

The Long Shadow of the Ancient Greek World

Professor Ian Worthington



THE TEACHING COMPANY ®

**The Long Shadow
of the Ancient Greek World**
Part II

Professor Ian Worthington



THE TEACHING COMPANY ®

**The Long Shadow
of the Ancient Greek World**
Part III

Professor Ian Worthington



THE TEACHING COMPANY ®

**The Long Shadow
of the Ancient Greek World**
Part IV

Professor Ian Worthington



THE TEACHING COMPANY ®

Ian Worthington, Ph.D.

Professor of History, University of Missouri–Columbia

Ian Worthington, Ph.D., is Frederick A. Middlebush Professor of History at the University of Missouri–Columbia. He was born in England in 1958 and received his B.A. in Classical Studies from the University of Hull and his M.A. in Ancient History from the University of Durham, where he wrote a thesis on the Pisistratid Tyranny at Athens. He went to Monash University in Melbourne, Australia, to write a thesis on the Greek orator Dinarchus and Athenian history in the age of Alexander the Great for his Ph.D., which he received in 1987. After Monash, he taught for 10 years in the classics departments at the University of New England and the University of Tasmania in Australia before moving to Missouri in 1998.

Professor Worthington has published 14 sole-authored and -edited books and more than 80 articles on Greek history, epigraphy, and oratory, including the biographies *Alexander the Great: Man and God* (Harlow, UK: Longman, 2004) and *Philip II of Macedonia* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008) and the Blackwell *Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006). He is currently writing a biography of Demosthenes, editing the Blackwell *Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, and serving as editor-in-chief of *Brill's New Jacoby*, a new edition of 856 fragmentary works by ancient Greek historians involving a team of 112 scholars in 16 countries.

Professor Worthington has given various newspaper, radio, and television interviews and also founded the biennial Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece conference series and the biennial Fordyce Mitchel Memorial Lecture Series, held in his department at the University of Missouri–Columbia. In 2005 he won the Chancellor's Award for Outstanding Research and Creativity in the Humanities, and in 2007 he won the Student-Athlete Advisory Council Most Inspiring Professor Award.

Professor Worthington and his wife have one son and one daughter. They live in Columbia, Missouri.

Table of Contents

The Long Shadow of the Ancient Greek World

Professor Biography	i
Course Scope	1
Lecture One Three Mainstays of Ancient Greece	3
Lecture Two The 8 th -Century Renaissance	5
Lecture Three Politics and Tyranny in Greece	7
Lecture Four The Exercise of Political Power in Athens	9
Lecture Five Dracon of Athens and the Birth of Greek Law	11
Lecture Six Solon of Athens—Social and Economic Reforms	13
Lecture Seven Solon, Democracy, and Law	15
Lecture Eight From Anarchy to Tyranny in Athens	17
Lecture Nine Pisistratus, Tyrant of Athens	19
Lecture Ten Tyranny Overthrown—The Sons of Pisistratus	21
Lecture Eleven Democracy Restored—Cleisthenes of Athens	23
Lecture Twelve Cleisthenes, the Real Father of Democracy?	25
Lecture Thirteen Sparta, the Odd-Man-Out State in Greece	27
Lecture Fourteen Death or Glory—Spartan Military Education	29
Lecture Fifteen “Come Back Carrying Your Shield or On It”	31
Lecture Sixteen From Sparta to Persia	33
Lecture Seventeen Marathon—End of the First Persian Invasion	35
Lecture Eighteen Thermopylae and the 300 Spartans	37
Lecture Nineteen Greece Triumphs—The End of the Persian Wars	39
Lecture Twenty From the Archaic to the Classical Period	41
Lecture Twenty-One The Delian League—Origins and First Steps	43
Lecture Twenty-Two From Delian League to Athenian Empire	45
Lecture Twenty-Three Ephialtes, Founder of Radical Democracy	47
Lecture Twenty-Four Rhetoric—A New Path to Political Power	49
Lecture Twenty-Five Democracy and Political Speech—Then and Now	51
Lecture Twenty-Six The Causes of the Peloponnesian War	53
Lecture Twenty-Seven The War’s Early Years and the Great Plague	55
Lecture Twenty-Eight Athenian Successes and a Temporary Peace	57
Lecture Twenty-Nine War Resumes—The Athenian Disaster in Sicily	59
Lecture Thirty Democracy Fails—Oligarchy in Athens	61
Lecture Thirty-One Final Battles—Sparta’s Triumph over Athens	63
Lecture Thirty-Two Why Athens Lost—The Impact on Greece	65
Lecture Thirty-Three The Household in the Polis	67
Lecture Thirty-Four Athenian Law and Society	69
Lecture Thirty-Five Historical Development of the Legal Code	71
Lecture Thirty-Six The Judicial Machinery of the Legal System	73
Lecture Thirty-Seven Types of Cases, Sycophants, and Pretrial	75
Lecture Thirty-Eight Going to Trial in Ancient Athens	77
Lecture Thirty-Nine Macedonia, North of Mount Olympus	79
Lecture Forty Philip II—“Greatest of the Kings of Europe”	81
Lecture Forty-One Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism	83
Lecture Forty-Two Greece Conquered—The End of Greek Autonomy	85

Table of Contents
The Long Shadow of the Ancient Greek World

Lecture Forty-Three	Philip’s Assassination and Legacy	87
Lecture Forty-Four	Alexander the Great—Youth, Early Kingship	89
Lecture Forty-Five	Alexander as General	91
Lecture Forty-Six	Alexander as King.....	93
Lecture Forty-Seven	Alexander as Man—and God?	95
Lecture Forty-Eight	Beyond the Classical—The Greeks and Us.....	97
Timeline		99
Glossary		101
Biographical Notes		104
Bibliography		108

The Long Shadow of the Ancient Greek World

Scope:

This course is taught chronologically, covering Greek history in the Archaic and Classical periods, from 750 B.C.E. to the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C.E. However, it is not the “usual” type of civilization course that tries to cover everything. Instead, by using history and society as a backdrop, it focuses on three major aspects that are as much a mainstay of our tradition as that of the Greeks: democracy, law, and imperialism. The last involves the mainland Greeks as well as Philip II and Alexander the Great of Macedonia. By studying these three themes, the course traces their origins and developments in great detail, critically examines their workings, considers what these meant for the Greeks, and compares and contrasts ancient forms and practices with our contemporary world. This allows us to ask questions about the ancient Greeks, not least being what have we learned—and not learned—from their lessons and mistakes.

Although the course deals with Greek civilization, the fact that almost all of our source material comes from Athens—not to mention that this city is the home of so many innovations—means we focus most of our attention on it until we turn to Macedonia. We will devote time to the other major power of the Greek mainland, Sparta, as well as some of the so-called tyrannies in Peloponnesian states that arose in the Archaic period. There are times when we will see that social attitudes and the like in Athens may be said to represent those of most Greeks and other times when we are in the dark as to what other Greeks felt, thought, or even did.

In keeping with the themes of democracy and law, the first set of lectures (Lectures One through Twelve) will focus on the origins of the legal code and of democracy, which are inextricably linked. The principal figures here are Dracon, who first codified the laws; Solon, whom we can call the Father of Democracy; and Cleisthenes, whom some also call a father figure for the way he took democracy to the rural masses. To understand what they did and how they did it—and hence the revolutionary nature of their work—we will examine the impact of other Greek states’ history on Athenian history and society before, during, and after their legislation.

Our third theme, imperialism, makes an appearance in Lectures Thirteen through Twenty-Two. We step away from Athens to deal with the history and society of the militaristic state of Sparta (Lectures Thirteen through Sixteen), which would head an empire that fought Athens and tore Greece apart in the Peloponnesian War of 431–404 B.C.E. Then we turn to the Persian Wars, a period that I call the coming of age of Greece, especially Athens, as a military power (Lectures Seventeen through Twenty). Until then, the Greeks had largely been in conflicts with each other, but when the Persians (especially under Xerxes) invaded Greece, the Greeks were faced with a common foe and had to unite to defeat it. Their success led to the Athenians founding the Delian League, which they would soon turn into a 5th-century empire at the expense of their allies (Lectures Twenty-One and Twenty-Two).

Success against the Persians brings us to a period of further developments in democracy (Lectures Twenty-Three through Twenty-Five). We look at the legislation of Ephialtes, who introduced direct or radical democracy and may even have introduced trial by jury (which was almost certainly an Athenian invention), and the rise of a new type of political leader, the orator (or *rhêtôr*). These *rhêtores*, sometimes called demagogues, used their oratorical powers to persuade the people to follow their own policies, which were not always in the best interests of states. In other words, the oratory had more effect than the substance of a speech. The implications of their power for democracy are obvious, as are the echoes of, and for, today’s political rhetoric. We consider some ancient speeches and orators and their influence on more recent speeches and politicians.

In our next set of lectures (Lectures Twenty-Six through Thirty-Two), we complete our consideration of 5th-century imperialism by discussing the Peloponnesian War, fought between the empires of Athens and Sparta. Periclean Athens was a time of great cultural and intellectual output, but Pericles and his scare-tactic rhetoric, I argue, engineered the start of the Peloponnesian War. The war itself is dealt with in some detail, and we consider the likelihood that Athens was defeated and lost its great empire not because of losing battles, massive losses of manpower, or financial insolvency but because of the nature of Athenian radical democracy.

The 4th century was when the legal system reached its maturity, and we turn to a set of lectures dealing with what the people thought of law, how the legal code developed, the relationship of law to society, and how different the judicial system of Classical Athens was from that of today (Lectures Thirty-Three through Thirty-Eight).

In the final part of the course, we move to Macedonian imperialism during the reigns of Philip II and Alexander the Great (Lectures Thirty-Nine through Forty-Seven). After a brief discussion of how different the Macedonians (who lived north of Mount Olympus) were from their Greek counterparts (Lecture Thirty-Nine), we survey Philip’s reign, stressing his major achievements, which included defeating the Greeks, making Macedonia a superpower, and creating the first nation-state in Europe. Alexander’s reign, especially his spectacular successes in Asia, are highlighted, with a focus on the downsides of his

reign and especially of his own character. History calls Alexander “great,” but it is my contention that he is undeserving of this epithet and that Philip deserves greater praise.

The final lecture (Lecture Forty-Eight) has some bigger-picture questions that we can take away from the course. For example, what happened to Greece, especially Athens, after the Classical period, and why? What has the role of Greek civilization really been in our Western tradition and in our lives? What have we learned—or not learned—from Greek civilization, and should we have learned more? The course ends therefore on a thoughtful note while leaving in the minds of the audience a greater knowledge and appreciation of enduring aspects of Greek history, society, and culture.

Lecture One

Three Mainstays of Ancient Greece

Scope: The introductory lecture explains why ancient Greece is important to our heritage; summarizes the three themes of this course: democracy, law, and imperialism; and explains why these themes were selected as the anchors for this course. Since most of our source material comes from Athens, we must focus for the most part on this city. The second half of the lecture is a brief survey of Greek history before the main period of our course, namely the Bronze Age civilization of the mainland and its legacy for the topics of our course.

Outline

- I. Welcome to the ancient Greek world!
 - A. In the first part of this lecture, I'm going to talk about why ancient Greece is important for us, what this course is about, and how I've organized the 48 lectures in it.
 - B. In the second part, we're going to look at aspects of what modern historians call the Bronze Age, the period from about 3000 to 1150 B.C.E., that have a direct bearing on what we're going to study in detail.
- II. The roots of the Western tradition lie with the ancient Greeks, and I want to focus on three aspects of Greek history that are as much a mainstay of our tradition as they were of the Greek: democracy, law, and imperialism.
 - A. I believe these three topics will help to explain what we're used to in our society today, how we live, what we have come to expect, and why; and I'd say these three topics tell us more about the Greeks than do other aspects of their society, such as the arts and culture.
 - B. The Greeks may have had a brilliant civilization, but there were downsides, such as warfare and imperialism.
 - C. My aim by the time we finish this course is not to teach you a lot of new stuff but to make you rethink some of your views on the Greeks.
 - D. Greeks were found all over the place—not only on the Greek mainland but also far beyond. For the purposes of our course, we will focus for the most part on Athens, because almost all of our literary source material comes from Athens.
- III. We're going to be dealing with the Archaic and Classical periods of Greek history, running from the middle of the 8th century B.C.E. to 323 B.C.E.
 - A. The Archaic period begins in about 750 B.C.E. and runs to the end of the Persian Wars in 478 B.C.E. This period is the subject of Lectures Two through Twenty-One.
 - B. The Classical period runs from the end of the Persian Wars in 478 to the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C.E., and it is the subject of Lectures Twenty-Two through Forty-Seven.
- IV. The content of the course is organized chronologically and thematically by these two periods.
 - A. We'll cover the origins and early developments of democracy and law, which one could argue characterize the Archaic period, in Lectures Three through Twelve.
 - B. In Lectures Thirteen through Sixteen, we'll discuss Sparta's rise to influence in Greece during the Archaic period and what made Sparta different from other states.
 - C. Lectures Seventeen through Twenty deal with the Persian Wars, the transition period from the Archaic period to the Classical period.
 - D. In Lectures Twenty-One through Thirty-Two, we will discuss the rise of Athenian imperialism, the great Peloponnesian War fought between Athens and Sparta, and some radical political developments in Athens.
 - E. The Athenians bounce back from their defeat in the Peloponnesian War and put together a 4th-century empire. It is in this period that their judicial system comes to maturity, which we will discuss in detail in Lectures Thirty-Three through Thirty-Eight.
 - F. Our final set, Lectures Thirty-Nine through Forty-Seven, deal with 4th-century Macedonian imperialism, first under Philip II and then under his son, Alexander the Great.
 - G. Our final lecture looks at Greek history after this period, asks questions that our course has raised, and asks what we can take away from it.

- V. Let's set the scene for the Archaic period by looking at the origins of some of the things that the Greeks of the mainland adapted and continued over the centuries.
- A. Well before the 8th century B.C.E., the Greeks had a flourishing civilization, which modern scholars call the Bronze Age.
 - B. The Bronze Age civilization of the Greek mainland is called the Mycenaean, named after Mycenae, which was ruled by Agamemnon.
 - C. Throughout the Bronze Age, monarchic power was the norm. Mycenaean Greece, like other areas, was comprised of a number of palaces, each headed by a king, with a bureaucracy.
 - D. Mycenaean civilization ended in about 1150 B.C.E. The reason is unknown, but we know the bottom line is that the Mycenaean age ended in a fight, because we have Linear B tablets preserved from many palaces.
 - E. With the end of Mycenaean civilization, the period known as the Dark Ages began, lasting till the start of the Archaic period in 750 B.C.E.
- VI. In summary, we've talked about some aspects of Mycenaean civilization that find their way, with changes, into the Archaic period.
- A. We need to trace these aspects to show that later Greek history was borrowed from what went on before it.
 - B. In the next lecture, we will discuss some of the things that we know about from the Dark Ages and then turn to the 8th-century renaissance, the start of the Archaic period, when history comes alive again and society develops unlike it has before.

Suggested Reading:

Morris and Powell, *The Greeks*.

Vermeule, *Greece in the Bronze Age*.

Questions to Consider:

1. When we talk of what Western civilization owes to the Greeks, what specific examples come to mind?
2. What are the main features of Minoan and Mycenaean society?

Lecture Two

The 8th-Century Renaissance

Scope: The Archaic period begins about 750 B.C.E., and this beginning is called the 8th-century renaissance. We discuss some aspects of the Dark Ages, the period that came between the end of the Bronze Age and the Archaic. We know little that happened in this period, hence its name. We survey what we do know before tracing the characteristics of the 8th-century renaissance, including colonization, trade, advances in art and writing, and the first Olympic Games. A pause is made to consider the meaning of the word “archaic”; the literal meaning of the word is different from how we use it today. The second half of the lecture shows that this period is also marked by socioeconomic grievances and the plight of the poor, which lead to civil war and the eviction of Eupatrid ruling families in a number of cities.

Outline

- I. The Dark Ages began in about 1150 B.C.E. with the end of the Bronze Age and stretched to about 750 B.C.E., the period of the 8th-century renaissance.
 - A. The first part of this lecture will discuss some aspects of the Dark Ages.
 - B. The second part of the lecture will deal with the 8th-century renaissance and the start of the Archaic period.
- II. This period is called the Dark Ages because we do not know everything that happened during that time.
 - A. The Dark Ages as a whole can be subdivided into three periods, thanks mainly to pottery styles: from about 1150 to 1050, sub-Mycenaean pottery; from about 1050 to 900, protogeometric pottery; and from about 900 to 750, geometric pottery.
 - B. We also find gold and ivory carvings being made, which shows advanced artistic craftsmanship. This in turn meant that the economy was taking off and precious metals were being imported from other countries.
 - C. In about 750 B.C.E., we have a burst of commercial contacts between the Greek mainland and other parts of the world, and this marks the end of the Dark Ages.
- III. The 8th-century renaissance heralds a new dawn in Greek history and civilization. Two major characteristics show the period to be a clear break with the past: increased trade (especially with areas to the west) and colonization.
 - A. Nearly every Greek state sent out colonists to the Black Sea, the north Aegean, and the lands to the west (principally Sicily and southern Italy). Colonization was probably something the Greeks were forced into doing because of the growing population on the mainland and the infertile soil.
 - B. The earliest wave of colonization took place in the mid-8th century to Italy and the west; a second wave took place about a century later to the coasts of the Hellespont and the Black Sea. Colonies continued to be founded even as late as the Classical period.
 - C. Artistic, social, and cultural innovations mark this period as a renaissance, including the invention of the Greek alphabet and the first Olympic Games in 776 B.C.E.
 - D. Cult centers began to spring up, there were further advances in pottery design, and we also see the appearance of the first large or monumental temples.
 - E. Literature also flourishes, especially epic poetry such as Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.
 - F. The Archaic period of Greek history lasts until 478 B.C.E. We use this term to describe pre-Classical Greece because the Archaic period is a new one after the murkiness of the Dark Ages.
- IV. The increasing warfare between individual states and civil distress among the people culminated in civil war, and it is this background that shapes the major political and judicial advances.
 - A. Throughout the Dark Ages and into the Archaic period, Greece was controlled by a number of aristocratic families who exercised oligarchic power.
 - B. Gradually some of the communities in various parts of Greece amalgamated into larger ones. One town became the main one for the area, known as a polis, and the people who lived in its area also became its citizens.
 - C. But there were some Greeks who preferred to live in an area that did not have a central polis. Such an area, one like Aetolia or Phocis, was called an ethnos.
 - D. The polis system had flaws; their independence led to mutual xenophobia developing among Greek poleis, and a huge gap arose between the aristocrats and the nonnobles.

Suggested Reading:

Morris and Powell, *The Greeks*.

Pomeroy, Burstein, Donlan, and Roberts, *Ancient Greece*.

Questions to Consider:

1. The idea of independent, self-sufficient, and autonomous states sounds in principle like a good one for any society and in any age, but what were the weaknesses of the polis system, and did they outweigh its strengths?
2. Since the ancient Greeks retained the polis system throughout their history, what sort of problems do you think they might have faced?

Lecture Three

Politics and Tyranny in Greece

Scope: In this lecture we consider the rule of the so-called tyrants in three important states in the Peloponnese: Argos, Sicyon, and Corinth. After a consideration of what the word “tyrant” means and how that meaning differs from its later pejorative meaning, we examine how these tyrants came to power and what characteristics they all have in common. These have a bearing on the plight of the poor in Athens, which we need to study to understand the development of law and democracy. We see how the tyrants’ rules benefited their states, and we also try to answer how and especially what factors led to the outbreak of tyranny in Greece.

Outline

- I. Resentment against the ruling families was felt not just by the farmers but also by a middle stratum of society.
 - A. Hence economic distress and social and political discontent came together throughout Greece.
 - B. This led to a number of tyrant rulers in various cities (especially in the Peloponnese) who overthrew the ruling families and seized power for themselves.
- II. This phenomenon of tyranny lasted from about 670 B.C.E. to the end of the 6th century B.C.E. and is often called “the age of the tyrants.”
 - A. In this period the word “tyrant,” or *tyrannos*, simply means an unconstitutional ruler.
 - B. They took advantage of the people’s discontent to seize power for themselves.
 - C. The three most important tyrannies outside Athens were those in the Peloponnese at Argos, Corinth, and Sicyon.
- III. The earliest tyrant was Pheidon of Argos, who seems to have been a hereditary king before he became tyrant.
 - A. Pheidon was an expansionist king; he wanted to extend the influence of Argos in southern Greece, and he was not afraid of taking on other states in the Peloponnese, especially Sparta.
 - B. He became a tyrant; thus he could rule absolutely.
 - C. Pheidon was reputed to have introduced the first coinage in Greece, apparently striking them at Aegina, but he could not have had anything to do with actual coinage.
 - D. He is said to have standardized the weights and measures for the entire Peloponnese (with the exception of Corinth), which helped to promote economic and commercial growth in that region as well as in other markets.
- IV. In Sicyon, close to Corinth, Orthagoras became tyrant in about the middle of the 7th century B.C.E., and on his death his son Myron I took over. In the early 6th century B.C.E., Cleisthenes took over the reins of power in Sicyon.
 - A. Cleisthenes apparently did not become a tyrant smoothly; he is supposed to have murdered one brother and deposed another.
 - B. Unlike his predecessors he was not prepared to live quietly in Corinth’s shadow, nor to see Argos’s power continue to rise in the Peloponnese.
 - C. Cleisthenes was also involved in the First Sacred War, a shadowy affair over the oracle of Apollo at Delphi that took place in probably 595–586 B.C.E. As a reward, Cleisthenes received a third of the spoils of war.
 - D. Sicyon’s role in the First Sacred War and its clashes with Argos, as well as Cleisthenes’ stimulation of its pottery manufacture, brought it to the attention of states outside the Peloponnese.
- V. Our final tyranny is that of the Cypselids at Corinth, which lasted more than 73 years.
 - A. Cypselus seized power in either 658 or 657 B.C.E., expelled the ruling Bacchiads, and himself ruled for 30 years.
 - B. When Cypselus died in 628, the tyranny passed to his son Periander, who ruled for about 40 years until 588.
 - C. When he died in 588, his nephew Psammetichus succeeded him and ruled for only three years, from 588 to 585, before the tyranny was overthrown.
- VI. It can be seen that the tyrannies—and tyrants—shared a number of common characteristics.
 - A. All the tyrants contributed to the economic progress of their cities (especially in pottery manufacture), introduced building programs to beautify their cities (such as temple-building programs), and arranged for an adequate water supply into the city and drainage to better the lifestyle of the people.
 - B. They also worked to establish their cities as intellectual and cultural centers by encouraging foreign craftsmen and poets to come and work in them.

- C. There might not be one single explanation for the phenomenon of tyranny, and individual circumstances in each city probably led to tyrants seizing power in them, but what all tyrannies do have in common is the overthrow of the existing regime.

Suggested Reading:

Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*.

Pomeroy, Burstein, Donlan, and Roberts, *Ancient Greece*.

Questions to Consider:

1. How and why did tyranny occur in Greece?
2. What characteristics do the tyrannies have in common, and why do you think that is?

Lecture Four

The Exercise of Political Power in Athens

Scope: Athens, like other states, was ruled by a number of aristocratic families who felt threatened by the rise of tyrannies elsewhere. This background allows us something of an excursus in this lecture to detail the nature of political power in Athens and its constitution during this period. We see how the upper-class families wielded power by controlling the office of archon (leader) and the Areopagus, an age-old council of ex-archons that had the duty of “guarding the laws,” and how the nonnobles had no political, social, or judicial rights. This lecture sets up the democratic reforms of Solon (Lectures Six and Seven) and Ephialtes (Lecture Twenty-Three) so as to understand the revolutionary nature of these two men’s achievements.

Outline

- I. In the last lecture, we saw how the tyrants of the Archaic period came to power by expelling the ruling families because they were doing little for the ordinary people and contributing to the instability of society with their exploitive rules, their faction fighting, or both.
 - A. This fact would not have been lost on the Eupatridae, who were in control of Athens; yet they continued to rule, and they disregarded the needs and wants of the ordinary people and any appeals about their plight.
 - B. Thus we have a scenario for civil war and the eventual development of democracy and a legal code, thanks to the work of Dracon and especially Solon, who is commonly called the Father of Democracy.
- II. In this lecture we’re going to talk about the nature of political power at Athens and its constitution before Solon.
 - A. Only by having a good grasp of these things can we really appreciate the revolutionary nature of Solon’s legislation and later that of the other democratic reformers Cleisthenes and Ephialtes, who built on what Solon started.
 - B. We are able to discuss the Athenian constitution and its development because of the treatise called *The Athenian Constitution*, which is attributed to Aristotle.
 - C. The first part of *The Athenian Constitution* is a history of its development, and the second part is a discussion of the workings of the constitution in the author’s own day.
- III. We are told in *The Athenian Constitution* that in this period there were three organs of the constitution: the archons, the Areopagus, and the Assembly.
 - A. Athens was governed by three top magistrates called archons, which we might translate as “leaders.”
 - B. These three archons seemed to share equal power and were in charge of the polis’s religious, military, and civic life. The basileus archon had various religious duties on behalf of the state; the *polemarchos* archon was in charge of military affairs; the eponymous archon was the chief civil minister in the state.
 - C. Under them, there were six *thesmothetae* (those “who lay down rules”), and they may have been assistants to the archons who carried out the archons’ orders.
 - D. The second organ in the pre-Solonian constitution was the Areopagus, which was a permanent council of nobles that presumably grew out of the Bronze Age Boule or king’s advisory council.
 - E. The final organ of the pre-Solonian constitution was the *Ekklesia* (the Assembly), which met on the Pnyx, a huge rocky outcrop close to the Acropolis. The Assembly was the democratic organ of the constitution where supposedly all citizens could meet.
- IV. Athens of the Classical period would eventually have a plethora of elected officials.
 - A. The vast majority of these had specific functions, such as officials in charge of trade and the marketplace (*agoranomoi*) and others in charge of the corn supply (*sitophylakes*), who were responsible for allegations of bad business practice; the *strategoï*, professional generals who could be reelected to that office; and the Eleven, a type of police force that was also in charge of the prison.
 - B. Athens was one of the larger poleis and so needed more officials—hundreds, in fact—to administer it under the Classical democracy.
 - C. This political system would not have come about without the political innovations of the 6th century B.C.E., which began with the work of Dracon and Solon.

Suggested Reading:

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What did the Athenian constitution consist of before Solon, and what did each organ do?
2. How might the nobles have dominated political life, since they were numerically inferior to the mass of people?

Lecture Five

Dracon of Athens and the Birth of Greek Law

Scope: In this lecture we are first going to talk about Cylon's attempt to establish a tyranny in the 630s and then Dracon's codification of the law in the 620s. Given the mood of the ordinary people after Cylon's failure, the ruling families selected Dracon to try to fix the commoners' social and economic plight. We focus on his legislation because it is fundamental to the development of the Classical legal system as well as our own. Dracon was responsible for codifying the law and, for the first time, assigning a penalty for each crime. Although what he did was rudimentary, his legislation attacked the arbitrary nature of the dispensation of justice and tried to make everyone subject to the same penalty. Despite these measures, civil war eventually broke out, which led to the appointment of Solon as extraordinary archon.

Outline

- I. The word aristocracy comes from the Greek *aristoi*, meaning the best men, but while they might have thought of themselves as this, the mass of ordinary people did not.
 - A. Perhaps the hoplite soldiers had a hand in bringing about the changes of regime elsewhere, and if the hoplites in other places could do this, they certainly could in Athens, given the unrest and civil distress rampant in Attica.
 - B. In this lecture, we are first going to talk about the attempted tyranny of Cylon in the 630s and then second the codification of the laws by Dracon in the 620s.
- II. In the 630s, an Athenian named Cylon seized the Acropolis.
 - A. Cylon and his brother managed to flee Athens, but his supporters fled to the sanctuary of Athena, where ultimately, on the orders of the archon Megacles (a member of the powerful Alcmeonidae family), the men were murdered.
 - B. The killings caused a rift in relations between Athens and Megara, given that some of the murdered supporters were from Megara.
 - C. The Alcmeonidae as a family were put on trial, prosecuted, cursed, and exiled from Athens.
- III. After Cylon's expulsion from the city, the Eupatridae must have met to decide what to do.
 - A. A large number of small farmers were *hektemoroi*: In debt to aristocratic neighbors, they had probably lost their farms and were enslaved, so there would have been much unrest.
 - B. There was also discontent from the middle stratum of society, the hoplites, because of being denied the chance to take part in the political process by attending the Assembly or standing for office.
 - C. Presumably with this in mind, in the 620s the Eupatridae appointed a man called Dracon to codify the laws.
- IV. Dracon did not invent something that became a law.
 - A. Law existed in Greece before this period, but it was a family affair in the sense that if someone were killed, the family would seek revenge on the murderer—or his family.
 - B. What Dracon did was begin the process that gave rise to the formal system of law and procedures, courts, trial by jury, the right of appeal, and other things we take for granted today.
 - C. He did this by laying down penalties for crimes and by taking the personal element out of seeking revenge, making the state responsible.
 - D. In his biography of Solon, Plutarch tells us that Dracon made the penalty for almost every offense death. This was an attempt to introduce some sort of ultimate deterrent and bring stability, law, and order to Attica.
 - E. He may also have introduced the law about the amount of interest to be repaid on a debt, which gave rise to the *hektemoroi*.
- V. Dracon's legislation was a significant advancement in the legal rights of the people.
 - A. He changed the system by taking out the personal and arbitrary elements of punishment and replacing them with the objective.
 - B. Equally important was his law on homicide. He removed the family's obligation to seek revenge on murderers and gave the state responsibility for punishment.

- VI.** Obviously Dracon's system had its flaws, but if we step back for a moment we can see how important he was to the development of the legal code.
- A.** He took away the arbitrary dispensation of justice, and in doing so for the first time put some limit on the powers of the Eupatridae—at least on their judicial abilities.
 - B.** Families could no longer kill in revenge but had to bow to a new process.
 - C.** For the first time, the laws were inscribed on *axones* and were set up on poles for all to see.
 - D.** Dracon's laws were repealed by later lawgivers, beginning with Solon, but apparently his homicide law was retained in Athens throughout the Classical period.
- VII.** Dissension continued, and by 600 the plight of the poor in the countryside ushered in a period of civil war.
- A.** Faced with that scenario, the Eupatridae made an Athenian called Solon extraordinary archon for the year 594/3.
 - B.** He was given full powers to put an end to the civil war.

Suggested Reading:

MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Greece*.

Pomeroy, Burstein, Donlan, and Roberts, *Ancient Greece*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Does the appointment of Dracon to codify the laws tell us anything about the grievances of the ordinary people at this time?
2. Why might Dracon lay down death as the penalty for every crime?

Lecture Six

Solon of Athens—Social and Economic Reforms

Scope: In 594 B.C.E., the ruling nobles elected an Athenian man named Solon to end the strife. They gave him absolute power for one year. What Solon did not only revolutionized Athenian (and Greek) society but also affects us today. He created democracy and added such things as the right of appeal to the legal code. In this lecture we examine Solon's economic and social legislation, how he tried to improve the lot of the nonnobles, and how he laid the foundations for Athens's economic prosperity in the Classical period. What did both sides want, and what did Solon give them? We also refer to some of the poetry he wrote, in which he tells us who he blames for Athens's situation and why he did what he did.

Outline

- I. In the first part of this lecture, I want to talk briefly about Solon, the man and legislator, and then in the second part I will turn to his reforms.
 - A. Solon was made extraordinary archon in 594 B.C.E. to bring an end to the civil war and to fix the problems plaguing Athenian society.
 - B. Most of our information about Solon comes from *The Athenian Constitution* and Plutarch's biography of him. Both of these works quote extracts from his lyric poetry.
 - C. Solon is commonly called the Father of Democracy.
 - D. Among ancient Greeks he took on legendary status; in Greek tradition he became one of the Seven Sages (or wise men) of Greece.
- II. Solon's poetry fortunately tells us a lot about what he did and why he did it.
 - A. He makes it clear that he is personally hurting from the civil war.
 - B. For him the rich were to blame for the civil distress, and he condemns their selfishness.
 - C. He also recognizes that the aristocrats wanted some sort of return to the status quo, the hoplites wanted some political voice, and the mass of the people wanted a cancellation of debts and land redistribution.
 - D. Regarding the power Solon wielded, he tells us that if he wanted to, he could have become tyrant.
 - E. He tells us that he saw himself as a mediator, placing every member of society where he considered that person should fit, and his legislation was to remedy what he considered wrong.
- III. Now we move to consider Solon's legislation. He passed a number of measures, which can be divided into economic, political, and judicial categories. We will consider each of these in turn.
 - A. His economic legislation feeds into the social legislation, and the rest of our lecture will deal with these.
 - B. The next lecture will discuss his political and judicial legislation and have some summing-up comments.
 - C. The chief complaint of the people was being enslaved despite being citizens.
- IV. Solon's economic legislation worked on two levels: the individual and the city.
 - A. On the individual level, he placed a ban on all future loans secured on the actual person and enacted a widespread cancellation of all debts by a measure known as the *seisachtheia*—"the shaking off of burdens."
 - B. Also, the grain that was grown in Attica was not enough to support the population, and what little grain was grown the nobles sold overseas for a hefty profit. To combat this, Solon banned the export of all natural produce apart from olive oil.
 - C. He did not redistribute the land as the people wanted, because he knew that would not solve agrarian distress.
 - D. As for the city of Athens, Solon introduced a law that fathers were to have their sons taught a trade, the idea being that skilled workers would contribute to the city's growth.
 - E. Solon also encouraged foreign craftsmen, potters especially, to move to Athens and offered them citizenship to lure them there.
 - F. Solon also seems to have changed Attica's system of weights and measures to make it uniform with those used elsewhere in the Greek world, which helped trading immensely.
- V. In theory the ordinary man was better off, but in practice he was far from it.
 - A. Farmers would again find themselves in debt, but Solon had forbidden loans secured on people's bodies. Thus their neighbors might be less inclined to help them.

- B. In the short term, the nonnobles were worse off, and they came to resent Solon because they thought he had not done enough.
 - C. Indeed, the increase in wealth that Solon was able to bring about only widened the gap between the haves and the have-nots and led to tensions down the road.
- VI. The same short-term versus long-term benefit applied also to the city of Athens.
- A. In the short term, there was no meteoric surge in pottery production, but eventually Athens became the leading producer of ornamental ware in the Greek world; its pottery exports played a significant role in its economy.
 - B. Its economy became one of the strongest in the Classical period.

Suggested Reading:

Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*.

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Why was Solon, not the ordinary farmer, able to recognize that for their situation to improve they needed to change their farming practices, and why did the farmers resist him?
2. Do you think Solon was right not to give in to all the demands of the ordinary people?

Lecture Seven

Solon, Democracy, and Law

Scope: This lecture considers Solon's political and judicial legislation. How did he actually create democracy? What did he do to help develop the legal code? As part of our survey of Solon, we consider the view of Aristotle's *Athenian Constitution* on the three most democratic aspects of Solon's constitution: Surprisingly, the development of democracy is not one of them! We also consider whether we can call the legislation of the Father of Democracy successful, given why he was appointed extraordinary archon.

Outline

- I. This lecture is focused on Solon's political and judicial legislation, which was far more revolutionary and affects us more than his economic legislation. So let's start with the political.
 - A. Solon replaced birth with wealth as the qualification for political office, which effectively ended the Eupatrid monopoly of power, eventually allowing nonnobles to stand for political office.
 - B. To work out how much wealth a person needed to take part in political life, Solon divided the Athenians into four new economic groups: *pentakosiomedimnoi*, *hippeis*, *zeugitae*, and *thetes*.
 - C. To stand for the top three archons—the basileus, *polemarchos*, and eponymous—candidates could come only from the top two classes—the *pentakosiomedimnoi* and *hippeis*.
 - D. Those interested in standing for the six *thesmothetae* positions could come from the third class—the *zeugitae*, the rankers or hoplites.
 - E. The *thetes* were ineligible to stand for any political office, but Solon enacted that the Assembly was to meet more regularly and that all citizens, including the *thetes*, could attend it.
 - F. Solon created a council of 400 men, called the Boule, that prepared the agenda for the Assembly, and it had a probouleutic function.
- II. We might say that the Athenians didn't really have democracy because not every citizen could stand for political office.
 - A. The *thetes* were disadvantaged because they could not stand for the archonship or membership in the Boule, but Solon realized that the aristocrats had the experience in governing.
 - B. In time, through their attendance at the Assembly, the *thetes* would gain that experience if they chose to work their way up. This was also an incentive to make people work harder, thus benefiting the city's economy as well as themselves if they had political aspirations.
 - C. As for the difference between aristocrats in the Boule influencing the people and the old system of Areopagus and archons deciding what's what, remember that the Assembly is now a check on those wanting to become archons and the actions of archons in office through the *euthune*.
 - D. Solon is labeled the Father of Democracy because he opened up political office and political participation to nonnobles. He did not introduce a fully developed system, but he started the whole process off.
- III. Let's turn to Solon's judicial legislation.
 - A. Solon amended many of the laws of Dracon, as far as punishment was concerned.
 - B. Solon introduced the right of appeal against a magistrate's decision (a procedure called *epheisis*), together with a court of appeal called the Heliaea.
 - C. He introduced third-party intervention.
 - D. Solon also introduced various laws, such as the law that children had to look after their parents in old age since there was no social security in Athens.
 - E. He was also said to have laid down laws about general behavior in public, wills and inheritance matters, speaking ill of the dead, and a host of regulations affecting women.
- IV. There is no question that Solon took what Dracon had begun and significantly added to the development of the legal system, and that he introduced a goodly number of laws.
 - A. This is shown in the year 410 B.C.E., when a group of officials called *anagrapheis* (inscribers) were given the job of collecting all the laws of Solon and reinscribing them on stones to be set up in a public place.
 - B. It is interesting that *The Athenian Constitution* tells us that the three most democratic elements of the Solonian constitution were the prohibition of loans secured on an actual person, the ability of anyone to prosecute on behalf of another citizen, and the right of appeal.

- C. *The Athenian Constitution* does not mention anything about nonnobles now having political power in the Assembly and that some of them could now stand for political office via the new grouping system.
- D. It is probably because *The Athenian Constitution* describes the constitution of Cleisthenes in 508 B.C.E. as “more democratic than that of Solon.”
- E. Solon expected the Areopagus and the archons to continue running affairs as before and for the people to have a say in those affairs via the Assembly. Moreover, Solon’s constitution favored only those able to attend the assemblies in Athens.

Suggested Reading:

Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*.

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Questions to Consider:

1. How did Solon create democracy, and can we really use that term for Archaic Athens?
2. Is it right to say that Solon was ultimately unsuccessful, or are we defining what he did (and did not do) too narrowly?

Lecture Eight

From Anarchy to Tyranny in Athens

Scope: The decades after Solon were marked by anarchy, aristocratic faction fighting, and further civil war. In this period we see the rise to power of the tyrant Pisistratus, a nobleman who championed the cause of the poor. He attempted tyranny three times, and we look at the two failed attempts before his third, successful one in 545 B.C.E. The second attempt nicely (and amusingly) illustrates the people's attitude toward the gods and the extent to which religion went hand in hand with daily life. We see how Pisistratus established his power at the expense of the noble families and consider what his aims were.

Outline

- I. Despite what Solon did for the people and for the city of Athens, in the short as well as the long term, both sides of society, nobles and nonnobles, were unhappy with what he did.
 - A. Why did they feel this way, and were those feelings justified? We'll spend the first half of this lecture considering these questions and whether, by extension (given this resentment), we should call Solon's legislation successful.
 - B. In the second half of the lecture, we'll consider the aftermath of his legislation: Despite what Solon did, Athens was headed for a tyranny.
- II. Solon's constitution was utopian because he assigned people to his four property groups based on where he thought their places should be in society.
 - A. Solon was not interested in winning popularity and making friends. He chose to suffer the wrath of both sides of society, rich and poor, acting only in what he felt were the city's best interests.
 - B. As with Dracon's laws, Solon's were inscribed on *kyrbeis* and *axones*, which were set up on poles in the portico of the basileus archon.
 - C. *The Athenian Constitution* also tells us that Solon made his laws complicated and opaque in their wording, so that the Athenians were often in dispute with them.
- III. There is no doubt that Solon's legislation had far-reaching consequences as far as political, economic, and judicial matters went, and we can recognize his importance in history. But technically, he was unsuccessful.
 - A. Solon steered Athens down the path to tyranny, because thanks to him there was even more of a struggle for the archonship.
 - B. Do his successes outweigh this failure? How should we measure success and evaluate Solon?
- IV. Now we move to the second part of our lecture, the aftermath of Solon's departure and the rise to power of Pisistratus the tyrant in 545 B.C.E.
 - A. Not long after Solon left Athens for Egypt, the old conflicts—which he had been appointed to end—reared their heads again.
 - B. They were centered on control of the office of eponymous archon, which shows us again that of the three archons the eponymous was the most important.
 - C. So we get the scenario for the rise of three factions in Attica that were contending for political power in Athens.
 - D. Also, we have the emergence on the political scene of Pisistratus, the champion of the poor, who would establish a tyranny that lasted for most of the second half of the 6th century.
- V. Our sources indicate that at this time there was factional strife involving several noble families who were broadly divided into three geographical-political groups.
 - A. One group was called the Men of the Plain (the area closest to Athens), which was led by a certain Lycurgus.
 - B. The second group was the Men of the Coast (the area that extended around and south of Athens down to Cape Sounion on the Attic promontory), which was led by Megacles.
 - C. The third group was called the Men Beyond the Hills (the area east of the city, beyond Mount Hymettus), which was led by Pisistratus.
 - D. These groups were not just geographical ones depending on where their leaders' power bases lay in Attica; they had a political nature as well.

- VI. Although Pisistratus was a nobleman, just like the tyrants in other cities were, he seems to have set himself up as a champion of the poor.
- A. We can therefore say that he headed a radical group, wanting a new form of rule, and *The Athenian Constitution* even calls him a democrat.
 - B. He also wanted to end the faction fighting between the nobles, which was the cause of Athens's problems.
- VII. It took Pisistratus three attempts to seize power and hold onto it.
- A. His first attempt was in about 560. The attempt failed, though; the families of the other two groups, headed by Lycurgus and Megacles, united to kick him out.
 - B. Pisistratus tried a second time, probably around 556. He dressed a tall lady named Phya as the Athena, then entered Athens with her, claiming he was the goddess's choice for leader.
 - C. During this second attempt, he also married Megacles' daughter to secure Megacles' support, but later he refused to consummate the marriage. Megacles turned on him and forced him into exile. Pisistratus then settled in Thrace, where he built up considerable financial reserves.
 - D. Pisistratus used his newfound wealth to hire mercenaries, and in 545, he invaded Attica at the head of his personal army, intent this time on seizing power and holding onto it for good. He disarmed the citizens to ensure there would be no armed uprising against him.
 - E. Athens then fell under a tyranny—the one thing that the Eupatridae had worked to prevent since the time of Dracon almost a century earlier.
 - F. Pisistratus would remain tyrant until his death in 528. His sons Hippias and Hipparchus succeeded him, and it was not until 510 that the tyranny came to an end.
 - G. *The Athenian Constitution* calls Pisistratus's rule “the age of Cronus,” meaning it was a golden age in Athens's history.

Suggested Reading:

Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*.

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Pomeroy, Burstein, Donlan, and Roberts, *Ancient Greece*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Is it any surprise that the social and political situation in Attica after the legislation of Solon led to someone like Pisistratus trying to seize power?
2. What does the Phya trick tell us about the religious beliefs of not only the Athenians but also Greeks in general?

Lecture Nine

Pisistratus, Tyrant of Athens

Scope: Aristotle's *Athenian Constitution* refers to the tyranny of Pisistratus as a "golden age" in Athenian history. In this lecture we look at how Pisistratus benefited the people and city economically, artistically, and culturally by his exploitation of religion and his power as tyrant. This is the period, for example, when the first official texts of the Homeric poems were established, when tragedy was born, and when Athens began to emerge as the great cultural center of the Greek world. Its economy began to flourish. Pisistratus also contributed to the legal system with the introduction of traveling judges to help those in rural areas who could not go to Athens for justice.

Outline

- I. We finished the last lecture with the excellent press *The Athenian Constitution* gave Pisistratus's rule: the "age of Cronus," a golden age. In this lecture we'll discuss what Pisistratus did to earn that praise.
 - A. Pisistratus followed the pattern of the Archaic tyrants in other states whom we discussed in Lecture Three by bettering the lifestyles of the people and promoting the city as an economic power.
 - B. He was concerned with maintaining peace and friendship with other states, in particular Sparta and Megara.
 - C. Peace would not merely mean no hostilities and hence no need to commit resources elsewhere; it also meant a chance for the economy to prosper.
- II. Pisistratus knew he could build on Solon's economic legislation and make Athens wealthier, but he also knew he could not do this without ending the factional strife that had plagued Athens for generations and held back its economic advancement.
 - A. These two aims—improving the city and people and ending the faction fighting among the aristocrats—are at the heart of what he did, which was enacting a cunning combination of social, foreign, and religious policies.
 - B. He adopted Solon's idea of switching to olive and vine cultivation, but unlike Solon, because of the power he now wielded as tyrant, he was able to order the farmers to change.
 - C. As a result of this move, Attic land that was largely unable to grow grain came into its own. Olive oil became one of Athens's biggest exports and helped to pay for the much-needed imported grain.
 - D. The boom in olive and vine cultivation set a fire under other sectors of the economy too, such as pottery production.
- III. An offshoot of basic container production was artistic advancement; it did not take long before potters, and then painters, began to design more sophisticated and luxury pottery items.
 - A. By about 550 B.C.E., the technique known as black figure appeared in Athens; by about 530, the technique known as red figure came into being in Athens.
 - B. It was not long before Athens eclipsed Corinth as the leading pottery producer in Greece, with both the individual and the city benefiting. As a result, Athens began to acquire a cultural reputation in the Greek world.
 - C. It wasn't just pottery—both everyday and ornamental—that Pisistratus encouraged, but artistic life in general. It was deliberate policy to make Athens the cultural capital of Greece.
 - D. The Pisistratids patronized foreign poets from all over the Greek world. They were responsible for producing the first official texts of the Homeric poems, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.
 - E. Pisistratus integrated Homer into an annual religious festival to the city's patron deity, Athena. This was called the Panathenaea.
 - F. Pisistratus also created a new festival in honor of Dionysus, the god of wine and fertility.
 - G. Tragedy had a long way to go before it reached its zenith with the great plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides in the 5th century B.C.E., but it started thanks to the patronage of Pisistratus—and tragedies in Athens were always performed at the Dionysia festival.
- IV. Pisistratus also benefited his people and city in other ways.
 - A. He introduced "deme judges." These were men who traveled around to the various towns of Attica hearing cases and probably deciding appeals.
 - B. Like the other tyrants, Pisistratus introduced a building program, including the rebuilding of the temple to Athena on the Acropolis and the great temple of Olympian Zeus.
 - C. Another project ordered by Pisistratus was the building of an aqueduct to bring water into the city.
 - D. Also of benefit was the building of a defensive wall around the city.

- E. Building projects, better water supply, and economic stimulation are standard on the part of tyrants overall and had a triple function: to improve lives, to make the regime popular, and to provide jobs in construction.
- V. Pisistratus differed from the other Archaic-age tyrants with his exploitation of religion.
 - A. His religious festivals were a deliberate effort to combat local Attic cults in favor of Athenian ones and to attract people to the city.
 - B. His careful foreign policy of peaceful relations with other states dovetailed into his economic and religious policy, to benefit Athens and its people economically and promote the city as a cultural and economic power in the Greek world.
- VI. Pisistratus died of illness in 527 B.C.E., and the tyranny passed to his sons Hippias and Hipparchus. But the golden age was about to end.

Suggested Reading:

Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*.

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Was a tyranny at Athens inevitable?
2. Can you see a hidden agenda on Pisistratus's part? If so, what do you think it might be?

Lecture Ten

Tyranny Overthrown—The Sons of Pisistratus

Scope: The first part of this lecture looks at the reign of Pisistratus's sons, the murder of one of them in 514 B.C.E., and the growing tension with the powerful military state of Sparta, which led to the overthrow of the tyranny in 510 B.C.E. In the second part of this lecture, we ask the hard questions. Pisistratus sounds wonderful, but was he? To what extent did he have the people's best interests at heart, or was he cynically exploiting them to maintain his regime (which was, after all, based on force)? There is no question that the people and the city prospered, but do the ends justify the means? Should we agree with Aristotle that this was a golden age when we consider Pisistratus's domination of the people?

Outline

- I. When Pisistratus died in 527 B.C.E., his sons took over the tyranny. In this lecture we look at their rule and its fall at the hands of Sparta. We end with some concluding comments about the tyranny overall.
 - A. Pisistratus was succeeded by his sons Hippias and Hipparchus in some form of joint rule.
 - B. Hippias was the dominant one and in control of affairs, because he was the oldest, as well as being more "public spirited and sensible."
 - C. Hipparchus was puerile, more interested in the arts and partying than public life.
- II. These two sons continued their father's economic policies and indeed extended them.
 - A. They were responsible for developing the silver mines at Laurium that would produce the silver for Athens's first state coinage in about 525.
 - B. An official coinage is fundamental to any economy, but they also had a propaganda function to connect the coins to Athens.
 - C. The previous coinage that some Athenians had been using became obsolete with the rise of a new state coinage, further centralizing the position of Athens in Attica.
- III. In foreign policy, thanks to worsening relations with Sparta, the sons fared less well.
 - A. The Alcmeonidae family was in exile but intent on returning. To this end, they soon started to use Sparta to work toward bringing the Pisistratid tyranny to an end.
 - B. In 514, Hipparchus was murdered by Harmodius and Aristogeiton. The motive for the assassination is unknown, and *The Athenian Constitution* doesn't help: It confuses names and first says it was personal, then gives us a political twist.
 - C. The assassination was a turning point in the Pisistratid tyranny. Gone was its benevolent nature from the days of Pisistratus, because after 514 Hippias's rule was harsh.
 - D. The Alcmeonidae family helped to bring down Hippias in 510 when they agreed to fund the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, which gave them leverage over the priestess of Apollo, the Pythia.
 - E. An initial Spartan expedition by sea was thwarted by Athens, but King Cleomenes ended the Pisistratid tyranny in 510.
 - F. It is important to note that it was a Spartan force, ultimately at the instigation of an exiled Athenian family, that toppled the tyranny, not the ordinary Athenians.
- IV. Let me now make some concluding comments about the tyranny and its place in Athenian history.
 - A. We can applaud Pisistratus and his sons for how they benefited the city economically and for their patronage of the arts; certainly they were cultured and lovers of art themselves.
 - B. But we must not forget that Pisistratus came to power by defeating the army of the Eupatridae, who were then in control of Athens, at Pallene.
 - C. Pisistratus was part of a support network of tyrant alliances, as opposed to allies with other poleis.
 - D. Remember also that he disarmed the people to offset any opposition to him, and he went everywhere with his own private mercenary bodyguard.
 - E. At the heart of Pisistratus's policies was the increased centralization of Athens in Attica, which was only possible by combating the influence of the aristocrats in the various areas of Attica through exploiting religion.

- V. We can understand how the people would have found Pisistratus's rule acceptable after all the faction conflict between the noble families, which resulted in bad rule, civil strife between nonnoble and noble, and general poverty, all of which had sprung up again in the aftermath of Solon's legislation.
 - A. At the same time, we cannot overlook that underneath everything Pisistratus did was his political agenda: to encourage national loyalty over local loyalties, and to keep the people occupied.
 - B. Nevertheless, given the real strides that Athens and the people made economically and culturally, we might say that the Pisistratid tyranny was needed at this time, and hence its ends justified Pisistratus's means.
- VI. All of Pisistratus's work to end local faction fighting was undone when the tyranny fell.
 - A. Fighting among noble families immediately broke out, once again centered on the eponymous archonship.
 - B. Within two years, however, the strife was over, thanks to the Alcmeonid Cleisthenes, who finally curtailed the local power of the nobles and introduced further democratic reforms.

Suggested Reading:

Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*.

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Given Pisistratus's very real achievements in the spheres of economic growth and intellectual and cultural life, can we say that his ends justified his means?
2. What does the fact that the people did not conspire to bring down the tyranny tell us of what they really wanted out of their lives?

Lecture Eleven

Democracy Restored—Cleisthenes of Athens

Scope: The peace Athens enjoyed under Pisistratus declined dramatically when the tyranny was overthrown and Sparta was again forced to invade Athens. Faction fighting was rampant among the aristocratic families until the legislation of Cleisthenes. As we shall see, he was determined to end the infighting once and for all, and his legislation dramatically increased the fledgling democracy introduced by Solon that had been suspended by Pisistratus. Cleisthenes is also sometimes called the Father of Democracy, and we will examine his political, social, and judicial legislation in this and the following lecture.

Outline

- I. The period of the Pisistratid tyranny might have given Athens some relief from factional strife, but its fall in 510 B.C.E. led to immediate clashes between noble families. These ended thanks to Cleisthenes and his round of democratic legislation in 508 B.C.E.
 - A. With the expulsion of Hippias from Athens in 510, Cleisthenes (a member of the Alcmeonidae family) and Isagoras (who *The Athenian Constitution* says was a friend of the tyrants) went head to head.
 - B. Their struggle was centered once again on the eponymous archonship.
 - C. Cleisthenes evidently was losing out, because Isagoras was elected archon for 508.
- II. Isagoras's days were numbered, however, because he enlisted the support of Sparta, under King Cleomenes, to help maintain his power.
 - A. Cleomenes' invasion, and especially his attempt to set up an oligarchy, proved too much; the Athenians rebelled.
 - B. After Cleomenes and Isagoras left Athens, the Assembly made Cleisthenes, according to *The Athenian Constitution*, "leader and champion of the people" and "placed all their trust" in him.
 - C. He changed the way people named themselves, from using family names to using locality names, to mask who were the new citizens and who were the old.
 - D. The Athenians gave Cleisthenes some type of extraordinary power to fix the faction fighting that had caused such disruption to all sectors of society.
 - E. The huge difference between Solon and Cleisthenes was that it was the people, not the ruling aristocrats or Eupatridae, who gave Cleisthenes this mandate.
- III. But how could he fix things when others before him had failed?
 - A. Cleisthenes fixated on freeing the people from intimidation by their local aristocrats.
 - B. Cleisthenes' legislation altered existing social conditions and put an end to the influence of the aristocratic power bases in Attica.
- IV. Let's begin with his political legislation—and I warn you, it's complicated.
 - A. Cleisthenes mixed up the population of Attica into 10 new tribes by dividing Attica into a number of administrative areas, the idea being that people's loyalty would now be to their tribes.
 - B. Since members of the tribe would come from different parts of Attica, someone in one town would not be intimidated because he could call on fellow tribesmen from other areas for support.
 - C. So there was no population displacement, but individuals became part of a geographically scattered tribe that was divided into three regions—city, coast, and inland—and further subdivided each region into 10 parts, or *trittyes*.
 - D. What Cleisthenes now did was take one *trittys* from each region and assign it to a tribe, so that each tribe became composed of three different *trittyes*.
 - E. Building on this system, Cleisthenes created assemblies for each tribe and each town that decided matters affecting that tribe, each reporting to the Athenian Assembly.
 - F. Moreover, it was the tribal Assembly that elected the members of the Boule by lot. Cleisthenes now increased the Boule to 500, 50 men from each of the 10 tribes.
 - G. Also, each town had its own demarch (official in charge, like a mayor).
 - H. The assigning of towns to *trittyes* and *trittyes* to tribes sounds very arbitrary. But there was nothing arbitrary about Cleisthenes' system.

Suggested Reading:

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*.

Questions to Consider:

1. How might Cleisthenes' division of Attica end the influence of local nobles?
2. How much of our democratic system of government can be seen so far in the legislation of Solon and Cleisthenes?

Lecture Twelve

Cleisthenes, the Real Father of Democracy?

Scope: Cleisthenes successfully ended faction fighting with his legislation. It can be said that his political system—as it related to rural areas as well as the city—had affinities with the hierarchy of local, state, and federal administration in the United States. He was also responsible for two other innovations: the creation of professional generals, elected from each tribe, and the use of ostracism as a check on would-be tyrants. Nevertheless, we need to question his motives. Was he a genuine political and social reformer, or was his goal to enhance his power and that of his family in political life? Also, in taking democracy to the masses in a way that Solon had not, does that make him deserving of the title Father of Democracy?

Outline

- I. We're going to conclude our discussion of Cleisthenes in this lecture by looking at what his division of Attica meant. Then we'll consider other aspects of his legislation before ending with the questions about his motive and whether he also deserves the label Father of Democracy.
- II. In the previous lecture, we saw how Cleisthenes divided up Attica and scattered its people among 10 new tribes.
 - A. The idea was to protect the ordinary people from the oppression of local aristocrats and to cut down on faction fighting.
 - B. In tandem with this reform was his move to change the way the people referred to themselves.
- III. What did Cleisthenes' division of Attic society really mean?
 - A. The answer lies in the putting of people from different towns into the same tribes. Now people from different parts of Attica—nonnobles and nobles—were merged via the *trittyes* into new and different tribes.
 - B. People's loyalties switched to their tribal Assembly, and more than that these assemblies elected their tribe's representatives to the Boule in Athens, which came to control the day-to-day administration of the state.
 - C. His legislation allowed the Boule to acquire this power and to be composed of a wide section of Attic society. This system is the closest to proportional representation we will find in the ancient Greek world.
 - D. Candidates to the Boule were not directly elected. The process of election to the Boule was by lot. However, these men would still need to meet with their tribe's approval before putting themselves forward.
 - E. Cleisthenes also widened the socioeconomic composition of the Boule, and nonnobles began to play a role in higher-level state administration.
 - F. These measures meant that the ordinary people gained experience in politics and administration both inside and outside Athens.
- IV. *The Athenian Constitution* describes the Cleisthenic constitution as "more democratic than that of Solon."
 - A. Cleisthenes took democracy to the masses in a way that Solon did not.
 - B. Cleisthenes gave these same people the opportunity to participate in a political system in which all citizens—nobles and nonnobles—were in theory equal.
 - C. They discussed business that affected them all, and they elected their tribal representatives to the Boule, who would support that tribe and its members.
 - D. Perhaps we can have two Fathers of Democracy, then. After all, the development of democracy was complicated, and we can't expect one man to do it all.
- V. Two other innovations of Cleisthenes need to be discussed.
 - A. The first was in the military sphere, where he introduced the office of the *strategos*, or professional general. Ten *strategoí* (one general from each tribe) were elected annually to these positions.
 - B. The other and final innovation is ostracism. Cleisthenes was believed to have introduced this procedure as a constitutional way of expelling would-be tyrants from Athens to protect the democracy.
- VI. There is no question that the people benefited thanks to Cleisthenes' legislation. However, was he a genuine political and social reformer, or was his legislation a by-product of his ultimate goal to increase the political power of the Alcmeonidae?
 - A. Is it really possible that he did not realize how much his own family could benefit from what he did?
 - B. It is up to you to decide whether he was a genuine reformer or a con man.

- VII.** The Greeks had come a long way from the era of oligarchic rule and the lack of rights for all citizens, not to mention their enslavement at the hands of their fellows.
- A.** The *hektemoroi* who faced enslavement became prospering olive farmers, taking part in a political system regardless of where they happened to live in Attica.
 - B.** The power of the people was such that it was able to rise up against a Spartan invasion in 508, barricade a Spartan king and a would-be oligarchic ruler on the Acropolis, and force them into submission. And all of this in less than a century—going back to Solon in 594, that is.
 - C.** But even more astonishing is what the 5th century will bring as far as the power of Athens and the people go.

Suggested Reading:

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Was Cleisthenes a genuine social and political reformer or a con man extraordinaire?
2. Does Cleisthenes, more than Solon, deserve to be regarded as the Father of Democracy?

Lecture Thirteen

Sparta, the Odd-Man-Out State in Greece

Scope: In this and the following two and a half lectures, we deal with Sparta, Athens's traditional enemy. Sparta in the early Archaic period was developing like any other city as far as its economy and culture were concerned. Then it suddenly turned its back on such things and focused on being self-sufficient and creating a military society. In this lecture we look at the early political development of Sparta and the legislation of Lycurgus, who brought the Spartan constitution (the Rhetra) from the god Apollo at Delphi. Plutarch's life of Lycurgus quotes the Rhetra, which we discuss for the light it throws on what the Spartan constitution consisted of, with its unique combination of monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy.

Outline

- I. After our broad survey of Athenian history and society, we turn to what will be the other superpower of the Classical period: Sparta.
 - A. Sparta was the odd-man-out state in Greece because it was so different from any other polis.
 - B. In this and the next two and a half lectures, we're going to look at various aspects of Spartan history and society, beginning with some general observations about Sparta and then an examination of its constitution.
- II. Sparta was located in the area of the Peloponnese called Laconia, and its people were of the Dorian race.
 - A. These Dorians migrated into Greece and down to the Peloponnese from the north toward the end of the Bronze Age, and they seem to have ridden roughshod over the native populations of the region.
 - B. After the arrival of the Dorians, these original inhabitants (*perioikoi*) continued to live close by or "dwelt around" Sparta and were required to fight in the Spartan army.
- III. Sparta is a difficult place to study because of how ancient writers—especially Xenophon, Plato, and Plutarch—pictured the Spartans.
 - A. To outsiders, the Spartans had an organized society, in which everyone was equal and adhered to the laws; as a result, the term "Spartan mirage" is often applied.
 - B. The Spartans might have lived in a structured society, but it was just as chaotic as elsewhere.
 - C. The Spartans would boast the most formidable land army in Greece until the Macedonian army under Philip II in the mid-4th century B.C.E.
 - D. Despite the Spartans' power and influence—and the fact that they eventually came to control two-fifths of the Peloponnese—the city of Sparta itself was devoid of magnificent buildings and temples.
- IV. Sparta was originally founded when four small villages merged. Later it absorbed the town of Amyclae, and by the 8th century B.C.E. it had taken over all Laconia to become its polis.
 - A. In the Dark Ages, the reign of a single king ended. In Sparta, this was replaced with two kings.
 - B. During this period and the early Archaic period, the Spartans produced fine Laconian pottery, furniture, poetry, and wine.
 - C. Then, suddenly, all of this stopped and the Spartans developed a unique political and social system, which excluded all luxury goods and creature comforts.
 - D. Lycurgus brought a decree from the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, which redefined or reformed the Spartan political structure. It became a mixture of monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy.
- V. The decree about the Spartan constitution that Lycurgus brought back from Delphi was called the great Rhetra.
 - A. The Spartans were first to be divided into various groups (*phylai* and *obai*), and their constitution was made up of a combination of monarchic, aristocratic, and democratic elements.
 - B. They had the Gerousia (a council of elders that included two kings, the *archagetai*) and an Assembly, called the *Apella*; from the Greek "to hold an assembly."
 - C. Why there were two kings is not properly known.
 - D. The Gerousia was a body of 30 men made up of 28 nobles over the age of 60 and the 2 kings ex officio.
 - E. The *Apella* was open to full male citizens over the age of 30, who were known as Spartiates.
 - F. One other addition to the Spartan constitution that is not mentioned in the Rhetra is the introduction of the ephorate, a five-man elected body with power over the kings. It grew to have considerable power in Sparta.

- VI. Let's conclude by outlining some of the similarities and differences between the Athenian and Spartan constitutions.
- A. There was no monarchic element in the Athenian constitution; the closest we get to that is the basileus archon, and he wasn't a king. But the Gerosia is very similar to the aristocratic-oligarchic Areopagus that dominated political life for so long.
 - B. Perhaps the biggest difference between the Athenian and Spartan constitutions is the assemblies.
 - C. It's not just the mixed constitution that makes the Spartans different from the other Greeks; it is also their system of military education and how their society was organized.

Suggested Reading:

Cartledge, *The Spartans*.

Powell, *Athens and Sparta*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Which of the organs of the Spartan constitution could dominate the others, and why?
2. What are the similarities and differences between the Athenian and Spartan constitutions?

Lecture Fourteen

Death or Glory—Spartan Military Education

Scope: In this lecture we move from Sparta's political order to the social and economic reforms ascribed to Lycurgus. We begin with the redistribution of land, and then we focus principally on the radical change to Spartan society brought about by the introduction of the brutal system of military education for all males from age seven, called the *agoge*. The aim was to build the best army in Greece. We look at what this training, in which the death rate was high, involved and what type of man and soldier emerged at the end of it.

Outline

- I. In this lecture we move from Sparta's political order to its social and to the other reforms ascribed to Lycurgus in the social and economic spheres.
 - A. One was the redistribution of the land of Laconia, apparently to try to redress the inequality between the people.
 - B. Another major reform attributed to Lycurgus was the system of military training called the *agoge* and the introduction of common messes or barracks.
- II. The *agoge* became the core of the educational system for males and is the most characteristic aspect of Spartan society. The *agoge* was compulsory for all males.
 - A. Until the age of seven, boys and girls played together and trained together in the nude.
 - B. At age seven, girls and boys were segregated. Girls carried on living at home, still doing physical training. But the boys left their homes and went to live in a military mess or barracks called a *sysition*.
 - C. Until the men were 30, they were not allowed to move into their own homes. They were allowed to marry when they hit their early 20s, but they had to visit their wives in secret.
 - D. Husbands were required to spend every weekend in the *sysition* and to eat dinner there every evening with their comrades-in-arms, because Spartan men were required to serve in the army until they were 60, and so training needed to be ongoing after graduating the *agoge*.
- III. The training in the *agoge* was often brutal.
 - A. At age seven the young boys were divided into what were called herds for their physical and obedience training.
 - B. At age 12 they cut their hair short and moved to what we might call military maneuvers.
 - C. At age 14 the boys became known as ephebes, and they began to take part in military campaigns. This period lasted until age 20, when they grew their hair long again and grew the Spartan beard.
 - D. At age 30 each man graduated, received his *kleros* (land allotment), and became a full Spartan citizen, or Spartiate.
 - E. To maintain that status, he had to continue paying "mess dues," which would be in food and drink, for the rest of his life. If he did not, he would no longer be a Spartiate.
 - F. A lot of Spartan boys and men must have failed the *agoge*. Some would have died in training or dropped out, which we know did happen, because these unfortunate souls were called "inferiors" or "tremblers."
- IV. The goal of the *agoge* was twofold: to produce first-rate soldiers who would fight and die for the state without question and to train future members of the *krypteia*, the secret police.
 - A. The Spartans' attitude toward civic life and what they considered important helps us understand why they were considered so different by their fellow Greeks.
 - B. We gain vivid insight into what life in the *agoge* was like from Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus* and from a work by Xenophon called the *Constitution of the Spartans*.
 - C. The measures taken in the *agoge* to toughen boys and men and to improve their ability to steal, run, and fight were all meant to benefit them and their fellow soldiers when on campaign.
 - D. Another aspect of the *agoge* system was what we might call institutionalized homosexuality. The idea behind this, from a military perspective, was that in battle the soldiers would be fighting on behalf of the state as well as protecting their lovers.
 - E. Graduates of the *agoge* certainly earned their *kleros*, and we can see why the Spartan army earned the reputation it did as the best-trained and toughest fighting force in Greece.

- V. If you think the Spartan women got off easy in this system, think again.
- A. Although girls stayed home after age seven and were looked after by their mothers, they still continued with physical training to make them strong and healthy.
 - B. This was because society's expectation of Spartan women was to produce strong babies, who would grow up either to fight for Sparta if boys or bear more strong babies if girls.

Suggested Reading:

Cartledge, *The Spartans*.

Powell, *Athens and Sparta*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What were the principal features of the *agoge* in Sparta, and what were its strengths and weaknesses?
2. To what extent did the people have more power in Athens than in Sparta?

Lecture Fifteen

“Come Back Carrying Your Shield or On It”

Scope: In this lecture we discuss the role of women in Spartan society, in contrast to the women of Athens. Then we focus on the Spartans’ annexation of the neighboring state of Messenia and their turning the native population into state-owned slaves, or “helots.” A revolt by these helots, who significantly outnumbered the Spartans, may have led to the creation of the *agoge* to maintain military superiority over these subject peoples. At the same time, we see Sparta beginning a series of alliances with other states in the Peloponnese, which will lead to the formation of the Peloponnesian League, under Spartan hegemony, in the mid-6th century B.C.E. This league would eventually become the Spartans’ 5th-century empire.

Outline

- I. In our last lecture, we focused on the role of male Spartans in the *agoge* and what was expected of them in Spartan society.
 - A. In the first part of this lecture, it’s the women’s turn, and along the way we’ll see some of the differences between Spartan and other Greek women.
 - B. Then in the second part I want to discuss in some detail why and when the *agoge* was introduced.
 - C. That will take us to the third and final part, the origins of Sparta’s Peloponnesian League.
- II. We begin with Spartan women, who had more independence and rights than their counterparts in Athens.
 - A. Spartan women could own land, even if they had brothers, and in the 4th century B.C.E. Aristotle talks of two-fifths of the land of Laconia being owned by women.
 - B. The decline in manpower, and the fact that the Spartan man was always busy in some way with warfare, also explains why women played a more overt role in Spartan public life than they did elsewhere.
- III. If the lot of the Spartan man was to graduate the *agoge* and fight for the state, the lot of the Spartan woman was to bear strong babies.
 - A. Even after the separation of boys and girls at age seven, the girls continued with physical training, and as a result Spartan women had a reputation among the Greeks for toughness.
 - B. In addition to their reputation for toughness was the Spartan women’s attitude toward their children dying nobly for the state.
 - C. Any idea that Spartan children were smothered and brought up as mummy’s boys is shown to be false by the number of sayings attributed to Spartan women about their children, sayings that circulated widely in the Greek world.
 - D. Because the Spartans were obsessed with producing healthy male babies, the females married young, in their late teens.
 - E. The Spartan preoccupation with strong and plentiful male babies gave rise to the practice of wife sharing, and offspring from these extramarital liaisons belonged equally to all. The Spartans were in effect practicing selective breeding (eugenics).
 - F. Domestic life, then, was radically different in Sparta from in, say, Athens. The wife was established as head of the household, and she was seen as a mother figure and a father figure to the children.
- IV. It is now time to consider when and why the *agoge* was introduced. For these factors, we need to bring in the helots.
 - A. Helots were state-owned serfs and had no political, social, or judicial rights. The helots were perhaps the reason for the introduction of the *agoge* and the radical reorganization of Spartan society.
 - B. During the Archaic period, the Spartans conquered Messenia and turned the free, native inhabitants into slaves, or “helots.” The campaign is called the First Messenian War.
 - C. About a century later, the helots revolted, forcing the Spartans to intervene in Messenia again in the Second Messenian War. This war was serious, and it took a lot out of the Spartans.
 - D. In 371 B.C.E. the Thebans defeated the Spartans at the Battle of Leuctra, and the following year the Thebans invaded the Peloponnese, liberated the helots, and refounded Messene.
 - E. The dependence on the helots and the scare from their revolt may well mean that the Second Messenian War led to the radical transformation of society along the militaristic lines of the *agoge*.

- F. Another reason for linking the helots to the *agoge* is that by farming the *kleroi* for the Spartans, they allowed the Spartan men time to focus only on military affairs and army service, as they did not have to bother farming themselves.
- V. Another offshoot of the helot problem was the development of the organization that was destined to become Sparta's empire: the Peloponnesian League.
 - A. Sparta had been gradually increasing its power in the Peloponnese but had been held in check by Argos.
 - B. In 546 B.C.E., the Spartans were finally able to defeat the Argives, and Sparta thus began the trend for a series of alliances with other Peloponnesian states and the formation of what modern historians call the Peloponnesian League.
 - C. It is plausible to connect the helot threat to Spartan security with the formation of this league, the idea being that if the helots revolted again and the Spartans were hard pushed, they could count on their allies for help.
 - D. In the Peloponnesian League, the Spartan allies swore an oath to support each other in times of war and to follow the lead of the Spartans.
 - E. The league enhanced the power and prestige of Sparta, but it also drew Sparta into the orbit of Greek affairs in a way that its society was ill-equipped to deal with when Persia emerged on the Greek scene.

Suggested Reading:

Cartledge, *The Spartans*.

Powell, *Athens and Sparta*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Does it make sense to connect the introduction of the *agoge* to the helot problem?
2. How might the Spartans' attitude toward family life influence the views of other Greeks about them?

Lecture Sixteen

From Sparta to Persia

Scope: We conclude our survey of Sparta in this lecture. We look at how the Spartans were viewed by the other Greeks. We also examine how Sparta, despite its intention of being an inward-looking society, becomes involved in the affairs of other Greek states, including Athens, when it helped to put down the Pisistratid tyranny (Lecture Nine). Relations between Athens and Sparta deteriorated rapidly, but making matters worse for the Greeks was the emerging menace of Persia. Finally, we trace the apparent overture to the Persian invasion of Greece—the so-called Ionian revolt (499–494 B.C.E.).

Outline

- I. In the first part of this lecture, we conclude our discussion of Sparta with some observations on Spartan society that show its weaknesses. Then the second part of our lecture takes us to the era of the Persian Wars, which end the Archaic period.
- II. As we've seen, Spartans grew up in a military society in which fighting for the state was placed first and family life and participation in political activities second.
 - A. All of these things—especially the importance the Spartans placed, or rather did not place, on politics and the family—were abhorrent to other Greeks.
 - B. If the Spartans had maintained a lifestyle that cut them off from the rest of the Greeks, like living as a commune, they might well have led a model existence compared to life in other poleis.
 - C. But they didn't, and the Peloponnesian League and the reputation of the Spartan army drew the Spartans into affairs well beyond the Peloponnese.
- III. Sparta's reputation on the mainland was also paramount.
 - A. Sparta's social and military developments might sound great, and they contributed to the "Spartan mirage" we talked about in Lecture Thirteen.
 - B. But the social and military developments would affect the city detrimentally because they involved Sparta in central Greek affairs, something the Spartans never wanted to happen.
 - C. Another thing that affected the Spartans detrimentally was their reliance on the helots, who far outnumbered them, to provide sustenance; thus the Spartans were forced to be careful not to commit large forces elsewhere in Greece or overseas.
 - D. To make matters worse, Sparta suffered a declining population that affected its fighting strength, which was what its society was all about in the first place.
 - E. Sparta was facing problems as no other polis was, and these problems detrimentally affected Sparta as time continued.
- IV. As if the deteriorating relations between Athens and Sparta weren't bad enough, by the start of the 5th century B.C.E., Greece was feeling the presence of another power that would cause it much grief: Persia.
 - A. These wars were the backdrop to the growth in Athenian imperialism in the 5th century, as well as bringing the Archaic period to an end and ushering in the Classical.
 - B. The Persian empire was enormous and was too vast for one person to control it effectively.
 - C. The Greeks of the mainland did not know a great deal about the Persians and so were swayed by stories of how rich the Great King was and how big and invincible the Persian army was.
 - D. The Persian Wars have their origin in what is called the Ionian revolt, which broke out in 499 B.C.E.
 - E. The high point in the Ionian revolt came in 498 with the burning of Darius's most westerly palace at Sardis.
 - F. Over the next few years, the Ionian cities enjoyed some successes against the Persian king, but then in 494 their fleet was decisively defeated at the Battle of Lade, near Miletus.
 - G. The revolt was over, and Darius reestablished control of the coast of Asia Minor.
- V. Darius was enraged at the burning of the Sardis palace, for which he blamed Athens and Eretria.
 - A. He therefore decided on a punitive mission to Greece, and in 492 he sent a fleet under his son-in-law Mardonius, but bad weather around the Chalcidice wreaked havoc on the fleet, and it was forced back to Persia.
 - B. Darius tried again in 490, sending a fleet commanded by his nephew Artaphernes and a Mede named Datis, and this time it sailed across the Aegean to Euboea.

- C. Did Darius intend this 490 mission to punish Eretria and Athens for supporting the Ionian revolt, or did he have something else in mind?
- D. A decade later, in 481 B.C.E., Xerxes would invade Greece, intent on conquering it, out of revenge for the Persian defeat. Often, when we talk about the Persian Wars, we mean Xerxes' invasion.
- E. According to Herodotus, Darius's mission was not just to punish only Athens and Eretria; he used the burning of Sardis as a pretext to extend Persian influence over the whole of Greece.
- F. But let's step back a moment and rethink whether the 490 campaign should be seen as part of the Persian Wars. There are grounds to argue Darius did not intend to conquer all of Greece.
- G. It makes more sense for the 490 invasion to be a punitive one against Eretria and Athens; if other states submitted to him, that would be icing on the cake. Even better would be the surrender of the Spartans.

Suggested Reading:

Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*.

Cartledge, *The Spartans*.

Green, *The Greco-Persian Wars*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What impression do you have of the Spartans, and why do you have it?
2. What motivated Darius to involve himself with the mainland Greeks?

Lecture Seventeen

Marathon—End of the First Persian Invasion

Scope: The Greeks' support of the cities of Asia Minor in their abortive revolt from Persian rule prompted the Persian king Darius to send an army to Attica, ostensibly to seek revenge, in 490 B.C.E. The Persians landed on the plain of Marathon in eastern Attica and were faced by an Athenian army supported by a small contingent of Plataeans. The Spartans, to whom the Athenians appealed for help, were not present. The Persian army was defeated, and the Battle of Marathon was significant in Athens's coming of age as a military power.

Outline

- I. I want to talk more about Herodotus in this lecture because he is the major source for the Persian Wars and is pivotal in the development of Greek historiography, another product of the Archaic period. So I'll say a few words about him now before moving on to discuss the Battle of Marathon.
- II. Herodotus was a Greek from Halicarnassus, in Caria, and he is commonly called the Father of History, since he was the first serious researcher and the first to write of events in prose.
 - A. The title of his work, *Historiá*, means "researches" and is usually translated as *Histories*.
 - B. Herodotus fashions his narrative to show the later Persian Wars as perhaps inevitable and reinforces the idea of a need to know our history and to understand differences in culture, religion, and belief.
 - C. Because Herodotus is dealing with a large time span, much of his work consists of digressions about persons, places, and things, for he made his living out of reciting his work, and so he needed to keep the interest level of his audience high.
 - D. Herodotus believed in the traditional gods, and he puts forward supernatural explanations for why things happened.
 - E. Nevertheless, his work is distinguished from the previous poets or chroniclers who merely tell stories because he tries to get at the truth.
 - F. Herodotus's account of the events of the Persian Wars is generally reliable because he lived through them, although he probably wrote about them in the middle of the 5th century B.C.E., when he might not have remembered things quite so sharply.
- III. Let's get back to the history.
 - A. The Ionian revolt of 499–494 B.C.E. had been at best a gallant failure, but it had shown three things: that Persian power, long regarded as invincible, could be countered; the importance of fleets in naval warfare, for the revolt ended at the decisive Battle of Lade; and the need for unity in resisting a common foe.
 - B. Herodotus believed that disunity among the Greeks at Lade was the reason for their defeat.
 - C. In 490 a Persian fleet arrived at Eretria on Euboea and besieged the city. Despite Athenian help, Eretria fell to a seven-day siege.
 - D. There was panic in Athens when the Persians crossed to land at Marathon in eastern Attica. The people mobilized an army and sent a certain Pheidippides to run to Sparta and plead for immediate help.
 - E. The Spartans refused an immediate deployment of men on the grounds that they were celebrating a religious festival in honor of Apollo. In the end only a small force of Plataeans marched with the Athenian hoplites to Marathon.
 - F. Marathon was really the first major test of the Athenian *polemarchos* archon Callimachus and the 10 *strategoí*. The 10 generals had different ideas from each other about strategy, and then there was Callimachus to factor in.
- IV. In the end, the *strategos* Miltiades was allowed to plan the strategy and direct operations, and he won the battle for them.
 - A. Miltiades arranged the Greek line with Callimachus commanding the right flank, Aristides and Themistocles in charge of the center, and the Plataean allies on the left flank.
 - B. Miltiades had deliberately made both flanks deeper, and the heavier flanks were able to smash the Persian line. The battle turned into fierce hand-to-hand fighting.
 - C. To an extent the Persians' ineptitude had contributed to the defeat because they had not reconnoitered the terrain adequately.
 - D. Herodotus says that 6,400 Persians were killed to the Athenians' 192, which included Callimachus.
 - E. News of the Athenians' victory was taken to the city from Marathon by Pheidippides.
 - F. It was customary on the part of the victor to dedicate spoils from battles to the gods, and Miltiades was no different. He dedicated these to the god Zeus at Olympia.

- V. The invincible Persian army had been beaten by the Greek hoplite army.
 - A. The Battle of Marathon became one of the most significant events in Athens's history for what it symbolized and how it came to be portrayed: as an Athenian victory that saved Greece; forget the role of the Plataeans in it.
 - B. The battle also gives us a new Greek word: *Marathonomachoi*, the fighters at Marathon.
 - C. Marathon was Athens's coming of age as a military power. This is not something that would have gone down well with the Spartans, but now the Athenians had defeated the Persian army, and on Greek soil.
 - D. So we move from Athens as a growing economic power and cultural center—both of which Sparta was not—to Athens as a growing military power, with distinguished hoplites.
 - E. Darius died in 486 B.C.E., and the Persian throne passed to his son Xerxes. Xerxes would launch a massive invasion of Greece in 481, leading some 200,000 troops.

Suggested Reading:

Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*.

Green, *The Greco-Persian Wars*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Why is Herodotus called the Father of History, and are we right to do so, given his limitations by our standards?
2. The Athenians downplayed the role of the Plataeans at Marathon for their own propaganda reasons. Does this sort of downplaying still happen today?

Lecture Eighteen

Thermopylae and the 300 Spartans

Scope: The Persians sought revenge for their defeat at Marathon by invading Greece in 481 B.C.E. with a massive army and fleet led by Xerxes, the Great King himself. In this lecture we discuss the Persian bridging of the Hellespont on a pontoon bridge of boats, the Greek response to this Persian invasion, and the first battle at Thermopylae in 480. Here is where the famous 300 Spartans led by Leonidas refused to surrender and were annihilated. Though they were defeated, the Spartans' bravery was a morale boost for the Greeks and has been remembered throughout history.

Outline

- I. The Athenians' victory at Marathon had dramatic repercussions in the city.
 - A. Until Marathon, the Alcmeonidae family dominated Athenian politics, as Cleisthenes had intended, but the Persian issue and especially Marathon brought about a change in foreign policy, and with it a change in political leadership that eclipsed that of the Alcmeonids.
 - B. This confidence can be seen in the people now being prepared to hold their leaders accountable for their actions and not let them off.
 - C. Another example of the new confidence is the first recorded instance of ostracism in 488/7 B.C.E.
- II. One of the greatest of the Athenian leaders—and most anti-Persian—in this period was Themistocles.
 - A. In 493 B.C.E., when he served as archon, he had the port town of Piraeus, which served as Athens's harbor, fortified.
 - B. Then in 483 he persuaded the people to spend a budget surplus on building 100 new triremes, the main Greek warship.
 - C. Themistocles' move laid the foundations for the later naval victories over the Persians, and they also paved the way for Athens first to become the leading naval force in Greece, then to put together an empire.
- III. After the Persians' defeat at Marathon, Herodotus tells us that Darius was bent on revenge.
 - A. Darius died in 486 B.C.E. and was succeeded by Xerxes.
 - B. Herodotus states specifically that in 481, Xerxes intended to conquer all Greece.
 - C. Xerxes crossed from Asia to Europe, and he was in northern Greece within a relatively short span of time.
 - D. Herodotus lists the various parts of the Persian invasion force, and when we add up the numbers, we get a total force of 5,283,320. Modern historians put Xerxes' land force at around 200,000 and his fleet at around 600–800 ships.
 - E. In the face of the Persian danger, all Athenian exiles were recalled in 481, including those ostracized in previous years like Aristides.
- IV. In the meantime the Spartans called a meeting of the Greek states at Corinth to discuss strategy and create an alliance against Persia.
 - A. The alliance agreed to do five things.
 1. To make pledges of loyalty against Persia and those Greek states that had Medized—that is, submitted to Persian control.
 2. To try to end the enmity between participants in the alliance.
 3. To send embassies to powerful states that had not turned up.
 4. To send spies into Asia to find out more about what Xerxes was up to.
 5. To decide who would be the overall commander of the Greek forces.
 - B. Some 31 states turned up and formed an alliance that modern historians call the Hellenic League.
 - C. Choosing an overall commander led to quarrels between Sparta and Athens, but in the interest of unity the Spartan general Eurybiades was made commander-in-chief of all of the league's land and naval forces.
 - D. The Greeks decided that the best strategy would be to defend a narrow place as far north as possible to render the Persian cavalry ineffective, so the Greeks targeted Thermopylae.
 - E. The Greek force fortified a position at Thermopylae, but there was a downside to the place because anyone taking it could come out behind those at the mouth of the pass, hence encircling them.
 - F. Herodotus tells us that on the third day of the Persian attack, a Greek traitor betrayed the path to Xerxes.

- V. The Greek force at Thermopylae held a conference, some in favor of leaving before their obvious defeat at Persian hands, and others—especially Leonidas—intent on resisting Persia at all costs.
- A. In the end, Leonidas dismissed the Greek army apart from his 300 Spartans and a contingent of Thebans and Thespians.
 - B. So ended the first battle of the Persian Wars on Greek soil; the Battle of Thermopylae was a Persian victory.
 - C. It is the Spartans' heroism at Thermopylae that is remembered more than the Persian victory.
 - D. The Spartans' bravery made such a great impression on the Greeks that the defeat at Thermopylae became a morale victory for the Greeks.

Suggested Reading:

Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*.

Green, *The Greco-Persian Wars*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Had the nature of warfare been changing so that Themistocles was right to see the value of Athens becoming a naval power?
2. Can you think of any defeats in later history that turned into morale victories as Thermopylae did for the Greeks?

Lecture Nineteen

Greece Triumphs—The End of the Persian Wars

Scope: At the same time as Thermopylae, Themistocles defeated the Persians off Artemisium (northern Euboea), which affected the Persian war effort greatly. The Greek forces withdrew south to Salamis, an island off the western coast of Attica. This move allowed the Persians free access through Greece, and they burned and ransacked Athens. At Salamis, Themistocles forced a naval battle, which the Greeks won, virtually annihilating the Persian fleet. Then in the spring of 479 B.C.E., a pitched battle was fought at Plataea in which the Persians were defeated.

Outline

- I. The Spartan bravery at Thermopylae became a morale boost for the Greeks even though the Persians were victorious, and even better for them was the news that Themistocles had defeated the Persians at sea off Artemisium.
 - A. In this lecture we're going to look at the major Persian defeats at Greek hands at the battles of Salamis and Plataea.
 - B. We will start, however, with the Battle of Artemisium.
- II. It seems that part of the Persians' strategy to take Thermopylae was to land troops behind the Greek line so as to cut it off front and rear.
 - A. To achieve this, the Persian fleet had to sail down to Euboea and into the narrow straits that separated the island from the mainland.
 - B. Themistocles had stationed the Greek fleet off Artemisium to the island's north so as to block the Persian fleet, and as the Persians sailed into view he prepared to do battle.
 - C. In a series of naval engagements fought over two days, he defeated the Persian fleet.
 - D. When the Persians could not land their men at Thermopylae after all, the remainder of the fleet from the battle pulled away and made its way down Euboea's eastern coastline, headed for Salamis.
 - E. It was at Salamis that the Greeks were assembling after Thermopylae. However, the Persian ships ran into some rough weather, and a large number of them sank.
 - F. Xerxes' lines of communication were anchored in his fleet, so the loss of ships at Artemisium and off Euboea disrupted his lines and affected Persian morale greatly.
- III. At Salamis the Greeks debated what to do about their situation. While they were doing so, Herodotus says that they saw the smoke from a burning Athens.
 - A. The news that Athens had been taken, and seeing the smoke as the Persians burned it, caused despair among the Greeks at Salamis.
 - B. Themistocles knew that it was vital for the Greek force to stay united, and he also wanted to force another naval battle against Persia that was likely to affect the progress of the Persian land force, now in Attica.
 - C. According to Herodotus, Themistocles wrote a letter that he arranged to fall into Xerxes' hands, and Xerxes immediately ordered the Persian fleet to attack the Greek one.
 - D. Xerxes' order meant the Greeks had no choice but to stand and fight.
 - E. Some 200 Persian ships were destroyed in the battle of Salamis, which, regardless of any propaganda, was very much the victory of Themistocles and the Athenian navy.
- IV. Salamis was a turning point in the war.
 - A. Xerxes realized it, as his actions after the battle indicate. He ordered the execution of the Phoenician captains in his fleet. Then, with the remnants of his fleet, he returned to Persia, leaving his general Mardonius behind, in charge of the Persian land force.
 - B. Mardonius was a skilled general, and he successfully led his Persian troops out of central Greece and north to Medized Thessaly. He would return to do battle in the following spring.
 - C. With the Persians in such disarray after Salamis, we might expect the Greeks to take advantage of this and march to finish them off. For some reason they did not.
- V. In the spring of 479 B.C.E., Mardonius sent his ally Alexander, the king of Macedonia, to Athens as his envoy. Alexander told the Athenians that Mardonius requested that Athens ally with Persia.
 - A. In practical terms, Athens would be seen as Medizing, and the Assembly decided against the offer.

- B. Mardonius had no choice now but to march against the Greeks, and the fate of Greece would be decided on land. In the summer of 479 B.C.E., Mardonius secured Attica.
- C. The Athenians urgently sent for help to Sparta, and the Spartan army of 5,000 men marched out to help Athens.
- D. Meanwhile, Mardonius moved back into Boeotia to meet the Greek army at Plataea.
- E. The battle was hard fought and victory went to the Greeks, with the Spartans playing a conspicuous role because of their bravery. Mardonius was killed in the fighting—yet another blow to Persia.
- F. The victory at Plataea was a complement to that at Salamis, and Plataea was the end of the Persian Wars on Greek soil.
- G. On the same day, according to Herodotus, the Greek fleet that had pursued Xerxes caught up with the Persians at Mycale off the coast of Ionia and defeated them in battle.

Suggested Reading:

Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*.

Green, *The Greco-Persian Wars*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What role did individuals like Miltiades, Leonidas, and especially Themistocles play in the Persian Wars?
2. Does the Greek failure to mop up the Persians after Salamis come as a surprise, given what we know of the weaknesses of the polis system?

Lecture Twenty

From the Archaic to the Classical Period

Scope: In this lecture we examine the aftermath of the Persian Wars and how they affected the Greeks, especially Athens and Sparta. The Persian Wars form the bridge between the Archaic and the Classical periods, and they are something of Athens's coming-of-age as a military power. The second part of this lecture recaps the more important aspects of the Archaic period that we have traced, especially the three themes of our course, and prepares us for our detailed analysis of these themes in the longer and more complex Classical period that follows the wars and runs until the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C.E.

Outline

- I. The Persian Wars came to an end with the Greeks completely victorious.
 - A. In the first part of this lecture, we discuss the aftermath of the Persian Wars and ask two questions: Who was responsible for defeating the Persians, and to what extent did the Persians themselves contribute to the loss?
 - B. In the second part, we discuss whether the Persian Wars end the Archaic period and are the prelude to the Classical, or whether they start the Classical period.
- II. Let's begin with the aftermath, then go on to the questions.
 - A. Because it was the victory at Plataea that actually caused the Persians to leave Greek soil, the Hellenic League resolved to make the site of the battle sacred ground dedicated to Zeus.
 - B. Individual league members and private individuals from other states set up artworks at Delphi as thank you gifts to the god for delivering them from Persian domination.
 - C. The league also set up a bronze victory monument at Delphi, dedicated to the god Apollo.
 - D. There also was still the matter of the states that had Medized, especially Thebes, and so after Plataea, various operations were conducted.
- III. Herodotus ends his account of the Persian Wars with the siege and liberation of the island of Sestos, which had been in Persian hands.
 - A. We don't know why Herodotus ended with Sestos, but he could see what naval power provided for Athens after Sestos.
 - B. Herodotus ultimately explained Xerxes' defeat as having to do with his arrogance, or "hubris." For Herodotus, Xerxes was doomed to failure the moment he bridged the Hellespont.
 - C. However, the reason he put forward for Xerxes' defeat might well have been downplayed in places like Sparta and Athens.
- IV. The era of the Persian Wars raises a number of questions that have a bearing on the Classical period that follows and especially on the future relations between Athens and Sparta.
 - A. Perhaps the most obvious question is whether Athens or Sparta deserves more credit for defeating Persia, since both sides claimed credit for this.
 - B. Herodotus states baldly that the Athenians saved Greece—that if it hadn't been for Salamis, all would have been lost—but Salamis did not actually expel the Persians from Greek soil.
 - C. Since Plataea was the final battle in the Persian Wars on the mainland, and given the role that Sparta played in it, can we say that ultimately it was the Spartans who were responsible for the Persian defeat?
 - D. What about the Persians themselves? Did they come prepared? To what extent did they contribute to their own defeat? On balance, the Persians were not well prepared.
- V. The era of the Persian Wars was a crucially important one in Greek history, and there are very good reasons for seeing it as the end of the Archaic period rather than the start of the Classical period.
 - A. Some modern scholars assign the Persian Wars to the start of the Classical period, and the rationale is that they herald a new dawn in the military history of Greece and the rise of imperialism.
 - B. I disagree because I see the Persian Wars as a natural ending to the Archaic period, given its advances politically, culturally, artistically, and militarily.
 - C. Athens's role in defeating the Persians provided the city with the means to launch its own league, which we will see clash massively with Sparta. It is this clash of the superpowers of Athens and Sparta that sets the tone of the Classical period.

- D. Here I'm disregarding artistic and intellectual advances in the Classical period.
- VI. Placing the Persian Wars in a context does matter because it brings up the interesting issue of how the Greeks saw the wars, so let's deal with this.
- A. The Persian Wars come to be one of the three most widely used *topoi* (topics) in law court speeches of the 4th century, the age from which our extant forensic speeches hail.
 - B. The other two periods that are also frequently exploited in oratory are the age of the Trojan War and the Pisistratid tyranny.
 - C. The Greeks of these times were great ancestors and set all sorts of standards that people of the Classical age should have aspired to.
 - D. The Archaic period becomes something of a golden age, and again that's why the greatness of the Greeks defeating the Persians is a fitting conclusion to the Archaic period.

Suggested Reading:

Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*.

Green, *The Greco-Persian Wars*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Why did the Persians lose the Persian Wars?
2. What might have Greek history been like if the Persians had defeated the Greeks at Plataea?

Lecture Twenty-One

The Delian League—Origins and First Steps

Scope: In this lecture we turn to imperialism. The Athenians played a significant role in the defeat of the Persians, especially at sea, and in 478 B.C.E. they formed an alliance of Greek states commonly called the Delian League, based on the power of the fleet. It would become Athens's 5th-century empire. Needless to say, the Spartans viewed the increase in Athens's military power with alarm. We look at how the Athenians formed the league at the expense of Sparta, what membership in it entailed, and how the Athenians dominated it. In this and the following lectures, we use the contemporary account of the historian Thucydides of Athens, and we conclude this lecture with some introductory comments about him.

Outline

- I. We have seen in our discussion of the Persian Wars that when faced by a common foe, a goodly number of the Greek states could overlook their xenophobic attitudes and unite.
 - A. In the first part of this lecture, we discuss the origins and nature of the Delian League, which the Athenians put together in the aftermath of the Persian Wars.
 - B. Then we turn to some of its anti-Persian actions.
 - C. Finally, we meet our next major contemporary source, Thucydides, and we conclude the lecture with some words about him.
- II. To my first point, the origins and nature of the Delian League.
 - A. The wars' end raised important questions. Was the Persian threat over? Moreover, why group together as merely a defensive force—why not be an offensive one as well?
 - B. From this background emerges the logical idea to have a Greek force ready and waiting to meet any renewed Persian threat immediately, and to try to neutralize that threat by assisting disaffected subjects so as to divert the Great King's attention from Greece.
 - C. But the Persian Wars had shown two things: the pivotal role that naval battles played in the defeat of the Persians, and that the Peloponnesian League (headed by Sparta) could never be the union to resist the Persians and stick it to them.
 - D. These factors more than anything else probably got the Athenians thinking that they could use their role in the Persian Wars to get their own league off the ground.
 - E. A year after the battles at Plataea and Mycale, the Spartans sent out a joint Spartan-Athenian force under Pausanias to liberate Greek cities in regions such as Cyprus and the Hellespont from Persian rule.
 - F. Pausanias, the same man who had led the Spartans at Plataea, proved unpopular. So the Greeks began to urge the Athenians to take over command.
- III. The Athenians saw the Spartan unpopularity as a golden opportunity.
 - A. Aristides is credited by our sources with establishing Athens's new league, what modern historians call the Delian League.
 - B. The Delian League was a naval league, and while it was set up as anti-Persian, the Athenians also stressed the need to champion the Greeks of Asia Minor, so the Delian League was both offensive and defensive.
 - C. The allies of Athens were to pay a regular annual tribute (*phoros*) to Athens, in peacetime as well as war.
 - D. The autonomy of each ally was respected, and the Delian League allies had their own council, the Synedrion, which met on Delos. Athens was not a member of this council so as not to intimidate allied debate in any way.
 - E. In 477 B.C.E., on Delos, the new allies of Athens swore an oath of allegiance to Athens as hegemon, or leader, of the league. They also swore to have the same friends and enemies.
- IV. At first sight, the constitution of the Delian League seemed balanced and fair and the allies seemed to be on equal terms with Athens. However, appearance is not reality, and from the outset Athenian hegemony was ensured.
 - A. For one thing, the amount of tribute was always assessed and collected by Athenian officials.
 - B. More importantly, the Athenians controlled everyone's foreign policy since they dictated league policy in foreign affairs.
 - C. As for the allies' judicial rights, any appeals were heard by a court in Athens.
 - D. Finally, there was the oath of eternal allegiance, which the Athenians might have made deliberately ambiguous.

- V. Now on to some of the league's early anti-Persian actions.
- A. For the first few years of the league's existence, the Athenians kept to the charter.
 - B. The anti-Persian nature of the league is best seen in the activities of the general Cimon.
 - C. The Delian League then was living up to its promise, but Athens became more imperialistic in its ventures and less concerned with the rights and privileges of its allies.
- VI. For the rise of Athenian imperialism and many of the events of the Peloponnesian War, we turn to the contemporary writer Thucydides, an Athenian general who served in its early stages.
- A. Thucydides was lived c. 460–400 B.C.E.
 - B. The purpose of his work was to describe not merely the Peloponnesian War itself but also its symptoms.
 - C. He represents the next generation of historian after Herodotus, and Thucydides is often called a scientific historian.
 - D. Thucydides was influenced by his intellectual background, and in particular the rational and scientific approaches to medicine and science.
 - E. However, he has his shortcomings and personal axes to grind that make us question his veracity: He never tells us his sources or his reasons for accepting or rejecting something; he is biased toward certain individuals; and he includes in his narrative a number of speeches delivered in important Assembly debates throughout the war, but they are not verbatim.
 - F. Nevertheless, Thucydides' history remains vital for us, as it is still a contemporary account of much of the war.

Suggested Reading:

Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Why might the Spartans be suspicious and even afraid of the Delian League?
2. How much of the charter of the Delian League was deliberately ambiguous, and hence not in the allies' best interests?

Lecture Twenty-Two

From Delian League to Athenian Empire

Scope: In this lecture, we see what Thucydides had to say about the early years of the Delian League and the growth of Athenian imperialism, as shown by the nature of Athenian leadership of the league and the imperialistic policies of its leaders. Initially, relations between Athens and its allies were good, but beginning in the 470s B.C.E., there was deterioration in relations because of Athenian expansion and the disregard of allied autonomy. This eventually led to armed clashes with Sparta, and we thus conclude the lecture with the so-called First Peloponnesian War of 460–445 B.C.E.

Outline

- I. The growth of the league into an empire was slow at first but ominous. Things really started to happen in 470 B.C.E.
 - A. In 470 the Athenians sent a contingent of troops against the town of Carystus, in the southwest part of the island of Euboea.
 - B. In the same year, the island of Naxos revolted from the Delian League. The Athenians sent out a fleet and besieged it, and when it capitulated they forced it back into the league.
 - C. Thucydides says the incident with Naxos was a turning point in the development of Athenian imperialism because it was the first time the constitution of an allied city had been disregarded.
 - D. In 465 the island of Thasos in the North Aegean, off the coastline of Thrace, revolted from the league. When Thasos capitulated to Athens, the Athenians took over their mines and used the revenues for Athenian, not league, purposes.
 - E. All of this is clear exploitation on the Athenians' part and a blatant disregard of allied autonomy. These things are always indications of an empire getting off the ground.
- II. On the home front in Athens, things were about to heat up. Athenian relations with Sparta became polarized in the policies of the two principal statesmen of the time, Cimon and Themistocles.
 - A. Cimon was in favor of maintaining amicable relations with Sparta and not risking antagonism, but he was also an imperialist, intent on expanding Athens's empire.
 - B. Themistocles was also an imperialist, but he cared little for Sparta.
 - C. The difference of opinion over Sparta led to clashes between these two statesmen. Cimon won and had Themistocles ostracized.
 - D. After Cimon himself was ostracized in 462 B.C.E., Ephialtes introduced radical democracy into Athens. (We will leave the topic of Ephialtes' reforms for later lectures.)
- III. We now turn to the so-called First Peloponnesian War of 460–445. During this time Athens and Sparta first came to serious blows and the Delian League became Athens's empire.
 - A. The conflict started with Megara (a city with enormous strategic benefits) joining the Delian League.
 - B. When Megara was attacked by Corinth and Aegina, the Athenians protected the city and built the defensive "Long Walls," a move that angered the Spartans.
 - C. Spartans entered the war by campaigning in Boeotia. The Athenians countered aggressively, triumphing in Boeotia and winning over many new members for the Delian League.
 - D. But overcommitment by Pericles, including a failed campaign in Egypt, cost the Athenians dearly.
- IV. The transfer of the league treasury from Delos to Athens in 454 was a turning point in the development of the league into an Athenian empire, for the Athenians illegally began to use a portion of the allied tribute for their own ends.
- V. In around 449, one event occurred that marked the actual empire coming into being: the Peace of Callias.
 - A. This treaty brought an end to hostilities between Persia and Greece.
 - B. With the treaty completed, the anti-Persian mandate of the Delian League was fulfilled, and the league should have disbanded. Athens, however, kept the league together by force.
- VI. In 445, hostilities between Sparta and Athens ended in what is known as the Thirty Years' Peace.
 - A. Under the terms of the Thirty Years' Peace, Athens was supposed to give up all of its newly acquired possessions, though in practice it did not do so.
 - B. More importantly, the Thirty Years' Peace also laid down that neither Athens nor Sparta was to interfere with each other's allies.

VII. The Athenians continued their heavy-handed approach to the allies over the next few decades.

- A.** Athenians sometimes placed garrisons or governors in suspect cities and established cleruchies in allied lands. (A cleruchy was an Athenian settlement founded by displacing native peoples and seizing their lands.)
- B.** Athenians were also hated for their illegal use of allied tribute for their own ends, for their disregard of the allied council, and for increasing the amount of tribute each ally was to pay over the years without consulting the allies or informing the council.
- C.** Whether the Athenians intended from the outset to turn their league into an empire to counter the Peloponnesian League or whether this was something that developed over time is difficult to determine.

VIII. In our next lecture, we will consider the tremendous political change in Athens that the imperialistic policies of leaders like Cimon and Themistocles unwittingly brought about.

Suggested Reading:

Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*.

Questions to Consider:

1. To what extent did the Athenians try to reconcile hegemony with individual autonomy?
2. Why do you think the Athenians did not disband the Delian League when the threat from Persia abated?

Lecture Twenty-Three

Ephialtes, Founder of Radical Democracy

Scope: During the chaos of the Persian Wars, the Areopagus had regained much of its previous power in Athens at the expense of the growing democracy. In this lecture we see how the Areopagus was able to do this and how the people reacted against it. A turning point in favor of the people's political advancement came in 462 B.C.E. when Ephialtes curtailed the political and judicial power of the Areopagus. Thanks to Athens's growing empire, he introduced what is known as radical, or direct, democracy, in which the people became sovereign in their state. Apart from two periods, as we shall see, this system remained the norm throughout the Classical period.

Outline

- I. In our last lecture, we briefly discussed the context of Ephialtes' legislation of 462 B.C.E., which was two years before the so-called First Peloponnesian War broke out.
 - A. Before we can better understand many of Athens's actions in the Peloponnesian War, we need to understand how Ephialtes' legislation changed Athenian political life and how politicians rose to power in the Assembly.
 - B. In this lecture we'll look at the background to Ephialtes' legislation in 462, as well as what he did.
- II. Thanks to the imperialistic politics of leaders like Themistocles and Cimon, Athens became very powerful, very wealthy, and acquired more allies in its Delian League.
 - A. But Athenian policy toward Sparta, polarized in the policies of Themistocles and Cimon, was playing as much a role in political affairs as in policy toward Persia.
 - B. The different policies of these two powerful men led to Themistocles' ostracism in 471 B.C.E., leaving the spotlight on Cimon.
 - C. In 464, a major earthquake had wreaked havoc in the Peloponnese. Many Spartans were killed, and the helots seized the chance to revolt.
 - D. The Spartans, in desperation, sought help from other members of the "old" Hellenic League.
 - E. When, in 462, Cimon brought a contingent of troops to Sparta to help the city in its fight against the helots, the Spartans surprisingly sent them packing.
 - F. This was an insult to Athens, and Cimon was ostracized.
 - G. With Cimon out of the way, the hoplites lacking a leader, and the mass of people dominant in the Assembly, Ephialtes was able to introduce a further round of democratic legislation.
- III. Ephialtes is called a champion of the people in *The Athenian Constitution*.
 - A. During the chaos of the Persian Wars, the Areopagus had recovered much of its earlier influence and administered the city.
 - B. This apparent regression in the development of democracy and the influence of the moderate element in Athenian democracy were not appreciated by the nonnobles, especially the *thetes*.
 - C. Given Ephialtes' verbal attacks on the Areopagus, it seems he was setting himself up as some sort of spokesperson for the disaffected masses.
 - D. Aristocratic leaders wanted to muzzle the increasing political power of the people, but at the same time they were keen to expand the Delian League by bringing in more allies into it and promoting Athenian hegemony over the allies.
 - E. The Delian League was a naval empire, and its existence depended on the fleet, which was rowed by the *thetes*. But the democratic situation evidently did not sit well with the *thetes*, and moreover they had a voice.
 - F. Thus, as the city grew more powerful, correspondingly so did the *thetes* because of their vital role in the navy.
- IV. Even if Cimon had not been ostracized, there are very real chances that Ephialtes' legislation would still have been passed in the Assembly because of the power of the people and their dissatisfaction.
 - A. Whether Ephialtes was a genuine political reformer or was exploiting the situation for his own ends cannot be determined, but he is as important to Athenian democracy as Solon or Cleisthenes.
 - B. We are told that Ephialtes attacked that last bastion of the aristocrats, the Areopagus, by conducting a purge of its members.
 - C. The damage done to the Areopagus's name from many of its members' corrupt activities was enormous, and its reputation took a significant nose dive.

- D. Ephialtes' second move against the Areopagus made it impotent: He transferred its political and judicial powers to the Assembly, the Boule, and the law courts.
 - E. Ephialtes' transfer of the *euthune* to the popular bodies had enormous significance.
- V. Ephialtes died in 461 B.C.E.
- A. In the aftermath of Ephialtes' demise, Pericles rose to prominence. He would be elected a *strategos* 15 times, and he dominated Athenian political life.
 - B. As a result of Ephialtes' legislation, Athens moved into a period of direct, or radical, democracy, with the people becoming sovereign in the state.
 - C. In this direct democracy, we see the rise to political power of certain types of nonnoble speakers called *rhêtores* or demagogues, who will lead the masses in the Assembly by their exploitation of rhetoric for their own political agendas.
 - D. Direct democracy will also spread to many other poleis; indeed democracy, not oligarchy, was the most common form of political system in Classical Greece.

Suggested Reading:

Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*.

Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*.

Questions to Consider:

1. To what extent did Athenian imperialism contribute to a radical change in its political system?
2. What is meant by radical democracy in Classical Athens and now?

Lecture Twenty-Four

Rhetoric—A New Path to Political Power

Scope: Democracy brought with it not only increased participation on the part of the people but also a rise in the number of men who advised the people, thanks to Ephialtes' reforms. Significantly, a person did not need to hold political office to speak to his peers; he relied on his oratorical abilities, the product of the new rhetorical training, which was a by-product of the advances in democracy. These men were given the collective name *rhêtores*, or speakers. Out of this grew the term demagogue, or leader of the people, which took on a more odious connotation. In this lecture we look at the rise of the *rhêtores*, how rhetoric developed, and how it came to be exploited for political ends—and for deceiving the people.

Outline

- I. We're now in the period known as radical democracy, the product of Ephialtes' legislation of 462 B.C.E.
 - A. Radical democracy made the people sovereign in the state, and it brought with it a rise in the number of men who advised the people in the Assembly.
 - B. In this lecture we will focus on how political leadership changed in the decades after Ephialtes.
- II. Pericles dominated political life from the death of Ephialtes in 461 B.C.E. to his own in 429 B.C.E.
 - A. The 450s–430s are often referred to as the Periclean era or Periclean Athens.
 - B. Pericles exercised power by means of his election and reelection to the office of *strategos*, or general, which he used as a stepping stone into political life.
 - C. When Pericles died in 429, *rhêtores* came to influence in Athens, as well as many other cities in Greece, and flourished in places far removed from Greece.
 - D. What made these new speakers different was that they were nonnobles, who were able to rise as they did because advances in rhetoric meshed with radical democracy, both of which favored all speakers.
- III. As Thucydides tells us, it was the visit to Athens of Gorgias, a man from the town of Leontini in Sicily, in 427 B.C.E. that affected the Athenians more than anything else.
 - A. Gorgias appeared before the Assembly, asking the people to help his native town against Syracuse, and they were mesmerized by his performance.
 - B. Later he would return to Athens, and he taught rhetoric there and elsewhere in Greece.
 - C. What Gorgias taught was the means for anyone, no matter how inexpert he was, to speak on any subject and persuade his listeners he was right.
 - D. Rhetoric was not just in the political arena of the Assembly or Boule, but also the in the judicial arena of the law courts.
 - E. Rhetoric also didn't bring about the end of public speaking as the preserve of the aristocrats just because nonnobles were speaking in debates; it was also because they were advising on policy, and eventually proposing it.
- IV. As radical democracy continued, it became obvious that the road to political power no longer lay in holding an elected political office, like an archonship, but in addressing assemblies.
 - A. These new speakers were given the collective name *rhêtores* (orators) because they used their oratorical ability to sway the audience to their side, and as a group over the decades they had similar characteristics.
 - B. The social snobbery on the part of the upper stratum of society led to other terms being applied to the *rhêtores*, which eventually took on odious connotations, the most common being demagogue (*dêmagôgos*).
- V. The first, prototypical demagogue was an Athenian called Cleon who would berate and criticize the people in the Assembly. This set a trend that other *rhêtores* would follow.
 - A. Many of the demagogues were not venal or pursuing their own agendas, even if they are presented that way by our sources.
 - B. In addition to the social snobbery against the demagogues, many ancient writers had personal axes to grind against them.
 - C. Some demagogues were corrupt, but others weren't.
 - D. It is clear that the people were aware of the exploitation of rhetoric for political purposes. Obviously, everyone knew what rhetoric was about because it was taught in schools.

- E. They were also warned about rhetoric and its pitfalls by the very people making speeches.
- VI. The Athenian system of democracy strikes us as odd, since the people seem to expect to be beguiled by the rhetoric of their speakers. So here are some related questions we'll consider in our next lecture.
- A. What are the implications of the relationship of the speaker to the mass of people in radical democracy? Does it affect the sovereignty of the people in reality?
 - B. If our own democracy owes so much to that of the Greeks, how different is it?
 - C. Finally, how is rhetoric used by modern politicians and leaders; in other words, what is the rhetorical debt that today's leaders owe to the Greeks?

Suggested Reading:

Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*.

Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Was the critical opinion of the upper echelon of Greek society of the demagogues justified?
2. What are our expectations when we listen to a major policy speech, for example, by a senior politician, and how and why might they be different from those of the Athenians?

Lecture Twenty-Five

Democracy and Political Speech—Then and Now

Scope: In this lecture we examine the differences between Classical Athenian democracy and our own. We focus especially on the shortcomings of the Athenian system and consider how “democratic” it really was, since the people could be led by influential speakers with agendas to follow policies that were not always in the best interests of the city. Then we turn to the debt we owe to Classical rhetoric. We ask what the difference is between ancient and modern rhetoric, as well as how Classical rhetoric (and even some Classical orators) have informed more recent speeches.

Outline

- I. In this lecture we will examine the differences between Classical Athenian democracy and our own.
 - A. We focus on the shortcomings of the Athenian system and consider the accuracy of the label “democracy.”
 - B. Then I want to turn to the difference between ancient and modern rhetoric and look at how Classical speeches have influenced those delivered in more recent times.
- II. Let’s begin with ancient and modern democracy.
 - A. The Greek word *demokratia* gives us the word democracy, and it literally means “the people possess the political power in the state.”
 - B. “The people” means the entire citizen body, as it does today, but in Athens citizenship was decided by birth; women and foreigners could not vote; and even in those poleis that were democratic, slavery was widespread.
 - C. Although in a country like America foreigners cannot vote and cannot hold office, women certainly can, and you can get citizenship by a variety of means, including by permanent residency or green card status.
 - D. Another difference between then and now is that in Classical Athens all male citizens had in theory equality in deliberating about state policy, as well as equality in the eyes of the law.
 - E. There was also a big difference when it came to exercising political power. In the radical Athenian democracy, there was no real dividing line between the ordinary citizens and those who were elected to office, as there is today.
 - F. Another difference is that state pay for attending the Assembly or serving as a juror was only just enough to encourage a small farmer or potter to take a day off work to attend, while elected elite today probably make a lot more money.
- III. All of these differences may be obvious. But perhaps less obvious is how we take for granted that people in the Athenian democracy really did have an equal say in state affairs, as the radical system seems to allow.
 - A. Demosthenes said that Athenian democracy was compassionate toward the weak, prohibited powerful individuals from acting violently toward others, and refused to allow corrupt speakers to influence the masses.
 - B. In theory that sounds great, but the reality was very different, thanks to the demagogues who exploited rhetoric to sway the people in the Assembly. Hence this affects our view of Athenian democracy.
 - C. The Assembly might make all the decisions in domestic and foreign policy, and in this respect the people were sovereign, but while Athens was in name a democracy, power was in the hands of one man, who led the people.
 - D. These leaders—these *rhētores*—were not elected to any office, and technically they could not be impeached or censured in any other way, as elected officials could be.
 - E. Perhaps we need to be more careful when we talk about the roots of our democracy lying in that of the Athenian and be thankful that at least the line today between the leaders and the led is clearly marked.
- IV. We have seen that rhetoric developed alongside democracy, or is it the other way around?
 - A. One obvious difference between rhetoric then and now is that in the Classical period there was an emphasis on performance, and now the emphasis is on understanding and interpretation.
 - B. Perhaps the use of rhetoric today is another reason why those in the public eye, especially politicians, get compared to the great orators of the past, especially Demosthenes.
 - C. Perhaps another debt that modern rhetoric has to the ancient, or rather modern orators have to the Classical, is the understanding that even someone who might be a natural speaker must practice.
 - D. Classical rhetoric has also been a great model for speechwriters.
 - E. Our democracy might be different from democracy in the Classical period, but apart from the different circumstances, the dependence on rhetoric has changed little.

- F. We've needed to chart the rise of the demagogues so that we can understand as best we can why the Athenians did what they did in their history after 462 B.C.E., how politics was practiced in Classical times, and the differences between the political system of Classical Athens and our own.

Suggested Reading:

Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*.

Worthington, *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Is it right to compare modern politicians with the orators of Classical Athens, such as Demosthenes?
2. What other speeches from previous generations might have their "origins" in Classical Athens?

Lecture Twenty-Six

The Causes of the Peloponnesian War

Scope: The Peloponnesian War was fought because of Athenian imperialism and the Spartans' fear of Athens's power. In this lecture we look at the three major events (at Corcyra, Potidaea, and Megara) that led to the Spartans' declaration of war. Although Athens's involvement in each of these places might be explained by the city protecting its economic and security interests, it is argued that Pericles was manipulating events to force the Spartans to act and that he did so because, like Thucydides, he saw that war was inevitable. He spoke in the Assembly about the danger from Sparta and persuaded them of the need to fight for their way of life.

Outline

- I. The Peloponnesian War of 431–404 B.C.E. was fought between Athens and its allies in the Delian League and the Peloponnesian League headed by Sparta.
 - A. It was pretty obvious that the Thirty Years' Peace of 445 B.C.E. at the end of the First Peloponnesian War was never going to last, not least because neither side really respected its terms.
 - B. Thucydides gives us two reasons for the war's outbreak—what he calls the “truest explanation,” and then the “immediate causes.”
 - C. He tells us the truest explanation was Athens's growth as an imperial power and Sparta's fear of that growth.
 - D. Thucydides' immediate causes for the war—that is, why it broke out when it did in 431—are three events of Athenian involvement in Corcyra, Potidaea, and Megara.
 - E. In this lecture we are going to examine the immediate causes, but before we do, remember that neither side was willing to be seen as breaking the Thirty Years' Peace.
- II. With this factor in mind, we move to the causes of the Peloponnesian War—namely, Pericles backed Sparta into a corner, and Sparta was thus forced to declare war on Athens.
 - A. To begin with, in 435, Corcyra and its colony Epidamnus became locked in a dispute. This led to Epidamnus invoking the help of Corinth, which made the Corcyraeans turn to Athens.
 - B. A naval battle strained relations between Athens and Corinth, but things got worse in 433 when Athens switched attention to Potidaea.
 - C. Pericles suggested to the people that Macedonia, Corinth, and Potidaea could unite and so threaten Athenian interests in that region, so the Athenians defeated Corinthian troops in battle in 432.
 - D. In 432 Pericles also issued a decree against Megara, and everyone knew that Pericles' hidden agenda here was to force Megara back into the Delian League.
- III. When Corinth and Megara began to make noises about leaving the Peloponnesian League because of the Spartans' unsympathetic attitude toward them, matters came to a head.
 - A. In the summer of 432, there were two debates in the Spartan *apella*. At the first, speeches were put to the Spartans by the Corinthians, Megarians, and Aeginetans, putting pressure on Sparta to declare war.
 - B. The Spartans decided to issue an ultimatum to Athens: Rescind the Megarian decree, or Sparta would declare war on behalf of its allies.
 - C. The Assembly met in Athens, and Pericles argued that for the safety of Athens and its democratic system, for the safety of the lifestyle that the people were used to, the Spartan ultimatum had to be rejected.
 - D. The Athenians voted in Pericles' favor, and the Spartans voted that the Athenians had broken the Thirty Years' Peace and declared war. And so the Peloponnesian War began.
- IV. Let's ask some questions about these immediate causes and then try to work out who was responsible for the war.
 - A. Although the Spartans were the technical aggressors in the Peloponnesian War because they were the ones who formally declared war, the question is whether they were forced to do so by Pericles' use of key Spartan allies as pawns.
 - B. What about the moves against Potidaea and Megara for security reasons?
 - C. If war was inevitable, the best time for it to happen was when one state had the resources to defeat the other, but it was imperative that Athens not be seen as breaking the Thirty Years' Peace.
 - D. From this perspective, Pericles' hidden agenda comes to light: He neatly exploited major Spartan allies to force Sparta into a corner where the only recourse was to support its allies and so declare war on Athens.

- E. The Athenians thus become the victims, entering a war apparently not of their own making to defend their way of life.
- F. But now we have hostilities underway, and it's time to discuss the war itself.

Suggested Reading:

de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*.

Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Given what we know about the aspirations of Athens and of Sparta, was Thucydides right to see the Peloponnesian War as inevitable because of Sparta's fear of Athens's power?
2. Do you think Pericles engineered the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War?

Lecture Twenty-Seven

The War's Early Years and the Great Plague

Scope: In this lecture we examine the first few years of the war, including Pericles' war strategy and the effects of the great plague that wiped out about one-quarter of Athens's population, including Pericles. We look at the rise to political power of Cleon, one of the new *rhêtôres*, who is often called the first demagogue, and the way he is vilified in sources such as Thucydides, Aristophanes, and Aristotle's *Athenian Constitution*. Our lecture concludes with the revolt of Mytilene (a city on the island of Lesbos) and the speeches in Thucydides discussing its punishment, which the historian uses to critique the nature of Athenian imperialism at that time.

Outline

- I. In this lecture we examine the first few years of the war, from 431 to 427 B.C.E.
 - A. The year 427 marks the end of the revolt of Mytilene, as well as the speeches of Cleon and Diodotus to the Athenian Assembly, which put forward alternative punishments.
 - B. Thucydides, who gives us these speeches, uses them to critique the nature of Athenian imperialism at that time.
- II. Before we start on all this, let's consider the resources of the two sides at the start.
 - A. There's no question the Athenians were the odds-on favorite to win the war. They had plenty of money and manpower.
 - B. The Spartan resources were also good, but they didn't match the Athenians'.
- III. The first 10 years of the war, from 431 to 421, are called the Archidamian War.
 - A. In May 431, Archidamus of Sparta led a Spartan force into Attica to devastate their crops, and in doing so to lure the Athenian army into battle.
 - B. Pericles recognized the Spartan strategy, and he decided on a three-pronged response: Resist a land battle; do not increase Athenian territory; and use the Athenian fleet to ravage the Peloponnese every year, to harass the Spartan war effort.
- IV. It's hardly a surprise that the resulting overcrowding in the city, plus the Spartans' devastation of the land, made Pericles unpopular.
 - A. Then something occurred that no one had expected: the great plague, which probably broke out because of overcrowding in the city and the lack of hygiene.
 - B. As a result there was a tremendous falling away from religion, and that led to lawlessness and a complete lack of morality.
 - C. In 429, Pericles died of plague, and his death opened the door to the nonnoble demagogues, of whom Cleon was the first.
- V. By 428 or so the plague had run its course, and its effect on Athens may have had a bearing on the revolt of Mytilene.
 - A. Mytilene wanted complete autonomy.
 - B. The Athenians managed to deploy a fleet that blockaded Mytilene. To offset a shortage of money, they raised the allied *phoros*.
 - C. Mytilene capitulated after a lengthy siege in 427.
 - D. It was decided on the motion of Cleon to enforce a severe punishment on the Mytilene, but the next day the Assembly reconvened to debate the punishment again.
 - E. Cleon was opposed by a man named Diodotus, who advised that in the long run it would be better for Athens if only the ringleaders of the revolt were executed.
 - F. The Athenians were swayed by Diodotus's speech, and the previous day's decision was reversed. In this way, their allies would be reconciled to Athenian leadership.
 - G. In these speeches we gain an insight into what contemporary Athenians thought about how Athens should rule its empire.

Suggested Reading:

Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Tritle, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Why did the plague have such a catastrophic effect on Athenian society and the Athenians' attitude to morality?
2. Is it right to condemn Cleon's brand of imperialism, given that Athens had just suffered the plague and needed to keep its empire intact at all costs?

Lecture Twenty-Eight

Athenian Successes and a Temporary Peace

Scope: In this lecture we trace events from the Mytilene debate to the Peace of Nicias in 421 B.C.E., which was a temporary cessation of hostilities in the war. We focus on the successful Athenian campaign at Pylos and Sphacteria in 425–424 in some detail. This involves analysis of Cleon’s role in political affairs and his portrayal in Aristophanes’ biting comedy, *Knights*. We end with the Battle of Amphipolis in 422, in which Cleon and the Spartan general Brasidas died and which led to the Peace of Nicias.

Outline

- I. In this lecture we take events of the war down to the Peace of Nicias in 421 B.C.E., which was a temporary cessation of hostilities.
 - A. We focus on the successful Athenian campaign at Pylos and Sphacteria in 425–424 in some detail.
 - B. We end with the Battle of Amphipolis in 422, in which Cleon and the Spartan general Brasidas died and which led to the Peace of Nicias.
- II. In 425, an Athenian fleet headed for Sicily dropped off a contingent of troops at Pylos, on a bay across from the island of Sphacteria.
 - A. Demosthenes gave orders to fortify Pylos as a base from which to stir the helots to revolt and so distract the Spartans’ attention from Athens.
 - B. The Spartans deployed 420 Peloponnesian hoplites to Sphacteria and sent a further force by sea to eject the Athenians.
 - C. A naval battle was fought in the bay of Pylos, which resulted in a decisive Athenian victory. Moreover, the 420 troops on Sphacteria were now cut off and blockaded.
 - D. The Spartan government sued for peace with Athens, also requesting safe passage for the 420 troops on Sphacteria.
 - E. Cleon persuaded the people to reject the Spartan overtures because all Spartans wanted was an armistice.
- III. The siege of Sphacteria was entrusted to the aristocratic and wealthy general Nicias.
 - A. For some reason, he wasn’t able to capture the troops on the island, and in an Assembly meeting, Cleon attacked Nicias for his inefficiency.
 - B. According to Thucydides, Nicias called what he thought was Cleon’s bluff, telling him to go and do the job.
 - C. To everyone’s surprise, Cleon and Demosthenes captured the Spartan troops on Sphacteria and brought them back to Athens.
 - D. The presence of Spartan prisoners in Athens ended the annual invasions of Attica, as Cleon had originally predicted.
- IV. This was a major victory.
 - A. Cleon’s influence in Athens drastically increased, and he was elected *strategos* for the following year.
 - B. It was an enormous win for the Athenians, but the odium attached to the *rhêtores* is seen in how Thucydides and Aristophanes treat the victory by glossing over it or trashing Cleon.
- V. The Pylos/Sphacterian campaign was also the high point of the Archidamian War for the Athenians.
 - A. Flushed with success, there was a move now to abandon Pericles’ strategy of not extending the frontiers of the Athenian empire, as is seen in an imperialistic invasion of Boeotia in 424.
 - B. Although the Athenians gained some successes in Boeotia, they suffered a major defeat at Delium in that same year that undid all their gains in Boeotia to date.
 - C. The worst loss for the Athenians, however, was that of their colony of Amphipolis in Thrace, which began to turn the war in favor of Sparta, even though the Athenians still held the Spartan captives from Sphacteria.
 - D. The loss of Amphipolis and the Spartan gains allowed Nicias to regain some influence at home.
 - E. The Spartan government was also in favor of peace, but by now it had begun to distrust its general, Brasidas.
 - F. Thanks to this Spartan attitude and Nicias’s urgings, a one-year truce was drawn up between Athens and Sparta in 423.

- VI.** The truce was soon shattered by the activities of Brasidas in northern Greece when he encouraged the city of Scione in the Chalcidice to revolt from Athens.
- A.** This allowed Cleon to disparage the Spartans in the Assembly, and in 422, when the truce expired, Cleon, elected *strategos* again, was able to persuade the people to send troops under his command to reconquer Amphipolis.
 - B.** At Amphipolis, the Athenians lost the battle, and both Cleon and Brasidas were killed in it.
- VII.** Cleon, I think, was one of the better demagogues and doesn't deserve the bad press that Thucydides, Aristophanes, and even *The Athenian Constitution* give him.
- A.** He may well have had hidden agendas, but he acted in the city's best interests in rejecting the Spartan overtures for peace in 425, and did engineer the great victory at Pylos/Sphacteria in 424.
 - B.** He saw the need to counter Spartan influence in the north, and although he was clearly not the man to beat Brasidas in battle, he took a force north and did stand against him.
 - C.** The Battle of Amphipolis was decisive, in that Brasidas's death ended Spartan policies in the north and Cleon's death allowed Nicias to dominate the Assembly.
 - D.** Both sides were ready for peace, and after negotiations during the winter of 422/1, the Peace of Nicias was agreed to in March 421. It was to last for 50 years.

Suggested Reading:

Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Tritle, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Would you agree that Cleon does not deserve the bad press given to him by Thucydides and Aristophanes?
2. Do you think the Peace of Nicias had any hope of lasting, given the strategic importance of Pylos and Amphipolis to both Athens and Sparta?

Lecture Twenty-Nine

War Resumes—The Athenian Disaster in Sicily

Scope: Thucydides attributed Athens's loss in the war to the Sicilian expedition and the decline in leadership after Pericles. In this lecture we see the collapse of the Peace of Nicias and examine the background to the Sicilian expedition. We look at how the Athenians were duped into committing help to an ally in Sicily, and we consider the aims of Alcibiades, who proposed the expedition, and of Nicias, who spoke in the Assembly against it. Finally, we discuss two major religious violations as the great fleet was about to sail to Sicily in 415 B.C.E. that vividly demonstrate the Greek attitude toward religion and that almost cause the Greeks to abort the expedition: the profanation of the Mysteries at Eleusis and the mutilation of the city's herms.

Outline

- I. The Peace of Nicias, which ended the Archidamian War, did not last long.
 - A. In this lecture, we touch on the renewal of hostilities in the Peloponnesian War, and then we turn to Sicily.
 - B. In focusing on the Athenians' Sicilian expedition, we'll discuss how it came about, what happened during it, and how it affected the Athenian war effort.
- II. The Peace of Nicias was really only an interruption in the whole sequence of events of the Peloponnesian War.
 - A. A war faction led by Alcibiades grew to dominance in Athens, countering Nicias's passive faction.
 - B. Alcibiades was after military glory, and this was clearly something he could never achieve while Athens was not at war with someone.
- III. In 418 B.C.E., Alcibiades persuaded the Athenians that Sparta had broken the Peace of Nicias, and then in 416 the Athenians became embroiled in Sicily.
 - A. In the winter of 416, an embassy from the town of Egesta went to Athens to request assistance in a conflict with its southern neighbor, Selinus.
 - B. Selinus was an ally of Syracuse, a colony of Corinth, which meant if the Athenians agreed to support Egesta, they would also be taking on Syracuse.
 - C. In Athens, an Assembly was held about whether to help Egesta.
 - D. The crowd, carried by Alcibiades' oratorical prowess, voted to send 100 triremes, and command was split among three commanders: Alcibiades, Lamachus, and Nicias.
- IV. The armada to Sicily was ready to set sail in 415.
 - A. On the morning of its departure, however, the Athenians woke to find the city's herms (good luck symbols) mutilated, and the fleet was immediately put on hold. Also, there was the profanation of the Mysteries at Eleusis.
 - B. Alcibiades' enemies blamed him, but the Assembly could not find any evidence against him, so it was decided to let him sail with the fleet.
 - C. At Rhegium, it was discovered that the Egestans had lied about their wealth and were unable to pay the costs of the expedition.
 - D. To make matters worse, the three commanders could not agree on a plan of action, and the end result was that the Athenian fleet did nothing for the rest of 415 and early 414. However, in 414, the idea was formed to besiege Syracuse.
- V. In 414, an Syracusan embassy went to Sparta to seek Spartan aid against the Athenians, and the Syracusans launched an attack, in which Lamachus was killed.
 - A. The supreme command was now in the hands of Nicias, who had been against the expedition in the first place.
 - B. Alcibiades, who was recalled to stand trial again, instead fled to Sparta, where he began to intrigue with the Spartans against the Athenians.
 - C. Nicias ordered the fleet into the harbor at Syracuse, which gave the Athenians an advantage.
 - D. Within days of arriving at Syracuse, the Spartans and their general Gylippus had formed a joint plan with the Syracusans that undid all of Nicias's work.

- VI.** Nicias sent a letter to the Athenian Assembly requesting that he be relieved of his command and said that Sicily was a lost cause, but the Assembly voted to send a second expedition under the command of Demosthenes instead.
- A.** This second fleet arrived in 413 and hit trouble immediately. While trying to retake Epipolae, Demosthenes was soundly defeated.
 - B.** As the Athenian force was getting ready to set sail, a lunar eclipse occurred, which the Athenians interpreted as a sign they were to stay, and the Athenian fleet stayed in the harbor at Syracuse.
 - C.** The Syracusans blocked up the entrance to their harbor so the Athenian fleet could not put to sea, then attacked, completely defeating the Athenians and their allies.
 - D.** Those who survived the battle were hunted down and slaughtered.
 - E.** Nicias surrendered to Gylippus, and the remaining Athenians were then taken captive.

Suggested Reading:

Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Tritle, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What does the Athenians' reaction to the herms and Mysteries scandals tell us about the role religion played in Greek life?
2. Can we blame Alcibiades for not returning to Athens?

Lecture Thirty

Democracy Fails—Oligarchy in Athens

Scope: In this lecture we examine what happened during the Sicilian expedition, Athens's great defeat, and how that failed expedition led to the imposition of oligarchy in Athens in 411 B.C.E. We refer to Aristophanes' comedy *Lysistrata*, with its plot of the women of all Greece going on a sex strike until the men declare peace, and how this play reflects the mood of the Athenians at this time and even foreshadows the oligarchy. We trace the effect of the oligarchy on the Athenians and how they almost lost the war in 411.

Outline

- I. The defeat in Sicily had enormous repercussions for Athens.
 - A. First, we will look at the results of Athens's great defeat and how it led to the imposition of oligarchy in Athens in 411 B.C.E.
 - B. Second, we will examine Aristophanes' biting comedy *Lysistrata* and how this play might be calling for an oligarchy.
 - C. Third, we will discuss the oligarchy itself.
- II. Let's begin with the aftermath of the Sicilian expedition.
 - A. Thucydides blames Nicias for the catastrophe in Sicily, but we cannot deny credit to Syracuse for destroying so powerful an invader.
 - B. Nevertheless, the Athenians had contributed greatly to the failure, such as giving command of the first fleet to three men who had such different ideas, forcing Alcibiades off the scene, and accepting the bad decisions of the Assembly.
 - C. The expedition was disastrous for Athens and had grave repercussions because the city temporarily abolished the payment of tribute by the allies in an effort to prevent any revolts.
- III. The Spartans could have moved in for the kill at this point, but for some reason they didn't.
 - A. Instead, with Alcibiades' help, Sparta finally began building a fleet of 100 triremes and solicited an alliance with Persia.
 - B. Alcibiades also persuaded the Spartans to make an alliance with Syracuse and to establish an enclave on Attic soil.
 - C. But when Sparta's king, Agis, caught Alcibiades having sex with his wife, Alcibiades was forced to leave and fled to Asia Minor.
 - D. Thus, in the ineptitude of the democracy that led to the Sicilian disaster and in Alcibiades' desire to return home, we find the genesis of the oligarchic coup that Athens suffered in 411.
- IV. For some time there had been an element in Athenian political life that desired some restrictions on the power of the people.
 - A. In 413, a committee had been set up that consisted of 10 men called *probouloi*, who had some sort of decision-making power.
 - B. In the same year, and before the coup, Aristophanes produced *Lysistrata*, a comedy that was also an antiwar play and possibly foreshadowed the oligarchy.
 - C. Alcibiades, now living with Tissaphernes (the satrap of Sardis), let it be known in Athens that he could persuade Tissaphernes to ally with the Athenians and give them money against Sparta, but only if Athens became an oligarchy and if he, Alcibiades, were recalled.
 - D. Tissaphernes would not of course do any of the things that Alcibiades said he would, but by the time Athens realized this, it was too late.
- V. In June of 411, an Athenian named Pisander engineered a bloodless coup in Athens under the Assembly's approval. This oligarchy is commonly called the Rule of the Four Hundred.
 - A. There are some affinities with the Solonian constitution here: The Committee of Four Hundred echoed Solon's Boule of Four Hundred, and the power lay in the hands of the moderates.
 - B. The oligarchs tried to increase Athens's financial reserves and general wellbeing, and they abolished state pay and dismissed the Boule.
 - C. Splits soon occurred in the ranks of the oligarchs over policy toward Sparta, and it began to affect their rule of Athens detrimentally.

- D. Furious at what the Four Hundred were doing in Athens, the Athenians at Samos decided to elect their own *strategoi* and thus essentially reconstitute the Assembly.
 - E. When the oligarchs proved to be no different from the democracy in running the war, the people had had enough.
 - F. In September 411, the wellbeing of Athens passed into the hands of the Five Thousand, who would rule Athens until June 410, when direct democracy was restored.
- VI. Hence, by the end of 410, we have the Assembly and Boule running again, and pay for political office was reintroduced.
- A. The hostile contingent of Athenians manning the fleet at Samos was therefore appeased, and life seemed as though it could return to normal.
 - B. To safeguard democracy in the future, each citizen swore an oath of loyalty to kill anyone trying to subvert the constitution, and to do so with impunity.
 - C. The historical reality was quite different, because the situation facing the Athenians was desperate.
 - D. If Sparta had pressed home its advantage again, the war would have been over for Athens, but Sparta let another opportunity slip by.
 - E. During this time, Athens recovered a lot of ground, thanks to Alcibiades, who was operating off Asia Minor.
 - F. Both Athens and Sparta would keep their empires—and their animosities—and it would be only a matter of time before hostilities broke out again.

Suggested Reading:

Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Tritle, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What did the Athenians really have to gain from the Sicilian expedition, and was it justified from a political point of view?
2. Do Alcibiades' activities show that, as in the Persian Wars, it was individuals, not governments, who influenced the course of events?

Lecture Thirty-One

Final Battles—Sparta's Triumph over Athens

Scope: In this lecture we survey the war's last years, up to the Athenians' defeat at the Battle of Aegospotami in 405 B.C.E. Although Athens bounced back after the overthrow of the oligarchy in 411, thanks mostly to Alcibiades' successes, a series of poor decisions on the part of its leaders and people, plus the Persians' material support of Sparta, spelled the city's doom. We examine the terms imposed on Athens by the triumphant Spartans, which included the end of its Delian League, the abolition of its democracy, and the installation of a cruel, pro-Spartan oligarchy.

Outline

- I. This is the concluding lecture on the Peloponnesian War.
 - A. We will first survey its last years, up to the Athenians' final defeat at the Battle of Aegospotami in 405 B.C.E.
 - B. Then we will consider the peace terms that Sparta imposed on Athens, which included a pro-Spartan oligarchy.
 - C. Finally, we will discuss the restoration of democracy in 403.
 - D. For events after 411, we have to use Xenophon's *Hellenica*, which picks up where Thucydides left off and covers Greek history down to 362.
- II. Athens may have regained its naval ascendancy in the Aegean, but Sparta too had made gains.
 - A. Tissaphernes had been replaced by the Great King of Persia's son Cyrus, who was very keen to prove himself by getting involved in the Peloponnesian War on the side of Sparta.
 - B. In 407, Alcibiades returned to Athens, but in 406 he was held responsible for the defeat at the Battle of Notion, and he fled again, never to return to Athens.
 - C. The Spartans followed up their victory by besieging Mytilene, but within a month Athens and its allies had a fleet of 150 ships that sailed off under the command of Conon to relieve Mytilene.
 - D. In a major naval battle at Arginousae, Athens was victorious, but then the problems began that led to the execution of 6 of the city's 10 *strategoi*.
- III. After Arginousae, the Spartans sued for peace, and this time they promised to leave Decelea. However, Cleophon persuaded the Assembly to reject the Spartan appeal once more.
 - A. Since neither side could keep on fighting, the war was going to be decided by one last battle—the battle of Aegospotami.
 - B. In the summer of 405, Lysander attacked the city of Lampsacus in the Hellespont region by land and sea and successfully seized it. The Athenians sent a fleet immediately to counter Sparta's moves in this area.
 - C. For four days the Athenians sailed into the straits, trying to lure the Spartans into battle, but Lysander refused to move.
 - D. On the fifth day, the *strategos* in charge—Philocles—devised a plan to coax Lysander out, but it didn't work. Lysander landed at Aegospotami and secured both it and the Athenian fleet.
 - E. The Athenians had lost the Peloponnesian War.
- IV. Lysander did not intend to attack Athens itself but to starve it into surrender.
 - A. His control of Lampsacus and now Aegospotami meant that he could block the corn that the Athenians needed from leaving the Hellespont, and he proceeded to do this.
 - B. Lysander then sailed to Athens to blockade the Piraeus. That meant that no supplies could get in, and no Athenians could get out.
 - C. In the meantime, the Spartan king Agis, then at Decelea, marched on Athens, which was preparing for a siege.
 - D. At the same time, the other Spartan king, Pausanias, invaded Attica and joined Agis in besieging the city.
 - E. The war formally ended in April 404.
- V. In Sparta, an assembly of the Peloponnesian allies was held to decide the Athenians' punishment.
 - A. Some allies, such as Thebes and Corinth, demanded the destruction of Athens; however, the Spartans persuaded their allies to spare Athens and its people.
 - B. The Spartans were concerned that if Athens were wiped off the face of Greece, another power would take advantage of the situation and eventually cause problems for the Spartans.

- C. Instead, the Athenians had to destroy their Long Walls and Piraeus fortifications.
 - D. They were also to dismantle the Delian League, keep only 12 ships, and become allies of Sparta, acknowledging its hegemony over them.
 - E. The Spartans also installed a pro-Spartan oligarchy in the city, called the Rule of the Thirty, which was led by the extremist Critias.
- VI. The Thirty came to exercise power in a far more bloody way than the oligarchy of 411, and their regime was characterized by the exiling and murdering of opponents—citizens and metics—for personal reasons.
- A. According to *The Athenian Constitution*, some 1,500 citizens were put to death, and thousands of Athenians—democrats that is—fled into exile.
 - B. The Thirty lasted from September 404 to January 403, when an Athenian named Thrasybulus and a group of exiled democrats returned to Athens and defeated the Thirty.
 - C. Athens was still not free from the tyranny, though, and the remaining tyrants expected Lysander to return with help, but that was not to be.
 - D. In the end, King Pausanias marched to Athens and brokered a deal between the people that had stayed in Athens to support the Thirty and the exiled democrats, whereby both sides agreed to reconcile their differences.
 - E. By September 403, Thrasybulus and the democrats were back in Athens, and the move to restore democracy began.

Suggested Reading:

Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Tritle, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Thucydides attributed Athens's loss in the war to the Sicilian expedition and the decline in the nature of Athenian leadership after Pericles, but is this really true?
2. Why were the Spartans so quick to seek terms following defeats rather than showing the same resilience as the Athenians?

Lecture Thirty-Two

Why Athens Lost—The Impact on Greece

Scope: Why did the Athenians lose the Peloponnesian War? Was it because they lost some key battles, they exhausted their resources, and the Persians allied with Sparta against them, or was there some other reason? This lecture examines the failure of Athens's radical democracy, whose actions lie behind every event that was to the city's detriment. The second half of the lecture is a brief, narrative treatment of Greek history after the war and before the accession of Philip II of Macedonia, who would forever change Greek history and would lay the foundations for the great invasion of Asia that Alexander the Great would bring to fruition.

Outline

- I. In the first part of this lecture, we conclude our discussion of the Peloponnesian War by asking some questions about how and why Athens lost the war. Then I want to give a brief treatment of Greek history after the war and before the accession of Philip II as king of Macedonia in 359 B.C.E.
- II. At the start of the Peloponnesian War, Athens was the odds-on favorite to win it given its resources—especially its fleet and treasury. So how and why did the city lose it?
 - A. The Athenians suffered more reversals than triumphs during the war.
 - B. Thucydides' commented that the poor leadership after Pericles' death caused Athens's defeat; however, Pericles' strategy could not have won a war that lasted this long.
 - C. One factor in why Athens lost, I would argue, was the nature of its political system and the role of the people in it.
- III. Let me expand on why I think a democracy cannot run a war.
 - A. The ease by which individual speakers could exploit rhetorical skills to sway the Assembly shows how fickle the people were, and that was not good for supporting a consistent war policy.
 - B. The war brought two periods of oligarchy for Athens, and this showed the downsides of coupling an unstable domestic life with the disastrous foreign policy that existed in Athens because of the radical democracy.
 - C. The explanation for why Athens lost the war lies with the Athenians themselves.
 - D. To make matters worse, the Athenians never learned from their mistakes, as their military exploits and their own brand of imperialism in the 4th century will prove.
- IV. The period in Greek history from 404 to 362 is commonly called the period of the hegemonies.
 - A. The period from 404–371, at the end of the Peloponnesian War, is known as the Spartan hegemony.
 - B. After the defeat of the Athenians at Aegospotami, Lysander had established a number of oligarchies in states that were former Athenian allies, called “decarchies.”
 - C. In 395, Athens, Thebes, Corinth, and Argos allied in what is commonly called the Quadruple Alliance and went to war against Sparta. Modern historians call this the Corinthian War, and it lasted until 387.
 - D. In the early days of the war, Lysander was killed, and a further blow to Sparta was the defeat of its navy at Cnidus by Conon.
 - E. A surprising defeat for the Spartan army in 390 at the hands of the Athenian general Iphicrates caused the Spartans to appeal to the Great King for help, which was granted but on the Great King's terms.
 - F. The King's Peace restored the status quo as of 404, and in return for Persian help the Spartans turned their backs on the Greeks of Asia Minor.
- V. The Spartans now became involved in Boeotian affairs, where they saw Thebes's power as a source for concern.
 - A. By 378, Thebans who had fled when Sparta seized the citadel of Cadmea returned with Athenian troops and expelled the Spartan garrison from Thebes.
 - B. The Athenians' support for the Thebans probably led to an unsuccessful attempt on the part of Sparta to seize the Piraeus.
 - C. As a result, in 404, the Athenians created a new league called the Second Athenian Naval Confederacy.
 - D. But it was not the Athenians who brought about an end to the Spartan hegemony; it was the Thebans.
 - E. Declining relations between Sparta and Thebes led to the Spartans invading Boeotia with a Peloponnesian force in 371, and the Thebans inflicted a decisive defeat on the Spartans.

- F. The Spartans had recovered from defeat before, but the Thebans liberated the helots and restored their former capital at Messene by Mount Ithome. This immediately ended Sparta's influence in central Greek affairs and reduced the state to a shadow of its former self.
- VI. The Spartan hegemony was over, and from 371 to 362 the Thebans were the dominant force on the Greek mainland. Their supremacy was short-lived, however, for in 362 Epaminondas found himself faced with problems in the Peloponnese.
- A. There a number of states, including Sparta, united against Thebes and even enlisted the aid of Athens.
 - B. Epaminondas did battle with the coalition army at Mantinea, and although the Thebans were victorious, Epaminondas was killed. As a result, the Thebans made peace with the other Greeks.
 - C. The Athenians turned their confederacy into a 4th-century empire, but in the process they again disregarded the autonomy of their allies and broke their oaths.
 - D. Xenophon's account of Greek history ends in 362. Coincidentally, Macedonia, under King Philip II (father of Alexander the Great), was rising up in the north.

Suggested Reading:

Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Tritle, *The Peloponnesian War*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What do you think were the major events of the Peloponnesian War, as opposed to the minor ones?
2. Was it possible for a democracy like Athens to be an imperial ruler and govern its empire effectively and properly, or was there a moral contradiction between democracy and the requirements of empire? Can we ask this question of other societies today?

Lecture Thirty-Three

The Household in the Polis

Scope: The first part of this lecture examines the Athenian family and its role in Athenian society as a prelude to the forthcoming lectures on law and society. We will focus on the roles of the various members of the family, especially women, and what the state expected of them. In tandem with this was the emergence of laws that focus on the family. The second part of the lecture discusses aspects of Athenian society arising out of the family that show its downsides. These are a sobering balance to the usual impression we have of the greatness of Athens.

Outline

- I. The family was an integral part of Greek society as a whole, and it is in protecting the family that the legal code was shaped.
 - A. This lecture outlines the relationship of the family to the polis and the role of the family in civic life.
 - B. We also discuss the family unit—the members of it, what each was expected to do, what society’s attitudes were toward each member, and so forth.
 - C. Finally, on the society side, we see some examples of its downsides, which put a different perspective on it.
- II. The Greek word for family or family unit was *oikos*.
 - A. Aristotle, in his *Politics*, emphasized that the *oikos* was such an integral part of the polis that, crudely put, you could not have a polis without *oikoi*.
 - B. There were also similarities in running the two entities, *oikos* and polis.
- III. Aristotle defined the *oikos* as consisting of a husband, a wife, a slave, and legitimate children.
 - A. The head of the household was known as the *kyrios*, and he was the absolute authority in the household with three distinct duties: to provide the *oikos* with the means of sustenance, to protect it in times of war, and to ensure the household’s standing in the eyes of the gods.
 - B. The wife was in charge of managing household affairs, and she had the special task of looking after the slaves. Wives had no political rights and limited judicial rights.
 - C. The line of descent passed from father to son; however, there were exceptions.
- IV. Marriages were arranged, often for economic reasons.
 - A. Athenian girls married young, usually at about age 12 or 13, but the groom was normally in his early 30s.
 - B. The reason for the extreme youth of the girl is bound up with her being a virgin, for only legitimate children from a marriage could inherit the *oikos*.
 - C. This concern about legitimacy is also why the law against adultery was so strict and why adultery was a public offense.
- V. Let us move to the children in the family. Male children had seniority over female.
 - A. Males were expected to grow up and inherit the *oikos*, while the girls would marry in their very early teens and move out of the *oikos* into their own.
 - B. While the boys would eat the normal staple food with meat from time to time, occasionally wine if the family could afford it, girls seldom ate meat and hardly ever wine with a meal.
 - C. Until about the age of seven or so, boys and girls were generally reared side-by-side; after that age, they would separate, and in wealthier households it would be the boys who received a more formal education.
 - D. Archaeological evidence shows that child burials were common, though whether these are the product of natural deaths or exposure is hard to say.
- VI. The final member of the *oikos* as Aristotle defines it is the slave.
 - A. Aristotle described slaves as animate tools, which tells us what the attitude toward them was, and they were frequently physically exploited.
 - B. Slaves were non-Athenians, captured in warfare either against foreign foes or other Greek poleis.
 - C. Slaves were used in economic sectors of society such as mining and agriculture, and most households also had slaves in them.
 - D. The line between free and unfree was harshly drawn.

- VII.** There is another side to the coin of Athenian society that puts a very different light on it. What I'm going to talk about, however, stems from our own Western values and traditions.
- A.** To begin with, there is the obvious inconsistency between the Athenians calling their political system a democracy and not allowing women to vote, or even to represent themselves in court.
 - B.** Not just the Athenians but also all Greeks condoned slavery; Greece was in fact a slave-based economy.
 - C.** We might give up on trying to understand the mores of Greek society compared to ours when it comes to children.

Suggested Reading:

Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes*.

Hamel, *Trying Neaira*.

Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece*.

Questions to Consider:

1. To what extent did the protection of individual family members or of the family as a unit influence the development of law?
2. Do the intellectual and cultural merits of the Athenians outweigh the downsides to their society as they appear to us?

Lecture Thirty-Four

Athenian Law and Society

Scope: After our examination of the warfare of the 5th century B.C.E. and before our examination of Macedonian imperialism, we finish off our consideration of Athenian law. In this lecture, we make some preliminary comments about the differences between the Classical legal system and that of today. For the Athenians, the most important concept was *isonomia*, or equality before the law. We mention three literary works—Plato’s *Crito*, Sophocles’ *Antigone*, and Aristophanes’ *Wasps*—that show what sorts of things concerned the Athenians as their legal code developed, how seriously they viewed their legal system, and how they could also be entertained by it.

Outline

- I. Law is one of our course’s major themes, and it’s in the 4th century B.C.E. that the legal system reaches maturity, so we are going to discuss law in some detail in this and the next four lectures.
 - A. In this lecture I will comment on the differences between the Classical legal system and that of today.
 - B. Then we look at the relationship of Athenian law to society, and vice versa.
- II. It is an understatement to say that the Athenian judicial system was different from that of today.
 - A. Both prosecution and defense were drawn from ordinary citizens, who would have to bring a case themselves and would have to speak on behalf of themselves in the courts before a jury of their peers.
 - B. There was no cross-examination during a case, and while the testimony of witnesses was admissible, it was commonly written out before the trial and then read out in court.
 - C. There was no single judge in control of things who might interpret points of law and guide the jury, so the jurors were both judge and jury.
 - D. Another major difference was the speed of trials. *The Athenian Constitution* tells us that four private cases and one public case were judged per day, so this means the whole procedure was probably rushed.
 - E. Depending on the type of case, the jury was often composed of hundreds or even thousands of citizens.
 - F. Women were not allowed to appear in court, just as they could not attend the Assembly.
 - G. Noncitizens were not as well served by the law: Metics had some judicial rights, bastards had few judicial rights, and slaves and prostitutes had no judicial rights.
- III. The Athenians viewed *isonomia*, a term they coined that meant equality before the law, as fundamental to their society, and *isonomia* carried over into their political system, emphasizing the theoretical equality of everyone in that as well.
 - A. Like religion, law went hand in hand with Greek society.
 - B. And since the *oikos* was the backbone of the polis, so to speak, we see that the Athenians developed their laws to protect the *oikos*, and then the individuals who composed it, rather than the other way round.
 - C. The Athenian democracy is often called the rule of the law by some modern historians.
- IV. The idea of a social contract is found in its most explicit form in Classical Athens in Plato’s *Crito*.
 - A. In 399 B.C.E., Socrates was condemned to death by a court over trumped-up charges.
 - B. *Crito* visits Socrates and tries to persuade him to flee prison.
 - C. Socrates refuses to flee because he has sworn to live by the laws of Athens and the decisions of the law courts.
 - D. The bottom line is that Athenian society, like any society that does not want to suffer anarchy, has to uphold the laws.
- V. Almost half a century before Socrates’ trial, the Athenians were grappling with the difference between natural (or divine) laws and man-made ones. We can see this in Sophocles’ *Antigone*.
 - A. In *Antigone*, King Creon has ordered that the corpse of one of Antigone’s brothers not be buried. If anyone does bury him, Creon orders the person be executed.
 - B. Antigone has also lost her other brother, but he was a hero, and so has been buried in accordance with what society would expect.
 - C. Antigone buries her brother, and when her execution is ordered, she kills herself by blocking herself up in a cave. Creon realizes the error of his ways, but she’s already dead.
 - D. The play binds together two things that are at the heart of Greek society: religion and law.

- VI.** The people clearly appreciated how serious law was, but that doesn't mean the Athenians couldn't enjoy a joke at the law's expense. In 422, Aristophanes used the jury system as the plot for his satirical play *Wasps*.
- A.** In this comedy, the chorus of wasps is the jurors, and the antihero is an elderly juror who suffers from "jury mania."
 - B.** His son, the hero, is determined to cure his father of his jury mania, and so he tries to keep his father prisoner at home, and eventually he succeeds.
 - C.** While the courts did entertain, the image of the jurors in *Wasps* is not typical. Jurors took their participation in the jury system seriously, and they understood that the rule of the law was the basis of Athenian society.

Suggested Reading:

Carey, *Trials from Classical Athens*.

MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What are the major differences between the legal system in Classical Athens and that of today, and why do such differences exist?
2. How seriously was participation in the Athenian jury system viewed by the Athenians?

Lecture Thirty-Five

Historical Development of the Legal Code

Scope: This lecture discusses the history of the legal code in more detail, from the Wild West style of the Bronze Age to the rise of the democratic juries and the protection of rights in the mature system of the Classical period. We focus on the legislation of Dracon in the 620s, Solon in 594/3, and Ephialtes in 462 B.C.E., as well as the establishment of the board of *nomothetai* (“lawgivers”) that was charged with keeping uniformity in the laws.

Outline

- I. In this lecture we discuss the development of the legal code from the Bronze Age to the maturity of the judicial system in the Classical period.
- II. Before Draco, there was law in Greece, although it was more of an informal type of justice.
 - A. We know from Homer that disputes between individuals over property were more often than not settled by fights.
 - B. He also tells us that an individual’s family got involved in disputes, which could turn into blood feuds that lasted for generations.
 - C. What comes out of all of this and helps to shape the legal code is the importance attached to the family unit throughout Greek history.
 - D. Justice was mostly dispensed on the spot. Getting a third party to intervene as an arbiter rarely happened, except when both parties could not agree or perhaps had fought themselves to a standstill.
 - E. From Homer we learn that disputes were heard in public, and it is important to note the influence of public opinion on speakers and judges.
 - F. From all of this, we can see how arbitrary and problematic law in the pre-Archaic period was.
- III. It was not until the late Archaic period, when we start to have more historical information, that we know the Greeks began to create a formal law code.
 - A. Given Cylon’s abortive coup, and in an attempt to prevent possible civil war in Attica and preserve their power, the Eupatridae chose Dracon to codify the laws. He began the process that led to a formal law code.
 - B. The people, however, were not appeased, and so civil war broke out. This lasted a goodly number of years before the Eupatridae elected Solon extraordinary archon in 594 B.C.E. to try to end the warfare.
 - C. We know he was ultimately unsuccessful in ending the civil strife, but he did introduce a series of political, economic, and judicial measures that would transform Athens and its people.
 - D. Solon amended many of Dracon’s laws and introduced the right of appeal, called *epheisis*, that presumably went in tandem with the HeliAEA. He also introduced third-party arbitration and a number of laws that affected women and the family.
 - E. People swore to uphold and live by the laws, and current and new laws were set up in public in the Agora for all to see, but the problem with Solon’s laws is that many were introduced at a later period and ascribed to him to give them a pedigree.
 - F. It took Pisistratus to address the plight of the nonnobles and Cleisthenes to end the civil strife properly, and although the next few decades were chaotic, the law code must have continued to develop.
- IV. The most important figure in the development of the legal code after Solon was Ephialtes in 462.
 - A. *The Athenian Constitution* tells us that when he introduced his radical democratic legislation, he also transferred much of the judicial power of the Areopagus to the law courts.
 - B. Ephialtes’ legislation led to a vast increase in court business and meetings. This means that by Ephialtes’ time the Athenians had invented trial by jury, because *The Athenian Constitution* talks about Ephialtes transferring judicial power to the courts.
 - C. Thus out of the HeliAEA established by Solon grew the right to trial by ordinary citizens judged by their peers, one of the bastions of any democratic society.
 - D. Ephialtes also entrusted the judicial scrutiny of a magistrate’s term in office, called the *euthune*, to the Assembly, with a final decision, if the archon was found corrupt, in the law courts.

- V. Some time in the 5th century B.C.E. the judicial procedure known as *graphe paranomon*, or prosecution for proposing an illegal law, was introduced.
- A. This procedure presumably grew out of the desire to ensure that no laws were introduced that might potentially harm the state or contravene existing laws.
 - B. It soon became something of a political weapon, and because of it ostracism fell into disuse.
- VI. We finish on an innovation that marks for me the coming of age of the legal system that Draco had started in the 620s B.C.E.
- A. When democracy was restored in 403 B.C.E., the Athenians decided to make some major changes to their law code, and so they set up two boards of *nomothetai* (lawgivers), who would examine which of the so-called laws of Solon and Dracon were relevant and which should be updated.
 - B. This was completed in the archon year 403/2, the archonship of Eucleides, and was seen as the start of a new legal era for Athens.
 - C. At the same time, a revolutionary change was made as far as decrees passed by the Assembly or Boule becoming law.

Suggested Reading:

Carey, *Trials from Classical Athens*.

MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What are the essential differences between the law of the Bronze Age and that of the Classical period?
2. Who or what do you think played the most significant role in the development of the legal code?

Lecture Thirty-Six

The Judicial Machinery of the Legal System

Scope: In this lecture the judicial machinery of the developed legal system is discussed. We examine three important components of this machinery: the magistrates, the courts, and the private and public arbitrators. In doing so we can again see the importance the Athenians attached to law and their readiness to participate in the legal system—perhaps more so than to take part in the political life of the city.

Outline

- I. This lecture discusses what we may call the judicial machinery of the legal system. We examine the three important components of this machinery: the magistrates, the courts, and the private and public arbitrators.
- II. The magistrates we've already met.
 - A. In the Bronze Age, justice was dispensed by the king and perhaps tribal elders.
 - B. By the Archaic period, in the case of Athens, the Areopagus had control of political and judicial life.
 - C. As the Classical period continued, litigation in Athens increased dramatically. At some point trial by jury had been introduced, and justice was dispensed by different law courts, including the Areopagus and the Assembly.
- III. Although the courts dispensed justice, no case came to court until the appropriate magistrate said so.
 - A. Each of the archons was responsible for a different type of suit, including private and public offenses: The basileus archon dealt with cases involving religion; the eponymous archon dealt with all family and property matters; and the *polemarchos* archon dealt with metics.
 - B. The archons delegated some judicial tasks to the six *thesmothetae*, who introduced the *euthune* of the elected official, which was a balance to the *dokimasia*.
 - C. The Athenian legal system also had in it magistrates who had specific technical or professional duties, and these made them responsible for cases in their own particular areas.
 - D. Then there were the 10 *strategoï*, who dealt with cases that involved military crimes.
 - E. There were also the 10 *synegoroï*, who prosecuted a magistrate who had failed his *euthune*, and other public prosecutors who prosecuted those found guilty after an investigation by the Assembly or Boule.
- IV. Since Athens was one of the larger poleis in the Classical period, it had a large number of courts.
 - A. For the Archaic and early Classical periods, the Areopagus was responsible, along with the archons, for dispensing justice.
 - B. Ephialtes' legislation in 462 rendered the Areopagus largely impotent, and during his term he gave the courts, Assembly, and Boule the right to judge an official's conduct.
 - C. There were five special courts set up to try different types of homicide.
 - D. Once trial by jury became the norm, all of the law courts (*dikasteria*) become an important part of the Athenian constitution.
- V. The final part of the judicial machinery is the arbitrators. These people were extremely important in the constitution.
 - A. We already talked about the role of arbitrators in early Greek law, when two parties who could not reconcile their differences approached either a king or tribal elder to settle the dispute.
 - B. By the Classical period, arbitration was a formal process governed by law, and there were both private and public arbitrators, who were significantly different.
 - C. Another alternative was to apply for the case to go to a formal law court.
 - D. Some arbitrators were called tribal judges—4 elected from each of the 10 tribes. These tribal judges decided private cases brought by members of their tribe.
 - E. Arbitration was seen as a convenient way of settling a dispute out of court, especially for those who would feel intimidated facing a big jury and having to argue their own cases.
 - F. It seems that the vast majority of private disputes never made it to a court of law; hence arbitration reduced the workload of the courts.
 - G. Also, public arbitration was seen as a civic duty.

Suggested Reading:

Carey, *Trials from Classical Athens*.

MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What were the benefits of the arbitration process, and why might individuals prefer it?
2. What might be the implications of the discrepancy between Assembly pay and jury pay for the Athenians' involvement in their legal or political systems?

Lecture Thirty-Seven

Types of Cases, Sycophants, and Pretrial

Scope: This lecture examines the types of cases, both public and private, and procedures that existed in the developed legal system of Athens. The case is made for the origins of the lawyer in two professional groups who, in return for a fee, would help those going to court. These groups were the *logographoi*, or speechwriters, who wrote court speeches on behalf of clients (whether prosecutor or defendant), and the *synegoroi*, or speakers, who would speak on a client's behalf in court. We also consider the odious sycophants, or blackmailers, who seemed to have been castigated by society.

Outline

- I. In this lecture we examine some of the types of public and private cases and procedures that existed in the developed legal system of Athens.
 - A. We will consider sycophants, and we will talk about the lead-up to the trial, including witness testimony and the preliminary hearing.
 - B. Then I want to try out a heresy on you, an idea about the origins of the modern attorney.
- II. Let us begin with the types of cases.
 - A. A private case was called a *dike idia*, and a public case was called a *dike demosia*.
 - B. A private case affected a small number of disputants, and a charge had to be made by one of those affected against someone else.
 - C. A public case affected the state as a whole, and any adult male citizen could bring a suit against the alleged criminal.
 - D. Although cases were generally divided into private (*dike*) and public (*graphe*) ones, the line between them was not always clear cut, and some crimes fell into categories that strike us today as odd.
 - E. In a *dike*, the dispute could be settled either by the arbitration process or by a trial. The jury size and penalties varied depending on the crime.
 - F. If a citizen wanted to charge a person with a *graphe*, one of several procedures was used to initiate the case, again depending on the nature of the charge.
 - G. It is important to remember that sometimes a crime might be covered under a variety of laws.
- III. Let's turn to the litigants.
 - A. As we know, it was up to a private individual to bring a suit against someone, and those individuals would speak on their own behalf in court if the case made there.
 - B. The prosecutor might be the wronged person himself, or (under Solon's law of third-party intervention) he might be a volunteer prosecutor.
 - C. Included among the prosecutors was another group, the sycophants, who were blackmailers. Needless to say, sycophancy was scorned by members of society, although sycophants may have been tacitly viewed as a necessary evil to check the activities of potential lawbreakers.
- IV. As we already said, a victim could accuse someone by a *dike* if the matter was private or by one of several procedures if the matter was public.
 - A. Some of these procedures involved a magistrate from the outset (*ephegesis*), and others just the accuser himself (*apagoge*).
 - B. The accuser had to make his case to the relevant magistrate, who would set a date for a more formal hearing, called an *anakrisis*, a preliminary enquiry.
 - C. The *anakrisis* was held in the open air, and anyone could observe it. Only after that did the magistrate decide whether the case had merit and should proceed to a law court or arbitration.
 - D. If the matter was proceeding to a court, all the evidence from the *anakrisis* was sealed in urns, and no additional evidence could be added during this time.
 - E. It was during the *anakrisis* that the accused could challenge his accuser if he thought he was being prosecuted under the wrong law.
 - F. The process of private individuals prosecuting someone or defending themselves would have been intimidating to many people. That is why we see the rise in the 4th century of a group called the *logographoi*, or professional speechwriters.

- G. The litigants could also call on supporting speakers, or *synegoroi*, to speak on their behalf in court.
- V. Now let's get heretical. I see in the formal class of *logographoi* (who charged fees for their legal and writing expertise) and the more informal group of *synegoroi* (who spoke on your behalf) the origins of the modern lawyer.
 - A. If successful, a modern lawyer can build up a large and powerful law firm and perhaps even attract media attention if the right case comes along.
 - B. The same was true in Athens, except there were no law firms as such. There were, however, a number of high-profile trials, and many *logographoi* shot to fame and fortune because of them.

Suggested Reading:

Carey, *Trials from Classical Athens*.

MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Since the Athenians never tried to eradicate sycophancy (for example, with harsher penalties), do you think they tacitly condoned it because it kept potential lawbreakers in check?
2. The Greeks never talked about an individual's "rights" but only about the laws. Does the Athenian judicial system reveal that the Athenians thought only in terms of their polis's welfare, not the individual's welfare?

Lecture Thirty-Eight

Going to Trial in Ancient Athens

Scope: In this final lecture on our theme of law, we look at what an actual trial entailed. There was a preliminary hearing called an *anakrasis*, so what happened at it? When a case got to court, how long did a trial last? What was required on the part of the litigants? What role did the jury have, and how did it vote? What sorts of penalties were prescribed for crimes? We again see some striking differences between Classical trials and those of today, but it is wrong for us to think of the Athenian trial as amateurish and of the jurors as mere spectators who were there only for the entertainment.

Outline

- I. In previous lectures we covered aspects of the judicial system, such as its machinery and process, which have set us up for this lecture, our final on the theme of law: what the actual trial day entailed.
- II. A number of trials would be heard on the days when the courts met, which was about two-thirds of the year.
 - A. The jurors arrived at the court complexes very early in the morning and underwent a multistage selection process. Once assigned to their courts, the jurors sat through some administrative proceedings. Then the trial proper began.
 - B. This was divided into three stages, and the term usually applied to the whole trial process is “tripartite day” or “measured-out day.”
 - C. Each speaker had the same amount of time, which was controlled by a water clock.
 - D. The jurors voted at the end of the defense speech.
 - E. If the jurors declared the defendant innocent, they drew their pay and went home, as did the defendant. If they found him guilty and there was the option of a speech to suggest an alternate penalty, they returned to their seats to sit through the final third of the “tripartite day” to hear speeches about the penalty.
 - F. The most famous alternative penalty is perhaps that of Socrates. However, where the law formally prescribed a penalty, the defendant could not propose an alternative one.
- III. *The Athenian Constitution* tells us that four private cases and one public case were heard per day. However, I personally question whether high-profile public cases could be dealt with in a day.
 - A. For example, in 323 B.C.E. Demosthenes was put on trial for treason and was prosecuted by 10 men appointed by the state.
 - B. When we think about 10 prosecution speeches, plus all manner of supporting evidence, it’s hard to think of all of that fitting into the 2 hour and 12 minute limit. Demosthenes himself would have spoken at length in his own defense.
 - C. Then there’s the matter of how long it would take the jury to vote and for their ballots to be counted, because the jury at Demosthenes’ trial numbered 1,501.
 - D. Furthermore, in the Classical period a new word comes into existence: *dekazein*. It has the specialized meaning of large-scale bribery of jurors.
- IV. So we turn to the speeches of prosecution and defense, which were also very different from those of today.
 - A. We have a goodly number of actual forensic speeches that have survived, and I’d recommend the collection contained in Chris Carey’s *Trials from Classical Athens*.
 - B. It’s interesting that with the exception of two highly political, showpiece trials, all our extant speeches are either the prosecution one or the defense one in a case, not both sides.
 - C. Much of the content of the speeches we have would be ruled inadmissible and would have the speaker fined for contempt and even disbarred today.
 - D. It was also common for defendants to parade their wives and children through court, crying and gnashing their teeth, to gain the sympathy of the jurors.
 - E. Another difference also, given the large size of juries in Athens, was the noise level and ability to hear properly; speakers did not stop if the jurors got distracted.
 - F. Perhaps somewhat similar to today, though handled differently, is the sense of dramatic immediacy to the speeches we have, because speakers often addressed the jurors directly and challenged them to find a defendant guilty.

- V. To us, the Athenian court system might seem very amateurish and like going to the theater.
 - A. Yet having said that, jurors took their dicastic oaths seriously, just as the people recognized the importance of law in city life.
 - B. We should recognize that without the Athenian court system, we would not enjoy the rights and privileges and the recourse to law and appeal that we have and take for granted today.

Suggested Reading:

Carey, *Trials from Classical Athens*.

MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Was the Athenian court system amateurish?
2. How much of a role did rhetoric play in the forensic speeches?

Lecture Thirty-Nine

Macedonia, North of Mount Olympus

Scope: Before Philip II, Macedonia was a social, cultural, economic, and political backwater with no centralized rule and a weak, conscript army, prey to foreign incursions by neighboring tribes. In antiquity, Mount Olympus was the geographical border between Greece and Macedonia, but a racial line apparently existed as well, for the Greeks called the Macedonians barbarians, meaning they did not speak Greek. In this lecture we look at the differences between Greeks and Macedonians—their ethnicity, social customs (including polygamy), political institutions, and culture—and conduct a brief survey of Macedonia's turbulent history before Philip's dynamic reign.

Outline

- I. In this lecture we return to the theme of imperialism, not of Athens but of Macedonia under Philip II and Alexander the Great, and how Greeks responded to it.
 - A. In the first part of this lecture, we'll set the scene by examining details of Macedonian life, including social and political customs and the issue of Macedonian ethnicity.
 - B. Then, in the second part of the lecture, we will look briefly at Macedonia's turbulent history before Philip came to power in 359 B.C.E.
 - C. One thing I would like to clarify at the outset, in case you decide to read more on Macedonian history, is that you'll often see the geographical area referred to as Macedonia but the state called Macedon.
- II. The geographical barrier between Greece and Macedonia in antiquity was Mount Olympus.
 - A. For much of its early history, Macedonia was divided into two parts because of the rugged Pindus mountain range: Upper Macedonia to the west and Lower Macedonia to the east.
 - B. The capital at Pella was in Lower Macedonia, but because of the split between Upper and Lower Macedonia the king was often faced by hostilities from the peoples of Upper Macedonia, especially the group of people called the Illyrians.
 - C. Because of this internal division, there was never any unity in the kingdom, and this was something Philip II addressed when he became king.
 - D. Unlike Greece, Macedonia was rich in natural resources, such as silver, gold, copper, iron, lead, and especially timber. But despite the abundance of natural resources, the economy was in a weak state before Philip.
- III. There was an ethnic chasm between the Macedonians and the Greeks, as is shown by social customs, political institutions, and possibly racial differences.
 - A. The Greeks called the Macedonians barbarians because the Greeks called anyone who did not speak Greek a barbarian.
 - B. However, I believe that all of the information can only point to the Macedonians being Greek and speaking Greek. The Greeks presumably could not understand the Macedonian dialect, which allowed them to call the Macedonians barbarians.
 - C. Socially as well, the Greeks looked down their noses at the Macedonians. Two of the biggest cultural differences from the Greeks were the Macedonians' consumption of undiluted wine and their practice of polygamy.
 - D. Politically, Macedonia was a monarchy. The Macedonian government was composed of two halves: the king and the Assembly. But in practice the king's power was absolute.
- IV. Macedonia was in a dismal state before Philip became king in 359, but by the time he was assassinated in 336, after being king for only 23 years, Macedonia was the superpower of the ancient world.
 - A. It had the best-trained and toughest army and a centralized monarchy. It had imposed its hegemony over the Greeks, and Philip had even made plans for an invasion of Asia.
 - B. To understand Philip's achievements better, in the second part of the lecture we will look briefly at Macedonian history before Philip.
- V. For much of its earlier history, Macedonia was plagued by interference in its domestic politics from the tribes all around it and elsewhere.
 - A. Before Philip, Macedonia used the ports on the Chalcidic coastline for its imports and exports. However, in the late 390s, the Olynthians seized parts of eastern Macedonia and backed a pretender to the throne.

- B.** The Athenians especially interfered in Macedonia's domestic affairs, including supporting pretenders to the throne. They did this not just to secure the high-quality timber needed for their fleet, but also in a bid to regain Amphipolis.
- C.** Some of the earlier Macedonian kings, including Alexander I and Perdiccas II, had tried to combat foreign incursions and even took on the Illyrians, who represented the greatest threat to Macedonian security.
- D.** Archelaus enhanced the army, built roads to help with military communications and trade, and founded a new capital at Pella, with a view perhaps to trade. He also wanted to extend the cultural pull of his capital.
- E.** Archelaus had not united Macedonia or created a strong dynastic line, though. The weak reigns of his successors prove his failings, as these kings undid most of Archelaus's accomplishments.
- F.** In 359, the Dardanians, an Illyrian tribe, invaded Macedonia again and defeated them. Then they and perhaps other Illyrian tribes, as well as the Paeonians, massed to invade deeper into Macedonia.
- G.** At the same time, two pretenders, one backed by Athens and the other by Thrace, made a bid for the throne. But then the Assembly acclaimed the dead king's brother, Philip, as king.
- H.** Under Philip, Macedonian history would change in a way that no Greek or Macedonian could have envisaged in 359.

Suggested Reading:

Hammond, *Philip of Macedon*.

Worthington, *Philip II of Macedonia*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Why did social snobbery exist between the Macedonians and the Greeks?
2. What was Macedonia like when Philip became king in 359 B.C.E.?

Lecture Forty

Philip II—“Greatest of the Kings of Europe”

Scope: In this lecture we see how Philip dealt with the threats to Macedonia by a combination of diplomacy and deceit, setting a pattern for his reign. Part of that diplomacy was political marriage, and we note Philip’s second, third, and fourth political marriages in this lecture. Then we turn to his army reforms, by which he created the most formidable—and successful—army in the Classical period. Philip was initially concerned with border security, centralizing the power of the monarchy, and economic stimulation, but his measures brought him into contact with the Greeks, especially Athens, and then into conflict with them. This shaped his imperialistic policy toward Greece.

Outline

- I. In our last lecture, we ended with the defeat of the king before Philip, which led to Macedonia facing four serious external threats.
 - A. In this lecture, we are first going to see how Philip handled these threats by a combination of speed, diplomacy, deceit, and military force that set a pattern for his reign.
 - B. In the second part, we’re going to consider his army reforms as being at the heart of his policy to bring about border security and a union of Upper and Lower Macedonia.
 - C. We will end on how Philip’s moves to enhance Macedonia’s economic interests brought him into conflict with the Greeks, especially Athens.
- II. Diodorus gives us a narrative history of Philip’s reign, and the praise, I think, is justified. We also note his military skills and his diplomatic abilities, which were the key to his successes.
 - A. On Philip’s accession in 359 B.C.E., the situation was serious, but he created an armistice with the Illyrians and bribed the Paeonians and the Thracians not to invade Macedonia.
 - B. This left the Athenians, and Philip decided to use diplomacy that centered on making the Athenians think he was going to arrange for Amphipolis to be returned to them.
 - C. Within a matter of months, Philip had ended these very serious threats to Macedonia and bought the necessary time to consolidate his position as king.
 - D. Philip decided that he was going to end the invasions and interference by hostile powers once and for all. Border security became his first priority.
- III. This brings us now to his creation of a new army for military and political reasons.
 - A. When Philip was a hostage in Thebes, he experienced what military prowess can do for a state and learned much about military strategy from the Theban general Epaminondas.
 - B. All of these experiences influenced Philip greatly, and in 359 he turned to army reform, putting into practice at least some of his experiences at Thebes.
 - C. Philip’s army reforms continued throughout his reign because as he conquered more territories he would add foreign troops, specialist and otherwise, to his army.
 - D. We need to bear in mind that Philip was constantly adopting and adapting in a way that the Greeks were not.
- IV. Philip began by introducing new tactics and weaponry.
 - A. These included switching the main attacking arm of the army from the infantry to the cavalry.
 - B. Philip also created a corps of mounted scouts, the *prodromoi*, that was a fast-strike force.
 - C. The Macedonian infantry was arranged in phalanxes, but Philip varied the depth of the phalanx formation from 8 ranks to 32.
 - D. Thus we have the hypaspists, a special corps of shield-bearing infantry, who were more lightly armed and were trained to move at higher speeds than the regular phalanx.
 - E. Macedonian infantrymen were trained in the use of a new weapon, the *sarissa*, a type of pike.
 - F. The men as a whole were rigorously trained, and the soldiers served full time in the army and were taught to be self-sufficient.
 - G. Philip was also keen on technology, in his case siege engines. He created a mechanical engineering corps.

- V. In the spring of 358, Philip tried out his new army. He attacked the Paeonians and quickly defeated them. Then he invaded Illyria, and the Illyrians as a whole had to agree to Philip's terms.
 - A. The victory freed Upper Macedonia from Illyrian influence, and more importantly it united Upper and Lower Macedonia as never before.
 - B. His army reforms had a political role. Philip organized the various peoples of his army by different ethnic units but put them together as a whole army.
 - C. He also knew that with this and with continued military successes would come a feeling of national unity.
 - D. The unification of Macedonia and the resulting elevation of Pella as capital of the entire kingdom were arguably Philip's greatest successes.
- VI. Philip's moves to secure his borders brought him into contact with the Greeks, and in 358 he intervened in Thessaly by giving aid to Larisa against its traditional enemy, Pherae.
 - A. A more formal alliance with Larisa made sense at this time because Philip needed allies; Thessaly had the best horses for his cavalry; and his alliance with Larisa meant that he had now secured his southern border.
 - B. The alliance was cemented by his marrying a woman from Larisa named Philinna. Philip had only his eastern and southwestern borders to worry about now.
 - C. In 357 he turned to his southwestern border, where he struck an alliance with the king of Epirus, which included his marriage to the princess Olympias.
 - D. Further expansion could now follow, but this would bring him into conflict with the Greeks, especially the Athenians.
- VII. By 357, Philip had become involved in the rich mining regions close to Amphipolis, which thus set in motion his moves to stimulate Macedonia's economy like never before.
 - A. Mining became fundamental to the Macedonian economy, because the gold and silver were turned into coinage.
 - B. By the end of his reign, the economy was very strong and its coinage the strongest in Europe.
 - C. The Athenians had a history of interfering in Macedonian politics, so he could not allow them any influence in that area. Hence in 357 Philip seized Amphipolis—and kept it.
 - D. When the Athenians realized he had duped them, they declared war on him.
 - E. Philip must have known the Athenians would have this reaction, so the big question is whether he provoked war as a means of involving himself more in Greek affairs.

Suggested Reading:

Hammond, *Philip of Macedon*.

Worthington, *Philip II of Macedonia*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Should we admire or criticize Philip's combination of diplomacy and deceit in his first years as king?
2. Do Philip's army reforms indicate he intended anything other than an army that would maintain his borders against hostile incursions?

Lecture Forty-One

Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism

Scope: Philip was at war with Athens from 357 to 346 B.C.E. He was also involved in a sacred war to liberate the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, which had been seized by the state of Phocis; this war began in 355 and also ended in 346. We consider both of these wars, which were used by Philip as stepping stones into central Greek affairs. At their conclusion he had become a significant force in central Greek politics.

Outline

- I. In this lecture we discuss Philip's war with Athens over Amphipolis from 357 to 346 B.C.E. and his involvement in the Third Sacred War of 355–346 B.C.E., both of which he used as stepping stones into central Greek affairs.
- II. The Athenians had declared war on Philip in 357, when he seized Amphipolis and kept it.
 - A. The Athenians did little in their war against Philip for some time because of their financial problems and a revolt of many of their allies in their Second Naval Confederacy, called the Social War.
 - B. Philip also made no moves against Athens in the early years of the war. In fact there were no battles fought between Philip and Athens during this war, and it was settled diplomatically in 346.
 - C. But Philip's aloofness from the war with Athens was because he was busy elsewhere, further securing and expanding his borders, stimulating the economy, and then getting involved in the Third Sacred War.
- III. The background to the Third Sacred War kicks off in 356.
 - A. In that year, the Amphictyonic Council ordered the Phocians to pay a fine imposed on them some time earlier for cultivating sacred land close to Delphi.
 - B. The Phocians refused on the grounds that the land belonged to them. To protest their maltreatment, a Phocian force seized Delphi.
 - C. This force was soon reinforced by several thousand mercenaries, hired by pilfering from the treasuries at Delphi.
 - D. When it defeated an Amphictyonic League army sent to liberate the oracle, a Sacred War was declared on Phocis in 355.
 - E. Philip exploited the Third Sacred War for his own ends in central Greece.
- IV. Philip was not involved in the Third Sacred War at its outbreak, as Macedonia was not a member of the league. However, in the summer of 353 his ally Larisa in Thessaly appealed to him for help in a clash with Pherae.
 - A. He agreed to support Larisa, but then Pherae appealed for help to the Phocian commander Onomarchus.
 - B. Onomarchus ordered his brother Phayllus to march to Pherae's support, but when Philip defeated Phayllus, Onomarchus led his entire force and defeated Philip.
 - C. In 352 Philip defeated and killed Onomarchus and the Phocian troops and mercenaries at the Battle of the Crocus Field in Thessaly.
 - D. The resilient Phocians immediately elected Onomarchus's brother Phayllus as general of their remaining troops.
 - E. Philip had very cleverly engineered what amounted to a legitimate way for him to interfere in central Greek affairs as an ally of the Amphictyonic League.
 - F. The year 352 is also significant in that Philip was elected archon of Thessaly. That meant Philip was recognized as a player in Greek affairs.
 - G. Philip tried to reconcile Pherae with his rule by marrying Nicesipolis, but Pherae remained unconvinced of Philip's good intentions.
- V. Philip had to spend some time after he defeated Onomarchus in reestablishing his influence in Illyria, Paeonia, and Epirus and countering the threat of an Athenian-Thracian-Chalcidian alliance, all of which were the product of his defeat in 353.
 - A. It did not take him long to do so, and in 349 and 348 he moved decisively against the Chalcidice.
 - B. It appears that, after his defeat at the hands of Onomarchus, all of these places planned either to invade Macedonia, counter Philip's power as king, or both. Hence that one defeat had dramatic repercussions for his kingship.
 - C. The fallout from Philip's defeat marks a change in Philip's policy toward the Greeks and hence the start of what I'd call Macedonian imperialism proper.

VI. If Philip and his empire were going through some changes, so too was Athens.

- A. Demosthenes had made an entry into political life in the mid-350s, and when he turned his attention to Philip, his career took off.
- B. In 346 the hard-pressed Thebans invited Philip to join in defeating the Phocians once and for all. This scenario suited Philip, who wanted to end both the Sacred War and his war with Athens, because this would give him leverage in central Greek affairs.
- C. Among other things, it was essential to prevent Athens and Thebes from becoming allies because the combined resources of these two states would cause problems for him. Also, we cannot rule out the memories he had of his treatment while a hostage.
- D. By 346, Philip had entered into some sort of tacit deal with the Phocians, whereby they handed over to him the strategically important pass of Thermopylae and also surrendered to him, not to the Amphictyonic League.
- E. When the Phocians surrendered Thermopylae and their state to Philip, he thus ended the Sacred War without a final battle.
- F. The two Phocian votes in the Amphictyonic League were given to Philip, and he was also elected president of the Pythian Games at Delphi for 346, which were part of the Olympic cycle—a significant honor.
- G. As for the Athenians, after several diplomatic embassies between Philip and Athens, the two powers swore to the Peace of Philocrates, also in 346. The peace was a bilateral peace and alliance between Philip and the Athenians, each side swearing on behalf of its allies.

Suggested Reading:

Hammond, *Philip of Macedon*.

Worthington, *Philip II of Macedonia*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What sort of attitude do you think Philip had toward the Athenians, and why?
2. What was Philip's agenda in central Greece, and to what extent did he manipulate events in the Third Sacred War to achieve it?

Lecture Forty-Two

Greece Conquered—The End of Greek Autonomy

Scope: In this lecture we examine Philip's dealings with the Greek states from 346 to 338 B.C.E., during which time the Athenian orator Demosthenes worked tirelessly to discredit Philip as a despot and to provoke further warfare. He was successful, and in 338 the Battle of Chaeronea was fought between Philip and a coalition of Greek states. It was one of Greek history's decisive battles, for Philip's victory meant that Greece fell under the hegemony of Macedonia and Greek autonomy came to an end. We discuss this exciting battle, in which Philip's son and heir, the 18-year-old Alexander, played no small role in the victory by annihilating the famous Theban Sacred Band.

Outline

- I. In the first part of this lecture, we're going to discuss Philip's dealings with the Greek states from 346 to 338 B.C.E., during which time Demosthenes worked to discredit Philip and to provoke further warfare between Athens and Macedonia. In the second part of the lecture, we'll discuss the result: the Battle of Chaeronea in 338 B.C.E.
- II. The Peace of Philocrates was doomed to fail.
 - A. Athenian imperialistic ambitions did not abate, and the Thebans resented how Philip championed the Athenians over them.
 - B. The Athenian attitude is shown when Philip was elected president of the Pythian Games in 346 and they decided against attending.
 - C. This prompted Demosthenes to deliver a speech to the Athenian Assembly called "On The Peace," which argued that while the Peace of Philocrates was a bad one for the Athenians, they should adhere to its terms to give themselves time to regroup.
 - D. Demosthenes did not see the peace as anything but ephemeral, and his anti-Macedonian stance is famous, but whether it is a genuine one is not certain. All of this raises questions about him.
- III. Back to the aftermath of the Peace of Philocrates.
 - A. In 345, Philip was busy with a short campaign against an Illyrian tribe and also with transferring some of his people from one part of Macedonia to another.
 - B. In 344 Philip was forced to intervene again in Thessaly, so he installed a pro-Macedonian oligarchy and a garrison in Pherae, but then he divided Thessaly equally into a tetrarchy, with each part under the control of a governor that he appointed himself.
 - C. Demosthenes took Philip's actions in Thessaly to say Philip had enslaved the whole of Thessaly, but the Thessalians had not been enslaved. Demosthenes' rhetoric helped to convince the Assembly that Philip intended to end Greek freedom.
 - D. In 344 Philip also sent an embassy to Athens, proposing changes to the Peace of Philocrates.
 - E. Demosthenes reacted by arguing that the new arrangement would weaken Athens's hegemony over its empire, as its allies would now have closer links to Philip.
 - F. Athens and Macedonia were again on a collision course.
- IV. The Peace of Philocrates was on life support in 344, but it died in 343.
 - A. In that year, Philocrates, the architect of the peace, was put on trial, but he fled into exile before his trial. Demosthenes was now out to distance himself from the peace as far as possible.
 - B. Demosthenes began to work toward building a coalition of Greek states to face Philip, including Thebes.
 - C. Also in 343, Demosthenes brought a suit against his rival Aeschines for misconduct on one of the diplomatic embassies to Philip in 346 that led to the Peace of Philocrates. The charge was personal, but he also was further distancing himself from the peace.
- V. Relations between Philip and Athens plummeted during the later 340s, because in 341 Philip defeated Thrace and added it to the Macedonian empire.
 - A. Athenian worries over the Chersonese intensified in the spring of 340, when Philip left Pella, marched through Thrace, and besieged Perinthus and Byzantium.
 - B. When the Athenian force stationed along the Thracian Chersonese was suddenly called away, Philip seized the opportunity to capture the Athenian corn convoy. Demosthenes persuaded the Athenians to declare war on Philip.

- C. It is of interest for the history of Alexander the Great that when Philip left for Byzantium in 340, he made Alexander regent of Macedonia.
 - D. In the meantime, Philip was getting nowhere with the siege of Byzantium. As he marched back, he made a brief foray into Scythia, defeating the Scythians in battle and killing their king Ateas, adding Ateas's kingdom to Macedonia.
 - E. As the Macedonians marched home, a fierce Thracian tribe called the Triballi engaged Philip in battle, where he was severely wounded.
- VI.** Back in Greece, events were moving quickly. The Amphictyonic League declared another sacred war in 339, this time against Amphissa.
- A. The Amphissans had wanted to bring charges against the Athenians, but at a council meeting Aeschines turned the tables on them.
 - B. The reaction to it was lackluster, perhaps because the Greeks as a whole realized Philip would be brought in as leader of the Amphictyonic army.
 - C. When Philip did indeed enter Greece to wage war on Amphissa and suddenly detoured, passing through Thermopylae and so threatening Thebes and then Athens, Demosthenes persuaded the Assembly to let him go to Thebes to negotiate an alliance against Philip.
 - D. As a result, Athens and Thebes allied against Philip and were soon joined by several other Greek states.
 - E. Faced by this coalition, Philip staked everything on a pitched battle at Chaeronea in Boeotia in August 338.
 - F. In a clever strategy, Philip, with Alexander commanding the Companion cavalry, lulled the Greeks into thinking he was retreating. The Greeks thus opened up a gap in their line, as Philip intended. The battle turned into a rout, and Philip was master of Greece.

Suggested Reading:

Hammond, *Philip of Macedon*.

Worthington, *Philip II of Macedonia*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What role did Demosthenes play in inciting the Athenians against Philip, and why?
2. Can we determine what Philip's attitude was toward the Greeks, and had it changed since the Peace of Philocrates in 346 B.C.E.?

Lecture Forty-Three

Philip's Assassination and Legacy

Scope: We conclude our survey of Philip's reign with his general settlement of the Greek states (by which Greece became part of the Macedonian empire) and his plans to invade the Persian empire. Why did he target Asia? How far did he intend to go? The lecture covers Philip's controversial seventh marriage, which led to Alexander's defiance of him. It also covers his assassination at the height of his power in 336 B.C.E., which may have involved Alexander and his mother, Olympias. Philip's legacy, which allowed Alexander to achieve what he did, is highlighted in the final part of the lecture.

Outline

- I. We finish looking at Macedonian imperialism under Philip by examining his reign down to his assassination in 336 B.C.E. Then we conclude with remarks about Philip's legacy, which allowed Alexander to achieve what he did.
- II. The Battle of Chaeronea made Philip master of Greece, but that meant little unless he could somehow reconcile the Greeks to Macedonian hegemony.
 - A. He knew that reconciliation did not mean Greeks living happily under Macedonian rule, but if the exercise of power were masked in some way, that might be different.
 - B. Before he could turn to a longer-term settlement of Greece, Philip needed to negotiate a series of individual settlements with those states that had opposed him at Chaeronea.
 - C. He first dealt with the Thebans by installing a Macedonian oligarchy and garrison and took away the hegemony of its Boeotian League; he also ordered the Thebans to pay a ransom for the corpses of those killed at Chaeronea and sold those Thebans taken prisoner in the battle as slaves.
 - D. Philip sent Alexander at the head of an embassy to receive the Athenians' oath to a treaty of friendship and alliance that officially ended the war against Philip that had been declared in 340. Why Philip treated the Athenians so leniently is not fully known, though I have a couple of suspicions.
 - E. Philip then headed to the isthmus and into the Peloponnese to deal with the states there. At that point, Philip felt he could turn to the matter of absorbing Greece into his empire.
- III. In the winter of 338, Philip summoned deputations from all Greek cities to meet him at Corinth and announced his intention to bring about a common peace.
 - A. Philip's common peace was an enforced one, and there was to be administrative machinery that made it look like the Greeks still had a say in running Greece. This was called the community of the Greeks (*to koinon ton Hellenon*), or the League of Corinth.
 - B. Philip knew that an enforced common peace would be a deterrent for hostile action, but he also knew that the Greeks cherished their freedom.
 - C. The reality was very different from the appearance: Macedonia was not a member of the common peace, but given Philip's power, the Greeks had no choice but to elect him hegemon, giving him control of the council.
 - D. The deputations from the Greek states returned to their homes to announce Philip's plans, and these same deputations returned for a second meeting at Corinth in the spring of 337, where Philip was formally elected hegemon of the league.
 - E. At this meeting, Philip announced his grand plan to invade the Persian empire.
- IV. We don't know when Philip first began to think about invading Asia.
 - A. Diodorus says Philip first thought of doing so in 346, which has led some historians to believe the Peace of Philocrates was something of an exit policy: With central Greece settled, Philip could invade Asia.
 - B. The official reasons for invading Asia were pan-Hellenic ones: to liberate the Greek cities of Asia Minor from Persian rule and to seek revenge for what the Greeks, especially the Athenians, had suffered during the Persian Wars.
 - C. The real reasons may have had to do with Philip's need to keep his army on campaign, revenge on the Persians for helping Perinthus when Philip besieged it in 340, and especially to acquire more revenue.
 - D. Philip may well have been hard pressed financially, but he knew that the Greeks would care little for his problems, so he made the Asian expedition a pan-Hellenic one.

- V. After the spring meeting of the League of Corinth, Philip returned to Pella to plan for the Asian expedition.
- A. Later that same year, he married a teenaged Macedonian girl named Cleopatra. Philip may have wanted to father another son as he got ready to leave for Asia.
 - B. In the spring of 336, the advance force left for Asia Minor, the plan being Philip and the main army would join them after the marriage of his daughter by Olympias (also called Cleopatra) to Alexander, the king of Epirus.
 - C. The day after the marriage, Philip was stabbed to death by one of the members of the bodyguard in the theater at Aegae.
 - D. The official reason, as put out by Alexander, was that Pausanias assassinated the king for personal reasons, but the truth will never be known, as Pausanias was killed within minutes of trying to flee the scene.
 - E. Some historians suggest that Olympias (and perhaps even Alexander) arranged the assassination for political reasons.
- VI. Philip was a charismatic king whose merits far outweighed his faults.
- A. From a near-feudal type of society, Macedonia became the first nation-state in Europe.
 - B. Philip left Alexander a united Macedonia for the first time in its history; a centralized monarchy; thriving urban centers; a formidable, trained army; no external threats; a strong economy; new incomes; the strongest coinage in Europe; and general prosperity.
 - C. All of this and more, however, was in marked contrast to the situation Philip faced on his accession in 359 and to the woeful legacy of Alexander the Great.
 - D. The 4th century is usually called “the age of Alexander,” but I argue that the 4th century should be called “the age of Philip and Alexander.”

Suggested Reading:

Hammond, *Philip of Macedon*.

Worthington, *Philip II of Macedonia*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Which of the motives for Philip’s assassination do you think is the more plausible?
2. How different was Macedonia on Philip’s death from when he became king?

Lecture Forty-Four

Alexander the Great—Youth, Early Kingship

Scope: We begin this lecture with the miraculous stories that surrounded Alexander's conception and birth, which were designed to show his superhuman status. Alexander's upbringing, his earlier military exploits, and his growing rift with Philip are touched upon, before we turn to his accession as king in 336 B.C.E. and the first two years of his reign, up until he left for Asia in 334 B.C.E. In our survey of Alexander's reign, our aim is to examine why history perceived him as great and whether he is still worthy of this epithet when we consider his downsides.

Outline

- I. Alexander the Great was born in July 356 B.C.E., the son of Philip's fourth wife, Olympias of Epirus. He was not the eldest son, for he had a brother, Arrhidaeus.
 - A. We cannot consider Alexander's reign in anything like the detail it deserves; nevertheless, Alexander's importance in Greek history is so great that this course must consider his exploits.
 - B. We address the question of Alexander's greatness, because it is very hard to get to the real person.
 - C. In this lecture we look at Alexander's youth, his accession to the Macedonian throne in 336, and his first turbulent couple of years as king.
- II. All sorts of miraculous stories surrounded Alexander's conception and birth, and these were designed to show his superhuman status even before he was born.
 - A. One story has it that the night before Olympias and Philip married, Olympias was impregnated by Zeus's lightning and would give birth to someone with the bravery of a lion.
 - B. Another story says one night Philip spied Olympias in bed with a huge snake that was Zeus in disguise, and soon after this incident Olympias became pregnant.
 - C. When Alexander was being born, the temple of Artemis at Ephesus burned down. It was said this was because the goddess had left her temple to help deliver Alexander and the temple's destruction was an omen that the Persian empire was doomed to fall to Alexander.
 - D. These stories are obviously false, but they give us excellent examples of how Alexander saw himself.
 - E. Stories that exaggerated Alexander as a person, his achievements, or both continued throughout his life.
- III. Alexander was taught to hunt, to fight, and to ride like other Macedonian youths. When Alexander turned 14 in 342, his father hired Aristotle, the foremost philosopher of the day, to be his tutor.
 - A. Aristotle would tutor Alexander for three years. This took place in Mieza, far from the Macedonian court, on Philip's orders. Exactly why Philip wanted this is unknown.
 - B. Aristotle probably would have built on Alexander's education by teaching him philosophy, rhetoric, zoology, and geometry.
 - C. Aristotle had a lot to work with: Alexander was a voracious reader who had already read much of Greek literature; Homer was his bible, and Euripides his favorite tragic playwright.
- IV. Then in 340 Philip besieged Byzantium and needed Alexander back. Alexander was now 16, and he became regent of Macedonia in his father's absence.
 - A. In response to an apparent revolt by the Maedians, Alexander led an army and defeated them. Then he moved people from Macedonia into a new military outpost in Maedian territory and named it Alexandropolis.
 - B. Two years later, in 338, Alexander, at the age of 18, commanded the left flank of the Macedonian army at the Battle of Chaeronea.
 - C. After the battle, Philip ordered Alexander to lead the diplomatic embassy to the Athenians to return the ashes of their citizens who died in the battle and to receive the Athenian surrender.
 - D. There is no question that Philip was grooming Alexander as heir to the throne. However, after Chaeronea relations between Alexander and Philip deteriorated rapidly.
 - E. Philip's decision to not bring Alexander to Asia and to instead leave him behind as regent of Macedonia and Greece couldn't have angered and disappointed Alexander more.

- V. Philip was showing no signs of slowing down, and Alexander knew that he, Alexander, was not going to win any military glory while sitting in Pella.
- A. With all of these factors in mind, we can reasonably suspect that Alexander and his mother played a role in Philip's bloody assassination in 336.
 - B. Alexander became king at age 20.
 - C. When news of Philip's death reached the Greeks, they revolted from the League of Corinth.
 - D. Furthermore, we are told that not everyone was in favor of Alexander's accession, so perhaps there were other viable contenders for the throne.
 - E. Alexander began a purge of his possible opponents that lasted well into the next year.
 - F. Then Alexander turned to deal with the Greeks, and within a matter of a few weeks he had ended the revolt by a combination of diplomacy and force.
- VI. Alexander returned to Pella, but before long he campaigned against the Triballi.
- A. His motive was perhaps revenge for the defeat they had inflicted on Philip in 339. However, we should not rule out Alexander as king wanting to win the confidence of his army in battle.
 - B. In 335, the Illyrians revolted and prepared to invade Macedonia. Alexander immediately led an army into Illyria and was gaining the upper hand when he received word that the Thebans had again revolted.
 - C. The Theban action was a serious threat that Alexander could not ignore. It had the potential to bring in other Greek states, and the revolt was also going to delay Alexander's invasion of Asia.
 - D. Breaking off his Illyrian campaign, Alexander marched south and gave the Thebans one chance to surrender; when they did not, he besieged the city. Then Alexander turned over its punishment to members of the League of Corinth, who ordered its total destruction.
 - E. The message from the razing of Thebes was clear: Defiance of Alexander would meet with terrible consequences.
- VII. With Greece finally secure, Alexander could plan for the Asian expedition for the following spring.
- A. In the meantime, the last of his opponents, real or imaginary, was put to death. Among them was Amyntas, who was the true heir to the throne in 359 when Philip became king, and Attalus.
 - B. A lot happened in the first two years of Alexander's kingship, but there was even more to come.

Suggested Reading:

Cartledge, *Alexander the Great*.

Worthington, *Alexander the Great: Man and God*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Do you think the miraculous stories of Alexander's conception and birth were to show he was special, or did they have a hidden agenda?
2. Is Alexander's punishment of Thebes really so terrible, given his position in 335 B.C.E. and that the city had twice revolted from the League of Corinth?

Lecture Forty-Five

Alexander as General

Scope: In this lecture we discuss Alexander's three major battles against the Persians: Granicus in 334 B.C.E.; Issus in 333 B.C.E.; and Gaugamela in 331 B.C.E., at which Darius III, the Great King, was present. As a result of Alexander's victories at these battles, the Persian empire was incorporated into the new Macedonian empire, and Alexander became Lord of Asia. We also briefly touch on Alexander's campaigns in Bactria, Sogdiana, and India, where he enjoyed a spectacular victory against the Indian prince Porus at the Hydaspes River in 326. All of these battles are testimony to Alexander's military genius and strategic planning against often hugely numerically superior armies.

Outline

- I. How great was Alexander as a general?
 - A. In this lecture we discuss Alexander's three major battles against the Persians: Granicus in 334 B.C.E., Issus in 333 B.C.E., and Gaugamela in 331 B.C.E.
 - B. We will then briefly touch on Alexander's campaigns in Bactria, Sogdiana, and India.
 - C. We also consider aspects of Alexander's generalship that show a different side that affects his military greatness.
- II. In the spring of 334, Alexander led his army from Pella to the Hellespont.
 - A. Before landing in Asia, Alexander threw a spear into Asian soil, saying that he accepted it as a gift from the gods.
 - B. In three battles, Alexander defeated the Persians to absorb Persia into the Macedonian empire.
 - C. Back on the mainland, the Greeks may well have been cowed by Macedonia, but in Athens at least the flame of opposition continued to burn.
- III. Alexander's first battle against a Persian army was fought in 334, at the Granicus River.
 - A. The satrap, Arsites, decided to engage the Macedonians in battle.
 - B. It was a rout, and one person who almost died was Alexander himself.
 - C. After Granicus, Alexander marched down the coast of Asia Minor, receiving the surrender of towns there or taking others by siege.
 - D. In the spring of 333, he detoured to Gordium, where there was a wagon tied to a pole with a famous knot. It was said that whoever untied the knot would rule Asia. Alexander cut through it.
- IV. By now, Alexander was getting reports that Darius was leading a vast army from Babylon against him. The two sides would meet in battle in the summer of 333 at Issus.
 - A. Despite the overwhelming numerical superiority of the Persians, Alexander attacked first. His strategy was to penetrate the Persian line, to get behind it with his cavalry, and to go after Darius.
 - B. Alexander never got the chance to engage Darius, for when he did smash through the Persian line, Darius fled.
 - C. For the rest of the day and into nightfall, the Macedonian army pursued the Persians as they fled the battlefield, and they massacred them. This was a great victory for Alexander.
- V. The final battle against the Persians, who were again led by Darius, was in September 331 at Gaugamela.
 - A. By then Alexander had successfully besieged a number of places, most famously Tyre and Gaza, come to control Syria and the Levantine coast, and received the submission of Egypt.
 - B. Alexander's strategy was again to try to capture or kill Darius.
 - C. Apart from an anxious few moments when the Macedonian left wing under Parmenion nearly gave way, the battle was another Macedonian victory.
 - D. Again Darius fled, this time to Bactria with Bessus, and at first Alexander pursued Darius.
 - E. The victory at Gaugamela meant that Alexander was in effect Great King.
 - F. In the meantime, Bessus and some of the other satraps overthrew Darius and murdered him.
 - G. Bessus however declared himself Great King, forcing Alexander to pursue him into Bactria and Sogdiana. This new campaign marked the departure from the original mandate of the League of Corinth.

- VI.** Alexander probably didn't need to invade Bactria, but some of the hardest fighting took place in Bactria and Sogdiana for the next three years. By 327, Bessus was dead and Alexander believed he had conquered those areas.
- A.** After Bactria and Sogdiana, Alexander pushed on into India, where he would fight one major battle against the Indian prince Porus at the Hydaspes River in 326; the Macedonians were victorious.
 - B.** This victory was the high point of Alexander's time in India. After it, he besieged a number of towns that defied him, massacring the inhabitants when he took them.
 - C.** He also was not prepared to stop marching east, and this was his undoing. At the Hyphasis River, his troops mutinied, and Alexander was forced to turn back to Greece.
 - D.** Leaving India, he marched westward through the Gedrosian Desert, during which about a third of the men with him died because of the hostile natural conditions.
 - E.** In the meantime, Bactria and Sogdiana revolted, and there was nothing he could do.
 - F.** In 324 at Opis, the army mutinied again, this time over Alexander's policy to discharge his veterans.
 - G.** In Babylon in June 323, Alexander died on the eve of his next campaign: Arabia.
 - H.** There is no doubt that on the battlefield Alexander was a military genius. However, we notice how Alexander's reason for doing something is personal, for his own military reputation.

Suggested Reading:

Cartledge, *Alexander the Great*.

Worthington, *Alexander the Great: Man and God*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Which of Alexander's battles do you think is the most exciting and/or best reflects his military skills?
2. How does the ending of Alexander's Asian campaign affect our evaluation of him as a great general?

Lecture Forty-Six

Alexander as King

Scope: In this lecture, we look at the behavior on Alexander's part that must affect our appreciation of him as king and hence our evaluation of him as "great." As examples, we discuss the conspiracies of Philotas and of the pages, which Alexander seems to have exploited to rid himself of vocal opponents, and his drunken murder of a senior general, Cleitus. We also consider the accuracy of a view that is still fairly common: that he was an idealist who wanted to use his power to unite the races.

Outline

- I. How great was Alexander as a king?
 - A. In this lecture, we look at his disturbing behavior and the parts of his character that emerged as he marched further eastward, which must affect our appreciation of him as king and hence our evaluation of whether he should still be called "great."
 - B. As examples, we discuss two conspiracies against him, as well as his drunken murder of a senior general, Cleitus.
 - C. Finally, we examine the view that he was an idealist, wanting to use his power as king to unite the races.
- II. In 330 B.C.E. at Phrada, in Bactria, a soldier called Dimnus apparently plotted to kill Alexander.
 - A. When Dimnus tried to recruit a man called Cebalinus into the conspiracy, Cebalinus told Philotas about it, but Philotas decided against telling Alexander. Finally, Cebalinus told Alexander about the plot himself.
 - B. The king immediately ordered an investigation, which led to the arrest of Demetrius (a royal bodyguard) and Philotas. Dimnus committed suicide.
 - C. Philotas was put on trial for treason, found guilty, and executed by javelin. Then Alexander gave orders for the execution of Philotas's father, the veteran general Parmenion.
 - D. There is no question that Philotas was in the wrong not to have informed Alexander about a plot; however, he was not part of it.
 - E. What lies at the heart of the Philotas conspiracy, as modern historians call it, is Alexander's ridding himself of critics; this also includes the case of Parmenion.
 - F. Philotas's and Parmenion's fates give us a disturbing insight into Alexander's growing paranoia and inability to handle criticism.
- III. Then at Maracanda in the summer of 328, a drinking party got out of hand when Alexander and Cleitus, one of his senior generals, got into a bitter argument.
 - A. This was in reaction to flatterers at the party trying to outdo each other in their praise of Alexander at the expense of Philip.
 - B. Everyone present was very drunk, especially Alexander, and he attacked Cleitus.
 - C. Ptolemy managed to bundle Cleitus out of the banqueting hall, but as things calmed down, Cleitus bounded back in, taunting Alexander further. Alexander then grabbed a pike off one of his bodyguards and killed Cleitus on the spot.
 - D. There was no conspiracy here involving Cleitus, nothing to indicate that Alexander thought he was about to be assassinated. It is impossible to excuse Alexander's action.
- IV. A short while later, in Bactra in 327, another conspiracy against Alexander was discovered, this time involving the royal pages.
 - A. While on a hunt, Alexander was poised to kill a boar when one of the boys, Hermolaus, killed it instead. For this, Hermolaus was publicly caned and his horse confiscated.
 - B. Hermolaus wanted revenge, and he apparently persuaded three other pages to join him in killing Alexander in his sleep, but Alexander foiled the plot.
 - C. Eventually details of the conspiracy came out, and the young pages, the court historian, and Aristotle's nephew Callisthenes (who was responsible for the pages' education at court) were arrested.
 - D. The pages were tortured and stoned to death, but at no point did they say that Callisthenes was involved in any plot. Nevertheless, Alexander had him executed as a traitor.
 - E. The pages' conspiracy was an odd affair, and Alexander was up to something by implicating Callisthenes in the plot.

- V. As king, Alexander insisted on spreading Greek civilization throughout Asia, but Alexander made no attempt to recognize local customs when they contradicted what Greeks believed in or when he personally disliked them.
- A. A case in point was the Bactrian custom of killing their elderly or infirm. Alexander ended this custom because the Greeks considered it reprehensible.
 - B. It was this sort of attitude that caused discontent through all the places he marched and affected his kingship.
 - C. One belief about Alexander that contributes to the image of him as a great king is that he was an idealist who strove to unite the races into one, a unity of mankind. The issue is important, because it has a bearing on how we should consider the historical Alexander.
 - D. Several events in Alexander's reign have been seen as his desire to establish a brotherhood of mankind, but none of these has any ideological purpose, just a pragmatic one.
 - E. The sorts of things we've been talking about have to affect our view of Alexander as a king and especially whether we can still blindly call him "great," but perhaps the best way to assess his greatness is by his legacy, which, compared to what his father left him, was woeful.

Suggested Reading:

Cartledge, *Alexander the Great*.

Worthington, *Alexander the Great: Man and God*.

Questions to Consider:

1. How do the conspiracies and mutinies against Alexander affect the common belief that he was a great general?
2. Do you think Alexander was idealistic and did think of uniting the races as one?

Lecture Forty-Seven

Alexander as Man—and God?

Scope: One of the most controversial aspects of Alexander’s reign is whether he considered himself divine. We look at the various examples from his reign that shed some light on his belief, specifically his exploitation of religion, his visit to the oracle of Zeus Ammon, his attempt to enforce *proskynesis*, his motive for invading Arabia, the attitude of his court and army toward the end of his reign, and the influences of his father Philip’s divinity. We note the question Alexander asked Brahman philosophers in India—How might a man become a god?—and how he reacted to their answer. The implications of divinity for Alexander’s “greatness” are obvious.

Outline

- I. How great was Alexander as a man?
 - A. One of the most controversial aspects of Alexander’s reign was whether he came to believe he was a god on earth. There are plenty of examples to support this view, but in this lecture, we discuss only some of the major ones.
 - B. After that, we conclude with remarks about Alexander and events in Greece during his reign.
- II. The story of Alexander’s divinity began with the legend about his divine conception. We look at those that had a bearing on Alexander’s pretensions to personal divinity.
 - A. In 334 B.C.E., Alexander visited the oracle of Apollo at Didyma, who apparently said he was a son of Zeus.
 - B. Then he went to Egypt, and although Alexander was never crowned pharaoh, he took on the attributes of the pharaoh.
 - C. It was Alexander’s visit to the oracle of Zeus Ammon in the Libyan desert that was the turning point in his divinity. From that time, Alexander referred to himself as son of Zeus.
 - D. In 327 at Bactra, he tried to enforce *proskynesis* (that people prostrate themselves before him) because he thought of himself a god and wanted his men to acknowledge this as well.
 - E. In 326, when Alexander was forced to turn back from India, he set his sights on Arabia partly because he thought of himself as a potential third god to the Arabians.
 - F. During his Indian campaign, Alexander moved away from emulating the deeds of Heracles and identified himself more closely with Dionysus.
 - G. Then there was the heroic cult to Alexander’s friend Hephaestion. Since Hephaestion was now a demigod, that made Alexander, his superior, a god.
 - H. During the last year or so of Alexander’s life, a contemporary source says that incense was burned in his presence and everyone observed a reverential silence. All of these indicate a cult to him during his lifetime.
 - I. There is also the matter of embassies from the Greek poleis that went to meet him at Babylon in 323, though it does not mean they believed he was a god.
- III. But did Alexander come to think of himself as a god as the scale of his achievements grew, or did he always intend to set himself up as divine? I think the evidence points to the latter.
 - A. Philip laid the foundations of the Macedonian empire and developed the plan to invade Asia. Alexander would simply be following in Philip’s footsteps; the scale might be different, but to Alexander that wouldn’t mean much.
 - B. Two areas that would propel him ahead of his father would be establishing an absolute monarchy and being worshipped as a god while alive.
 - C. Wanting to eclipse the exploits of his father and be a god while alive became the be-all and end-all of Alexander’s reign.
- IV. Alexander’s military achievements were spectacular, and the world he opened to the Greeks equally so, but does a king deserve to be called “great” when he is responsible for so much death?
 - A. Alexander was responsible for the unnecessary wholesale slaughter of native peoples and the loss of tens of thousands of his own men.
 - B. He was a king who didn’t produce an undisputed heir to succeed him and so plunged his empire into 30 years of bloody civil war that saw that empire torn apart.
 - C. He was a king whose violent temper and growing paranoia led him to engineer the executions of his friends and generals and to kill one of them in cold blood.

- D. He was a king who toward the end of his life was a megalomaniac, who believed in his own divinity, and who risked all for his own personal glory.
- V. Let's end now with some consideration of Greece, especially Athens, during Alexander's absence in Asia and Demosthenes' later career.
- A. We've already said that Greece remained cowed during Antipater's regency, apart from the abortive war of Agis III of Sparta from 331 to 330.
 - B. In 330, the enmity between Demosthenes and Aeschines reached a head again in court.
 - C. Things heated up in 324 with the arrival of the imperial treasurer Harpalus in Athens.
 - D. Then in June 323, Alexander died. When this news reached the Greeks, it was at first disbelieved, but when the news was confirmed, the Greeks revolted from the League of Corinth in what is called the Lamian War, which ended in 322.
 - E. During the revolt, Demosthenes returned to Athens, but Antipater brought an end to democracy in Athens and called for the surrender of anti-Macedonian politicians. Demosthenes fled but was hunted down, and he committed suicide by drinking poison.
 - F. Alexander and Philip did not have any influence on the workings of Greek democracy and law, but as we've seen, they did have influence on the Greeks, ending the imperialistic ambitions of many poleis and then their autonomy.
 - G. The impact of these two kings on the Greeks signals the end of the Classical period, just as the impact of the Persian Wars signaled the end of the Archaic.

Suggested Reading:

Cartledge, *Alexander the Great*.

Worthington, *Alexander the Great: Man and God*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Did Alexander really see himself as a god on earth?
2. Should Alexander III of Macedonia still be called "the Great"?

Lecture Forty-Eight

Beyond the Classical—The Greeks and Us

Scope: In this final lecture, we address a number of questions that the course has raised, and we consider what we can take away from this course as a whole. To begin with, what happened to Greece, especially Athens, after the Classical period, and why? What has the role of Greek civilization really been in our Western tradition and in our lives? Compared with the Greeks from the end of the Dark Ages through the Classical period, has our society made similar advances, and if not, why not? An extension of this consideration is the question of what we have learned from Greek civilization—or not learned from it—and whether we should have learned more.

Outline

- I. Greek society would never be the same again after Alexander. There was now only one Greek empire, that of Macedonia.
 - A. In this, our final lecture, we take a broad look at changes in Greece during the 400 years or so from the start of the Archaic period to the end of the Classical period, and what they mean for us today.
 - B. Then we discuss what advances the Greeks made from the end of the Dark Ages to end of the Classical period, and whether by comparison future societies made similar developments.
- II. How and why did Athens decline as a political and military power in the Hellenistic period? The answer is threefold.
 - A. First, Greece as a whole became a battlefield among Alexander's successors as they fought for the Macedonian throne.
 - B. Second, Macedonian control of Athens meant the abolition of its democracy and the installation of a garrison in the city.
 - C. Third and finally, the Athenians were never able to bounce back and be in a position to lead the Greeks again.
- III. After Alexander the Great died, the period known as Hellenistic began. For the first half-century or so after Alexander's death, Greece was a battleground.
 - A. After Antipater died in 319 B.C.E., his son Cassander besieged Athens in 317 and installed Demetrius of Phalerum, who ruled Athens absolutely for the next 10 years, until 307, when he was expelled by Antigonus Monophthalmus and his son, Demetrius Poliorcetes.
 - B. The death of Antigonus Monophthalmus in battle in Asia and the flight of Poliorcetes from the same battle in 301 gave Cassander Athens again. He died in 297, and in 296 Poliorcetes was able to retake Athens.
 - C. With the help of Ptolemy I of Egypt, in 287 the Athenians were able to revolt from Poliorcetes' rule, force him to come to terms, and restore their democracy again.
 - D. When the Galatians invaded Macedonia from the north in the 270s, Poliorcetes' son, Antigonus Gonatas, was able to seize the Macedonian throne.
 - E. Once he was secure in Macedonia, Gonatas quickly established his control over Greece.
 - F. The Athenians roused Greece to war against him in 268, in what is called the Chremonidean War, but he quickly defeated the them.
 - G. When Gonatas died in 239, his son Demetrius II succeeded him, but no noises came from any Greek. The Athenian position did not really change with subsequent Macedonian kings.
- IV. I'd like to turn now to consider the advances the Greeks made from the end of the Dark Ages through the Classical period, and how these have affected our lives.
 - A. At the end of the Dark Ages, the cities of Greece were oligarchies, controlled by a number of ruling families.
 - B. The 8th-century renaissance brought with it not merely a rebirth of Greek civilization but the beginnings of a grass-roots rebellion against the ruling families that would eventually lead to the creation of democracy and a legal code.
 - C. Democracy and law were the two major achievements of the Archaic period, but downsides to the achievements of the Archaic period emerged in the Classical: As cities developed economically and politically, they came more into conflict with each other.
 - D. Although there was warfare in the Archaic period, ending with the Persian Wars, it is in the Classical period that we see a change in the nature of warfare and the development of imperialism on a grander scale, culminating in the Peloponnesian War.

- E. Imperialistic designs ended when Greece as a whole clashed with Macedonia under Philip II and fell under Macedonian hegemony. In 322, the Macedonians abolished the direct democracy of Athens, and it never recovered.
- V. This brings us to the final set of considerations: Has our society developed along similar lines to the Greeks'? How much have we really learned from them?
- A. Like the Greeks, we've had to adapt to meet different societies' needs, which is as much a development as anything the Greeks did. In some cases, societies made the sorts of changes that we saw in the Archaic period, especially to fix things that had changed for the worse.
 - B. The Greeks left us their democratic and legal systems, but in many countries these faded with time. Think of the despotic power of kings and the socioeconomic plight of nonnobles in medieval and early modern Europe.
 - C. But how much have we really learned from the Greeks—or not learned from them—and should we have learned more?
 - D. On the surface, it looks like we've learned a lot, and we certainly owe them a lot. I think history has shown not just the value of democracy and a legal system to protect the rights of individuals and ensure equality before the laws, but the *need* for these.
 - E. The Greeks in the Hellenistic period got used to being part of a world far larger than their own. We know today that our country doesn't exist in isolation, and we're probably experiencing the same feelings the Greeks had as they got used to being part of a larger whole.
 - F. When the mainland Greeks in the later 4th century fell under the Macedonian hegemony, they lost their autonomy and their freedom. By looking at Greek history, we can appreciate all the more the importance of freedom and democracy.
 - G. What we haven't done is properly learn from the Greeks about the downfalls of imperialism. We have taken so much from Greek civilization, and we have learned so much from it, but in the end one of its most important lessons is one we cannot accept.

Suggested Reading:

Freeman, *The Greek Achievement*.

Morris and Powell, *The Greeks*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Why did Athens decline as a political and military power in the Hellenistic period?
2. To what extent should we see the Greeks as our cultural ancestors?

Timeline

B.C.E.

c. 3000–1150	The Bronze Age.
c. 1184	The Trojan War era.
c. 1150–750	The Dark Ages.
c. 750–478	The Archaic period.
750–700	Homer’s <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i> composed.
c. 740–c. 720	First Messenian War (Sparta seizes Laconia)
c. 668	Tyranny of Pheidon of Argos.
c. 658	Cypselus seizes power at Corinth.
c. 670–c. 650	Second Messenian War.
650	Lycurgus’s supposed reforms at Sparta.
630s	Cylon’s attempted tyranny in Athens.
628	Periander becomes tyrant at Corinth.
620s	Dracon’s codification of the laws in Athens.
594	Solon’s legislation at Athens.
588	Psammetichus becomes tyrant at Corinth.
560	Pisistratus’s first attempt at tyranny at Athens.
556	Pisistratus’s second attempt at tyranny at Athens.
c. 550	Sparta founds the Peloponnesian League.
545–528	Pisistratus’s tyranny in Athens.
528	Tyranny of Hippias and Hipparchus at Athens.
514	Hipparchus assassinated.
510	Hippias expelled from Athens.
508	Cleisthenes’ democratic legislation at Athens.
499–494	Ionian revolt.
490	Battle of Marathon.
480	Battles of Thermopylae, Artemisium, and Salamis.
479	Battle of Plataea.
478	Athens founds the Delian League.
478–323	The Classical period.
462	Ephialtes’ legislation in Athens.
460–445	First Peloponnesian War (Sparta versus Athens).
454	Delian League treasury moved to Athens.
449	Peace of Callias.
431–404	Peloponnesian War (Sparta versus Athens).
430–429	Plague in Athens.
429	Death of Pericles.

415–413	Sicilian expedition.
411	Oligarchy of the Four Hundred in Athens.
405	Battle of Aegospotami.
404–403	Oligarchy of the Thirty in Athens.
404–371	Spartan hegemony of Greece.
399	Trial and execution of Socrates.
378	Second Athenian Naval Confederacy formed by Athens.
371–362	Theban supremacy in Greece.
359–336	Reign of Philip II of Macedonia.
356	Birth of Alexander III (the Great).
338	Battle of Chaeronea (Philip defeats the Greeks).
338–337	League of Corinth formed.
336–323	Reign of Alexander III (the Great) of Macedonia.
324–323	Alexander in Asia.
323–30	The Hellenistic period.
146	Roman annexation of Greece.

Glossary

agoge: The Spartan system of military education, perhaps introduced by Lycurgus, in which boys were enrolled at age seven, lived in barracks (*sysitia*), and underwent rigorous and often brutal training until age 30, when they could move into their own homes. Only those who “graduated” from the *agoge* were full Spartan citizens (Spartiates).

anakrisis: The preliminary enquiry before a magistrate, at which the charge would be read out, the accuser and accused would be interrogated by the magistrate, and the decision would be made as to whether the dispute should proceed to court.

Apella: The Spartan assembly, open only to Spartiates (full Spartan citizens); the Apella did not have the right to debate.

Archaic period: The period of Greek history from the end of the Dark Ages (c. 750 B.C.E.) to the end of the Persian Wars (478 B.C.E.).

archon: “Leader”; the principal magistrate (our word “politician” does not quite correspond) in a polis.

Assembly (*Ekklesia*): The main political organ of the Athenian constitution, attended by all male citizens, that debated and legislated on all aspects of domestic and foreign policy. Anyone could speak to those present on matters of public concern. The Spartan assembly was called the Apella.

ballot: In a trial, jurors were given two bronze ballots—one with a hollow axle and the other with a solid axle. If they wished to acquit the defendant, they dropped the solid-axled ballot into a bronze urn and discarded the other in a wooden urn. If they wished to condemn the defendant, they dropped the hollow-axled ballot into a bronze urn and discarded the other in a wooden urn.

Classical period: The period in Greek history from the end of the Persian Wars (478 B.C.E.) to the death of Alexander the Great (323 B.C.E.).

cleruchy: A settlement of Athenian citizens that established itself in allied towns, dispossessing the local population of its homes and livelihood. Cleruchies were thus distinct from colonies and were a hated feature of 5th-century Athenian imperialism.

common peace: A general (or common) agreement by which the Greek states all made alliances with one another. If a member state acted in any inappropriate manner, it would face the wrath of the others against it.

Dark Ages: The period of Greek history from the end of the Bronze Age (c. 1150 B.C.E.) to the 8th-century renaissance, the start of the Archaic period (c. 750 B.C.E.).

Delian League: The modern name given to the Athenians’ 5th-century confederacy (478–404 B.C.E.), out of which grew their 5th-century empire.

demagogue: “Leader of the people”; by the middle of the 5th century B.C.E., a man who rose to power not by election to office but by using his rhetorical powers in the Assembly to sway the masses.

demokratia: Literally means “the people (*demos*) possess the political power (*kratos*) in the state,” and so gives us our word “democracy.”

dikasteria: The people’s courts in Athens, whose ancestor arguably is the Heliaea (court of appeal) established by Solon in 594. The jurors (*dikasts*) at cases would often number in the hundreds; the courts heard four private suits a day and one public suit a day.

Ekklesia: See Assembly.

Eleven, the: A type of police force; also guarded prisoners in jail and was used in certain legal procedures.

Eupatridae: The collective name given to the groups of ruling families that exercised political power in the poleis during the Dark Ages and early Archaic period.

Gerousia: “Council of elders”; an aristocratic council in the Spartan constitution composed of 28 nobles over the age of 60 and the 2 kings.

Heliaea: The “court of appeal” created by Solon in 594, out of which arguably grew the developed courts (*dikasteria*) of the Classical period. It is unknown whether the Heliaea was actually a separate court or whether the Assembly met in some quasi-judicial capacity to “hear” appeals.

Hellenistic period: The period of Greek history from the death of Alexander the Great (323 B.C.E.) to Octavian’s annexation of Egypt following the Battle of Actium (30 B.C.E.).

helots: The people of Messenia who were enslaved by the Spartans in probably the 8th century B.C.E. and forced to work their lands for the Spartans. They were the economic backbone of the Spartan state, but the danger of a helot revolt was always a factor in Spartan foreign policy. They were liberated by Thebes in 371 B.C.E.

Iliad: The story of the last year of the 10-year-long Trojan War, culminating in the fall of Troy, as composed by Homer.

isonomia: “Equality before the law”; one of the catchphrases associated with the developed political and legal systems in Greece.

League of Corinth: The modern name given to the organization created by Philip II of Macedonia in 338–337 B.C.E., by which the Macedonian hegemony of Greece was assured. The Greeks were bound together in a “common peace” to deter revolt or uprising against Macedonia; the peace was administered by this league, over which Philip was the leader (hegemon).

logographos: A speechwriter who, in return for payment, would write prosecution and defense speeches for clients going to court and probably also dispensed legal advice.

Minoan civilization: The name given to the Bronze Age civilization of Crete, the golden age of which was c. 1900–c. 1600 B.C.E.

Mycenaean civilization: The name given to the Bronze Age civilization of mainland Greece, the golden age of which was c. 1500–c. 1150 B.C.E.

Odyssey: The story of the travels and adventures of the Greek hero Odysseus from Troy back to Greece, as composed by Homer.

oikos (pl. oikoi): The family or family unit. It consisted (according to Aristotle) of the husband, wife, legitimate children, and slaves.

Peloponnesian League: The modern name given to the Spartans’ confederacy that was created in about the middle of the 6th century B.C.E. It had great longevity, then crumbled in the 360s B.C.E. following the liberation of the helots by Thebes in 371 B.C.E.

Pnyx: The large rocky outcrop close to the Acropolis where the Athenian Assembly met. Several thousand citizens sat in an auditorium area on this rock, which afforded an excellent view of the Acropolis.

polis (pl. poleis): “City-state”; a polis was the main town in an area that came to dominate and eventually administer that area. Poleis were autonomous states throughout Greece that were frequently at odds with each other, which often led to warfare. As such, they were never able to unite properly. The origin of the polis system is unknown, but it occurred some time during the Dark Ages.

pothos: “Longing”; this was the driving force behind much of Alexander’s actions. It represents more than just a desire to do something; rather, it is an absolute need to go somewhere or do something for personal reasons.

proskynesis: “Genuflection”; the Asian social ritual of greeting the Great King either by kneeling and blowing him a kiss or by lying flat on the floor in front of him. The Greeks considered this type of greeting before a living man blasphemous; hence the opposition to Alexander the Great when he tried to enforce it on his own men as well.

rhêtores: Speakers (orators) in the Assembly. The Athenians had no word for our “politician”; the closest they came to it was *rhêtores kai strategoi* (“orators and generals”).

rhetra: “Decree” or “constitution”; the decree allegedly brought by Lycurgus of Sparta from the god Apollo at Delphi that ordered the Spartans’ constitution. There is reference in it to the kings, the Gerousia (council of elders), and the Apella (assembly).

satrap: The term for a governor of a province (satrapy) in the Persian empire. Although the satraps were subservient to the Great King, to whom they paid taxes and levied troops when required, they had considerable independence in their satrapies.

Second Athenian Naval Confederacy: The Athenians’ 4th-century B.C.E. empire, which came into being as an anti-Spartan alliance in 378 B.C.E. (contrast their Delian League) and was forcibly dismantled in 338 B.C.E. after their defeat at the Battle of Chaeronea against Philip II of Macedonia.

Spartiate: The technical term for a full Spartan citizen with all political, social, and judicial rights.

strategos (pl. strategoi): A professional general. The office was created by Cleisthenes of Athens in 508 B.C.E., although the first *strategos* was not elected until 501 B.C.E. Military experience was a prerequisite for this office; hence their professional nature compared to the largely amateur archons. There were 10 *strategoi* elected annually, and reelection was allowed.

synegoros: A person who, in return for payment, would speak on behalf of the prosecutor or defendant in a court of law.

thetes: The lowest of Solon's four property groups in Athens. They represented the lower social stratum in society and were unable to stand for political office but could attend and participate in the Assembly. As rowers in the fleet (before slaves were used more extensively), the thetes contributed to the rise of Athens as an imperial power. They also supported Ephialtes' radical democratic legislation in 462 B.C.E.

tripartite day: The term used for the trial day, which was divided into three parts: The first third was given over to the prosecution, the second third to the defense, and the final third heard speeches proposing an alternative penalty if the accused were found guilty.

tyranny: An unconstitutional rule by a tyrant (*tyrannos*), who in the Archaic period would seize power and expel the ruling families because of their exploitation and disregard of the people. The tyrants tended to be benevolent rulers (for example, Pisistratus of Athens), and the word did not take on the odium it has today until the 4th century B.C.E.

Biographical Notes

Alcibiades (c. 450–404 B.C.E.): Athenian statesman and general and member of the Alcmeonidae family. Alcibiades was able to provoke Sparta into renewing the Peloponnesian War despite the Peace of Nicias in 421 B.C.E., and in 416 he persuaded the Assembly to send a large armada to Sicily. Although he sailed with the fleet, he was recalled to stand trial for his alleged earlier destruction in Athens of the sacred herms (busts of Hermes on top of stone pillars) but instead fled to Sparta. There he intrigued with the Spartans against Athens. He fled Sparta after having sex with King Agis II's wife and went to stay with the satrap Tissaphernes in 412. When the Athenians pardoned him, he returned to the city in 407. He was winning influence for Athens at sea again when in 406 he was blamed for an Athenian defeat, even though he was not present at it. He left Athens again to live in Thrace. In 404, he was killed while traveling to the court of Artaxerxes II of Persia.

Alexander III (“the Great”) (356–323 B.C.E., r. 336–323 B.C.E.): King of Macedonia from 336 B.C.E. (when his father Philip II was assassinated) until his death in Babylon in 323. In 324, Alexander invaded Asia, defeated the Persians to become “Lord of Asia,” and marched east to what Greeks called “India” (modern Pakistan) before an army mutiny forced him back. His plan to invade Arabia was abandoned when he died. Alexander's empire included Greece; Syria and the Levantine coast; Egypt; Persia; and “India.” In addition to his spectacular conquests, he opened up new trading opportunities between West and East and saw the spread of Greek civilization to the East. Although a brilliant general, there were downsides to his nature and kingship that affect the appellation “Great.”

Aristides (530–468 B.C.E.): Athenian and general at the Battle of Marathon against Persia. In c. 483 B.C.E., Aristides was ostracized by Themistocles because he did not believe in the latter's naval policy at the expense of the land army. He returned in 480 as part of a general amnesty when Xerxes invaded Greece. He fought at Salamis in 480 and at Plataea in 479. When the Persian threat was ended, he took advantage of Sparta's unpopularity as leader of the Peloponnesian League to coax some of its allies and other states into joining a new league headed by Athens. This was the Delian League, which would grow into a 5th-century empire. He was the first to assess the amount of tribute that the allies should pay Athens. Aristides was regarded as a very honest man and was nicknamed “the Just.”

Brasidas (d. 422 B.C.E.): Spartan general and politician (he had been an ephor) in the early part of the Peloponnesian War. Brasidas fought against Athens at Pylos in 425 B.C.E., then operated mostly in northern Greece (especially the Chalcidice) against Athenian interests. In 422, Cleon marched at the head of an Athenian army to recover the Athenian colony of Amphipolis, which had opened its gates to Brasidas. In the battle, both Cleon and Brasidas were killed, which led to the Peace of Nicias in 421. Brasidas was buried at Amphipolis, where the city recognized him as its founder and established a cult to him.

Cleisthenes of Athens (c. 570–after 508 B.C.E.): Member of the noble Alcmeonidae family and democratic reformer in Athens. In 508 B.C.E., Cleisthenes introduced legislation that increased popular participation in the fledgling democracy. By dividing the people of Attica among 10 new tribes, each with its own tribal assembly, Cleisthenes reduced the power of the nobles in their local areas and made the people look to their tribe and its assembly for support. This assembly also elected 50 of its members to serve on the Boule in Athens. Cleisthenes increased the Boule to 500 members (50 from each tribe), introduced ostracism, and also created the professional office of general (*strategos*).

Cleisthenes of Sicyon (fl. 6th century B.C.E.): Tyrant of Sicyon in the early 6th century B.C.E. Cleisthenes contributed to his city's economic prosperity and seems to have had multiple clashes with Argos. These led to his banning the singing of the Homeric poems for their praise of Argos and changing the name of the four tribes at Sicyon because they were the same as those in Argos. He involved Sicyon in the First Sacred War (595–586), fought against Cirrha over the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, and helped end the war when he blocked supplies to Cirrha. The dates of his life are unknown, but he is believed to have died before 532.

Cleon (d. 422 B.C.E.): Athenian politician and a general in the early part of the Peloponnesian War. Cleon's rise to political prominence began after Pericles' death in 429 B.C.E. He was a member of the Boule in 428. In 427, at an assembly debating the punishment for the people of Mytilene (who had revolted the previous year), he proposed that all the men should be executed and the women and children enslaved. His harsh proposal was accepted, but the following day the people held another assembly and reversed its decision. In 424, working with Demosthenes, he captured the Spartans blockaded on Sphacteria to the embarrassment of Nicias and went on to raise the allied tribute and jury pay. In 422 he led an army to recapture Amphipolis from Sparta, but he and the Spartan general Brasidas were both killed in battle. Cleon was the first man from a business background (he was a tanner) to take advantage of the radical democracy and exploitation of rhetoric to speak in an assembly with a view to leading the people (hence “demagogue”), not merely to criticize policy.

Cylon (fl. 7th century B.C.E.): A former victor at the Olympic Games, Cylon attempted a tyranny in Athens in the 630s B.C.E. (the exact year is unclear). The reason for his attempt and details of his action are unknown, but he was unsuccessful and was quickly expelled from the city. This was perhaps owing to the xenophobic attitude of Greeks toward each other,

because Cylon's father-in-law, Theagenes, the tyrant of Megara, had sent him troops. Cylon managed to escape when he was overthrown, but his supporters were put to death.

Cypselus (d. 628 B.C.E.): A former polemarch at Corinth, Cypselus seized power there in either 658 or 657 B.C.E. and ruled as tyrant for 30 years until his death. His rule was mild and benevolent; unlike the other tyrants, he did not need a bodyguard. He stimulated the economy, especially in pottery manufacture; founded a number of colonies; built a treasury at Delphi; and attracted foreign artists to his court. He was succeeded as tyrant by his son Periander (r. 628–588 B.C.E.) and his nephew Psammetichus (r. 588–585 B.C.E.).

Demosthenes (d. 413 B.C.E.): Athenian general in the Peloponnesian War. In 425 B.C.E., while commanding a fleet en route to Sicily, Demosthenes landed at Pylos in the southwest Peloponnese and fortified it. He may well have been trying to entice the helots to revolt and so divert Sparta's attention from Athens. The Spartans landed a force on the opposite island of Sphacteria and tried to oust the Athenian enclave, but Demosthenes prevented them. After a naval skirmish, a number of Spartans were blockaded on Sphacteria, and Demosthenes (working with Cleon) captured them in 424. After largely inconsequential campaigns in central Greece, in 414 Demosthenes was sent as co-commander of a second fleet to Sicily to reinforce the first one. Communication problems between him and Nicias led to their capture and execution in 413.

Demosthenes (c. 385–322 B.C.E.): Athenian politician and orator. Demosthenes began his career writing law court speeches for others but soon moved into the political arena of the Assembly, where he opposed the imperialism of Philip II of Macedonia. He became so powerful that from the mid-340s, he dictated Athenian policy against Philip. Ultimately, that policy was a failure, as Philip II ended Greek autonomy. Demosthenes was less vocal during the reign of Alexander (336–323), but on the latter's death he played a role in persuading the Greeks to revolt against Macedonia. When his surrender was ordered by Alexander's successors, he committed suicide. Demosthenes is also famous for his oratory, both political and forensic; his forensic speech "On the Crown" of 330 is perhaps the greatest example of Greek prose composition that is extant.

Dracon (c. 659–c. 601 B.C.E.): In the 620s B.C.E. (the exact year is unknown), increasing civil strife between Athenian nobles and nonnobles led to the former appointing Dracon to codify the laws. Exactly what he did is unclear, other than he enacted that the penalty for every crime was execution. Hence his name gave rise to our word "draconian." The importance of his work lies in his taking the personal aspect out of the dispensation of law. Before his time, the eupatridae dispensed justice arbitrarily; Dracon took the first step toward a more formal, objective law code because everyone was now subject to the same penalty for all crimes.

Ephialtes (d. 461 B.C.E.): Athenian general who served in the Aegean in 465 B.C.E. and then entered political life. Ephialtes introduced legislation in the Assembly that attacked the power of the Areopagus, which had enjoyed a resurgence of influence thanks to the help it provided for the city during the Persian Wars. Ephialtes first conducted a purge of the Areopagus, expelling many of its members for corruption. He then transferred almost all of its judicial powers to the law courts and its political powers to the Assembly and Boule, thus inaugurating radical democracy in Athens. The Areopagus was left with only a few judicial powers and became a shadow of its former self. There is a belief that Ephialtes was assassinated.

Herodotus (c. 484–425 B.C.E.): The "father of history" whose account of the Persian Wars is an invaluable contemporary source for this period, despite being riddled with errors of chronology, troop numbers (he put Xerxes' invading army in 480 at 2 million), digressions, and the like. Herodotus owes his appellation to being the first writer to collect data, organize it in a coherent fashion, and in particular try to analyze it critically. He called his work *Historiā* ("researches" or "enquiries"); hence our word "history." He attached the greatest value to personal observation (*opsis*) and to consulting the most learned sources rather than relying on hearsay. Thus in book 2 of his *Histories*, which is a mammoth digression on the history and civilization of Egypt, he talks of what he has seen and then of his consulting of the priests, who have kept the most accurate accounts and so would know the most.

Hipparchus (d. 514 B.C.E.): Son of Athenian tyrant Pisistratus and younger brother of tyrant Hippias. *See Hippias.*

Hippias (d. 490 B.C.E. or thereafter): When the Athenian tyrant Pisistratus died in 528 B.C.E., power passed to his sons Hippias and Hipparchus. Hippias was the elder and controlled the political aspects of the tyranny, whereas Hipparchus played more of a cultural role in it. Both sons continued their father's policies, and under their regime Athens minted its first state coinage (the "owls"). However, Hipparchus was murdered in 514 by Harmodius and Aristogeiton, and Hippias's rule became very harsh. In 510 the Spartans besieged him on the Acropolis, and when his children were captured he surrendered. In 490, then in his late 70s or even 80, he was with the Persians that landed at Marathon, but he interpreted the loss of a tooth as a sign that he was not to return to Athens.

Leonidas (521–480 B.C.E.): The famous Spartan king, a descendant of Heracles, who stood fast at the head of the 300 Spartans against the Persians at Thermopylae in 480 B.C.E. Leonidas's action is explained by an oracle from Apollo at Delphi that said a king from the house of Heracles must die so that Sparta would not be sacked. Leonidas took only his 300-

strong royal bodyguard, and these made up part of a 7,000-strong Greek force that for two days resisted the Persians penetrating the pass of Thermopylae. On the third day, a Greek traitor revealed a path around the Greek force. At this point Leonidas ordered the other Greeks to leave, and the Spartans fought to their death. Their bravery had an enormous effect on Greek morale, and Leonidas was revered as a hero.

Lycurgus (fl. 7th century B.C.E.): The dates of Lycurgus, the legendary lawgiver of Sparta, are unknown, although he probably lived and worked in the first half of the 7th century. Indeed, he may not even have existed but may instead have been invented by the Spartans to give a pedigree to their constitution. He is credited with bringing the Spartan constitution back from Apollo at Delphi in a document called the *rhētra*. He is also believed to have introduced various social measures at Sparta, including the *agoge* (the Spartan system of military training), but this is a matter of debate. Apparently he went back to Delphi to find out if the gods approved of his laws, but before he did he made the people swear to uphold his laws until he returned. Apollo approved, and so Lycurgus starved himself to death, ensuring that the Spartans had to adhere to his laws.

Miltiades (c. 555–489 B.C.E.): Athenian general and politician. Miltiades was archon in 524/3 B.C.E., and since this was during the Pisistratid tyranny, which controlled archon elections, he must have been on relatively good terms with the tyrants. He lived in the Chersonese for some time, but after his support of the Ionian revolt of 499–494, he moved to Athens in case of reprisals from the Persian king. In 490 the Persians landed at Marathon, and an Athenian-Plataean force gave Miltiades, who was one of the 10 generals there, the final decision on strategy. He masterminded the victory over the Persians. The following year he was wounded on campaign in the Cyclades and later died.

Nicias (470–413 B.C.E.): Athenian nobleman who was general and statesman in the Peloponnesian War. Nicias was moderate in his views and clashed with Cleon and Alcibiades, for example, in their prosecution of the war. He was in charge of the siege of the Spartans on Sphacteria in 424 B.C.E., but when it grew protracted and Cleon attacked Nicias in an assembly, he handed over his command to him. Cleon and Demosthenes went on to capture the Spartans quickly, and Nicias's embarrassment is perhaps the reason why he did not take part in an invasion of Boeotia the same year. Nicias was keen to make peace with Sparta, and after Cleon was killed at Amphipolis in 422, Nicias brokered a peace (named after himself) in 421, but it did not last. In 416, Nicias opposed Alcibiades' plan to sail to Sicily, but nevertheless he served as one of its commanders. The Athenians were defeated in Sicily, in no small part because of Nicias's ineptitude, and he was executed there in 413.

Pericles (495–429 B.C.E.): Athenian statesman and general and a member of the Alcmeonidae family. Pericles was elected general 15 times. He became politically prominent after the death of Ephialtes in 461. From then until his death from plague in 429, he controlled Athenian policy and turned the Delian League into a 5th-century Athenian empire. Because of his oratorical prowess in the Assembly, he became so influential that Thucydides talks of power being only in his hands. It is likely that he engineered the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War in 431 in an effort to assert Athenian influence in Greece at the cost of Sparta. Aside from his political and military leadership, Pericles was responsible for great cultural advances in Athens, so much so that this period in Athenian history is called the age of Pericles. During this time, the Parthenon was rebuilt (beginning in 447) and the Propylaea, the monumental gateway to the Acropolis, was built. Pericles' sober and stirring funeral oration, as given to us by Thucydides, is one of the great speeches of antiquity; it was exploited by Lincoln in the Gettysburg Address and by Clinton in his D-Day anniversary speech.

Pheidon (fl. 7th century B.C.E.): Reputed to be the earliest tyrant of Greece, coming to power in Argos probably c. 668 B.C.E. We do not know a lot about his rule. Pheidon is credited with the introduction of coinage in Greece, although this is open to doubt. He does seem to have standardized the weights and measures for the Peloponnese (with the exception of Corinth). He was determined to expand Argive influence in the northern part of the Peloponnese, and this may have had something to do with his taking over the presidency of the Olympic Games at Olympia. He clashed with the Spartans at the Battle of Hysiae, which took place in 668 and may have been his stepping stone to the tyranny.

Philip II (382–336 B.C.E.): Philip became king of Macedonia in 359 B.C.E. when his brother, Perdiccas III, was killed in battle and the next in line to the throne (Perdiccas's son Amyntas, hence Philip's nephew) was a minor. Philip transformed Macedonia from a political, social, cultural, and military backwater into the foremost military power of the later 4th century. He centralized the capital at Pella, secured his kingdom's borders from the invading tribes that had plagued its history, created the first professional army (including a mechanical engineering department), and created a feeling of national pride as was never felt before. His measures to aid the economy, especially in the exploitation of natural resources and mining, made Macedonia wealthy and its coinage the best in Europe. An imperialist, he imposed Macedonian hegemony on Greece after the Battle of Chaeronea in 338 and was poised to invade Asia in 336 when he was assassinated at the old capital of Aegae.

Pisistratus (d. 528 B.C.E.): Tyrant of Athens. Pisistratus's first two attempts at tyranny (in 561 and 556 B.C.E.) were unsuccessful, but in 545 he successfully led an army against the Eupatridae and ruled Athens until his death in 528. Although he ruled absolutely, Athens and the people prospered greatly, thanks to his peaceful foreign and economic policy. Athens eclipsed Corinth as the leading pottery producer in Greece, and painters began experimenting with new artistic styles, such as black- and red-figure pottery. He also patronized foreign poets; Thespis was said to have created the genre of tragedy during

this period, and the first official edition of the Homeric poems was produced. Pisistratus was succeeded by his sons Hippias and Hipparchus.

Solon (638–558 B.C.E.): Legendary Athenian lawgiver, poet, and “father of democracy.” In 594 B.C.E., the Eupatridae made Solon extraordinary archon to bring to an end the civil war that had been ranging in Attica for some time. He seems to have been accepted as mediator by both nobles and nonnobles. In his poetry he blames the rich for the situation, but he also tells us he was not prepared to meet all the demands of the poor. Solon introduced a number of political, economic, and judicial reforms, including the right of appeal and making wealth, not birth, the qualification for political office. By ending the aristocratic monopoly of power, Solon allowed nonnobles the chance (eventually) to aspire to political office, and it was this, together with opening the Assembly (which debated and passed all matters of domestic and foreign policy) to the lowest class of citizens, that earned him the title of father of democracy. After his archonship, he left Athens to give his legislation the chance to work, but faction fighting broke out again.

Themistocles (524–467 B.C.E.): Athenian general and statesman. In 493 B.C.E. Themistocles served as archon, and among other things he persuaded the people to spend a budget surplus on building 200 new triremes, the main Greek warship. Thanks to this move, the Athenian fleet became the most powerful in the Aegean. During the Persian Wars, Themistocles masterminded the Athenian naval victories at the battles of Artemisium and Salamis, both in 480. Salamis was pivotal in helping the Greeks ultimately defeat the Persian threat, for Xerxes left after it. However, Themistocles’ anti-Spartan stance led to his enemies organizing his ostracism in 470 (a number of *ostraka* from his ostracism have been found). He went first to Argos and then to Persia, where he died in 467 as governor of Magnesia.

Thucydides (460–c. 395 B.C.E.): Athenian general and historian. Thucydides wrote a contemporary account of the Peloponnesian War down to the oligarchy in 411 B.C.E.; it is unknown why he did not write about events until 404. The first book of his work is a discussion of his historical methodology (which is again based on a critical approach like that of Herodotus), the need for preciseness (*akribeia*), how the Delian League became an empire, and the events that led to the outbreak of hostilities. Thucydides had many axes to grind, not least against the demagogues, that make his narrative biased. His hatred of Cleon, for example, is evident; this may be due not only to social snobbery, for Cleon may have had Thucydides exiled in 424 for failing to save Amphipolis from Brasidas. He also peppers his narrative with speeches from prominent debates, but the veracity of these is also open to doubt because after 424 he was not present in Athens for any of them, and he seems to use them as vehicles to express his own views. Thus the speeches of Cleon and of Diodotus in the Mytilene debate of 427 show the good and bad ways to administer an empire.

Xerxes (519–465 B.C.E.): Xerxes I succeeded his father Darius I as Great King of Persia and ruled from 485 to 465 B.C.E. He was intent on punishing the Greeks for the Persian defeat at Marathon in 490, and in 481 he constructed a pontoon bridge of boats, on top of which was a causeway, and over this his army crossed the Hellespont. His first battle in Greece, at Thermopylae in 480, was a victory for him, but then his navy was defeated twice in the same year, first at Artemisium and then Salamis. After the latter defeat, Xerxes returned to Persia, leaving behind his general Mardonius to continue the war in Greece. He was stabbed to death in 465.

Bibliography

Collections of Ancient Sources in Translation

Arnaoutoglou, I. *Ancient Greek Laws. A Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1998. A comprehensive collection of ancient Greek laws covering a variety of private and public procedures as contained in various sources (literary, epigraphic), together with lists of further reading.

Carey, C. *Trials from Classical Athens*. London: Routledge, 1997. Discusses the Athenian legal system and workings of the courts, then gives an excellent selection of forensic speeches dealing with various procedures such as adultery, homicide, assault, and slander.

Crawford, M. H., and D. Whitehead. *Archaic and Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. A comprehensive selection of translated Greek source material for the Archaic and Classical periods. The emphasis is on political and military history, and there are good notes to the translated passages.

Fornara, C. *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. A valuable collection of the less accessible sources (inscriptions, papyri, later commentators) for the period 750–404 B.C.E., together with explanatory notes on the translated passages.

Harding, P. E. *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. In the same series as Fornara and translating the same types of source material for the period 404–301 B.C.E., with explanatory notes on the translated passages.

Heisserer, A. J. *Alexander the Great and the Greeks. The Epigraphic Evidence*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980. A discussion of the little inscriptional evidence for Alexander's reign. Heisserer gives the Greek texts (some with photos), English translations, and detailed commentaries on each one, setting them in their historical and social contexts.

Treatments of Greek History

Wider-Ranging:

Freeman, C. *The Greek Achievement. The Foundation of the Western World*. New York: Penguin, 1999. Traces and discusses Greek history over a very wide chronological range, from the Bronze Age to the late Roman period, to show the legacies of the Greeks.

Hammond, N. G. L. *A History of Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986. A chronological and thorough political and military history of the Greeks from the Bronze Age to the aftermath of Alexander the Great's death, written by one of the 20th century's great scholars of ancient history.

Jones, N. F. *Ancient Greece: State and Society*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997. Traces and examines Greek history from the Bronze Age to Hellenistic period, but for a nice change the emphasis is on social, cultural, and economic matters, rather than political and military history.

Morris, I., and B. Powell. *The Greeks. History, Culture, and Society*. London: Pearson, 2006. Integrates archeological material with literary evidence to provide a wide-ranging discussion of political and military history as well as social and cultural matters from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period.

Pomeroy, S., S. Burstein, W. Donlan, and J. Roberts. *Ancient Greece. A Political, Social, and Cultural History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. A textbook that covers Greek history from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period, with a focus on political and military history but not neglecting aspects of the intellectual and artistic background.

Sealey, R. *A History of the Greek City States, ca. 700–338 B.C.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1976. A chronological political and military history of the Greeks from the Archaic period to the death of Philip II, though its discussions of various source-based controversies require some prior knowledge.

More Period Specific:

Andrewes, A. *The Greek Tyrants*. London: Hutchinson, 1974. Provides a thorough discussion of the rise of tyranny and its characteristics in the Archaic period, with a chapter-by-chapter discussion of the various tyrannies.

Buckler, John. *Aegean Greece in the Fourth Century*. Leiden, MA: Brill, 2003. Not for the faint hearted, this big, heavy book goes into great detail about mainland Greek history from the end of the Peloponnesian War to the death of Philip II. Notes about physical features, land routes, etc. from the author's many travels to Greece pepper the narrative.

———. *The Theban Hegemony*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980. Deals in detail with the period of Theban domination in Greece from 371 to 362. The narrative is aided considerably by the author's many travels to Greece.

Burn, A. R. *The Lyric Age of Greece*. London: Edward Arnold, 1960. Focuses on the literary and intellectual life and output of the Archaic period, with discussion of the events and problems.

Ehrenberg, V. *From Solon to Socrates*. London: Methuen, 1973. A sober and unromantic narrative of the Archaic and Classical periods to the death of Socrates in 399 B.C.E.

Hornblower, S. *The Greek World, 479–323 B.C.* London: Methuen, 1983. Very readable and informed account of a complex period from the end of the Persian Wars to the death of Alexander the Great.

McGlew, J. F. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993. Examines the rule of the tyrants in the Archaic period, how they projected themselves, the nature of their rule, and, especially, how the people resisted them and how this influenced them.

Ryder, T. T. B. *Koine Eirene. General Peace and Local Independence in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965. The best book on common peace in Greece, with sound discussion of what this meant and analysis of the various common peaces, including that of Philip II in 337 B.C.E.

Tritle, L., ed. *The Greek World in the Fourth Century*. London: Routledge, 1997. A collection of original essays by modern scholars that trace the history of the major states and areas—and life in them—including the eastern and western Mediterranean as well as the Greek mainland.

Vermeule, E. *Greece in the Bronze Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972. A terrific textbook by one of the period's foremost experts that covers Greek history from the Stone Age to the end of the Bronze Age. All aspects of political, social, economic, religious, and military life are dealt with in detailed yet readable fashion, and various plates and line drawings nicely illustrate the archaeological finds that are discussed.

Places, Persons, and Events

Sparta:

Cartledge, Paul. *Agasilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987. A big book that is more than a biography of King Agasilaos but stands as a solid history of the Spartan hegemony.

———. *Sparta and Lakonia*. London: Routledge, 1979. Excellent discussion of Spartan history from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period that integrates archaeological and literary material.

———. *The Spartans*. New York: Vintage, 2004. Cartledge is one of the two world experts on Sparta (cf. Hodkinson below); this book synthesizes his work on Sparta and considers the Spartans' legacy—a must-read for anyone interested in Sparta!

Forrest, W. G. *A History of Sparta*. Reprint, London: Hutchinson, 1971. Somewhat dated now, but still useful as a general history of Sparta and for the picture it gives of its society.

Hamilton, C. D. *Agasilaos and the Failure of Spartan Hegemony*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991. Not as in-depth by any means as Cartledge (see above), but useful for getting a handle on this king and especially the complex Spartan hegemony.

Hodkinson, S. *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*. London: Duckworth, 2000. Written by the other of the two world experts on Sparta (cf. Cartledge above), this book gives a different insight into Spartan society by focusing on social and economic matters, especially land ownership, instead of the “usual” political and military history. Again, a must-read for anyone interested in Sparta!

Powell, Anton. *Athens and Sparta*. London: Routledge, 1988. A series of thematic chapters considers various aspects of Athenian and Spartan government and society; nicely sets up a comparison and contrast between them.

Whitby, M., ed. *Sparta*. London: Routledge, 2002. A collection of reprinted articles and essays by modern scholars that deal with various aspects of Spartan society.

Persian Wars:

Burn, A. R. *Persia and the Greeks*. London: Duckworth, 1984. An excellent account of the Persian Wars. Contains the best outline of events in Persia prior to the wars.

Green, P. *The Greco-Persian Wars*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996. A revised version of an earlier book; stimulating and challenging, it both describes the events of the wars and discusses in particular the roles of the individuals in them.

Hignett, C. *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963. Rather dated now, but still an excellent description and discussion of the wars.

Lenardon, R. J. *The Saga of Themistocles*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1978. A great biography of the rags-to-riches rise, then fall from grace, of one of the leading individuals in the Persian Wars and Athenian naval history.

Athenian Empire/Peloponnesian War and Aftermath:

Cawkwell, G. L. *Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War*. London: Routledge, 1997. Excellent analysis of Thucydides' narrative of the war, with consideration of Thucydides' aims, manipulation of his account, and “message.”

Davidson, J. *Courtesans and Fishcakes*. London: HarperCollins, 1997. This is one of those rare books whose title does not do justice to its content. A discussion of Athenian habits becomes the backdrop for a fascinating account of every aspect of Greek social life that brings the ancient Greeks alive. The scholarship is superb, and the book is written in an engaging style that makes it hard to put down.

de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London: Duckworth, 1972. More than just a masterly account of how the war started, the massive number of appendices discuss all manner of material, including events of the 4th century B.C.E.

Ellis, W. M. *Alcibiades*. London: Routledge, 1989. A very sound and readable biography of one of the more colorful characters in Greek history.

Kagan, Donald. *The Archidamian War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974. This and the following three entries are part of Kagan's four-volume series on the causes, course, and consequences of the Peloponnesian War. In this, the second volume, the first 10 years of the war (431–421 B.C.E.) are described and discussed.

———. *The Fall of the Athenian Empire*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987. The final volume in Kagan's Peloponnesian War series describes and discusses the final years of the war, up to Athens's surrender in 404 B.C.E.

———. *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969. This is the first in Kagan's multivolume, learned study of the Peloponnesian War. As the title states, this volume deals in detail with how and why the war broke out.

———. *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981. This, the third volume in Kagan's series, takes events in the war from the Peace of Nicias, which ended the Archidamian War, to the expedition to Sicily in 415 B.C.E.

———. *The Peloponnesian War*. New York: Viking, 2003. In a synthesis of the multivolume work cited above, Kagan treats the entire war within one set of covers. This makes for a thick book but one whose style is engaging and that deftly incorporates all the events and discussions.

———. *Pericles of Athens and the Birth of Democracy*. New York: Macmillan, 1991. Arising out of Kagan's history of the Peloponnesian War, this very good biography deals with one of the most influential figures in Greek political, military, and cultural history.

Krentz, P. *The Thirty at Athens*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982. A very neat analysis and discussion of the brutal oligarchy imposed on Athens by Sparta at the end of the Peloponnesian War, which was toppled the following year by exiled democrats.

Meiggs, R. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. A big, thick, scholarly book that brilliantly discusses and illustrates the rise of Athenian imperialism and its nature from the earliest days of the Delian League to the Athenians' fully developed empire.

Roisman, J. *The General Demosthenes and His Use of Military Surprise*. Stuttgart, Germany: F. Steiner, 1993. A sound treatment of the strategic abilities of the general of the Peloponnesian War, who is often overlooked because of the activities of his contemporaries Alcibiades and Cleon.

Samons, L. J. *Athenian Democracy and Imperialism*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998. Contains selections of translated ancient sources and reprints of selected works by modern scholars that deal with various aspects of Athenian 5th-century history and imperialism.

Strauss, B. *Athens after the Peloponnesian War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986. Deals with the complicated period following Athens's defeat in the war to 386 B.C.E., with the emphasis on restoring democracy and the consensus of the people to it.

Tritle, L. *The Peloponnesian War*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2004. The most recent treatment of the war, carefully crafted and written, influenced greatly by the author's personal experiences of war in Vietnam.

Macedonia:

Barr-Sharrar, B., and E. N. Borza, eds. *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1982. Excellent, lavishly illustrated essays by leading scholars, covering many aspects of Macedonian life and history with a focus on art and architecture.

Borza, E. N. *In The Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992. Deals with Macedonian history from the Archaic period to the end of the reign of Philip, with a thorough consideration of the archaeological as well as literary evidence.

Carney, E. *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000. Discusses the (surprisingly) neglected topic of royal women at the Macedonian court; in doing so, it sheds much light on social customs in Macedonia.

Errington, R. M. *A History of Macedonia*, trans. C. Errington. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990. Deals with the political and military history of Macedonia from the 5th century to the reign of Philip, but on the basis of literary evidence rather than archaeological, so it does have some limitations.

Hammond, N. G. L. *The Macedonian State: Origins, Institutions, and History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989. Condenses the author's massive three-volume history of Macedonia and its institutions from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period. A lot of information is often treated thematically, and it's not really bedtime reading!

Hammond, N. G. L., and G. T. Griffith. *A History of Macedonia*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979. The second of the three-volume history of Macedonia is given in this bibliography because it is relevant to the period of our course, discussing in great detail the Archaic period to the death of Philip II. (His reign is written by Griffith on pp. 203–698, with a contribution by Hammond on pp. 647–674.) Sources quoted in Greek and Latin are not usually translated.

Worthington, Ian, ed. *Ventures into Greek History. Essays in Honour of N. G. L. Hammond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994. A collection of original essays by modern scholars that deal with various aspects of Classical Greek history and source material, mostly to do with Macedonia.

Philip II:

Cawkwell, G. L. *Philip of Macedon*. London: Faber & Faber, 1978. Based primarily on the ancient literary sources, this is a synthesis of the author's many articles on 4th-century Greek history. Does not take into account the Vergina royal tombs.

Ellis, J. R. *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1976. A detailed, scholarly appraisal of Philip, written from Philip's perspective, not that of the Greeks toward Philip. Does not take into account the Vergina royal tombs.

Hammond, N. G. L. *Philip of Macedon*. London: Duckworth, 1994. A thorough analysis of Philip's aims and reign, taking into account the Vergina royal tombs, although some knowledge of Greek history is expected.

Hammond, N. G. L., and G. T. Griffith. *A History of Macedonia*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979. See the comments on this volume under "Macedonia."

Hatzopoulos, M. B., and L. D. Loukopoulos, eds. *Philip of Macedon*. Athens: Ekdotike Athenon, 1980. Beautifully and generously illustrated collection of papers by leading scholars on various aspects of Philip's personality and achievements.

Sealey, R. *Demosthenes and His Time: A Study in Defeat*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993. Chronological treatment focusing on Demosthenes' policy to Philip II of Macedonia especially, which the author sees as doomed to failure and a sign of the problems inherent in the polis system.

Worthington, Ian. *Philip II of Macedonia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008. A detailed discussion of Philip's reign and of controversies such as his alleged divinity and the Vergina royal tombs, arguing that as a king he was greater than Alexander.

Alexander the Great:

Bosworth, A. B. *Alexander and the East*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. An excellent critical account of Alexander's Indian campaigns and the nature of the sources.

———. *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. The best scholarly biography; rightly skeptical of the veracity of the sources, it presents a critical appraisal of Alexander. Be warned about the dense narrative!

Cartledge, Paul. *Alexander the Great: The Hunt for a New Past*. Woodstock, NY: Overlook, 2004. Very sound, meticulously researched, and well-written biography that portrays Alexander objectively, recognizing his superior military skills as well as his character flaws.

Engels, D. *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978. An indispensable book that tackles the fascinating topic of the mechanics and logistics of moving a vast army across the distances that Alexander's traveled. Tons of statistics support the author's points!

Fraser, P. M. *Cities of Alexander the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. Excellent book that discusses the many cities Alexander named after himself throughout Asia and argues that the vast majority were military settlements and outposts, not actual cities.

Fuller, J. F. C. *The Generalship of Alexander the Great*. Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1960. An indispensable book for anyone interested in Alexander as a general. In a masterly account, the author considers Alexander as a tactician and strategist and gives discussions of Alexander's battles and sieges.

Green, P. *Alexander of Macedon*, rev. ed. London: Pelican, 1974. A vivid narrative and judicious consideration of Alexander and the source problems, which presents the king as ruthless and self-absorbed, but with Homeric qualities.

Hammond, N. G. L. *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman*. Bristol: Bristol Press, 1989. An excellent biography, especially for its analysis of Alexander's military skills.

———. *The Genius of Alexander the Great*. London: Duckworth, 1997. Not as good as his earlier biography, as it uncritically presents the rosy or legendary Alexander.

Heckel, W., and L. A. Tritle, eds. *Crossroads of History. The Age of Alexander the Great*. Claremont, CA: Regina Press, 2003. A collection of original essays by modern scholars, dealing with various aspects of Alexander.

Holt, F. *Alexander the Great and the Mystery of the Elephant Medallions*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2003. Discusses Alexander's exploits in India and the propaganda of these medallions to magnify his achievements there and add to the Alexander legend.

O'Brien, J. M. *Alexander the Great: The Invisible Enemy*. London: Routledge, 1992. Argues Alexander's actions were due to his drinking, as seen in his modeling himself on Dionysus, god of wine, and that he was an alcoholic. Highly contentious, especially in the use of ancient sources.

Roisman, J., ed. *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*. Leiden, MA: Brill, 2003. Another collection of original essays by modern scholars, dealing with various aspects of Alexander.

Worthington, Ian. *Alexander the Great: Man and God*, rev. exp. ed. London: Pearson, 2003. Provides a critical description and discussion of Alexander's life and reign, along with the major controversies associated with him. The thesis is that things like his pretensions to personal divinity outweigh his military genius and affect our evaluation of him as "great."

———, ed. *Alexander the Great: A Reader*. London: Routledge, 2004. Contains selections of translated ancient sources and reprints of selected works by modern scholars, dealing with various aspects of Alexander, including his Asian campaigns, divinity, and greatness.

Aspects of Society

Democracy and Politics:

Connor, W. R. *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971. A clearly written and engaging account of the role of rhetoric and the corresponding rise of the *rhêtores* in Athenian politics.

Forrest, W. G. *The Emergence of Greek Democracy 800–400 B.C.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966. Despite its age, this is a great book that discusses the development of democracy and the character of Greek politics; it is also well illustrated.

Hansen, M. H. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991. Hansen is the world expert on Athenian political institutions. This is the best book on Athenian democracy, tracing its development and discussing the workings of the various organs of the constitution and role of people in democratic life.

———. *The Tradition of Ancient Greek Democracy and Its Importance for Modern Democracy*. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters, 2005. A short treatise (70 pages) that deftly and engagingly considers the tradition of Athenian democracy from about C.E. 1750 to today.

Ober, J. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989. A controversial and challenging study of political speakers' exploitation of political and civic ideology and the possible resulting dynamic between speakers and the mass of people.

Rhodes, P. J. *Ancient Democracy and Modern Ideology*. London: Duckworth, 2003. Reviews modern discussions of Athenian democracy to show the strengths and weaknesses of applying present practices and methodologies to the past.

Yunis, H. *Taming Democracy: Models of Political Rhetoric in Classical Athens*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996. A detailed study of political rhetoric in the context of Athenian democracy, with attention to Plato's reaction to rhetoric and his theories on it.

Law:

Arnaoutoglou, I. *Ancient Greek Laws. A Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1998. See the comments on this volume under "Ancient Sources in Translation."

Carey, C. *Trials from Classical Athens*. London: Routledge, 1997. See the comments on this volume under "Ancient Sources in Translation."

Christ, M. *The Litigious Athenian*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. Investigates the rise of the legal system, the corresponding increased litigation, and how the rise of rhetoric impacted the courts and influenced juries.

Cohen, D. *Law, Violence and Community in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Examines the role of litigation in society to argue that to Athenians the technicalities of law meant less than the character and status of the litigants.

Gagarin, M., and D. Cohen, eds. *Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. The most recent collection of original essays by leading scholars on various aspects of law, both in and outside Athens.

Hamel, D. *Trying Neaira: The True Story of a Courtesan's Scandalous Life in Ancient Greece*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003. Highly recommended for the picture it paints of prostitution in Greece and the social mores of the Greeks based on the real-life trial of Neaira and her husband for allegedly passing off illegitimate children as citizens.

Harrison, A. R. W. *The Law of Athens*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968–1971. A masterly discussion dealing with legal procedure and matters of family and property law. Note that the author frequently quotes in Greek or gives terms in Greek but does not translate them.

Just, R. *Women in Athenian Law and Life*. London: Routledge, 1989. A solid and readable account of the position of women in society that examines different types of evidence, including oratory and drama, to show how the Athenians viewed women and their relationship to law.

Lacey, W. K. *The Family in Classical Greece*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1968. Despite its age, still an excellent account of the role of the family unit in Greek society, what each member was supposed to do, and how the family was protected by law.

Lewis, J. D. *Early Greek Lawgivers*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 2007. Excellent introduction to the more obscure early lawgivers as well as major legislators like Solon, together with notes on their societies and the development of the legal code.

MacDowell, D. M. *The Law in Classical Athens*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1978. In many ways, still the best treatment of the development of law from the Bronze Age to the Classical era, with an analysis of the workings of the legal system.

Todd, S. *The Shape of Athenian Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993. Rightly weaves political and social matters into a discussion of the development of law and the argument that law did not have a binding force in society but was used as a vehicle to persuade an audience.

Oratory/Rhetoric:

Connor, W. R. *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971. See the comments on this volume under “Democracy and Politics.”

Kennedy, G. A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963. An excellent account of the development and forms of Greek rhetoric, from its origins to the Hellenistic period, discussing the works and style of the Greek orators and rhetoricians.

———. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. The author wrote a multivolume work on rhetoric from its early beginnings into the Christian era. This book is a well-crafted, condensed version of that work.

Ober, J. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989. See the comment on this volume under “Democracy and Politics.”

Roisman, J. *The Rhetoric of Masculinity: Manhood According to the Attic Orators*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005. A stimulating discussion of how orators swayed their audiences by rhetorically exploiting Athenian masculine values and perceptions.

Usher, S. *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. A comprehensive discussion of all genres of Greek oratory, with chapters on the Greek orators whose works survive.

Worthington, Ian, ed. *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. A collection of original essays by leading scholars that forms the biggest comprehensive treatment of rhetoric, including its history from Homer to Byzantium, the relationship of rhetoric to various literary genres, and the role of rhetoric in various aspects of Greek society and education.

———, ed. *Demosthenes: Statesman and Orator*. London: Routledge, 2000. A collection of original essays by leading scholars, dealing with Demosthenes' life as a politician and orator.

Yunis, H. *Taming Democracy: Models of Political Rhetoric in Classical Athens*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996. See the comments on this volume under “Democracy and Politics.”