

# Hellenic Homonoia and the New Decree from Plataea

*William C. West*

THE CLASSICAL ORIGINS of *homonoia*, ‘oneness of mind, unanimity, concord’ (*LSJ*), called by W. W. Tarn “one of the great conceptions of the Hellenistic age,” have been illuminated by discoveries and scholarship of recent years. Mme de Romilly has drawn attention to what could be the earliest use of a form of the abstraction in Thucydides VIII and has also considered some possible, but far from certain, antecedents. One of these is lines 44–45 of the Themistocles decree: ὅπως δ’ ἂν καὶ ὁμονοοῦντες ἅπαντες Ἀθηναῖοι | ἀμύνωνται τὸν βάρβαρον. More recently, an inscription has come to light at Plataea which attests the existence of a dual cult of Zeus Eleutherius and Homonoia of the Hellenes in at least the third century B.C. Dated by its French editors between 261 and 246, it is a decree of an Hellenic League honoring an Athenian, Glaucon son of Eteocles, for dedications and gifts to Zeus Eleutherius and Homonoia of the Hellenes and prescribing that it be set up by the common altar of the divinities. Previously this cult of Homonoia had been known only in the third century of our era at Plataea (*IG VII 2510*) and a priest of the Homonoia of the Hellenes and Zeus Eleutherius attested at Athens by inscriptions of the second and third centuries.<sup>1</sup> Thus the new inscription extends the antiquity of the dual cult some five or six

<sup>1</sup> A general view of the social significance of *homonoia* in the Hellenistic period is given by W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 3rd ed. rev. by the author and G. T. Griffith (London 1952) 90–91. The *editio princeps* of the Themistocles decree is M. H. Jameson, *Hesperia* 30 (1960) 198–223, but a convenient edition, taking account of intervening scholarship, is *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, ed. by R. Meiggs and D. Lewis (Oxford 1969) no.23. The discovery in 1971 at Plataea of the new decree was announced, with text and modern Greek translation, by Th. G. Spyropoulos, *AAA* 6 (1973) 375ff; it is fully published, with commentary and an interpretative discussion, by R. Étienne and M. Piérart, “Un décret du Koinon des Hellènes à Platées en l’honneur de Glaucon, fils d’Étéocles, d’Athènes,” *BCH* 99 (1975) 51–75. The early history of the term *homonoia* is explored by J. de Romilly, “Vocabulaire et propagande, ou les premiers emplois du mot ὁμονοία,” *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine* (Paris 1972) 199–209. For the Athenian priest of the Homonoia of the Hellenes and Zeus Eleutherius in Roman imperial times, see D. Geagan, *TAPA* 103 (1972) 152–53 and 156–58.

centuries and makes one wonder whether *homonoia* might have had the same status as other political abstractions (*eirene*, *demokratia*, *demos*, etc.) which were worshipped at Athens as early as the fourth century.<sup>2</sup>

A goddess Homonoia had been known from dedications and an altar at Thera in the third century B.C. (*IG XII.3* 1336, 1341, 1342) but not Homonoia of the Hellenes.<sup>3</sup> The Theran dedications are private,

<sup>2</sup> The evidence is diverse, but the worship of abstractions with political significance is amply attested for the fourth century and, in one or perhaps two instances, may go back to the fifth. An altar to Eirene is known from Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328 F 151). It is generally dated 375/4, since Isocrates speaks of the institution of a sacrifice to Peace (*Antid.* 109–11). Pausanias saw a statue of Eirene carrying Ploutos in the Agora, after he had mentioned the group of the eponymous heroes (1.8.2); cf. H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens* (Princeton 1972) 168.

*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1496, accounts of the treasurers of Athena and overseers in the time of Alexander, records public sacrifices to Demokratia, which may have been instituted in the early fourth century, and also to Eirene and to Agathe Tyche. Cf. Plut. *De glor. Ath.* 7, and J. H. Oliver, *Demokratia, the Gods, and the Free World* (Baltimore 1960) 105ff. A painting of Demokratia and Demos, with Theseus, by Euphranor was displayed in the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherius (Paus. 1.3.3.). A relief depicting the two abstractions crowned the stele of the Athenian law of 337/6 against tyranny (B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 21 [1952] 355–59). A bench in the Theater of Dionysus is inscribed as reserved for the priest of Demokratia (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 5029a), who sat beside the priest of Demos and the Charites (see *infra*).

Eukleia and Eunomia may have had an independent cult even earlier. Pausanias speaks of a *ναός* for Eukleia, an *ἀνάθημα* for the battle of Marathon, after mentioning the Eleusinion near the north slope of the Acropolis (1.14.5). Several red-figure vases of the late fifth and early fourth century, by the Meidias painter and in the style of the Meidias painter, show Eukleia and Eunomia in the company of Aphrodite and other attendants, including some Graces. See R. Hampe, *Röm. Mitt* 62 (1955) 107–23. Inscriptions of Roman imperial date attest a priest of Eukleia and Eunomia (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 3738, 4193, 4874), and a seat in the Theater of Dionysus is reserved for a priest of the two divinities (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 5059). A sanctuary of Eukleia and Eunomia was restored, along with several old sanctuaries, in Roman times (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1035.53). See G. R. Culley, *Hesperia* 44 (1975) 207–23.

A cult of Demos and the Charites, who included Eukleia and Eunomia among others, was probably in existence in at least the last third of the third century B.C. (cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 834, 4676). A seat in the Theater of Dionysus was reserved for the priest of the dual cult (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 5029a) and another for the priest of Demos, the Charites and Roma (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 5047). For the political significance of this cult, possibly extending back into the classical period, see Oliver (*supra*), 107ff.

<sup>3</sup> A series of dedications, including an altar, were made to Homonoia on Thera, among other dedications and gifts to several divinities, by a certain Artemidorus son of Apollonius, of Perge: *IG XII.3* 1333–1350. The same individual also dedicated *ναός* to Ptolemy Euergetes, indicating in the dedicatory inscription (*IG XII.3* 464) that he had lived prosperously under three Ptolemies. At some time he became a citizen of Thera (*IG XII.3* 1344). The dedications to Homonoia are certainly private and, as most of Artemidorus' dedications were set up in a separate precinct, may hint that an association between Thera and Artemidorus' native Perge is realized in the dedicator himself. One of the dedications of the Theran precinct is made to Artemis Soter of Perge (*IG XII.3* 1350). For Artemidorus see *Prosop. Ptol.* VI no.15188.

whereas Homonoia of the Hellenes, with her companion Zeus of Freedom, recalls the public propaganda of Athenian oratory and monuments. The French editors of the decree cautiously trace the idea of the abstraction in Isocrates and documentary propaganda of the Persian wars in the fourth century B.C. but do not consider how it could have developed from the traditional notion of *homonoia* which signified domestic concord. When one makes a broad investigation of *homonoia* in its primary sense of the reconciliation of factions in a single city, it emerges that the divinity Homonoia of the Hellenes could well have appeared in the late fourth century. Philip II of Macedon or Alexander then become attractive candidates for the authority which founded the dual cult.

The fundamental meaning of *homonoia*, as it figured in political propaganda of the late fifth and fourth centuries, is concord, or harmony among factions. It signifies unanimity among interest groups, often simply the well-to-do and the poor, and is recognized as a positive good to the *polis*, associated with various political virtues (e.g., *σωφροσύνη*: Pl. *Resp.* 432A; *φιλία*: Clit. 409E; *δικαιοσύνη*: *ibid.* 410A; *τὸ ἀγαθόν*: Xen. *Mem.* 4.4.16). A work *On Concord* is attributed to the sophist Antiphon, of which several fragments are known.<sup>4</sup> Classical authors often speak of *homonoia* and *stasis* as opposites (Lys. 18.17; Arist. *Eth.Nic.* 8.1.1155a24–26; *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1.1422b30ff), and we are perhaps justified in speculating that interest in *homonoia* as a literary subject may first have been stimulated by sophists who contrasted it with *stasis*, as they dealt with other pairs of opposites, such as *logos/ergon*, *nomos/physis*, etc. The study of concord is not confined to the philosophical schools, however. Demosthenes forcefully reminds us that knowledge of how to promote *homonoia* is part of the stock-in-trade of the political orator (*De Cor.* 246), and its use in oratory and by orators can be fully documented.<sup>5</sup>

Although the best known instances of the propaganda of *homonoia*

<sup>4</sup> See *The Older Sophists*, ed. by R. K. Sprague (Columbia [S.C.] 1972): *Antiphon*, transl. by J. S. Morrison, frs. 117–145 (=Diels-Kranz B 45–71, differently arranged).

<sup>5</sup> Xenophon states that in all cities the best men promote concord and that all citizens must swear an oath concerning it (*Mem.* 4.4.16). Aristotle's definition of *homonoia* in *Eth.Nic.* 9.6.1167a22–b16 emphasizes its close association with what is expedient for the city . . . *τὰς πόλεις ὁμονοεῖν φαίνεσθαι, ὅταν περὶ τῶν συμφερόντων ὁμογνωμῶσι* (1167a26–27). The author of the *Rhet. ad Alex.* lists it with ideals which are *σύμφερον τῇ πόλει* and prescribes instructions whereby an orator may by analogy demonstrate its expedience (1422b30ff). Elsewhere *homonoia* is seen as a good for the city, the aim of the good citizen, etc. (*Dem. Lept.* 108, 110; *Ps.-Dem.* [25].89; Hyperides, *Euxenippus* 37; Dinarchus, *Philocles* 19).

are to be found in the speeches of Isocrates, especially his ceremonial works, the abstraction is clearly appropriate to deliberative and judicial oratory. Occasions for speeches urging *homonoia* in public deliberation would arise when there is danger of revolution, imminence of warfare, or need to deal with the question of exiles (as, for instance, at Athens before 480 or in 403 and later). No such deliberative speeches are extant, but reference is made to a decree moved by Hyperides, in Ps.-Demosthenes [26].11, after the battle of Chaeronea: ὅτε γὰρ Ὑπερείδης ἔγραψε . . . εἶναι τοὺς ἀτίμους ἐπιτίμους, ἢ ὁμονοοῦντες ἅπαντες ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας προθύμως ἀγωνίζονται.

Evidence that deliberative speeches on *homonoia* were actually made, however, is not lacking in references of historians and contemporary orators. Thucydides states that during the oligarchic revolution of 411 the Athenian generals on Samos compelled the soldiers to take oaths to maintain the democracy and ὁμονοῆσαι (8.75.2). During the rule of the Four Hundred in Athens itself the various factions agree to hold an assembly περὶ ὁμονοίας (8.93.3). Lysias speaks of oaths for *homonoia* in connection with the events of 404/3 (25.27), Andocides of deliberations on *homonoia* in 404 after loss of the fleet at Aegospotami (*Myst.* 73) and of a pledge (πίστιν) for *homonoia* (*ibid.* 76). Later in the same speech he calls these measures *κυμφρόντα ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς* (106) and says that the Athenians are admired by the Hellenes for turning to *homonoia* and *σωτηρία τῆς πόλεως* (140). The repayment in 403 by the democracy of monies borrowed from Sparta by the Thirty is repeatedly cited as an example of *homonoia* (*Dem. Lept.* 12; *Isoc. Areop.* 68–69; *Arist. Ath. Pol.* 40.3).

For the form which such a deliberative speech might have had, we are perhaps justified in using Demosthenes' first epistle, which has been regarded as genuine.<sup>6</sup> It is sent to the Athenian assembly, for reading in the course of debate, at some time after the death of Alexander. After preliminary remarks which link his own return to the city with the security and liberty of all the Greeks and the difficulty of presenting his advice in the form of a letter, the author urges the establishment of concord in the city (§5) as the first substantive item of the body of the letter. He goes on to show that this proposal will strengthen the city and best prepare it for leadership in war

<sup>6</sup> The spuriousness of epistolary literature is practically an article of faith, but the authenticity of several epistles in the Demosthenic corpus, including the epistle on concord, is argued by J. A. Goldstein, *The Letters of Demosthenes* (New York 1968), esp. 176–81, 252–57.

(against the Macedonians) for liberation of the Greeks. This goal is voiced specifically in the letter's conclusion (§16). *Eleutheria* in external relations is claimed in both the beginning and end of the letter as the result of the reconciliation proposed.

The suitability of the *homonoia* of the Athenians in 403 as an *exemplum* is readily adaptable also to judicial oratory. One may cite the words of the sons of Eucrates, brother of Nicias, who defend themselves against the attempt to confiscate their property because of alleged collaboration with the Thirty in 404/3 (18.17–18): “If it has been expedient to your majority that some keep what they have while others are deprived unjustly, then you properly have no concern for things you have said. You would agree that *homonoia* is the greatest good, *stasis* the cause of all evils . . . These are the things you decreed (ἔγνωτε) when you returned . . . For you remembered our misfortunes and prayed that the gods would establish *homonoia* . . .” In another speech the speaker defends himself against the charge of collaborating with the Thirty made on the grounds that he had remained in the city in 404/3. By citing his willingness to undertake liturgies and perform services whenever called upon, in addition to his blameless conduct, he attempts to prove his good will (εὐνοία) to the democracy and emphasizes the need for *homonoia* (25.20, 21, 23). Judicial speeches dealing with confiscation of property, citizenship, restoration of exiles, etc., were appropriate for appeals to *homonoia* (cf. Andoc. *Myst.* 109), especially when such appeals could be related to the *exemplum par excellence*, the reestablishment of democracy in 403.

We may now turn to epideictic speeches, where one can see the clearest application of the potential of the abstraction for political propaganda. It will be best to postpone consideration of Isocrates for the moment, since Lysias' epideictic speeches provide excellent examples of the uses of *homonoia* which are also, doubtless later, to be found more fully developed in Isocrates. In the *Epitaphius*, composed for the ceremony of burial in the Ceramicus of Athenians who fell at a battle, possibly at the Nemea river during the Corinthian war, traditional encomia of the *progonoi* include praise of them for establishing *homonoia* and *eleutheria* (18).<sup>7</sup> The two abstractions are juxta-

<sup>7</sup> Dem. *Timoc.* 24.180–86 and *Andr.* 22.72–78 are lengthy ‘epideictic’ sections of judicial speeches, in which the *progonoi* are praised for their *homonoia*. The two passages are virtually identical. The latter is used as the peroration of its speech, the former as an epideictic expansion in the course of a section dealing with the duties of public officials.

posed in the context in which they appear, and one is led to think of *homonoia* and *eleutheria* as the slogan of a political program of Athens which aimed at concord of factions at home and freedom in foreign affairs.<sup>8</sup> In a later section of the speech (54–65) *homonoia* is dwelt upon again in a context which praises the Athenians who reestablished the democracy in 403 and sharply criticizes Sparta for her management of the hegemony after 404. The speaker focuses upon the loss of *eleutheria* under Spartan rule, contrasting it to the defense of freedom by the Athenians of the fifth century. The next step in the rhetorical logic of the speech will be to link the *homonoia* of the returned democrats and the preceding glories of the fifth century with the actions of the men buried on the occasion in question.

The *Epitaphius* was written for an Athenian audience, during the Corinthian war, and the *homonoia* praised in it was that of Athens. The *Olympic* speech was composed for an Olympic festival and possibly delivered in the 380's. In it the speaker urges war against Persia under Spartan leadership and the liberation of Sicily from tyranny as well. He praises the other kind of unanimity, *homonoia* among cities with a common purpose. He does not use the actual word in this sense but does use a periphrasis for it when he says: "We should abandon our mutual wars and *with a single aim in our minds provide for the common safety*, feeling shame for past events, fear for the

<sup>8</sup> *Eleutheria* and *autonomia* for the Greek cities is an announced aim of the second Athenian confederacy: cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 43.9ff, and must have been the standard formulation of this political ideal in public documents in the fourth century (cf. Artaxerxes' letter announcing the common peace of 387/6 in Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31 and Alexander's treaty with the League of Corinth in Ps.-Dem. [17].8). It was once maintained that the former referred to external and the latter to internal affairs, but it is perhaps better to consider the terms identical in significance. See W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great II* (Cambridge 1948, repr. Boston 1956) 203–05.

Additional propaganda of freedom in Athens in connection with the second confederacy is suggested by the fact that the charter of the league is set up beside the statue of Zeus Eleutherius (IG II<sup>2</sup> 43.65–66) in front of the god's stoa in the agora. Conon, Evagoras and Timotheus, all heroes of the revival of Athenian naval power in the fourth century, also have honorary statues before this stoa (cf. Isoc. *Evag.* 57; Paus. 1.3.2.). Conon and Timotheus had honorary statues on the Acropolis (Paus. 1.24.3; IG II<sup>2</sup> 3774 [Tod, GHI no.128]). Conon was awarded a crown for his victory at Cnidus, which was kept on the Acropolis (Dem. *Andr.* 72=*Timoc.* 180; cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1425.284–85), and an honorary decree for him proclaimed that he had freed the allies from the Spartans (Dem. *Lept.* 69). *Homonoia*, on the other hand, is regularly praised in epideictic oratory, in contexts where the speaker contrasts Spartan leadership unfavorably with that of Athens (Lys. *Epit.* 54–65; Isoc. *Paneg.* 104, 106; *Areop.* 68–69) and is predicated of the *progonoi* (cf. n.7 *supra*). Specific criticism of Sparta for her treatment of the Greek cities is voiced in IG II<sup>2</sup> 43.9ff.

future, and emulating the deeds of our ancestors . . . (33.6).” *Homonoia* and *eleutheria*, together, transferred to an international sphere, are clearly echoed in the phrase τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ χρωμένους ἀντέχεσθαι σωτηρίας.

Given this sentiment of Lysias’ speech and similar exhortations in the *Panegyricus* of Isocrates, it is easy to believe that the urging of a war against Persia (or other tyranny) was traditional in a festival speech and offered as a panacea to the usual divisiveness among the Greek cities. Isocrates speaks of a type of speech which urges war against the barbarian and *homonoia* of the Hellenes (*Antid.* 77; *Panath.* 13), and Gorgias is customarily seen as inventor of the genre, perhaps in one of the Olympic festivals of the late fifth century. Plutarch states that Gorgias delivered a speech on *homonoia* at Olympia (*Conj. Praecep.* 144B–C) concerning the harmony of city, agora and friends. This sounds as though its subject was the harmony of factions rather than *homonoia* among the Greeks in general, but Philostratus (*VS* 1.493) says that Gorgias urged the Greeks, in his Olympic oration, to pursue *homonoia* among themselves and attack Persia. At any rate, Lysias and Isocrates should perhaps be interpreted as making a traditional appeal in a speech of recognized genre. Harmony among cities acting in accord is not an idea natural to the Greek mind, and, for rhetorical effectiveness, it had to be associated with what could be perceived as a common goal, war against the barbarian, or opposition to tyranny. *Homonoia*, then, traditionally referred to the harmony of factions in a city but could be extended, in a special occasion, to mean the harmony of cities themselves. In this secondary sense it is always qualified in a phrase such as *ὁμόνοια τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, *ὁμόνοια ἡμῶν αὐτῶν*, etc.

Both types of usage may be found in Isocrates, neither being peculiar to him. He does not refer casually to *homonoia*, however. It is a recurrent theme in major speeches (*Paneg.* 3, 138, 173; *Phil.* 16, 83, 141; *Panath.* 13, 42, 77) and is capable of expansion (*Panath.* 225–28). Reference to internal *homonoia*, reconciliation of factions or interest groups within a single city, is also a favorite subject of Isocrates. It is, as we have noted, a goal of fourth-century politics and is generally predicated by Isocrates of the *progonoi* or of the Athenians who ruled an empire in the fifth century (*Paneg.* 78; *Areop.* 31–35; *De Pace* 19). Mention of such *homonoia* provides a point of departure for criticizing Sparta, in terms of her management of an empire as well as her

internal politics, perceived as aiming at suppression of neighbors or local dissidents rather than reconciliation (*Paneg.* 104, 106; *Areop.* 68–69).

Internal *homonoia* is best accommodated by Isocrates to an epideictic speech or epideictic portion of a speech, but *homonoia* of the Hellenes is found in both an epideictic statement and a hortatory formulation. In this regard, one should note Aristotle's recognition of the close connection between the statement of praise and the deliberative statement: "Praise and advice have a common form, for what you would suggest in deliberation becomes an encomium when the manner of expression is changed . . ." (*Rhet.* 1.9 1367b37ff). In terms of both usages, the *Panegyricus* combines both the hortatory and epideictic features (hortatory: 3, 173, 174; epideictic: 85, 138) and, to a lesser extent, so does the *Philip* (hortatory: 16, 83, 141; epideictic: 40). Combination of the propaganda of *homonoia* and *eleutheria*, in the sense that we observed in Lysias, is fully implied in all cases where *homonoia* is urged in connection with war against the barbarian or tyranny, since such war is promoted in defense of *eleutheria*. Juxtaposition of the two ideals is explicit in various expressions: *Paneg.* 85 (περὶ μὲν τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας ὁμοιοῦντες), 104 (τὴν τῶν συμμάχων ὁμόνοιαν κοινὴν ὠφέλειαν νομίζοντες . . . τὰς πόλεις διωκοῦμεν), and 106 (ἐλεύθεροι δὲ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους, ἀστασίαστοι δὲ πρὸς σφᾶς αὐτοῦς).

In reconstructing the transition of Homonoia of the Hellenes from abstract ideal to divinity, Étienne and Piérart cite general propaganda of the middle of the fourth century, showing that the abstraction had been linked by Isocrates with war against Persia and that the creation of a Plataean legend is reflected in the fabrication of documents such as the Covenant of Plataea and the Oath of Plataea. They believe that the Eleutheria festival was founded after 338, but prefer to think that the divinization of Homonoia came later. Worship of Homonoia at this festival is not attested in our sources for it, which are late but may preserve a genuine tradition of the fourth century.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Plutarch describes the ritual of a celebration in *Aristides* 21 and twice remarks that it is still practiced in his time. He does not mention Homonoia, but details of the ceremony may have been modified in Roman imperial times. The foundation of the festival is mentioned in connection with the victory of 479 by him and Diod. 11.29.1–2, Strab. 9.2.31 and Paus. 9.2.6. References to it by classical authors do not exist, but it is mentioned in the Hellenistic and Roman imperial period: Posidippus, fr.29 Kock; L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta* II (Paris 1969) 758–67. It is generally believed that the Eleutheria were at least re-founded with special prestige after 338, with the restoration of Plataea, although the games



*Homonoia* is thought to be divine when invoked in Alexis' *Hypobolimaïos* (fr.244 Kock), which is roughly contemporary with the treaty of alliance between Athens, Sparta and Ptolemy II against Antigonos Gonatas moved by Chremonides (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 687*). The decree promotes the alliance in terms of *eleutheria* and *homonoia* (esp. lines 31ff). In Alexis' play a reveller drinks successive toasts to Ptolemy, his sister Arsinoe and Homonoia, who is understood to be a goddess. There are problems with this interpretation of the scene, however, if one wishes to insist that it proves Homonoia's divinity. The drink is a toast, not a sacrificial libation, and can as easily be taken to be a comic gesture of casual nature. Only this fragment of the play is known, furthermore, and it is dated by this apparent reference to the alliance at the time of the Chremonidean war.

This view, assigning the divinization of freedom and concord to the time of Chremonides, seems to me an overly restrictive formulation of the evidence. Worship of abstractions with political significance is, at Athens, a development of at least the fourth century (see n.2 *supra*). Diodorus refers to *homonoia* as a characteristic of the Oath of Plataea, immediately after he mentions the sacrifice to freedom at the Eleutheria festival (11.29.2). The association of *homonoia* and *eleutheria*, moreover, is not confined to propaganda of the Persian wars. It is adapted to the rhetorical demands of analogous situations presented to different audiences. This association may have originated in Athens, but it was used on occasions of international gatherings as well.

It is highly likely that the worship of Zeus Eleutherius and Homonoia of the Hellenes at the same altar is the culmination of this development of propaganda.<sup>10</sup> Both represent political aspirations

---

may have existed in some form earlier (cf. B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists III* [Princeton 1950] 104 n.40; Étienne and Piérart, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.1] 67–68).

<sup>10</sup> That Zeus Eleutherius was the patron of free cities and their institutions, as Zeus had been the sponsor of monarchical regimes, is discussed by Oliver, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 11–12, 16–17. Examples of the establishment of a cult to this divinity after the overthrow of tyranny and the institution of a civic regime are: Samos after the fall of Polycrates (Hdt. 3.142) and Syracuse after that of Thrasybulus in 466/5 (Diod. 11.72.2). Coins with the head of Zeus Eleutherius were issued by Metapontum (C. Seltman, *Greek Coins, A History of Metallic Currency and Coinage down to the Fall of the Hellenistic Kingdoms*<sup>2</sup> [London 1955] 120) and by Syracuse after the overthrow of tyranny by Timoleon (Seltman, *ibid.* 193 and pl. xlv, 4; G. K. Jenkins, *Ancient Greek Coins* [New York 1972] 182 and figs. 352, 354).

After the battle of Plataea in 479 Pausanias sacrificed to Zeus Eleutherius in the agora of Plataea (Thuc. 2.71.2, 3.58.5). While this is not mentioned as a new foundation, it is signifi-

easily conceptualized and promoted in public oratory, *eleutheria* and *homonoia*. The fact that we now have evidence of a dual cult of these divinities at Plataea, a site associated with the Persian wars of the fifth century,<sup>11</sup> attested at a far earlier period than previously known, strengthens this view considerably.

The case for the establishment of the dual cult in the latter part of the fourth century by Philip II or Alexander is much more attractive than the French editors of the decree will allow. They note this possibility but dismiss it in favor of the third century context. Quite apart from the fact that Isocrates urged Philip to establish *homonia* among the Greeks by leading a war against Persia, a war which Alexander actually conducted, it is antecedently possible.<sup>12</sup> Pausanias states that Philip restored the Plataeans to their land after the battle of Chaeronea (4.27.10; 9.1.8). Names of Plataeans appear in the Delphian *naopoi* lists in the 330's. Respect for local divinities would be a first priority in the refounding of a city, although full rebuilding of the city walls may have extended over several years.

It is not surprising that traditions of rebuilding at Plataea are also associated with Alexander. After describing the destruction of Thebes in 335 by Alexander and Greek confederates, including Plataeans, Arrian notes that the alliance promised to rebuild the walls of Plataea

---

cant that it occurred after victory over Persia, that he restored the Plataeans to their land, together with *autonomia*, and that the Plataeans set great store by it and their annual maintenance of the sacrifice when on trial for their lives in 427 (*ibid.* 3.58.4). An altar to Zeus Eleutherius was erected on the battlefield, near the graves of the Greeks (Paus. 9.2.5; Plut. *Arist.* 19.6–7, 20.4). Since Zeus Eleutherius at Plataea was seen as sponsor of the freedom of the Greeks, the area of the graves of the warriors soon became an area of propaganda (Hdt. 9.85), similar to the public dedications made at Delphi and Olympia where the dedicatory inscription of the offering listed the cities which had fought against Persia (Meiggs-Lewis, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.1] no.27; Hdt. 9.81; Paus. 5.23.1–2).

<sup>11</sup> The decree specifies that it be set up by the common altar of the divinities, and a structure which could be interpreted as this altar was uncovered in 1971 near the find-spot of the decree, in an area later used for Christian graves of the fourth and fifth centuries (Spyropoulos, *loc.cit.* [*supra* n.1]). The 'altar' is situated approximately 200 meters due east of the northern remains of the walls of ancient Plataea, and this site is obviously compatible with Pausanias' brief remarks as to its location. Three bases of dedications by *oi Bωιωτοί* to Zeus Eleutherius (*IG VII 1672–74*) had been found in the nineteenth century in the nearby ruins of Byzantine churches, probably those which lay within the area called the northwest *διατείχιμα* by A. N. Skias, an excavator of the site (*Praktika* [1899] 42–43 55–56).

<sup>12</sup> S. Perlman (*Historia* 25 [1976] 28) thinks that Isocrates, aware of the potential for imperialism by a hegemonial power, wanted Philip to establish *homonoia* among the Greeks before the expedition against Persia.

(*Anab.* 1.9.10). A similar promise was made by Alexander himself, after his conquests in Asia, in Plutarch's *Alexander* (34), and in the *Aristides* (11) Alexander is represented as both rebuilding Plataea and causing it to be proclaimed at the Olympic games in honor of Plataea's service to Greece in the Persian wars. Because of the acceptability of the combination of *homonoia* and *eleutheria* in propaganda of the fourth century, it is possible that the Macedonian kings first created the dual cult of Zeus Eleutherius and Homonoia of the Hellenes at Plataea as embodying the ideals which they sought to continue among the Greek cities.

Macedonian awareness of the potential of buildings, especially temples, and dedications for *eunoia* and propaganda in the cities is well known, and an impressive number of instances may be collected. The construction of the South Stoa at Corinth is dated in the last third of the fourth century and referred to the influence of Philip and Alexander.<sup>13</sup> The League of Corinth, founded in 338, would need an extensive place of meeting, and civic improvement in Corinth would also perhaps conciliate Greeks who were still estranged. Strabo says that Alexander promised to rebuild the temple of Artemis at Ephesus on the condition, refused by the Ephesians, that the dedicatory inscription should bear his name (14.1.22). He did, however, build the temple of Athena Polias at Priene, and the dedicatory inscription is preserved: βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος | ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναὸν | Ἀθηναίῃ Πολιάδι (*I.Priene* no.156). In the same vein is the dedication sent to Athena at Athens after the battle at the Granicus in 334 of three hundred Persian panoplies, with the inscription in the name of Alexander and the Hellenes except the Lacedaemonians. For the same victory, dedication of a group of bronze statues, of Alexander and his fallen 'companions', was made at Dium (*Arr. Anab.* 1.16.4-7; *Plut. Alex.* 16.8).<sup>14</sup>

As for *homonoia* itself, the Macedonian kings persistently urge keeping the common peace, receiving back exiles and forsaking revolution. Such principles can be understood as prominent features

<sup>13</sup> Debris beneath the South Stoa dates from the second half of the fourth century, and it is thought that the building of the stoa signals a building program undertaken by Philip and Alexander: see O. Broneer, *The South Stoa and its Roman Successors: Corinth I.4* (Princeton 1954) 156-57.

<sup>14</sup> E. Badian (*Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg* [Oxford 1966] 48) notes how the dedication to Athena at Athens actually manipulates the truth of the fighting.

of the oath Philip compelled the Greeks to take in joining the League of Corinth, although the text of the surviving document must be heavily restored. It is generally held that this treaty was renewed in the subsequent one with Alexander. Alexander's continuing interest in the maintenance of internal harmony in the cities is attested by two documents of the late 330's: a letter to the Chians insisting on the return of all exiles and the establishment of a democratic constitution, and a letter to Priene which grants special privileges to the Prieneans who reside in the port city Naulochum and insists on the preservation of existing boundaries between the cities.

More significant is the so-called exiles decree of 324.<sup>15</sup> Diodorus says that Alexander announced to his army in Asia that exiles in all Greek cities were to be restored and sent Nicanor to make a proclamation to this effect at the Olympic games (18.8). The exiles decree has not been connected with Alexander's desire to promote *homonoia* but it certainly may be, especially since the new decree from Plataea has appeared. Enforcement of the exiles decree would be the enforcement of *homonoia*, and one would expect that some cities would publish their own regulation in response. Two such documents exist, from Mytilene and Tegea. In that of Mytilene, at lines 29–30, reference is made to land settlements by the king (*sc.* Alexander), and all men are urged to live in the city *ὁμονόεντες* . . .<sup>16</sup>

It is perhaps not fashionable to see Alexander as a catalyst in the divinization of Homonoia, as a reaction to Tarn's idealized picture of him. In several studies, the most extensive of which appeared in 1948, he emphasized the importance of Stoicism for the spread of the worship of Homonoia during the Hellenistic period but argued that the authority of a king was necessary for its establishment as a divinity.<sup>17</sup> Prior to the discovery of the decree from Plataea, a deity

<sup>15</sup> The exiles decree was welcomed by some cities but vigorously opposed by others, notably Athens and Aetolia, and it is usually discussed in terms of whether it violated the terms of the League of Corinth. See V. Ehrenberg, *Alexander and the Greeks* (Oxford 1938) 40–41; Tarn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) I.111–14; Badian, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.14) 50–53; C. B. Welles, *Alexander and the Hellenistic World* (Toronto 1970) 46; and J. R. Hamilton, *Alexander the Great* (Pittsburgh 1973) 136ff.

<sup>16</sup> The documents cited are collected by M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* II (Oxford 1948): treaty of Philip with the Greeks, no.177; treaty of Alexander with the Greeks, no.183; dedication of the temple of Athena Polias at Priene, no.184; letter of Alexander to the Chians, no.192; letter of Alexander to Priene, no.185; decree of Mytilene, no.201; decree of Tegea, no.202.

<sup>17</sup> Tarn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) I.146–48 and II, App. 25. Tarn's views have been criticized by

Homonoia was known at Iasus and Priene, where she was worshipped (C. Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques* no.1203; *I.Priene* no.111), and in Ptolemaic Thera, where she had an altar (see n.3 *supra*). None of these inscriptions can be dated earlier than the third century B.C., and the earliest, the Theran altar, is a private dedication. In no case does the association of public propaganda and location combine so well as at Plataea. When one draws several threads together, the juxtaposition of *homonoia* and *eleutheria* in rhetorical contexts, the repeated association of Homonoia of the Hellenes with war against Persia, the traditions which make Philip or Alexander responsible for rebuilding Plataea, the concern of these monarchs for judicious use of propaganda in building and for the promotion of internal concord in the cities, the Macedonian kings become serious candidates for the authority which established Homonoia of the Hellenes as a divinity at Plataea at the threshold of the Hellenistic age.<sup>18</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL  
August, 1977

---

Badian in *Historia* 7 (1958) 425–44. Badian emphasizes that Alexander's prayer for *homonoia* in the banquet of Opis, discussed in Arr. *Anab.* 7.11.8–9, refers to concord between the Macedonians and Persians, not to the unity of mankind.

<sup>18</sup> Part of the research for this paper was carried out in 1974, when the author held a fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities. A version was presented to the American Philological Association at its 108th annual meeting 29 December 1976. Some additional verification of topography (*cf. supra* n.11) was conducted in June 1977. I am grateful to Professors George Kennedy and Philip Stadter for several suggestions which improved the paper, but, naturally, I am alone responsible for its content.