

Copyright © 1983 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America 10 9 8

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Fine, John V. A. (John Van Antwerp) 1903-The ancient Greeks.

Includes index.

1. Greece—History—To 146 B.C. I. Title. DF214.F5 1983 938 82-23283 ISBN 0-674-03311-6 (cloth) ISBN 0-674-03314-0 (paper)

Contents

1. The Early Aegean World	1
2. The Dark Age	26
3. The Age of Transition	46
4. Colonization	62
5. Social, Economic, and Political Develope	nents
in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries	94
6. Early Sparta	137
7. Early Athens	176
8. The Greeks and the Persians	244
9. Delian League and Athenian Empire	329
10. The Development of Athenian Democrac	cy 383
11. The Peloponnesian War	442
12. The Fourth Century	526
13. Macedonia and Greece	605
Notes	685
Index	709

THE ANCIENT GREEKS

The Ancient Greeks

famous Behistun (Bisitun) Monument, engraved some 225 feet above ground level on a precipitous cliff in the Zagros mountains, yielded its secrets. At great personal risk the Englishman Henry Creswicke Rawlinson managed to copy the long cuneiform inscriptions which accompanied the relief sculpture. Subsequently he and various scholars were able to decipher the inscriptions, which proved to be a proclamation of Darius the Great recorded in three separate languages: Old Persian, Elamite, and Babylonian (Akkadian). This brilliant and difficult achievement provided scholars with the necessary clues for interpreting other languages written in cuneiform scripts which were current at different times in the first three millennia B.C. in Asia from the Mediterranean Sea eastward into the Iranian plateau.

In the Aegean area it was the German Heinrich Schliemann who first demonstrated the existence of civilizations long before the traditional date of 776 B.C. This amazing and indomitable man, after amassing a fortune in business, set out to prove the soundness of his boyhood conviction that the Homeric poems reflected a historical and not a mythical civilization. His excavations, beginning at Troy in 1870, at Mycenae in 1874, at Orchomenus in 1880, and at Tiryns in 1885, revealed that powerful states had flourished centuries before the accepted beginning of Greek history and that some of the remains corresponded closely with descriptions given by Homer. Influenced by a tradition, persistent throughout antiquity, that King Minos of Crete had once ruled as master of the Aegean, the Englishman Arthur Evans began to excavate at Cnossos in 1899. The remarkable results of his excavations soon proved that there had existed in Crete a civilization in many ways more magnificent than the one on the Greek mainland, a civilization by which the mainland had been greatly influenced in the second millennium B.C.

Archaeological excavations have been very numerous in the twentieth century in Greece and the Aegean islands, in the Balkans, in Asia Minor, and in the Near and Middle East. Since the subject of this book is the history of the Greeks, the first question to be faced is whether the inhabitants of Greece, the islands, and Crete, whose early civilization was being revealed by archaeology, were the ancestors of the historical Greeks and the speakers of the same Indo-European language. The later Greeks, steeped in the Homeric epics, never doubted that the heroes fighting the Trojan War under the command of Agamemnon of Mycenae were their ancestors, but modern scholars had to consider the possibility that Homer had taken over a saga which Greeks, arriving at some unknown time, had inherited from their predecessors. The fact that in historical times many place names in Greece, the islands, and

10 The Ancient Greeks

composed catalogues of the heroes who joined the expedition against Troy, and that in the course of time catalogues of heroes in other exploits may have been added to the catalogue of the heroes against Troy as the Trojan War became a central theme in the evolution of Greek epic. Since the briefer Trojan Catalogue contains no hint of the post-Mycenaean Aeolic and Ionian migrations to Asia Minor, it is probable that oral poets originally composed it on the basis of inadequate Mycenaean knowledge of Anatolia. In view of the facts that one catalogue lists forces about to engage in an overseas expedition and the other enumerates forces which presumably were to oppose it and that both seem to be of Mycenaean origin, it is reasonable to assume that they are concerned with an actual expedition to Asia Minor. It may be perverse to deny that that expedition was the one against Troy.

According to the Greek tradition, which is confirmed by archaeology, the Achaeans did not settle at Troy after destroying it. The excavations show that for about a generation after the sack of the citadel, the survivors continued to live in the ruins. Early in the twelfth century some unknown people, bringing a crude "knobbed ware" pottery, appeared on the scene and apparently blended with the remnants of the Trojans. These two periods are now known as Troy VIIb, 1 and 2. For about four hundred years following 1100 the site seems to have been deserted, but in the Greek colonizing period of the eighth and seventh centuries Troy VIII, largely a Greek settlement, arose. This was the Troy visited by Alexander the Great at the beginning of his Asiatic expedition. Subsequently the site was extensively rebuilt by the Romans, and with this Troy IX the history of ancient Troy came to an end.

If the fall of Troy VIIa is correctly dated to about 1200, then its fate coincided with disasters which occurred in the Near East in the same general period. In these years the Hittite Empire in Asia Minor crumbled, many cities in Anatolia and Syria were destroyed, and Egypt was exposed to at least three serious attacks. The causes of all these disturbances are obscure, but they certainly are connected somehow with the Phrygian migration into Asia Minor and the activity of the so-called Peoples of the Sea. The Phrygians, who may have entered Anatolia by crossing the Bosporus or the Hellespont—it is worth noting that in Homer Phrygians are listed as allies of the Trojans—or equally possibly from the northeast, seem to have been chiefly responsible for the fall of the Hittite Empire and subsequently to have become the dominant power in Anatolia for several centuries. The Peoples of the Sea were a composite group; some may have come from regions north of the Aegean, some may have been inhabitants of Aegean islands, and others undoubtedly were tribes which had been driven out of Asia Minor by the

14 The Ancient Greeks

Mycenaean Greece? The answer is still a mystery. If the Dorians were responsible, they left no identifying signs behind; and it should be noted that 1200 is about a century earlier than the traditional date for the coming of the Dorians. Feuds between cities—and also within cities—possibly contributed to the chaos. The depression caused by the disruption of trade with the East may have weakened what political unity existed in the Mycenaean world and caused one state to try to profit by despoiling another. One of the main themes in Greek epic tradition was the war of Argos against Thebes.⁹

The violent upheavals of these generations brought an end to the great days of Mycenaean civilization. All the people, naturally, did not perish, but the whole way of life must have changed greatly. The breakdown of the cultural—and possibly the political—unity is revealed by the emergence of various local types of pottery. It seems clear that with the destruction of the palaces, the great kingdoms collapsed. Some of the sites continued to be inhabited, but all aspects of civilization were on a much lower plane. The best example of continuity is provided by Athens. It was not destroyed as so many cities were around 1200, but the strengthening of the walls, the great pains taken to guarantee an adequate water supply within the area of the citadel, and the subsequent abandonment of the houses beyond the northeast walls-all to be dated in the same general period-suggest that Athens felt itself threatened by the same forces which were causing so much ruin in other parts of Greece. As a result of escaping the destruction which befell Greece as a whole, Athens became the chief city on the mainland for several centuries.

The development of Athenian pottery is interesting, for it reveals a continuous process with no violent breaks. In the twelfth century the pottery was of a debased Mycenaean type—good evidence that Athens was affected by the troubles harassing the Greek world-but from this there gradually evolved protogeometric, which in turn passed into Attic geometric and then proto-Attic. Protogeometric pottery is particularly important for the light it throws on the history of the period. Recent study has proved that Athens was the original home of this type of pottery and that in the course of the eleventh century it began to spread from Athens to other parts of the Greek world. Since tradition states and archaeology proves that Athens was not occupied by the Dorians, it seems certain that the old idea-that the Dorians either brought geometric pottery with them or created it after establishing themselves in Greece-must be abandoned. It is most probable also that the other innovations of the period-cremation burials and the use of iron weapons-which formerly were ascribed to the Dorians did not owe their ori-

18 The Ancient Greeks

tablets, and the Homeric poems. There has been, and still is, so much dispute about how the evidence furnished by the epics should be interpreted that it is essential to understand the nature of the problems involved in any attempt to use Homer as a historical source. The main problem can be stated simply. The Iliad deals with various events which are supposed to have occurred in the tenth year of the Achaean siege of Troy, while the Odyssey is primarily concerned with the adventures experienced by Odysseus on his return to Ithaca from Troy. The sack of Troy, however, should be dated to about 1180 according to Greek tradition and somewhat earlier according to many archaeologists; but Homer in the view of the Greeks lived in the ninth century, and on the basis of the internal evidence of the poems themselves he should be dated probably a century later. Four or five hundred years, therefore, separated Homer from the events which he was describing, and the question naturally arises concerning the accuracy of the tradition to which he fell heir. In the days before Schliemann's excavations the subject matter of the Iliad and the Odyssey was considered to be myth; after the startling discoveries at Troy and Mycenae the pendulum swung in the direction of accepting the two epics as basically historical accounts of real events. Researches carried on in this century in the field of oral epic poetry have demonstrated that whatever answer should be given to the question must be based on some understanding of the nature of oral poetry.

Oral epic poetry and its singers are phenomena characteristic of many illiterate or semiliterate societies. 12 Recent studies of the phenomena in Yugoslavia and in remoter parts of Greece, where oral poetry and its singers still exist (although they are rapidly disappearing with the advance of "civilization"), have provided many insights into the subject. These poets are definitely preservers of traditions, but they are far more than mere memorizers of traditional poetry which they have inherited from their predecessors. Through long years of apprenticeship and practice they have steeped themselves in the rhythms and basic themes of the poetry, and above all in the formulas. These formulas are phrases, running from half a line to several lines, which express in the appropriate rhythms many ideas basic to oral poetry. The apprentice, by listening constantly to older poets, learns hundreds of these formulas in much the same way in which a person can learn a new language by ear. The result is that after living with the poetry for years, the formulas, themes, and rhythms become so much a part of the poet that he instinctively thinks and composes in such terms. He does not consciously memorize a tale; he learns the basic facts-the skeleton-of many stories, but when he gives a performance, although he preserves the tradition in his subject matter, he also becomes an individual creator. That is, he does not delib-

The Ancient Greeks

Age (ca. 1400-1200) only in a very limited and dangerously subjective sense, any attempt to characterize that age must be based primarily on the archaeological findings, including, of course, the information provided by the Linear B tablets. The Mycenaean world covered a wide area, from Thessaly in the north to Crete in the south, and from Ithaca in the west to Rhodes and Cyprus in the east. A full account of Mycenaean civilization, naturally, would have to take cognizance of the finds from all the excavated sites, of which those with the most familiar names are—besides Mycenae—Argos, Pylos, Tiryns, Athens, Eleusis, Orchomenus, and Thebes; but since evidence of varying dates gathered from so many places is confusing even to the specialist, the few remarks made here will be restricted to Mycenae. This procedure seems justifiable, despite the revealing excavations at Pylos, for not only does Mycenae symbolize the age, but also the archaeological activity there has been unusually thorough.

The rocky hill of Mycenae had been inhabited at least since the third millennium. The remarkable shaft graves which Schliemann unearthed, now dated to the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries, are clear evidence that by that time powerful rulers were in control of the site. In the following generations there was much building and rebuilding, but it is very difficult to assign the shattered remains to a definite period or purpose. Most archaeologists, however, believe that the construction activity reached its peak towards the middle of the thirteenth century. 15

Mycenae was a fortress rather than a city, likened by an excavator to the Kremlin or the Tower of London. Within the citadel were located the buildings which housed those essential to the functioning of the state: the huge palace of the king, the large houses of the higher military and civil officials, and smaller ones for soldiers, scribes, artisans, and slaves. The majority of the civilian population apparently lived in settlements below the citadel and in the adjacent low hills wherever water and fertile land were available. Probably many of these people could seek refuge within the citadel in times of danger. The citadel was surrounded by walls constructed from great blocks of limestone, so huge that the ancients believed that only the Cyclopes could have put them in place. The original height of these walls is unknown, but the thickness averaged some 20 feet. The main entrance to the citadel was the famous Lion Gate, about 10 feet wide and slightly higher, surmounted by a lintel of conglomerate weighing some 20 tons. Above this lintel in the "relieving triangle" was the relief-two lions rampant, one on either side of an upright pillar. This relief, almost the oldest example of monumental sculpture found in Greece, is amazingly effective. It almost certainly had a religious and heraldic significance—the lions as attendants of the

2 The Dark Age

HE DISCUSSION IN the preceding chapter of some of the problems concerning the decline of Mycenaean civilization and the migration or uprising of the Dorians should suggest why the period of Greek history which followed the Mycenaean Age is commonly known as the Dark Age. The term is justified both because of the lower level to which civilization sank and because of the difficulty, with the source material at hand, in penetrating the darkness which encompassed the whole Aegean world. It is not until the eighth century that more satisfactory information begins to become available and that occasional contacts between the Greeks and the Assyrians and Egyptians provide some welcome chronological landmarks. This long period, roughly from 1200 to 750, is one of great significance, for in it the Greeks, after the chaos caused by migrations or uprisings subsided, settled down in their historical homes and laid the foundations for their future remarkable civilization.

The basic sources for the study of the Dark Age are the Homeric poems. Although the Iliad deals with a short period in the Trojan War and the Odyssey with the return home of Odysseus and with the troubles his kingdom had been experiencing in his absence, the remarks made previously on the technique of oral poetry should assist the reader in recognizing that the conditions reflected in the poems are, on the whole, those with which Homer and his predecessors were familiar. One would probably not go far wrong, then, if he accepted the Iliad and the Odyssey as providing a picture of life primarily as it was in the ninth century and especially among the "Ionian" Greeks who had crossed to the coast of Asia Minor, for it was among these Ionians that the two epics developed into their final forms. It is well to remember, moreover, that a custom is not necessarily a static phenomenon. The custom of today is what it is because it has evolved from the custom of yesterday, and in turn it will develop into the custom of tomorrow. From this point of view, then, it is reasonable to consider the Iliad and Odyssey not as revealing the conditions of some arbitrarily selected date but as reflecting a way of life which not only had roots in the past but also was to continue largely unchanged into the future. Homer and his predecessors, of course, were

30 The Ancient Greeks

some less burdensome inferior status, some had intermingled with the tribal groups, some had sought refuge in the mountains encircling Thessaly and in mountainous Arcadia, but many had tried to escape the dangers and chaos of this period by migrating to the coast of Asia Minor. Because this migration took place in the Dark Age, the information about it, just as in the case of the Dorian problem, comes largely from legends; but of the actuality of the migration there is no doubt since, when history began to emerge from the obscurity which followed the breakup of Mycenaean civilization, Greeks were found living on the west coast of Asia Minor and the adjacent islands from the Hellespont south to Rhodes.

The first immigrants settled along the northwest coast of Asia Minor as far south as Smyrna and the Hermus River and also on the neighboring islands, Lesbos and Tenedos.' Since their dialect was Aeolic, which may have started forming in the Mycenaean period, it seems clear that they had come chiefly from Thessaly, Boeotia, and other parts of central Greece, presumably fleeing from the Dorian "invasion" or upheavals. These Aeolians ultimately established twelve communities on the Asiatic mainland which were organized in some sort of religious league. The most important of these towns, Smyrna, was subsequently taken over by the Ionians. Much later, probably in the eighth century, colonists from Lesbos and also from the Aeolian league occupied the Troad, where, among other communities, they established Troy VIII. According to tradition, the original migrants from Greece had been led by Penthilus, the son of Orestes, and had finally settled in their new homes in the second generation after his death. The name of Penthilus may merely represent the desire of these eastern Greeks to connect themselves with the great Mycenaean traditions, but the story that they occupied their new lands only after three generations of wanderings could very well reflect the historical likelihood that various groups arrived at different times and that they had to struggle with the natives before they could take up residence. The archaeological evidence from the excavations at old Smyrna provides valuable chronological data and also largely confirms the dates given by Greek tradition.2 The earliest Greek pottery-protogeometric-found at Smyrna dates from about 1000 B.C., and since Smyrna, as the most southerly of the Aeolian cities, was quite possibly the last to be established, it seems reasonable to assume that the others were founded considerably earlier, as the legends imply.

According to ancient tradition (Strabo, 13.1.3) the Ionian migration to that part of the west coast of Asia Minor extending from the

34 The Ancient Greeks

Minor—were small, unpretentious settlements, and for many generations all aspects of life were correspondingly simple. It was not until the end of this period that the characteristic community of classical Greece—the polis—began to take shape.

When historical information becomes more plentiful for the study of the Greeks, it is clear that certain institutions of a social and semipolitical nature were fundamental to their way of life-phylai (tribes), phratries (brotherhoods), gene ("clans"), and oikoi (households). Since evidence for these institutions before Homer is lacking, the question of their origin and functions obviously is open to debate. For a long time it was assumed that the Greeks who migrated to Greece around 2000 B.C. were organized by kinship or fictitious kinship groups, the most comprehensive one being the tribe and the most basic and natural one the genos ("clan")—a grouping that seemed analogous with what was known of migrating tribes throughout history.4 When the decipherment of the Linear B tablets revealed no mention of these groups, the usual argument was that although such bureaucratic documents were not concerned with "kinship" institutions, they continued to exist in some form among the common people. There is an increasing tendency now, however, to maintain that these institutions first appeared in the Dark Age,5 a point of view which leaves one wondering how the migrating tribes were organized. Since this controversy is probably unanswerable, it will be avoided here except for a few remarks made below on the phratries.

The earliest definite mention of the three Dorian tribes, Pamphyli, Hylleis, Dymanes, is in the seventh-century elegiac poet Tyrtaeus (fragment 1) in reference to the Spartans. In historical times these tribes were found in all Dorian communities for which there is evidence, although in certain cities, for example Argos and Sicyon, additional tribes were created for the non-Dorian elements. There is no record for this tribal organization in Thessaly, Boeotia, or in the Aeolian towns of northwestern Asia Minor,6 a fact which might support the hypothesis that the migrating proto-Greeks of about 2000 B.C. did not enter Greece in tribal formation. The four so-called Ionian tribes existed in Athens and in at least four of the Ionian cities in Asia Minor, Samos, Miletus, Ephesus, and Teos, although these eastern cities later added two tribes presumably as a means of giving civic rights to non-Ionian Greeks and to some native peoples. It seems certain that the four tribes were transferred to the Asiatic coast at the time of the Ionian migration, for there is no evidence in this period for a migration in the opposite direction. This conclusion, incidentally, supports the ancient tradition that the major part of the Ionian migration set sail from Attica. It will suffice to say here

38 The Ancient Greeks

gifts when at some future time they or their sons should be guests of the men on whom they were now showering hospitality. Along with this giving of guest gifts there often was established a bond of friendship—guest-friendship—which became hereditary between the families concerned. Such relationships, particularly when they arose between prominent and ruling families, probably constituted an embryonic form of political alliances.

Since practically the whole economy of the Greeks in this period was rural, whether pastoral or agricultural, a knowledge of the system or systems of land tenure would be essential to a real understanding of their way of life. Once again, the fact that this was the Dark Age stands in the way of obtaining the desired certainty on these basic problems. When the proto-Greeks entered Greece in the second millennium it is reasonable to assume that, like many other peoples at a similar stage of development, they worked the lands on which they settled not as individuals but as kinship groups of some sort. The system may very well have been some variation of the Open Fields12-strips of land cultivated communally-a method which was widespread in early and medieval Europe. As Mycenaean civilization evolved, the great centers with their bureaucratic regimes must have brought about various changes in the status of land, but, as noted in the preceding chapter, it is still impossible to derive from the Linear B tablets a clear picture of land tenure in the fourteenth, thirteenth, and twelfth centuries. Then came the confusion of the Dorian "invasion" or upheaval and the migrations to Asia Minor. The Greeks in this Dark Age, whether on the mainland or the coast of Asia Minor, presumably reverted to the earlier way of working the land. For the ninth century the only "contemporary" literary source is Homer, and as always with the epics, there is the problem of whether certain relevant passages reflect the conditions of the ninth century or a later period, or whether there are embedded in them survivals from an older social and economic order. Nevertheless a few observations can be made with some assurance.

There is a famous passage in the twelfth book of the *Iliad* (421-423) in which the Achaeans and Trojans fighting across the wall separating them are compared to two men contending about boundaries, "having measuring rods in their hands, in a common field, and in a small space they struggle for an equal share." The picture here is clearly of an arable field possessed in common by some community—possibly a kinship group—in which an equal share, marked off by stones, was allotted to each man. An attractive explanation is that these lines refer to some type of Open-Field system of cultivation. The same statement can be made about a few other passages, particularly the scene depicted on the shield

42 The Ancient Greeks

Pottery was necessary for various purposes. In regions where there was good clay most of the pottery utensils were probably made at home, but potters were needed to bring their wares to districts which had no supplies of clay. Leatherworkers were in demand for only the more intricate articles, since the tanning of hides and the making of simple articles like sandals were done at home. The smith is a good example of the lack of division of labor, for although he was called *chalkeus* (worker in bronze), he also worked with iron, silver, and gold. Because of the rather complicated and heavy nature of a smith's equipment, it was necessary for him to have his own shop. The customer would supply the metal required for the desired object. Hesiod (Works and Days, 493-495) provides an interesting glimpse of a smithy and reveals that in the wintertime its warmth tempted men away from their assigned tasks.

Although there are many references to these craftsmen in Homer and in Hesiod, the artisan class was still a small one. The methods of work were simple, and there was no middleman between the producer and the user. In most cases the family supplied the craftsmen with the necessary raw materials. In later times, particularly in cities like Athens and Corinth, the artisans were to become an important element of the population, but in the Dark Age their role was minor because the economy was chiefly rural and because the households tried to be as self-sufficient as possible.

The thetes were the humblest and most downtrodden class in the social scale of the period, if class is an appropriate word to use for a group whose origins must have been very diverse. Although one can only guess at these origins-descendants of earlier inhabitants who had been dispossessed by immigrants, runaway slaves, people expelled from some kinship organization, refugees from a blood feud-their unhappy condition is well documented. In some ways their lot was worse than that of the slaves, for a slave, if he did his work faithfully, could count on security-food, lodging, and at times the affectionate concern of his master. Security, however, was precisely what the thetes lacked. In a world where one's welfare depended on belonging to a kinship organization or on possessing a profession or craft which was useful to the community, the thetes were people without land, a trade, or family connections. Some must have lived as beggars, to whom there are various references in the Odyssey, but the majority tried to earn a living as hired laborers. They were employed by the oikoi for various purposes, especially in busy agricultural seasons. Even a small farmer, as Hesiod reports, needed a hired hand (thes) on occasions. They were available also for tasks which had no connection with the land. When the suitors of Penelope learned that Telemachus had sailed away in search of news of his father, Odysseus,

58 The Ancient Greeks

pable of bearing arms and of those who, now past that age, had once been capable of bearing arms. Such assemblies seemingly had no formal powers, but from their meetings the king and his advisers could test the temper of the people.

Under the aristocracies it is reasonable to assume that the dominant clans, whether few or many in number, would have attempted to eliminate or, at least, weaken any general assembly of the people. When later sources, referring to the sixth or seventh century, mention the Thousand at Cyme and Colophon, and the "hundred households" at Opus in east Locris, one can probably interpret these round numbers as referring to the number of adult males in the ruling clans. Assemblies of such men may very well have existed. Their functions would have been partly legislative and partly electoral—legislative insofar as they voted on proposals submitted to them by the councils and magistrates, and electoral in those cases where appointments to magistracies and councils were not under the control of the councils themselves. Needless to say, the candidates for any office had to be members of the ruling class.

It is most unlikely that any but members of the clans could participate in these assemblies. As the seventh century progressed, however, and the new phenomenon of the heavy armed foot soldiers (hoplites) began to supplant in military importance the previously all-important cavalry, it is probable that membership in the assembly was increased; but even so most of these hoplites presumably came from the clans, although possibly from the less prominent ones. The lower social elements of the population—the artisans and the day laborers—almost certainly were excluded from admission to the assemblies. To judge from later evidence, ownership of land was an essential prerequisite for any kind of political recognition. It is doubtful whether the small peasants had any political status, for their holdings would have been too insignificant to meet the property qualifications necessary for citizenship.

It may be anachronistic to apply the expression "citizenship" to this early period, but the ruling aristocrats, for their very survival, had to be acutely aware of who was and was not entitled to full privileges in the state. Those excluded from these privileges were part of the state from the very fact that they lived and worked there, but their membership was, so far as can be ascertained, purely a passive one. In the betterment of the position of the underprivileged in some states and their rise to complete control in the later democracies lies one of the most important themes in the internal history of Greece well down into the fifth century.

In ending this brief sketch of the nature of the early aristocracies, it will be useful to discuss the four chief bases on which the power and influence of the nobles seem to have rested. First, there was clan organiza-

4 Colonization

N THE EIGHTH century the Greeks began to set forth from the homeland, the Aegean islands, and the coast of Asia Minor in what became one of the great colonizing movements of history. By the time this movement began to wane some two centuries later, Greek colonies had been established from the Crimea to the Nile Delta and from the Caucasus to Spain. Since these colonies were invariably founded on the shores of the Mediterranean, Hellespont, Propontis, Bosporus, and Black Sea or at the mouths of rivers flowing into these bodies of water, Plato's humorous comparison of the Greeks to frogs around a pond (Phaedo, 109b) was very apt.

Since hundreds of colonies were sent out by scores of cities in the course of two centuries, it is reasonable to assume that, except for special cases, there were similar underlying causes for such a widespread movement. By the eighth century the Greek world had had several generations of comparative quiet. Cities were emerging and aristocracies were taking over the responsibility of government from the kings. More settled conditions probably had caused an increase in population. The categories of population in the cities everywhere were roughly the same. Various oikoi controlled the best land. Many of these oikoi, especially the more prosperous ones, had become members of larger units, the gene, which contributed to the solidarity of "kinship" groups. Below these wealthy oikoi whose members, the aristoi, formed the ruling class were less successful oikoi with their plots of land of varying size and fertility—a group which presumably should be classified as peasants. There were also growing numbers of men without land—the thetes, or hired laborers, and a small artisan class.

In a society of this type, whose economy was almost exclusively agricultural and pastoral, growth of population presented a serious problem. If families produced more than one son, the land would subsequently have to be shared or divided. If this pattern continued for several generations, the available land would no longer be sufficient to support the increasing numbers. For the peasant with his smaller lot the problem obviously was more acute. Hesiod (Works and Days, 376-380), writing from the farmer's point of view about 700, advises that a man

naean civilization had its counterpart in the Near East. Great powers either disappeared or were so weakened that for several centuries their aggressive policies were curtailed. This fact is of great importance, for it meant that during their weak and formative period the Greeks were able to lay the foundations of their cities and civilization free from foreign interference. If in the Dark Age the Hittites, Babylonians, Assyrians, or Egyptians had been strong, it is most unlikely that the Greeks, at least those in Asia Minor, would have been able to develop as independent people.

By the eighth and seventh centuries, the great period of Greek colonization, the situation in the Near East, as it concerned the Greeks, can be summarized as follows. Early in the seventh century Phrygian power collapsed, and the Lydians, who may have been part of that realm, established under Gyges a kingdom in western Asia Minor which seriously threatened the Greeks living on the coast.

Syria to the southeast, as always, was playing an important role in history. In northern Syria the Minoans had had trade relations with Ugarit (Ras Shamra), and subsequently the Mycenaeans had settlements there and on the island of Cyprus. Ugarit was destroyed early in the twelfth century, apparently by the Peoples of the Sea. The return of the Greeks to this general region was demonstrated by Sir Leonard Woolley in his excavations between 1936 and 1949 at Alalakh and Al Mina.2 Alalakh, some forty miles north of Ras Shamra, was on the Orontes, about twenty miles inland from the mouth of the river. This site, after having been inhabited for over 2,000 years, was utterly destroyed in the first decade of the twelfth century by the Peoples of the Sea, and was never really settled again. Woolley reasoned, however, that Alalakh must have had a harbor town at the mouth of the Orontes, and even though this harbor town was presumably destroyed also in the 1190s, its location would have been too important to be permanently abandoned. His reasoning was proved correct by his excavations at Al Mina, which revealed a city-almost certainly the Posideium mentioned by Herodotus-that had existed from at least the last half of the ninth century. The remains of the buildings-chiefly warehouses-and the pottery-Cypriote, Cycladic, Euboean, Rhodian, and, later, Corinthian and Attic-suggest that this was a trading post established by Greek merchants coming from many areas. Its significance as a place where Greeks and easterners met and where oriental products and ideas could enter the Aegean world is obviously very great. One would like to know whether occupation of Al Mina had been continuous from the close of the Mycenaean period, but unfortunately the area on which the

metals—chiefly copper and iron—from the Etruscans, who, sailing probably from the east on several occasions in the tenth and ninth centuries, had settled and prospered in the region north of Rome. Excavations have unearthed the components of an eighth-century iron "foundry" on the island. Interest in trade is emphasized by the number of oriental objects found in the ruins, which reminds one that the Euboeans had shared also in the Greek activities at Al Mina from the end of the ninth century. Since Pithecusae and Cumae with their fertile land were also fine locations for agricultural colonies, the former protected from attack by land, the latter with an adequate citadel, it is probably a mistake, as with many other colonies, to think that settlements had to be either agricultural or commercial. Those settlers at Pithecusae who were interested in trade may also have realized that the island was an excellent base for piratical enterprises.

Cumae played a very important role in the history of western civilization, for, since it was the most northerly of the Greek colonies in Italy, it was the first Greek community with which the Etruscans and later the Romans came into contact. The Cumaeans used a Chalcidic form of the Greek alphabet, and it was this alphabet which the Etruscans adopted and later passed on to the Romans. The first example of this Chalcidic alphabet was discovered on a geometric cup found at a level in the Pithecusae excavations to be dated about 730 B.C. On this cup three lines, written from right to left, had been incised. Professor John Boardman's translation of these hexameters runs: "Nestor had a most drink-worthy cup, but whoever drinks of mine will straightway be smitten with desire of fair-crowned Aphrodite." Among the settlers at Cumae there was apparently a group from Boeotia called Graei. Since these were among the first Greeks whom the Romans came to know, it seems that these obscure people were the origin of the name "Graeci" which the Romans ultimately applied to all the Hellenes.

After Cumae, the next series of Greek colonies were founded first in Sicily and then in southern Italy. Thucydides in his sketch at the beginning of book 6 gives a valuable list of the colonies in Sicily which provides a relative chronology for their establishment. Herodotus also furnishes some useful data, and later authors like Pseudo-Scymnus (ca. 100 B.C.), Strabo (age of Augustus) in books 5 and 6 of his Geography, and the fourth century A.D. bishop-historian Eusebius of Caesarea contribute information, misinformation, and legends. Chalcidians from Euboea, apparently reinforced on occasions by other Ionians, were the most active colonizers. About 734 they founded Naxos on the eastern coast of Sicily; the name has led to the natural inference that some of the settlers came from the Aegean island Naxos. Sicilian Naxos itself remained

between Greeks and Carthaginians were constantly bad, and Diodorus' thinking may have been colored by his knowledge of the long and bitter struggles between the Carthaginians and the Romans.

By the founding of Himera in 648 and Selinus in 628 the Greeks had come into proximity with the Phoenicians, but there is no evidence for hostility 10 until the events of about 580 mentioned in confused passages of Diodorus (5.9) and Pausanias (10.11.3). After the Gelaeans and Rhodians had established the colony of Acragas, which strengthened Greek control of southern Sicily, a Cnidian named Pentathlos with a band of Cnidians and Rhodians tried to settle at the site subsequently called Lilybaeum on the western tip of Sicily. A Greek colony at this place would have dominated the small Phoenician settlement at Motya. It seems that after founding his colony Pentathlos aided the people of Selinus in an attack on the Elymian town of Segesta. He was defeated and killed, and his surviving followers fled in their ships to the island of Lipara, where they established themselves. The victorious Elymians with the aid of the Phoenicians then destroyed the newly founded settlement at "Lilybaeum." This episode can be, and has been, interpreted as an effort by the Greeks to force the Phoenicians out of western Sicily.

Motya had been settled by the Phoenicians towards the end of the eighth century, about the same time or slightly later than the archaeological evidence for the founding of Utica and Carthage. From the point of view of the Phoenicians at Carthage, Motya was an important post, not only for trade in Sicily but also as a staging point for ships to and from the Etruscans, with whom the Phoenicians had many relations from at least the early seventh century. The Greek desire to dominate or destroy Motya, unless it is to be considered a chauvinistic move to make Sicily more Greek, presumably had a mercantile basis. In Greek eyes. "Lilybaeum" was the best point in Sicily from which to launch ships for the metal wealth of Spain, and there is little doubt that the search for metals was a matter of great concern to both Phoenicians and Greeks. The poet Stesichorus, living in Himera in the first half of the sixth century, wrote of "the boundless silver-rooted springs of the river Tartessus."

Many different views about the nature of Tartessus have been expressed by authors, ancient and modern, but here the subject must be treated succinctly. Since ancient geographers often confused Tartessus with Gades, the city traditionally founded by the Phoenicians in 1110, it is not surprising that the belief arose that the Phoenicians had early learned of Spanish wealth in metals. This belief was strengthened among modern scholars by the frequent occurrence in the Old Testament of the expression "ships of Tarshish" in references, among others,

attacked by a combined Etruscan and Phoenician fleet and forced to evacuate the island. Corsica fell to the Etruscans, and Sardinia more and more came under the control of the Phoenicians. These Phoenicians were chiefly from Carthage, which, since the weakening of Tyre caused by the long siege of Nebuchadnezzar, 585-572, took over the leadership of the Phoenicians in the west.

The picture in Sicily is not clear, but it is probable that Carthage tried to strengthen the position of Motya and the other Phoenician communities. It was the increase of Carthaginian influence in west Sicily that may partially explain the actions of Dorieus in 511-510, as told by Herodotus (5.42-47). Dorieus, the younger brother of the Spartan king Cleomenes, received official permission to found a colony apparently directed against Carthage. He first went to the African coast between Cyrene and Carthage, but after about two years (ca. 514-512) he was driven out by the Carthaginians and natives. Then, following a brief return to Sparta, he set out on a venture (511-510) to establish a Greek settlement under Mt. Eryx. This aim was so clearly an aggressive Greek attempt to dominate western Sicily that the Carthaginians, Sicilian Phoenicians, and Elymians combined and in a battle, in which Dorieus was killed, put an end to the Greek undertaking. It is worth noting that in this struggle the people of Selinus who had been profiting from trade with Carthage did nothing to assist Dorieus.

To summarize this brief discussion of the relations between the Phoenicians and the Greeks in the west, the situation at the end of the sixth century can be stated as follows: the Carthaginians, succeeding to the role of Tyre, had strengthened themselves in Africa, had become leaders of the Phoenicians in west Sicily, and had gained a controlling position in Sardinia and the Balearic islands. It was at this time also that the Carthaginians succeeded in barring the Greeks from sailing through the Pillars of Heracles and having access to the metals of Tartessus by establishing a naval base at Carteia (Algerians) in what is now the bay of Gibraltar.

WHILE THE Greeks were colonizing Sicily in the eighth and seventh centuries, a similar migration was finding its way to the boot of Italy, but, whereas in the former movement the Chalcidians and Corinthians were the most active participants, in the latter the small Achaean states on the south shore of the Corinthian Gulf took the lead. About 720 a group of Achaeans founded Sybaris on the Italian instep. This city grew so rich from its fertile lands and later also from commerce until its destruction in 511/10 by its southern rival Croton that the word "Sybarite" became and still is a term to describe a luxurious voluptuary.

they soon were so threatened by combined Etruscan and Carthaginian resistance to their piracy that they abandoned their Corsican home and sailed to the future Elea, where they enjoyed a quiet prosperity and also gave rise to an important school of philosophy (Herodotus, 1.165-167).

The only Greek colony of great importance west of Italy and Sicily was Massalia (Marseilles), founded by the Phocaeans slightly east of the mouth of the Rhone about 600 B.C. Earlier than this the Rhodians apparently had explored the western Mediterranean, founded a colony, Rhode, on the northeast coast of Spain, and given their name to the river Rhone. Subsequently the Phocaeans (through Massalia) refounded Rhode, changing its name to Emporiae, "Market" (modern Ampurias), and established several other stations on the east and south coasts of Spain to secure the route for the metal trade with Tartessus. By the end of the sixth century, however, as mentioned earlier, the Carthaginians succeeded in barring the Pillars of Heracles to the Greeks. Massalia itself became a great trading city through which raw materials from the interior passed into the Greek world and Greek products reached the native Celts. The most famous of these products is the magnificent bronze krater, over five feet high, dated about 520 B.C., which was found in a royal Celtic grave at Vix. The depth of Massaliot influence on the Celts is emphasized by the fact that even to this day certain traces of Phocaean Greek seem to be detectable in some southern French dialects. 12

Although the dates of the western colonies are not as exact as one would wish, scholars are in general agreement that after the founding of Ischia and Cumae ca. 750, the intense activity of the Euboeans, especially the Chalcidians, and of the Corinthians should be assigned to the last third of the eighth century. There is less unanimity, however, about the initial stages of the colonizing movement in the Aegean area. In the northwest corner of the Aegean, forming the eastern border of the Thermaic Gulf, lies the three-pronged promontory known in ancient and modern times as Chalcidice. It is almost certain that the region owed its name to the number of colonies founded there by Chalcis in Euboea. The Eretrians and the Aegean island of Andros also participated in this activity occasionally. The usual opinion is that most of these colonies were established by the Chalcidians either simultaneously with the founding of the western colonies or after their activity in the west had ceased. Another point of view argues that the total lack of traditional foundation dates for the colonies in Chalcidice—the only region for which such dates are lacking-in itself points to an early period for the colonizing of the region. 13 Fragment 98 of Aristotle states that in the Lelantine War the Chalcidian colonies sent aid to Chalcis. Colonies presumably would not have been in a position to send such help unless they

furnished by Pseudo-Scymnus, who links the foundations with various events in Median and Persian history. The data provided so far by archaeology largely confirm his dates.

Although other cities participated in this great colonizing movement, Miletus was by far the most active. Pliny in his Natural History (5.112) states that Miletus founded more than ninety cities in the general area. This number, even though one may consider it exaggerated, is significant, for clearly Miletus did not have an adequate population to establish that many colonies of an agricultural type. Most of the settlements, at least in the beginning, were trading posts. The Greeks were looking for commodities which were in short supply at home, and they settled in places where the supplies of fish, metals, timber, and grain were in abundance.

No attempt will be made here to enumerate all the colonies of which there is record, but it will be worthwhile to list and comment briefly on those which played an important role in Greek and, in some cases, in subsequent history. It is less confusing to list them by their consecutive geographical positions, starting with the west coast of the Black Sea, than chronologically by foundation dates, many of which are uncertain.

Along the west coast northward from the Bosporus lay Apollonia; Mesembria; Tomis (modern Costanza), where the exiled Ovid about 9 A.D. wrote his Tristia; Istrus, not far from the Ister (Danube) Delta; and at the mouth of the Dniester, Tyras (modern Belgorod-Dnestrovsk). On the north coast Olbia was founded in the last quarter of the seventh or in the first half of the sixth century on the estuary of the Bug River; it rapidly became the center of the grain trade to the Greek world, a position which it held until the fourth century B.C. Thereafter it slowly declined in importance and by the fourth century A.D. disappeared from history. Further to the east was the Tauric Chersonese (Crimea). Here about 600 the Milesians established Panticapaeum (Kerch) on the Cimmerian Bosporus. Within a century various other colonies were founded in this area and also across the straits—some sent out by Panticapaeum itself. In the fifth century these communities united to form the Bosporan Kingdom, with its capital at Panticapaeum. This kingdom, composed of Scythian and Greek elements, in the fourth century supplanted Olbia as the center of the grain trade; it continued in existence, but with many vicissitudes, until the fourth century A.D. The most northerly colony to be founded, which became part of the Bosporan Kingdom, was Tanais on the mouth of the Tanais (Don) River where it flows into Lake Maeotis (Sea of Azov). The chief remains of this town date from the third cen-

83 Colonization

tury B.C., but Soviet archaeologists have discovered traces of what was presumably an earlier stage of the colony only a few miles distant.

On the eastern coast, where the Caucasus mountains recede somewhat from the sea, the Greeks founded several trading colonies, the most important being Phasis and Dioscurias in Colchis, the land of the legendary Medea (west Georgia). On the south shore of the Black Sea, almost at the midpoint, the Milesians founded Sinope in the last quarter of the seventh century. Sinope, with its good harbor, became a flourishing trading city; among its distinguished citizens were the fourth-century Cynic philosopher Diogenes and the fourth- and third-century comic poet Diphilus. Sinope sent out many small trading colonies of which the best known was Trapezus (Trebizond), famous as the place where Xenophon and the remnants of the Ten Thousand first sighted the sea after their march back from the interior of Babylonia. Amisus, slightly east from Sinope, was established by either the Milesians or the Phocaeans about the middle of the sixth century. It soon became important as the chief center for the export of the iron which the neighboring natives—the Chalybes—smelted from the ore derived from mines in their territory. The last colony to be mentioned on the south coast was Heraclea in Bithynia. This city, founded in the first half of the sixth century by Megarians and Boeotians, provided a useful harbor on the voyage from the Bosporus to Sinope. It flourished because of the abundance of tunny fish in the waters and timber in the interior, and by the end of the century sent forth two colonies of its own, Kallatis on the west coast of the Black Sea and Chersonesus in the southwest corner of the Crimea near modern Sevastopol.

THE COLONIZATION movement so far described was directed to the west, north, and northeast; in the south the activity was much less, but the colonies in Africa, Naucratis and Cyrene, although only two in number, were nonetheless very important in Greek history. Greek relations with Egypt in the Dark Age are obscure. Odysseus' raid on Egypt (Odyssey, 14.245-286) and Strabo's statement (17.1.6) that Egyptians were posted at Rhacotis, near the Canopic mouth of the Nile, to prevent foreign raiders are evidence for the prevalence of piracy, presumably in the ninth and eighth centuries. The discovery of Egyptian bronzes probably dating from the early seventh century, especially in Crete and Samos, and Herodotus' story (4.152) that the Samian merchant Kolaios (ca. 638) had been sailing for Egypt before being blown westward to Tartessus, suggest that by the seventh century trading connections of some sort had been established.

The important evidence for the entry of the Greeks into Egypt is associated with Psammetichus I (663-609), the founder of the XXVI (Saite) dynasty. According to Herodotus (2.152-154), Psammetichus, in his successful effort to defeat the eleven other princes in the Delta, employed Ionian and Carian pirates who were raiding the area. Subsequently, as reward to these troops, he granted them land, known as the Camps, on either side of the Pelusian mouth of the Nile. These soldiers and their descendants continued to live there and apparently at the neighboring Daphnai until the pharaoh Amasis about a century later transferred them to Memphis to protect himself against disaffected Egyptians. Herodotus (2.163) says that when Amasis defeated his predecessor Apries and became pharaoh, 30,000 Ionian and Carian mercenaries fought in the army of the defeated monarch. The number may well be greatly exaggerated, but it causes one to suspect that the Ionians and Carians who fought earlier under Psammetichus were more than marauding pirates. It has been persuasively argued that these men must be understood in terms of the social and economic conditions which were sending forth thousands of colonists in these centuries. It is possible that Psammetichus, realizing his need of soldiers to achieve his domestic aims and to drive out the Assyrians, had circulated word in Ionia and Caria that those who came to serve under him would be rewarded with grants of land. The men who flocked to Egypt, then, were part colonists and part soldiers, and formed a continuing army which the pharaoh could employ in addition to the sometimes unreliable class of native warriors. The Greeks who scratched their names on the leg of a statue of Ramses II before the Temple of Abu Simbel in Nubia on the occasion of the invasion of Psammetichus II in 591 may have been descendants of these men (M&L, no. 7). These Ionians and Carians were granted the right of intermarriage with Egyptian women, which presumably explains why in Hellenistic times there were groups of foreigners in Memphis called Hellenomemphitai and Karomemphitai.

Little is known about these Ionians and Carians beyond the military role they played under the Saite pharaohs, a role which probably continued more or less unchanged after the Persian conquest of Egypt in 525. It was the traders and artisans following in the wake of the mercenaries who were responsible for establishing the colony of Naucratis on the Canopic arm of the Nile. Since archaeologists have found pottery on the site dating from the last quarter of the seventh century, it is probable that it was Psammetichus I who granted the Greeks permission to settle on this spot. Because Greek traders could easily turn into pirates, he may very well have considered it better for his kingdom that all these foreigners be assembled in one locality. Herodotus states in an impor-

85 Colonization

tant passage (2.178–179) that Amasis (570–526), being a philhellene, granted Naucratis as a city to live in to the Greeks who came to Egypt, and to the merchants not wishing to live there permanently he gave land for building altars and precincts to the gods. Ionians from Chios, Teos, Phocaea, and Clazomenae, Dorians from Rhodes, Cnidos, Halicarnassus, and Phaselis, and Aeolians from Mytilene (in Lesbos) combined to build a great temple precinct (temenos) called the Hellenion. Other Greeks—Aeginetans, Samians, and Milesians—established separate precincts to Zeus, Hera, and Apollo, respectively. Since some of the remains from Naucratis clearly antedate Amasis by several generations, Herodotus is definitely wrong in attributing the beginning of the settlement to his reign. Amasis, in view of the hostility of the Egyptians to the Greeks, may have insisted that Greeks who had strayed away from the original settlement confine themselves to the one site.

To judge from Herodotus' language it was the permanent settlers, presumably merchants and artisans, who formed the polis Naucratis. The transient traders, residing in the market (emporion) area, were not classified as citizens. When one contemplates the scattered and confusing information about Naucratis, one realizes that it was not at all a typical Greek colony. Since it was established by traders from numerous cities, there was no "mother city," although centuries later Miletus claimed that honor. The ordinary Greek colony was a free and autonomous city, whereas Naucratis was established only after permission had been granted by the pharaoh (presumably Psammetichus I, revised by Amasis), and it was attached to a native settlement in which archaeology seems to prove that there was a large fort. Efforts were made to keep the Greeks isolated from the natives, and, in contrast to the privileges granted to the mercenaries mentioned above, intermarriage with the Egyptians was forbidden. Also a fourth-century inscription reveals that the area of Naucratis then, as probably before, owed a tithe to an Egyptian deity.

Although much is, and perhaps always will be, unknown about Naucratis, its importance is obvious. It was the one Greek city in Egypt until the founding of Alexandria in 332-331, and for many years it was chiefly through Naucratis that Greek influences could enter Egypt and, what is more significant, that Egyptian influences, colored by the deliberately archaizing policy of the Saite dynasty, could penetrate into the Greek world.

Some five hundred miles to the west of Naucratis, Dorian settlers from Thera, an island in the southern Aegean, founded Cyrene on the north coast of Africa about 631 B.C. Since the unusually large amount of data concerning the founding and early years of Cyrene contained in

ancient authors such as Herodotus, Pindar (with scholia), and Diodorus has been supplemented by the discovery at Cyrene of the very important "Stele of the Founders," a rather full account of this colony is indispensable. Although no two Greek colonies evolved in identical ways, nevertheless the fuller information about Cyrene contributes to an understanding of the type of problems inherent in the founding and formative years of other colonies for which less evidence has been preserved. The reader is uged to read the account furnished by Herodotus (4.150–204), for there he will find a fascinating account in which fact, legend, and propaganda are all intermingled.

The island Thera, occupied by Dorians in the early part of the first millennium B.C., suffered severely, according to Herodotus, from a prolonged drought in the latter half of the seventh century. Under this story there is probably concealed the fact that at Thera, as elsewhere, the population had become too large for the limited arable land available. The Theraeans consulted the oracle at Delphi and were told to found a colony in Libya. They thereupon sent two penteconters to Libya under the command of Battus or, as he is called in certain sources, Aristotle. The name Battus presents a problem for which there are at least three possible solutions. It may actually have been the real name of the founder; or it may have been an epithet, meaning stammerer, applied to "Aristotle" because of a speech impediment; or, as Herodotus thought, the founder may have received that name because Battus was the native Libyan word for king. If the last hypothesis is correct, then the Greeks, including the Battiads, soon ceased to think of the word as a title and used it like a regular proper name. Since only two penteconters were dispatched, those selected to go could hardly have exceeded two hundred. The number is significant because it provides evidence for the smallness of some of the colonial undertakings.

Battus and his followers sailed to Itana on the eastern coast of Crete, where they hired a Cretan purple-dyer to serve as their guide. Possibly this episode about the Cretan guide refers to a preliminary exploratory voyage. In any case, the story about the Cretan is reasonable, for Cretan sailors were active at this time and a purple-dyer from Itana may well have been familiar with the dye-producing shellfish on the coast of Africa to the south. The colonists at first settled on a little island, Plataea (Bomba), near the coast. An initial settlement on an offshore island was probably a common procedure; the colonists were thereby provided with an easily defensible home while they tried to ascertain what the attitude of the natives was likely to be. Parallel examples are known from Syracuse, where the island of Ortygia was the first settlement, from

89 Colonization

AGREEMENT [PACT] OF THE FOUNDERS [line 23]

Decided by the assembly. Since Apollo has given a spontaneous prophesy to Battus and the Theraeans ordering them to colonize Cyrene, the Theraeans resolve that Battus be sent to Libya as leader and king: that the Theraeans sail as his companions: that they sail on fair and equal terms, according to family; that one son be conscripted from each family; that those who sail be in the prime of life; and that, of the rest of the Theraeans, any free man who wishes may sail. If the colonists establish the settlement, any of their fellow-citizens who later sails to Libya shall have a share in citizenship and honours and shall be allotted a portion of the unoccupied land. But if they do not establish the settlement and the Theraeans are unable to help them and they suffer inescapable troubles up to five years, let them return from that land without fear to Thera, to their possessions and to be citizens. But he who is unwilling to sail when the city sends him shall be liable to punishment by death and his goods shall be confiscated. And he who receives or protects another, even if it be a father his son or brother his brother, shall suffer the same penalty as the man unwilling to sail. [line 40; end of Pact of the Founders decree On these conditions they made an agreement, those who stayed here and those who sailed on the colonial expedition, and they put curses on those who should transgress these conditions and not abide by them, whether those living in Libya or those staying in Thera. They moulded wax images and burnt them while they uttered the following imprecation, all of them, having come together, men and women, boys and girls. May he who does not abide by this agreement but transgresses it melt away and dissolve like the images, himself and his seed and his property. But for those who abide by the agreement, both those who sail to Libya and those who remain in Thera, may there be abundance and prosperity both for themselves and their descendants. 18

Scholars at first were inclined to consider the Pact of the Founders (lines 23-40) and the following narrative section a forgery or at best an account based on the tradition preserved in some local chronicle. Since then a strong case has been made for accepting the Pact as authentic or, at least, as representing a slightly reworded version of the original document. ¹⁹ Certainly the proposer of the decree, since the decree was passed, was able to convince his fellow citizens in Cyrene that the Pact was genuine. It is worth noting that only the first part of the Pact (lines 23-40) is given in the form of a decree; the rest of the document (lines 40-51) is presented in narrative. If the proposer had been trying to pass off a forgery, one would expect him to have couched the whole document, given under the heading Pact of the Founders, in the more authentic-seeming

form of a decree. Skeptics of the genuineness of the document have pointed to its heading: "Decided by the assembly." Without doubt it is surprising to find such a formula in use in Thera at a time when it was still governed by a king, but a similar phraseology can be cited from contemporary Dreros in Crete (although Dreros was ruled by an aristocracy): "The city has thus decided" (M&L, no. 2). On the whole, it seems reasonable to believe that the Pact of the Founders is a copy of an authentic document, possibly edited somewhat to modernize it, which had been preserved from the seventh century on either stone, wood, or some other material. If it is genuine, the importance of the Pact of the Founders for providing an insight into the procedures adopted in organizing a colony and into the mentality of seventh-century Greeks hardly needs to be emphasized.

N THE preceding pages an attempt has been made to give some idea of the magnitude of the Greek colonization movement in the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries. Only a few of the innumerable colonies have been mentioned. A complete enumeration would probably be impossible and certainly would be a complicated task, since the pattern, with some colonies failing and then sometimes being subsequently refounded on the same or different sites, and with many colonies themselves sending out new colonies, is very complex. It is necessary to emphasize, however, that the expression "colonization movement" when applied to the Greeks must not be associated in meaning with such modern terms as "colonialism," "colonial policies," or "colonial empires." A few of the early trading posts, some of Corinth's foundations along the northwest coast of Greece, and certain Athenian undertakings in the area of the Hellespont in the sixth century, which will be discussed in a later chapter, possibly could be included under a category of "colonial imperialism," but the overwhelming majority of Greek colonies from their earliest days were independent city-states, completely free from any political connection with, or subordination to, the mother cities.

There must have been considerable variation in the procedures followed in sending out and establishing a colony, especially in the early days before a pattern had been set, but evidence is lacking on just what those variations were. Certainly by the last third of the seventh century, as the data concerning the founding of Cyrene by Thera reveal, the whole undertaking was organized and supervised by the state. Possibly, particularly in the first phase of colonization, the initiative may occasionally have come from some leader, perhaps a disgruntled noble, who succeeded in collecting a band of followers and then set out on what was essentially a private undertaking. One should not eliminate the element

91 Colonization

of pure love of adventure from some of these enterprises, although it seems clear that in every case a certain amount of information was available concerning the region in which the colony was to be established. Usually, however, the ruling aristocrats or oligarchs in the state dispatched the colonists as a solution to social, economic, or political problems which were plaguing the state, such as overpopulation with its resulting land hunger, and political discontent or feuds. Subsequently the search for necessary raw materials and markets for local products, whether grown or manufactured, became an increasing motive for the founding of colonies.

When a city decided to send out a colony, it probably called for volunteers, but it is clear from the procedure followed in the founding of Cyrene that if enough volunteers were not forthcoming, compulsion, probably through some form of lot, was employed. The favor of the gods was essential for any such dangerous and important undertaking. Hence, by the seventh century at least, it became regular practice for cities on the mainland of Greece and for the Ionians in Asia Minor to obtain the blessing of Apollo at Delphi and Apollo at Didyma, respectively, on the proposed colony. The state appointed the leader of the colony, the oecist, under whose guidance the new community was established. After his death the oecist was buried in a prominent place in the town, and at his tomb he received the honors due to a hero, as the divine founder of the city. Since the majority of the early colonists wished to become landowners, one of the first tasks of the oecist, once possession of the new territory had been acquired, must have been to arrange for the allocation of the land. There is no definite evidence on how the assignments were made, and certainly there is no proof that the lots (kleroi) were all of equal size. It seems, however, that the descendants of the holders of the original lots became the aristocratic element, as contrasted with later settlers and members of the artisan class. These aristocrats, many of whose forefathers had been "have-nots," now belonged to the "haves"; and, true to human nature, they ordinarily exhibited little sympathy for the less fortunate who in the course of time emerged in all the colonies.

The colonies, although politically independent from their very foundation, usually—and naturally—maintained close ties with the mother cities. This relationship was symbolized by the sacred fire which the colonists took with them from the hearth of the city they were leaving to kindle the flame on the hearth of the new community. The colonists brought with them the political and religious institutions—the magistracies, the tribal division, the cults—of the mother city, and also the alphabet and calendar. Delegates from the colony were dispatched to

attend the chief religious festivals of the founding city and, as trade developed, trade relations between the two communities were usually close. If a colony subsequently sent out a colony of its own, it was the custom to obtain the leader, the oecist, from the mother city. Corcyra, for example, when it founded Epidamnus, sent out the colonists under an oecist from Corinth.

The importance of the age of colonization for Greek and subsequent history can hardly be exaggerated. In the two centuries from approximately 750 to 550 the Greeks, who previously had been confined to the mainland of Greece, the islands of the Aegean, including Crete to the south, and the west coast of Asia Minor, spread over the whole Mediterranean and Black Sea regions. Throughout this wide area new city-states arose which, although somewhat influenced by local conditions, for the most part developed in similar fashion to the older poleis, reproducing all their good and evil features. The influence of this tremendous expansion on the social, economic, political, and cultural life of the Greeks will be discussed in the pages to come, but this chapter should end with a few observations on the effects of this widespread movement on the attitude of the Greeks towards themselves.

Colonization, by creating hundreds of new city-states, greatly furthered the innate preference of the Greeks to live in self-sufficient, parochial communities. In fact, it was the success of the new colonial settlements that, as much as anything, ensured that the Greek way of life would be that of the polis. But paradoxically, this colonial movement which had such a particularistic effect also contributed to a feeling of unity among the Greeks. On a small scale this resulted from the frequent partnership of inhabitants from two or more cities in the establishing of a colony, but much more from association with various strange peoples. As the Greeks came into contact with the natives of Spain, Italy, and Sicily, with the Thracians, Scythians, Anatolians, Egyptians, and Libyans, the different and seemingly strange ways and characteristics of their new neighbors made them realize more and more that the differences among themselves, if they existed at all, were insignificant. After all, whether men came from Sparta or Corinth, from Locris or Miletus, they all spoke the same language, possessed the same traditions coming down from the Heroic Age, and shared similar religious ideas and attitudes towards life. Although the Greeks probably intermingled with the natives more than is usually realized, especially in the interior of Sicily and with the Thracians, Scythians, and Libyans, on the whole they remained aloof. As the years passed and their city way of life developed in contrast to the tribal or nomadic cultures of the majority of their new neighbors, the Greeks

93 Colonization

came to think of themselves as different from these other peoples and increasingly to become aware of their own basic unity.

There is no certain evidence as to when the dichotomy between Hellenes and barbarians (that is, those speaking an unintelligible language) became an accepted concept. Thucydides (1.3) says it was late, and points out that Homer did not employ the term Hellenes to designate all the Greeks, nor the expression barbarians to refer to non-Greeks. Actually Homer (*Iliad*, 2.867) does use the term barbarian once, in the expression "barbarian-speaking Carians." Surely it is a safe inference to state that the unifying term Hellene with its opposite, barbarian, came into common parlance as one of the results of colonization. It is significant that the shrine built in conjunction by nine Greek cities in Naucratis in the latter years of the seventh century was called the Hellenion.

Colonization fostered a feeling of unity among the Greeks in another way, which is more or less a corollary to the tendency just described. The Olympian Games according to tradition were established in 776, but they did not acquire a Panhellenic significance until the following century. The other Panhellenic festivals—the Pythian, Isthmian, and Nemean Games, whatever their origin may have been, were little more than local celebrations until the sixth century. It seems clear that the colonies were very influential in transforming these festivals, especially the one at Olympia, into real Panhellenic occasions. The colonists were glad to return periodically to the ultimate motherland, and in August every fourth year they flocked to Olympia in great numbers to watch the athletic contests, to participate in the excitement of the carnival atmosphere, to negotiate some business deals, and incidentally to join in the religious ceremonies before the great temples of Zeus and Hera. The colonies sent their share of athletes to contend in the games, and the prowess of certain victors from the cities of Sicily and from Cyrene were celebrated in some of Pindar's finest Olympian and Pythian Odes. Hence it is important to bear in mind the significance of these great festivals in keeping the spirit of unity alive and of the colonies in contributing so much to their vitality.

97 Social, Economic, and Political Developments

more closely connected with the needs of their own cities. A shipowner (nauklēros, to use the term later in use) of Miletus, for example, would know that his city was always in need of foodstuffs. Accordingly he would load his ship with Milesian woolen garments and pottery and, if there was still space in his ship, take along a merchant (emporos) with his cargo. They would then sail to Olbia, where they would dispose of their commodities for a cargo of grain and preserved fish. There is no clear evidence as to how these traders disposed of their commodities. If they had to remain at the port of call throughout the winter season, they may have sold their wares themselves at retail; on the other hand, they may have had recourse to local traders (kapēloi).

In the course of time regular patterns of trade developed. Miletus and other Ionian cities traded especially in the Propontis and Black Sea regions, although they all had interests in Egypt through Naucratis, and Miletus and particularly Phocaea had interests in the west. For many years the Phocaeans seem to have had a monopoly on the silver and tin trade with Spain. Corinth traded especially with the west from the middle of the seventh century, and Chalcis with its colonies in Italy, Sicily, and Chalcidice. From the beginning of the sixth century there is evidence for Athenian trade in the area of the Hellespont and Propontis. Close ties or possibly some type of alliance may have been established between certain cities. In the Lelantine War (late eighth and early seventh century?) between Chalcis and Eretria in Euboea, Samos aided the former and Miletus the latter. Herodotus' statement (6.21) that Miletus mourned deeply over the destruction of Sybaris in Italy could suggest that there had been close commercial relations between the two cities.

It is obvious that the new economic opportunities which were emerging in the seventh century must have had repercussions on the social system in the Greek world. The nobles were landed aristocrats, and wealth, so far as it affected political and social position, was estimated on the basis of land and its products. At least this was the case in Attica at the time of Solon's reforms, ca. 594, and there is no reason to doubt that the same situation obtained throughout Greece in the seventh century. Some of the nobles, however, probably were taking an interest in trade and were more and more frequently exchanging their surplus agricultural products for foreign luxuries which could be hoarded or displayed on occasions such as funerals and the providing of dowries, when conspicuous consumption was in order. When Sappho's brother sailed with a cargo of wine to Naucratis, he was playing the role of a Lesbian farmer disposing of surplus produce rather than that of a professional trader. Solon also engaged in trade, not as a regular occupation but presumably to finance his travels.

The land not controlled by the great families was owned and worked by the small farmers and peasants. Evidence concerning them between the time of Hesiod and that of Solon is almost entirely lacking, but to judge from conditions in Athens at the time of Solon's reforms, their plight by the end of the seventh century was an evil one. Colonization had helped relieve the pressure on the land, and those farmers who had gone out as colonists were now owners of the original lots (kleroi) in the new settlements and hence were in a privileged position. The peasants and farmers who remained at home, however, were apparently falling more and more into a situation where they were at the mercy of the nobles.

Despite these changes which were occurring to the population living on and from the land, it was in the cities, growing steadily larger as a result of the increase in trade and manufacturing, that the most significant innovations were taking place. Craftsmen (demiourgoi) had existed in the Greek cities from their beginnings, but now there was a much greater demand for the products of their skills. As owners of workshops in which commodities such as pottery, utensils, arms, and textiles were manufactured, many of these artisans must have done a thriving business. It is important to bear in mind, however, that these industrial establishments were not factories in any modern sense but merely workshops (ergasteria), small in physical size and with a very limited work force. The personnel of a typical shop consisted of the owner and possibly other members of his family with a few hired workers and probably several slaves, for slavery was steadily becoming a more important factor in social and economic life.2 Many members of the artisan class must also have become traders. Since the approved sailing season lasted only from April to September, some of these demiourgoi may have worked as craftsmen during the major part of the year and then, when the seas became safe, they or some members of their families may have loaded some of the fruits of the winter's work on a merchant ship and sailed off to dispose of these commodities at a foreign port. The increasing prosperity of the artisan class must also have contributed to the betterment of the lot of the day laborers—the thetes of Homer and Hesiod—for employment in the shops and service as crew members on the trading ships provided working opportunities for more and more men.

The most important aspect of these new economic developments was that a certain part of the population in the Greek cities was acquiring wealth of a type different from that of land and its products. In this category of movable wealth, whether it was in the form of gold and silver bullion or manufactured articles, some of the demiourgoi were possibly becoming even wealthier than the nobles, and after the introduction of

coinage about 600 B.C. this tendency very likely became more pronounced. One significant consequence of this increase in movable wealth, the new phenomenon of hoplite soldiers, was mentioned in an earlier chapter. Until the end of the eighth century and even later the military power of the state had rested on the nobles, who alone could afford the horses, chariots, and weapons necessary for war. This military monopoly was one of the strongest bases of the privileged position of the aristocracies. By the middle of the seventh century, however, as the famous proto-Corinthian Chigi Vase reveals, the hoplite formation was in use, and the individual soldiers were accoutred in what became standard hoplite gear-helmet, corselet, greaves, round shield, short sword, and thrusting spear. The reliability of this representation is confirmed by the poems of Tyrtaeus written in the last half of the century. The transition to the new type of fighting equipment was presumably a gradual process. A late eighth century tomb at Argos contained a hoplite helmet and corselet, and late eighth and early seventh century pottery exhibits both old and new types of fighting. It is likely that the metalsmiths, aided by improvements in technique and the increasing availability of iron, were meeting growing demands for armaments from men now becoming wealthy in movables. Much of this equipment may have been purchased by those who subsequently sought employment as mercenaries at home or abroad.

Since the hoplite shield, carried with the left forearm inserted under a bar and the hand grasping a bracket at the edge of the shield, enabled a warrior to use his right arm for manipulating his thrusting spear, the result was that a hoplite fighting individually had his right side exposed. The real effectiveness of the hoplite system arose when men were trained to fight in phalanx formation, with each man in the line having his right side protected by the shield of the hoplite on his right. It must have taken considerable drilling to instruct men to fight efficiently in this formation. The suggestion has been made that Pheidon, the tyrant of Argos, was the first to develop this system and that his supposed victory over the Spartans at Hysiae possibly about 668 was the first demonstration of the merits of the hoplite phalanx.

As the seventh century progressed, the hoplite army in most sections of Greece became the main military arm of a state, supplanting the older tradition of nobles fighting more or less as individual champions and whatever systems were employed in the intervening years. These hoplites must have developed a strong group feeling, since they realized that their effectiveness depended on the steadiness of the line and since each man knew that his personal protection was provided by the man on his right. Men such as these, who now could claim that they were the

defenders of the state, naturally posed a threat to the political and social prestige previously monopolized by the aristocrats. It is impossible to state precisely the social strata from which these hoplites came, but since it was Greek custom that a man provide his own weapons and armor, they must have been men of some economic substance. Probably some of them were aristocrats or at least successful farmers, but many almost surely came from the demiourgoi who had gained wealth in movables.³

This latter group presents an interesting and thorny problem. So far as one can ascertain, wealth, at least in relation to political and social status, was still estimated on the basis of land and its products. How did hoplites, whose wealth was based on movables, acquire the political recognition to which they felt their economic success and their new value as defenders of the state entitled them? The acquisition of land was difficult since little waste land remained to be occupied, and aristocrats and peasants were not inclined to sell any of their acres, even if tradition had allowed such sales, which, in many parts of Greece at least, is improbable. There is no certain answer to this problem--it will be studied in some detail later in its application to Athens-but somehow, in some or many cities, the wealthier non-nobles were acquiring political powers whereby governments gradually changed from aristocracies to timocracies. As confirmation for this conclusion one can cite the complaint of the Lesbian aristocratic poet Alcaeus, ca. 600, that "possessions make the man," and the ranting of Theognis of Megara some fifty years later against the habit of nobles marrying rich commoners (lines 185-190): "Yet in marriage a good man thinketh not twice of wedding the bad [that is, of low birth] daughter of a bad sire if the father give him many possessions, nor doth a woman disdain the bed of a bad man if he be wealthy, but is fain rather to be rich than to be good. For 'tis possessions they prize; and a good man weddeth of bad stock and a bad man of good; race is confounded of riches." As will be seen shortly, the tyrants may have had something to do with helping non-noble hoplites break down the exclusiveness of the nobility. In any case, there is no doubt that the new conditions provided by trade and manufacturing were undermining the props of the old aristocratic organization and creating a rather revolutionary atmosphere in the social, economic, and political spheres.

ONE OF THE great milestones in breaking down the privileged position of the aristocracies was the act of codifying the unwritten laws and reducing them into writing. Among the early Greeks, as among any early people, the laws were the ancestral customs—the customs, rules, and judgments which had gradually evolved from generation to genera-

Social, Economic, and Political Developments

tion for regulating society and making civilized life possible. In Homer they were called themistes or dikai; the earmark of uncivilized peoples, such as the Cyclopes, was that they had no themistes. Hesiod (Works and Days, 276-279) makes the same point when he says that Zeus gave dikē to mankind, but not to fish, beasts, or birds. In a society that was governed first by kings and then by aristocracies, it is natural that the knowledge, interpretation, and application of these unwritten laws became the exclusive prerogative of the nobles. This control over the administration of justice was one of the main bases of the power of the aristocratic governments, and it is known that they manipulated this control to their own advantage. A passage in the Iliad (16.386-388) speaks of Zeus's anger at men who make crooked judgments (themistes) in the assembly place and drive out dike (here almost with one of its later meanings-justice); and Hesiod frequently denounces the bribe-swallowing princes for delivering crooked judgments (dikai). No wonder the victims of the maladministration of justice felt that the laws, no matter how harsh they might be, had to be wrested from the secrecy and mystery with which the nobles were shrouding them, for, as Euripides expressed it several centuries later (Suppliants, 433-434), "When the laws are written, both the weak and wealthy have equal justice $(dik\bar{e})$." It is often said, or implied, that it was the threatening attitude and the demands of the masses which forced the nobles to acquiesce in the publication of the laws. Certainly their discontent must have been a contributing factor, but the "masses" were probably still too unorganized, too powerless, and too illiterate to have assumed a leading role in any issue of such importance. It is far more likely that the initiative in this onslaught on aristocratic privilege came from that segment of the population which, through acquisition of wealth in movables and the consequent ability to give military service as hoplites, was now in a position to exert some influence on the policies of the state.4

A prerequisite for reducing the unwritten laws to writing, obviously, was that knowledge of writing be reasonably widespread in the Greek world. The type of writing mentioned in the first chapter, the syllabic Linear B script, apparently did not survive the collapse of Mycenaean civilization. At any rate, archaeology so far has revealed no evidence for the use of writing among the Greeks in the Dark Age. When writing appeared again in the Greek world, an alphabetic system had supplanted the earlier, cumbersome syllabic method. After generations of controversy, scholars are now in more or less general agreement that this momentous invention was made probably about the middle of the eighth century and almost surely on the Syrian coast. Since the Greeks adapted the north Semitic alphabet to the needs of their own language,

be an oversimplification of history to maintain that the total explanation of the phenomenon of tyranny is to be found in the struggle against aristocratic rule, but it is nonetheless true that in those cities which were under the domination of tyrants for one, two, and occasionally three generations, the noble families never again recovered their former exclusive and privileged position after the expulsion of the tyrants.

The subject of Greek tyrants is a fascinating one, but once again the historian is thwarted by a lack of satisfactory sources of information—a great loss, for a thorough understanding of these early tyrants would provide answers to many of the baffling problems in the history of Greece in the seventh and sixth centuries. So many tyrants arose in these centuries that this period is sometimes called the age of tyrants. The term is only partly acceptable, for tyranny was a recurring phenomenon in the Greek world. In actual fact, there were two main periods in which tyrannies were widespread in Greece: the age of the older tyrants lasting from about the middle of the seventh century to the end of the sixth, although prolonged in Sicily until 461; and the age of the later tyrants, which began with the rise to power of Dionysius I of Syracuse in 405 and continued until the Roman conquest in the second century B.C. In general, therefore, one can say that tyranny was particularly prevalent in periods of transition; in its earlier phase it contributed to the breakdown of the aristocratic state, whereas in its later phase it was one of the symptoms of the decline of the polis.

The words "tyrant" and "tyranny" did not originally have the evil and sinister connotations which they acquired later for the Greeks and which they have in the modern world. The first occurrence of the word tyranny is in fragment 25 of Archilochus, referring to Gyges (ca. 685-657): "I care not for the wealth of golden Gyges, nor ever have envied him; I am not jealous of the works of gods and I have no desire for great tyranny." Here the word signifies absolute despotism, but since Gyges obtained his position by overthrowing the preceding Lydian dynasty, there may also be a suggestion of usurped power. Since the term is a loanword in the Greek language, it is quite possible that it was borrowed from the Lydians, with whom the Greeks were in close contact. The poet Alcaeus, early in the sixth century, employed the word tyrant to characterize his political opponent Pittacus. Since Pittacus was an elected official and not a tyrant in any later technical sense, Alcaeus was using the term as one of abuse. In the same century Solon and Theognis used the word in their poetry to characterize anyone possessed of absolute power. In Athens after the overthrow of the Pisistratid tyranny, and especially after the repulse of the Persian despotism with which the exiled Pisistratids had been cooperating, the idea of absolute power cen-

tered in one man became increasingly hateful. Nevertheless, in fifthcentury literature, particularly in poetry, the term tyrant, although sometimes having an evil connotation, was often used as a mere synonym for the word king. It was not until the fourth century that the word, in the writings of philosophers like Plato and Aristotle, acquired a technical meaning: to them tyranny was an institution, a perverted form of government, in which a man seized power by force and ruled irresponsibly without regard to the laws of the state. Even earlier, if Thucydides (2.63) is to be trusted, the term was acquiring this special meaning, for in a speech delivered by Pericles in 430, the Athenian statesman is reported to have said to the people: "For what [the empire] you hold is, to speak somewhat plainly, a tyranny; to take it, perhaps, was wrong, but to let it go is unsafe." The philosophers in their analysis of tyranny usually depict the tyrant as a demagogue who, as leader of the masses, seized supreme power. In this concept they were influenced by the nature of tyranny, especially in Sicily, in their own times. It seems certain that it is an anachronism to speak of demagogues in the seventh and even in the sixth century for the very simple reason that the masses, the demos, were not yet sufficiently organized to provide followers for a demagogue.7

From the middle of the seventh century until the end of the sixth, and even later in Sicily and Italy, tyrannies were a common phenomenon in the Greek world. The western tyrannies form a somewhat special category and will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. In the Aegean world there is evidence for tyrants in Corinth, Sicyon, Megara, Athens, Mytilene, Miletus, Ephesus, Samos, and Naxos, not to mention various other cities for which only the name of a tyrant has been preserved. Many cities, of course, may have had tyrannies concerning which no information has survived.

In so widespread a movement, although circumstances naturally varied from place to place, it is reasonable to look for some general underlying cause. There is little reason to question the statement made earlier that in the great majority of cases the basic cause for the rise of tyrannies was opposition to the social, economic, political, and religious monopoly of power exercised by the aristocrats. When one tries to characterize these tyrants, however, and to describe the elements of the population which supported them in their rise to power, one becomes engulfed in a mire of controversies, as can be seen from the various answers which have been offered for these problems. Historians with Marxist leanings tend to see in these tyrants inspired leaders who led their proletarian followers in a successful uprising against their capitalistic masters,

while historians tarred with a fascist brush eulogize them as benevolent despots who set their cities on the paths to their manifest destinies. Among less doctrinaire scholars opinions also vary widely; some see in the tyrants opportunistic nobles who seized power as a result of feuds between noble families, others argue that they were nobles, or occasionally commoners, who seized power as leaders of the masses—that is, as demagogues—and still others recognize in them men who championed the cause of the growing group of men wealthy in movables in the struggle to break down aristocratic privilege. The ironic fact is that the advocate of any one of these theories, or of numerous variants of them, can find some support in the ancient sources for his interpretation.

The sources are miserably inadequate and peculiarly susceptible to subjective explanations. Except for a few passages in contemporary poets, especially in the Athenian Solon, the first account of many of these tyrants is to be found in the pages of Herodotus. When Herodotus was writing his great work, ca. 450-430, two generations had already passed since the suppression of the Pisistratid tyranny in Athens and three or more generations since the disappearance of some of the earlier tyrants. Thus there had been sufficient time for all sorts of stories and anecdotes, many of them of the nature of folktales, to develop, especially since the tyrants as colorful and uninhibited individuals provided excellent material for the myth-making genius of the Greeks. Herodotus' accounts are obviously valuable, but they are exasperatingly anecdotal and devoted largely to the private lives of the despots.

Thucydides, later in the fifth century, makes a few passing comments on tyranny, but it is not until the fourth century, when a different type of tyranny was prevalent, that much was written on the tyrants. Of the historian Ephorus, unfortunately, nothing but fragments has been preserved; hence his account of and judgment on the tyrants have to be inferred from the use made of Ephorus by much later writers. In the writings of the philosophers Plato and Aristotle many discussions of tyranny are to be found, but they must be used with great caution. Both men were influenced in their conception of tyranny by the contemporary demagogic type of tyrant. Plato, in his political theory, was intent on representing tyranny as a perverted form of government; his vivid picture of the typical tyrant, if applied to the striking figures of the seventh and sixth centuries, would yield but a travesty. Aristotle tries harder to be objective and historical, but, although he records actions of certain tyrants which may be true, he usually is thinking of tyranny in a generic sense, and he lists the kinds of measures which a tyrant would be likely to take. Thus, while one can learn from Aristotle what a brilliant

this narrow and, according to tradition, oppressive oligarchy, paved the way for the rise of a tyrant and the collapse of the Bacchiads. 10

The tyrant was Cypselus, who, according to the ancient sources, established a dynasty which endured for over seventy years. Cypselus was the son of a Bacchiad lady, Labda, who, rejected in marriage by the Bacchiads because of her lameness, became the wife of Aetion of Lapith stock, which presumably signified pre-Dorian stock. Herodotus (5.92) tells a fascinating story about the baby Cypselus. The Bacchiads, warned by an oracle that the offspring of Labda and Aetion would prove their undoing, resolved to kill the child but were frustrated by the mother, who hid her baby in a jar or chest (kypselē). The folktale nature of this story is clear, as is the attempt to find an aetiological explanation for the name Cypselus. Herodotus, who was more interested in Cypselus' son, gives little information about Cypselus himself. He merely says that after his babyhood escape, Cypselus grew to manhood, obtained the tyranny, banished many of the Corinthians, deprived many of their property and still more of their lives, and then after ruling for thirty years ended his life happily, leaving the tyranny to his son Periander.

A late source, Nicolaus of Damascus, probably following the fourth-century historian Ephorus, provides further data which are worth examining briefly. According to this account (fragments 57-60), Cypselus, after his escape as a baby, grew to manhood in Olympia. On returning to Corinth he became polemarch. This is an interesting statement, for in early Athens, at least, that office was a military one. As polemarch, Cypselus was required by law to imprison people who had been convicted by a court and to exact the appropriate fines, but by treating the condemned kindly he endeared himself to the people. Incidentally, the fact that he held office is sufficient to prove that he was considered to be of good family; in fact, because of his mother, his connection with the ruling genos was probably recognized. By employing such "demagogic" methods and exploiting the hatred felt for the Bacchiads as a whole, he organized a group of followers and killed the reigning Bacchiad. Then "the demos appointed him king."

This brief sentence has two points of interest. If the terminology is correct, Cypselus was not thought of as a tyrant but as a successor to the previously reigning Bacchiads. It is possible that his aim was to restore the kingship to the ancestral form it had had before becoming an annual office monopolized by the Bacchiad clan. Second, how should the word demos be interpreted? Earlier in the fragment Cypselus is said to have curried favor with the plēthos, the "masses," but his holding the office of polemarch and the later specific statement that he never had a body-

guard suggests that he had the backing of the army. Such evidence, obviously, is unsatisfactory, but it can be used to support the interpretation that demos in this passage refers to the hoplite group and that, accordingly, Cypselus became ruler as leader of the new type of warriors.

Only one other action of Cypselus need be mentioned here: he banished the Bacchiads and confiscated their property. One of these exiles, Demaratus, according to tradition, settled in Etruscan Tarquinii and sired Lucumo, who subsequently ruled in Rome as Tarquinius Priscus. The implication is that the confiscated Bacchiad property was divided among some of the Corinthians. Did the poor people, including struggling peasants, receive parcels of land, or were the landed estates of the Bacchiads divided among the hoplites, who may have been Cypselus' chief supporters? If the latter suggestion is correct, then it reveals a way in which men who may have been wealthy in movables only became landowners also.

Cypselus was succeeded by his son Periander who, in later times, was often selected as an example of the typical tyrant. This fact in itself suggests that he was an unusual person, no doubt brutal, but certainly able and colorful. In one tradition he was included among the Seven Wise Men (a list, varying over the years, of seventh and sixth century men noted for their pithy statements). In general the traditions about him are hostile; they reflect the sort of stories, largely dealing with his personal life, which would have been circulated by his enemies. A good example is the famous story of his relations with Thrasybulus, the tyrant of Miletus (Herodotus, 5.92). Wishing to learn how he could rule more securely and effectively, he sent a messenger to Thrasybulus to ask for advice. Thrasybulus said nothing to the messenger, but led him to a grain field beyond the city and, while walking through the field, cut off and threw away the tallest ears of grain. When this action was reported by the perplexed messenger to Periander, he immediately understood its meaning and proceeded to put to death or banish those leading Corinthians who had not been touched by Cypselus. One's confidence in the truth of this particular anecdote is not increased when one remembers that Aristotle (Politics, 3.8.3) reverses the characters, making Thrasybulus the one who was seeking advice, and that the Roman historian Livy (1.54) tells a comparable story about Tarquinius Superbus at Rome. Nevertheless, the picturesque tale may very well reflect Periander's policy. A second-generation tyrant was not likely to have the support which had put his predecessor in power, and there probably were many who resented seeing an irregular office, such as tyranny was, being regularized through a hereditary and dynastic principle. Accord-

ing to one tradition Cypselus had banished only the Bacchiads; it would not be surprising if his son had to turn against other nobles and influential people who did not want one-man rule to be perpetuated.

Although the Cypselids were in power for some seventy years, the nature of the source material concerning them is such that it is impossible to give a satisfactory account of their reigns. Their colonizing activity, however, is well authenticated. Cypselus and Periander founded colonies on the northern shore of the Corinthian Gulf on the cost of Aetolia, and along the northwestern coast of Greece from Acarnania to Illyria. The most important of these colonies were Leucas, Anactorion, Ambracia, and on the coast of Illyria, Apollonia and Epidamnus; the last of these, although a colony of Corcyra, had its oecist and probably some settlers from Corinth. The policy followed in establishing these settlements was different from that applied to Corcyra and Syracuse; these new colonies were founded and in certain cases ruled by sons of the Cypselids. Even Corcyra for a time was brought under Cypselid authority. The control over these colonies, which in the days of the tyrants was based on personal relations, survived the downfall of the dynasty, for as late as the end of the fifth century most of these communities were not independent city-states, as was the rule with Greek colonies, but were subject in one way or another to Corinthian rule. When these colonies began to issue coinage, apparently early in the fifth century, the coins were struck on the same standard and with the same types as those of Corinth. Even Potidaea, which Periander founded in the northeast in the Chalcidic peninsula, was still receiving annual Corinthian governors as late as the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.

The establishment of the colonies along the west coast of Greece undoubtedly served various social, economic, and political purposes such as relieving Corinth of any excess population, whether rural or urban, and removing certain elements politically dangerous to the Cypselids. These settlements also provided ports of call for the voyage to Italy and Sicily, and bases for the embryonic Corinthian fleet in its effort to police the sea against pirates and to keep watch on hostile Corcyra. Since Ambracia was located at the beginning of the land route to the famous oracle of Zeus at Dodona in Epirus, one would like to know whether the Cypselids were trying to establish close relations with that ancient shrine. The colonies on the Illyrian coast are interesting, for they may have had a much more significant purpose than the obvious assistance they provided in obtaining the Illyrian iris necessary for the Corinthian perfume makers. Since Corinth began to issue silver coinage probably in the time of Periander or shortly thereafter, the question of the source of its silver supply naturally arises. Archaeologists so far have not been able

to give a definitive answer to this problem, but Illyria, despite the fact that evidence for Corinthian penetration into the interior of that region is all post-tyranny, seems to have the strongest claim. If this hypothesis is correct it would explain, in part at least, why Corinth, contrary to the usual Greek custom, insisted on keeping its colonies on the northwest coast of Greece strictly under its control.

It is probable that the Cypselids, like most tyrants, were responsible for a large building program, but the Roman destruction of Corinth in 146 B.C. was so complete that few traces of the early city have survived. The temple of Apollo, of which some columns are still remaining, may have been erected in the time of Periander, although some scholars suggest that it was built to commemorate the fall of the Cypselids; the answer depends on whether the higher or lower dating for the dynasty is correct. In either case, it is an early temple, and hence Corinth deserves some of the credit for developing the Doric order in architecture. One can be almost certain that the Cypselids were responsible for various improvements to the city such as streets, drains, and the establishment of fountains, for it is axiomatic that tyrants had to find employment for the population. Excavations seem to prove that the diolkos, a runway paved with stone connecting the Saronic and Corinthian Gulfs, should be assigned to the time of Periander. On this, with the help of rollers, ships could be transported from one body of water to the other, thus giving shipowners an alternative to making the long voyage around the Peloponnesus.11 The price paid for this convenience would have been another source of revenue for the tyrant.

Beyond the colonizing policy, this somewhat hypothetical building program, and Periander's activity as an arbitrator in a dispute between Mytilene and Athens concerning Sigeum, which will be discussed in the chapter on early Athens, the chief source of information about the Cypselids is to be found in the enumeration of typical tyrannical measures given by Aristotle in his Politics (5.9.1-9), some of which may refer to the Cypselids, and in statements in later authors derived probably from Ephorus. Three of these measures, which seem to be associated particularly with Periander, deserve brief mention if for no other reason than to emphasize that in enacting them the Cypselids may have had other motives than the derogatory ones attributed to them. The ancient sources imply that the prohibitions against idleness and the acquiring of slaves, and the various sumptuary laws, were all motivated by the desire to keep the people so poor and so busy trying to make a living that they would have no time or opportunity to conspire against the tyrants. Needless to say, the Cypselids, like any tyrants, would have attempted to prevent the formation of clubs and societies which could have become centers of

dangerous discontent, but the motives which led them to pass enactments such as those just mentioned were hardly the childish and peevish ones attributed to them. They would have been interested in keeping the population busy, for the greater the output of the farms and the workshops, the greater would be the revenues, which were needed by the tyrants for projects such as sending out colonies and constructing buildings. Sumptuary laws may have been intended, among other things, to try to prevent the ruinous ostentation in which the wealthy were indulging, an aim similar to that envisaged by various more or less contemporary lawgivers. Periander's prohibition on the acquiring of slaves surely was not just an arbitrary measure directed against the rich. The fact that he and his father sent out various colonies is good evidence for overpopulation and unemployment in Corinth at the time. The attempt to curtail slave labor was probably intended to make employment easier for the free citizen.

The confused sources reveal that Periander's position towards the end of his life became increasingly precarious. He was succeeded by a nephew, who within a few years was assassinated by the Corinthians. Then, according to Nicolaus of Damascus, the demos razed the houses of the tyrants, dug up their graves, cast out the bones, and immediately established a new constitution. At this point the text unfortunately becomes corrupt, but from what is known of Corinth at a somewhat later time, it can safely be said that an oligarchy, but one much more broadly based than in the time of the Bacchiads, succeeded the fallen Cypselids. It is quite possible, therefore, that the demos which helped Cypselus to power and the demos which took control after the end of the tyranny in both cases should be understood as the upper classes, including those who could serve as hoplites.

ABOUT FIFTEEN miles west of Corinth, in the previously obscure town of Sicyon, another tyranny, known as that of the Orthagorids, was established towards either the middle or the end of the seventh century. The story of its rise, as in the case of the Cypselids, is largely withdrawn from view. According to a papyrus fragment of an author probably dependent on Ephorus, the founder of the dynasty, Orthagoras, was the son of a butcher (mageiros) named Andreas. When one reads in Pausanias (6.19.1) that Myron, presumably the brother of Orthagoras, was victor in the chariot race at the Olympic Games in 648 B.C., an achievement possible only for a member of a well-to-do family, it becomes likely that the description of Andreas as a butcher was a deliberate calumny originating with the aristocratic opponents of the tyranny. The papyrus emphasizes the military prowess of Orthagoras, because of which he was

Since Cirrha was destroyed and its population annihilated in this war, the accounts about the causes and results of the struggle as preserved in the scattered sources are those provided by the victors. Their claim was that Cirrha was interfering with the proper functioning of the shrine and oracle of Apollo at Delphi. If, as seems probable, Delphi was not yet under the supervision of the Amphictiony, the inference is that Cirrha itself was controlling the sanctuary. If, then, before the war the policy of Cirrha and Delphi was one, it is worth considering, as has been suggested, what the relations of those who launched the Sacred War were to the Cirrha-Delphi complex.

At Athens, Delphi had encouraged the attempt of Cylon to become tyrant ca. 632, and subsequently it had branded as accursed the genos of the Alcmaeonids, whose leader Megacles had been responsible for the slaying of Cylon's immediate followers. At Sicyon, although the chronological order of events is far from clear, Delphi had opposed Cleisthenes' policy against the Dorian cult of Adrastus. Since Cleisthenes paved the way for the collapse of Cirrha by his naval blockade of the port, and since Cirrha was so renowned for its maritime interests that for centuries the whole Corinthian Gulf was frequently called the Crisaean Gulf and a tradition arose that Cirrha-Crisa had founded Metapontum in Italy (Ephorus in Strabo, 6.1.15), it is reasonable to suspect that commercial interests, rather than religious indignation, were influencing Cleisthenes.

Regarding the Thessalians any statements are precarious. Scattered evidence seems to confirm that throughout the archaic period they were trying to push southward. Plutarch in his Amatorius (Moralia, 760-761) relates that in the Lelantine War-the long-lasting conflict between Chalcis and Eretria in Euboea allegedly for possession of the intervening Lelantine plain, in which Thucydides (1.15) says almost all Greek states were ultimately involved, a struggle which probably should be dated in the closing years of the eighth century and the first half of the sevenththe Thessalians contributed to the ultimate victory of Chalcis by serving with their cavalry. Since in the push south the Thessalians were constantly thwarted by the Phocians, it may be legitimate to believe that Thessaly was interested in crushing the Phocian city of Cirrha and thus obtaining more influence over Delphic policies. In view of such observations about Athenian, Sicyonian, and Thessalian attitudes towards the Cirrhaean-dominated Delphi, one may look with favor on the judgment of a scholar that "the Sacred War was fought for Delphi, but it was 'for the possession of' not 'for the sake of.' "15

The war seemingly was a long one, marked first by the leadership of the Athenian Alcmaeon, son of the Megacles who had caused the Alcmaeonids to be accursed, and the successful blockade of Cirrha by

Cleisthenes' fleet, and then by fighting in the mountains where the surviving Cirrhaeans, having established themselves in a fortress (a memory of Bronze Age Crisa?), were ultimately overcome by the Thessalians—according to one tradition through the poisoning of the waters of the Pleistos River by a doctor who had come from the island of Cos (Hippocratic Corpus, letter 27). The consequences of this war were significant for Greek history in many ways. Cirrha was razed to the ground, and the plain of Crisa was dedicated to Apollo with the solemn stipulation that it should remain uncultivated forever. This Crisaean plain with its sacred character was to play a leading part in the events two and a half centuries later which led to the victory in the Fourth Sacred War of Philip II of Macedonia over the Greeks at Chaeronea in Boeotia in 338. Following the First Sacred War, if not in its course, the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi was placed under the protection of the Anthelan Amphictiony, henceforth called Delphic.

To commemorate the "deliverance" of Delphi, the games, which had been held there formerly on a minor scale, were reorganized. According to the Parian Chronicle, after the destruction of Cirrha a contest, in which the prize was a material one (chrematites), was established in 591. Following the conclusion of all the fighting, the contest, under the aegis of the Amphictiony, attained the prestige of being stephanitesthat is, a contest in which the prize was a wreath. The new games, known as the Pythia, were held every four years and soon achieved fame second only to the Olympic Games among the great Panhellenic festivals. At the first celebration in 582 Cleisthenes was victor in the chariot race (Pausanias, 10.7.6). It is interesting to note that apparently in the same year (582) the Isthmian Games in honor of Poseidon were also reorganized as a Panhellenic festival to be held every second year. Those scholars who accept the "higher" dating for the Cypselids see in this reorganization a celebration to commemorate the overthrow of the tyranny at Corinth; those who accept the "lower" dating consider the enhancing of the prestige of the Isthmian Games to be the work of Periander. 17

Some years after the end of the First Sacred War the wooing and marriage of Cleisthenes' daughter, Agariste, occurred, a subject to which Herodotus devotes six very interesting chapters (6.126–131). Cleisthenes, like all the tyrants, believed in the grand, flamboyant gesture; he may very well have consciously been imitating the courting of Helen, but the fact that he had a famous model is no valid reason to doubt that he arranged a picturesque pageant for his daughter's marriage. The episode casts considerable light on the methods of the tyrants and, in particular, on the relations of various prominent Greeks towards them. Herodotus

tells how Cleisthenes, after winning the chariot race at the Olympic Games of 576 (?), proclaimed to the assembled multitude that any Greek who considered himself worthy to become his son-in-law should come to Sicyon within sixty days. Thirteen suitors arrived, two from Athens and one each from eleven other cities. The fact that two came from Italy and several from western Greece may suggest, as does possibly also his previous attack on Cirrha, that Cleisthenes had particular interests in the west; in any case the absence of any suitors from the Aegean islands or the Greek cities in Asia might have considerable significance if enough evidence were available for interpretation. Cleisthenes entertained these aspirants magnificently for a year and carefully observed their prowess and conduct in athletic games and social intercourse. Two Athenians pleased him most, but on the day on which the selection of husband for Agariste was to be made, one of them, Hippocleides, son of Tisander, ruined his chance by dancing too indecorously under the influence of wine. Thus the choice fell on Megacles, the son of that Alcmaeon who had commanded the Athenian forces in the Sacred War. The other suitors were dismissed with thanks for the honor they had conferred on Cleisthenes by their presence, and each was presented with a talent of silver. Herodotus ends his account with some important genealogical information. The issue of the marriage of Agariste and Megacles was Cleisthenes, named after his maternal grandfather, who "established the tribes and the democracy for the Athenians." Another son, Hippocrates, also was born from this union; Hippocrates had a daughter Agariste, named after the daughter of the tyrant of Sicyon, and this Agariste, after marrying Xanthippus, gave birth to the great Athenian statesman Pericles.

Two observations, at least, should be made about this colorful episode told by Herodotus. First, even admitting that it contains picturesque embellishments, it provides a vivid glimpse into the brighter side of the luxurious life at a tyrant's court. Second—and far more significant—it emphasizes, more than any other item in all the preserved sources, how dangerously misleading it is to generalize about these tyrants. The usual, and natural, attitude of the historian is to think of them as men who climbed to power by murdering and banishing aristocrats, who consequently were consumed with a passionate hatred for their oppressors. In this brief story of Herodotus, however, young men of noble families from a dozen cities in the Greek world eagerly accepted a tyrant's hospitality and aspired to a marriage relationship with him. The Athenian suitors came from families—the Alcmaeonids and Philaidae—which became increasingly prominent in Athens. In this connection it should be mentioned that one member of the Philaidae bore the

name Cypselus; this man, who was archon in Athens ca. 597 (M&L, no. 6), was almost certainly the grandson of the founder of the Corinthian tyranny. Herodotus expressly says that the distinction of the Alcmaeonids was enhanced throughout Greece by the marriage of Megacles to the daughter of the tyrant of Sicyon.

Herodotus (6.127), when listing the suitors who came to Sicyon at Cleisthenes' invitation, includes the following statement: "And from the Peloponnesus Leocedes, son of Pheidon the tyrant of the Argives, Pheidon who created measures for the Peloponnesians and committed outrages greatest of all Greeks by expelling the Elean managers of the games and himself holding the games at Olympia." Pheidon has been mentioned casually in earlier pages, but this seems an appropriate place in which to state the difficulty of dating this enigmatic man. Although Herodotus in this passage places Pheidon in the early decades of the sixth century, other ancient sources, all later than Herodotus, seem to write of him in the context of the seventh, eighth, or even ninth century. Ephorus, the fourth-century historian whose Universal History was very influential throughout antiquity, to judge from his fragments, depicts Pheidon as a powerful ruler of Argos who warred successfully against Sparta. One important event in this supposed early hostility between Argos and Sparta was the battle at Hysiae in the southwestern Argolid, in which the Argives defeated the invading Spartans in 669 B.C. Of extant ancient authors, Pausanias (2.24.7; 3.7.5), living in the second century A.D., is the only source to mention this battle, but he does not name the Argive leader. It has become rather common among modern historians to assume that Pheidon was the Argive general and that his victory resulted from his innovative use of hoplites in phalanx formation. The introduction of hoplite fighting in the seventh century is a well-established fact, although some scholars feel that the year 669 is too early in the century for such a large-scale encounter. One scholar, however, has argued rather effectively against the generally accepted view that throughout the Dark Age and the archaic period there was bitter enmity between Argos and Sparta. 18 His reasoning, in part, is that in the eighth and seventh centuries Sparta was too much engaged in establishing control over Laconia and Messenia, and in the first half of the sixth century too occupied with fighting Arcadian Tegea, to launch in these years an incursion into the Argolid.

The question of the date and activity of Pheidon is one of the key problems in the history of the archaic period. Because of the scarcity and contradictory nature of the evidence, conclusions have to be based on hypotheses, and it is only too easy for a hypothesis suggested on one page to appear somewhat later as a fact. Here it is sufficient to call attention

to the dilemma that, although most historians place Pheidon somewhere in the seventh century and connect him with the development of hoplite warfare, an argument is also possible for assigning him to the early sixth century, as Herodotus states.

Herodotus (5.67-68) mentions briefly Cleisthenes' hostility to the Argives; his stripping of honors from the Argive hero Adrastus, who had a cult at Sicyon; and his attitude towards the Dorians. Since the cult of Adrastus was popular in Dorian Sicyon, Cleisthenes requested permission from the Delphic oracle to expel it, but was insultingly refused. If this episode happened when Cirrha was dominating Delphi, as is probable, it could have been one of the reasons leading to Cleisthenes' participation in the First Sacred War. In response to Delphi's insult Cleisthenes established in Sicyon, with Theban permission, the cult of Melanippus, the legendary enemy of Adrastus, transferring to him the honors and sacrifices which had belonged to Adrastus. In connection with this friction between Cleisthenes and the Argives, it is interesting to note that the Nemean Games in honor of Zeus were recognized as the fourth Panhellenic festival in 573 under the direction of Cleonae, a town in the northern part of the Argolid. 19 Since Cleonae almost certainly was under the influence of Argos, a logical conclusion is that the reorganization of the Nemean Games was some sort of propaganda move directed against Cleisthenes. It is quite possible that Adrastus, ousted from Sicyon, was awarded appropriate honors in the Nemean Games.

After his remarks on Adrastus, Herodotus states that Cleisthenes, in order that the Sicyonians and Argives should not share in common the names of the three Dorian tribes, Hylleis, Pamphyli, and Dymanes, changed these names in Sicyon to "Pigmen," "Assmen," and "Swinemen," while giving to his own tribe the designation Archelaoi, the rulers. This change of names, which Herodotus says remained in force for sixty years after Cleisthenes' death, was a strange way to achieve Sicyonian solidarity against Argos. Possibly they were nicknames popular among the disgruntled non-Dorians. The story, however it is to be explained, brings to the fore the important, but largely unanswerable, question concerning the relations in the Peloponnesus of the Dorians-whether one accepts the usual Dorian invasion interpretation or the concept of a Dorian uprising—with the rest of the population. Regardless of its truth, the legend of the Return of the Heraclidae had become orthodox by the end of the Dark Age, and an element of the population, whether descendants of the Mycenaeans in general or of the Mycenaean ruling class, was considered non-Dorian. In Sparta, as will be discussed in the following chapter, many of the pre-Dorians were reduced to serfdom, and there are various hints in the scattered sources that in other parts of

enduring for about a hundred years. Herodotus' statement about the continued "use" of the derogatory names of the tribes for sixty years after the death of Cleisthenes, therefore, would remain unexplained.

Tyranny also emerged in the latter half of the seventh century in Megara, another Dorian community, located to the northeast of Corinth in a largely mountainous part of the isthmus. The only attempt in the extant ancient sources to interpret the rise of Theagenes as tyrant in Megara is a passage in Aristotle's Politics (5.4.5). In a discussion of how unscrupulous demagogues can subvert democracies, Aristotle remarks that in early times demagogues, who had military abilities or held military office, often became tyrants by convincing the demos of their hostility to the wealthy. As an example he mentions Theagenes at Megara, who slaughtered the flocks of the rich which he had found grazing beside the river. This story, probably based on a sound, if exaggerated, tradition, is not particularly enlightening as an explanation of basic causes leading to the rise of tyranny. Certainly the concepts of democracy and demagogues in the seventh century are anachronistic. One scholar, realizing that in the fifth century Megara had a considerable woolen industry, argues that the industry had begun earlier and that Theagenes was attempting to obtain a monopoly of it;21 but there would seem to be more effective ways to achieve this aim than to destroy the sheep whose wool provided the basis for the industry. Theagenes apparently was an aristocrat; at least, he married his daughter to an Athenian noble who tried and failed to establish a tyranny in Athens (ca. 632). If he eliminated flocks which had been trampling down the crops on the plots of the peasants, it is quite possible that he became a hero to them and also furnished them with a much-appreciated ration of meat; but the fact that, after the overthrow of the tyranny, the aristocrats still seem to have been in control at Megara suggests that, although Theagenes' melodramatic action may have reflected quarrels and rivalries among the nobles, the tyranny at Megara was not a movement to overthrow the aristocracy.

Whatever may be the correct interpretation for the tyranny of Theagenes, it is evident from scattered sources and especially from the roughly 1,400 lines of elegies ascribed to Theognis of Megara (floruit 550) that Megara was the scene of great social disturbances and changes in the sixth century. Movable wealth was gaining recognition as a result of the earlier colonizing activity, and in the passage quoted earlier in this chapter Theognis laments that the landed aristocrats, for the sake of wealth, were intermarrying with this new, base-born class. In another poem addressed to his friend Cyrnus, Theognis writes (lines 53-58): "Cyrnus, this city is a city still, but lo! her people are other men, who of

old knew neither judgments nor laws, but wore goatskins to pieces about their sides, and had their pasture like deer without this city; and now they be good men, O son of Polypaüs, and they that were high be now of low estate. Who can bear to behold such things?" It would seem that these lines refer to the betterment of the lot of the poor peasants, or possibly even serfs. One would like to know if Theagenes had had anything to do with such social measures. The only evidence is a story contained in the eighteenth of Plutarch's Greek Questions (295D) that some time after the overthrow of Theagenes, the poor managed to push through a measure by which they recovered the interest which they had already paid on their debts. Banishments and confiscations of property were probably common occurrences. Theognis himself experienced this fate, and his poem referring to this, in which he prays that he may be able to drink the black blood of his enemies (lines 341-350), reveals only too starkly the bitterness of the social and political divisions that could exist in the Greek world. In the case of Megara, as far as one can ascertain, a rather widely based oligarchy had control of the state by the end of the sixth century.

ACROSS THE Aegean Sea the Greek cities on the coast of Asia Minor and on the large offshore islands like Lesbos and Samos also had experiences with tyrannies towards the end of the seventh and in the sixth century. The history of Mytilene in Lesbos is especially interesting in this period; one can sense the contemporary passions in the poetic fragments of Alcaeus, who-with his almost contemporary Mytilenean, Sappho-was recognized as the greatest of the early Greek lyric poets. Additional bits of information about the state of affairs in early Mytilene can be found in a few later authors who probably had the whole body of Alcaeus' poetry to draw upon. When the monarchy was overthrown in Mytilene, presumably in the second half of the eighth century, the control of the government came into the power of the royal clan of Penthilids, reputed descendants of Orestes' son Penthilus, who, according to legend, had founded Mytilene at the time of the Aeolian migration. This narrow oligarchy became increasingly corrupt and brutal-Aristotle in a passage of the Politics (5.8.13) tells how they went about beating people with clubs—and was overthrown, and its members largely annihilated, about the middle of the seventh century by outraged nobles.

An aristocracy, consisting of leading noble families, now took control, but before many years had passed a tyrant was in power at Mytilene. This tyranny may have been established as a result of feuds between members of the ruling nobility, although Alcaeus' remark about

possessions making the man suggests that another social class was beginning to acquire influence in the state. This tyrant (Melanchrus) was overthrown by a group of men including Alcaeus' brothers and Pittacus, the man who ultimately solved Mytilene's internal troubles. Before long another tyrant, Myrsilus, arose, and Pittacus, Alcaeus, and other nobles swore a solemn oath to destroy him. For reasons unknown Pittacus switched his allegiance to Myrsilus, thereby earning the hatred and scorn of Alcaeus. Somewhat later the tyrant died and Alcaeus exulted: "Now a man must get drunk, and drink violently, since Myrsilus is dead." The poet's joy was brief, for soon he and his brother had to leave Lesbos in exile; one wonders if they had been suspected of tyrannical aspirations. After a few years, during which the brother served as a mercenary in the Babylonian army, Alcaeus, his brother, and other exiles, well financed by the king of Lydia, tried to accomplish their return to Mytilene by force. The threat was so great that the Mytileneans (the nobles?) elected Pittacus to a special office to meet the emergency, a task which he successfully accomplished (Aristotle, Politics, 3.9.5-6).22

Alcaeus calls Pittacus a tyrant and heaps abuse on him, emphasizing, with typical aristocratic disdain, his low birth. Pittacus, however, was clearly a noble, for no commoner would have been accepted by Alcaeus and his fellow aristocrats as a sworn member of a group to slay the tyrant Myrsilus, as Pittacus had been. Also it is known that Pittacus married a lady from the survivors of the Penthilid clan. Aristotle says that Pittacus was elected aisymnētēs, an office which he defines as an elective form of tyranny; unfortunately the only example he provides for this office is Pittacus himself. When this non-Greek word is found elsewhere used in a political sense, it refers to an annual magistrate in certain of the eastern Greek cities. For all practical purposes apparently Pittacus was a tyrant, but after ten years (590-580) he voluntarily surrendered his powers. In that period, however, his statemanship was distinguished enough to earn him a place as one of the Seven Wise Men. Of his activity in his term of office, unfortunately, very little is known. Rather than establishing a new constitution, he contented himself with enacting special laws, including one aimed at curbing extravagant funeral expenditures. It is clear from Alcaeus' poetry that after the expulsion of the Penthilids a council and assembly (agora) had been part of the governmental machinery in Mytilene. Pittacus certainly made use of these bodies, probably opening membership in them to wider circles. Disgust with the excesses of extreme aristocrats like Alcaeus may have induced the Mytileneans to accept some sort of compromise. An oligarchy-in which, presumably, men possessed of movable wealth took part-became responsible for the management of affairs, and oligarchy remained

Anatolian elements. The original Ionian Ephesians thus preserved the purity of the Ionian tribes, now reduced to chiliastyes, within the new tribe—Ephesians—but since the other four new tribes seemingly were made up of Greeks who had come to Ephesus from diverse places and of Anatolians, it is clear that the older Ionian element was no longer the dominant part of the population. Although on present evidence it cannot be proved, it is quite possible that the tyrants had been supported by natives and by Greeks who had not been accepted as citizens of Ephesus, and that this new five-tribe system was the way in which the tyrants rewarded their followers by making them full citizens of the city.

In this connection it is interesting to observe that the first temple to Artemis in Ephesus was built about 600. Ephesian Artemis was largely an oriental mother-goddess with whom the Greek Artemis was identified. Her acceptance as the patron goddess of Ephesus at this time emphasizes, as does the new tribal organization, the great increase of oriental elements and influences in the originally entirely Greek city of Ephesus. Herodotus (1.147) states that the Ephesians did not celebrate the purely Ionian festival Apaturia; it may very well have been at this time that the celebration of the festival was abandoned.

The most famous of the tyrannies among the eastern Greeks was that of Polycrates in the large island of Samos,24 which lies close to the Asia Minor coast, about equidistant from Ephesus and Miletus. Samos, like many other Greek states, had shared in the colonizing activity of the seventh century. It was a Samian merchant who in the second half of that century opened up the profitable metal trade with Tartessus in southern Spain, and the Samians participated in the colonizing of Naucratis in Egypt. Subsequently they were active in the northeast, founding Perinthus on the north shore of the Propontis. It seems safe to assume that colonization and its stimulus of trade and industry, with the attendant increase in the importance of movable wealth, created social and political problems in Samos as in so many other parts of the Greek world. The first evidence of trouble is preserved in Plutarch's Greek Questions, 57 (Moralia, 303E-304C), where one reads that the landowners (geomoros) took control of the state after the murder of Demoteles and the putting down of his monarchy. Since nothing more is known of this Demoteles, it is generally assumed that he had succeeded in establishing some sort of tyranny. Plutarch then says that when the Megarians sent an expedition against Perinthus, the landowners dispatched nine generals with a fleet to aid their colonists. Since Perinthus was founded about the year 600, it is reasonable to date this episode to a period when the colony was still in a formative stage. After achieving their purpose, the generals returned to Samos and with the help of their Megarian prison-

ers proceeded to massacre most of the landowners, who had assembled in the council chamber. What type of government was established after the overthrow of the "oligarchy" of the landowners is not stated, but this confused account reveals that Samos was experiencing social and political troubles in this period. The literary sources supply no further information about Samos until the emergence of Polycrates as tyrant, which is dated by the chronographers to 532/1. Herodotus (3.39) states that Polycrates, on seizing power, at first shared his authority with his two brothers, but subsequently killed one of them and banished the other. The report (3.120) that he gained ascendancy with the backing of only fifteen hoplites suggests that the path to power may have been somewhat prepared for him, possibly by his father.

Of the many stories about Polycrates preserved in the ancient authors, the majority emphasize his naval power and his unfailing success—until his final reversal. Herodotus (3.122) speaks of his great fleet and his many victories, and adds that he was the first Greek, unless one counts Minos of Cnossos, who planned to become master of the sea. Polycrates undoubtedly increased Samian naval power greatly, but it is probable that the beginning of this dominance went back to the crushing of Phocaea by the Persian conquest of ca. 545. Since from that time the Persians had control over all the Greek cities of Asia Minor, it has been suggested that Polycrates owed his reputation and influence among the islanders, and possibly even in Greece proper, to his role as leader of the resistance against any further Persian advance westward. His alliance with Amasis, king of Egypt, can be interpreted as a defensive move against Persian aggression.

This alliance gave rise to one of Herodotus' famous stories (3.40-43). Amasis, fearing that the unbroken success of his friend would arouse the jealousy of the gods, wrote to him suggesting that, in order to avert divine anger, he throw away the object he treasured most highly. Polycrates, believing that the advice was sound, put out to sea in a penteconter and cast overboard a beautiful and artistic seal ring. A few days later a fisherman who had caught an unusually fine fish brought it as a gift to the tyrant, and when the fish was opened, the ring was found in its stomach. Polycrates immediately wrote to Amasis about this almost miraculous happening. After hearing the story, the Egyptian king, convinced that the tyrant was a marked man in divine eyes, broke off the alliance. Whatever one's attitude to this folktale may be, it is clear that Herodotus confused the ending, for Amasis, who was being threatened with a Persian attack, was in no position to cast off a powerful naval ally. Subsequent events make it certain that it was Polycrates who renounced the alliance and joined forces with the Persians; at least he sent a con-

therefore, that one cannot explain the basis of the power of this man living so late in the archaic period unless somehow, despite the inexplicable vagaries of his career, he was able to capitalize on the very real danger of Persian aggression, as presumably Thrasybulus had done in the case of the Lydian threat.

Polycrates is the last of the seventh- and sixth-century tyrants that need be mentioned in this chapter, for the Pisistratids of Athens will be treated subsequently in the discussion of early Athens, and the tyrants established by the Persians in the Greek cities of Asia Minor owed their position to their Persian masters and not to the internal conditions of the cities.

THE AGE IN which these tyrants appeared—the seventh and sixth centuries-was clearly one of great social, economic, and political upheaval. Since most of the tyrannies arose in cities like Corinth, Sicyon, Megara, Miletus, and Samos, in which trade and manufacturing were on the increase, it is reasonable to conclude that the tyrants received support from the traders and artisans, who, as men wealthy in movables rather than in land and as potential hoplites, resented the exclusive control of the state held by the landed aristocracy. The tyrants themselves were not proletarians and should not be thought of as leaders of a proletarian revolution. They were usually ambitious nobles who probably had been feuding with other nobles, although some may have belonged to a lower social class. This is not to say that they may not have been supported by the "masses," whom they ultimately helped; it is merely a warning against viewing these tyrants as farseeing, idealistic social revolutionaries. Their rise to power was often, if not always, helped by their military prowess, presumably as leaders of the emerging hoplites. At the time of their seizing of power the tyrants probably were holding some influential office from which they refused to resign, and the actual coup apparently consisted of gaining control of the citadel, which was achieved with the support of their followers and possibly, at times, with the assistance of some mercenary troops.

Certainly once they had occupied the citadels, the tyrants must have worked fast against their enemies. Many nobles were murdered; others were driven out or fled into exile. How widespread this assault on the nobles was is unknown. The information concerning the Pisistratids at Athens and the evidence for good relations between tyrants and noble families of other cities are warnings against assuming any complete liquidation of the aristocracy. Some, or possibly many, aristocratic estates, however, were confiscated and divided among the tyrants' partisans. Although it is natural to assume that this land was assigned to the

"masses" and to struggling peasants, there is no specific statement to this effect; hence it is quite possible that some—if not all—of this land was given to the non-landowning followers of the tyrants, thus enabling these men possessing only movable wealth to acquire landed wealth also.

The tyrants apparently did not produce any substantial change in the constitutional machinery of the various cities. The chief change lay in their own persons, for which there was no place in existing constitutions. It is not known what office, if any, a tyrant held. Some may have continued, unconstitutionally, in the office they held when they staged the coup. Orthagoras and Cypselus, for example, may have continued to be polemarchs. In general, however, their power was personal and was based on their successful leadership of the "middle class" and also of the downtrodden lower classes against the aristocratic monopoly of the state. The express statement that Cypselus had no bodyguard suggests that some tyrants, at least, had enough popular support not to have to rely on military force. The chief changes they effected in the governments probably consisted in a change of personnel. They undoubtedly saw to it that their followers held the important offices and became members of the council. The fact that these followers were largely members of the new business class-men of ability and experience-helps to explain why the tyrannies, in their early stages at least, seem to have been efficient.

The tyrants were men of great energy, and many activities can be credited to them. The Cypselids eased many social and economic problems by undertaking extensive colonization. All the tyrants, apparently, were great builders. In the various cities temples arose and harbors were improved; more efficient methods were provided for the water supply; streets were paved; and drainage systems were established. In fact, a real development towards urbanization occurred under the tyrants. They were also interested in cultural matters, as is revealed by their establishing, or reorganizing, festivals for various gods, and by trying to attract to their courts the most famous artists, architects, and poets of the time. One could continue to list many accomplishments of this kind, but such an enumeration is likely to sound like a eulogy of the tyrants. Granted that they did achieve much for their cities and certainly were responsible for economic life becoming more diversified, one would still like to have answers to questions such as the following: How many of these projects were financed by confiscations resulting from brutal murders and exiles? Under what labor conditions were some of the great building undertakings carried out, especially the digging of the aqueduct tunnel through a mountain for Polycrates of Samos? Unfortunately there are no certain

which little is known, was in the form of spits (obeloi), six of which constituted a handful (drachma). A tradition arose, reported in part by Strabo (8.3.33) drawing on Ephorus, that Pheidon of Argos had dedicated some of these spits to Hera after he had invented measures, weights, and coinage struck from silver, a tradition recorded by the Parian Chronicle under the year 895. For reasons that will be given below, it is now certain that Pheidon did not invent coinage. The attribution to him may have grown out of the probably erroneous belief that he established a system of weights in addition to one of measures. Since the various weight denominations (obols, drachmas, minas, talents, and so on) subsequently were used in many places also to designate coins or sums of money, the association of Pheidon's name with the introduction of coinage followed easily.

There is little doubt that Xenophanes (in Pollux, 9.83) and Herodotus (1.94) were correct in assigning the first striking of gold and silver coins to the Lydians, but it may be appropriate to give some credit to the Ionian Greeks also. The fully developed coin, as distinct from its prototypes, can be defined as a piece of metal of definite weight and shape which has been stamped with a particular mark by its issuer, whether public or private, as a guarantee of its weight and purity. The earliest and best evidence for such coins and their immediate forerunners comes from Ephesus. The foundations of the first temple of Artemis there were laid about 600 B.C. When the building was started, many objects of value were dedicated to the goddess, thus forming a "foundation deposit" below the base of the temple. Many of these articles can be dated by archaeologists to the last third of the seventh century, and among them are about a hundred coins and proto-coins, mostly of electrum, a natural alloy of gold and silver. The words of a distinguished numismatist are worth quoting in reference to these coins: "As one passes from the mere dump, through the punched dump, the punched and striated dump, the punched and striated dump with a type cut into it, to the normal coin, all lying in nearly contemporary deposits, little if at all affected in appearance or weight by wear, one has the feeling of assisting at the very birth of coinage. If the deposits may be dated about 600 B.C., then this great event can hardly have taken place much more than a generation earlier."28

The findings of archaeology have not provided similar evidence from other Ionian cities, but it is reasonable to assume that coinage made its appearance in them at roughly the same time as in Ephesus—that is, sometime in the last quarter of the seventh century. The invention was adopted, with silver as the metal, slightly later in Aegina and some of the islands, about 590. In Corinth, the first coinage probably

should be assigned to about 575, whereas the first Athenian coinage seems to date from around 560. Thereafter its adoption passed throughout the Greek world. It produced many changes in social and economic life, for money could be put to work to produce more money in ways that were impossible for the older forms of movable wealth. Important as money economy became, however, it did not oust natural economy, which persisted in many backward parts of Greece and also continued in various forms even in the more progressive cities.

It used to be argued that the purpose of the invention and adoption of coinage was the desire to facilitate trade. Scholars have recently shown that the denominations of early coins refute this assumption.²⁹ The commonest type of the electrum coins found in the foundation deposit at Ephesus weighs slightly more than the early Athenian silver drachma. Since until the time of Alexander the Great electrum was estimated to be ten times more valuable than silver, the intrinsic worth of these Ephesian coins can be understood if one remembers that in fifthcentury Athens a drachma was normal pay for a day's work. The early Greek coins were of denominations of two, four, or more drachmas. Such coins, almost like bullion, were useless for daily trading activities. The coins found at Ephesus, presumably guaranteed by the king of Lydia, could have been used for purposes like the payment of mercenaries. In the Greek world, since political and economic life was becoming more complicated as the cities developed, the high-denomination coins may have been struck, and guaranteed for weight and purity, by the city governments for the more accurate control of their expenditures on matters such as public works and distribution of surpluses among the citizens and of their income from harbor dues, taxes, fines, punishments, and the like. It was only late in the fifth century that fractional coins of small denominations, which could be used for everyday business, were minted; but until then, and even afterwards, barter remained common.

ogists, over fifty sites in Laconia were occupied in the thirteenth century, most of which suffered devastation in the general catastrophe which struck Mycenaean civilization around 1200 B.C. Menelaus, Agamemnon's brother, had his capital at Lacedaemon, which may have been near the subsequent Therapnai on the east bank where in historical times the Menalaion was located, or on the west bank at Amyclae some four or five miles south of the future Sparta. From Homer's description it is clear that Menelaus' kingdom comprised a considerable part of Laconia. The lovely golden cups found in the tholos tomb near modern Vaphio, close to the ruins of Amyclae, are striking evidence that this general area belonged in the Mycenaean cultural world.

As has been mentioned in preceding chapters, the reasons for the collapse of Mycenaean civilization are still a subject of scholarly discussion. Whether the responsibility should be attributed largely to a Dorian migration or to an uprising of Mycenaean "Dorians," there is no certain archaeological evidence for Dorian presence in the Argolid and Laconia until the closing years of the eleventh century. In the course of the following century four adjacent villages slowly developed on the west bank of the Eurotas, and from the union of these villages, probably late in the ninth century, historic Sparta began to evolve. The origin of the name is disputed; scholarly opinion is now inclined to explain it as derived from the prevalent plant spartos (Spanish broom) rather than from sparte, meaning, presumably, the sown land. Although the word "Sparta" was employed widely in literature, the Spartans themselves used the term "Lacedaemon" as the official name of their city and the territory it controlled. In all treaties and other similar documents which have been preserved, the Spartans were always referred to officially as Lacedaemonians.

The Spartan attempt to control Laconia was a slow and difficult process. This is illustrated by the fact that the Mycenaean town of Amyclae, some four or five miles south of Sparta, was not conquered until sometime in the first half of the eighth century. Amyclae must have come to satisfactory terms with Sparta, for it was not destroyed but was incorporated as a fifth village into the growing town of Sparta. The fall of Amyclae apparently weakened the resistance of the remaining Mycenaeans, and within a generation the Spartans had forced their way southward to the sea.

It is impossible to give a satisfactory account of the expansion of Spartan control in the eighth and seventh centuries, first over Laconia and then over Messenia. With rare exceptions the only information available consists of the inferences one can draw from archaeological findings and from the many legends included in the third and fourth

books of Pausanias devoted to those two regions respectively. Since this expansion was completed by the end of the seventh century, the historian must work backwards from the comparatively known to the largely unknown in an effort, with the help of the fragments of Tyrtaeus, to identify those events which paved the way for creating the Sparta of the sixth and subsequent centuries.²

By about 750 Sparta had become master of all Laconia. This expansion was directed against the remnants of the Mycenaeans and also against Dorians who had settled in various communities throughout Laconia at more or less the same time that the town of Sparta was taking shape. The Dorian settlements, presumably, were not destroyed but became politically subordinate to Sparta. As perioeci—communities lying on the periphery—they retained a large amount of local autonomy but, at least in later times, owed military service to the Spartans. The Mycenaean survivors for the most part were reduced to a form of serfdom. Their land apparently was divided among the Spartan nobles, who, as absentee landowners, enjoyed a certain proportion of the revenues from the land to which the "serfs" were bound. This was the beginning of the helot system, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

In the second half of the eighth century the Spartans began the conquest of Messenia to the west, an undertaking which was to be decisive for their subsequent history. Since this was the time when the great colonizing movement, caused chiefly by land hunger, started in the Greek world, one can assume that the Spartans, beyond their lust for conquest, also felt that their growing population needed more arable land than the already appropriated fertile Eurotas valley. Messenia had been part of the Mycenaean world, as the excavations at Pylos on the west coast and the discovery of various tholos tombs have revealed. Readers of the Odyssey will remember that Telemachus and Nestor's son, Pisistratus, in their chariot journey from Pylos to Lacedaemon lodged for the night at Pherae. With the collapse of Mycenaean civilization towards the end of the thirteenth century, Messenia also entered a dark age. In the confused centuries that followed one can imagine the presence of various small communities—some Dorian, some Mycenaean, some mixed. From the end of the eleventh century there is evidence for settlements characterized by protogeometric pottery in the area of the Messenian Gulf.

The information available on the Spartan conquest of Messenia is very limited.³ The closest approach to a contemporary source is the poetry, preserved in a few fragments, of the Spartan Tyrtaeus, who lived at the time of the "Second Messenian War," some two or three generations after the initial conflict. There is also a mass of legendary data preserved

especially in the fourth book of Pausanias. To understand the nature of these legends, one should remember that Messenia, after subjection to Sparta for some three and a half centuries, regained its freedom in 369. This remarkable reversal of fortune naturally stimulated the curiosity of the Messenians, and other Greeks in general, to inquire into the history of this long-suppressed people. Little material, however, was available for this investigation, beyond the oral traditions passed down from generation to generation. Pausanias (chapter 6) states that he drew most of the data for his account of the Messenian wars from two third-century authors-Myron of Priene and Rhianus of Cretan Bene, the former writing in prose about part of the First Messenian War and the latter, in poetry, about aspects of the Second War. Rhianus was an Alexandrian scholar and poet who in his epic, Messeniaca, composed a work centering around the exploits of a hero, Aristomenes, as the Iliad was centered around Achilles. The epic is no longer extant, but if Pausanias drew chiefly from it and from the little-known Myron, the questionable authenticity of his "History of Messenia" hardly needs exposition.

On the basis of sources of this sort, it seems probable that even before the "official" First Messenian War the Spartans had crossed the Taygetus range and acquired some influence in the area of the Nedon River (Dentheliatis) and on the eastern and northern coast of the Messenian Gulf, possibly by imposing perioecic status on certain conquered settlements. The "official" war can safely be dated to the last half of the eighth century, for Tyrtaeus speaks of the Spartan king Theopompus as the leader. It also seems significant that in the preserved records of Olympic victors, questionable as they are for the early period, seven Messenians are listed in the period 776-736 but none thereafter until the fourth century, with one exception, ca. 684, which can be taken as evidence that Sparta enslaved only part of Messenia in the first war. After long fighting the Spartans gained control of the plain through which the Pamisus River flows when the Messenians, according to Tyrtaeus, in the twentieth year fled from their fortress on Mt. Ithome. Those who were unable to escape to other parts of the Peloponnesus were reduced to the status of helots, "galled with great burdens like asses, bringing to their lords under grievous necessity a half of all the fruit of the soil" (fragment 6). Along the shores of the Messenian Gulf, Sparta organized more perioecic communities, presumably among those Messenians who were chiefly Dorian.

It is probable that the Spartan nobles, who were responsible for victory in the First Messenian War, alone received allotments of land in the newly conquered territory. The discontent felt by other segments of the Spartans at this exclusion from the fruits of victory was revealed by

senian Gulf, and the Nauplians were settled at Methone on the southwest coast of Messenia.5

By the end of the seventh century Sparta, in control of Laconia and Messenia, had attained almost its maximum territorial expansion. Thereafter, extension of its political influence was usually achieved by a system of alliances.

MPORTANT AS Sparta was in the political and military history of Greece, however, it was its institutions—constitutional, social, and economic, the so-called Lycurgan constitution—which made it unique in the Greek world and were responsible for the influence and fascination which Sparta has exercised from ancient times down to the present.

The sources for the development and the character of the Lycurgan constitution, as for the expansion of Spartan control over Laconia and Messenia in the eighth and seventh centuries, are limited and unsatisfactory. In addition to the archaeological evidence and the confusing and often contradictory legends preserved in late authors like Pausanias, the fragments of poets who lived and worked in Sparta in the seventh century-Tyrtaeus, the Lydian Alcman, and the Lesbian Terpanderare helpful, but pathetically few. Then for almost two full centuries no author who wrote about Sparta has been preserved. In the latter half of the fifth century Herodotus and Thucydides had much to say about the Spartans in their histories, but both were chiefly concerned with foreign relations, Herodotus concentrating on the period of the Persian Wars and the preceding generation or two, Thucydides on the Peloponnesian War. In the fourth century Xenophon wrote extensively on Sparta and the Spartans, but, like Thucydides, he was dealing primarily with contemporary events. Ephorus, existing now only in fragments, had great influence on subsequent writers and seems to have emphasized the themes of early Argive imperialism and of the continual hostility between Argos and Sparta. In the same century both Plato and Aristotle discussed Sparta at some length in their writings on political philosophy, Aristotle rather critically, but Plato usually very favorably. In fact, an early stage of the idealized picture of Sparta-what can be called the myth of Sparta-can be traced to some of the doctrinaire statements and conclusions of Plato.

In this summary it is unnecessary to list the numerous Hellenistic writers (Rhianus of Crete was mentioned above) who wrote about Sparta, since most of their works are not extant. It will be sufficient to call attention to Plutarch (ca. 46-120 A.D.) and Pausanias, whose floruit is placed about the middle of the second century A.D. Pausanias in book 3 provides much valuable information on the physical aspects of Sparta

kingship as a weakening of the royal power at Sparta at just about the same time that elsewhere in Greece monarchy was yielding to aristocracy. It is true that the Eurypontids were the younger house and that the names of certain early representatives, even if subsequently inserted--Prytanis (roughly, "president") and Eunomos ("good law")-suggest an interest in civil government. The Eurypontids, thus, are considered as leaders of the aristocracy and the damos (Doric for demos), presumably landowners who could serve as fighting men, in an effort to restrict the arbitrary power of the Agiad kings. They achieved their purpose not by abolishing the kingship but by effecting a compromise whereby the Agiad king should always have a Eurypontid colleague. Granted that the early Eurypontid names Prytanis and Eunomos are suggestive, it is hard to believe that the aristocrats in their struggle against kingly power would have promoted a dual kingship, whose consequences might not have been a weakening of arbitrary power. One wonders also at the "altruism" of the aristocrats in agreeing to promote one of their number to a more exalted position.

In view of the almost total lack of information on the early development of Sparta, it is probably best to assume a dual kingship from an early period. The Eurypontids, however, may have had some responsibility for obtaining what one scholar has called the religious sanction for the new "republic." This sanction was secured in the form of an oracle from Apollo at Delphi; presumably the situation had previously been explained to the priests. Plutarch (Lycurgus, 6) quotes what purports to be the wording of the oracle, called a rhetra. The term rhetra here probably signifies an oracle which was enacted by the assembly. Plutarch writes that the rhetra was delivered to Lycurgus himself. This raises the probably unanswerable question of whether there ever was a real Lycurgus and, if so, when he lived. Regardless of one's attitude to this question, there seems to be no sound reason to doubt that Plutrach has preserved an ancient document, one that could be called the charter of "republican" government at Sparta. Needless to say, there has been endless argument on the significance and validity of this document. Those scholars who wish to date Lycurgus before the middle of the eighth century have to assume that the rhetra was preserved orally until the knowledge of writing became available. Even so, they are faced with the problem of when Delphi became sufficiently influential to issue such pronouncements. Those who date Lycurgus in the eighth or seventh century must deal with the tradition that Lycurgus forbade "laws" to be written down.

The text of the rhetra, as preserved by Plutarch, is corrupt at the end, and the wording, with its participles and infinitives, is so com-

pressed that it is impossible to be sure what subject or subjects should be understood. The gist of the document, if one avoids certain technicalities, is the following: "Having erected a temple of Zeus Syllanios (Hellanios?) and Athena Syllania, having arranged(?) tribes and obai, having established thirty men, including the kings, as Gerousia, hold assemblies from season to season, then both introduce proposals and make final decisions(?)"—and then the corrupted line which probably means something like "and the power to belong to the damos."

This brief document, paraphrased here because of the difficulty of providing a generally acceptable translation, illustrates the nature of the material with which the historian of early Sparta must work. At this point it will be sufficient to say that the tribes presumably are the three Dorian tribes, while the obai refer to territorial tribes or regions of the town of Sparta, which will be discussed later; that the dual kingship is recognized; and that a Gerousia with a fixed membership was formed from the previous Council of Elders. Probably the kings and the Gerousia were responsible for introducing proposals, and the right of ratification lay with the damos. According to Plutarch, when the damos subsequently began to change and amend the proposals placed before it rather than merely ratifying them, the kings Theopompus (victor in the First Messenian War and surviving well into the seventh century) and Polydorus (ruling until after 669) inserted into the rhetra the words "if the damos should give its decision incorrectly, then the Elders and the kings shall make the final decision(?)." Tyrtaeus (fragment 4), writing at the time of the Second Messenian War, apparently included this amendment in the original rhetra as a device to control the damos if it should act otherwise than anticipated.

Whatever explanation one prefers for the origin of the dual kingship at Sparta, it is certain that the institution persisted for the long period from at least sometime in the eighth century until the closing years of the third. The nature of the kingship was similar to that depicted in Homer, but its powers were limited by its dual character and also by the constantly increasing importance of two other organs of the Spartan government—the board of five ephors and the Gerousia. Like Homeric kings, the kings of Sparta were leaders in war, and as was appropriate for men whose ultimate origin supposedly was divine, they had the priestly duties of acting as intermediaries between gods and men. In the field their powers were almost unlimited, although it is not clear how the two rulers shared the command. Towards the end of the sixth century a quarrel broke out between the two kings on campaign, and thereafter it was stipulated that only one king should be dispatched on a military expedition (Herodotus, 5.75).

the course of time, they so greatly curtailed. Some scholars believe that the ephors were originally priests who, even after they became secular magistrates, retained one of their earlier religious functions—that of watching the heavens. This theory is possible, although it would be surprising to find a priestly caste which was willing to abandon most of its religious attributes and prerogatives. The ancient sources most commonly assign the establishment of this magistracy to Lycurgus (although it is noteworthy that it was not mentioned in the rhetra) or to Theopompus, the king during the First Messenian War. The fact that the Spartans had ephor lists supposedly going back to what would be 754/3 (the traditional date for the founding of Rome) might favor the attribution to Lycurgus, while the explanation given by Plutarch (Cleomenes, 10) that the kings, because of their long absences in the Messenian War, appointed deputies at home seems to point to Theopompus. One major difficulty stands in the way of accepting either of these suggestions. When information about the ephors becomes available they are always five in number, representing apparently the five territorial tribes (obai) into which Sparta was divided, each tribe being identified with one of the five component villages of Sparta. From a fragment of Tyrtaeus, however, it is clear that in the time of the Second Messenian War the Spartans were still organized according to the three old Dorian tribes. Organization of the Spartans by the five territorial tribes probably belongs to the end of the seventh century. The answer to this chronological dilemma may be that originally there were not five ephors-possibly only three to correspond to the three Dorian tribes-and that subsequently the number was increased to five. In any case, so far as the evidence goes, it was from the end of the seventh century that the board of ephors became an increasingly important part of the Spartan government.

The ephors were elected by and from the full body of Spartan citizens for the term of a year and apparently could not be reelected to office. As the supposed representatives of the Spartan people, they soon became the chief administrative officials of the state; the president of the board was the eponymous magistrate—that is, the man who gave his name to the year. Their power over the kings has already been mentioned—the monthly exaction of an oath, the watching of the heavens every ninth year for signs of divine displeasure with the kings, and the presence of two ephors with the king on a military campaign. The ephors were responsible for mobilizing the army and deciding what contingents should be called up. They received foreign ambassadors and, when necessary, introduced them to the assembly. They apparently alone had the right to convene meetings of the Gerousia and assembly,

and they may have been the only ones authorized to introduce measures before these bodies. Their power over the lesser magistrates was almost unlimited. In the judicial field they heard the majority of civil cases, and in conjunction with the Gerousia they formed a court for all criminal matters. They seemingly had general supervision over the education of the young; as will be seen below, this education was the basic factor in the formation of the Spartan way of life. In fact, there were very few aspects of life in Sparta over which the ephors did not exercise some control.⁹

Many writers on Sparta, both ancient and modern, have claimed that the ephors, because they were elected from all the Spartan citizens, provided the democratic aspect of the Spartan constitution. This may have been true when they first became important magistrates at the close of the seventh century, but if so the situation soon changed, as it ultimately did with the tribunes at Rome. In this connection Plutarch (Lycurgus, 29.6) has an interesting statement which deserves to be quoted: "For the institution of the ephors did not weaken but rather strengthened the civil polity (politeia), and though it was thought to have been done in the interests of the people (demos), it really made the aristocracy more powerful." This rather startling judgment should be considered in conjunction with Aristotle's criticism (Politics, 2.6.14) that, since the ephors were chosen from the people in general, poor men were often elected to office who, because of their poverty, were particularly susceptible to bribery. Plutarch's mention of an aristocracy and Aristotle's reference to bribery (and surely the bribes were not always given by foreigners, as in the example adduced by Aristotle) furnish a good transition to a consideration of another important organ of the Spartan constitution-the Gerousia.

The Gerousia was a senate of thirty members, including the two kings who attended meetings ex officio. No satisfactory explanation has ever been found for the setting of the regular membership at twenty-eight. Plutarch (Lycurgus, 5-6) states that Lycurgus was responsible for the establishment of the Gerousia and that it was confirmed by the rhetra which Apollo of Delphi gave to the lawgiver. Plutarch is certainly wrong in attributing to Lycurgus the creation of an entirely new institution, for the early Spartan kings must have had some sort of Council of Elders similar to those which existed in all other early Greek states. It is quite likely, however, that at a particular time the membership and powers of the Gerousia may have been defined, and, as suggested above, that time may have been the occasion of the rhetra, which possibly should be considered the charter of "republican" government at Sparta.

The Gerousia had great powers in the state. No measure could be

brought before the assembly until the senators had deliberated on the issues involved. This meant that the important right of initiative lay with them, although it was apparently exercised through the ephors. Criminal jurisdiction also lay within their province, but this was shared in some way, not well understood, with the ephors. The reasons for the great influence and prestige of the Gerousia are plain. No man was eligible for membership in the body until he had completed his sixtieth year and thus was no longer liable to military service. Election to the Gerousia was considered a reward for excellence—the highest honor that could befall a Spartan citizen. Once in the Gerousia, a man remained a member for the rest of his life and, so far as the evidence goes, he could not be held responsible for his words or deeds. Any permanent body of distinguished men in a governmental post can hardly fail to exercise great influence, and at Sparta, because of the age requirement, the influence naturally was conservative, if not reactionary. Aristotle's criticism of the Gerousia in the Politics (2.6.17) was very apt: "The mind, as well as the body, is subject to old age"; but the Spartans, needless to say, were more inclined to follow tradition than to heed the remarks of a philosopher.

The method of election to the Gerousia, which Aristotle called childish and Plutarch idealized, also was significant. Plutarch (Lycurgus, 26) describes the procedure in these words:

An assembly of the people having been convened, chosen men were shut up in a room near by so that they could neither see nor be seen, but only hear the shouts of the assembly. For as in other matters, so here, the cries of the assembly decided between the competitors. These did not appear in a body, but each one was introduced separately, as the lot fell, and passed silently through the assembly. Then the secluded judges, who had writing tablets with them, recorded in each case the loudness of the shouting, not knowing for whom it was given, but only that he was introduced first, second, or third, and so on. Whoever was greeted with the most and loudest shouting, him they declared elected.

One need not be overly skeptical to suspect that such an electoral method easily lent itself to manipulation in favor of a special group or clique. What group?

Many scholars, apparently influenced by the myth of the equality of all Spartans, deny that there was any privileged group of Spartans and maintain that any Spartan who had passed his sixtieth year could stand for election to the Gerousia. There are various passages in the ancient sources, however, which clearly suggest that an inner clique or aristocracy did exist within the Spartan citizen body. Aristotle in the *Politics* (4.7.5) writes: "A second ground for describing Sparta as a democracy is

the right of the people to elect to one of the two great institutions, the Senate, and to be eligible themselves for the other, the Ephorate" (Barker translation). This sentence certainly states clearly that the people could elect some people to the Gerousia, but not themselves. Again in the *Politics* (2.6.15), Aristotle, commenting on the need for all elements in a state to be satisfied with the constitution if it is to survive, remarks that this condition exists in Sparta, because the kings are content with the honors paid to their persons, the *kaloi kagathoi* (upper classes, gentlemen, aristocrats) with the Gerousia, for this office is the prize of excellence, and the people (demos) with the ephorate for which all are eligible.

In this connection one should remember the numerous references to rich Spartans which can be found in the pages of authors such as Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Aristotle, and Plutarch. All this talk about wealth and aristocracy is at complete variance with the notion of the equality of all the Spartans-a conception fostered by the myth of Sparta. It seems certain, therefore, that there existed in the Spartan state an aristocracy, an oligarchic group, or an inner clique-or whatever name one chooses to use. The origin and nature of this group will be treated below in the discussion of social and economic conditions; at this point it is sufficient to recognize its existence. It is probable that these wealthy members of the Gerousia were the ones responsible for the frequent bribery of the ephors to which Aristotle refers, and thus caused the ephorate to strengthen the aristocracy, as Plutarch states. These nobles, by controlling the Gerousia and exercising influence over the ephors and other magistrates, were the real power in the Spartan state; Demosthenes (20.107) commented in 355 that on election to the Gerousia a man becomes absolute master of the many. The nobles kept a jealous watch on the kings, who were their most dangerous potential rivals. Certain ambitious kings, like Cleomenes I and Pausanias in the early fifth century, irked at the supremacy of this oligarchic clique, tried to turn for support to the ordinary Spartans and even to the helots. As will be seen in subsequent chapters, they met a sorry end. Only in the third century was the corrupt power of these oligarchs temporarily broken. King Agis lost his life in the attempt. Cleomenes III succeeded briefly, and after him Nabis. The oligarchs had their ultimate revenge, however, for, thanks to them, Nabis was depicted in the pages of Polybius and Livy as a sadistic tyrant.

As in every Greek city, the Spartan government included an assembly of the full citizens—in this case of all who had reached their thirtieth year. Since there is no certain evidence that this body was called Apella, it will be better to use the more general term ecclesia. The ecclesia met

apparently once a month, most likely on the occasion of the full moon (scholiast to Thucydides, 1.67). The ephors succeeded the kings as presiding officers. The ecclesia had electoral powers, electing the members of the Gerousia, the ephors, and various other magistrates, and, as a legislative body, had the responsibility of passing on measures proposed to it. Evidence is very scanty, but it seems that the introduction of business was the prerogative of the ephors and that debate may have been restricted to the members of the Gerousia, the ephors, and the kings. According to the "amended" rhetra of "Lycurgus" mentioned above, if the assembly decided incorrectly, the Gerousia and the kings (and certainly later, the ephors) could ignore the vote and make the final decision themselves. Unfortunately, beyond the wording of the amendment to the rhetra, in which the proper meaning of the verb, here translated as "make the final decision," is uncertain, no information is available which shows the assembly trying to act independently. One derives the impression, however, that it did not play a role comparable to the assemblies in democratic Greek states.

Despite certain peculiarities, the Spartan government in general was similar to that of many other Greek states. The uniqueness of Sparta lay in its way of life. Since the whole social, economic, and educational system was, in the last analysis, associated with the manner of land tenure, it will be necessary to examine this baffling and possibly unanswerable problem at some length.

HE FULLEST account of the Spartan land system is contained in Plutarch's Life of Lycurgus, especially in chapter 8, which is quoted here in its entirety because it is easier to discuss the problems involved by starting from a definite text.

A second, and a very bold political measure of Lycurgus, is his redistribution of the land. For there was a dreadful inequality in this regard, the city was heavily burdened with indigent and helpless people, and wealth was wholly concentrated in the hands of a few. Determined, therefore, to banish insolence and envy and crime and luxury, and those yet more deep-seated and afflictive diseases of the state, poverty and wealth, he persuaded his fellow-citizens to make one parcel of all their territory and divide it up anew, and to live with one another on a basis of entire uniformity and equality in the means of subsistence, seeking preeminence through virtue alone, assured that there was no other difference or inequality between man and man than that which was established by blame for base actions and praise for good ones.

Suiting the deed to the word, he distributed the rest of the

Laconian land among the perioeci, or free provincials, in thirty thousand lots, and that which belonged to the city of Sparta, in nine thousand lots, to as many genuine Spartans. But some say that Lycurgus distributed only six thousand lots among the Spartans and that three thousand were afterwards added by Polydorus; others still, that Polydorus added half of the nine thousand to the half distributed by Lycurgus. The lot of each was large enough to produce annually seventy bushels of barley for a man and twelve for his wife, with a proportionate amount of wine and oil. Lycurgus thought that a lot of this size would be sufficient for them, since they needed sustenance enough to promote vigor and health of body, and nothing else. And it is said that on returning from a journey some time afterwards, as he traversed the land just after the harvest, and saw the heaps of grain standing parallel and equal to one another, he smiled, and said to them that were by: "All Laconia looks like a family estate newly divided among many brothers."

This is a pretty passage, but the more one looks at it, the more one realizes that it represents the idealized picture of Sparta, the myth, rather than the reality. In writing it Plutarch was clearly influenced by the career of Agis, the third-century reforming Spartan king, who was aiming at the restoration of the "Lycurgan" system. In the Life of Agis (8) Plutarch says that Agis was planning to divide Laconia into 4,500 lots for the Spartans and 15,000 for the perioeci. These numbers are exactly half of those listed in the Lycurgus, the explanation being that in the time of Agis Sparta no longer controlled Messenia. 10 Plutarch, therefore, subconsciously at least, was thinking of a Lycurgan redistribution of land in both Laconia and Messenia despite the fact that in his Life of Lycurgus he dates Lycurgus to a period several generations before the conquest of Messenia. Other authors, like Isocrates (12.176-179) and Plato (Laws, 3.684), when referring to the Spartan land system, avoid Plutarch's chronological blunder, but their picture of the Dorians marching into Laconia and Messenia and, apparently simultaneously with their arrival, dividing the land into equal lots for the Spartans obviously has no historical validity.

There is no reason to doubt that Agis proposed to assign land to 15,000 perioeci, for in his day Sparta was desperately in need of manpower to fill the thinning ranks of the army. The doubling of that number for the time of Lycurgus, however, in the erroneous belief that
Sparta then controlled Messenia is surely a fanciful picture of early
Spartan history. In regard to the allotments to the Spartans, Plutarch
evidently found conflicting data about the numbers and the period in

duties, left the citizen no time to engage in any private remunerative activity; in fact, participation in anything except public activity was prohibited by law. The state, therefore, had to provide complete maintenance for every citizen. The method devised was to assign to each citizen a portion of the public land—a kleros—cultivated by helots bound to the soil who had to turn over to the Spartan citizen a fixed amount of the produce of the land, an amount which in the judgment of the state was sufficient for his livelihood. Thus to be a citizen with full rights at Sparta, it was necessary to have the usufruct of a kleros. The second point which must be emphasized is that to retain that citizenship, the Spartan had to make from the produce of his kleros a monthly contribution to his military mess, the syssition, an institution which will be discussed below.

According to the myth this assignment of public land to Spartan citizens took place at one time and was believed to have been the work of the early lawgiver Lycurgus. Plutarch, in the passage quoted above, believed that the land was divided into 9,000 equal lots. According to Polybius (6.45.3), "the peculiar features of the Spartan State are said to be first the land laws by which no citizen may own more than another, but all must possess an equal share of the public land." Aristotle (Politics, 2.6.12) states it was thought that at one time there were 10,000 citizens. Assuming for the moment that the myth is reality, how could this system of the attachment of a kleros to a citizen have worked from generation to generation? There seem to be two chief possibilities. One is suggested by Plutarch in his Life Of Lycurgus (16.1), where he writes that if officials of the state, after examining a newborn boy, found him healthy, "they ordered the father to rear him, and assigned to the baby one of the 9,000 kleroi." The inference here is that the state kept under its own control the management of the public land. Presumably the new baby did not have the usufruct of his kleros until he came of age. When his father died, the son, since he had already been assigned a kleros, did not inherit his father's allotment, which must have reverted to the state, for by the law of equality no one was supposed to have two kleroi. If a father had several sons, then one would think each should have been assigned a lot of land. If the number of legitimate claimants to the kleroi rose above 9,000, there is no hint in the ancient sources as to how this dilemma would have been met, for there is no suggestion in the myth that additional public land was acquired after the original division into 9,000 lots.

The second possibility in regard to the management of the public land is also provided by Plutarch, this time in his Life of Agis (5). Referring apparently to the early fourth century, Plutarch writes: "However, since the number of families instituted by Lycurgus was still preserved in the transmission of estates, and father left to son his kleros . . ." The clear

meaning of these words is that, without any interference from the state, a son automatically inherited his father's kleros. Since later in the same chapter Plutarch says that it was the ephor Epitadeus (probably early in the fourth century) who first made it possible for a man to dispose of his kleros to whomever he wished, it is apparent that before that time the kleros was entailed in the sense that the citizen did not have outright ownership of it, but had only the usufruct of it on condition that he pass it on to his son. This possibility abounds in unanswerable questions, such as: If a man died without issue, did the kleros revert to the state? What happened if a man had numerous sons? According to the myth, each of the equal 9,000 lots was large enough to provide support for only one man and his family. Were some of the sons provided with kleroi which had reverted to the state when men who had no sons died?

It is idle to speculate further, for there obviously can be no meaningful answers to questions concerning a situation which never existed. As was seen above, it seems certain that the division of public land among the Spartans actually was carried out on several different occasions over a period of a century or more. Moreover, historical probability and the fact that the ancient sources contain so many references to rich as contrasted to poor Spartans lead to the sure conclusion that, although ultimately all full Spartan citizens shared in the public land, the amount assigned to individual Spartans varied greatly. Thus one must try to understand how the system of public land worked in reality rather than in myth. Unfortunately, it is more difficult to suggest explanations for the reality than for the myth.

In discussing this problem it will be best to begin with the available data concerning the decline in numbers of the full Spartan citizens (Spartiatai, often anglicized as Spartiates), for, since citizenship was based on possession of a kleros, it is clear that the decline in numbers must be intimately connected with the land system. According to tradition (and the tradition seems reasonable), there were at one time some 9,000 or 10,000 Spartan citizens to whom portions of public land had been assigned. This situation must refer to the period after the final conquest of Messenia, when Sparta had the maximum amount of public land at its disposal. By the year 480 there were, according to Herodotus (7.234), some 8,000 Spartan citizens. Definite figures are not available for the end of the fifth century, but the Spartan willingness to make peace with Athens in 425 to recover 120 Spartiatai who had been taken prisoner at Sphacteria (Thucydides, 4.38; 117) is clear evidence that the reduction in the numbers of full citizens had become a serious problem. By the time of the battle of Leuctra in 371, scholars have estimated that the citizen body may have sunk to 1,500 or 2,000 members. Early in 369

Messenia regained its independence. The chaos resulting from the loss of half of its territory must have wreaked havoc on the Spartan land system, particularly since it presumably followed on the measure of the ephor Epitadeus by which it became legal for a citizen to alienate his kleros. Thereafter, with the removal of all legal restraints on the kleroi, the rich began to acquire these portions of land by purchase, by foreclosure on mortgages, or by other methods, so systematically that, according to Plutarch (Agis, 5), at the beginning of the second half of the third century all the land was in the control of about 700 Spartiatai.

Since citizenship was based on possession of a kleros and since until probably the first third of the fourth century the kleroi were inalienable, how could the citizen body have declined from about 9,000 to some 2,000? A fragment from the fourth-century philosopher Heraclides Ponticus reads: "It is considered shameful for Lacedaemonians to sell land; but of the ancient part (archaia moira) it is not even allowed." If, as some scholars argue, the "ancient part" refers only to Laconia, it would be possible to assume that those citizens whose kleroi were in Messenia, despite the disgrace involved, sold their lots and hence ceased to rate as citizens. But it cannot be proved that this is the correct interpretation of the "ancient part," and also there would still be no explanation of the causes which induced Spartans to forfeit their citizenship by selling their kleroi. A definite answer to this problem of the astounding decline in the number of Spartiatai would illuminate one of the fundamental mysteries of ancient Sparta, but because of the lack of evidence, one must substitute speculation for an answer. Speculation usually centers around the system of military messes (syssitia). Each citizen had to make a monthly contribution from the produce of his kleros to his military mess. On two occasions (Politics, 2.6.21 and 2.7.4) Aristotle states that inability to meet this contribution requirement led to loss of citizenship.

Some scholars quote against Aristotle a sentence from Xenophon's Constitution of the Lacedaemonians (10.7): "For to all who satisfied the requirements of his code (ta nomima) he [Lycurgus] gave equal rights of citizenship, without regard to bodily infirmity or want of money." They then argue that "want of money" would include inability to meet the syssitia requirement, and hence this inability did not lead to loss of citizenship. In rebuttal of this argument one could maintain that satisfying the obligations of the code almost certainly would imply meeting the contribution requirement. Consequently this sentence does not prove that a man who did not contribute to the syssitia still retained his citizenship; it merely gives further evidence for the prevalence of economic inequality in ancient Sparta.

Why should any man possessing a kleros granted to him by the state

have been unable to meet the syssitia requirement? Again, more speculation is necessary. First, one must remember, as has been emphasized above, that despite the myth of equality there were rich and poor Spartans. Second, one must admit that, despite the external simplicity of life in Sparta, the rising standards of living elsewhere in Greece were also penetrating the Spartan iron curtain. The poor Spartan citizen, however, had nothing to live from except the fixed income from his kleros, an amount which had been set once and for all in days of simpler living. He may very well have found it difficult, if not impossible, to meet the demands of an increased standard of living and still be able to pay his contributions to the syssitia. On various occasions such a man may have had to borrow. Since his only asset was his kleros, he would have had to use it as security; but since it was inalienable, he could mortgage only the produce of his kleros. Following this line of speculation, it is possible to imagine many cases in which, after foreclosure, part or almost all of the revenues of the kleros fell into the hands of the creditor. The Spartan caught in this predicament would have been unable to meet his syssition contribution and, therefore, according to Aristotle, would have ceased to rate as a citizen. In Spartan terminology he would have ceased to be an equal and would have fallen into the ranks of inferiors, who, to judge from the ancient sources, became an ever-increasing element in the state.

The above is pure speculation, and speculation must also be employed to try to explain what happened to the kleros. There seem to be two main possibilities. One is that the kleros remained in the possession of the family, being passed down from generation to generation, but so beholden to creditors that it supplied little maintenance to the possessor. The other possibility is that as soon as a citizen failed to meet the syssitia requirement, his kleros reverted to the state. The ephors, as the chief administrative officers in the state, probably had the authority to dispose of such lots. If one remembers Aristotle's emphasis on how subject to bribery the ephors were, one wonders if the ephors, after receiving sufficient bribes, may not have allowed these vacated kleroi to be added to the already large holdings of public land possessed by the rich—the ruling oligarchic clique in this paradoxical state of Sparta.

This suggestion that the ephors may have permitted kleroi to accumulate in the hands of Spartan oligarchs leads naturally to a discussion of the controversial passage in Plutarch's Life of Agis. In chapter 5, after speaking of the evil effects on the Spartans of the increase of wealth following their final victory in the Peloponnesian War in 404, Plutarch says (presumably referring to this period of Spartan "hegemony") that Epitadeus, on becoming ephor, had a law enacted, with the support of the

powerful, making it possible for a man "to give his household (oikos) and his kleros to whom he wanted during his lifetime and to bequeath them by will." Since the oikos probably refers to a man's personal property, it is the kleros which is significant for the problem under consideration. In the rest of the chapter it is stated that the powerful, taking advantage of this law which soon must have signified the complete breakdown of the tradition of the inalienability of the kleros, continued to appropriate the land until by the time of Agis (in the 240s), only 700 Spartiatai remained as holders of kleroi. The Epitadeus in this passage, to whom the collapse of the "Lycurgan" system of equal kleroi is attributed, is mentioned by name in no other extant ancient source. Some scholars, therefore, have argued that he was only an invention of the revolutionary propaganda in the last half of the third century of Agis and Cleomenes, who advocated a return to the pristine Lycurgan institutions. This skepticism seems uncalled for when one examines Aristotle's remarks on the Spartan constitution, which, although not speaking of Epitadeus, seem to refer to the consequences of his measure.

In the Politics (2.6.10-12), written in the last half of the fourth century, Aristotle comments critically on the Spartan land system. He objects to the inequality in the holding of property, with some possessing a great deal and others very little. Therefore, the land had come into the control of a few. The laws have been at fault, for he (Lycurgus?) made it dishonorable to sell property, which was wise, but permitted those who wished to give or bequeath property. The result is that almost two-fifths of all the land belongs to women, because there are many heiresses and because the dowries are large. The heiresses can be given to any one who is pleasing. (In Athens, to keep the property in the family, the heiress was given to the next of kin). Thus a state which should have supplied many hoplites provided less than a thousand. The city consequently could not endure one blow, but was ruined by lack of men. (The blow surely is a reference to the Spartan defeat at Leuctra in 371.) Aristotle is therefore thinking of fourth-century Sparta, and although the only legislator he mentions in these pages is Lycurgus(?), it seems certain that with his talk of gifts, legacies of land, and large dowries he is thinking of the devastating effect of fourth-century legislation rather than of the mistakes of a "Lycurgus" far back in the dim past. The picture he gives of the concentration of wealth in a few hands is very similar to the one Plutarch draws in the Agis, although the Plutarch passage, of course, carries the account of Spartan decline into the century after Aristotle's time.

Because of the inadequate sources and the persistence of the idealized myth of Sparta, a definitive explanation of the kleros system and of

enough to justify rearing. Those who were found to be weak or crippled were exposed in a deserted chasm in Mt. Taygetus. For their first six years boys were raised at home under the care of their mothers; in the seventh year their lifelong service for the state began. For the next twenty-four years the boys lived in barracks, organized in herds (agelai). They were taught the rudiments of reading and writing, but the chief emphasis of the training was on physical and military exercises, with the aim of making them physically tough and totally obedient to commands. At six-year intervals they passed from one class to another, the training becoming more advanced and exacting with each change. In the second six-year period the boys usually had lovers from the more advanced class—the eirens. Xenophon and Plutarch try to idealize this relationship, emphasizing how the older boy would set an example for the younger one and how this one in turn would endeavor to live up to the expectations of his lover, but the brutal training and the barracks life obviously led to much homosexuality. In their nineteenth year the young Spartans passed into the class of eirens. They could now be used for fighting, but they were not considered full-fledged soldiers until they had graduated from this class. The eirens, as lovers and teachers, had many duties in connection with the training of the younger classes. This barracks life and constant training continued until the young Spartans had completed their thirtieth year. They were then considered men and, as citizens, could attend meetings of the assembly. Such home life as a Spartan had, now began, but until he had completed his sixtieth year every Spartan was eligible for military service and hence had to devote much of his time to military exercises and manoeuvres.

Much attention was also paid to the physical training of the girls, for the Spartans believed that women with well-developed bodies would produce correspondingly healthy and sturdy offspring. Not much is known about the exercises required for the girls, but Plutarch (Lycurgus, 14) writes that they practiced running, wrestling, and throwing the discus and javelin. Both boys and girls, and also adults, participated in many processions and festivals. On these occasions there were often contests between choruses of boys and girls or of boys, young men, and old men singing traditional songs and performing traditional dances. The Spartans placed much emphasis on music, especially that of the flute and the lyre—partly, perhaps, to alleviate the harshness of their lives, but certainly largely with the realization that performing the sometimes intricate steps in time to the music contributed to the development of bodily grace and coordination, qualities essential for the skillful hop-lite. 13

One of the most puzzling and sinister institutions in the Spartan

system of training was the krypteia, often translated as "secret police" or "secret service." Plutarch writes about it as follows (Lycurgus, 28): "The magistrates from time to time sent out into the country at large the most discreet of the young warriors, equipped only with daggers and such supplies as were necessary. In the day time they scattered into obscure and out of the way places, where they hid themselves and lay quiet, but in the night they came down into the highways and killed every helot whom they caught. Oftentimes, too, they actually traversed the fields where helots were working and slew the sturdiest and best of them." Plutarch, who idealizes the "Lycurgan" institutions, cannot believe that such measures were part of Lycurgus' legislation. He suggests that this barbarous treatment of the helots should be assigned to a much later period, probably after the great earthquake in the middle of the fifth century when the helots, taking advantage of the havoc which had been wreaked on Sparta, rose up against their masters and threatened the very survival of the Spartans.

Scholars have offered numerous interpretations of the krypteia. 14 One of the most convincing ones tries to explain the institution by comparison with customs which have been prevalent among primitive tribes in Africa, Australia, and North America, whereby young men before they are accepted as full members of the tribe are sent out into the forest to prove their manhood by living through their own ingenuity and often by shedding human blood. According to this explanation, then, the krypteia would have been the final stage in the training of a Spartan youth, the last initiation before he was recognized as a man. This view envisages that all Spartan youths participated in the institutions of the krypteia; but it is also possible to infer from the words of Plutarch that this particular type of training was reserved for only an elite group. As with all institutions, the nature of the krypteia probably changed as the generations passed. This suggestion is confirmed by the last reference to it preserved in the ancient sources. At the famous battle of Sellasia in 222, by which time the Spartan state had experienced many vicissitudes, Plutarch (Cleomenes, 28) mentions the krypteia as forming a contingent in the Spartan army, and charged, among other duties, with that of reconnaissance.

ROM THE discussion in this chapter of certain aspects of Spartan political, social, and economic institutions, it is clear that there are many problems about Sparta which can be answered only on the basis of probabilities. Plutarch and many other ancient authors assign the whole system with its resulting eunomia—the reign of good law—to the lawgiver Lycurgus, about whom they evidently knew nothing or little more than

the institutions which went by his name. Modern scholars have argued at great length about whether there ever was a historical Lycurgus and, if so, when he lived, or whether he was some divinity to whom in the course of time the Spartans attributed their various institutions whose origin had long been forgotten. Certainly he was worshipped at Sparta in later times (Plutarch, Lycurgus, 31), apparently as a god, but the divine cult could easily have developed from an earlier hero cult, the type of worship which Greeks usually offered to founders or refounders of cities after their death. Certainty on this matter will probably never be attained. It may be most reasonable, however, to conceive of Lycurgus as an early lawgiver to whom, because of his fame, many subsequent measures were assigned. If one accepts a historical Lycurgus, the most likely time for his activity seemingly would be either the time of the great rhetra, which can be interpreted as the beginning of the aristocratic "republic," to be dated perhaps in the first quarter of the seventh century; or in the troubled period either during or immediately following the Second Messenian War. Regardless of how important Lycurgus may have been in introducing new institutions or in systematizing old ones, it would obviously be a gross oversimplification to attribute the whole Spartan way of life to the legislation of one man. Too many of the Spartan institutions are clearly an inheritance from earlier times. The government, except for the peculiarity of the dual kingship, developed from the type of government that was universal in ninth- and eighth-century Greece, and many of the strange aspects of the Spartan system—the division of the boys and young men by age groups; the segregation of the sexes in the long period of training; the krypteia, which was probably a rite of initiation; the flogging of young Spartans at the altar of Artemis Orthia, in which many scholars recognize rites of both fertility and initiation—were certainly survivals, however much altered in the course of time, from primitive customs.

For an understanding of Sparta it would be a matter of great interest to know when these "Lycurgan" institutions attained their full development. The ancients and some moderns who date Lycurgus early—in the eighth century or even earlier—imply that Lycurgan Sparta, with all its harshness, austerity, and totalitarianism, goes back to that period. This view is almost certainly wrong. It is true that from the fragments of the poems of Tyrtaeus, who wrote in the middle of the seventh century at the time of the Second Messenian War, one derives a picture of the patriotism and military discipline of the Spartans. But Tyrtaeus was followed by Alcman. Alcman, although apparently an Ionian Greek from Sardis in Lydia, lived for many years in Sparta at some period in the last half of the seventh century. A papyrus discovered in 1855 has

preserved about half of one of his poems—a parthenion or hymn to be sung by a chorus of girls, presumably at a festival. The love of nature and the appreciation of beauty, as well as the frequently jesting tone, reflected in this poem and in other fragments make it hard to believe that Alcman would have chosen to leave the comparatively luxurious Sardis to live in Sparta if the atmosphere in Sparta were already that of an armed camp. In the following century the Sicilian poet Stesichorus found a hospitable home in Sparta, and the Megarian poet Theognis apparently resided there for a while when he was exiled from his native land.

Archaeology provides even stronger evidence for rejecting the picture of Sparta as an austere and drab place in the seventh and a large part of the sixth century. Excavations at Sparta, supplemented by literary references, have revealed that in these generations ivory, scarabs from Egypt, amber from the north, and luxurious dresses and gold from Lydia were imported. Local artisans excelled in carving ivory and in working with gold and silver, and especially as potters and bronze workers. Laconian pottery dating roughly from 650 to 550 has been discovered by archaeologists at sites as far apart as Ephesus in the east, Etruria and Massalia in the west, and Naucratis, Cyrene, and Carthage in Africa. In the field of bronze work the most remarkable creation, if properly attributed, was the magnificent bronze krater, probably from the last half of the sixth century, which was found in the grave of a Celtic princess at Vix in France. These artisans were presumably perioeci, but their wares were not all made for export, for the Spartans also purchased and made use of many of these articles. By the end of the sixth century, however, all these activities of artists and artisans seem to have ceased, and the picture revealed by archaeology is reminiscent of Plutarch's statement (Lycurgus, 10) that under Lycurgus the unnecessary and superfluous arts were banished, foreign wares were no longer imported, no goldsmiths or silversmiths existed, and emphasis was placed on utilitarian commodities such as beds, chairs, and tables. What is the explanation for this change in the externals, at least, of Spartan living which, to judge from the excavations, apparently occurred in the latter half of the sixth century?

One explanation which has been advanced is that Sparta may have fallen behind in trade competition with other states when in the sixth century they adopted the use of silver and electrum coins while Sparta continued with its cumbersome and commercially useless iron bars and spits. This explanation may have some validity, but when one remembers how much Greek trade, even after the introduction of coinage, was still carried on by barter and realizes that Sparta, although minting no

coins of its own (until the third century B.C.), did make use of the coinage of other states, it seems necessary to seek a more basic explanation. Hardly anything about Sparta can be stated with complete assurance, but there is no good reason to question the close connection between Spartan totalitarianism and austerity and the helot problem. The difficulty of trying to keep a population in serfdom had been revealed by the revolt of the Messenians in the Second Messenian War. The Spartans, on emerging victorious, decided to expand the system despite the warning they had just had of its dangers. It is true that Alcman flourished at Sparta after the Second Messenian War and that for a large part of the sixth century the artistic products of skilled craftsmen were popular there, but these facts need not have precluded the growth of militarism. As the years passed and the helots increased in number whereas the Spartan equals declined, a time must have come when the overwhelming numerical superiority of the helots, not to mention the perioeci, made it imperative to take drastic steps. Possibly the austerity and the requirement of devoting oneself totally to the welfare-chiefly militaryof the state should be connected with the name of Chilon, ephor about 556, of whom little is known except that he was famous enough to be included among the Seven Wise Men. The details of the change in the Spartan way of life cannot be traced step by step, but by the beginning of the fifth century the "Lycurgan" institutions had certainly reached their full development, and the fears which the Spartans felt of the helots and, to a much lesser extent, of the perioeci in the fifth and fourth centuries justify the assumption that it was primarily the necessity to keep large populations under control which turned Sparta into a bleak and barren military camp.

HE RULING caste of the Spartan equals (Spartiatai) would have been unable to live according to the Lycurgan institutions had it not been for other elements in the population of the Spartan state: the perioeci and the helots.

In the Spartan state the citizens, although possessing kleroi in Laconia and Messenia, all lived in the city of Sparta. The perioeci lived in the numerous communities, one hundred in number according to tradition, which were scattered throughout the territory controlled by the Spartans. Perioeci, which means simply those living on the periphery, were not unique to Sparta; there is evidence for them in other states such as Thessaly, Argos, and Elis. In general perioeci were subjects or dependents of a Greek state, having their own communities and local governments, but owing allegiance and various services to the ruling state. In Sparta the perioeci can be thought of as unequal allies or almost as infe-

time to matters of state. Excavations at Sparta which have revealed excellent products of artists and artisans, both local and imported, have made it clear that the famed "banishment of the unnecessary and superfluous arts" did not begin until towards the end of the sixth century. The explanation for the change to austerity is probably to be found in the increasing difficulty and danger the Spartans experienced in holding in suppression the ever-growing number of helots.

The impetus for this change may have come from the ephor Chilon, who, according to the fragmentary evidence, was a significant figure in Sparta in the middle of the sixth century. Chilon and his associates, in trying to put their measures into effect, may have believed or pretended that they were implementing or supplementing the work of the earlier lawgiver Lycurgus, who probably had been responsible for establishing the aristocratic "republic" a century or more earlier. The shrine at which Lycurgus received honors as either a god or a hero may already have been established. It is unlikely that many new measures were introduced at this time; it is more probable that various old customs, such as the division of youths into age groups for training purposes, the segregation of the sexes, and the initiation rites inherent in the krypteia, which had largely or partly fallen into abeyance, were once more strictly enforced. Since most of these customs were clearly ones that had been prevalent among the early Dorians, it was all the more easy to associate them with the name of Lycurgus and thereby to sanctify them. In some such way began the myth of Lycurgus and the Lycurgan institutions.

It is impossible to tell in what fashion the myth developed among the Spartans, for Sparta, having banished the superfluous arts, had no writers. The growth of the idealization of Sparta can be traced to some extent beyond the confines of Laconia. Oligarchs and aristocrats elsewhere in Greece usually looked with favor on Sparta, which, when possible, used its influence to support aristocratic regimes. In Athens, particularly in the closing years of the fifth century, the oligarchs, disgusted with what they considered the excesses of democracy, looked with longing eyes towards Sparta where no democratic "nonsense" was tolerated. In the first half of the fourth century, Plato, hating and distrusting democracy deeply and repelled by the selfish individualism which was so characteristic of his times, saw, or thought he saw, in Sparta much that was admirable-equality of all citizens, rigorous training of the young to be servants of the state, suppression of individualism and ostentatious luxury, absolute obedience to the laws-in short, an organization which had all the beauties of a geometric form. His Republic contains a strange medley of true and idealized Spartan elements. Aristotle, writing after the decline of Sparta following its loss of Messenia in 369, is more criti-

cal, but unfortunately in his *Politics* he discusses Sparta only occasionally.

In the generations following Alexander the Great, the Hellenistic philosophers, seeing the great social inequalities in their world and the constant threat of social revolution, contributed greatly to the myth of Spartan equality. It was Plutarch, however, writing in the late first and early second century A.D., who gave the idealized myth of Sparta its canonical form. His Life of Lycurgus is a fascinating document, and one can easily be swept along by the glowing, almost poetic, picture it presents. The critical reader, however, becomes more and more aware of inconsistencies, contradictions, anachronisms, and impossibilities in the account until he realizes that much of what he is reading has no relationship whatsoever with reality. Plutarch's Lives have had great influence through the ages, and not least the Lycurgus. To mention only one or two examples, in the eighteenth century French philosophers like Rousseau were greatly impressed by that biography, and leaders of the French Revolution were thinking of establishing a national school based on the ideas of Spartan training as depicted in the Lycurgus. The greatest evidence for the influence exerted by Sparta, however, both the idealized picture and the seamy side, is to be found in the tremendous interest which the Nazis and Nazi-minded German historians revealed for all things Spartan. The final sentence of an excellent book on Sparta published by a distinguished French scholar in 1939 on the eve of World War II deserves quotation: "And Sparta, mysterious and secret, after having nourished the thought of Plato and of Rousseau gives birth to a new mysticism."17

In this chapter an attempt has been made, as far as space permitted, to call attention to some of the realities which modern scholars have detected behind the facade of the idealized myth of Sparta. There is no need to repeat the arguments; it will be enough to emphasize that even at the "beginning" all Spartans were not equal, for among the so-called equals there was an aristocratic inner clique which through the Gerousia and the ephors managed to control the state. The "Lycurgan" system which they dominated was to be static: a privileged class of Spartan citizens who would be provided with all the necessities of life by inferior castes, the perioeci and the helots. The Spartans, thus freed from having to engage in any utilitarian occupations, could devote their lives from childhood on to the service of the state, and by acquiring supremacy in the profession of arms would be able to guarantee the permanence of this totalitarian structure. But institutions do not often remain static. The number of Spartan equals steadily declined, apparently chiefly from the inability of certain men to meet the requirements of the pheidi-

tia (military mess). These men fell into the category of inferiors, whose numbers increased in direct proportion to the decrease of the equals. The lot of these inferiors is one of the unanswered mysteries of Sparta, but their bitterness is vividly revealed by Xenophon's description (Hellenica, 3.3.4) of the abortive conspiracy of the "inferior" Cinadon in 398. Besides the inferiors, various other categories developed which marred and confused the symmetry of the "Lycurgan" constitution—sons of helot women by Spartan citizens, helots liberated as reward for some service (Neodamodeis), and the like. There is no evidence about how these hybrid groups, who certainly did not receive full citizenship, were integrated into the Spartan system.

The result of these developments is clear. From the beginning the Spartan citizens had had to defend themselves against the helots, but as time passed, other potentially dangerous internal enemies emerged—the inferiors, the various hybrid groups, and also the perioeci, who, as ideas of liberty and autonomy spread throughout the Greek world, probably often resented their somewhat humiliating status. These developments were gradual, however, and their full significance was revealed only by the great changes wrought by the Peloponnesian War and the subsequent loss of Messenia in 369. In the sixth century the efficiency of the Lycurgan institutions enabled Sparta to attain a position of leadership in the Greek world. Also, in fairness to totalitarian Sparta, it must not be forgotten that its prestige and the well-deserved reputation of its invincible hoplites caused it to be the center of the successful Greek resistance to the threat of Persian conquest. In conclusion to this chapter on early Sparta, therefore, it will be necessary to describe briefly how Sparta advanced to this position of leadership in the sixth century.

N THE seventh century Sparta secured a firm hold on Messenia to the west. The next task was to try to settle matters on the northern frontier, where for generations Sparta had engaged in occasional fighting with the Arcadians and Argives. According to Herodotus (1.66–68), the Spartans, deterred from trying to conquer all Arcadia by an oracle from Delphi but encouraged to attack Tegea, the town in the southern part of the eastern Arcadian plain, marched out bearing fetters with which to enslave the Tegeans. They were defeated, however, and chained in the very fetters which they had brought. Herodotus reports that even in his day these fetters could be seen suspended as a thank offering in the temple of Artemis at Tegea. This defeat probably occurred early in the sixth century, and for some time thereafter Sparta was consistently unsuccessful in its expeditions against Tegea. Finally another oracle was obtained which promised victory if the bones of Agamemnon's son, Orestes,

7 Early Athens

VERY DIFFERENT from the record of the closed society of Sparta was the history of Athens, which in the fifth century became the leading state politically, economically, and culturally among all the innumerable Greek states. So restless in mind and body that their enemies characterized them as "being born into the world to take no rest themselves and to give none to others" (Thucydides, 1.70), the Athenians, despite the many mistakes, excesses, and stupidities recorded in their history, have bequeathed to the world a fascinating vision of the potentialities of a truly open society. This chapter will trace the development of Athens from its almost unknown beginnings to the end of the sixth century, when Greece was on the eve of facing the great ordeal represented by the threat of Persian aggression.

Athens and parts of Attica had been inhabited for millennia before recorded history began. Remains of pottery produced by Neolithic man have been discovered on the northern and southern slopes of the Acropolis and also in the district which ultimately became the agora of historical Athens. There is evidence for habitation throughout the whole Bronze (Helladic) Age. It is probable, therefore, that the metalworking immigrants who are believed to have come to Greece from Asia Minor early in the third millennium blended with the remains of the Neolithic population in Attica, and this process of mingling was presumably continued in the early centuries of the second millennium, when most scholars think that the proto-Greeks entered the Greek peninsula. In the late Bronze Age-the Mycenaean period-Athens was the center of one of the many kingdoms which flourished in those fascinating but obscure times. In these centuries an increase in Minoan influences can be detected. A palace arose on the Acropolis-Homer's strong house of Erechtheus—and, as at Mycenae and Tiryns, the fortifications were strengthened towards the end of the thirteenth century, presumably against some anticipated danger. Athens was spared from the general devastation—whether the result of a Dorian migration or uprising which overwhelmed the Mycenaean world in the years following 1200. If the chaos was caused by invaders, it may be that they bypassed Athens because it was not on the direct route to the Peloponnesus or be-

WAS AS AS AS AS AS AS AS AS

THE ANCIENT GREEKS

A CRITICAL HISTORY John V. A. Fine

An esteemed teacher offers a major reassessment of the history of Greece from prehistoric times to the rise of Alexander. This is a work of prodigious scholarship written in grand style.

John Fine surveys the archaeological work that has revealed so much about the civilization of Crete and Mycenaean Greece, and discusses the age of colonization during which Greek colonies were established from the Crimea to the Nile, from the Caucasus to Spain. Analyzing social and economic developments, as well as foreign and intercity affairs, he assesses the history, culture, and democracy of Athens, and Sparta's institutions and military exploits; recounts the Greeks' relations and then war with the Persian empire; details alliances, struggles, and the varying fortunes of the Greek city-states; and describes the rise of Macedon.

"Fine . . . conveys the excitement of historical discovery and disputation with the relaxed, assured spontaneity of the lecturer. In his discussion of early Greece, he provides a rich blend of social, political, and cultural history." — New York Times Book Review

John V. A. Fine was Professor of Classics, Emeritus, Princeton University.

Front cover: View looking west from the interior of the Propylaea, Athens. Photograph by Boissonas, courtesy of the Fine Arts Library, Harvard University, Visual Collections.

The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England

