives a concise summary of the terms of the Peace “praised by everyone” which Callias made: the King is not to bring his army within the distance of a day’s horseback ride of the coast, and he is not to bring warships west of the Chelidonian and Cyanean Islands.

Demosthenes gives us no indication of when this Peace was made, but we now for the first time have a reference to Callias, the son of Hipponicus, as its negotiator. Furthermore, the details given by Demosthenes agree exactly with those given in the decree to which Callisthenes objected. We must also note the context in which Demosthenes’ mention of the Peace occurs: this speech, a vicious attack on Aeschines, had a vast array of supporting documentation, with about thirty-five official documents read in court.²³ It will be apparent that Demosthenes has been doing his homework, presumably in the state archives, and therefore that if there were official terms for the Peace of Callias, we may reasonably expect him to know them. The actual document is not read out verbatim, as it is not strictly relevant to the matter at hand.²⁴ Instead, since it provides Demosthenes with a useful illustration, he gives its main terms as Plutarch does. That the two are almost the same is most unlikely to be an accident.

The next literary reference to a Peace is to be found in the *Panathenaicus* of Isocrates, which was started in 342 and completed and issued in 339, when Isocrates was ninety-seven years of age. It is a rather diffuse

²¹Sealey (above, n. 7) 329.

²²Dem. 19.273.

²³These include letters from Philip, depositions on oath, official records, oracular responses received by the State, a formal and official oath, a resolution of the Boule, a treaty, a convention, decrees of the Amphictyonic Council, ten decrees of the Ecclesia, and the text of one official inscription set up in public.

²⁴If it had been, it would have been lost to us completely, since none of the supporting documents survives.

work and shows that, at the last, Isocrates was becoming somewhat decrepit; and it is here that he makes his third and final reference to an Athenian peace with Persia.²⁵ The way in which this Peace is mentioned is reminiscent of the *Panegyricus*:²⁶ Isocrates first of all describes a *state of affairs*—"the barbarians were not allowed to bring an army west of the Halys nor to sail west of Phaselis"—and there is a vague indication of the fifth century as the time when this was so: ἐπὶ . . . τῆς ἡμετέρας δυναστείας. Then in section 60 Isocrates speaks of (τὴν πόλιν) . . . τὴν δὲ καὶ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς πρὸς βασιλέα γενναιοτέρας καὶ μεγαλοφρονεστέρας ποιησαμένην, thus making reference to a definite agreement between Athens and Persia. It looks very much as if this section of the *Panathenaicus* is a scissors-and-paste job, produced by taking the basic structure of the *Panegyricus* references, and adding the Halys boundary detail from the *Areopagiticus* passage. Gomme is perhaps a little harsh when he says of Isocrates, "Who ever looked to him for accuracy?"²⁷ but he is probably not far from the truth, in this specific case at least.

Before we move on to the last clearly datable reference to a Peace in a fourth-century author, this may be an appropriate place to consider the remarks about a Peace made in Book 12 of Diodorus.²⁸ Diodorus tells us that King Artaxerxes, after learning of the defeats suffered in Cyprus at Cimon's hands (the year is 449/448, the archonship of Pedieus), and after taking the advice of his friends, decided that a peace with the Greeks would be advantageous. He sent written terms to his generals and satraps in the west; Artabazus and Megabyzus sent ambassadors to Athens to discuss a settlement; the Athenians were agreeable, and they sent Callias, the son of Hipponicus, and so a Peace was made. The terms given by Diodorus differ from what we have seen in any one source hitherto: we still have the Cyanean Islands in the north, but instead of the Chelidonian Islands in the South we find Phaselis, which has consistently been Isocrates' westernmost limit for Persian naval activity. On land we find that the western limit for the Persians is described as a three days' journey from the sea. This is different from the "one day's horseback ride from the coast" which we saw in "Protocallisthenes", in the Plutarch passage, and in Demosthenes, *De Falsa Legatione*.²⁹ If we are to go on asserting that "Protocallisthenes" is really the "official" version of the Peace, we must account for the variations with which we are now confronted.

²⁵Isoc. 12.59–61.

²⁶See above, 13.

²⁷A. W. Gomme, "Some Notes on Fifth-Century History," *JHS* 50 (1930) 105.

²⁸There are two passages: Diod. 12.2.1 is a general comment, consisting of part of the introduction to Book 12, while 12.4.4–6 gives the most detailed account of a Peace which we possess.

²⁹Plut. *Cim.* 13.4; Dem. 19.273.

We must first ask who is Diodorus' principal source. There is general agreement that for Books 11–16 of his history this was Ephorus of Cyme, who wrote a Universal History in almost thirty books covering the period from the return of the Heracleidae down to the reign of Philip of Macedon.³⁰ It seems probable that Ephorus died ca. 330 with the history incomplete. His son Demophilus then added an account of the Sacred War of 357/346.³¹ Again, it seems to be generally accepted that Ephorus wrote the greater part of his history after 350.³² An examination of the fragments in Jacoby makes it appear likely that the original of the passages in Diodorus under consideration came from either Book 11 or Book 13 of Ephorus. (Book 12 seems to have dealt with Sicily.) It is difficult to gain any precise idea of when these books were written, but from ancient testimony (T 17 Jacoby) it is clear that for the portion of his history dealing with events after 387 Ephorus used the *Hellenica* of Callisthenes, and from the fragments of Ephorus we can see that he covered events from 387 in Books 20 ff. of his history. From this we can obtain a rough indication of when Ephorus was writing: if he had reached Book 20 by about 338 or shortly after, we can conclude that his account of the Pentecontaetia was written between about 345 and 340.

At this point in our discussion, before we consider in detail the reasons for the variations in the terms of the Peace as reported by our sources, it will be convenient to add the information contained in Lycurgus' speech *In Leocratem*, which is now firmly dated to 331.³³ Here there is a reference to the Eurymedon campaign. This is immediately followed by: "They sailed round the whole of Asia, laying it waste." This may refer to Cimon's last campaign, though the matter is quite opaque. This in turn is followed by a remark about "the trophy at Salamis," and after this comes a reference to "fixing bounds for the barbarians regarding the freedom of Greece," and the making of an agreement. It is not clear from this when Lycurgus thought the Peace was made: if anything, perhaps after the Eurymedon campaign, but again the matter is decidedly vague. What is noteworthy, however, is that the terms of the Peace are quite definite: no land limits are mentioned, to be sure, but there is a reference to autonomy for the Greeks, and the sea limits for the westward movement of Persian warships are the Cyanean Islands in the north and Phaselis in the south. These terms, at least, are the same as the ones given by Diodorus (i.e., Ephorus) in the passage we considered above. And we must ask

³⁰*FGrHist* 70 (Commentary, 32–33 [with bibliography]; cf. the commentary on F 191); A. W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford 1945) 51–54.

³¹*FGrHist* 70 T 9, 10; cf. *FGrHist* 70 (Commentary, 24–25, 28–30).

³²*FGrHist* 70 (Commentary, 24); A. Lesky, *History of Greek Literature* (London 1966) 626–627.

³³Lycurg. *Leoc.* 72–73; cf. Wade-Gery, *Essays* 205, and F. Durrbach, *Lycurge: Contre Léocrate* (Éd. Budé [Paris 1956]) 25.

ourselves if one used the other, and, if so, which came first. In this connection we should note that Diodorus at 11.29.3 gives the text of the Greek oath before Plataea (again presumably from Ephorus), and that this is almost word for word the same at Lycurg. *Leoc.* 81. The speech against Leocrates, as we have seen, can be dated to 331. Ephorus, as we have also seen, probably wrote his account of the Pentecontaetia between about 345 and 340. Therefore, if Lycurgus used a literary source, it is a reasonable conclusion that he used Ephorus.³⁴

If we draw a few threads together now, we see that "Protocallisthenes" and Demosthenes agree in giving a one day's horse ride from the sea as a land limit, and the Cyanean and Chelidonian Islands as sea limits, while Diodorus/Ephorus and Lycurgus agree on an autonomy clause, and the Cyanean islands and Phaselis as sea limits; furthermore, Diodorus/Ephorus gives the land limit as a three days' journey on foot from the sea.

These discrepancies are certainly strange if there was an inscription set up in public for all to see. But perhaps they are not as crucial as they may at first appear to be. Plutarch in citing "Protocallisthenes" gives a very summary account, as does Demosthenes in the *De Falsa Legatione*. However, the geographical limits which they give for the power of the Persian King may be taken as at least implying the autonomy clause: in other words, its omission in "Protocallisthenes" and Demosthenes is not serious. As for the land limit, the "Protocallisthenes" statement is capable of misinterpretation; after all, one may legitimately ask what a *ἵππου δρόμος* is. Demosthenes has kept the phrase, but has added *ἡμέρας* and *πεζῇ* to it by way of explanation. Presumably, then, he interprets the phrase to mean "not to come closer to the sea *by land* than the distance a horse can travel in a day"; but *πεζῇ* can also mean "on foot," and the expression "a one day's horse ride on foot" is almost an oxymoron. Ephorus' version, "a three day's journey," is therefore probably designed as a variation, perhaps even to clarify Demosthenes, since the *De Falsa Legatione* was produced very close to the time when, as we have seen, Ephorus may have been working on his account of the Pentecontaetia. It is a pity that he did not have *πεζῇ*, like Demosthenes. At any rate, the difference here is probably non-essential, and we may recall the observation of Meiggs: "Where Ephorus (Diodorus) disagrees with Thucydides about the numbers of troops engaged in campaigns of the Peloponnesian War, it is likely that he had no independent sources but indulged an arbitrary and superficial striving after originality."³⁵ Here we have something con-

³⁴It is worth noting in passing Wade-Gery's comment on the Greek oath: "... no doubt both [Lycurgus and Diodorus] have it from Ephorus, since it is in ripe fourth-century style (e.g., no hiatus . . .)" (*Essays* 205, n. 1). Almost the same can be said of the terms of the Peace as given by Diodorus.

³⁵R. Meiggs, review of *ATL* 3, *CR* 66 (1952) 98, quoted by Sealey (above, n. 7) 331, n. 2.

siderably less serious, since, although the form of the expression is changed, the essential meaning remains the same. And the same thing holds with the sea limits; as a literary artist and *as a pupil of Isocrates*,³⁶ Ephorus presumably studied the works of his teacher. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to assume that he knew that Isocrates had twice given the sea-limit as Phaselis, and there was no reason for not retaining the name as an elegant variation on the Chelidonian Islands; and it may have been attractive to Ephorus for the very reason that it was different from the version of "Protocallisthenes"—and of Demosthenes.³⁷

It is, therefore, quite possible that "Protocallisthenes" and Demosthenes on the one hand, and Ephorus and Lycurgus on the other, all represent essentially the same tradition, at least as far as the *terms* of the Peace are concerned. Where there is not agreement is on the question of *when* this Peace occurred. "Protocallisthenes" was understood by both Plutarch and Callisthenes to be referring to some time after the Eurymedon campaign. The author of the *Menexenus* thought that the Peace came after the end of the Egyptian adventure and before the beginning of the first Peloponnesian War. Demosthenes gives no indication of when the Peace came about, but he does mention Callias. Ephorus mentions Callias, and dates the Peace firmly to 449/448. Lycurgus, finally, is vague about the date, and may possibly think that the Peace was a result of the Eurymedon campaign.

We should also remember that Demosthenes' statement in 343/342 is the first datable reference to a Peace of Callias, and that "Protocallisthenes" must precede Callisthenes, who was writing probably sometime fairly soon after 343. On the other hand, Isocrates in ca. 380 is vague in his first mention of a Peace; in ca. 357 he is also vague; his last reference to a Peace belongs to 342–339. More significantly, in 352 Demosthenes too is vague about the Peace. From this, then, it would seem to be a reasonable conclusion that the Peace was published sometime between 352 and 343/342; that is, the stele was set up within this period.

Again, since Plutarch was able to infer from what we have concluded was the original decree in Craterus' collection that the treaty was a

³⁶*FGH Hist* 70 T 1–5, 8, 24, 27.

³⁷It will be clear that there is no substantive difference between *ἐν τῷ . . . Χελιδονίων* (Dem. 19.273) and *ἐπὶ τὰδε Φασήλιδος* (Isoc. 7.80), if we remember that at Phaselis the coastline runs practically due north-south, and that, as a consequence, if one is going to come "this side of Phaselis" in a ship, one has to come west of the Chelidonian Islands. We may also note that "Protocallisthenes," Demosthenes, and Ephorus agree on the Cyanean Islands as the other sea-limit, thus confirming our belief that they are not an alternative to the Chelidonian Islands as a southern sea-limit (certainly nowhere else is there any suggestion of alternatives in our sources), but do indeed represent the rocks at the mouth of the Bosphorus (see above, n. 12). Wade-Gery ultimately withdrew his theory of a demilitarized zone at sea: cf. *Essays* 214–215 with B. D. Meritt and H. T. Wade-Gery (above, n. 3) 107, n. 44.

consequence of the Eurymedon campaign, and since Callisthenes objected to a formal Peace of the same period, we may assume that the decree itself contained no precise date; certainly, it would be reasonable to assume that it followed a major Athenian success, and the Eurymedon victories were quite the biggest after 479. Ephorus, from his studies in the fifth century,³⁸ realised that any peace after the Eurymedon victories could have lasted only a few years at best, and so he dated the Peace firmly to the period immediately after Cimon's death, when fighting did indeed die down. Callisthenes knew of two naval expeditions subsequent to the Eurymedon campaign,³⁹ and deduced from these that there was no formal peace, but only a *de facto* situation.

The question of when our fourth-century sources thought the Peace occurred leads us to another problem, which involves principally the historian Theopompus. By way of introduction to this we may notice that in Diodorus' account of the Peace there occurs the phrase *τὴν χώραν, ἧς βασιλεὺς Ἀρταξέρξης ἄρχει* (Diod. 12.4.5). Artaxerxes I ruled from 465 till 424, so any of the possible dates for the Peace of Callias which we have hitherto mentioned could easily fall within his reign. But if the stele on display in Athens gave no precise indication of a date for the Peace, we may perhaps think it unlikely that it would mention a specific king, and we must at least be aware of the possibility that, if the treaty had said *χώραν, ἧς βασιλεὺς ἄρχει*, Ephorus might have added the *Ἀρταξέρξης*, or Diodorus might have, or some reader might have, as a marginal gloss, which subsequently found its way into the text.

With this in mind we now turn to Theopompus' objections to the stele which was set up in Athens giving the details of the Peace.⁴⁰ In F 153 (Jacoby) the crucial words are *αἱ πρὸς βασιλέα Δαρείον Ἀθηναίων πρὸς Ἑλλήνας συνθήκαι*. To translate these words as they stand, and make sense, is very difficult indeed. Raubitschek made an attempt recently,⁴¹ and he argues that Theopompus is here contrasting the stern oath that was made "before the battle against the barbarians" (*πρὸ τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐν Πλαταιαῖς πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους*) with "the treaty which was made with Dareios against

³⁸We should remember that he was the only one of the sources under consideration who actually wrote an account of the Pentecontaetia.

³⁹Wade-Gery argues that the dates of these two naval expeditions are widely separated (*Essays* 203, n. 2).

⁴⁰*FGH Hist* 115 F 153–154 (from Book 25 of the *Philippica*). For the date of composition of these fragments see Connor (above, n. 14) 4–5, and especially 163, n. 53: the conclusion reached is that a date later than 340 is more likely than an earlier one. Connor also suggests that Theopompus may have been criticizing someone who recounted both the Plataea oath and the Peace, and argues that Ephorus would be a good candidate: "His history probably appeared around 340, and is likely to have included both incidents" (*op. cit.* 171, n. 20).

⁴¹A. E. Raubitschek (above, n. 1) 158.

the Greeks"; he also argues that the falsehood (*καταψεύδεται*) which Theopompus castigates has nothing to do with fabricated documents, but with the Athenians' attitude towards the Persians: in short, the Hellenic patriotism and sincerity of the Athenians are challenged. This certainly brings to our attention one of the principal problems in any consideration of Theopompus' attitude to the Peace, the degree of denial implied by the word *καταψεύδεται*.⁴² However, that a Greek would have used the word *πρός* twice in the same clause with wholly different meanings as Raubitschek does—"with Dareios against the Greeks"—seems quite improbable. So there is reason to suspect corruption, and this makes even the mildest attempt at objective argumentation almost impossible.⁴³ One point, however, should be noted: Spengel excised *Δαρείον*. Connor objects vehemently to this on the grounds that if Theopompus' text attacked a peace with Darius we have no right to assume that this is corrupt simply because it does not conform to our preconceptions.⁴⁴ Of course, Connor is quite right here. But can we be certain of *Δαρείον* in a passage which bears obvious signs of corruption? Perhaps Theopompus wrote *πρός βασιλέα*, and Theon the rhetor (second century A.D.), who is the source of this fragment of Theopompus, may have added *Δαρείον* by way of erroneous explanation, or someone else may have added it in the course of the transmission of the text.⁴⁵

In F 154 (Jacoby) we have what was at least part of Theopompus' objections to the Peace displayed in Athens.⁴⁶ Connor's translation of this fragment is: "Theopompus says in the twenty-fifth book of the *Philippica* that the treaty with the barbarian has been misrepresented since it is carved not in Attic letters but in Ionic ones."⁴⁷ The major difficulty here lies in the word *έσκευωρήσθαι*, which could mean anything from partial to total falsification. Connor's "has been misrepresented," then, is appropriately cautious. Theopompus (F 155 Jacoby) is our source for the information that the official changeover from Attic to Ionic script came in

⁴²While it is possible that the meaning of *καταψεύδεται* could range from dissatisfaction with some points of detail all the way to outright denial, the latter would certainly seem to be the more natural meaning of the word.

⁴³Emendations here are legion; see Connor (above, n. 14) 78 for a full *apparatus*.

⁴⁴Connor (above, n. 14) 80.

⁴⁵Wade-Gery (*Essays* 206) asserts that Theopompus did indeed write *Δαρείον*, that the Peace which he attacked was one made in 424/423 with Darius II, and that it is this Peace to which the orator Andocides referred in 391 B.C. in his speech *On the Peace with Sparta* (see below, 24 ff.).

⁴⁶*FGH Hist* 115 F 154 (=Harpocration s.v. 'Αττικοῖς γράμμασιν): I here quote Connor's text (above, n. 14) 89, since there are several textual difficulties. These do not, however, affect the general sense of the passage: Θεόπομπος δ' ἐν τῇ κε τῶν Φιλιππικῶν έσκευωρήσθαι λέγει τὰς πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον συνθήκας, (ὥς) οὐκ 'Αττικοῖς γράμμασιν έστηλίτευνται, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῶν 'Ιώνων.

⁴⁷Connor (above, n. 14) 91.

the archonship of Euclides (403/402), and his rejection of the stele displayed in Athens has given rise to elaborate hypotheses from supporters of a Peace (or Peaces) who would seek to explain precisely what it was that Theopompus saw.⁴⁸ We need not be much impressed by these tales, since they are all predicated upon the proposition that Theopompus was, in research at least, incompetent, if not a complete fool. It is, perhaps, necessary to remind ourselves that a Lexicon entry pertaining specifically to Attic letters is not likely to contain all of an historian's objections to something as important and complex as a peace treaty with Persia. Similarly, an historian attacking τὴν ὑπο πάντων θρυλουμένην εἰρήνην (Dem. 19.273) is not going to fail to read beyond the top line of a stele, or omit to look at the back of it, and so miss an earlier treaty inscribed there. Surely Theopompus' point is an elementary one, perhaps almost a prolegomenon to his main argument, and a warning to people who might subsequently be inclined to think that the stele on display in Athens was an original. Of course, even if the stele was inscribed at about the time of the Peace of Antalcidas or even as late as 343, this does not in itself mean that the Peace it described was a fraud: documents can be copied and re-published, and an objection based on letter forms can be cogent only if the actual stele was naively represented as being a fifth-century original. On the other hand, we are entitled to be suspicious if no one shows any sign of familiarity with the "original" at any time prior to the production of the "copy."

We should now turn to Andocides' speech *On the Peace with Sparta*, and the question of the so-called "Peace of Epilycus."⁴⁹ This speech was delivered in 391 B.C., and yet it is riddled with obvious errors concerning Athenian history during the preceding sixty years.⁵⁰ The five-year Peace of (probably) 451 is called a fifty-year peace, with an actual duration of thirteen years, and it was, according to Andocides, negotiated by Miltiades! The Euboean revolt of 446 is placed in 450, and the fortification of the Peiraeus, the work of Themistocles, is assigned to the period of this "fifty year peace." As Stockton observes: "... it says much for the ignorance of his Athenian audience that he can expect to get away with it." In chapter 29 of this speech Andocides tells his audience that peace was made with the Great King, and also a treaty of friendship for all time, and that all this was due to the diplomacy of his maternal uncle Epilycus;

⁴⁸For example, Wade-Gery, *Essays* 205; *ATL* 3.275-277.

⁴⁹Andoc. 3.29. The name "Peace of Epilycus" is applied to the treaty he describes, because Epilycus is the only one of the envoys whose name is mentioned. See Sealey (above, n. 7) 328.

⁵⁰Cf. D. Stockton (above, n. 1) 72-73 and A. Andrewes (above, n. 1) 2. And yet, in spite of his efforts to impress upon his Athenian audience the benefits of various peace treaties, Andocides makes no mention of a "Peace of Callias;" perhaps he had never heard of it: see Stockton (above, n. 1) 68.

but subsequently Athens threw everything away and became involved in the revolt of Amorges, which led to an alliance between Persia and Sparta, and so to Athens' ultimate downfall.

We may note that an everlasting friendship is arranged here (*φιλίαν εἰς τὸν ἀπαντα χρόνον*), and we may also note that no other details of the Peace are given except that it existed. We are not even given a date for this except that it was before Athenian involvement in the Amorges revolt, which is usually dated to ca. 414.⁵¹ Is this what Theopompus was referring to with his *αἱ πρὸς βασιλέα Δαρείου . . . συνθήκαι* (F 153 Jacoby)? In the paper mentioned above⁵² H. B. Mattingly argues that the Peace referred to by Andocides, which is usually dated to 424/423, was a reality, that it was an "eternal" alliance, as Andocides claimed, that the Persian king would as a consequence simply have been called *βασιλεύς*, without any further name, that the heading of the inscription set up in Athens would have contained no archon's name or secretary dating, and that therefore later Greeks would have had almost as much difficulty as we have today in dating documents with similarly unhelpful prescripts. He then argues that all we hear in fourth-century sources about a "Peace of Callias" really relates to the Peace of 424/423.⁵³ This is extremely ingenious, since there is now no need to explain all the objections that have been raised to a Peace of ca. 450—such things as the silence of Herodotus, and of Thucydides in Book 1, and the various Athenian "breaches" of the putative terms of the "Peace." It also explains the involvement of the satrap Pisouthnes in the Samian revolt in 440/439 (Thuc. 1.115.4), and the remark of the Mytilenean ambassadors to Olympia in 428, who complained of the Athenians *τῇν . . . τοῦ Μήδου ἐχθραν ἀνιέντας* (Thuc. 3.10.4), which is obviously a strange way to describe the making of a formal Peace. Instead, Mattingly accepts that warfare petered out between Athens and Persia ca. 450 and that there were only minor incidents thereafter down to 424/423, when a formal treaty was made with Persia, and limits to Persian naval and land advances were set. However, let us be quite clear: this theory ultimately depends on Mattingly's acceptance of the fact that Andocides is telling us the plain, unvarnished, truth when he describes the activities of his uncle; furthermore, if we accept this, we must also be aware that we are rating Andocides more highly as a source than Thucydides. Thucydides (4.50) mentions an Athenian embassy sent to Persia in 425/424 which reached Ephesus and then turned back on hearing of the death of Artaxerxes, but

⁵¹Cf. Wade-Gery, *Essays* 222: "... not later, and perhaps not much earlier, than 414"; Andrewes (above, n. 1) 4: "... one might guess from Thucydides 8.5.5 that Athens' support of it began not too long before winter 413/412."

⁵²Mattingly (above, n. 2) 271–281.

⁵³Mattingly (above, n. 2) 277.

he makes no mention of any peace in 424/423.⁵⁴ This silence must make its historicity extremely doubtful.

We can now turn to what may actually have happened both between Athens and Persia during the Pentecontaetia and within Athens during the fourth century. We should begin with the famous passage in Herodotus concerning an Athenian embassy to Susa led by Callias, son of Hipponicus (7.151–152). This occurred during Artaxerxes' reign, and is described as happening many years after Xerxes' invasion of Greece. At the same time there was an Argive embassy seeking reassurance as to the continuance of the friendship with Persia which had existed during the reign of Xerxes. Herodotus goes on to say that he cannot vouch for the authenticity of the story of the Argive embassy; he does not, however, cast any such doubt on the authenticity of the Callias embassy; furthermore, he is quite uninformative about its purpose (*ἐτέρου πρήγματος εἵνεκα*). The important thing here is that if the Argive embassy really took place, then it took place at the same time as the Callias embassy. The wording of Herodotus' Argive story seems to imply that that embassy took place soon after Artaxerxes' accession, and Walker's conclusion that the most suitable date would seem to be ca. 462–460 still appears cogent.⁵⁵ As Gomme somewhat stiffly pointed out: "All that Mr Walker leaves us with is, in 461 an embassy with no result (for war began again in 459), and in 449 a result, the cessation of hostilities, but no embassy."⁵⁶ In my view, this is absolutely correct, and we should remember that this is

⁵⁴On this point Mattingly (above, n. 2) 277 cites Andrewes' paper (above, n. 1). Andrewes argues that, as regards relations with Persia, there is a major hiatus in Thucydides, stretching from 4.50 to 8.5, and that what follows 8.5 with regard to Persia is only a stop-gap, which would have been removed, or at least altered, after events subsequent to 425/424 were fully worked up and incorporated in the revised history, since it was only after the war in Ionia was well under way that Thucydides came to realise the importance of the Amorges revolt and Athens' involvement in it. Inadequate as Thuc. 4.50–8.5 may be on relations with Persia, it is still difficult to see why Andrewes says: "... I am tempted to follow the hint that he found no difficulty in recording incidents down to 424 but somehow balked at recording an actual peace in 423" (*loc. cit.* 15).

The logic of the argument about Thucydides' late understanding of the importance of the Amorges revolt can be illustrated from another example: Andocides (3.30) tells of an embassy which came from Syracuse seeking Athenian friendship, apparently not long before the Sicilian expedition. This, like his account of the "Peace of Epilycus," is not to be found in Thucydides. Are we to assume that, because Thucydides wrote Books 6–7 of his history fairly soon after the failure of the Sicilian expedition, he omitted to mention this embassy, or balked at mentioning it, because he had not yet realised the importance of that expedition? A more judicious conclusion would surely be that Thucydides records neither the "Peace of Epilycus" nor the Syracusan embassy because he found no evidence of either ever having occurred.

⁵⁵E. M. Walker in *CAH* 5.470; see below, n. 59.

⁵⁶A. W. Gomme (above, n. 27) 106.

the only Athenian embassy reaching Susa during the Pentecontaetia for which we have unimpeachable fifth-century evidence.⁵⁷

Raubitschek has argued that the Alcmaeonidae always tended to favour the idea of friendship with Persia, and that this was a tradition which continued all the way down to Alcibiades.⁵⁸ If it is put no more strongly than this, such a view appears unexceptionable. It would seem, therefore, quite reasonable that, immediately after the ostracism of Cimon and the assassination of Ephialtes, at a time when there was a distinct surge of anti-Spartan feeling in Athens, Pericles should make peace overtures to Persia.⁵⁹ The Eurymedon campaign was still fresh in people's minds, there was a new king in Susa, and Athens, not yet the imperial power she was to become, no doubt felt that she was negotiating from a position of strength. Clearly, she was rebuffed;⁶⁰ and modern

⁵⁷That there were other embassies travelling between Athens and Persia cannot be doubted: see Ar. *Ach.* 61 ff., which depicts an Athenian embassy sent to Persia in 437/436 and returning to Athens only in 425. This is obviously intended to be comic, and there is unlikely to be any reference to a *specific* embassy, *pace* Mattingly (above, n. 3) 162, n. 64. For the embassy (or embassies) of Ppyrilampes see Pl. *Chrm.* 158; however, it is not clear whether Ppyrilampes really was a friend of Pericles or not: cf. Plut. *Per.* 13.15 with *Vita Anon. Thuc.* 6; in general, see Kirch *PA* 12493.

⁵⁸A. E. Raubitschek (above, n. 1) 152–154, 157.

⁵⁹S. K. Eddy (above, n. 1) 10–11 argues that the overtures to Persia came in 464/463, and mentions as reasons for Athens' wishing to negotiate at that particular time the strong bargaining position created by the victory at the Eurymedon, the increasing reluctance of members of the Delian League to continue to furnish ships, the revolt of Thasos, and a suspicion that Sparta might assist Thasos in that revolt. The first two points could apply to any date in the 460's; the last point, based on Thuc. 1.101.1–2, is tendentious: cf. Walker's discussion, *CAH* 5.72 and Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 *ad loc.*, 407. Eddy also suggests that ca. 463 Argos was interested in knowing the King's attitude towards her "projected" alliance with Athens: Thucydides, however, implies strongly (1.102.4) that the Athenian alliance with Argos was an immediate and direct result of the dismissal from Ithome. Surely Athens could find no more signal way in which to indicate the nature of the breach between herself and Sparta and the total collapse of the anti-Persian alliance, than by making peace overtures to Persia? Equally, such a major shift in Athenian policy would tend to presuppose a change of government, and again Walker's date suits the occasion better than Eddy's.

⁶⁰The curiously mixed reports we receive about the treatment received by Callias, son of Hipponicus, from the Athenians may be relevant here; the story of his being almost put to death and then fined fifty talents for taking bribes while serving on an embassy (Dem. 19.273; see above, 17) may belong to this embassy to Susa. On the other hand, Pausanias tells us (1.8.2) that there was a statue of Callias beside the statue of Peace; Plutarch (*Cim.* 13.5) has a slightly different story: on account of the peace the Athenians erected an altar to Peace and honoured Callias the negotiator of the peace exceedingly. The Pausanias and Plutarch stories look like variant versions of the same thing, and we should remember that Callias was one of the two envoys sent to Sparta to negotiate the Thirty-Year Peace (Diod. 12.7); when the "Peace" with Persia came to bear his name, the honours paid him by Athenians would naturally have become attached to this (cf. *ATL* 3.276).

history can provide us with a distinct analogy for what happened next.⁶¹ Failure of the Athenian peace overtures of ca. 462–460 leads almost immediately to the attempt to detach Egypt from the Persian Empire.

By 449, however, Athens had failed in Egypt, but had gone some way towards restoring the situation through Cimon's last campaign in Cyprus. Furthermore, by this time the Delian symmarchy had become an Athenian *ἀρχή*, and a formal peace with Persia would have been a considerable embarrassment to Athens' further imperialist ambitions. For Persia a formal peace would have been a humiliation, since Athens would inevitably have demanded total cession of Persian claims to Ionia. Fighting petered out between the two sides: there may have been an informal agreement, or both sides may simply have kept out of each other's way, and this obviously makes much better sense politically.⁶² If there was no formal Peace, the Athenians could counter any demands for an easing of the burdens imposed upon the members of the symmarchy by pointing out that, technically, a state of war with Persia still existed, and that hostilities might be resumed at any time.⁶³ Without a formal Peace, Persia could

⁶¹A formula could almost be constructed here: peace overtures (such as, perhaps, a "bombing pause") which fail lead inevitably to intensified hostilities.

⁶²See above, 15. The question of the dismantling of the fortifications of Ionia, discussed in detail by Wade-Gery (*Essays*, 219–220) may seem to argue against the idea of a "tacit agreement" between Athens and Persia; however, the cities which he mentions—Clazomenae, Cnidus, Lampsacus, and Cyzicus—were all tribute-paying members of the Delian League, and we should remember that demolition of fortifications, at first a punishment for revolt, subsequently became not only a means of discouraging revolt, but actually a mark of tribute-paying (i.e., non-autonomous) status; for the terminology cf. Thuc. 3.10.5, 3.11.1, 6.85.2, and especially 3.39.2—"autonomous" allies have walls and ships. Wade-Gery regards Thuc. 8.16.3 as his trump card: a Peloponnesian force with Persian assistance destroyed the landward wall at Teos *ὃ ἀνφοδόμῃσαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι*; he argues that the Athenians had pulled down the wall under the terms of the Peace and had rebuilt it in contravention of these terms at the time of the Amorges affair. The same argument as above can account for the demolition of the landward wall at Teos, which was also a tribute-paying ally; this the Athenians would naturally have rebuilt when fighting broke out with Persia. That Persian troops were co-operating with the Spartans just before a formal alliance between the two states need occasion no surprise.

⁶³The problem of the "missing year" in the Athenian quota-lists of the second assessment period is, in the present state of knowledge, insoluble: if there is a year missing from the quota-lists, it could be either 449/448 or 447/446, but it should be remembered that failure to record *aparchai* in any year does not necessarily mean that no tribute was collected. For summaries of this very contentious issue and select bibliographies see R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford 1969) 133–135; D. Kagan, *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca 1969) 113–115, and esp. 380–381; cf. also, most recently, R. Sealey, "Notes on Tribute-Quota-Lists 5, 6, and 7 of the Athenian Empire," *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 13–28.

We may also note that there is a contradiction between Plut. *Per.* 17.1 *καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην ἄγωσιν*, which Wade-Gery sees as a direct quotation from the text of the Congress Decree, itself an "immediate consequence" of the Peace (*Essays* 227, esp. n. 2), and the complaints made by Pericles' political enemies about Greece seeing Athens gilding and

sit back and wait for some period of Athenian weakness which would enable her to recover all that she had lost in Ionia: no formal claim would have to be abandoned. So, at the time of the Amorges revolt, the King started to demand from Tissaphernes τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχῆς φόρους, which the Athenians had prevented him from collecting (Thuc. 8.5.5), and at a later stage it is demanded that the king should παραπλεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γῆν (Thuc. 8.56.4); this re-assertion of an old claim is consequently embodied in the treaty between Sparta and Persia in language which seems loaded with possessive genitives: χώραν τὴν βασιλέως, ὅση τῆς Ἀσίας ἐστί, βασιλέως εἶναι· καὶ περὶ τῆς χώρας τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βουλευέτω βασιλεὺς ὅπως βούλεται (Thuc. 8.58.2).

This does not of course mean that diplomatic relations could not exist

adorning herself τοῖς εἰσφερομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον (Plut. *Per.* 12.2); for comment on this and other participles in this general context, implying the existence of a war *after* the beginning of Pericles' building programme, see Stockton (above, n. 1) 69–70. In addition, we may note that the use of the word εἰρήνη to denote what in the fifth century was usually referred to as σπονδαί is suspicious; furthermore, Plutarch is evidently quoting from the text of the decree as he found it, presumably in his copy of Craterus' collection (see above, 16). That we are here dealing with yet another fourth-century fabrication seems more than likely; for detailed arguments see R. Seager, "The Congress Decree: Some Doubts and a Hypothesis," *Historia* 18 (1969) 129–141, esp. 134–136.

Almost equally contentious is the problem of the decree relating to the Priestess and Temple of Athena Nike; for a text and useful discussion with bibliography see again Meiggs and Lewis, *op. cit.* 107–111. The question of date has recently become somewhat controversial: the orthodox view is that the decree was passed ca. 450–446; Mattingly (above, n. 2) 278–280 argues that the decree was passed ca. 427, and that the actual building of the temple, generally agreed to have taken place ca. 427–424, followed immediately; he would connect the decision to build with the crushing of the revolt of Lesbos. If Mattingly's date is not acceptable (cf. R. Meiggs [above, n. 3] 95–96), there are still several events, other than a putative "Peace of Callias," which could have led to a decision to build the temple; however, the fact that the scenes on the north and south sides of the frieze of the temple apparently depict fighting between Greeks and Persians has nothing to do with a decree passed in the 440's; since the temple was built in the 420's, it may represent nothing more than a nostalgic harking back to the days when the Greeks did not fight each other, but rather a common enemy.

Finally, for texts of, and commentary on the document known as "Anonymus Argentinensis" or "The Strasbourg Papyrus" or "The Reserve Decree" see *ATL* 2. D 13, 3.281; A. W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 2 (Oxford 1956) 28–32; H. T. Wade-Gery and B. D. Meritt, "Athenian Resources in 449 and 431 B.C.," *Hesperia* 26 (1957) 163–197; and D. Kagan, *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca 1969) 115–116, 382. We should note that there is nothing in this document which presupposes anything other than a more imperialistic policy on the part of Athens, even if we accept the "received" date of 450/449; furthermore, a document whose dating depends on a prescript beginning "thirty (?) years after the Persian Wars" can hardly be evidence for a Peace with Persia concluded only a few months previously! In all, I am inclined to agree with Gomme (*loc. cit.* 28): "... the restoration, the interpretation, and the value of this torn piece of papyrus are all alike doubtful."

between Athens and Persia in the years following 450: in the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes, produced in 425, a Persian ambassador is depicted on stage, and Dicaeopolis says, "Great King indeed! I'm sick of Embassies."⁶⁴ There was also the embassy sent to Susa in 425/424 which only got as far as Ephesus, and we know, too, that Sparta had sent many envoys to Susa (Thuc. 4.50).⁶⁵ Furthermore, it is clear that trade went on between mainland Greece and the Persian Empire, especially Phoenicia,⁶⁶ and most valuable in this connection is the comic poet Hermippus (fr. 63), who, listing the goods that Athens got in exchange for her wine, mentions Egyptian paper and sailcloth, Syrian incense, and Phoenician dates.⁶⁷

With regard to the "Treaty of 424/423" or, as Sealey calls it, "The Peace of Epilykos,"⁶⁸ I should say that, given Andocides' general chronological precision, if his uncle Epilykos ever went on an embassy, in all probability it was the abortive embassy of 425/424. Certainly, there is nothing in the years following which *demands* a formal peace between Athens and Persia.

So we come again to the fourth century, and it may now be useful to summarize the arguments about how the various versions of the Peace came into existence. As we have seen,⁶⁹ the reference at Isoc. *Paneg.* 118 seems to be to the period immediately after the Eurymedon campaign, and I have suggested that section 120 of the same work may show the "Peace of Callias" actually coming into being. The story of Callias' embassy to Susa in the late 460's in Herodotus was, I would submit, the starting point for this. Isocrates went on repeating this story, essentially a somewhat vague one, and we find it echoed in Demosthenes' speech *On the Liberty of the Rhodians* 29. There are, however, no details as yet (ca. 352 B.C.). The next firmly datable reference is in Demosthenes, *De Falsa Legatione* 273, a speech which was delivered in the summer of 343. The terms are the same as "Protocallisthenes," and this, I have argued, is the

⁶⁴Ar. *Ach.* 62: ποίου βασιλέως; ἄχθομαι 'γὼ πρέσβει. See above, n. 57.

⁶⁵We may legitimately ask when *Sparta* had made a formal peace with Persia, if the existence of a peace is assumed to be a prerequisite for diplomatic negotiations; see below, n. 67.

⁶⁶Thuc. 2.69.1 refers to Peloponnesian pirates operating in the area of Caria and Lycia and harming merchantmen sailing from Phaselis and Phoenicia and the mainland thereabouts; ps.-Xen. 2.7 mentions Athenian trade with Egypt and Lydia, among other places.

⁶⁷It has been alleged that none of this could have happened without a definite peace treaty: cf. G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* III. 1: *Die Pentekontaëtie* (Gotha 1897) 353: "direkte Seehandel . . . doch nicht ohne den Schutz eines vertragsmässigen Friedens entwickeln können." Trade between the allied powers of the Second World War and the two Germanies (especially the Federal Republic) has in no sense been hampered by the lack of a formal peace treaty; diplomatic relations exist too, and even formal alliances.

⁶⁸See above, n. 49.

⁶⁹See above, 13 ff.

stele which Craterus used and Theopompus denounced. Here the main outline of the Peace first appears, and its *details* are to be found, I think, with minor literary variations to allow for Isocrates, in Ephorus-Diodorus. The date assigned to the Peace fluctuated—a post-Eurymedon date was, as we have seen, the earliest; Callisthenes said in essence that such a peace was not possible after Eurymedon, and it looks as if he denied a peace altogether; Ephorus or *his* source (whatever that was at this point) saw this difficulty and so transferred the “Peace” to the period immediately after Cimon’s death; there are also traces of a tradition of some cessation of hostilities between Athens and Persia ca. 460/459 in the *Menexenus* and in Diodorus 11.77.4–5, though this is probably a separate issue. These variations would seem to imply that there was no close indication of date on the stele set up in Athens, since, in reading Craterus’ collection of decrees, Plutarch could still get the impression that the “Peace” came about as a result of the Eurymedon campaign.

Lastly, Theopompus. C. Habicht has recently reminded us that the digression on Athens in Book 25 of the *Philippica* of Theopompus comes in his narrative of events in the high 340’s, probably 348 and 347.⁷⁰ Habicht also points out that, in a speech (now lost) delivered by Aeschines after the fall of Olynthus in 348, certain decrees and oaths supposedly dating back to the fifth century were quoted.⁷¹ All these documents are suspect for various reasons, and, Habicht thinks, they were what triggered Theopompus’ denunciations of Athenian “falsifications” in Book 25 of the *Philippica*. Since the “Peace of Callias” was one of the things denounced by Theopompus, it, too, was probably one of the documents used in the propaganda campaign mounted against Philip after the fall of Olynthus. All these documents, then, are propaganda fakes designed to arouse the Athenians from their inactivity by reminding them of the glorious deeds of their ancestors.

My own arguments have pointed to the conclusion that the actual stele promulgating the “Peace of Callias” first appeared between ca. 352 and ca. 343. Habicht, using another argument, has suggested a date ca. 348: perhaps the one may be said to strengthen and complement the other. I cannot, of course, prove that *no* formal agreement was made by Athens ca. 450 and/or 424/423, just as those who believe in a formal peace cannot prove its existence either. What I am sure of, however, is that the details of the “Peace of Callias” as we have them today are a propaganda invention of the mid-fourth century.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO, LONDON

⁷⁰C. Habicht (above, n. 1) 12–13, 25–26.

⁷¹The evidence for this speech is to be found in Dem. *De Falsa Legatione* 303.