

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_174274

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY
EDITED BY ERNEST RHYS

HISTORY

GROTE'S HISTORY OF
GREECE IN TWELVE VOLS
VOLUME SIX

THE PUBLISHERS OF *EVERYMAN'S*
LIBRARY WILL BE PLEASED TO SEND
FREELY TO ALL APPLICANTS A LIST
OF THE PUBLISHED AND PROJECTED
VOLUMES TO BE COMPRISED UNDER
THE FOLLOWING TWELVE HEADINGS

TRAVEL ☙ SCIENCE ☙ FICTION
THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY
HISTORY ☙ CLASSICAL
FOR YOUNG PEOPLE
ESSAYS ☙ ORATORY
POETRY & DRAMA
BIOGRAPHY
ROMANCE



IN TWO STYLES OF BINDING, CLOTH,
FLAT BACK, COLOURED TOP, AND
LEATHER, ROUND CORNERS, GILT TOP.

LONDON : J. M. DENT & CO.
NEW YORK : E. P. DUTTON & CO.

“ ONSIDER
HISTORY
WITH THE
BEGINNINGS OF
IT STRETCHING
DIMLY INTO THE
REMOTE TIME; E
MERGING DARK
LY OVT OF THE
MYSTERIOUS
ETERNITY:  
THE TRUE EPIC
POEM AND UNI
VERSAL DIVINE
SCRIPTURE. . . ”



✓ CARLYLE ✓

A HISTORY OF GREECE BY GEORGE GROTE

VOLUME VI

EVERY
MAN
I WILL
GO
WITH
THEE
BE THY
GUIDE



IN THY
MOST
NEED
TO GO
BY
THY
SIDE

LONDON: PUBLISHED
by J. M. DENT & CO
AND IN NEW YORK
BY E. P. DUTTON & CO

RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VI

PART II.—HISTORICAL GREECE

(Continued)

	PAGE		PAGE
CHAPTER XLVI		like habits of Periklēs—his little	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND JUDICIAL CHANGES		pains to court popularity—less of	
AT ATHENS UNDER PERIKLES		the demagogue than Kimon . . .	9
First establishment of the democratical		Ephialtēs belonging to the demo-	
judicial system at Athens . . .	1	cratic party, and originally equal	
Union in the same hands, of functions		to Periklēs in influence. Efforts	
both administrative and judicial in		of Ephialtēs against magisterial	
early Athens—great powers of the		abuse	12
magistrates, as well as of the senate		Kimon and his party more powerful	
of Areopagus	ib.	than Ephialtēs and Periklēs, until	
Magistrates generally wealthy men—		the time when the Athenian troops	
oligarchical tendencies of the senate		were dismissed from Laconia. Ostra-	
of Areopagus—increase of demo-		cism of Kimon	ib.
cratic sentiment among the bulk		Measures carried by Ephialtēs and	
of the citizens	3	Periklēs to abridge the power of the	
Political parties in Athens. Periklēs		senate of Areopagus as well as of	
and Ephialtēs, democratical. Kimon,		individual magistrates. Institution	
oligarchical or conservative . . .	ib.	of the paid dikasteries	13
Democratical Dikasteries or Jury-		Separation of judicial from administra-	
courts, constituted by Periklēs and		tive functions	14
Ephialtēs. How these Dikasteries		Assassination of Ephialtēs by the con-	
were arranged	4	servative party	16
Pay to the Dikasts introduced and		Commencement of the great ascen-	
made regular	5	dency of Periklēs, after the death of	
The magistrates are deprived of their		Ephialtēs. Compromise between	
judicial, and confined to administra-		him and Kimon. Brilliant successes	
tive functions	6	of Athens, and æra of the maximum	
Senate of Areopagus—its antiquity—		of her power	17
semi-religious character—large and		Other constitutional changes.—The	
undefined controlling power	ib.	Nomophylakes	ib.
Large powers of the senate of Areo-		The Nomothetæ—distinction between	
pagus, in part abused, became in-		laws and psephisms or special decrees	
consistent with the feelings of the		—process by which laws were en-	
people after the Persian invasion.		acted and repealed	19
New interests and tendencies then		Procedure in making or repealing of	
growing up at Athens	7	laws assimilated to the procedure in	
Senate of Areopagus—a centre of		judicial trials	ib.
action for the conservative party and		Graphē Paranomôn — indictment	
Kimon	9	against the mover of illegal or un-	
Opposition between Kimon and Peri-		constitutional propositions	21
klēs—inherited from their fathers—		Working of the Graphē Paranomôn.	
character and working of Periklēs .	ib.	—Conservative spirit in which it is	
Reserved, philosophical, and business-		framed.—Restraint upon new pro-	
		positions, and upon the unlimited	
		initiative belonging to every citizen	ib.

	PAGE		PAGE
Abusive extension of the <i>Graphê Paranómōn</i> afterwards	23	confederates of Delos—the rest were subject and tributary	50
It was often used as a simple way of procuring the repeal of an existing law—without personal aim against the author of the law	<i>ib.</i>	Athens took no pains to inspire her allies with the idea of a common interest—nevertheless the allies were gainers by the continuance of her empire	51
Numbers and pay of the <i>dikasts</i> , as provided by <i>Periklēs</i>	24	Conception of <i>Periklēs</i> —Athens, an imperial city, owing protection to the subject-allies; who on their part, owed obedience and tribute	52
The Athenian democracy, as constituted by <i>Periklēs</i> , remained substantially unaltered afterwards down to the loss of Athenian independence—excepting the temporary interruptions of the Four Hundred and the Thirty	26	Large amount of revenue laid by and accumulated by Athens, during the years preceding the Peloponnesian war	<i>ib.</i>
Working of the numerous <i>dikasteries</i> —their large numbers essential to exclude corruption or intimidation—liability of individual magistrates to corruption	<i>ib.</i>	Pride felt by Athenian citizens in the imperial power of their city	57
The Athenian <i>dikasteries</i> are jury-trial applied on the broadest scale—exhibiting both its excellences and its defects, in an exaggerated form	31	Numerous Athenian citizens planted out as <i>kleruchs</i> by <i>Periklēs</i> . <i>Chersonesus</i> of Thrace. <i>Sinôpē</i>	58
The encomiums usually pronounced upon the theory of jury-trial would apply yet more strongly to the Athenian <i>dikasteries</i>	<i>ib.</i>	Active personal and commercial relations between Athens and all parts of the <i>Ægean</i>	59
Imperfections of jury-trial—exaggerated in the procedure of the <i>dikasteries</i>	32	<i>Amphipolis</i> in Thrace founded by Athens. <i>Agnon</i> is sent out as <i>Ekist</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Powerful effects of the <i>dikasteries</i> in exercising and stimulating the intellect and feelings of individual citizens	36	Situation and importance of <i>Amphipolis</i>	60
Necessity of learning to speak—growth of professional teachers of rhetoric—professional composers of speeches for others	40	Foundation, by the Athenians, of <i>Thurii</i> , on the southern coast of Italy	61
Rhetors and Sophists	45	Conduct of the refugee inhabitants of the ruined <i>Sybaris</i> —their encroachments in the foundation of <i>Thurii</i> : they are expelled and <i>Thurii</i> reconstituted	<i>ib.</i>
Polemics of <i>Sokratēs</i> , himself a sophist, against the sophists generally	46	<i>Herodotus</i> and <i>Lysias</i> —both domiciliated as citizens at <i>Thurii</i> . Few Athenian citizens settled there as colonists	62
Sophists and rhetors were the natural product of the age and of the democracy	47	Period from 445–431 B.C. Athens at peace. Her political condition. Rivalry of <i>Periklēs</i> with <i>Thucydides</i> son of <i>Melesias</i>	63
The <i>dikasteries</i> were composed, not exclusively of poor men, but of middling and poorer citizens indiscriminately	48	Points of contention between the two parties. 1. Peace with Persia. 2. Expenditure of money for the decoration of Athens	64
		Defence of <i>Periklēs</i> perfectly good against his political rivals	65
		Pan-Hellenic schemes and sentiment of <i>Periklēs</i>	<i>ib.</i>
		Bitter contention of parties at Athens—vote of ostracism— <i>Thucydides</i> is ostracised—about 443 B.C.	66
		New works undertaken at Athens. Third Long Wall. Docks in <i>Peiræus</i> —which is newly laid out as a town, by the architect <i>Hippodamus</i>	<i>ib.</i>
		<i>Odeon</i> , <i>Parthenon</i> , <i>Propylæa</i> . Other temples. Statues of <i>Athênē</i>	68
		Illustrious artists and architects— <i>Pheidias</i> , <i>Iktinus</i> , <i>Kallikratēs</i>	69
		Effect of these creations of art and architecture upon the minds of contemporaries	70
		Attempt of <i>Periklēs</i> to convene a general congress at Athens, of deputies from all the Grecian states	71

CHAPTER XLVII

FROM THE THIRTY YEARS' TRUCE, FOURTEEN YEARS BEFORE THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR, DOWN TO THE BLOCKADE OF POTIDÆA, IN THE YEAR BEFORE THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

Personal activity now prevalent among the Athenian citizens—empire of Athens again exclusively maritime, after the Thirty years' truce 49

Chios, *Samos*, and *Lesbos* were now the only free allies of Athens, on the same footing as the original

	PAGE
Revolt of Samos from the Athenians . . .	72
Athenian armament against Samos, under Periklēs, Sophoklēs the tragedian, &c. . .	73
Doubtful and prolonged contest—great power of Samos—it is at last reconquered, disarmed, and dismantled . . .	74
None of the other allies of Athens, except Byzantium, revolted at the same time . . .	75
Application of the Samians to Sparta for aid against Athens—it is refused chiefly through the Corinthians . . .	76
Government of Samos after the conquest—doubtful whether the Athenians renewed the democracy which they had recently established . . .	76
Funeral oration pronounced by Periklēs upon the Athenian citizens slain in the Samian war . . .	76
Position of the Athenian empire—relation of Athens to her subject-allies—their feelings towards her generally were those of indifference and acquiescence, not of hatred . . .	78
Particular grievances complained of in the dealing of Athens with her allies . . .	79
Annual tribute—changes made in its amount. Athenian officers and inspectors throughout the empire . . .	81
Disputes and offences in and among the subject-allies, were brought for trial before the dikasteries at Athens . . .	82
Productive of some disadvantage, but of preponderance of advantage to the subject-allies themselves . . .	83
Imperial Athens compared with imperial Sparta . . .	84
Numerous Athenian citizens spread over the Ægean—the allies had no redress against them, except through the Athenian dikasteries . . .	85
The dikasteries afforded protection against misconduct both of Athenian citizens and Athenian officers . . .	89
The dikasteries, defective or not, were the same tribunals under which every Athenian held his own security . . .	90
Athenian empire was affected for the worse by the circumstances of the Peloponnesian war. more violence was introduced into it by that war than had prevailed before . . .	90
The subject-allies of Athens had few practical grievances to complain of . . .	91
The Grecian world was now divided into two great systems; with a right supposed to be vested in each, of punishing its own refractory members . . .	93
Policy of Corinth, from being pacific, becomes warlike . . .	93
Disputes arise between Corinth and Korkyra—case of Epidamnus . . .	94
The Epidamnians apply for aid in their distress to Korkyra—they are	

refused—the Corinthians send aid to the place . . .	95
The Korkyræans attack Epidamnus—armament sent thither by Corinth . . .	96
Remonstrance of the Korkyræans with Corinth and the Peloponnesians . . .	96
Hostilities between Corinth and Korkyra—naval victory of the latter . . .	97
Large preparations made by Corinth for renewing the war . . .	99
Application of the Korkyræans to be received among the allies of Athens . . .	99
Address of the Korkyræan envoys to the Athenian public assembly . . .	100
Principal topics upon which it insists, as given in Thucydides . . .	101
Envoys from Corinth address the Athenian assembly in reply . . .	102
Decision of the Athenians—a qualified compliance with the request of Korkyra. The Athenian triremes sent to Korkyra . . .	104
Naval combat between the Corinthians and Korkyræans; rude tactics on both sides . . .	105
The Korkyræans are defeated . . .	106
Arrival of a reinforcement from Athens—the Corinthian fleet retires, carrying off numerous Korkyræan prisoners . . .	107
Hostilities not yet professedly begun between Athens and Corinth . . .	108
Hatred conceived by the Corinthians towards Athens . . .	109
They begin to stir up revolt among the Athenian allies—Potidæa, a colony of Corinth, but ally of Athens . . .	109
Relations of Athens with Perdikkas king of Macedonia, his intrigues along with Corinth against her—he induces the Chalkidians to revolt from her—increase of Olynthus . . .	110
Revolt of Potidæa—armament sent thither from Athens . . .	111
Combat near Potidæa between the Athenian force, and the allied Corinthians, Potidæans, and Chalkidians. Victory of the Athenians . . .	114
Potidæa placed in blockade by the Athenians . . .	115

CHAPTER XLVIII

FROM THE BLOCKADE OF POTIDÆA DOWN TO THE END OF THE FIRST YEAR OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR	
State of feeling in Greece between the Thirty years' truce and the Peloponnesian war—recognised probability of war—Athens at that time not encroaching—decree interdicting trade with the Megarians . . .	116
Zealous importunity of the Corinthians	

	PAGE		PAGE
in bringing about a general war, for the purpose of preserving Potidæa . . .	118	tion of Aspasia. Her character and accomplishments . . .	136
Relations of Sparta with her allies—they had a vote thus far—whether they would, or would not, approve of a course of policy which had been previously resolved by Sparta separately . . .	119	Family relations of Periklēs—his connexion with Aspasia. Licence of the comic writers in their attacks upon both . . .	ib.
Assembly of the Spartans separately addressed by envoys of the allied powers, complaining that Athens had violated the truce . . .	ib.	Prosecution of Anaxagoras the philosopher as well as of Aspasia—Anaxagoras retires from Athens—Periklēs defends Aspasia before the dikastery, and obtains her acquittal . . .	139
The Corinthian envoys address the assembly last, after the envoys of the other allies have inflamed it against Athens . . .	120	Prosecution of the sculptor Pheidias for embezzlement—instituted by the political opponents of Periklēs. Charge of peculation against Periklēs himself . . .	140
International customs of the time, as bearing upon the points in dispute between Athens and Corinth—Athens in the right . . .	121	Probability that Periklēs was never even tried for peculation, certainly that he never was found guilty of it . . .	141
Tenor of the Corinthian address—little allusion to recent wrong—strong efforts to raise hatred and alarm against Athens . . .	122	Requisition from the Lacedæmonians, for the banishment of Periklēs—arrived when Periklēs was thus pressed by his political enemies—rejected . . .	142
Remarkable picture drawn of Athens by her enemies . . .	123	Counter-requisition sent by the Athenians to Sparta for expiation of sacrilege . . .	ib.
Reply made by an Athenian envoy, accidentally present in Sparta . . .	124	Fresh requisitions sent from Sparta to Athens—to withdraw the troops from Potidæa—to leave Ægina free—to readmit the Megarians to Athenian harbours . . .	143
His account of the empire of Athens—how it had been acquired, and how it was maintained . . .	125	Final and peremptory requisition of Sparta—public assembly held at Athens on the whole subject of war and peace . . .	ib.
He adjures them not to break the truce, but to adjust all differences by that pacific appeal which the truce provided . . .	ib.	Great difference of opinion in the assembly—important speech of Periklēs . . .	144
The Spartans exclude strangers, and discuss the point among themselves in the assembly . . .	126	Periklēs strenuously urges the Athenians not to yield . . .	ib.
Most Spartan speakers are in favour of war. King Archidamus opposes war. His speech . . .	ib.	His review of the comparative forces, and probable chances of success or defeat in the war . . .	145
The speech of Archidamus is ineffectual. Short, but warlike appeal of the Ephor Sthenelaidas . . .	129	The assembly adopts the recommendation of Periklēs—firm and determined reply sent to Sparta . . .	147
Vote of the Spartan assembly in favour of war . . .	130	Views of Thucydides respecting the grounds, feelings, and projects of the two parties now about to embark in war . . .	ib.
The Spartans send to Delphi—obtain an encouraging reply . . .	ib.	Equivocal period—war not yet proclaimed—first blow struck not by Athens but by her enemies . . .	149
General congress of allies at Sparta. Second speech of the Corinthian envoy, enforcing the necessity and propriety of war . . .	ib.	Open violation of the truce by the Thebans—they surprise Plataea in the night . . .	ib.
Vote of the majority of the allies in favour of war—B.C. 432 . . .	132	The gates of Plataea are opened by an oligarchical party within—a Theban detachment are admitted into the agora at night—at first apparently successful, afterwards overpowered and captured . . .	150
Views and motives of the opposing powers . . .	ib.	Large force intended to arrive from Thebes to support the assailants early in the morning—they are delayed by the rain and the swelling of the Asôpus—they commence hostilities against the Plataean	
The hopes and confidence on the side of Sparta, the fears on the side of Athens. Heralds sent from Sparta to Athens with complaints and requisitions: meanwhile the preparations for war go on . . .	134		
Requisitions addressed by Sparta to Athens—demand for the expulsion of the Alkmaeonidæ as impious—aimed at Periklēs . . .	135		
Position of Periklēs at Athens: bitter hostility of his political opponents: attacks made upon him. Prosecu-			

Contents

xi

	PAGE
persons and property without the walls	153
Parley between the Plataeans and the Theban force without—the latter evacuate the territory—the Theban prisoners in Plataea are slain . . .	154
Messages from Plataea to Athens—answer	ib.
Grecian feeling, already predisposed to the war, was wound up to the highest pitch by the striking incident at Plataea	155
Preparations for war on the part of Athens—intimations sent round to her allies—Akarnanians recently acquired by Athens as allies—recent capture of the Amphilocheian Argos by the Athenian Phormio	156
Strength and resources of Athens and her allies—military and naval means—treasure	157
Ample grounds for the confidence expressed by Periklēs in the result	158
Position and power of Sparta and the Peloponnesian allies—they are full of hope and confidence of putting down Athens speedily	ib.
Efforts of Sparta to get up a naval force	160
Muster of the combined Peloponnesian force at the isthmus of Corinth, under Archidamus, to invade Attica	ib.
Last envoy sent to Athens—he is dismissed without being allowed to enter the town	161
March of Archidamus into Attica—his fruitless siege of Enōē	ib.
Expectation of Archidamus that Athens would yield at the last moment.—Difficulty of Periklēs in persuading the Athenians to abandon their territory and see it all ravaged	162
Attica deserted—the population flock within the walls of Athens. Hardships, privations, and distress endured	163
March of Archidamus into Attica	164
Archidamus advances to Acharnæ, within seven miles of Athens	165
Intense clamour within the walls of Athens—eagerness to go forth and fight	166
Trying position, firmness and sustained ascendancy, of Periklēs, in dissuading them from going forth	167
The Athenians remain within their walls: partial skirmishes only, no general action	ib.
Athenian fleet is despatched to ravage the coasts of Peloponnesus—first notice of the Spartan Brasidas—operations of the Athenians in Akarnania, Kephallēnia, &c.	168
The Athenians expel the Æginetans from Ægina, and people the island with Athenian kleruchs. The Æginetans settle at Thyrea in Peloponnesus	169

	PAGE
The Athenians invade and ravage the Megarid: sufferings of the Megarians	170
Measures taken by Athens for permanent defence.—Sum put by in the acropolis, against urgent need, not to be touched unless under certain defined dangers.—Capital punishment against any one who should propose otherwise	171
Remarks on this decree	172
Blockade of Potidæa—Sitalkēs king of the Odrysian Thracians—alliance made between him and Athens	174
Periklēs is chosen orator to deliver the funeral discourse over the citizens slain during the year	ib.
Funeral oration of Periklēs	176
Sketch of Athenian political constitution, and social life, as conceived by Periklēs	178
Eulogy upon Athens and the Athenian character	ib.
Mutual tolerance of diversity of tastes and pursuits in Athens	179
It is only true partially and in some memorable instances that the state interfered to an exorbitant degree with individual liberty in Greece	180
Free play of individual taste and impulse in Athens—importance of this phenomenon in society	181
Extraordinary and many-sided activity of Athens	182
Peculiar and interesting moment at which the discourse of Periklēs was delivered. Athens now at the maximum of her power—declining tendency commences soon afterwards	183

CHAPTER XLIX

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND YEAR DOWN TO THE END OF THE THIRD YEAR OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR	
Barren results of the operations during the first year of war	185
Second invasion of Attica by the Peloponnesians—more spreading and ruinous than the first	ib.
Commencement of the pestilence or epidemic at Athens	186
Description of the epidemic by Thucydides—his conception of the duty of exactly observing and recording	187
Extensive and terrible suffering of Athens	189
Inefficacy of remedies—despair and demoralisation of the Athenians	190
Lawless recklessness of conduct engendered	192

	PAGE		PAGE
Great loss of life among the citizens—blow to the power of Athens . . .	193	Wall of circumvallation built round Platæa—the place completely beleaguered and a force left to maintain the blockade . . .	218
Athenian armament sent first against Peloponnesus, next against Potidæa—it is attacked and ruined by the epidemic . . .	194	Athenian armament sent to Potidæa and Chalkidic Thrace—it is defeated and returns . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Irritation of the Athenians under their sufferings and losses—they become incensed against Periklēs—his unshaken firmness in defending himself . . .	195	Operations on the coast of Akarnania.—Joint attack upon Akarnania, by land and sea, concerted between the Ambrakiots and Peloponnesians . . .	219
Athenian public assembly—last speech of Periklēs—his high tone of self-esteem against the public discontent . . .	196	Assemblage of the Ambrakiots, Peloponnesians, and Epirotic allies—divisions of Epirots . . .	220
Powerful effect of his address—new resolution shown for continuing the war—nevertheless, the discontent against Periklēs still continues . . .	197	They march to attack the Akarnanian town of Stratus . . .	<i>ib.</i>
He is accused and condemned in a fine . . .	198	Rashness of the Epirots—defeat and repulse of the army . . .	221
Old age of Periklēs—his family misfortunes—and suffering . . .	199	The Peloponnesian fleet comes from Corinth to Akarnania—movements of the Athenian Phormio to oppose it . . .	222
He is re-elected Stratēgus—restored to power and to the confidence of the people . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Naval battle between Phormio and the Peloponnesian fleet—his complete victory . . .	223
Last moments and death of Periklēs . . .	200	Reflections upon these two defeats of the Peloponnesians . . .	227
His life and character . . .	201	Indignation of the Lacedæmonians at the late naval defeat . they collect a larger fleet under Knēmus to act against Phormio . . .	228
Judgement of Thucydides respecting Periklēs . . .	202	Inferior numbers of Phormio—his manœuvring . . .	229
Earlier and later political life of Periklēs—how far the one differed from the other . . .	204	The Peloponnesian fleet forces Phormio to a battle on the line of coast near Naupaktus. Dispositions and harangues on both sides . . .	230
Accusation against Periklēs of having corrupted the Athenian people—untrue and not believed by Thucydides . . .	205	Battle near Naupaktus . . .	231
Great progress and improvement of the Athenians under Periklēs . . .	206	The Peloponnesian fleet at first successful, but afterwards defeated . . .	232
Periklēs is not to blame for the Peloponnesian war . . .	207	Retirement of the defeated Peloponnesian fleet. Phormio is reinforced—his operations in Akarnania—he returns to Athens . . .	234
Operations of war languid, under the pressure of the epidemic. Attack of the Ambrakiots on the Amphiloichian Argos: the Athenian Phormio is sent with a squadron to Naupaktus . . .	208	Attempt of Knēmus and Brasidas to surprise Peiræus, starting from Corinth . . .	235
Injury done to Athenian commerce by Peloponnesian privateers. The Lacedæmonians put to death all their prisoners taken at sea, even neutrals . . .	209	Alliance of the Athenians with the Odrysian king Sitalkēs . . .	236
Lacedæmonian envoys seized on their way to Persia and put to death by the Athenians . . .	210	Power of the Odrysians in Thrace—their extensive dominion over the other Thracian tribes . . .	237
Surrender of Potidæa—indulgent capitulation granted by the Athenian generals . . .	212	Sitalkēs, at the instigation of Athens, undertakes to attack Perdikkas and the Chalkidians of Thrace . . .	238
Third year of the war—king Archidamus marches to the invasion of Attica . . .	<i>ib.</i>	His vast and multifarious host of Thracians and other barbarians . . .	239
Remonstrance of the Platæans to Archidamus—his reply—he summons Platæa in vain . . .	213	He invades and ravages Macedonia and Chalkidikē . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Platæans resolve to stand out and defy the Lacedæmonian force . . .	215	He is forced to retire by the severity of the season and want of Athenian co-operation . . .	240
Invocation and excuse of Archidamus on hearing the refusal of the Platæans . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Appendix . . .	241
Commencement of the siege of Platæa . . .	216		
Operations of attack and defence—the besiegers make no progress, and are obliged to resort to blockade . . .	<i>ib.</i>		

Contents

xiii

	PAGE		PAGE
CHAPTER L		sons chiefly concerned in the late revolt, together with Salæthus . . . 265	
FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FOURTH YEAR OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR DOWN TO THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMOTIONS AT KORKYRA		Important debate in the Athenian assembly upon the treatment of the prisoners . . . <i>ib.</i>	
Fourth year of the war—internal suffering at Athens—Renewed invasion of Attica . . . 245		First mention of Kleon by Thucydides—new class of politicians to which he belonged . . . <i>ib.</i>	
Revolt of Mitylênê and most part of Lesbos from Athens . . . <i>ib.</i>		Eukratês, Kleon, Lysiklês, Hyperbolus, &c. 267	
Proceedings of Athens—powerful condition of Mitylênê—Athenian fleet sent thither under Klêippidês . . . 246		Character of Kleon <i>ib.</i>	
Klêippidês fails in surprising Mitylênê carries on an imperfect blockade . . . 247		Indignation of the Athenians against Mitylênê—proposition of Kleon to put to death the whole male population of military age is carried and passed . . . 269	
He receives reinforcements, and presses the siege with greater vigour—want of resolution on the part of the Mitylênæans . . . 249		Repentance of the Athenians after the decree is passed. A fresh assembly is convened to reconsider the decree . . . 270	
The Mitylênæan envoys address themselves to the Spartans at the Olympic festival, entreating aid . . . <i>ib.</i>		Account of the second assembly given by Thucydides—speech of Kleon in support of the resolution already passed . . . 271	
Tone and topics of their address . . . 250		Remarks on the speech of Kleon . . . 272	
Practical grounds of complaint on the part of the Mitylênæans against Athens—few or none . . . 251		Speech of Diodotus in opposition to Kleon—second decree mitigating the former . . . 273	
The Peloponnesians promise assistance to Mitylênê—energetic demonstration of the Athenians . . . 253		Rapid voyage of the trireme which carries the second decree to Mitylênê—it arrives just in time to prevent the execution of the first . . . 275	
Asôpius son of Phormio—in Akarnania . . . <i>ib.</i>		Those Mitylênæans, whom Pachês had sent to Athens, are put to death—treatment of Mitylênê by the Athenians . . . 276	
The accumulated treasure of Athens exhausted by her efforts—necessity for her to raise a direct contribution . . . 254		Enormities committed by Pachês at Mitylênê—his death before the Athenian dikastery . . . 278	
Outbreak of the Platæans from their blockaded town . . . 255		Surrender of Platæa to the Lacedæmonians . . . 279	
Their plan of escape—its extraordinary difficulty and danger . . . 256		The Platæan captive garrison are put upon their trial before Lacedæmonian judges . . . 280	
Half the garrison of Platæa escapes to Athens . . . <i>ib.</i>		Speech of the Platæan deputies to these judges on behalf of themselves and their comrades . . . <i>ib.</i>	
Blockade of Mitylênê closely carried on by the Athenian general Pachês—the Mitylênæans are encouraged to hold out by the Lacedæmonians, who send thither Salæthus . . . 259		Reply of the Thebans 281	
Mitylênê holds out till provisions are exhausted—Salæthus arms all the people of Mitylênê for a general sally—the people refuse to join—the city is surrendered to Athens, at discretion . . . <i>ib.</i>		The Platæans are sentenced to death by the Lacedæmonian judges, and all slain . . . 283	
The Peloponnesian fleet under Alkidas arrives off the coast of Ionia—astonishment and alarm which its presence creates . . . 261		Reason of the severity of the Lacedæmonians—cases of Platæa and Mitylênê compared . . . <i>ib.</i>	
Pachês, after the capture of Mitylênê, pursues the fleet of Alkidas, which returns to Peloponnesus without having done anything . . . 263		Circumstances of Korkyra—the Korkyræan captives are sent back from Corinth, under agreement to effect a revolution in the government and foreign politics of the island . . . 284	
Pachês at Notium—he captures the place—his perfidy towards Hippas, the leader of the garrison . . . <i>ib.</i>		Their attempts to bring about a revolution—they prosecute the democratical leader Peithias—he prosecutes five of them in revenge—they are found guilty . . . 285	
Notium recolonised from Athens as a separate town . . . 264		They assassinate Peithias and several other senators, and make themselves masters of the government—they decree neutrality—their unavailing mission to Athens . . . 286	
Pachês sends to Athens about a thousand Mitylênæan prisoners, the per-			

	PAGE		PAGE
The oligarchical party at Korkyra attack the people—obstinate battle in the city—victory of the people—arrival of the Athenian admiral Nikostratus	287	Nikias first opposed to Kleon—next to Alkibiadēs. Oligarchical clubs or Hetæries at Athens, for political and judicial purposes	305
Moderation of Nikostratus—proceedings of the people towards the vanquished oligarchs	289	Kleon—his real function that of opposition—real power inferior to Nikias <i>ib.</i>	
Arrival of the Lacedæmonian admiral Alkidas, with a fleet of fifty-three triremes. Renewed terror and struggle in the island	290	Revival of the epidemic distemper at Athens for another year—atmospheric and terrestrial disturbances in Greece. Lacedæmonian invasion of Attica suspended for this year	307
Naval battle off Korkyra between Nikostratus and Alkidas	<i>ib.</i>	Foundation of the colony of Herakleia by the Lacedæmonians, near Thermopylæ—its numerous settlers, great promise, and unprosperous career	308
Confusion and defenceless state of Korkyra—Alkidas declines to attack it—arrival of the Athenian fleet under Eurymedon—flight of Alkidas <i>ib.</i>	<i>ib.</i>	Athenian expedition against Melos, under Nikias	309
Vengeance of the victorious Demos in Korkyra against the prostrate oligarchs—fearful bloodshed	292	Proceedings of the Athenians under Demosthenēs in Akarnania	310
Lawless and ferocious murders—base connivance of Eurymedon	293	Expedition of Demosthenēs against Ætolia—his large plans	311
Band of oligarchical fugitives escape to the mainland—afterwards land again on the island, and establish themselves on Mount Istônē	<i>ib.</i>	March of Demosthenēs—impracticability of the territory of Ætolia—rudeness and bravery of the inhabitants	312
Political reflections introduced by Thucydides on occasion of the Korkyræan massacre	295	He is completely beaten and obliged to retire with loss	313
The political enormities of Korkyra were the worst that occurred in the whole war	<i>ib.</i>	Attack of Ætolians and Peloponnesians under Eurylochus upon Naupaktus	314
How these enormities began and became exaggerated. Conduct of the opposing parties	297	Naupaktus is saved by Demosthenēs and the Akarnanians	315
Contrast between the bloody character of revolutions at Korkyra and the mild character of analogous phenomena at Athens	298	Eurylochus, repulsed from Naupaktus, concert with the Ambrakiots an attack on Argos	<i>ib.</i>
Bad morality of the rich and great men throughout the Grecian cities	299	Demosthenēs and the Athenians, as well as the Akarnanians, come to the protection of Argos	316
		March of Eurylochus across Akarnania to join the Ambrakiots	<i>ib.</i>
		Their united army is defeated by Demosthenēs at Olpæ—Eurylochus slain	317
		The surviving Spartan commander makes a separate capitulation for himself and the Peloponnesians, deserting the Ambrakiots	318
		The Ambrakiots sustain much loss in their retreat	319
		Another large body of Ambrakiots, coming from the city as a reinforcement, is intercepted by Demosthenēs at Idomenē, and cut to pieces	<i>ib.</i>
		Despair of the Ambrakiot herald on seeing the great number of slain	320
		Defenceless and feeble condition of Ambrakia after this ruinous loss	322
		Attempt to calculate the loss of the Ambrakiots	<i>ib.</i>
		Convention concluded between Ambrakia on one side, and the Akarnanians and Amphilocheians on the other	323
		Return of Demosthenēs in triumph to Athens	324
		Purification of Delos by the Athenians. Revival of the Delian festival with peculiar splendour	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER LI

FROM THE TROUBLES IN KORKYRA, IN THE FIFTH YEAR OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR, DOWN TO THE END OF THE SIXTH YEAR

Capture of Minða, opposite Megara, by the Athenians under Nikias	300
Nikias—his first introduction, position and character	301
Varying circumstances and condition of the oligarchical party at Athens	<i>ib.</i>
Points of analogy between Nikias and Periklēs—material differences	302
Care of Nikias in maintaining his popularity and not giving offence; his very religious character	303
His diligence in increasing his fortune—speculations in the mines of Laurium—letting out of slaves for hire	304

Contents

xv

	PAGE		PAGE
CHAPTER LII			
SEVENTH YEAR OF THE WAR—CAPTURE OF SPHAKTERIA			
Seventh year of the war—invasion of Attica	325	certainty of the blockade—Demosthenés sends to Athens for reinforcements to attack the island	344
Distress in Korkyra from the attack of the oligarchical exiles. A Peloponnesian fleet, and an Athenian fleet, are both sent thither	<i>ib.</i>	Proceedings in the Athenian assembly on receiving this news—proposition of Kleon—manceuvre of his political enemies to send him against his will as general to Pylus	<i>ib.</i>
Demosthenés goes on board the Athenian fleet with a separate command	<i>ib.</i>	Reflections upon this proceeding, and upon the conduct of parties at Athens	346
He fixes upon Pylus in Laconia for erection of a fort. Locality of Pylus and Sphakteria	326	Kleon goes to Pylus with a reinforcement—condition of the island of Sphakteria—numbers and positions of the Lacedæmonians in it	348
Eurymedon the admiral of the fleet insists upon going on to Korkyra, without stopping at Pylus. The fleet are driven into Pylus by a storm	327	Kleon and Demosthenés land their forces in the island, and attack it	349
Demosthenés fortifies the place through the voluntary zeal of the soldiers. He is left there with a garrison while the fleet goes on to Korkyra	328	Numerous light troops of Demosthenés employed against the Lacedæmonians in Sphakteria	351
Slow march of the Lacedæmonians to recover Pylus	329	Distress of the Lacedæmonians—their bravery and long resistance	352
Preparations of Demosthenés to defend Pylus against them	330	They retreat to their last redoubt at the extremity of the island	353
Proceedings of the Lacedæmonian army—they send a detachment to occupy the island of Sphakteria, opposite Pylus	<i>ib.</i>	They are surrounded and forced to surrender	354
They attack the place by sea and land—gallant conduct of Brasidas in the attack on the sea-side	331	Astonishment caused throughout Greece by the surrender of Lacedæmonian hoplites—diminished lustre of Spartan arms	355
Return of Eurymedon and the Athenian fleet to Pylus	332	Judgement pronounced by Thucydides himself—reflections upon it	356
He defeats the Lacedæmonian fleet in the harbour of Pylus	333	Piejudice of Thucydides in regard to Kleon. Kleon displayed sound judgement and decision, and was one of the essential causes of the success	358
The Lacedæmonian detachment is blocked up by the Athenian fleet in the island of Sphakteria—armistice concluded at Pylus	334	Effect produced at Athens by the arrival of the Lacedæmonian prisoners	359
Mission of Lacedæmonian envoys to Athens, to propose peace, and solicit the release of their soldiers in Sphakteria	335	The Athenians prosecute the war with increased hopefulness and vigour. The Lacedæmonians make new advances for peace without effect	360
The Athenians, at the instance of Kleon, require the restoration of Nisæa, Pégeæ, Trœzen, and Achaia, as conditions of giving up the men in Sphakteria and making peace	336	Remarks upon the policy of Athens—her chance was now universally believed to be most favourable, in prosecuting the war	361
The envoys will not consent to these demands—Kleon prevents negotiation—they are sent back to Pylus without any result	339	Fluctuations in Athenian feeling for or against the war: there were two occasions on which Kleon contributed to influence them towards it	362
Remarks on this assembly and on the conduct of Athens	340	Expedition of Nikias against the Corinthian territory	363
The armistice is terminated, and war resumed at Pylus. Eurymedon keeps possession of the Lacedæmonian fleet	342	He re-embarks—ravages Epidaurus—establishes a post on the peninsula of Methana	364
Blockade of Sphakteria by the Athenian fleet—difficulty and hardships to the seamen of the fleet	<i>ib.</i>	Eurymedon with the Athenian fleet goes to Korkyra. Defeat and captivity of the Korkyræan exiles in the island	<i>ib.</i>
Protracted duration, and seeming un-		The captives are put to death—cruelty and horrors in the proceeding	365
		Capture of Anaktorium by the Athenians and Akarnanians	366
		Proceedings of the Athenians at Chios and Lesbos	367
		The Athenians capture Artaphernes,	

	PAGE		PAGE
a Persian envoy, on his way to		with the army from Athens to	
Sparta	367	Delium in Bœotia	384
Succession of Persian kings—		Hippokratēs fortifies Delium, after	
Xerxes, Artaxerxes Longimanus,		which the army retires homeward . . .	386
&c. Darius Nothus	368	Gathering of the Bœotian military	
		force at Tanagra. Pagondas, the	
		Theban Bœotarch, determines them	
		to fight	387
CHAPTER LIII		Marshalling of the Bœotian army—	
EIGHTH YEAR OF THE WAR		great depth of the Theban hoplites	
Important operations of the eighth		—special Theban band of Three	
year of the war	370	Hundred	389
Capture of Kytthēra by the Athenians.		Order of battle of the Athenian army .	390
Nikias ravages the Laconian coast .	<i>ib.</i>	Battle of Delium—vigorously con-	
Capture of Thyrea—all the Æginetans		tested—advantage derived from the	
resident there are either slain in the		depth of the Theban phalanx . . .	<i>ib.</i>
attack, or put to death afterwards as		Defeat and flight of the Athenians	
prisoners	372	—Hippokratēs, with 1000 hoplites,	
Alarm and depression among the		is slain	392
Lacedæmonians—their insecurity in		Interchange of heralds—remonstrance	
regard to the Helots	373	of the Bœotians against the Athenians	
They entrap, and cause to be		for desecrating the temple of Delium	
assassinated, 2000 of the bravest		—they refuse permission to bury the	
Helots	<i>ib.</i>	slain except on condition of quitting	
Request from the Chalkidians and		Delium	394
Perdikkas that Spartan aid may be		Answer of the Athenian herald—he	
sent to them under Brasidas . . .	375	demands permission to bury the	
Brasidas is ordered to go thither,		bodies of the slain	395
with Helot and Peloponnesian		The Bœotians persist in demanding	
hoplites	<i>ib.</i>	the evacuation of Delium as a	
Elate and enterprising dispositions		condition for granting permission	
prevalent at Athens. Plan formed		to bury the dead.—Debate on the	
against Megara. Condition of		subject	<i>ib.</i>
Megara	376	Remarks on the debate	396
The Athenians, under Hippokratēs		Siege and capture of Delium by the	
and Demosthenēs, attempt to sur-		Bœotians	397
prise Nisæa and Megara	377	Sokratēs and Alkibiadēs, personally	
Conspirators within open the gate,		engaged at Delium	399
and admit them into the Megarian		March of Brasidas through Thessaly	
Long Walls. They master the whole		to Thrace and Macedonia . . .	400
line of the Long Walls	378	Rapidity and address with which he	
The Athenians march to the gates of		gets through Thessaly	401
Megara—failure of the scheme of		Relations between Brasidas and	
the party within to open them . .	379	Perdikkas—Brasidas enters into an	
The Athenians attack Nisæa—the		accommodation with Arrhibæus—	
place surrenders to them	<i>ib.</i>	Perdikkas is offended	402
Dissension of parties in Megara—		Brasidas marches against Akanthus.	
intervention of Brasidas	380	State of parties in the town . . .	403
Brasidas gets together an army, and		He is admitted personally into the	
relieves Megara—no battle takes		town to explain his views—his speech	
place, but the Athenians retire . .	381	before the Akanthian assembly . .	<i>ib.</i>
Revolution at Megara—return of the		Debate in the Akanthian assembly,	
exiles from Pégæ, under pledge of		and decision of the majority voting	
amnesty—they violate their oaths,		secretly, to admit him, after much	
and effect a forcible oligarchical		opposition	405
revolution	382	Reflections upon this proceeding—	
Combined plan by Hippokratēs and		good political habits of the Akan-	
Demosthenēs for the invasion of		thians	<i>ib.</i>
Bœotia on three sides at once . .	383	Evidence which this proceeding	
Demosthenēs, with an Akarnanian		affords, that the body of citizens	
force, makes a descent on Bœotia		(among the Athenian allies) did	
at Siphæ in the Corinthian Gulf		not hate Athens, and were not	
—his scheme fails and he retires .	<i>ib.</i>	anxious to revolt	406
Disappointment of the Athenian plans		Brasidas establishes intelligences in	
—no internal movements take place		Argilus. He lays his plan for the	
in Bœotia. Hippokratēs marches		surprise of Amphipolis	407
		Night-march of Brasidas from Arné,	
		through Argilus, to the river	
		Strymon and Amphipolis	<i>ib.</i>

Contents

xvii

	PAGE		PAGE
He becomes master of the lands round Amphipolis, but is disappointed in gaining admission into the town . . .	410	The Athenians banish Thucydides on the proposition of Kleon . . .	414
He offers to the citizens the most favourable terms of capitulation, which they accept. Amphipolis capitulates . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Sentence of banishment passed on Thucydides by the Athenians—grounds of that sentence. He justly incurred their verdict of guilty . . .	415
Thucydides arrives at Eion from Thasos with his squadron—not in time to preserve Amphipolis—he preserves Eion . . .	411	Preparations of Brasidas in Amphipolis for extended conquest—his operations against the Akté, or promontory of Athos . . .	420
Alarm and dismay produced at Athens by the capture of Amphipolis—increased hopes among her enemies . . .	412	He attacks Tôroné in the Sithonian peninsula—he is admitted into the town by an internal party—surprises and takes it . . .	421
Extraordinary personal glory, esteem, and influence, acquired by Brasidas . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Some part of the population, with the small Athenian garrison, retire to the separate citadel called Lékythus . . .	422
Inaction and despondency of Athens after the battle of Delium, especially in reference to arresting the conquests of Brasidas in Thrace . . .	413	Conciliating address of Brasidas to the assembly at Tôroné . . .	423
Loss of Amphipolis was caused by the negligence of the Athenian commanders—Euklés and the historian Thucydides . . .	414	He attacks Lékythus and takes it by storm . . .	<i>ib.</i>
		Personal ability and conciliatory efficiency of Brasidas . . .	424

before the appointment of the Prætor, the Athenian archons not only administered, but also exercised jurisdiction, voluntary as well as contentious—decided disputes, inquired into crimes, and inflicted punishment. Of the same mixed nature were the functions of the senate of Areopagus, and even of the annual senate of Five Hundred, the creation of Kleisthenês. The Stratêgi, too, as well as the archons, had doubtless the double competence, in reference to military, naval, and foreign affairs, of issuing orders and of punishing by their own authority disobedient parties: the *imperium* of the magistrates, generally, enabled them to enforce their own mandates as well as to decide in cases of doubt whether any private citizen had or had not been guilty of infringement. Nor was there any appeal from these magisterial judgements: though the magistrates were subject, under the Kleisthenean constitution, to personal responsibility for their general behaviour, before the people judicially assembled, at the expiration of their year of office—and to the further animadversion of the Ekklesia (or public deliberative assembly) meeting periodically during the course of that year: in some of which assemblies, the question might formally be raised for deposing any magistrate even before his year was expired.¹ Still, in spite of such partial checks, the

and judiciary functions among the Romans (*Essai sur les Loix Criminelles des Romains*, pp. 23, 79, 107, &c.). Compare Sir G. C. Lewis, *Essay on the Government of Dependencies*, p. 42, with his citation from Hugo, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, p. 42. Sir G. Lewis has given just and valuable remarks upon the goodness of the received classification of powers as a theory, and upon the extent to which the separation of them either has been, or can be, carried in practice: see also Note E. in the same work, p. 347.

The separation of administrative from judicial functions appears unknown in early societies. M. Meyer observes, respecting the judicial institutions of modern Europe, "Anciennement les fonctions administratives et judiciaires n'étoient pas distinctes. Du temps de la liberté des Germains et même long temps après, les plaids de la nation ou ceux du comté rendoient la justice et administroient les intérêts nationaux ou locaux dans une seule et même assemblée: sous le régime féodal, le roi ou l'empereur dans son conseil, sa cour, son parlement composé des hauts barons ecclésiastiques et laïcs, exerçoit tous les droits de souveraineté comme de justice: dans la commune, le bailli, mayor, ou autre fonctionnaire nommé par le prince, administroient les intérêts communaux et jugeoient les bourgeois de l'avis de la communauté entière, des corporations qui la composoient, ou des autorités et conseils qui la représentoient: on n'avoit pas encore soupçonné que le jugement d'une cause entre particuliers pût être étranger à la cause commune."—Meyer, *Esprit des Institutions Judiciaires*, book v. chap. II, vol. iii. p. 239; also chap. 18, p. 383.

¹ A case of such deposition of an archon by vote of the public assembly, even before the year of office was expired, occurs in Demosthenês, cont. Theokrin. c. 7: another, the deposition of a stratêgus, in Demosthen. cont. Timoth. c. 3.

accumulation, in the same hand, of powers to administer, judge, punish, and decide civil disputes, without any other canon than the few laws then existing, and without any appeal—must have been painfully felt, and must have often led to corrupt, arbitrary, and oppressive dealing. And if this be true of individual magistrates, exposed to annual accountability, it is not likely to have been less true of the senate of Areopagus, which, acting collectively, could hardly be rendered accountable, and in which the members sat for life.¹

I have already mentioned that shortly after the return of the expatriated Athenians from Salamis, Aristeidês had been impelled by the strong democratical sentiment which he found among his countrymen to propose the abolition of all pecuniary qualification for magistracies, so as to render every citizen legally eligible. This innovation, however, was chiefly valuable as a victory and as an index of the predominant sentiment. Notwithstanding the enlarged promise of eligibility, little change probably took place in the fact, and rich men were still most commonly chosen. Hence the magistrates, possessing the large powers administrative and judicial above described—and still more the senate of Areopagus, which sat for life—still belonging almost entirely to the wealthier class, remained animated more or less with the same oligarchical interests and sympathies, which manifested themselves in the abuse of authority. At the same time the democratical sentiment among the mass of Athenians went on steadily increasing from the time of Aristeidês to that of Periklês : Athens became more and more maritime, the population of Peiræus augmented in number as well as in importance, and the spirit even of the poorest citizen was stimulated by that collective aggrandisement of his city to which he himself individually contributed. Before twenty years had elapsed, reckoning from the battle of Plataea, this new fervour of democratical sentiment made itself felt in the political contests of Athens, and found able champions in Periklês and Ephialtês, rivals of what may be called the conservative party headed by Kimon.

We have no positive information that it was Periklês who

¹ Æschinês (cont. Ktesiphont. c. 9, p. 373) speaks of the senate of Areopagus as *ἐπεύθυνος*, and so it was doubtless understood to be : but it is difficult to see how accountability could be practically enforced against such a body. They could only be responsible in this sense—that if any one of their number could be proved to have received a bribe, he would be individually punished. But in this sense the dikasteries themselves would also be responsible : though it is always affirmed of them that they were not responsible.

introduced the lot, in place of election, for the choice of archons and various other magistrates. But the change must have been introduced nearly at this time, and with a view of equalising the chances of office to every candidate, poor as well as rich, who chose to give in his name and who fulfilled certain personal and family conditions ascertained in the *dokimasy* or preliminary examination. But it was certainly to Periklès and Ephialtès that Athens owed the elaborate constitution of her popular *Dikasteries* or Jury-courts regularly paid, which exercised so important an influence upon the character of the citizens. These two eminent men deprived both the magistrates, and the senate of *Areopagus*, of all the judicial and penal competence which they had hitherto possessed, save and except the power of imposing a small fine. This judicial power, civil as well as criminal, was transferred to numerous *dikasts*, or panels of jurors selected from the citizens; 6000 of whom were annually drawn by lot, sworn, and then distributed into ten panels of 500 each; the remainder forming a supplement in case of vacancies. The magistrate, instead of deciding causes or inflicting punishment by his own authority, was now constrained to impanel a jury—that is, to submit each particular case, which might call for a penalty greater than the small fine to which he was competent, to the judgement of one or other among these numerous popular *dikasteries*. Which of the ten he should take, was determined by lot, so that no one knew beforehand what *dikastery* would try any particular cause. The magistrate himself presided over it during the trial and submitted to it the question at issue, together with the results of his own preliminary examination; after which came the speeches of accuser and accused with the statements of their witnesses. So also the civil judicature, which had before been exercised in controversies between man and man by the archons, was withdrawn from them and transferred to these *dikasteries* under the presidency of an archon. It is to be remarked, that the system of reference to arbitration, for private causes,¹ was extensively applied at Athens. A certain number

¹ Respecting the procedure of arbitration at Athens, and the public as well as private arbitrators, see the instructive treatise of Hudtwalcker, *Über die öffentlichen und Privat Schieds-richter* (*Diaeteten zu Athen*: Jena, 1812.

Each arbitrator seems to have sat alone to inquire into and decide disputes: he received a small fee of one drachma from both parties; also an additional fee when application was made for delay (p. 16). Parties might by mutual consent fix upon any citizen to act as arbitrator: but there were a certain number of public arbitrators, elected or drawn by lot from

of public arbitrators were annually appointed, to one of whom (or to some other citizen adopted by mutual consent of the parties), all private disputes were submitted in the first instance. If dissatisfied with the decision, either party might afterwards carry the matter before the dikastery: but it appears that in many cases the decision of the arbitrator was acquiesced in without this ultimate resort.

I do not here mean to affirm that there never was any trial by the people before the time of Periklês and Ephialtês. I doubt not that before their time the numerous judicial assembly, called *Heliaea*, pronounced upon charges against accountable magistrates as well as upon various other accusations of public importance; and perhaps in some cases separate bodies of them may have been drawn by lot for particular trials. But it is not the less true, that the systematic distribution and constant employment of the numerous dikasts of Athens cannot have begun before the age of these two statesmen, since it was only then that the practice of paying them began. For so large a sacrifice of time on the part of poor men, wherein M. Boeckh states¹ (in somewhat exaggerated language) that "nearly one third of the citizens sat as judges every day," cannot be conceived without an assured remuneration. From and after the time of Periklês, these dikasteries were the exclusive assemblies for trial of all causes civil as well as criminal, with

the citizens every year: and a plaintiff might bring his cause before any one of these. They were liable to be punished under *εθουραι*, at the end of their year of office, if accused and convicted of corruption or unfair dealing.

The number of these public *Diaetetai* or arbitrators was unknown when Hudtwalcker's book was published. An inscription since discovered by Professor Ross and published in his work, *Über die Deme von Attika*, p. 22, records the names of all the *Diaetetai* for the year of the archon Antiklês, B.C. 325, with the name of the tribe to which each belonged.

The total number is 104: the number in each tribe is unequal: the largest number is in Kekropis, which furnishes sixteen: the smallest in Pandionis, which sends only three. They must have been either elected or drawn by lot from the general body of citizens, without any reference to tribes. The inscription records the names of the *Diaetetai* for this year B.C. 325, in consequence of their being crowned or receiving a vote of thanks from the people. The fragment of a like inscription for the year B.C. 337, also exists.

¹ Public Economy of the Athenians, book ii. chap. xiv. p. 227, Engl. transl.

M. Boeckh must mean that the whole 6000, or nearly the whole, were employed every day. It appears to me that this supposition greatly overstates both the number of days, and the number of men, actually employed. For the inference in the text, however, a much smaller number is sufficient.

See the more accurate remark of Schömann, *Antiquit. Juris Public. Græcor.*, sect. lxxi. p. 310.

some special exceptions, such as cases of homicide and a few others : but before his time, the greater number of such causes had been adjudged either by individual magistrates or by the senate of Areopagus. We may therefore conceive how great and important was the revolution wrought by that statesman, when he first organised these dikastic assemblies into systematic action, and transferred to them nearly all the judicial power which had before been exercised by magistrates and senate. The position and influence of these latter became radically altered. The most commanding functions of the archon were abrogated, so that he retained only the power of receiving complaints, inquiring into them, exercising some small preliminary interference with the parties for the furtherance of the cause or accusation, fixing the day for trial, and presiding over the dikastic assembly by whom peremptory verdict was pronounced. His administrative functions remained unaltered, but his powers, inquisitorial and determining, as a judge, passed away.¹

In reference to the senate of Areopagus also, the changes introduced were not less considerable. That senate, anterior to the democracy in point of date, and standing alone in the enjoyment of a life-tenure, appears to have exercised an undefined and extensive control which long continuance had gradually consecrated. It was invested with a kind of religious respect, and believed to possess mysterious traditions emanating from a divine source.² Especially, the cognisance which

¹ Aristotel. *Politic.* ii. 9, 3. Καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρεῖᾳ πάγῳ βουλὴν Ἐφιδάλτης ἐκόλουσε καὶ Περικλῆς· τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια μισθοφόρα κατέστησε Περικλῆς· καὶ τοῦτον δὴ τὸν τρόπον ἕκαστος τῶν δημαγωγῶν προήγαγεν, αἰξὼν εἰς τὴν νῦν δημοκρατίαν. Φαίνεται δ' οὐ κατὰ τὴν Σόλωνος γενέσθαι τοῦτο προαίρεσιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀπὸ συμπτώματος. Τῆς ναυαρχίας γὰρ ἐν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς ὁ δῆμος αἰτίος γενόμενος ἐφρονηματίσθη, καὶ δημαγωγοὺς ἔλαβε φαύλους, ἀντιπολιτευομένων τῶν ἐπιεικῶν· ἐπεὶ Σόλων γ' εἴκοι τὴν ἀναγκαιοτάτην ἀποδιδόναι τῇ δῆμῳ δύναμιν, τὸ τὰς ἀρχὰς αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύνειν· μηδὲ γὰρ τοῦτου κύριος ὢν ὁ δῆμος, δοῦλος ἂν εἴη καὶ πολέμιος.

² Deinarchus cont. Demosthen. *Or.* i. p. 91. φυλάττει τὰς ἀπορρήτους διαθήκας, ἐν αἷς τὰ τῆς πόλεως σωτήρια κεῖται, &c. So also Æschinēs calls this senate τὴν σκυθρωπὴν καὶ τῶν μεγίστων κυρίαν βουλὴν (cont. Ktesiphont. c. 9, p. 373 : compare also cont. Timarchum, c. 16, p. 41 ; Demosth. cont. Aristokrat. c. 65, p. 641). Plutarch, Solon, c. 19. τὴν ἄνω βουλὴν ἐπισκοποῦν πάντων καὶ φύλακα τῶν νόμων, &c.

Ἐδίκασον οὖν οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται περὶ πάντων σχεδὸν τῶν σφαλμάτων καὶ παρανομιῶν, ὡς ἅπαντὰ φησὶν Ἀνδροτίων ἐν πρώτῃ καὶ Φιλόχορος ἐν δευτέρᾳ καὶ τρίτῃ τῶν Ἀτθίδων (Philochorus, *Fr.* 17–58, ed. Didot, p. 19, ed. Siebelis).

See about the Areopagus, Schömann, *Antiq. Jur. Att. sect.* lxxvi. ; K. F. Hermann, *Griech. Staatsalterthümer*, sect. 109.

it took of intentional homicide was a part of old Attic religion not less than of judicature. Though put in the background for a time after the expulsion of the Peisistratids, it had gradually recovered itself when recruited by the new archons under the Kleisthenean constitution ; and during the calamitous sufferings of the Persian invasion, its forwardness and patriotism had been so highly appreciated as to procure for it an increased sphere of ascendancy. Trials for homicide were only a small part of its attributions. It exercised judicial competence in many other cases besides : and what was of still greater moment, it maintained a sort of censorial police over the lives and habits of the citizens—it professed to enforce a tutelary and paternal discipline beyond that which the strict letter of the law could mark out, over the indolent, the prodigal, the undutiful, and the deserters from old rite and custom. To crown all, the senate of Areopagus also exercised a supervision over the public assembly, taking care that none of the proceedings of those meetings should be such as to infringe the established laws of the country. These were powers immense as well as undefined, not derived from any formal grant of the people, but having their source in immemorial antiquity and sustained by general awe and reverence. When we read the serious expressions of this sentiment in the mouths of the later orators—Demosthenês, Æschinês, or Deinarchus—we shall comprehend how strong it must have been a century and a half before them, at the period of the Persian invasion. Isokratês, in his Discourse usually called *Areopagiticus*, written a century and a quarter after that invasion, draws a picture of what the senate of Areopagus had been while its competence was yet undiminished, and ascribes to it a power of interference little short of paternal despotism, which he asserts to have been most salutary and improving in its effect. That the picture of this rhetor is inaccurate—and to a great degree indeed ideal, insinuating his own recommendations under the colour of past realities—is sufficiently obvious. But it enables us to presume generally the extensive regulating power of the senate of Areopagus, in affairs both public and private, at the time which we are now describing.

Such powers were pretty sure to be abused. When we learn that the Spartan senate¹ was lamentably open to bribery, we can hardly presume much better of the life-sitting elders at Athens. But even if their powers had been guided by all that beneficence of intention which Isokratês affirms, they were in

¹ Aristotol. Politic. ii. 6, 18.

their nature such as could only be exercised over a passive and stationary people: while the course of events at Athens, at that time peculiarly, presented conditions altogether the reverse. During the pressure of the Persian invasion, indeed, the senate of Areopagus had been armed with more than ordinary authority, which it had employed so creditably as to strengthen its influence and tighten its supervision during the period immediately following. But that same trial had also called forth in the general body of the citizens a fresh burst of democratical sentiment, and an augmented consciousness of force, both individual and national. Here then were two forces, not only distinct but opposite and conflicting, both put into increased action at the same time.¹ Nor was this all: a novel cast was just then given to Athenian life and public habits by many different circumstances—the enlargement of the city, the creation of the fortified port and new town of Peiræus, the introduction of an increased nautical population, the active duties of Athens as head of the Delian confederacy, &c. All these circumstances tended to open new veins of hope and feeling, and new lines of action, in the Athenians between 480–460 B.C., and by consequence to render the interference of the senate of Areopagus, essentially old-fashioned and conservative as it was, more and more difficult. But at the very time when prudence would have counselled that it should have been relaxed or modified, the senate appear to have rendered it stricter, or at least to have tried to do so; which could not fail to raise against them a considerable body of enemies. Not merely the democratical innovators, but also the representatives of new interests generally at Athens, became opposed to the senate as an organ of vexatious repression, employed for oligarchical purposes.²

¹ Aristotle particularly indicates these two conflicting tendencies in Athens, the one immediately following the other, in a remarkable passage of his *Politics* (v. 3, 5)—

Μεταβάλλουσι δὲ καὶ εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν καὶ εἰς δῆμον καὶ εἰς πολιτείαν ἐκ τοῦ εὐδοκιμῆσαι τι ἢ αὐξηθῆναι ἢ ἀρχεῖον ἢ μῦριον τῆς πόλεως· οἷον, ἢ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴ εὐδοκιμήσασα ἐν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς ἔδοξε συντονωτέραν ποιῆσαι τὴν πολιτείαν. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ ναυτικὸς ὄχλος γενόμενος αἰτίος τῆς περὶ Σαλαμίνα νίκης καὶ διὰ ταύτης τῆς ἡγεμονίας καὶ διὰ τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν δύναμιν, τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἰσχυροτέραν ἐποίησεν.

The word *συντονωτέραν* ("stricter, more rigid") stands opposed in another passage to *ἀνειμένας* (iv. 3, 5).

² Plutarch, *Reipub. Ger. Præcept.* p. 805. Οὐκ ἀγνωῶ δὲ, ὅτι βουλήν τινες ἐπαχθῆ καὶ ὀλιγαρχικὴν κολουῦσαντες, ὥσπερ Ἐφιάλτης Ἀθήνησι καὶ Φορμίων παρ' Ἡλείοις, δύναμιν ἅμα καὶ δόξαν ἔσχον.

About the oligarchical character of the Areopagites, see Deinarchus cont. Demosthen. pp. 46, 98.

From the character of the senate of Areopagus and the ancient reverence with which it was surrounded, it served naturally as a centre of action to the oligarchical or conservative party: that party which desired to preserve the Kleisthenean constitution unaltered—with undiminished authority, administrative as well as judicial, both to individual magistrates and to the collective Areopagus. Of this sentiment, at the time of which we are now speaking, Kimon was the most conspicuous leader. His brilliant victories at the Eurymedon, as well as his exploits in other warlike enterprises, doubtless strengthened very much his political influence at home. The same party also probably included the large majority of rich and old families at Athens; who, so long as the magistracies were elected and not chosen by lot, usually got themselves chosen, and had every interest in keeping the power of such offices as high as they could. Moreover the party was further strengthened by the pronounced support of Sparta, imparted chiefly through Kimon, proxenus of Sparta at Athens. Of course such aid could only have been indirect, yet it appears to have been of no inconsiderable moment—for when we consider that Ægina had been in ancient feud with Athens, and Corinth in a temper more hostile than friendly, the good feeling of the Lacedæmonians might well appear to Athenian citizens eminently desirable to preserve: and the philo-Laconian character of the leading men at Athens contributed to disarm the jealousy of Sparta during that critical period while the Athenian maritime ascendancy was in progress.¹

The political opposition between Periklês and Kimon was hereditary, since Xanthippos the father of the former had been the accuser of Miltiadês the father of the latter. Both were of the first families in the city, and this, combined with the military talents of Kimon and the great statesmanlike superiority of Periklês, placed both the one and the other at the head of the two political parties which divided Athens. Periklês must have begun his political career very young, since he maintained a position first of great influence, and afterwards of unparalleled moral and political ascendancy, for the long period of forty years, against distinguished rivals, bitter assailants, and unscrupulous libellers (about 467–428 B.C.). His public life began about the time when Themistoklês was ostracised, and when Aristeidês was passing off the stage, and he soon displayed a character which combined the pecuniary probity of the one with the resource and large views of the

¹ Plutarch, Kimon, c. 16; Themistoklês, c. 20.

other ; superadding to both, a discretion and mastery of temper never disturbed—an excellent musical and lettered education received from Pythokleidês—an eloquence such as no one before had either heard or conceived—and the best philosophy which the age afforded. His military duties as a youthful citizen were faithfully and strenuously performed, but he was timid in his first political approaches to the people—a fact perfectly in unison with the caution of his temperament, but which some of his biographers¹ explained by saying that he was afraid of being ostracised, and that his countenance resembled that of the despot Peisistratus. We may be pretty sure however that this personal resemblance (like the wonderful dream ascribed to his mother² when pregnant of him) was an after-thought of enemies when his ascendancy was already established—and that young beginners were in little danger of ostracism. The complexion of political parties in Athens had greatly changed since the days of Themistoklês and Aristeidês. For the Kleisthenean constitution, though enlarged by the latter after the return from Salamis to the extent of making all citizens without exception eligible for magistracy, had become unpopular with the poorer citizens and to the keener democratical feeling which now ran through Athens and Peiræus.

It was to this democratical party—the party of movement against that of resistance, or of reformers against conservatives, if we are to employ modern phraseology—that Periklês devoted his great rank, character, and abilities. From the low arts, which it is common to ascribe to one who espouses the political interests of the poor against the rich, he was remarkably exempt. He was indefatigable in his attention to public business, but he went little into society, and disregarded almost to excess the airs of popularity. His eloquence was irresistibly impressive ; yet he was by no means prodigal of it, taking care to reserve himself, like the Salaminian trireme, for solemn occasions, and preferring for the most part to employ the agency of friends and partisans.³ Moreover he imbibed from his friend and teacher Anaxagoras a tinge of physical philosophy which greatly strengthened his mind⁴ and armed him against many of the reigning superstitions—but which at the

¹ Plutarch, Periklês, c. 4-7 *seq.*

² Herodot. vi. 131.

³ Plutarch, Reipub. Gerend. Præcept. p. 812 ; Periklês, c. 5, 6, 7.

⁴ Plato, Phædrus, c. 54, p. 270 ; Plutarch, Periklês, c. 8 ; Xenoph. Memor. i. 2, 46.

same time tended to rob him of the sympathy of the vulgar, rich as well as poor. The arts of demagogy were in fact much more cultivated by the oligarchical Kimon; whose open-hearted familiarity of manner was extolled, by his personal friend the poet Ion, in contrast with the reserved and stately demeanour of his rival Periklēs. Kimon employed the rich plunder, procured by his maritime expeditions, in public decorations as well as in largesses to the poorer citizens; throwing open his fields and fruits to all the inhabitants of his deme, and causing himself to be attended in public by well-dressed slaves, directed to tender their warm tunics in exchange for the threadbare garments of those who seemed in want. But the property of Periklēs was administered with a strict, though benevolent economy, by his ancient steward Evangelus—the produce of his lands being all sold, and the consumption of his house supplied by purchase in the market.¹ It was by such regularity that his perfect and manifest independence of all pecuniary seduction was sustained. In taste, in talent, and in character, Kimon was the very opposite of Periklēs: a brave and efficient commander, a lavish distributor, a man of convivial and amorous habits—but incapable of sustained attention to business, untaught in music or letters, and endued with Laconian aversion to rhetoric and philosophy; while the ascendancy of Periklēs was founded on his admirable combination of civil qualities—probity, firmness, diligence, judgement, eloquence, and power of guiding partisans. As a military commander, though noway deficient in personal courage, he rarely courted distinction, and was principally famous for his care of the lives of the citizens, discountenancing all rash or distant enterprises. His private habits were sober and recluse: his chief conversation was with Anaxagoras, Protagoras,² Zeno, the musician Damon, and other philosophers—while the tenderest domestic attachment bound him to the engaging and cultivated Aspasia.

Such were the two men who stood forward at this time as most conspicuous in Athenian party-contest—the expanding democracy against the stationary democracy of the past generation, which now passed by the name of oligarchy—the ambitious and talkative energy, spread even among the poor population, which was now forming more and more the

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 9, 16; Kimon, c. 10; *Scipubli. Gerend. Præcept.* p. 818.

² The personal intercourse between Periklēs and Protagoras is attested by the interesting fragment of the latter which we find in Plutarch, *Consolat. ad Apollonium*, c. 33, p. 119.

characteristic of Athens, against the unlettered and uninquiring valour of the conquerors of Marathon.¹ Ephialtês, son of Sophônidês, was at this time the leading auxiliary, seemingly indeed the equal of Periklês, and noway inferior to him in personal probity, though he was a poor man.² As to aggressive political warfare, he was even more active than Periklês, who appears throughout his long public life to have manifested but little bitterness against political enemies. Unfortunately our scanty knowledge of the history of Athens brings before us only some general causes and a few marked facts. The details and the particular persons concerned are not within our sight: yet the actual course of political events depends everywhere mainly upon these details, as well as upon the general causes. Before Ephialtês advanced his main proposition for abridging the competence of the senate of Areopagus, he appears to have been strenuous in repressing the practical abuse of magisterial authority, by accusations brought against the magistrates at the period of their regular accountability. After repeated efforts, to check the practical abuse of these magisterial powers,³ Ephialtês and Periklês were at last conducted to the proposition of cutting them down permanently, and introducing an altered system.

Such proceedings naturally provoked extreme bitterness of party-feeling. It is probable that this temper may have partly dictated the accusation preferred against Kimon (about 463 B.C.) after the surrender of Thasos, for alleged reception of bribes from the Macedonian prince Alexander—an accusation of which he was acquitted. At this time the oligarchical or Kimonian party was decidedly the most powerful: and when the question was proposed for sending troops to aid the Lacedæmonians in reducing the revolted Helots on Ithômê, Kimon carried the people along with him to comply, by an appeal to their generous feelings, in spite of the strenuous opposition of Ephialtês.⁴ But when Kimon and the Athenian hoplites returned home, having been dismissed by Sparta under circumstances of insulting suspicion (as has been mentioned in the preceding chapter), the indignation of the citizens was extreme. They renounced their alliance with Sparta, and entered into

¹ Aristophan. *Nubes*, 972, 1000 *seq.* and *Ranæ*, 1071.

² Plutarch, *Kimon*, c. 10; *Ælian*, V. H. ii. 43; xi. 9.

³ Plutarch, *Periklês*, c. 10: compare *Valer. Maxim.* iii. 8, 4. 'Εφιάλτην μὲν οὖν, φοβερὸν ὄντα τοῖς ὀλιγαρχικοῖς καὶ περὶ τὰς εὐθύνas καὶ διώξεις τῶν τὸν δῆμον ἀδικούντων ἀπαραίτητον, ἐπιβουλεύσαντες οἱ ἐχθροὶ δι' Ἀριστοδίκου τοῦ Ταναργικοῦ κρυφαίως ἀνείλον, &c.

⁴ Plutarch, *Kimon*, c. 16.

amity with Argos. Of course the influence of Kimon, and the position of the oligarchical party, was materially changed by this incident. And in the existing bitterness of political parties, it is not surprising that his opponents should take the opportunity for proposing soon afterwards a vote of ostracism¹—a challenge, indeed, which may perhaps have been accepted not unwillingly by Kimon and his party, since they might still fancy themselves the strongest, and suppose that the sentence of banishment would fall upon Ephialtês or Periklês. However, the vote ended in the expulsion of Kimon, a sure proof that his opponents were now in the ascendant. On this occasion, as on the preceding, we see the ostracism invoked to meet a period of intense political conflict, the violence of which it would at least abate, by removing for the time one of the contending leaders.

It was now that Periklês and Ephialtês carried their important scheme of judicial reform. The senate of Areopagus was deprived of its discretionary censorial power, as well as of all its judicial competence, except that which related to homicide. The individual magistrates, as well as the senate of Five Hundred, were also stripped of their judicial attributes (except the power of imposing a small fine²), which were transferred to the newly-created panels of salaried dikasts, lotted off in ten divisions from the aggregate *Heliaea*. Ephialtês³ first brought down the laws of Solon from the acropolis to the neighbourhood of the market-place, where the dikasteries sat—a visible proof that the judicature was now popularised.

In the representations of many authors, the full bearing of this great constitutional change is very inadequately conceived. What we are commonly told is, that Periklês was the first to assign a salary to these numerous dikasteries at Athens. He bribed the people with the public money (says Plutarch), in order to make head against Kimon, who bribed them out of his own private purse: as if the pay were the main feature in

¹ Plutarch, Kimon, c. 17. Οἱ δὲ πρὸς ὀργὴν ἀπελθόντες ἤδη τοῖς λακωνίζουσι φανερώς ἐχαλέπαινον, καὶ τὸν Κίμωνα μικρὰς ἐπιλαβόμενοι προφάσεως ἐξωστράκισαν εἰς ἑτὴ δέκα.

I transcribe this passage as a specimen of the inaccurate manner in which the ostracism is so often described. Plutarch says—"The Athenians took advantage of a slight pretence to ostracise Kimon:" but it was a peculiar characteristic of ostracism that it had no *pretence*: it was a judgement passed without specific or assigned cause.

² Demosthen. cont. Euerg. et Mnesibul. c. 12.

³ Harpokration—Ὁ κάτωθεν νόμος—Pollux, xiii. 128.

the case, and as if all which Periklēs did was, to make himself popular by paying the dikasts for judicial service which they had before rendered gratuitously. The truth is, that this numerous army of dikasts, distributed into ten regiments, and summoned to act systematically throughout the year, was now for the first time organised : the commencement of their pay is also the commencement of their regular judicial action. What Periklēs really effected was, to sever for the first time from the administrative competence of the magistrates that judicial authority which had originally gone along with it. The great men who had been accustomed to hold these offices were lowered both in influence and authority :¹ while on the other hand a new life, habit, and sense of power, sprung up among the poorer citizens. A plaintiff having cause of civil action, or an accuser invoking punishment against citizens guilty of injury either to himself or to the state, had still to address himself to one or other of the archons, but it was only with a view of ultimately arriving before the dikastery by whom the cause was to be tried. While the magistrates acting individually were thus restricted to simple administration and preliminary police, they experienced a still more serious loss of power in their capacity of members of the Areopagus, after the year of archonship was expired. Instead of their previous unmeasured range of supervision and interference, they were now deprived of all judicial sanction beyond that small power of fining which was still left both to individual magistrates, and to the senate of Five Hundred. But the cognisance of homicide was still expressly reserved to them—for the procedure, in this latter case religious not less than judicial, was so thoroughly consecrated

¹ Aristot. Polit. iv. 5, 6. *ἔτι δ' οἱ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ἐγκαλοῦντες τὸν δῆμόν φασι δεῖν κρίνειν· ὃ δ' ἀσμένως δέχεται τὴν πρόκλησιν· ὥστε καταλύονται πᾶσαι αἱ ἀρχαί, &c.* : compare vi. 1, 8.

The remark of Aristotle is not justly applicable to the change effected by Periklēs, which transferred the power taken from the magistrates, not to the people, but to certain specially constituted, though numerous and popular dikasteries, sworn to decide in conformity with known and written laws. Nor is the separation of judicial competence from administrative, to be characterised as “dissolving or extinguishing magisterial authority.” On the contrary, it is conformable to the best modern notions. Periklēs cannot be censured for having effected this separation, however persons may think that the judicature which he constituted was objectionable.

Plato seems also to have conceived administrative power as essentially accompanied by judicial (Legg. vi. p. 767)—*πάντα ἔρχοντα ἀναγκαῖον καὶ δικάστην εἶναι τινων*—an opinion doubtless perfectly just, up to a certain narrow limit : the separation between the two sorts of powers cannot be rendered *absolutely* complete.

by ancient feeling, that no reformer could venture to disturb or remove it.¹

¹ Demosthen. cont. Neær. p. 1372 ; cont. Aristokrat. p. 642.

Meier (*Attischer Prozess*, p. 143) thinks that the senate of Areopagus was also deprived of its cognisance of homicide as well as of its other functions, and that this was only restored after the expulsion of the Thirty. He produces as evidence a passage of Lysias (*De Cæde Eratosthenis*, p. 31-33).

M. Boeckh and O. Müller adopt the same opinion as Meier, and seemingly on the authority of the same passage (see the Dissertation of O. Müller on the Eumenides of Æschylus, p. 113, Eng. transl.). But in the first place, this opinion is contradicted by an express statement in the anonymous biographer of Thucydides, who mentions the trial of Pylilampês for murder before the Areopagus; and contradicted also, seemingly, by Xenophon (*Memorab.* iii. 5, 20); in the next place, the passage of Lysias appears to me to bear a different meaning. He says, *ἐκ καὶ πατρὶός ἐστι καὶ ἐφ' ὑμῶν ἀποδίδεται τοῦ φόνου τὰς δίκας δικάζειν*: now (even if we admit the conjectural reading *ἐφ' ὑμῶν* in place of *ἐφ' ὑμῶν* to be correct) still this restoration of functions to the Areopagus refers naturally to the restored democracy after the violent interruption occasioned by the oligarchy of the Thirty. Considering how many persons the Thirty caused to be violently put to death, and the complete subversion of all the laws which they introduced, it seems impossible to suppose that the Areopagus could have continued to hold its sittings and try accusations for intentional homicide, under their government. On the return of the democracy after the Thirty were expelled, the functions of the senate of Areopagus would return also.

If the supposition of the eminent authors mentioned above were correct—if it were true that the Areopagus was deprived not only of its supervising function generally, but also of its cognisance of homicide, during the fifty-five years which elapsed between the motion of Ephialtês and the expulsion of the Thirty—this senate must have been without any functions at all during that long interval; it must have been for all practical purposes non-existent. But during so long a period of total suspension, the citizens would have lost all their respect for it; it could not have retained so much influence as we know that it actually possessed immediately before the Thirty (*Lysias c. Eratosth. c. 11*, p. 126); and it would hardly have been revived after the expulsion of the Thirty. Whereas by preserving during that period its jurisdiction in cases of homicide, apart from those more extended privileges which had formerly rendered it obnoxious, the ancient traditional respect for it was kept alive, and it was revived after the fall of the Thirty as a venerable part of the old democracy; even apparently with some extension of privileges.

The inferences which O. Müller wishes to draw, as to the facts of these times, from the Eumenides of Æschylus, appear to me ill-supported. In order to sustain his view that by virtue of the proposition of Ephialtês “the Areopagus almost entirely ceased to be a high Court of Judicature” (*sect. 36*, p. 109), he is forced to alter the chronology of the events, and to affirm that the motion of Ephialtês must have been carried subsequently to the representation of the Eumenides, though Diodorus mentions it in the year next but one before, and there is nothing to contradict him. All that we can safely infer from the very indistinct allusions in Æschylus, is, that he himself was full of reverence for the Areopagus, and that the season was one

It was upon this same ground probably that the stationary party defended *all* the prerogatives of the senate of Areopagus—denouncing the curtailments proposed by Ephialtês as impious and guilty innovations.¹ How extreme their resentment became, when these reforms were carried—and how fierce was the collision of political parties at this moment—we may judge by the result. The enemies of Ephialtês caused him to be privately assassinated, by the hand of a Boeotian of Tanagra named Aristodikus. Such a crime—rare in the political annals of Athens, for we come to no known instance of it afterwards until the oligarchy of the Four Hundred in 411 B.C.—marks at once the gravity of the change now introduced, the fierceness of the opposition offered, and the unscrupulous character of the conservative party. Kimon was in exile and had no share in the deed. Doubtless the assassination of Ephialtês produced an effect unfavourable in every way to the party who procured it. The popular party in their resentment must have become still more attached to the judicial reforms just assured to them, while the hands of Periklês, the superior leader left behind and now acting singly, must have been materially strengthened.

It is from this point that the administration of that great

in which party bitterness ran so high as to render something like civil war (*ἐμφύλιον Ἄρη*, v. 864) within the scope of reasonable apprehension. Probably he may have been averse to the diminution of the privileges of the Areopagus by Ephialtês: yet even thus much is not altogether certain, inasmuch as he puts it forward prominently and specially as a tribunal for homicide, exercising this jurisdiction by inherent prescription, and confirmed in it by the Eumenides themselves. Now when we consider that such jurisdiction was precisely the thing confirmed and left by Ephialtês to the Areopagus, we might plausibly argue that Æschylus, by enhancing the solemnity and predicting the perpetuity of the remaining privilege, intended to conciliate those who resented the recent innovations, and to soften the hatred between the two opposing parties.

The opinion of Boeckh, O. Müller, and Meier,—respecting the withdrawal from the senate of Areopagus of the judgements on homicide, by the proposition of Ephialtês—has been discussed and (in my judgement) refuted by Forchhammer—in a valuable Dissertation—*De Areopago non privato per Ephialten Homicidii Judiciis*. Kiel, 1828.

¹ This is the language of those authors whom Diodorus copied (Diodor. xi. 77)—*οὐ μὲν ἀθρόως γε διέφυγε τηλικούτοις ἀνομήμασιν ἐπιβαλλόμενος* (Ephialtês), *ἀλλὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἀναireθεῖς, ἄηλον ἔσχε τὴν τοῦ βίου τελευτήν*. Compare Pausanias, i. 29, 15.

Plutarch (Periklês, c. 10) cites Aristotle as having mentioned the assassin of Ephialtês. Antipho, however, states that the assassin was never formally known or convicted (*De Cæde Hero*. c. 68).

The enemies of Periklês circulated a report (mentioned by Idomeneus), that it was he who had procured the assassination of Ephialtês, from jealousy of the superiority of the latter (Plutarch, Periklês, c. 10). We may infer from this report how great the eminence of Ephialtês was.

man may be said to date : he was now the leading adviser (we might almost say Prime Minister) of the Athenian people. His first years were marked by a series of brilliant successes—already mentioned—the acquisition of Megara as an ally, and the victorious war against Corinth and Ægina. But when he proposed the great and valuable improvement of the Long Walls, thus making one city of Athens and Peiræus, the same oligarchical party, which had opposed his judicial changes and assassinated Ephialtēs, again stood forward in vehement resistance. Finding direct opposition unavailing, they did not scruple to enter into treasonable correspondence with Sparta—invoking the aid of a foreign force for the overthrow of the democracy : so odious had it become in their eyes, since the recent innovations. How serious was the hazard incurred by Athens, near the time of the battle of Tanagra, has been already recounted ; together with the rapid and unexpected reconciliation of parties after that battle, principally owing to the generous patriotism of Kimon and his immediate friends. Kimon was restored from ostracism on this occasion, before his full time had expired ; while the rivalry between him and Periklēs henceforward becomes mitigated, or even converted into a compromise,¹ whereby the internal affairs of the city were left to the one, and the conduct of foreign expeditions to the other. The successes of Athens during the ensuing ten years were more brilliant than ever, and she attained the maximum of her power : which doubtless had a material effect in imparting stability to the democracy, as well as to the administration of Periklēs—and enabled both the one and the other to stand the shock of those great public reverses, which deprived the Athenians of their dependent landed alliances, during the interval between the defeat of Korōneia and the thirty years' truce.

Along with the important judicial revolution brought about by Periklēs, were introduced other changes belonging to the same scheme and system.

Thus a general power of supervision, both over the magistrates and over the public assembly, was vested in seven magistrates, now named for the first time, called Nomophylakes or Law-Guardians, and doubtless changed every year. These

¹ The intervention of Elpinikē, the sister of Kimon, in bringing about this compromise between her brother and Periklēs, is probable enough (Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 10, and Kimon, c. 14). Clever and engaging, she seems to have played an active part in the political intrigues of the day : but we are not at all called upon to credit the scandals insinuated by Eupolis and Stesimbrotus.

Nomophylakes sat alongside of the Proëdri or presidents both in the senate and in the public assembly, and were charged with the duty of interposing whenever any step was taken or any proposition made contrary to the existing laws. They were also empowered to constrain the magistrates to act according to law.¹ We do not know whether they possessed the presidency of a dikastery—that is, whether they could themselves cause one of the panels of jurors to be summoned, and put an alleged delinquent on his trial before it, under their presidency—or whether they were restricted to entering a formal protest, laying the alleged illegality before the public assembly. To appoint magistrates however, invested with this special trust of watching and informing, was not an unimportant step; for it would probably enable Ephialtēs to satisfy many objectors who feared to abolish the superintending power of the Areopagus without introducing any substitute. The Nomophylakes were honoured with a distinguished place at the public processions and festivals, and were even allowed (like the Archons) to enter the senate of Areopagus after their year of office had expired: but they never acquired any considerable power such as that senate had itself exercised. Their interference must have been greatly superseded by the introduction, and increasing application of the Graphē Paranomôn, presently to be explained. They are not even noticed in the description of that misguided assembly which condemned the six generals, after the battle of Arginusæ, to be tried by a novel process which violated legal form not less than substantial justice.² After the expulsion of the Thirty, the senate of Areopagus was again invested with a supervision over magistrates, though without anything like its ancient ascendancy.

Another important change, which we may with probability

¹ We hear about these Nomophylakes in a distinct statement cited from Philochorus, by Photius, Lexic. p. 674, Porson. Νομοφύλακες ἑτεροὶ εἰσι τῶν θεσμοθετῶν, ὡς Φιλόχορος ἐν ζ'. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχοντες ἀνέβαινον εἰς Ἀρείου πάγου ἐστεφανωμένοι, οἱ δὲ νομοφύλακες χρυσία στρόφια ἀγοντες· καὶ ταῖς θεαῖς ἐναντίον ἀρχόντων ἐκαθέζοντο· καὶ τὴν πομπὴν ἔπεμπον τῇ Παλλάδι· τὰς δὲ ἄρχας ἠνάγκαζον τοῖς νόμοις χρῆσθαι· καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ βουλῇ μετὰ τῶν προέδρων ἐκάθιστο, κωλύοντες τὰ ἀσύμφορα τῇ πόλει πράττειν· ἐπὶ τὰ δὲ ἦσαν· καὶ κατέστησαν, ὡς Φιλόχορος, ὅτε Ἐφιδάλτης μόνη κατέλιπε τῇ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῇ τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος.

Harpokration, Pollux, and Suidas give substantially the same account of these magistrates, though none except Photius mentions the exact date of their appointment. There is no adequate ground for the doubt which M. Boeckh expresses about the accuracy of this statement: see Schomann, Ant. Jur. Pub. Græc. sect. lxi. ; and Cicero, Legg. iii. 20.

² See Xenophon, Hellenic. i. 7; Andokidēs de Mysteriis, p. 40.

refer to Periklês, is, the institution of the Nomothetæ. These men were in point of fact dikasts, members of the 6000 citizens annually sworn in that capacity. But they were not, like the dikasts for trying causes, distributed into panels or regiments known by a particular letter and acting together throughout the entire year : they were lotted off to sit together only on special occasion and as the necessity arose. According to the reform now introduced, the Ekklesia or public assembly, even with the sanction of the senate of Five Hundred, became incompetent either to pass a new law or to repeal a law already in existence ; it could only enact a *psêphism*—that is, properly speaking, a decree applicable only to a particular case ; though the word was used at Athens in a very large sense, sometimes comprehending decrees of general as well as permanent application. In reference to laws, a peculiar judicial procedure was established. The Thesmothetæ were directed annually to examine the existing laws, noting any contradictions or double laws on the same matter ; and in the first prytany (tenth part) of the Attic year, on the eleventh day, an Ekklesia was held, in which the first business was to go through the laws *seriatim*, and submit them for approval or rejection ; first beginning with the laws relating to the senate, next coming to those of more general import, especially such as determined the functions and competence of the magistrates. If any law was condemned by the vote of the public assembly, or if any citizen had a new law to propose, the third assembly of the Prytany was employed, previous to any other business, in the appointment of Nomothetæ and in the provision of means to pay their salary. Previous notice was required to be given publicly by every citizen who had new propositions of the sort to make, in order that the time necessary for the sitting of the Nomothetæ might be measured according to the number of matters to be submitted to their cognisance. Public advocates were further named to undertake the formal defence of all the laws attacked, and the citizen who proposed to repeal them had to make out his case against this defence, to the satisfaction of the assembled Nomothetæ. These latter were taken from the 6000 sworn dikasts, and were of different numbers according to circumstances : sometimes we hear of them as 500, sometimes as 1000—and we may be certain that the number was always considerable.

The effect of this institution was, to place the making or repealing of laws under the same solemnities and guarantees as the trying of causes or accusations in judicature. We must recollect that the citizens who attended the Ekklesia or public

assembly were not sworn like the dikasts; nor had they the same solemnity of procedure, nor the same certainty of hearing both sides of the question set forth, nor the same full preliminary notice. How much the oath sworn was brought to act upon the minds of the dikasts, we may see by the frequent appeals to it in the orators, who contrast them with the unsworn public assembly.¹ And there can be no doubt that the Nomothetæ afforded much greater security than the public assembly, for a proper decision. That security depended upon the same principle as we see to pervade all the constitutional arrangements of Athens; upon a fraction of the people casually taken, but sufficiently numerous to have the same interest with the whole,—not permanent but delegated for the occasion,—assembled under a solemn sanction,—and furnished with a full exposition of both sides of the case. The power of passing psephisms, or special decrees, still remained with the public assembly, which was doubtless much more liable to be surprised into hasty or inconsiderate decision than either the Dikastery or the Nomothetæ—in spite of the necessity of previous authority from the senate of Five Hundred, before any proposition could be submitted to it.

As an additional security both to the public assembly and the Nomothetæ against being entrapped into decisions contrary to existing law, another remarkable provision has yet to be mentioned—a provision probably introduced by Periklēs at

¹ Demosthen. cont. Timokrat. c. 20, pp. 725, 726. Ἄρ' οὖν τῷ δοκεῖ συμφέρειν τῇ πόλει τοιοῦτος νόμος, ὃς δικαστηρίου γνώσεως αὐτὸς κυριώτερος ἔσται, καὶ τὰς ὑπὸ τῶν ὁμωμοκότων γνώσεις τοῖς ἀνωμότοις προστάξει λύειν; —Ἐνθυμείσθε, ἀπὸ τοῦ δικαστηρίου καὶ τῆς καταγνώσεως οἱ διεπῆδησεν (Timokratēs). ἐπὶ τὸν δῆμον, ἐκκλέπτων τὸν ἡδικηκότα! compare Demosthen. cont. Eubulid. c. 15.

See, about the Nomothetæ, Schömann, De Comitibus, ch. vii. p. 248 seqq., and Platner, Prozess und Klagen bey den Attikern, Abschn. ii. 3, 3, p. 33 seqq.

Both of them maintain, in my opinion erroneously, that the Nomothetæ are an institution of Solon. Demosthenēs indeed ascribes it to Solon (Schömann, p. 268): but this counts in my view for nothing, when I see that all the laws which he cites for governing the proceedings of the Nomothetæ, bear unequivocal evidence of a time much later. Schömann admits this to a certain extent, and in reference to the style of these laws—“*Illorum quidem fragmentorum, quæ in Timokrateâ extant, recentiorem Solonis ætate formam atque orationem apertum est.*” But it is not merely the style which proves them to be of post-Solonian date: it is the mention of post-Solonian institutions, such as the ten prytanies into which the year was divided, the ten statues of the Eponymi—all derived from the creation of the ten tribes by Kleisthenēs. On the careless employment of the name of Solon by the orators whenever they desire to make a strong impression on the dikasts, I have already remarked.

the same time as the formalities of law-making by means of specially delegated *Nomothetæ*. This was the *Graphê Paranomôn*—indictment for informality or illegality—which might be brought on certain grounds against the proposer of any law or any psephism, and rendered him liable to punishment by the *dikastery*. He was required in bringing forward his new measure to take care that it should not be in contradiction with any pre-existing law—or if there were any such contradiction, to give formal notice of it, to propose the repeal of that which existed, and to write up publicly beforehand what his proposition was—in order that there might never be two contradictory laws at the same time in operation, nor any illegal decree passed either by the senate or by the public assembly. If he neglected this precaution, he was liable to prosecution under the *Graphê Paranomôn*, which any Athenian citizen might bring against him before the *dikastery*, through the intervention and under the presidency of the *Thesmothetæ*.

Judging from the title of this indictment, it was originally confined to the special ground of formal contradiction between the new and the old. But it had a natural tendency to extend itself: the citizen accusing would strengthen his case by showing that the measure which he attacked contradicted not merely the letter, but the spirit and purpose of existing laws—and he would proceed from hence to denounce it as generally mischievous and disgraceful to the state. In this unmeasured latitude we find the *Graphê Paranomôn* at the time of Demosthenês. The mover of a new law or psephism, even after it had been regularly discussed and passed, was liable to be indicted, and had to defend himself not only against alleged informalities in his procedure, but also against alleged mischiefs in the substance of his measure. If found guilty by the *dikastery*, the punishment inflicted upon him by them was not fixed, but variable according to circumstances. For the indictment belonged to that class wherein, after the verdict of guilty, first a given amount of punishment was proposed by the accuser, next another and lighter amount was named by the accused party against himself—the *dikastery* being bound to make their option between one and the other, without admitting any third modification—so that it was the interest even of the accused party to name against himself a measure of punishment sufficient to satisfy the sentiment of the *dikasts*, in order that they might not prefer the more severe proposition of the accuser. At the same time, the accuser himself (as in other public indictments) was fined in the sum of 1000 drachms,

unless the verdict of guilty obtained at least one-fifth of the suffrages of the dikastery. The personal responsibility of the mover, however, continued only one year after the introduction of his new law. If the accusation was brought at a greater distance of time than one year, the accuser could invoke no punishment against the mover, and the sentence of the dikasts neither absolved nor condemned anything but the law. Their condemnation of the law with or without the author, amounted *ipso facto* to a repeal of it.

Such indictment against the author of a law or of a decree might be preferred either at some stage prior to its final enactment—as after its acceptance simply by the senate, if it was a decree, or after its approval by the public assembly, and prior to its going before the Nomothetæ, if it was a law—or after it had reached full completion by the verdict of the Nomothetæ. In the former case the indictment stayed its further progress until sentence had been pronounced by the dikasts.

This regulation is framed in a thoroughly conservative spirit, to guard the existing laws against being wholly or partially nullified by a new proposition. As, in the procedure of the Nomothetæ, whenever any proposition was made for distinctly repealing any existing law, it was thought unsafe to entrust the defence of the law so assailed to the chance of some orator gratuitously undertaking it. Paid advocates were appointed for the purpose. So also, when any citizen made a new positive proposition, sufficient security was not supposed to be afforded by the chance of opponents rising up at the time. Accordingly, a further guarantee was provided in the personal responsibility of the mover. That the latter, before he proposed a new decree or a new law, should take care that there was nothing in it inconsistent with existing laws—or, if there were, that he should first formally bring forward a direct proposition for the repeal of such pre-existent law—was in no way unreasonable. It imposed upon him an obligation such as he might perfectly well fulfil. It served as a check upon the use of that right, of free speech and initiative in the public assembly, which belonged to every Athenian without exception,¹ and which was cherished by the democracy as much as it was condemned by oligarchical thinkers. It was a security to the dikasts, who were called

¹ The privation of this right of public speech (*παρρησία*) followed on the condemnation of any citizen to the punishment called *ἀτιμία*, disfranchisement, entire or partial (Demosthen. cont. Neær. p. 1352, c. 9; cont. Meidiam, p. 545, c. 27). Compare for the oligarchical sentiment, Xenophon, Republ. Athen. i. 9.

upon to apply the law to particular cases, against the perplexity of having conflicting laws quoted before them, and being obliged in their verdict to set aside either one or the other. In modern European governments, even the most free and constitutional, laws have been both made and applied either by select persons or select assemblies, under an organisation so different as to put out of sight the idea of personal responsibility on the proposer of a new law. Moreover, even in such assemblies, private initiative has either not existed at all, or has been of comparatively little effect, in law-making; while in the application of laws when made, there has always been a permanent judicial body exercising an action of its own, more or less independent of the legislature, and generally interpreting away the text of contradictory laws so as to keep up a tolerably consistent course of forensic tradition. But at Athens, the fact that the proposer of a new decree, or of a new law, had induced the senate or the public assembly to pass it, was by no means supposed to cancel his personal responsibility, if the proposition was illegal. He had deceived the senate or the people, in deliberately keeping back from them a fact which he knew, or at least might and ought to have known.

But though a full justification may thus be urged on behalf of the *Graphê Paranomôn* as originally conceived and intended, it will hardly apply to that indictment as applied afterwards in its plenary and abusive latitude. Thus *Æschinês* indicts *Ktesiphon* under it for having under certain circumstances proposed a crown to *Demosthenês*. He begins by showing that the proposition was illegal—for this was the essential foundation of the indictment: he then goes on further to demonstrate, in a splendid harangue, that *Demosthenês* was a vile man and a mischievous politician: accordingly (assuming the argument to be just) *Ktesiphon* had deceived the people in an aggravated way—first by proposing a reward under circumstances contrary to law, next by proposing it in favour of an unworthy man. The first part of the argument only is of the essence of the *Graphê Paranomôn*: the second part is in the nature of an abuse growing out of it,—springing from that venom of personal and party enmity which is inseparable, in a greater or less degree, from free political action, and which manifested itself with virulence at Athens, though within the limits of legality. That this indictment, as one of the most direct vents for such enmity, was largely applied and abused at Athens, is certain. But though it probably deterred unpractised citizens from originating new propositions, it did not

produce the same effect upon those orators who made politics a regular business, and who could therefore both calculate the temper of the people, and reckon upon support from a certain knot of friends. Aristophon, towards the close of his political life, made it a boast that he had been thus indicted and acquitted seventy-five times. Probably the worst effect which it produced was that of encouraging the vein of personality and bitterness which pervades so large a proportion of Attic oratory, even in its most illustrious manifestations; turning deliberative into judicial eloquence, and interweaving the discussion of a law or decree along with a declamatory harangue against the character of its mover. We may at the same time add that the *Graphê Paranomôn* was often the most convenient way of getting a law or a psephism repealed, so that it was used even when the annual period had passed over, and when the mover was therefore out of danger—the indictment being then brought only against the law or decree, as in the case which forms the subject of the harangue of Demosthenês against Leptinês. If the speaker of this harangue obtained a verdict, he procured at once the repeal of the law or decree, without proposing any new provision in its place; which he would be required to do—if not peremptorily, at least by common usage,—if he had carried the law for repeal before the *Nomothetæ*.

The dikasteries provided under the system of Periklês varied in number of members: we never hear of less than 200 members—most generally of 500—and sometimes also of 1000, 1500, 2000 members, on important trials.¹ Each man received pay from the treasurers called *Kolakretæ*, after his day's business was over, of three oboli or half a drachm: at least this was the amount paid during the early part of the Peloponnesian war. M. Boeckh supposes that the original pay proposed by Periklês was one obolus, afterwards tripled by Kleon; but his opinion is open to much doubt. It was indispensable to propose a measure of pay sufficient to induce citizens to come, and come frequently, if not regularly. Now one obolus

¹ See Meier, *Attisch. Prozess*, p. 139. Andokidês mentions a trial under the indictment of *γραφὴ παρανόμων*, brought by his father Leogoras against a senator named Speusippus, wherein 6000 dikasts sat—that is the entire body of Heliasts. However, the loose speech so habitual with Andokidês renders this statement very uncertain (*Andokidês de Mysteriis*, p. 3, § 29).

See Matthiæ, *De Judiciis Atheniensium*, in his *Miscellanea Philologica*, vol. i. p. 252. Matthiæ questions the reading of that passage in Demosthenês (cont. Meidiam, p. 585), wherein 200 dikasts are spoken of as sitting in judgement; he thinks it ought to be *πεντακοσίου* instead of *διακοσίου*—but this alteration would be rash.

seems to have proved afterwards an inadequate temptation even to the ekklesiasts (or citizens who attended the public assembly), who were less frequently wanted, and must have had easier sittings, than the dikasts: much less therefore would it be sufficient in the case of the latter. I incline to the belief that the pay originally awarded was three oboli: ¹ the rather, as these new institutions seem to have nearly coincided in point of time with the transportation of the confederate treasure from Delos to Athens—so that the Exchequer would then appear abundantly provided. As to the number of dikasts actually present on each day of sitting, or the minimum number requisite to form a sitting, we are very imperfectly informed. Though each of the ten panels or divisions of dikasts included 500 individuals, seldom probably did all of them attend. But it also seldom happened, probably, that all the ten divisions sat on the same day: there was therefore an opportunity of making up deficiencies in division A—when its lot was called and when its dikasts did not appear in sufficient numbers—from those who belonged to division B or Δ, besides the supplementary dikasts who were not comprised in any of the ten divisions: though on all these points we cannot go beyond conjecture. Certain it is, however, that the dikasteries were always numerous, and that none of the dikasts could know in what causes they would be employed, so that it was impossible to tamper with them beforehand.²

¹ See on this question, Boeckh, Public Econ. of Athens, ch. xv. p. 233; K. F. Hermann, Griech. Staatsalt. § 134.

The proof which M. Boeckh brings to show, first, that the original pay was one obolus—next that Kleon was the first to introduce the triobolus—is in both cases very inconclusive.

Certain passages from the Scholiast, stating that the pay of the dikasts fluctuated (*οὐκ ἔστηκεν—ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ἐδίδοτο*) do not so naturally indicate a rise from one obolus to three, as a change backwards and forwards according to circumstances. Now it seems that there were some occasions when the treasury was so very poor that it was doubtful whether the dikasts could be paid: see Lysias, cont. Epikrat. c. 1; cont. Nikomach. c. 22; and Aristophan. Equit. 1370. The amount of pay may therefore have been sometimes affected by this cause.

² There is a remarkable passage on this point in the treatise of Xenophon, De Republic. Athen. iii. 6. He says—

Φέρε δὴ, ἀλλὰ φησί τις χρῆναι δικάζειν μὲν, ἐλάττους δὲ δικάζειν. Ἀνάγκη τοίνυν, εἰ μὲν πολλὰ (both Weiske and Schneider substitute *πολλὰ* here in place of *ὀλίγα*, which latter makes no sense) ποιῶνται δικαστήρια, ὀλίγοι ἐν ἑκάστῳ ἔσονται τῷ δικαστηρίῳ· ὥστε καὶ διασκευάσασθαι ῥᾶδιον ἔσται πρὸς ὀλίγους δικαστάς, καὶ συνδεκάσαι (so Schneider and Matthiæ in place of *συνδικάσαι*) πολὺν ἥττον δικαίως δικάζειν.

That there was a good deal of bribery at Athens, where individuals could be approached and dealt with, is very probable (see Xenoph. de Repub.

Such were the great constitutional innovations of Periklēs and Ephialtēs—changes full of practical results—the transformation, as well as the complement, of that democratical system which Kleisthenēs had begun and to which the tide of Athenian feeling had been gradually mounting up during the preceding twenty years. The entire force of these changes is generally not perceived, because the popular dikasteries and the Nomothetæ are so often represented as institutions of Solon, and as merely supplied with pay by Periklēs. This erroneous supposition prevents all clear view of the growth of the Athenian democracy by throwing back its last elaborations to the period of its early and imperfect start. To strip the magistrates of all their judicial power, except that of imposing a small fine, and the Areopagus of all its jurisdiction except in cases of homicide—providing popular, numerous, and salaried dikasts to decide all the judicial business at Athens as well as to repeal and enact laws—this was the consummation of the Athenian democracy. No serious constitutional alteration (I except the temporary interruptions of the Four Hundred and the Thirty) was afterwards made until the days of Macedonian interference. As Periklēs made it, so it remained in the days of Demosthenēs—though with a sensible change in the character, and abatement in the energies, of the people, rich as well as poor.

In appreciating the practical working of these numerous dikasteries at Athens, in comparison with such justice as might have been expected from individual magistrates, we have to consider, first—That personal and pecuniary corruption seems to have been a common vice among the leading men of Athens and Sparta, when acting individually or in boards of a few members, and not uncommon even with the kings of Sparta,—next, That in the Grecian cities generally, as we know even from the oligarchical Xenophon (he particularly excepts Sparta), the rich and great men were not only insubordinate to the magistrates, but made a parade of showing that they cared nothing about them.¹ We know also from the same unsus-

Ath. iii. 3): and we may well believe that there were also particular occasions on which money was given to the dikasts, some of whom were punished with death for such corrupt receipt (*Æschinēs* cont. *Timarch.* c. 17-22, p. 12-15). But the passage above quoted from Xenophon, an unfriendly witness, shows that the precautions taken to prevent corruption of the dikasteries were well devised and successful, though these precautions might sometimes be eluded.

¹ Xenophon, *De Republ. Laced.* c. 8, 2. Τεκμαίρομαι δὲ ταῦτα, ὅτι ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσιν οἱ δυνατότεροι οὔτε βούλονται δοκεῖν τὰς

pected source,¹ that while the poorer Athenian citizens who served on shipboard were distinguished for the strictest discipline, the hoplites or middling burghers who formed the infantry were less obedient, and the rich citizens who served on horseback the most disobedient of all. To make rich and powerful criminals effectively amenable to justice has indeed been found so difficult everywhere, until a recent period of history, that we should be surprised if it were otherwise in Greece. When we follow the reckless demeanour of rich men like Kritias, Alkibiadēs,² and Meidias, even under the full-grown democracy of Athens, we may be sure that their predecessors under the Kleisthenean constitution would have been often too formidable to be punished or kept down by an individual archon of ordinary firmness,³ even assuming him to

ἀρχὰς φοβεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ νομίζουσι τοῦτο ἀνελεύθερον εἶναι· ἐν δὲ τῇ Σπάρτῃ οἱ κράτιστοι καὶ ὑπέρχονται μάλιστα τὰς ἀρχάς, &c.

Respecting the violent proceedings committed by powerful men at Thebes, whereby it became almost impossible to procure justice against them for fear of being put to death, see Dikæarchus, Vit. Græc. Fragm. ed. Fabr. p. 143, and Polybius, xx. 4, 6; xxiii. 2.

¹ Xenophon, Memorab. iii. 5, 18. Μηδαμῶς, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, ὦ Περικλεῖς, οὕτως ἡγοῦ ἀνηκέστῃ πονηρίᾳ νοσεῖν Ἀθηναίους· Οὐχ ὀρᾶς, ὡς εὐτακτοὶ μὲν εἰσιν ἐν τοῖς ναυτικοῖς, εὐτάκτως δ' ἐν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσι πείθονται τοῖς ἐπιστάταις, οὐδένων δὲ καταδεέστερον ἐν τοῖς χοροῖς ὤπηρετοῦσι τοῖς διδασκάλοις; Τοῦτο γάρ τοι, ἔφη, καὶ θαυμαστόν ἐστι· τὸ τοὺς μὲν τοιούτους πειθαρχεῖν τοῖς ἐφ' ἐστῶσι, τοὺς δὲ ὀπλίτας, καὶ τοὺς ἱππεῖς, οἳ δοκοῦσι καλοκἀγαθίᾳ προκεκρίσθαι τῶν πολιτῶν, ἀπειθεστάτους εἶναι πάντων.

² See Xenophon, Memorab. i. 2, 12-25; Thucyd. vi. 15, and the speech which he gives as spoken by Alkibiadēs in the assembly, vi. 17; Plutarch, Alkibiad. c. 7-8-16, and the Oration of Demosthenēs against Meidias throughout: also Fragm. V. of the Πελαργοί of Aristophanēs, Meineke, ii. p. 1128.

³ Sir Thomas Smith, in his Treatise on the Commonwealth of England, explains the Court of Star-Chamber as originally constituted in order "to deal with offenders too stout for the ordinary course of justice." The abundant compounds of the Greek language furnish a single word exactly describing this same class of offenders—"ὑβριστοδίκαι"—the title of one of the lost comedies of Eupolis; see Meineke, Historia Critica Comicorum Græcorum, vol. i. p. 145.

Dean Tucker observes, in his Treatise on Civil Government, "There was hardly a session of parliament from the time of Henry III. to Henry VIII., but laws were enacted for restraining the feuds, robberies and oppressions of the barons and their dependents on the one side—and to moderate and check the excesses and extortions of the royal purveyors on the other; these being the two capital evils then felt. Respecting the tyranny of the ancient baronage, even squires as well as others were not ashamed to wear the liveries of their leaders, and to glory in every badge of distinction, whereby they might be known to be retained as the bullies of such or such great men, and to engage in their quarrels, just or unjust, right or wrong. The histories

be upright and well intentioned. Now the *dikasteries* established by Periklês were inaccessible both to corruption and

of those times, together with the statutes of the realm, inform us that they associated (or as they called it, *confederated* together) in great bodies, parading on horseback in fairs and markets, and clad in armour, to the great terror of peaceable subjects: nay, that they attended their lords to parliament, equipped in the same military dress, and even dared sometimes to present themselves before the judge of assize, and to enter the courts of justice in a hostile manner—while their principals sat with the judges on the bench, intimidating the witnesses, and influencing the juries by looks, nods, signs and signals." (*Treatise concerning Civil Government*, p. 337, by Josiah Tucker, D.D. London, 1781.)

The whole chapter (p. 301–355) contains many statutes and much other matter, illustrating the intimidation exercised by powerful men in those days over the course of justice.

A passage among the *Fragmenta* of Sallust, gives a striking picture of the conduct of powerful citizens under the Roman Republic. (*Fragm. lib. i. p. 158*, ed. Delph.)

"At discordia, et avaritia, et ambitio, et cætera secundis rebus oriri sueta mala, post Carthaginis excidium maximè aucta sunt. Nam injuriæ validiorum, et ob eas discessio plebis à Patribus, aliæque dissensiones domi fuere jam inde à principio: neque amplius, quam regibus exactis, dum metus à Tarquinio et bellum grave cum Etruriâ positum est, æquo et modesto jure agitatum: dein, servili imperio patres plebem exercere: de vitâ atque tergo, regio more consulere: agro pellere, et à cæteris expertibus, soli in imperio agere. Quibus serviitiis, et maximè fœnoris onere, oppressa plebes, cum assiduus bellis tributum simul et militiam toleraret, armata Montem Sacrum et Aventinum insedit. Tumque tribunos plebis, et alia sibi jura paravit. Discordiarum et certaminis utrimque finis fuit secundum bellum Punicum."

Compare the exposition of the condition of the cities throughout Europe in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, in Hüllmann's *Stadte-Wesen des Mittelalters*, especially vol. iii. p. 196–199 *seqq.*

The memorable institution which spread through nearly all the Italian cities during these centuries, of naming as *Podesta* or supreme magistrate a person not belonging to the city itself, to hold office for a short time—was the expedient which they resorted to for escaping the extreme perversion of judicial and administrative power, arising out of powerful family connexions. The restrictions which were thought necessary to guard against either favour or antipathies on the part of the *Podesta*, are extremely singular (Hüllmann, vol. iii. p. 252–261 *seqq.*).

"The proceedings of the patrician families in these cities (observes Hüllmann) in respect to the debts which they owed, were among the worst of the many oppressions to which the trading classes were exposed at their hands—one of the greatest abuses which they practised by means of their superior position. How often did they even maltreat their creditors, who came to demand merely what was due to them!" (*Städte-Wesen*, vol. ii. p. 229.)

Machiavel's *History of Florence* illustrates, throughout, the inveterate habit of the powerful families to set themselves above the laws and judicial authority. Indeed he seems to regard this as an incorrigible chronic malady in society, necessitating ever-recurring disputes between powerful men and the body of the people. "The people (he says) desire to live according to

intimidation : their number, their secret suffrage, and the impossibility of knowing beforehand what individuals would sit in any particular cause, prevented both the one and the other. And besides that, the magnitude of their number, extravagant according to our ideas of judicial business, was essential to this tutelary effect¹—it served further to render the trial solemn and the verdict imposing on the minds of parties and spectators, as we may see by the fact, that in important causes the dikastery was doubled or tripled. Nor was it possible by any other means than numbers² to give dignity to an assembly of

the laws ; the great men desire to overrule the laws : it is therefore impossible that the two should march in harmony.” “Volendo il popolo vivere secondo le leggi, e i potenti comandare a quelle, non è possibile che capino insieme” (Machiavelli, *Istorie Fiorentine*, liv. ii. p. 79, ad ann. 1282).

The first book of the interesting tale, called the *Promessi Sposi*, of Manzoni,—itself full of historical matter, and since published with illustrative notes by the historian Cantù—exhibits a state of judicial administration, very similar to that above described, in the Milanese, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ; demonstrated by repeated edicts, all ineffectual, to bring powerful men under the real control of the laws.

Because men of wealth and power, in the principal governments of modern Europe, are now completely under the control of the laws, the modern reader is apt to suppose that this is the natural state of things. It is therefore not unimportant to produce some references (which might be indefinitely multiplied) reminding him of the very different phenomena which past history exhibits almost everywhere.

¹ The number of Roman judges employed to try a criminal cause under the *questiones perpetue* in the last century and a half of the Republic, seems to have varied between 100, 75, 70, 56, 51, 32, &c. (Laboulaye, *Essai sur les Loix Criminelles des Romains*, p. 336, Paris, 1845.)

In the time of Augustus, there was a total of 4000 judges at Rome, distributed into four decuries (Pliny, *H. N.* xxxiii. 1, 31).

The venality as well as the party corruption of these Roman judges or jurors, taken from the senatorial and equestrian orders, the two highest and richest orders in the state,—was well known and flagrant (Appian, *Bell. Civ.* i. 22, 35, 37 ; Laboulaye, *ibid.* p. 217–227 ; Walter, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, ch. xviii. sect. 237, 238 ; Asconius in Cicero. *Verrin.* p. 141–145, ed. Orell. ; and Cicero himself, in the remarkable letter to Atticus, *Ep. ad Attic.* i. 16).

² Numerous dikasteries taken by lot seem to have been established in later times in Rhodes and other Grecian cities (though Rhodes was not democratically constituted) and to have worked satisfactorily. Sallust says (in his *Oratio II. ad Cæsarem de Republicâ ordinandâ*, p. 561, ed. Cort.), “Judices à paucis probari, regnum est ; ex pecuniâ legi, inhonestum. Quare omnes primæ classis judicare placet ; sed numero plures quam judicant. Neque Rhodios, neque alias civitates unquam suorum judiciorum pœnituit ; ubi promiscuè dives et pauper, ut cuique sors tulit, de maximis rebus juxta ac de minimis disceptat.”

The necessity of a numerous judicature, in a republic where there is no standing army or official force professionally constituted, as the only means

citizens, of whom many were poor, some old, and all were despised individually by rich accused persons who were brought before them—as Aristophanês and Xenophon give us plainly to understand.¹ If we except the strict and peculiar educational

of enforcing public-minded justice against powerful criminals, is insisted upon by Machiavel, *Discorsi sopra Tito Livio*, lib. i. c. 7.

“Potrebbe ancora allegare, a fortificazione della soprascritta conclusione, l'accidente seguito pur in Firenze contra Piero Soderini: il quale al tutto seguì per non essere in quella repubblica alcuno modo di accuse contro alla ambizione dei potenti cittadini: perchè lo accusare un potente a otto giudici in una repubblica, non basta: bisogna che i giudici siano assai, perchè pochi sempre fanno a modo de' pochi,” &c.: compare the whole of the same chapter.

I add another remarkable passage of Machiavel—*Discorso sulla Riforma* (of Florence, addressed to Pope Leo X.), pp. 119, 120, vol. iv. of the complete edition of his works, 1813.

“E necessarissimo in una repubblica questo ricorso, perchè i pochi cittadini non hanno ardire di punire gli uomini grandi, e però bisogna che a tale effetto concorrano assai cittadini, acciochè il giudicio si nasconda, e nascondendosi, ciascuno si possa scusare.”

¹ Aristophan. *Vesp.* 570; Xenophon, *Rep. Ath.* i. 18. We are not to suppose that *all* the dikasts who tried a cause were very poor: Demosthenês would not talk to very poor men as to “the slave whom each of them might have left at home” (*Demosthenês cont. Stephan. A.* c. 26, p. 1127).

It was criminal by law in the dikasts to receive bribes in the exercise of their functions, as well as in every citizen to give money to them (*Demosth. cont. Steph. B.* c. 13, p. 1137). And it seems perfectly safe to affirm that in practice the dikasts were never tampered with beforehand: had the fact been otherwise, we must have seen copious allusions to it in the many free-spoken pleadings which remain to us (just as there are in the Roman orators): whereas in point of fact there are hardly any such allusions. The word *δεκάων* (in *Isokratês de Pac. Or.* viii. p. 169, sect. 63) does not allude to obtaining by corrupt means verdicts of dikasts in the dikastery, but to obtaining by such means votes for offices in the public assembly, where the election took place by show of hands. *Isokratês* says that this was often done in his time, and so perhaps it may have been; but in the case of the dikasteries, much better security was taken against it.

The statement of Aristotle (from his *Πολιτεῖαι*, *Fragm.* xi. p. 69, ed. Neumann: compare *Harpokration v. Δεκάσειν*; *Plutarch, Coriolan.* c. 14; and *Pollux*, viii. 121) intimates that Anytus was the first person who taught the art τοῦ δεκάσειν τὰ δικαστήρια, a short time before the battle of *Ægospotami*. But besides that the information on this point is to the last degree vague, we may remark that between the defeat of the oligarchy of Four Hundred, and the battle of *Ægospotami*, the financial and political condition of Athens was so exceedingly embarrassed, that it may well be doubted whether she could maintain the paid dikasteries on the ordinary footing. Both all the personal service of the citizens, and all the public money, must have been put in requisition at that time for defence against the enemy, without leaving any surplus for other purposes; there was not enough even to afford constant pay to the soldiers and sailors (compare *Thucyd.* vi. 91; viii. 69, 71, 76, 86). If therefore in this time of distress, the dikasteries were rarely convoked, and without any certainty of pay, a powerful accused person might find it more easy to tamper with them

discipline of Sparta, these numerous dikasteries afforded the only organ which Grecian politics could devise, for getting redress against powerful criminals, public as well as private, and for obtaining a sincere and uncorrupt verdict.

Taking the general working of the dikasteries, we shall find that they are nothing but jury-trial applied on a scale broad, systematic, unaided, and uncontrolled, beyond all other historical experience—and that they therefore exhibit in exaggerated proportions both the excellences and the defects characteristic of the jury-system, as compared with decision by trained and professional judges. All the encomiums, which it is customary to pronounce upon jury-trial, will be found predicable of the Athenian dikasteries in a still greater degree: all the reproaches, which can be addressed on good ground to the dikasteries, will apply to modern juries also, though in a less degree. Such parallel is not less just, though the dikasteries, as the most democratical feature of democracy itself, have been usually criticised with marked disfavour—every censure or sneer or joke against them which can be found in ancient authors, comic as well as serious, being accepted as true almost to the letter; while juries are so popular an institution, that their merits have been over-stated (in England at least) and their defects kept out of sight. The theory of the Athenian dikastery, and the theory of jury-trial as it has prevailed in England since the Revolution of 1688, are one and the same: recourse to a certain number of private citizens, taken by chance or without possibility of knowing beforehand who they will be, sworn to hear fairly and impartially plaintiff and defendant, accuser and accused, and to find a true verdict according to their consciences upon a distinct issue before them. But in Athens this theory was worked out to its natural consequences; while English practice, in this respect as in so many others, is at variance with English theory. The jury, though an ancient and a constant portion of the judicial system, has never been more than a portion—kept in subordination, trammels, and pupilage, by a powerful crown and by judges presiding over an artificial system of law. In the English state trials, down to a period not long before the Revolution of 1688, any jurors who found a verdict contrary

beforehand, than it had been before, or than it came to be afterwards, when the system was regularly in operation. We can hardly reason with safety therefore, from the period shortly preceding the battle of *Ægospotami*, either to that which preceded the Sicilian expedition, or to that which followed the subversion of the Thirty.

to the dictation of the judge were liable to fine; and at an earlier period (if a second jury on being summoned found an opposite verdict) even to the terrible punishment of attain^t.¹ And though, for the last century and a half, the verdict of the jury has been free as to matters of fact, new trials having taken the place of the old attain^t—yet the ascendancy of the presiding judge over their minds, and his influence over the procedure as the authority on matters of law, has always been such as to overrule the natural play of their feelings and judgement as men and citizens²—sometimes to the detriment, much oftener to

¹ Mr. Jardine, in his interesting and valuable publication, *Criminal Trials*, vol. i. p. 115, after giving an account of the trial of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton in 1553, for high treason, and his acquittal, observes—“There is one circumstance in this trial, which ought not to be passed over without an observation. It appears that after the trial was over, the jury were required to give recognizances to answer for their verdict, and were afterwards imprisoned for nearly eight months and heavily fined by a sentence of the Star-Chamber. Such was the security which the trial by jury afforded to the subject in those times; and such were the perils to which jurors were then exposed, who ventured to act upon their conscientious opinions in state prosecutions! But even these proceedings against the jury, monstrous as they appear to our improved notions of the administration of justice, must not be considered as a wanton exercise of unlawful power on this particular occasion. The fact is that the judges of England had for centuries before exercised a similar authority, though not without some murmuring against it; and it was not until more than a century after it, in the reign of Charles II., that a solemn decision was pronounced against its legality.

. . . . “In the reign of James I. it was held by the Lord Chancellor Egerton, together with the two Chief Justices and the Chief Baron, that when a party indicted is *found guilty on the trial*, the jury shall not be questioned; but on the other side, when the jury hath *acquitted* a felon or a traitor against manifest proof, they may be charged in the Star-Chamber for their partiality in finding a manifest offender not guilty. After the abolition of the Star-Chamber, there were several instances in the reign of Charles II., in which it was resolved that both grand and petit juries might be fined for giving verdicts against plain evidence and the directions of the court.” Compare Mr. Amos’s Notes on Fortescue, *De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*, c. 27.

² Respecting the French juries, M. Cottu (*Réflexions sur la Justice Criminelle*, p. 79) remarks—

“Le désir ardent de bien faire dont les jurés sont généralement animés, et la crainte de s’égarer, les jette dans une obéissance passive à l’impulsion qui leur est donnée par le président de la Cour d’Assise, et si ce magistrat sait s’emparer de leur estime, alors leur confiance en lui ne connoît plus de bornes. Ils le considèrent comme l’étoile qui doit les guider dans l’obscurité qui les environne, et pleins d’un respect aveugle pour son opinion, ils n’attendent que la manifestation qu’il leur en fait pour la sanctionner par leur déclaration. Ainsi au lieu de deux juges que l’accusé devoit avoir, il n’en a bien souvent qu’un seul, qui est le président de la Cour d’Assise.”

Anselm Feuerbach (in the second part of his work, *Ueber die Oeffent-*

the benefit (always excepting political trials), of substantial justice. But in Athens the dikasts judged of the law as well as of the fact. The laws were not numerous, and were couched in few, for the most part familiar, words. To determine how the facts stood, and whether, if the facts were undisputed, the law invoked was properly applicable to them, were parts of the integral question submitted to them, and comprehended in their verdict. Moreover, each dikastery construed the law for itself without being bound to follow the decisions of those which had preceded it, except in so far as such analogy might really influence the convictions of the members. They were free, self-judging persons—unassisted by the schooling, but at the same time untrammelled by the awe-striking ascendancy, of a professional judge—obeying the spontaneous inspirations of their own consciences, and recognising no authority except the laws of the city, with which they were familiar.

Trial by jury, as practised in England since 1688, has been politically most valuable, as a security against the encroachments of an anti-popular executive. Partly for this reason, partly for others not necessary to state here, it has had greater credit as an instrument of judicature generally, and has been supposed to produce much more of what is good in English administration of justice, than really belongs to it. Amidst the unqualified encomiums so frequently bestowed upon the honesty, the unprejudiced rectitude of appreciation, the practical instinct for detecting falsehood and resisting sophistry, in twelve citizens taken by hazard and put into a jury-box—comparatively little account is taken either of the aids, or of the restrictions, or of the corrections in the shape of new trials, under which they act, or of the artificial forensic medium into which they are plunged for the time of their service: so that the theory of the case presumes them to be more of spontaneous agents, and more analogous to the Athenian dikasts, than the practice confirms. Accordingly, when we read these encomiums in

lichkeit und Mündlichkeit der Gerechtigkeitspflege, which contains his review of the French judicial system, Ueber die Gerichtsverfassung Frankreichs, Abt. iii. H. v. p. 477) confirms this statement from a large observation of the French courts of justice.

The habit of the French juries, in so many doubtful cases, to pronounce a verdict of guilty by a majority of seven against five (in which case the law threw the burthen of actual condemnation upon the judges present in court, directing their votes to be counted along with those of the jury), is a remarkable proof of this aversion of the jury to the responsibility of decision: see Feuerbach, *ibid.* p. 481 *seq.* Compare also the treatise of the same author, *Betrachtungen über das Geschwornen-Gericht*, p. 186–198.

modern authors, we shall find that both the direct benefits ascribed to jury-trial in ensuring pure and even-handed justice, and still more its indirect benefits in improving and educating the citizens generally—might have been set forth yet more emphatically in a laudatory harangue of Periklēs about the Athenian dikasteries. If it be true that an Englishman or an American counts more certainly on an impartial and uncorrupt verdict from a jury of his country than from a permanent professional judge, much more would this be the feeling of an ordinary Athenian, when he compared the dikasteries with the archon. The juror hears and judges under full persuasion that he himself individually stands in need of the same protection or redress invoked by others: so also did the dikast. As to the effects of jury-trial in diffusing respect to the laws and constitution—in giving to every citizen a personal interest in enforcing the former and maintaining the latter—in imparting a sentiment of dignity to small and poor men, through the discharge of a function exalted as well as useful—in calling forth the patriotic sympathies, and exercising the mental capacities of every individual—all these effects were produced in a still higher degree by the dikasteries at Athens; from their greater frequency, numbers, and spontaneity of mental action, without any professional judge, upon whom they could throw the responsibility of deciding for them.¹

¹ I transcribe from an eminent lawyer of the United States—Mr. Livingston, author of a Penal Code for the State of Louisiana (Preface, p. 12-16), an eloquent panegyric on Trial by Jury. It contains little more than the topics commonly insisted on, but it is expressed with peculiar warmth, and with the greater fulness, inasmuch as the people of Louisiana, for whom the author was writing, had no familiarity with the institution and its working. The reader will observe that almost everything here said, in recommendation of the jury, might have been urged by Periklēs with much truer and wider application, in enforcing his transfer of judicial power from individual magistrates to the dikasteries.

“By our constitution (*i.e.* in Louisiana), the right of a trial by jury is secured to the accused, but it is not exclusively established. This however may be done by law, and there are so many strong reasons in its favour, that it has been thought proper to insert in the code a precise declaration that in all criminal prosecutions, the trial by jury is a privilege which cannot be renounced. Were it left entirely at the option of the accused, a desire to propitiate the favour of the judge, ignorance of his interest, or the confusion incident to his situation, might induce him to waive the advantage of a trial by his country, and thus by degrees accustom the people to a spectacle which they ought never to behold—a single man determining the fact, applying the law, and disposing at his will of the life, liberty, and reputation of a citizen Those who advocate the present disposition of our laws say—admitting the trial by jury to be an advantage, the law does enough when it gives the accused the option to

On the other hand, the imperfections inherent in jury-trial were likewise disclosed in an exaggerated form under the

avail himself of its benefits: he is the best judge whether it will be useful to him: and it would be unjust to direct him in so important a choice. This argument is specious, but not solid. There are reasons, and some have already been stated, to show that this choice cannot be freely exercised. There is moreover another interest besides that of the culprit to be considered. If he be guilty, the state has an interest in his conviction: and whether guilty or innocent, it has a higher interest,—that the fact should be fairly canvassed before judges inaccessible to influence, and unbiassed by any false views of official duty. It has an interest in the character of its administration of justice, and a paramount duty to perform in rendering it free from suspicion. It is not true therefore to say, that the laws do enough when they give the choice between a fair and impartial trial, and one that is liable to the greatest objections. They must do more—they must restrict that choice, so as not to suffer an ill-advised individual to degrade them into instruments of ruin, though it should be voluntarily inflicted; or of death, though that death should be suicide.

“Another advantage of rendering this mode of trial obligatory is, that it diffuses the most valuable information among every rank of citizens: it is a school, of which every jury that is impanelled is a separate class, where the dictates of the laws and the consequence of disobedience to them are practically taught. The frequent exercise of these important functions moreover gives a sense of dignity and self-respect, not only becoming to the character of a free citizen, but which adds to his private happiness. Neither party-spirit, nor intrigue, nor power, can deprive him of his share in the administration of justice, though they can humble the pride of every other office and vacate every other place. Every time he is called upon to act in this capacity, he must feel *that though placed in perhaps the humblest station, he is yet the guardian of the life, the liberty, and the reputation of his fellow-citizens against injustice and oppression; and that while his plain understanding has been found the best refuge for innocence, his incorruptible integrity is pronounced a sure pledge that guilt will not escape.* A state whose *most obscure citizens* are thus individually elevated to perform these august functions; who are alternately, the defenders of the injured, the dread of the guilty, the vigilant guardians of the constitution; without whose consent no punishment can be inflicted, no disgrace incurred; who can by their voice arrest the blow of oppression, and direct the hand of justice where to strike—such a state can never sink into slavery, or easily submit to oppression. Corrupt rulers may pervert the constitution: ambitious demagogues may violate its precepts: foreign influence may control its operations: but while the people enjoy the trial by jury, taken by lot from among themselves, they cannot cease to be free. The information it spreads, the sense of dignity and independence it inspires, the courage it creates—will always give them an energy of resistance that can grapple with encroachments, and a renovating spirit that will make arbitrary power despair. The enemies of freedom know this: they know how admirable a vehicle it is, to convey the contagion of those liberal principles which attack the vitals of their power, and they therefore guard against its introduction with more care than they would take to avoid pestilential disease. In countries where it already exists, they insidiously endeavour to innovate, because they dare not openly destroy: changes inconsistent with the spirit of the institution are introduced, under the plausible pretext of

Athenian system. Both juror and dikast represent the average man of the time and of the neighbourhood, exempt indeed from pecuniary corruption or personal fear,—deciding according to what he thinks justice or to some genuine feeling of equity, mercy, religion, or patriotism, which in reference to the case before him he thinks as good as justice—but not exempt from sympathies, antipathies, and prejudices, all of which act the more powerfully because there is often no consciousness of their presence, and because they even appear essential to his

improvement : *the common class of citizens are too ill-informed to perform the functions of jurors—a selection is necessary.* This choice must be confided to an agent of executive power, and must be made among the most eminent for education, wealth, and respectability : so that after several successive operations of political chemistry, a shining result may be obtained, freed indeed from all republican dross, but without any of the intrinsic value that is found in the rugged, but inflexible integrity, and incorruptible worth, of the original composition. Men impanelled by this process bear no resemblance but in name to the *sturdy, honest, unlettered jurors who derive no dignity but from the performance of their duties ; and the momentary exercise of whose functions gives no time for the work of corruption or the influence of fear.* By innovations such as these the institution is so changed as to leave nothing to attach the affections or awaken the interest of the people, and it is neglected as an useless, or abandoned as a mischievous contrivance."

Consistently with this earnest admiration of jury-trial, Mr. Livingston, by the provisions of his code, limits very materially the interference of the presiding judge, thus bringing back the jurors more nearly to a similarity with the Athenian dikasts (p. 85) : " I restrict the charge of the judge to an opinion of the law and to the repetition of the evidence, *only when required by any one of the jury.* The practice of repeating all the testimony from notes,—always (from the nature of things) imperfectly, not seldom inaccurately, and sometimes carelessly taken,—has a double disadvantage : it makes the jurors, who rely more on the judge's notes than on their own memory, inattentive to the evidence ; and it gives them an imperfect copy of that which the nature of the trial by jury requires that they should record in their own minds. Forced to rely upon themselves, the necessity will quicken their attention, and it will be only when they disagree in their recollection that recourse will be had to the notes of the judge." Mr. Livingston goes on to add, that the judges, from their old habits acquired as practising advocates, are scarcely ever neutral—almost always take a side—and generally against the prisoners on trial.

The same considerations as those which Mr. Livingston here sets forth to demonstrate the value of jury-trial, are also insisted upon by M. Charles Comte, in his translation of Sir Richard Phillips's *Treatise on Juries*, enlarged with many valuable reflections on the different shape which the jury-system has assumed in England and France (*Des Pouvoirs et des Obligations des Jury, traduit de l'Anglois, par Charles Comte, 2d ed. Paris, 1828, with preliminary Considérations sur le Pouvoir Judiciaire, p. 100 seqq.*).

The length of this note forbids my citing anything further either from the eulogistic observations of Sir Richard Phillips or from those of M. Comte : but they would be found (like those of Mr. Livingston) even more applicable to the dikasteries of Athens than to the juries of England and America.

idea of plain and straightforward good sense. According as a jury is composed of Catholics or Protestants, Irishmen or Englishmen, tradesmen, farmers, or inhabitants of a frontier on which smuggling prevails,—there is apt to prevail among them a corresponding bias. At the time of any great national delusion, such as the Popish Plot—or of any powerful local excitement, such as that of the Church and King mobs at Birmingham in 1791 against Dr. Priestley and the Dissenters—juries are found to perpetrate what a calmer age recognises to have been gross injustice. A jury, who disapprove of the infliction of capital punishment for a particular crime, will acquit prisoners in spite of the clearest evidence of guilt. It is probable that a delinquent, indicted for any state offence before the dikastery at Athens,—having only a private accuser to contend against, with equal power of speaking in his own defence, of summoning witnesses and of procuring friends to speak for him—would have better chance of a fair trial than he would now have anywhere except in England and the United States of America; and better than he would have had in England down to the seventeenth century.¹ Juries bring the

¹ Mr. Jardine (Criminal Trials, Introduct. p. 8) observes, that the “proceedings against persons accused of state offences in the earlier periods of our history, do not deserve the name of trials: they were a mere mockery of justice,” &c.

Respecting what English juries have been, it is curious to peruse the following remarks of Mr. Daines Barrington, Observations on the Statutes, p. 409. In remarking on a statute of Henry VII., A.D. 1494, he says—

“The 21st chapter recites—‘That perjury is much and customarily used within the city of London, among such persons as passen and been impanelled in issue, joined between party and party.’

“This offence hath been before this statute complained of in preambles to several laws, being always the perjury of a *juror*, who finds a verdict contrary to his oath, and not that which we hear too much of at present, in the witnesses produced at a trial.

“In the Dance of Death, written originally in French by Macharel, and translated by John Lydgate in this reign, with some additions to adapt it to English characters—a juryman is mentioned, who had often been bribed for giving a false verdict, which shows the offence to have been very common. The sheriff, who summoned the jury, was likewise greatly accessory to this crime, by summoning those who were most partial and prejudiced. Carew, in his account of Cornwall, informs us that it was a common article in an attorney’s bill to charge *pro amicitia vicecomitis*.

“It is likewise remarkable, that partiality and perjury in jurors of the city of London is more particularly complained of than in other parts of England, by the preamble of this and other statutes. Stow informs us that in 1468, many jurors of this city were punished by having papers fixed on their heads, stating their offence of having been tampered with by the parties to the suit. He likewise complains that this crying offence continued in the time of Queen Elizabeth, when he wrote his account of

common feeling as well as the common reason of the public—or often indeed only the separate feeling of particular fractions of the public—to dictate the application of the law to particular cases. They are a protection against anything worse—especially against such corruption or servility as are liable to taint permanent official persons—but they cannot possibly reach anything better. Now the dikast trial at Athens effected the same object, and had in it only the same ingredients of error and misdecision, as the English jury : but it had them in stronger dose,¹ without

London : and Fuller, in his English Worthies, mentions it as a proverbial saying, that London juries hang half and save half. Grafton also, in his Chronicle, informs us that the Chancellor of the Diocese of London was indicted for a murder, and that the bishop wrote a letter to Cardinal Wolsey, in behalf of his officer, to stop the prosecution, ‘because London juries were so prejudiced, that they would find Abel guilty for the murder of Cain.’

“The punishment for a false verdict by the petty jury is by writ of attaint : and the statute directs, that half of the grand jury, when the trial is *per medietatem linguæ*, shall be strangers, not Londoners.

‘And there’s no London jury, but are led
In evidence as far by common fame,
As they are by present deposition.’

(Ben Jonson’s *Magnetic Lady*, Act III. Sc. 3.)

“It appears by 15 Henry VI. c. 5 (which likewise recites the great increase of perjury in jurors and in the strongest terms), that in every attaint there were thirteen defendants—the twelve jurors who gave the verdict and the plaintiff or defendant who had obtained it, who therefore was supposed to have used corrupt means to procure it. For this reason, if the verdict was given in favour of the crown, no attaint could be brought, because the king could not be joined as a defendant with the jury who were prosecuted.”

Compare also the same work, p. 394–457, and Mr. Amos’s Notes on Fortescue de Laudib. Leg. Angliæ, c. 27.

¹ In France, jury-trial was only introduced for the first time by the Constituent Assembly in 1790; and then only for criminal procedure: I transcribe the following remarks on the working of it from the instructive article in Merlin’s *Répertoire de Jurisprudence*, article *Juré*. Though written in a spirit very favourable to the jury, it proclaims the reflections of an observing lawyer on the temper and competence of the jurymen whom he had seen in action, and on their disposition to pronounce the verdict according to the *feeling* which the case before them inspired.

“Pourquoi faut-il qu’une institution qui rassure les citoyens contre l’endurcissement et la prévention si funeste à l’innocence, que peut produire l’habitude de juger les crimes . . . qu’une institution qui donne pour juges à un accusé, des citoyens indépendans de toute espèce d’influence, ses pairs, ses égaux . . . pourquoi faut-il que cette institution, dont les formes sont simples, touchantes, patriarcales, dont la théorie flatte et entraîne l’esprit par une séduction irrésistible, ait été si souvent méconnue, trompée par l’ignorance et la pusillanimité, prostituée peut-être par une vile et coupable corruption?

“Rendons pourtant justice aux erreurs, même à la prévarication, des jurés : ils ont trop de fois acquitté les coupables, mais il n’a pas encore été prouvé qu’ils eussent jamais fait couler une goutte de sang innocent : et si

the counteracting authority of a judge, and without the benefit of a procedure such as has now been obtained in England.

l'on pouvoit supposer qu'ils eussent vu quelquefois le crime là où il n'y en avoit qu'une apparence trompeuse et fausse, ce ne seroit pas leur conscience qu'il faudroit accuser : ce seroit la fatalité malheureuse des circonstances qui auroient accompagné l'accusation, et qui auroit trompé de même les juges les plus pénétrants et les plus exercés à rechercher la vérité et à la démêler du mensonge.

“ Mais les reproches qu'ont souvent mérités les jurés, c'est d'avoir cédé à *une fausse commiseration*, ou à l'intérêt qu'étoient parvenus à leur inspirer les familles d'accusés qui avoient un rang dans la société : c'est souvent d'être sortis de leurs attributions, qui se bornent à apprécier les faits, et les juger d'une manière différente de la loi. *J'ai vu cent exemples de ces usurpations de pouvoir et de ce despotisme des jurés.* Trop souvent ils ont voulu voir une action innocente, là où la loi avoit dit qu'il y avoit un crime, et alors ils n'ont pas craint de se jouer de la vérité pour tromper et éluder la loi.” . . . “Sera-t-il possible d'améliorer l'institution des jurés, et d'en prévenir les écarts souvent trop scandaleux ? Gardons-nous d'en douter. Que l'on commence par composer le jury de propriétaires intéressés à punir le crime pour le rendre plus rare : que surtout on en éloigne les artisans, les petits cultivateurs, hommes chez qui sans doute la probité est heureusement fort commune, mais dont l'esprit est peu exercé, et qui accoutumés aux déférences, aux égards, cèdent toujours à l'opinion de ceux de leurs collègues dont le rang est plus distingué : ou qui, familiarisés seulement avec les idées relatives à leur profession, n'ont jamais eu, dans tout le reste, que des idées d'emprunt ou d'inspiration. On sait qu'aujourd'hui ce sont ces hommes qui dans presque toute la France forment toujours la majorité des jurés : mettez au milieu d'eux un homme d'un état plus élevé, d'un esprit délié, d'une élocution facile, il entraînera ses collègues, il décidera la délibération : et si cet homme a le jugement faux ou le cœur corrompu, cette délibération sera nécessairement mauvaise.

“ Mais pourra-t-on parvenir à vaincre l'insouciance des propriétaires riches et éclairés, à leur faire abandonner leurs affaires, leurs familles, leurs habitudes, pour les entraîner dans les villes, et leur y faire remplir des fonctions qui tourmentent quelquefois la probité, et donnent des inquiétudes d'autant plus vives que la conscience est plus délicate ? Pourquoi non ? Pourquoi les mêmes classes de citoyens qui dans les huit ou dix premiers mois de 1792, se portaient avec tant de zèle à l'exercice de ces fonctions, les fuir-oient-elles aujourd'hui ? surtout si, pour les y rappeler, la loi fait mouvoir les deux grands ressorts qui sont dans sa main, si elle s'engage à récompenser l'exactitude, et à punir la négligence ? ” (Merlin, Répertoire de Jurisprudence, art. Jurés, p. 97.)

In these passages it deserves notice, that what is particularly remarked about juries, both English and French, is, their reluctance to convict accused persons brought before them. Now the character of the Athenian dikasts, as described by Mr. Mitford and by many other authors, is the precise reverse of this : an extreme severity and cruelty, and a disposition to convict all accused persons brought before them, upon little or no evidence—especially rich accused persons. I venture to affirm that to ascribe to them such a temper generally, is not less improbable in itself, than unsupported by any good evidence. In the speeches remaining to us from defendants, we do indeed find complaints made of the severity of the dikasteries : but in those speeches which come from accusers, there are

The feelings of the dikasts counted for more, and their reason for less : not merely because of their greater numbers, which naturally heightened the pitch of feeling in each individual—but also because the addresses of orators or parties formed the prominent part of the procedure, and the depositions of witnesses only a very subordinate part. The dikast¹ therefore

abundance of complaints to the contrary—of over-indulgence on the part of the dikasteries, and consequent impunity of criminals. Nor does Aristophanês—by whom most modern authors are guided even when they do not quote him—when fairly studied, bear out the temper ascribed by Mr. Mitford to the dikasts ; even if we admitted Aristophanês to be a faithful and trustworthy witness, which no man who knows his picture of Sokratês will be disposed to do. Aristophanês takes hold of every quality which will raise a laugh against the dikasts, and his portrait of them as Wasps was well calculated for this purpose—to describe them as boiling over with acrimony, irritation, impatience to find some one whom they could convict and punish. But even he, when he comes to describe these dikasts in action, represents them as obeying the appeals to their pity, as well as those to their anger—as being yielding and impressionable when their feelings are approached on either side, and unable, when they hear the exculpatory appeal of the accused, to maintain the anger which had been raised by the speech of the accuser. (See Aristophan. Vesp. 574, 713, 727, 974.) Moreover, if from the Vespæ we turn to the Nubes, where the poet attacks the sophists and not the dikasts, we are there told that the sophists could arm any man with fallacies and subterfuges which would enable him to procure acquittal from the dikasts, whatever might be the crime committed.

I believe that this open-mindedness, and impressibility of the feelings on all sides, by art, eloquence, prayers, tears, invectives, &c., is the true character of the Athenian dikasts. And I also believe that they were, as a general rule, more open to commiseration than to any other feeling—like what is above said respecting the French jurymen : *εὐκίνητος πρὸς ὀργήν* (*δ' Ἀθηναίων δῆμος*), *εὐμετάθετος πρὸς ἔλεον*—this expression of Plutarch about the Athenian demos is no less true about the dikasts : compare also the description given by Pliny (H. N. xxxv. 10) of the memorable picture of the Athenian demos by the painter Parrhasius.

¹ That the difference between the dikast and the jurymen, in this respect, is only one of degree, I need hardly remark. M. Merlin observes, “Je ne pense pas, comme bien des gens, que pour être propre aux fonctions de juré, il suffise d'avoir *une intelligence ordinaire et de la probité*. Si l'accusé paroissoit seul aux débats avec les témoins, il ne faudroit sans doute que du bon sens pour reconnoître la vérité dans des déclarations faites avec simplicité et déguisées de tout raisonnement : mais il y paroît assisté presque toujours d'un ou de plusieurs défenseurs qui par des interpellations captieuses, embarrassent ou égarent les témoins ; et par une discussion subtile, souvent sophistique, quelquefois éloquente, enveloppent la vérité des nuages, et rendent l'évidence même problématique. Certes, il faut plus que de bonnes intentions, il faut plus que du bon sens, pour ne pas se laisser entraîner à ces fausses lueurs, pour se garantir des écarts de la sensibilité, et pour se maintenir immuablement dans la ligne du vrai, au milieu de ces impulsions données en même temps à l'esprit et au cœur” (Merlin, Répertoire de Jurisprudence, art. Jurés, p. 98).

At Athens, there were no professional advocates : the accuser and the

heard little of the naked facts, the appropriate subjects for his reason—but he was abundantly supplied with the plausible falsehoods, calumnies, irrelevant statements and suggestions, &c., of the parties, and that too in a manner skilfully adapted to his temper. To keep the facts of the case before the jury, apart from the falsehood and colouring of parties, is the most useful function of the modern judge, whose influence is also considerable as a restraint upon the pleader. The helps to the reason of the dikast were thus materially diminished, while the action upon his feelings, of anger as well as of compassion, was sharpened, as compared with the modern juror.¹ We see in the remaining productions of the Attic orators how much there is of plausible deception, departure from the true issue, and

accused (or the plaintiff and defendant, if the cause was civil), each appeared in person with their witnesses, or sometimes with depositions which the witnesses had sworn to before the archon: each might come with a speech prepared by Antipho (Thucyd. viii. 68) or some other rhetor: each might have one or more *ξυνηγόρους* to speak on his behalf after himself, but seemingly only out of the space of time allotted to him by the clepsydra. In civil causes, the defendant must have been perfectly acquainted with the plaintiff's case, since besides the *Anakrisis* or preliminary examination before the archon, the cause had been for the most part already before an arbitrator. In a criminal case the accused party had only the *Anakrisis* to guide him, as to the matter of which he was to be accused: but it appears from the prepared speeches of accused parties which we now possess, that this *Anakrisis* must have been sufficiently copious to give him a good idea of that which he had to rebut. The accuser was condemned to a fine of 1000 drachms, if he did not obtain on the verdict one-fifth of the votes of the dikasts engaged.

Antipho not only composed speeches for pleaders before the dikastery, but also gave them valuable advice generally as to the manner of conducting their case, &c., though he did not himself speak before the dikasts: so also Ktesiklēs the *λογογράφος* (Demosthenēs cont. Theokrin. c. 5) acted as general adviser or attorney. Xenophon (Memor. i. 2, 51) notices the persons "who knew how to furnish advice and aid to those engaged in a suit at law" (*οἱ συνδικοῦν ἐπιστάμενοι*) as analogous to the surgeon when a man was sick; though they bore no current professional name.

¹ Aristotle in the first and second chapters of his *Treatise de Rhetoricā*, complains that the teachers and writers on rhetoric who preceded him, treated almost entirely of the different means of working on the feelings of the dikasts, and of matters "extraneous to the real question which the dikasts ought to try" (*περὶ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος τὰ πλεῖστα πραγματεύονται· διαβολὴ γὰρ καὶ ἔλεος καὶ ὀργή, οὐ περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δικαστὴν*, &c., i. 1, 1: compare, i. 2, 3 and iii. 1, 2).

This is sufficient to show how prominent such appeals to the feelings of the dikasts were, in actual fact and practice, even if we did not know it from the perusal of the orations themselves.

Respecting the habit of accused persons to bring their wives and children before the dikasts as suppliants for them to obtain mercy or acquittal, see Aristophan. *Vesp.* 567–976; Andokidēs de *Mysteriis* (ad finem), and Lysias *Orat.* iv. de *Vulnere* (ad finem).

appeals to sympathies, antipathies, and prejudices of every kind, addressed to the dikasteries.¹ Of course such artifices were

¹ To a person accustomed to the judicature of modern Europe, conducted throughout all its stages by the instrumentality of professional men (judges, advocates, attorneys, &c.), and viewed by the general public as a matter in which no private citizen either could act or ought to act for himself—nothing is more remarkable in reading the Attic judicial orations (to a certain extent also the Roman) than the entire absence of this professional feeling, and the exhibition of justice both invoked and administered by private citizens exclusively. The nearest analogy to this, which modern justice presents, is to be found in the Courts of Requests and other courts for trying causes limited to small sums of property—too small to be worth the notice of judges and lawyers.

These Courts, in spite of their direct and important bearing on the welfare and security of the poorer classes, have received little elucidation. The History of the Birmingham Court of Requests, by Mr. William Hutton (lately republished by Messrs. Chambers), forms an exception to this remark, and is full of instruction in respect to the habits, the conduct, and the sufferings of poor persons. It furnishes, besides, the closest approach that I know to the feelings of Athenian dikasts and pleaders, though of course with many important differences. Mr. Hutton was for many years unremitting in his attendance as a Commissioner, and took warm interest in the honourable working of the Court. His remarks upon the position, the duties, and the difficulties of the Commissioners, illustrated by numerous cases given in detail, are extremely interesting, and represent thoughts which must have often suggested themselves to intelligent dikasts at Athens.

"Law and equity (he says, p. 34) often vary. If the Commissioners cannot decide *against* law, they can decide *without* it. Their oath binds them to proceed according to *good conscience* (περὶ θροῦ οὐκ εἰσι νόμοι, γνώμη τῇ δικαιοτάτῃ—was the oath of the Athenian dikast). A man only needs information to be able to decide."

A few words from p. 36, about the sources of misjudgement. "Misinformation is another source of evil: both parties equally treat the Commissioners with deceit. The only people who can throw light upon the subject will not.

"It is difficult not to be won by the first speaker, if he carries the air of mildness and is master of his tale; or not to be biassed in favour of infirmity or infancy. Those who cannot assist themselves, we are much inclined to assist.

"Nothing dissolves like tears. Though they arise from weakness, they are powerful advocates, which instantly disarm, particularly those which the afflicted wish to hide. They come from the heart and will reach it, if the judge has a heart to reach. Distress and pity are inseparable.

"Perhaps there never was a judge, from seventeen to seventy, who could look with indifference upon beauty in distress; if he could, he was unfit to be a judge. He should be a stranger to decision who is a stranger to compassion. All these matters influence the man, and warp his judgement."

This is a description, given by a perfectly honest and unprofessional judge, of his own feelings when on the bench. It will be found illustrated by frequent passages in the Attic pleaders, where they address themselves to the feelings here described in the bosom of the dikasts.

resorted to by opposite speakers in each particular trial. We have no means of knowing to what extent they actually perverted the judgement of the hearers.¹ Probably the frequent habit of sitting in dikastery gave them a penetration in detecting sophistry not often possessed by non-professional citizens. Nevertheless it cannot be doubted that in a considerable proportion of cases, success depended less upon the intrinsic merits of a case, than upon apparent airs of innocence, and truth-telling, dexterity of statement, and good general character, in the parties, their witnesses, and the friends who addressed the court on their behalf. The accusatory speeches in Attic oratory, wherein punishment is invoked upon an alleged delinquent, are expressed with a bitterness which is now banished from English criminal judicature, though it was common in the state trials of two centuries ago. Against them may be set the impassioned and emphatic appeals made by defendants and their friends to the commiseration of the dikasts; appeals the more often successful, because they came last, immediately before decision was pronounced. This is true of Rome as well as of Athens.²

As an organ for judicial purposes, the Athenian dikasteries were thus a simple and plenary manifestation of jury-trial, with its inherent excellences and defects both brought out in exaggerated relief. They ensured a decision at once uncorrupt, public-minded, and imposing—together with the best security which the case admitted against illegal violences on the part of the rich and great.³ Their extreme publicity—as well as their

¹ Demosthenês (cont. Phormio. p. 913, c. 2) emphatically remarks how much more cautious witnesses were of giving false testimony before the numerous dikastery, than before the arbitrator.

² Asconius gives an account of the begging off and supplication to the judges at Rome, when sentence was about to be pronounced upon Scaurus, whom Cicero defended (ed. Cicero. *Orat. pro Scauro*, p. 28. ad Orell.): "*Laudaverunt Scaurum consulares novem—Horum magna pars per tabellas laudaverunt, qui aberant: inter quos Pompeius quoque. Unus præterea adolescens laudavit, frater ejus, Faustus Cornelius, Syllæ filius. Is in laudatione multa humiliter et cum lacrimis locutus non minus audientes permovit, quam Scaurus ipse permoverat. Ad genua judicum, cum sententiæ ferrentur, bifariam se diviserunt qui pro eo rogabant: ab uno latere Scaurus ipse et M. Glabrio, sororis filius, et Paulus, et P. Lentulus, et L. Æmilius Buca, et C. Memmius, supplicaverunt: ex alterâ parte Sylla Faustus, frater Scauri, et T. Annius Milo, et T. Peducæus, et C. Cato, et M. Octavius Lænas.*"

Compare also Cicero, Brutus, c. 23, about the defence of Sergius Galba; Quintilian, I. O. ii. 15.

³ Plato, in his *Treatise de Legibus* (vi. p. 768), adopts all the distinguishing principles of the Athenian dikasteries. He particularly insists, that the citizen who does not take his share in the exercise of this function,

simple and oral procedure, divested of that verbal and ceremonial technicality which marked the law of Rome even at its outset, was no small benefit. And as the verdicts of the *dikasts*, even when wrong, depended upon causes of misjudgement common to them with the general body of the citizens, so they never appeared to pronounce unjustly, nor lost the confidence of their fellow-citizens generally. But whatever may have been their defects as judicial instruments, as a stimulus both to thought and speech, their efficacy was unparalleled, in the circumstances of Athenian society. Doubtless they would not have produced the same effect if established at Thebes or Argos. The susceptibilities of the Athenian mind, as well as the previous practice and expansive tendencies of democratical citizenship, were also essential conditions—and that genuine taste for sitting in judgement and hearing both sides fairly, which, however Aristophanês may caricature and deride it, was alike honourable and useful to the people. The first establishment of the *dikasteries* is nearly coincident with the great improvement of Attic tragedy in passing from Æschylus to Sophoklês. The same development of the national genius, now preparing splendid manifestations both in tragic and comic poetry, was called with redoubled force into the path of oratory, by the new judicial system. A certain power of speech now became necessary, not merely for those who intended to take a prominent part in politics, but also for private citizens to vindicate their rights or repel accusations, in a court of justice. It was an accomplishment of the greatest practical utility, even apart from ambitious purposes; hardly less so than the use of arms or the practice of the gymnasium. Accordingly, the teachers of grammar and rhetoric, and the composers of written speeches to be delivered by others, now began to multiply and to acquire an unprecedented importance—as well at Athens as under the contemporary democracy of Syracuse,¹ in which also some form of popular judicature was established. Style and speech began to be reduced to a system, and so communicated; not always happily, for several of the early rhetors² adopted an

conceives himself to have no concern or interest in the commonwealth—
τὸ παράπαν τῆς πόλεως οὐ μέτοχος εἶναι.

¹ Aristot. ap. Cicero. Brut. c. 12. "Itaque cum sublatis in Siciliâ tyrannis res privatæ longo intervallo judiciis repeterentur, tum primum quod esset acuta ea gens et controversa naturâ, artem et præcepta Sículos Coracem et Tisiam conscripsisse," &c. Compare Diodor. xi. 87; Pausan. vi. 17, 8.

² Especially Gorgias: see Aristotel. Rhetor. iii. 1, 26; Timæus, Fr.; Dionys. Halicarn. De Lysiâ Judicium, c. 3: also Foss, Dissertatio de

artificial, ornate, and conceited manner, from which Attic good taste afterwards liberated itself. But the very character of a teacher of rhetoric as an art,—a man giving precepts and putting himself forward in show-lectures as a model for others, is a feature first belonging to the Periklean age, and indicates a new demand in the minds of the citizens.

We begin to hear, in the generation now growing up, of the rhetor and the sophist, as persons of influence and celebrity. These two names denoted persons of similar moral and intellectual endowments, or often indeed the same person, considered in different points of view ;¹ either as professing to improve the moral character—or as communicating power and facility of expression—or as suggesting premises for persuasion, illustrations on the common-places of morals and politics, argumentative abundance on matters of ordinary experience, dialectical subtlety in confuting an opponent, &c.² Antipho of the deme Rhamnus in Attica, Thrasymachus of Chalkêdon, Tisias of Syracuse, Gorgias of Leontini, Protagoras of Abdêra, Prodikus of Keôs, Theodôrus of Byzantium, Hippias of Elis, Zeno of Elea, were among the first who

Gorgiâ Leontino, p. 20 (Halle, 1828) ; and Westermann, *Geschichte der Beredsamkeit in Griechenland und Rom*, sect. 30, 31.

¹ Plato (Gorgias, c. 20-75 ; Protagoras, c. 9). Lysias is sometimes designated as a sophist (Demosth. cont. Neær. c. 7, p. 1351 ; Athenæ. xiii. p. 592). There is no sufficient reason for supposing with Taylor (Vit. Lysiaë, p. 56, ed. Dobson) that there were two persons named Lysias, and that the person here named is a different man from the author of the speeches which remain to us : see Mr. Fynes Clinton, *Fast. H.* p. 360, Appendix, c. 20.

² See the first book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (alluded to in a former note) for his remarks on the technical teachers of rhetoric before his time. He remarks (and Plato had remarked before him) (i. 1 and 2) that their teaching was for the most part thoroughly narrow and practical, bearing exclusively on what was required for the practice of the dikastery (*περὶ τοῦ δικάζεσθαι πάντες πειρῶνται τεχνολογεῖν*) : compare also a remarkable passage in his *Treatise de Sophisticis Elenchis*, c. 32 ad finem. And though he himself lays down a far more profound and comprehensive theory of rhetoric and all matters appertaining to it (in a treatise which has rarely been surpassed in power of philosophical analysis), yet when he is recommending his speculations to notice, he appeals to the great practical value of rhetorical teaching, as enabling a man to "help himself" and fight his own battles in case of need—*Ἀποπον εἰ τῷ σώματι μὲν αἰσχροὺν μὴ δύνασθαι βοηθεῖν ἑαυτῷ, λόγῳ δὲ οὐκ αἰσχροὺν* (i. 1, 3 ; compare iii. 1, 2 ; Plato, Gorgias, c. 41-55) ; Protagoras, c. 9 ; Phædrus, c. 43-50 ; Euthydem. c. 1-31 ; and Xenophon, *Memorab.* iii. 12, 2, 3).

See also the character of Proxenus in the *Anabasis* of Xenophon, ii. 6, 16 ; Plutarch, *Vit. X. Orator.* p. 307 ; Aristoph. *Nubes*, 1108 ; Xenophon, *Memorab.* i. 2, 48 ; Plato *Alkibiadês*, i. c. 31, p. 119 ; and a striking passage in Plutarch's life of Cato the elder, c. 1.

distinguished themselves in these departments of teaching. Antipho was the author of the earliest composed speech really spoken in a dikastery and preserved down to the later critics.¹ These men were mostly not citizens of Athens, though many of them belonged to towns comprehended in the Athenian empire, at a time when important judicial causes belonging to these towns were often carried up to be tried at Athens—while all of them looked to that city as a central point of action and distinction. The term *Sophist*, which Herodotus² applies with sincere respect to men of distinguished wisdom such as Solon, Anacharsis, Pythagoras, &c., now came to be applied to these teachers of virtue, rhetoric, conversation, and disputation; many of whom professed acquaintance with the whole circle of human science, physical as well as moral (then narrow enough), so far as was necessary to talk about any portion of it plausibly and effectively, and to answer any question which might be proposed to them. Though they passed from one Grecian town to another, partly in the capacity of envoys from their fellow-citizens, partly as exhibiting their talents to numerous hearers, with much renown and large gain,³—they appear to have been viewed with jealousy and dislike by a large portion of the public.⁴ For at a time when every citizen pleaded his own cause before the dikastery, they imparted, to those who were rich enough to purchase it, a peculiar skill in the common weapons, which made them seem like fencing-masters or professional swordsmen amidst a society of untrained duellists.⁵

¹ Plutarch, Vit. X. Orator. p. 832; Quintilian, iii. 1, 10. Compare Van Spaan (or Ruhnken), *Dissertatio de Antiphonte Oratore Attico*, pp. 8, 9, prefixed to Dobson's edition of Antipho and Andokidês. Antipho is said to have been the teacher of the historian Thucydidês. The statement of Plutarch that the father of Antipho was also a sophist, can hardly be true.

² Herodot. i. 29; iv. 95.

³ Plato (Hippias Major, c. 1, 2; Menon, p. 95; and Gorgias, c. 1, with Stallbaum's note); Diodor. xii. 53; Pausan. vi. 17, 8.

⁴ Xenophon. Memorab. i. 2, 31. To teach or learn the art of speech was the common reproach made by the vulgar against philosophers and lettered men—τὸ κοινῇ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἐπιτιμώμενον (Xenoph. Memor. i. 2, 31). Compare Æschinês cont. Timar. about Demosthenês, c. 25, 27, which illustrates the curious fragment of Sophoklês, 865. Οἱ γὰρ γύνανδροι καὶ λέγειν ἡσκηκότες.

⁵ Such is probably the meaning of that remarkable passage in which Thucydidês describes the Athenian rhetor Antipho (viii. 68): Ἀντιφῶν, ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναίων ἀρετῇ τε οὐδενὸς ὀσπερος, καὶ κρᾶτιστος ἐνθυμηθῆναι γενόμενος καὶ ἂν γνώη εἰπεῖν· καὶ ἐς μὲν δῆμον οὐ παριῶν οὐδ' ἐς ἄλλον ἀγῶνα ἐκούσιος οὐδένα, ἀλλ' ὑπόπτως τῷ πλήθει διὰ δόξαν δεινότητος διακείμενος, τοὺς μέντοι ἀγωνιζομένους καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ καὶ ἐν δῆμῳ, πλεῖστα

Moreover Sokratês,—himself a product of the same age, a disputant on the same subjects, and bearing the same name of a *Sophist*¹—but despising political and judicial practice, and looking to the production of intellectual stimulus and moral impressions upon his hearers—Sokratês—or rather, Plato speaking through the person of Sokratês—carried on throughout his life a constant polemical warfare against the sophists and rhetors, in that negative vein in which he was unrivalled. And as the works of these latter have not remained, it is chiefly from the observations of their opponents that we know them; so that they are in a situation such as that in which Sokratês himself would have been, if we had been compelled to judge of him only from the Clouds of Aristophanês, or from those unfavourable impressions respecting his character which we know, even from the Apologies of Plato and Xenophon, to have been generally prevalent at Athens.

This is not the opportunity however for trying to distinguish the good from the evil in the working of the sophists and rhetors. At present it is enough that they were the natural product of the age; supplying those wants, and answering to that stimulus, which arose partly from the deliberations of the Ekklesia, but still more from the contentions before the εἰς ἀνὴρ, ὅστις ξυμβουλευσάιτό τι, δυνάμενος ὠφελεῖν. “Inde illa circa occultandam eloquentiam simulatio,” observes Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* iv. i. 8.

Compare Plato (Protagoras, c. 8; Phædrus, c. 86), Isokratês cont. Sophistas, *Or.* xiii. p. 295, where he complains of the teachers—οἵτινες ὑπέσχοντο, δικάζεσθαι διδάσκειν, ἐκλεξάμενοι τὸ δυσχερέστατον τῶν ὀνομάτων, ὃ τῶν φθονούντων ἔργον εἶη λέγειν, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῶν προεστώτων τῆς τοιαύτης παιδείσεως, Demosthen. *De Fals. Legat.* c. 70, 71, p. 417–420; and Æschin. cont. Ktesiphon. c. 9, p. 371—κακοῦργον σοφιστὴν, οἰόμενον ῥήμασι τοὺς νόμους ἀναιρήσειν.

¹ Æschinês cont. Timarch. c. 34, p. 74. Ὑμεῖς μὲν, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, Σωκράτην μὲν τὸν σοφιστὴν ἀπεκτείνετε, ὅτι Κριτίαν ἐφάνη πεπαιδευκῶς, ἕνα τῶν τριάκοντα τῶν τὸν δῆμον καταλυσάντων.

Among the sophists whom Isokratês severely criticises, he evidently seems to include Plato, as may be seen by the contrast between δόξα and ἐπιστήμη, which he particularly notes, and which is so conspicuously set forth in the Platonic writings (Isokratês cont. Sophistas, *Or.* xiii. p. 293: also p. 295). We know also that Lysias called both Plato and Æschinês the disciple of Sokratês, by the name of *Sophists* (Aristeidês, *Orat. Platonic.* xlv. Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων, p. 407, vol. ii. ed. Dindorf). Aristeidês remarks justly that the name Sophist was a general name, including all the philosophers, teachers, and lettered men.

The general name *Sophists*, in fact, included good, bad, and indifferent, like “the philosophers, the political economists, the metaphysicians,” &c. I shall take a future opportunity of examining the indiscriminate censures against them as a class, which most modern writers have copied implicitly from the polemics of ancient times. This examination will be found in ch. lxvii. of the present history.

dikastery,—in which latter a far greater number of citizens took active part, with or without their own consent. The public and frequent dikasteries constituted by Periklês opened to the Athenian mind precisely that career of improvement which was best suited to its natural aptitude. They were essential to the development of that demand out of which grew not only Grecian oratory, but also, as secondary products, the speculative moral and political philosophy, and the didactic analysis of rhetoric and grammar, which long survived after Grecian creative genius had passed away.¹ And it was one of the first measures of the oligarchy of Thirty, to forbid, by an express law, any teaching of the art of speaking. Aristophanês derides the Athenians for their love of talk and controversy, as if it had enfeebled their military energy; but in his time most undoubtedly, that reproach was not true—nor did it become true, even in part, until the crushing misfortunes which marked the close of the Peloponnesian war. During the course of that war, restless and energetic action was the characteristic of Athens even in a greater degree than oratory or political discussion, though before the time of Demosthenês a material alteration had taken place.

The establishment of these paid dikasteries at Athens was thus one of the most important and prolific events in all Grecian history. The pay helped to furnish a maintenance for old citizens, past the age of military service. Elderly men were the best persons for such a service, and were preferred for judicial purposes both at Sparta, and as it seems, in heroic Greece. Nevertheless, we need not suppose that *all* the dikasts were either old or poor, though a considerable proportion of them were so, and though Aristophanês selects these qualities as among the most suitable subjects for his ridicule. Periklês has been often censured for this institution, as if he had been the first to ensure pay to dikasts who before served for nothing, and had thus introduced poor citizens into courts previously composed of citizens above poverty. But in the first place, this supposition is not correct in point of fact, inasmuch as there were no such constant dikasteries previously acting without pay; next, if it had been true, the habitual

¹ Xenoph. Memor. i. 2, 31. λόγων τέχνην μὴ διδάσκειν. Xenophon ascribes the passing of this law to a personal hatred of Kritias against Sokratês, and connects it with an anecdote exceedingly puerile, when considered as the alleged cause of that hatred, as well as of the consequent law. But it is evident that the law had a far deeper meaning, and was aimed directly at one of the prominent democratical habits.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 49

exclusion of the poor citizens would have nullified the popular working of these bodies, and would have prevented them from answering any longer to the reigning sentiment at Athens. Nor could it be deemed unreasonable to assign a regular pay to those who thus rendered regular service. It was indeed an essential item in the whole scheme¹ and purpose, so that the suppression of the pay of itself seems to have suspended the dikasteries, while the oligarchy of Four Hundred was established—and it can only be discussed in that light. As the fact stands, we may suppose that the 6000 Heliasts who filled the dikasteries were composed of the middling and poorer citizens indiscriminately ; though there was nothing to exclude the richer, if they chose to serve.

CHAPTER XLVII

FROM THE THIRTY YEARS' TRUCE, FOURTEEN YEARS BEFORE
THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR, DOWN TO THE BLOCKADE OF
POTIDÆA, IN THE YEAR BEFORE THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

THE judicial alterations effected at Athens by Periklês and Ephialtês, described in the preceding chapter, gave to a large proportion of the citizens direct jury functions and an active interest in the constitution, such as they had never before enjoyed ; the change being at once a mark of previous growth of democratical sentiment during the past, and a cause of its further development during the future. The Athenian people were at this time ready for personal exertion in all directions. Military service on land or sea was not less conformable to their dispositions than attendance in the ekklesia or in the dikastery at home. The naval service especially was prosecuted with a degree of assiduity which brought about continual improvement in skill and efficiency ; while the poorer citizens, of whom it chiefly consisted, were more exact in obedience and discipline than any of the more opulent persons from whom the infantry or the cavalry were drawn.² The maritime multitude, in addition to self-confidence and courage, acquired by this

¹ Thucyd. viii. 67. Compare a curious passage, even in reference to the time of Demosthenês, in the speech of that orator contra Boeotum de Nomine, c. 5. *καὶ εἰ μισθὸς ἐπορίσθη τοῖς δικάσταις, εἰσῆγον ἂν με δῆλον ὅτι, &c.*

² Xenophon, Memorab. iii. 5, 18.

laborious training an increased skill, which placed the Athenian navy every year more and more above the rest of Greece. And the perfection of this force became the more indispensable as the Athenian empire was now again confined to the sea and seaport towns; the reverses immediately preceding the Thirty years' truce having broken up all Athenian land ascendancy over Megara, Bœotia, and the other continental territories adjoining to Attica.

The maritime confederacy—originally commenced at Delos under the headship of Athens, but with a common synod and deliberative voice on the part of each member—had now become transformed into a confirmed empire on the part of Athens, over the remaining states as foreign dependencies; all of them rendering tribute except Chios, Samos, and Lesbos. These three still remained on their original footing of autonomous allies, retaining their armed force, ships, and fortifications, with the obligation of furnishing military and naval aid when required, but not of paying tribute. The discontinuance of the deliberative synod, however, had deprived them of their original security against the encroachments of Athens. I have already stated generally the steps (we do not know them in detail) whereby this important change was brought about, gradually and without any violent revolution—for even the transfer of the common treasure from Delos to Athens, which was the most palpable symbol and evidence of the change, was not an act of Athenian violence, since it was adopted on the proposition of the Samians. The change resulted in fact almost inevitably from the circumstances of the case, and from the eager activity of the Athenians contrasted with the backwardness and aversion to personal service on the part of the allies. We must recollect that the confederacy, even in its original structure, was contracted for permanent objects, and was permanently binding by the vote of its majority, like the Spartan confederacy, upon every individual member.¹ It was destined to keep out the Persian fleet, and to maintain the police of the Ægean. Consistently with these objects, no individual member could be allowed to secede from the confederacy, and thus to acquire the benefit of protection at the cost of the remainder: so that when Naxos and other members actually did secede, the step was taken as a revolt, and Athens only performed her duty as president of the confederacy in

¹ Thucyd. v. 30: about the Spartan confederacy—*εἰρημένον, κύριον εἶναι, ὃ, τι ἂν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν συμμάχων ψηφίσσεται, ἢν μή τι θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων κώλυμα ᾖ.*

Athens before Peloponnesian War 51

reducing them. By every such reduction, as well as by that exchange of personal service for money-payment, which most of the allies voluntarily sought, the power of Athens increased, until at length she found herself with an irresistible navy in the midst of disarmed tributaries, none of whom could escape from her constraining power,—and mistress of the sea, the use of which was indispensable to them. The synod of Delos, even if it had not before become partially deserted, must have ceased at the time when the treasure was removed to Athens—probably about 460 B.C., or shortly afterwards.

The relations between Athens and her allies were thus materially changed, by proceedings which gradually evolved themselves and followed one upon the other without any pre-concerted plan. She became an imperial or despot city, governing an aggregate of dependent subjects, all without their own active concurrence, and in many cases doubtless contrary to their own sense of political right. It was not likely that they should conspire unanimously to break up the confederacy, and discontinue the collection of contribution from each of the members; nor would it have been at all desirable that they should do so: for while Greece generally would have been a great loser by such a proceeding, the allies themselves would have been the greatest losers of all, inasmuch as they would have been exposed without defence to the Persian and Phœnician fleets. But the Athenians committed the capital fault of taking the whole alliance into their own hands, and treating the allies purely as subjects, without seeking to attach them by any form of political incorporation or collective meeting and discussion—without taking any pains to maintain community of feeling or idea of a joint interest—without admitting any control, real or even pretended, over themselves as managers. Had they attempted to do this, it might have proved difficult to accomplish,—so powerful was the force of geographical di-semination, the tendency to isolated civic life, and the repugnance to any permanent extramural obligations, in every Grecian community. But they do not appear to have ever made the attempt. Finding Athens exalted by circumstances to empire, and the allies degraded into subjects, the Athenian statesmen grasped at the exaltation as a matter of pride as well as profit.¹ Even Periklês, the most prudent and far-sighted of them, betrayed no consciousness that an empire

¹ Thucyd. ii. 63. τῆς δὲ πόλεως ὑμᾶς εἰκὸς τῷ τιμωμένῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχειν, ὅπερ ἅπαντες ἀγάλλεσθε, βοηθεῖν, καὶ μὴ φεύγειν τοὺς πόνοους, ἢ μὴδὲ τὰς τιμὰς διώκειν, &c.

without the cement of some all-pervading interest or attachment, although not practically oppressive, must nevertheless have a natural tendency to become more and more unpopular, and ultimately to crumble in pieces. Such was the course of events which, if the judicious counsels of Periklês had been followed, might have been postponed, though it could not have been averted.

Instead of trying to cherish or restore the feelings of equal alliance, Periklês formally disclaimed it. He maintained that Athens owed to her subject-allies no account of the money received from them, so long as she performed her contract by keeping away the Persian enemy and maintaining the safety of the *Ægean* waters.¹ This was, as he represented, the obligation which Athens had undertaken; and provided it were faithfully discharged, the allies had no right to ask questions or exercise control. That it was faithfully discharged no one could deny. No ship of war except from Athens and her allies was ever seen between the eastern and western shores of the *Ægean*. An Athenian fleet of sixty triremes was kept on duty in these waters, chiefly manned by Athenian citizens, and beneficial as well from the protection afforded to commerce as for keeping the seamen in constant pay and training.² And such was the effective superintendence maintained, that in the disastrous period preceding the 'Thirty years' truce, when Athens lost Megara and Bœotia, and with difficulty recovered Eubœa, none of her numerous maritime subjects took the opportunity to revolt.

The total of these distinct tributary cities is said to have amounted to 1000, according to a verse of Aristophanês,³ which cannot be under the truth, though it may well be, and probably is, greatly above the truth. The total annual tribute collected at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, and probably also for the years preceding it, is given by Thucydides at about 600 talents. Of the sums paid by particular states, however, we have little or no information.⁴ It was placed

¹ Plutarch, Periklês, c. 12.

² Plutarch, Periklês, c. 11.

³ Aristophan. Vesp. 707.

⁴ The island of Kythêra was conquered by the Athenians from Sparta in 425 B.C., and the annual tribute then imposed upon it was four talents (Thucyd. iv. 57). In the Inscription No. 143, ap. Boeckh Corp. Inscr., we find some names enumerated of tributary towns with the amount of tribute opposite to each, but the stone is too much damaged to give us much information. Tyrodiza in Thrace paid 1000 drachms: some other towns, or junctions of towns, not clearly discernible, are rated at 1000,

Athens before Peloponnesian War 53

under the superintendence of the Hellenotamiæ; originally officers of the confederacy, but now removed from Delos to

2000, 3000 drachms, one talent, and even ten talents. This inscription must be anterior to 413 B.C., when the tribute was converted into a five per cent. duty upon imports and exports: see Boeckh, *Public Econ. of Athens*, and his notes upon the above-mentioned Inscription.

It was the practice of Athens not always to rate each tributary city separately, but sometimes to join several in one collective rating; probably each responsible for the rest. This seems to have provoked occasional remonstrances from the allies, in some of which the rhetor Antipho was employed to furnish the speech which the complainants pronounced before the dikastery: see Antipho ap. Harpokration, v. Ἀπόταξις—Συντελεῖς. It is greatly to be lamented that the orations composed by Antipho for the Samothrakians and Lindians (the latter inhabiting one of the three separate towns in the island of Rhodes) have not been preserved.

Since my first edition, M. Boeckh has published a second edition of his *Public Economy of the Athenians*, with valuable additions and enlargements. Among the latter are included several Inscriptions (published also for the most part in Rangabé's *Antiquités Helléniques*) recently found at Athens, and illustrating the tribute raised by ancient Athens from her subject-allies. M. Boeckh has devoted more than half his second volume (from p. 369 to p. 747) to an elaborate commentary for the elucidation of these documents.

Had it been our good fortune to recover these Inscriptions complete, we should have acquired important and authentic information respecting the Athenian Tribute-system. But they are very imperfectly legible, and require at every step conjectural restoration as well as conjectural interpretation. To extract from them a consistent idea of the entire system, M. Boeckh has recourse to several hypotheses, which appear to me more ingenious than convincing.

The stones (or at least several among them) form a series of records, belonging to successive years or other periods, inscribed by the Thirty Logistæ or Auditors (Boeckh, p. 584). The point of time from which they begin is not positively determinable. Rangabé supposes it to be Olymp. 82, 1 (452 B.C.), while Boeckh puts it later—Olymp. 83, 2, B.C. 447 (p. 594–596). They reach down, in his opinion, to B.C. 406.

As to the amount of tribute demanded from or paid by the allies, collectively or individually, nothing certain appears to me obtainable from these Inscriptions; which vary surprisingly (as Boeckh observes, pp. 615, 626, 628, 646) in the sums placed opposite to the same name. We learn however something about the classification of the subject-allies. They were distributed under five general heads,—1. Karian Tribute. 2. Ionic Tribute. 3. Insular Tribute. 4. Hellespontine Tribute. 5. Thracian Tribute. Under the first head, Karian, we find specified 62 names of cities; under the second, Ionic, 42 names; under the third, Insular, 41; under the fourth, Hellespontine, 50; under the fifth, Thracian, 68. The total of these (with the addition of four undecypherable names not aggregated to either class) makes 267 names of tributary cities (Boeckh, p. 611). Undoubtedly all the names of tributaries are not here included. Boeckh supposes that an approximation to the actual total may be made, by adding one-fifth more, making in all 334 tributaries (p. 663). This shows a probable minimum, but little more.

Allusion is made in the Inscriptions to certain differences in the mode of

administration of Periklēs, the revenue including tribute was so managed as to leave a large annual surplus; insomuch that a treasure of coined money was accumulated in the Acropolis during the years preceding the Peloponnesian war—which treasure when at its maximum reached the great sum of 9700 talents (= £2,230,000), and was still at 6000 talents, after a serious drain for various purposes, at the moment when that war began.¹ This system of public economy, constantly laying by a considerable sum year after year—in which Athens stood alone, since none of the Peloponnesian states had any public reserve whatever,² goes far of itself to vindicate Periklēs from

three: accordingly the speaker dwells upon many topics calculated to raise a bad impression of Alkibiadēs, and a favourable impression of himself.

Among the accusations against Alkibiadēs, one is, that after having recommended in the assembly of the people that the inhabitants of Melos should be sold as slaves, he had himself purchased a Melian woman among the captives, and had had a son by her: it was criminal (argues the speaker) to beget offspring by a woman whose relations he had contributed to cause to be put to death, and whose city he had contributed to ruin (c. 8).

Upon this argument I do not here touch, any further than to bring out the point of chronology. The speech, if delivered at all, must have been delivered, at the earliest, nearly a year after the capture of Melos by the Athenians: it may be of later date, but it *cannot possibly be earlier*.

Now Melos surrendered in the winter immediately preceding the great expedition of the Athenians to Sicily in 415 B.C., which expedition sailed about midsummer (Thucyd. v. 116; vi. 30). Nikias and Alkibiadēs both went as commanders of that expedition: the latter was recalled to Athens for trial on the charge of impiety about three months afterwards, but escaped in the way home, was condemned and sentenced to banishment in his absence, and did not return to Athens until 407 B.C., long after the death of Nikias, who continued in command of the Athenian armament in Sicily, enjoying the full esteem of his countrymen, until its complete failure and ruin before Syracuse—and who perished himself afterwards as a Syracusan prisoner.

Taking these circumstances together, it will at once be seen that there never can have been any time, ten months or more after the capture of Melos, when Nikias and Alkibiadēs *could* have been exposed to a vote of ostracism at Athens. The thing is absolutely impossible: and the oration in which such historical and chronological incompatibilities are embodied, must be spurious; furthermore it must have been composed long after the pretended time of delivery, when the chronological series of events had been forgotten.

I may add that the story of this duplication of the tribute by Alkibiadēs is virtually contrary to the statement of Plutarch, probably borrowed from Æschinēs, who states that the demagogues *gradually* increased (κατὰ μικρόν) the tribute to 1300 talents (Plutarch, Aristeid. c. 24).

¹ Thucyd. ii. 13.

² Thucyd. i. 80. The foresight of the Athenian people, in abstaining from immediate use of public money and laying it up for future wants, would be still more conspicuously demonstrated, if the statement of Æschinēs the orator were true, that they got together 7000 talents between

the charge of having wasted the public money in mischievous distributions for the purpose of obtaining popularity; and also to exonerate the Athenian Demos from that reproach of a greedy appetite for living by the public purse which it is common to advance against them. After the death of Kimon, no further expeditions were undertaken against the Persians. Even for some years before his death, not much appears to have been done. The tribute-money thus remained unexpended, and kept in reserve, as the presidential duties of Athens prescribed, against future attack, which might at any time be renewed.

Though we do not know the exact amount of the other sources of Athenian revenue, however, we know that tribute received from allies was the largest item in it.¹ And altogether the exercise of empire abroad became a prominent feature in Athenian life, and a necessity to Athenian sentiment, not less than democracy at home. Athens was no longer, as she had been once, a single city, with Attica for her territory. She was a capital or imperial city—a despot-city, was the expression used by her enemies, and even sometimes by her own citizens²—with many dependencies attached to her, and bound to

the peace of Nikias and the Sicilian expedition. M. Boeckh believes this statement, and says, "It is not impossible that 1000 talents might have been laid by every year, as the amount of tribute received was so considerable" (Public Economy of Athens, ch. xx. p. 446, Eng. Trans.). I do not believe the statement: but M. Boeckh and others, who do, ought in fairness to set it against the many remarks which they pass in condemnation of the democratical prodigality.

¹ Thucyd. i. 122-143; ii. 13. The *πεντηκοστή*, or duty of two per cent. upon imports and exports at the Peiræus, produced to the state a revenue of thirty-six talents in the year in which it was farmed by Andokidês, somewhere about 400 B.C., after the restoration of the democracy at Athens from its defeat and subversion at the close of the Peloponnesian war (Andokidês de Mysteriis, c. 23, p. 65). This was at a period of depression in Athenian affairs, and when trade was doubtless not near so good as it had been during the earlier part of the Peloponnesian war.

It seems probable that this must have been the most considerable permanent source of Athenian revenue next to the tribute; though we do not know what rate of customs-duty was imposed at the Peiræus during the Peloponnesian war. Comparing together the two passages of Xenophon (Republ. Ath. i, 17, and Aristophan. Vesp. 657), we may suppose that the regular and usual rate of duty was one per cent. or one *ἐκατοστή*—while in case of need this may have been doubled or tripled—*τὰς πολλὰς ἐκατοστὰς* (see Boeckh, b. iii. ch. 1-4, p. 298-318, Eng. Trans.). The amount of revenue derived even from this source, however, can have borne no comparison to the tribute.

² By Periklês, Thucyd. ii. 63. By Kleon, Thucyd. iii. 37. By the envoys at Mêlos, v. 89. By Euphemus, vi. 85. By the hostile Corinthians, i. 124, as a matter of course.

follow her orders. Such was the manner in which not merely Periklês and the other leading statesmen, but even the humblest Athenian citizen, conceived the dignity of Athens. The sentiment was one which carried with it both personal pride and stimulus to active patriotism. To establish Athenian interests among the dependent territories was one important object in the eyes of Periklês. While discouraging all distant¹ and rash enterprises, such as invasions of Egypt or Cyprus, he planted out many kleruchies, and colonies of Athenian citizens intermingled with allies, on islands and parts of the coast. He conducted 1000 citizens to the Thracian Chersonese, 500 to Naxos, and 250 to Andros. In the Chersonese, he further repelled the barbarous Thracian invaders from without, and even undertook the labour of carrying a wall of defence across the isthmus which connected the peninsula with Thrace ; since the barbarous Thracian tribes, though expelled some time before by Kimon,² had still continued to renew their incursions from time to time. Ever since the occupation of the elder Miltiadês about eighty years before, there had been in this peninsula many Athenian proprietors, apparently intermingled with half-civilised Thracians: the settlers now acquired both greater numerical strength and better protection, though it does not appear that the cross-wall was permanently maintained. The maritime expeditions of Periklês even extended into the Euxine sea, as far as the important Greek city of Sinôpê, then governed by a despot named Timesilaus, against whom a large proportion of the citizens were in active discontent. Lamachus was left with thirteen Athenian triremes to assist in expelling the despot, who was driven into exile along with his friends and party. The properties of these exiles were confiscated, and assigned to the maintenance of six hundred Athenian citizens, admitted to equal fellowship and residence with the Sinôpians. We may presume that on this occasion Sinôpê became a member of the Athenian tributary alliance, if it had not been so before: but we do not know whether Kotyôra and Trapezus, dependencies of Sinôpê farther eastward, which the 10,000 Greeks found on their retreat fifty years afterwards, existed in the time of Periklês or not. Moreover the numerous and well-equipped Athenian fleet under the command of Periklês produced an imposing effect upon the barbarous princes and tribes along the coast,³ contributing

¹ Plutarch, Periklês, c. 20.

² Plutarch, Kimon, c. 14.

³ Plutarch, Periklês, c. 19, 20.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 59

certainly to the security of Grecian trade, and probably to the acquisition of new dependent allies.

It was by successive proceedings of this sort that many detachments of Athenian citizens became settled in various portions of the maritime empire of the city—some rich, investing their property in the islands as more secure (from the incontestable superiority of Athens at sea) even than Attica, which since the loss of the Megarid could not be guarded against a Peloponnesian land invasion¹—others poor, and hiring themselves out as labourers.² The islands of Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros, as well as the territory of Estiæa, on the north of Eubœa, were completely occupied by Athenian proprietors and citizens: other places were partially so occupied. And it was doubtless advantageous to the islanders to associate themselves with Athenians in trading enterprises, since they thereby obtained a better chance of the protection of the Athenian fleet. It seems that Athens passed regulations occasionally for the commerce of her dependent allies, as we see by the fact that shortly before the Peloponnesian war she excluded the Megarians from all their ports. The commercial relations between Peiræus and the Ægean reached their maximum during the interval immediately preceding the Peloponnesian war. These relations were not confined to the country east and north of Attica: they reached also the western regions. The most important settlements founded by Athens during this period were, Amphipolis in Thrace and Thurii in Italy.

Amphipolis was planted by a colony of Athenians and other Greeks, under the conduct of the Athenian Agnon, in 437 B.C. It was situated near the river Strymon in Thrace, on the eastern bank, and at the spot where the Strymon resumes its river-course after emerging from the lake above. It was originally a township or settlement of the Edonian Thracians, called Ennea Hodoi or Nine Ways—in a situation doubly valuable, both as being close upon the bridge over the Strymon, and as a convenient centre for the ship-timber and gold and silver mines of the neighbouring region. It was distant about three English miles from the Athenian settlement

¹ Xenophon, Rep. Ath. ii. 16. *τὴν μὲν οὐσίαν τοῖς νήσοις παρατίθενται, πιστεύοντες τῇ ἀρχῇ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν· τὴν δὲ Ἀττικὴν γῆν περιορῶσι τεμνομένην, γινώσκοντες ὅτι εἰ αὐτὴν ἐλεήσουσιν, ἐτέρων ἀγαθῶν μείζονων στερήσονται.*

Compare also Xenophon (Memorabil. ii. 8, 1, and Symposion, iv. 31).

² See the case of the free labourer and the husbandman at Naxos, Plato, Euthyphro. c. 3.

of Eion at the mouth of the river. The previous unsuccessful attempts to form establishments at Ennea Hodoi have already been noticed—first that of Histiaëus the Milesian, followed up by his brother Aristagoras (about 497–496 B.C.), next that of the Athenians about 465 B.C. under Leagrus and others—on both which occasions the intruding settlers had been defeated and expelled by the native Thracian tribes, though on the second occasion the number sent by Athens was not less than 10,000.¹ So serious a loss deterred the Athenians for a long time from any repetition of the attempt. But it is highly probable that individual Athenian citizens, from Eion and from Thasus, connected themselves with powerful Thracian families, and became in this manner actively engaged in mining—to their own great profit, as well as to the profit of the city collectively, since the property of the kleruchs, or Athenian citizens occupying colonial lands, bore its share in case of direct taxes being imposed on property generally. Among such fortunate adventurers we may number the historian Thucydidês himself; seemingly descended from Athenian parents intermarrying with Thracians, and himself married to a wife either Thracian or belonging to a family of Athenian colonists in that region, through whom he became possessed of a large property in the mines, as well as of great influence in the districts around.² This was one of the various ways in which the collective power of Athens enabled her chief citizens to enrich themselves individually.

The colony under Agnon, despatched from Athens in the year 437 B.C., appears to have been both numerous and well-sustained, inasmuch as it conquered and maintained the valuable position of Ennea Hodoi in spite of those formidable Edonian neighbours who had baffled the two preceding attempts. Its name of Ennea Hodoi was exchanged for that of Amphipolis—the hill on which the new town was situated being bounded on three sides by the river. The settlers seem to have been of mixed extraction, comprising no large proportion of Athenians. Some were of Chalkidic race, others came

¹ Thucyd. i. 100.

² Thucyd. iv. 105; Marcellinus, Vit. Thucyd. c. 19. See Rotscher, *Leben des Thukydides*, ch. i. 4, p. 96, who gives a genealogy of Thucydidês, as far as it can be made out with any probability. The historian was connected by blood with Miltiadês and Kimon, as well as with Olorus king of one of the Thracian tribes, whose daughter Hegesipylê was wife of Miltiadês the conqueror of Marathon. In this manner therefore he belonged to one of the ancient heroic families of Athens and even of Greece, being an Æakid through Ajax and Philæus (Marcellin. c. 2).

Athens before Peloponnesian War 61

from Argilus, a Grecian city colonised from Andros, which possessed the territory on the western bank of the Strymon immediately opposite to Amphipolis,¹ and which was included among the subject allies of Athens. Amphipolis, connected with the sea by the Strymon and the port of Eion, became the most important of all the Athenian dependencies in reference to Thrace and Macedonia.

The colony of Thurii on the coast of the Gulf of Tarentum in Italy, near the site and on the territory of the ancient Sybaris, was founded by Athens about seven years earlier than Amphipolis, not long after the conclusion of the Thirty years' truce with Sparta, B.C. 443. Since the destruction of the old Sybaris by the Krotoniates, in 509 B.C., its territory had for the most part remained unappropriated. The descendants of the former inhabitants, dispersed at Laüs and in other portions of the territory, were not strong enough to establish any new city: nor did it suit the views of the Krotoniates themselves to do so. After an interval of more than sixty years, however, during which one unsuccessful attempt at occupation had been made by some Thessalian settlers, these Sybarites at length prevailed upon the Athenians to undertake and protect the re-colonisation; the proposition having been made in vain to the Spartans. Lampon and Xenokritus, the former a prophet and interpreter of oracles, were sent by Periklês with ten ships as chiefs of the new colony of Thurii, founded under the auspices of Athens. The settlers, collected from all parts of Greece, included Dorians, Ionians, islanders, Bœotians, as well as Athenians. But the descendants of the ancient Sybarites procured themselves to be treated as privileged citizens, monopolising for themselves the possession of political powers as well as the most valuable lands in the immediate vicinity of the walls; while their wives also assumed an offensive pre-eminence over the other women of the city in the public religious processions. Such spirit of privilege and monopoly appears to have been a frequent manifestation among the ancient colonies, and often fatal either to their tranquillity or to their growth; sometimes to both. In the case of Thurii, founded under the auspices of the democratical Athens, it was not likely to have any lasting success. And we find that after no very long period, the majority of the colonists rose in insurrection against the privileged Sybarites, either slew or expelled them, and divided the entire territory of the city upon equal principles among the colonists of every

¹ Thucyd. iv. 102; v. 6.

different race. This revolution enabled them to make peace with the Krotoniates, who had probably been unfriendly so long as their ancient enemies the Sybarites were masters of the city and likely to turn its powers to the purpose of avenging their conquered ancestors. And the city from this time forward, democratically governed, appears to have flourished steadily and without internal dissension for thirty years, until the ruinous disasters of the Athenians before Syracuse occasioned the overthrow of the Athenian party at Thurii. How miscellaneous the population of Thurii was, we may judge from the denominations of the ten tribes—such was the number of tribes established, after the model of Athens—Arkas, Achais, Eleia, Bœotia, Amphiktyonis, Doris, Ias, Athenais, Euboia, Nesiôtis. From this mixture of race they could not agree in recognising or honouring an Athenian Œkist, or indeed any Œkist except Apollo.¹ The Spartan general Kleandridas, banished a few years before for having suffered himself to be bribed by Athens along with king Pleistoanax, removed to Thurii and was appointed general of the citizens in their war against Tarentum. That war was ultimately adjusted by the joint foundation of the new city of Herakleia half-way between the two—in the fertile territory called Siritis.²

The most interesting circumstance respecting Thurii is, that the rhetor Lysias, and the historian Herodotus, were both domiciliated there as citizens. The city was connected with Athens, yet seemingly only by a feeble tie; it was not numbered among the tributary subject allies.³ From the circumstance, that so small a proportion of the settlers at Thurii were native Athenians, we may infer that not many of the latter at that time were willing to put themselves so far out of connexion with Athens—even though tempted by the prospect of lots of land in a fertile and promising territory. And Periklês was probably anxious that those poor citizens, for whom emigration was desirable, should rather become kleruchs in some of the islands or ports of the Ægean, where they would serve (like the colonies of Rome) as a sort of garrison for the maintenance of the Athenian empire.⁴

¹ Diodor. xii. 35.

² Diodor. xii. 11, 12; Strabo, vi. 264; Plutarch, Periklês, c. 22.

³ The Athenians pretended to no subject allies beyond the Ionian Gulf, Thucyd. vi. 14: compare vi. 45, 104; vii. 34. Thucydides does not even mention Thurii, in his catalogue of the allies of Athens at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war (Thucyd. ii. 15).

⁴ Plutarch, Periklês, c. 11.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 63

The fourteen years between the Thirty years' truce and the breaking out of the Peloponnesian war, are a period of full maritime empire on the part of Athens—partially indeed resisted, but never with success. They are a period of peace with all cities extraneous to her own empire; and of splendid decorations to the city itself, emanating from the genius of Pheidias and others, in sculpture as well as in architecture.

Since the death of Kimon, Periklēs had become, gradually but entirely, the first citizen in the commonwealth. His qualities told for more, the longer they were known, and even the disastrous reverses which preceded the Thirty years' truce had not overthrown him, since he had protested against that expedition of Tolmidēs into Bœotia out of which they first arose. But if the personal influence of Periklēs had increased, the party opposed to him seems also to have become stronger and better organised than before; and to have acquired a leader in many respects more effective than Kimon—Thucydidēs son of Melēsias. The new chief was a near relative of Kimon, but of a character and talents more analogous to that of Periklēs; a statesman and orator rather than a general, though competent to both functions if occasion demanded, as every leading man in those days was required to be. Under Thucydidēs, the political and parliamentary opposition against Periklēs assumed a constant character and an organisation, such as Kimon with his exclusively military aptitudes had never been able to establish. The aristocratical party in the commonwealth—the “honourable and respectable” citizens, as we find them styled, adopting their own nomenclature—now imposed upon themselves the obligation of undeviating regularity in their attendance on the public assembly, sitting together in a particular section so as to be conspicuously parted from the Demos. In this manner their applause and dissent, their mutual encouragement to each other, their distribution of parts to different speakers, was made more conducive to the party purposes than it had been before when these distinguished persons were intermingled with the mass of citizens.¹ Thucydidēs himself was eminent as a speaker, inferior only to Periklēs—perhaps hardly inferior even to him. We are told that in reply to a question put to him by Archidamus, whether Periklēs or he were the better

¹ Compare the speech of Nikias, in reference to the younger citizens and partisans of Alkibiadēs sitting together near the latter in the assembly—*οὐς ἐγὼ ὁρῶν νῦν ἐνθάδε τῷ αὐτῷ ἀνδρὶ παρακελευστούς καθημένους φοβοῦμαι, καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἀντιπαρακελεύομαι μὴ καταισχυρῆναι, εἰ τῷ τις παρακῆθῃται τῶνδε, &c.* (Thucyd. vi. 13.) See also Aristophanēs, *Ekklesiaz.* 298 *seq.*, about partisans sitting near together.

wrestler, Thucydidēs replied—"Even when I throw him, he denies that he has fallen, gains his point, and talks over those who actually saw him fall."¹

Such an opposition, made to Periklēs in all the full licence which a democratical constitution permitted, must have been both efficient and embarrassing. But the pointed severance of the aristocratical chiefs, which Thucydidēs son of Melēsius introduced, contributed probably at once to rally the democratical majority round Periklēs, and to exasperate the bitterness of party conflict.² As far as we can make out the grounds of the opposition, it turned partly upon the pacific policy of Periklēs towards the Persians, partly upon his expenditure for home ornament. Thucydidēs contended that Athens was disgraced in the eyes of the Greeks by having drawn the confederate treasure from Delos to her own acropolis, under pretence of greater security—and then employing it, not in prosecuting war against the Persians,³ but in beautifying Athens by new temples and costly statues. To this Periklēs replied that Athens had undertaken the obligation, in consideration of the tribute-money, to protect her allies and keep off from them every foreign enemy—that she had accomplished this object completely at the present, and retained a reserve sufficient to guarantee the like security for the future—that under such circumstances, she owed no account to her allies of the expenditure of the surplus, but was at liberty to employ it for purposes useful and honourable to the city. In this point of view it was an object of great public importance to render Athens imposing in the eyes both of the allies and of Hellas generally, by improved fortifications,—by accumulated embellishment, sculptural and architectural,—and by religious festivals, frequent, splendid, musical and poetical.

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 8. "Όταν ἐγὼ καταβαλῶ παλαίων, ἐκεῖνος ἀντιλέγων ὡς οὐ πέπτωκε, νικᾷ, καὶ μεταπεῖθει τοὺς ὄρῳντας.

² Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 11. ἡ δ' ἐκείνων ἄμιλλα καὶ φιλοτιμία τῶν ἀνδρῶν βαθυτάτην τομὴν τεμοῦσα τῆς πόλεως, τὸ μὲν δῆμον, τὸ δ' ὀλίγους ἐποίησε καλεῖσθαι.

³ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 12. διέβαλλον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις βοῶντες, ὡς ὁ μὲν δῆμος ἄδοξεῖ καὶ κακῶς ἀκούει τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων χρήματα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκ Δήλου μεταγαγών, ἡ δ' ἔνεστιν αὐτῷ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγκαλοῦντας εὐπρεπεστάτη τῶν προφάσεων, δέισαντα τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐκείθεν ἀνελεῖσθαι καὶ φυλάττειν ἐν ὀχυρῷ τὰ κοινὰ, ταύτην ἀνῆρχε Περικλῆς, &c.

Compare the speech of the Lesbians, and their complaints against Athens, at the moment of their revolt in the fourth year of the Peloponnesian war (Thucyd. iii. 10); where a similar accusation is brought forward—ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐώρωνμεν αὐτοὺς (the Athenians) τὴν μὲν τοῦ Μῆδου ἔχθραν ἀνένιτας, τὴν δὲ τῶν ξυμμάχων δούλωσιν ἐπειγομένους, &c.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 65

Such was the answer made by Periklēs in defence of his policy against the opposition headed by Thucydidēs. And considering the grounds of the debate on both sides, the answer was perfectly satisfactory. For when we look at the very large sum which Periklēs continually kept in reserve in the treasury, no one could reasonably complain that his expenditure for ornamental purposes was carried so far as to encroach upon the exigencies of defence. What Thucydidēs and his partisans appear to have urged, was that this common fund should still continue to be spent in aggressive warfare against the Persian king, in Egypt and elsewhere—conformably to the projects pursued by Kimon during his life.¹ But Periklēs was right in contending that such outlay would have been simply wasteful; of no use either to Athens or her allies, though risking all the chances of distant defeat, such as had been experienced a few years before in Egypt. The Persian force was already kept away both from the waters of the Ægean and the coast of Asia, either by the stipulations of the treaty of Kallias, or (if that treaty be supposed apocryphal) by a conduct practically the same as those stipulations would have enforced. The *allies* indeed might have had some ground of complaint against Periklēs, either for not reducing the amount of tribute required from them, seeing that it was more than sufficient for the legitimate purposes of the confederacy,—or for not having collected their positive sentiment as to the disposal of it. But we do not find that this was the argument adopted by Thucydidēs and his party; nor was it calculated to find favour either with aristocrats, or democrats, in the Athenian assembly.

Admitting the injustice of Athens—an injustice common to both the parties in that city, not less to Kimon than to Periklēs—in acting as despot instead of chief, and in discontinuing all appeal to the active and hearty concurrence of her numerous allies; we shall find that the schemes of Periklēs were nevertheless eminently Pan-Hellenic. In strengthening and ornamenting Athens, in developing the full activity of her citizens, in providing temples, religious offerings, works of art, solemn festivals, all of surpassing attraction,—he intended to exalt her into something greater than an imperial city with numerous dependent allies. He wished to make her the centre of Grecian feeling, the stimulus of Grecian intellect, and the type of strong democratical patriotism combined with full liberty of individual taste and aspiration. He wished not merely to retain the adherence of the subject states, but to attract the admiration.

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 20.

and spontaneous deference of independent neighbours, so as to procure for Athens a moral ascendancy much beyond the range of her direct power. And he succeeded in elevating the city to a visible grandeur,¹ which made her appear even much stronger than she really was—and which had the further effect of softening to the minds of her subjects the humiliating sense of obedience; while it served as a normal school, open to strangers from all quarters, of energetic action even under full licence of criticism—of elegant pursuits economically followed—and of a love for knowledge without enervation of character. Such were the views of Periklēs in regard to his country, during the years which preceded the Peloponnesian war. We find them recorded in his celebrated Funeral Oration pronounced in the first year of that war—an exposition for ever memorable of the sentiment and purpose of Athenian democracy, as conceived by its ablest president.

So bitter however was the opposition made by Thucydidēs and his party to this projected expenditure—so violent and pointed did the scission of aristocrats and democrats become—that the dispute came after no long time to that ultimate appeal which the Athenian constitution provided for the case of two opposite and nearly equal party-leaders—a vote of ostracism. Of the particular details which preceded this ostracism, we are not informed; but we see clearly that the general position was such as the ostracism was intended to meet. Probably the vote was proposed by the party of Thucydidēs, in order to procure the banishment of Periklēs, the more powerful person of the two and the most likely to excite popular jealousy. The challenge was accepted by Periklēs and his friends, and the result of the voting was such that an adequate legal majority condemned Thucydidēs to ostracism.² And it seems that the majority must have been very decisive, for the party of Thucydidēs was completely broken by it. We hear of no other single individual equally formidable, as a leader of opposition, throughout all the remaining life of Periklēs.

The ostracism of Thucydidēs apparently took place about two years³ after the conclusion of the 'Thirty years' truce

¹ Thucyd. i. 10.

² Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 11–14. Τέλος δὲ πρὸς τὸν Θουκυδίδην εἰς ἀγῶνα περὶ τοῦ ὀστράκου καταστὰς καὶ διακινδυνεύσας, ἐκείνον μὲν ἐξέβαλε, κατέλυσε δὲ τὴν ἀντιτεταγμένην ἑταιρείαν. See, in reference to the principle of the ostracism, a remarkable incident at Magnesia, between two political rivals, Krêtinēs and Hermeias; also the just reflections of Montesquieu, *Esprit des Loix*, xxvi. c. 17; xxix. c. 7.

³ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 16: the indication of time however is vague.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 67

(443-442 B.C.), and it is to the period immediately following, that the great Periklean works belong. The southern wall of the acropolis had been built out of the spoils brought by Kimon from his Persian expeditions; but the third of the long walls connecting Athens with the harbour was the proposition of Periklēs, at what precise time we do not know. The long walls originally completed (not long after the battle of Tanagra, as has already been stated) were two, one from Athens to Peiræus, another from Athens to Phalêrum: the space between them was broad, and if in the hands of an enemy, the communication with Peiræus would be interrupted. Accordingly Periklēs now induced the people to construct a third or intermediate wall, running parallel with the first wall to Peiræus, and within a short distance¹ (seemingly near one furlong) from it: so that the communication between the city and the port was placed beyond all possible interruption, even assuming an enemy to have got within the Phalêric wall. It was seemingly about this time, too, that the splendid docks and arsenal in Peiræus, alleged by Isokratēs to have cost 1000 talents, were constructed;² while the town itself of Peiræus was laid out anew with straight streets intersecting at right angles. Apparently this was something new in Greece—the towns generally, and Athens itself in particular, having been built without any symmetry, or width, or continuity of streets.³ Hippodamus the Milesian, a man of considerable attainments in the physical philosophy of the age, derived much renown as the earliest town architect, for having laid out the Peiræus on a regular plan. The market-place, or one of them at least, permanently bore his name—the Hippodamian agora.⁴ At a time when so many great architects were displaying their genius in the construction of temples, we are not surprised to hear that the structure of towns began to be regularised also. Moreover we are told that the new colonial town of Thurii,

¹ Plato, *Gorgias*, p. 455, with Scholia; Plutarch, *Periklēs*, c. 13; Forchhammer, *Topographie von Athen*, in *Kieler Philologische Studien*, p. 279-282. See the map of Athens and its environs in the *Classical Atlas*, Everyman's Library.

² Isokratēs, *Orat.* vii.; *Areopagit.* p. 153, c. 27.

³ See *Dikæarchus*, *Vit. Græciæ*, *Fragm.* ed. Fuhr. p. 140: compare the description of *Platæa* in *Thucydides*, ii. 3.

All the older towns now existing in the Grecian islands are put together in this same manner—narrow, muddy, crooked ways—few regular continuous lines of houses: see *Ross, Reisen in den Griechischen Inseln*, *Letter xxvii.* vol. ii. p. 20.

⁴ Aristotle, *Politic.* ii. 5, 1; *Xenophon*, *Hellen.* ii. 4, 1; *Harpokration*, v. *Ἰπποδάμεια*.

to which Hippodamus went as a settler, was also constructed in the same systematic form as to straight and wide streets.¹

The new scheme upon which the Peiræus was laid out was not without its value as one visible proof of the naval grandeur of Athens. But the buildings in Athens and on the acropolis formed the real glory of the Periklean age. A new theatre, termed the Odeon, was constructed for musical and poetical representations at the great Panathenaic solemnity. Next, the splendid temple of Athênê, called the Parthenon, with all its masterpieces of decorative sculpture, friezes, and reliefs: lastly, the costly portals erected to adorn the entrance of the acropolis, on the western side of the hill, through which the solemn processions on festival days were conducted. It appears that the Odeon and the Parthenon were both finished between 445 and 437 B.C.: the Propylæa somewhat later, between 437 and 431 B.C., in which latter year the Peloponnesian war began.² Progress was also made in restoring or re-constructing the Erechtheion, or ancient temple of Athênê Polias, the patron goddess of the city—which had been burnt in the invasion of Xerxes. But the breaking out of the Peloponnesian war seems to have prevented the completion of this, as well as of the great temple of Dêmêter at Eleusis, for the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries—that of Athênê at Sunium—and that of Nemesis at Rhamnus. Nor was the sculpture less memorable than the architecture. Three statues of Athênê, all by the hand of Pheidias, decorated the acropolis—one colossal, 47 feet high, of ivory, in the Parthenon³—a second of bronze, called the Lemnian Athênê—a third of colossal magnitude, also in bronze, called Athênê Promachos, placed between the Propylæa and the Parthenon, and visible from afar off, even to the navigator approaching Peiræus by sea.

It is not of course to Periklês that the renown of these splendid productions of art belongs. But the great sculptors and architects, by whom they were conceived and executed, belonged to that same period of expanding and stimulating Athenian democracy, which likewise called forth creative genius in oratory, in dramatic poetry, and in philosophical speculation. One man especially, of immortal name,—

¹ Diodor. xii. 9.

² Leake, *Topography of Athens*, Append. ii. and iii. p. 328–336, 2nd edit.

³ See Leake, *Topography of Athens*, 2nd ed. p. 111, Germ. Transl. O. Müller (*De Phidiæ Vitâ*, p. 18) mentions no less than eight celebrated statues of Athênê, by the hand of Pheidias—four in the acropolis of Athens.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 69

Pheidias,—born a little before the battle of Marathon, was the original mind in whom the sublime ideal conceptions of genuine art appear to have disengaged themselves from that stiffness of execution, and adherence to a consecrated type, which marked the efforts of his predecessors.¹ He was the great director and superintendent of all those decorative additions, whereby Periklēs imparted to Athens a majesty such as had never before belonged to any Grecian city. The architects of the Parthenon and the other buildings—Iktinus, Kallikratēs, Korœbus, Mnesiklēs, and others—worked under his instructions: and he had besides a school of pupils and subordinates to whom the mechanical part of his labours was confided. With all the great contributions which Pheidias made to the grandeur of Athens, his last and greatest achievement was far away from Athens—the colossal statue of Zeus, in the great temple of Olympia, executed in the years immediately preceding the Peloponnesian war. This stupendous work was sixty feet high, of ivory and gold, embodying in visible majesty some of the grandest conceptions of Grecian poetry and religion. Its effect upon the minds of all beholders, for many centuries successively, was such as never has been, and probably never will be, equalled in the annals of art, sacred or profane.

Considering these prodigious achievements in the field of art only as they bear upon Athenian and Grecian history, they are phænomena of extraordinary importance. When we learn the profound impression which they produced upon Grecian spectators of a later age, we may judge how immense was the effect upon that generation which saw them both begun and finished. In the year 480 B.C., Athens had been ruined by the occupation of Xerxes. Since that period, the Greeks had seen, first the rebuilding and fortifying of the city on an enlarged scale—next, the addition of Peiræus with its docks and magazines—thirdly, the junction of the two by the long walls, thus including the most numerous concentrated population, wealth, arms, ships, &c. in Greece²—lastly, the rapid creation of so many new miracles of art—the sculptures of Pheidias as well as the paintings of the Thasian painter Polygnôtus, in the temple of Theseus, and in the portico

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 13–15: O. Müller, *De Phidiæ Vitâ*, p. 34–60; also his work, *Archäologie der Kunst*, sect. 108–113.

² Thucyd. i. 80. *καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπασιν ἀριστα ἐξήρτυνται, πλοῦτῳ τε ἰδίῳ καὶ δημοσίῳ καὶ ναυσὶ καὶ ἵπποις καὶ ὕπλοις, καὶ ὅχλῳ ὅσος οὐκ ἐν ἄλλῳ ἐν γὰρ χωρίῳ Ἑλληνικῇ ἐστίν*, &c.

called Pœkilê. Plutarch observes¹ that the celerity with which the works were completed was the most remarkable circumstance connected with them; and so it probably might be, in respect to the effect upon the contemporary Greeks. The gigantic strides by which Athens had reached her maritime empire were now immediately succeeded by a series of works which stamped her as the imperial city of Greece, gave to her an appearance of power even greater than the reality, and especially put to shame the old-fashioned simplicity of Sparta.² The cost was doubtless prodigious, and could only have been borne at a time when there was a large treasure in the acropolis, as well as a considerable tribute annually coming in. If we may trust a computation which seems to rest on plausible grounds, it cannot have been much less than 3000 talents in the aggregate (about £690,000).³ The expenditure of so large a sum was of course a source of great private gain to contractors, tradesmen, merchants, artizans of various descriptions, &c., concerned in it. In one way or another, it distributed itself over a large portion of the whole city. And it appears that the materials employed for much of the work were designedly of the most costly description, as being most consistent with the reverence due to the gods. Marble was rejected as too common for the statue of Athênê, and ivory employed in its place.⁴ Even the gold with which it was surrounded weighed not less than forty talents.⁵ A large expenditure for such purposes, considered as pious towards the gods, was at the same time imposing in reference to Grecian feeling, which regarded with admiration every variety of public show and magnificence, and repaid with grateful deference the rich men who indulged in it. Periklês knew well that the visible splendour of the city, so new to all his contemporaries, would cause her great power to appear greater still, and would thus

¹ Plutarch, Periklês, c. 13.

² Thucyd. i. 10.

³ See Leake, *Topography of Athens*, Append. iii. p. 329, 2nd ed. Germ. transl. Colonel Leake, with much justice, contends that the amount of 2012 talents, stated by Harpokration out of Philochorus as the cost of the Propylæa alone, must be greatly exaggerated. Mr. Wilkins (*Atheniensia*, p. 84) expresses the same opinion; remarking that the transport of marble from Pentelikus to Athens is easy, and on a descending road.

Demetrius Phalereus (ap. Cicer. de Officiis, ii. 17) blamed Periklês for the large sum expended upon the Propylæa. It is not wonderful that he uttered this censure, if he had been led to rate the cost of them at 2012 talents.

⁴ Valer. Maxim. i. 7, 2.

⁵ Thucyd. ii. 13.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 71

procure for her a real, though unacknowledged influence—perhaps even an ascendancy—over all cities of the Grecian name. And it is certain that even among those who most hated and feared her, at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, there prevailed a powerful sentiment of involuntary deference.

A step taken by Periklēs, apparently not long after the commencement of the Thirty years' truce, evinces how much this ascendancy was in his direct aim, and how much he connected it with views both of harmony and usefulness for Greece generally. He prevailed upon the people to send envoys to every city of the Greek name, great and small, inviting each to appoint deputies for a congress to be held at Athens. Three points were to be discussed in this intended congress. 1. The restitution of those temples which had been burnt by the Persian invaders. 2. The fulfilment of such vows, as on that occasion had been made to the gods. 3. The safety of the sea and of maritime commerce for all.

Twenty elderly Athenians were sent round to obtain the convocation of this congress at Athens—a Pan-Hellenic congress for Pan-Hellenic purposes. But those who were sent to Bœotia and Peloponnesus completely failed in their object, from the jealousy, noway astonishing, of Sparta and her allies. Of the rest we hear nothing, for this refusal was quite sufficient to frustrate the whole scheme.¹ It is to be remarked that the dependent allies of Athens appear to have been summoned just as much as the cities perfectly autonomous; so that their tributary relation to Athens was not understood to degrade them. We may sincerely regret that such congress did not take effect, as it might have opened some new possibilities of converging tendency and alliance for the dispersed fractions of the Greek name—a comprehensive benefit not likely to be entertained at Sparta even as a project, but which might perhaps have been realised under Athens, and seems in this case to have been sincerely aimed at by Periklēs. The events

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 17. Plutarch gives no precise date, and O. Müller (*De Phidiae Vitâ*, p. 9) places these steps, for convocation of a congress, before the first war between Sparta and Athens and the battle of Tanagra—*i. e.* before 460 B.C. But this date seems to me improbable: Thebes was not yet renovated in power, nor had Bœotia as yet recovered from the fruits of her alliance with the Persians; moreover, neither Athens nor Periklēs himself seems to have been at that time in a situation to conceive so large a project; which suits in every respect much better for the later period, after the Thirty years' truce, but before the Peloponnesian war.

of the Peloponnesian war, however, extinguished all hopes of any such union.

The interval of fourteen years, between the beginning of the Thirty years' truce and that of the Peloponnesian war, was by no means one of undisturbed peace to Athens. In the sixth year of that period occurred the formidable revolt of Samos.

That island appears to have been the most powerful of all the allies of Athens.¹ It surpassed even Chios or Lesbos, standing on the same footing as these two : that is, paying no tribute-money—a privilege when compared with the body of the allies,—but furnishing ships and men when called upon, and retaining, subject to this condition, its complete autonomy, its oligarchical government, its fortifications, and its military force. Like most of the other islands near the coast, Samos possessed a portion of territory on the Asiatic mainland, between which and the territory of Milêtus lay the small town of Priênê, one of the twelve original members contributing to the Pan-Ionic solemnity. Respecting the possession of this town of Priênê, a war broke out between the Samians and Milesians, in the sixth year of the Thirty years' truce (B.C. 440–439). Whether the town had before been independent, we do not know, but in this war the Milesians were worsted, and it fell into the hands of the Samians. The defeated Milesians, enrolled as they were among the tributary allies of Athens, complained to her of the conduct of the Samians, and their complaint was seconded by a party in Samos itself, opposed to the oligarchy and its proceedings. The Athenians required the two disputing cities to bring the matter before discussion and award at Athens. But the Samians refused to comply :² whereupon an armament of forty ships was despatched from Athens to the island, and established in it a democratical government ; leaving in it a garrison and carrying away to Lemnos fifty men and as many boys from the principal oligarchical families, to serve as hostages. Of these families, however, a certain number retired

¹ Thucyd. i. 115 ; viii. 76 ; Plutarch, Periklês, c. 28.

² Thucyd. i. 115 ; Plutarch, Periklês, c. 25. Most of the statements, which appear in this chapter of Plutarch (over and above the concise narrative of Thucydides) appear to be borrowed from exaggerated party stories of the day. We need make no remark upon the story, that Periklês was induced to take the side of Milêtus against Samos by the fact that Aspasia was a native of Milêtus. Nor is it at all more credible, that the satrap Pissuthnes, from goodwill towards Samos, offered Periklês 10,000 golden staters as an inducement to spare the island. It may perhaps be true, however, that the Samian oligarchy, and those wealthy men whose children were likely to be taken as hostages, tried the effect of large bribes upon the mind of Periklês to prevail upon him not to alter the government.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 73

to the mainland, where they entered into negotiations with Pissuthnes the satrap of Sardes, to procure aid and restoration. Obtaining from him seven hundred mercenary troops, and passing over in the night to the island, by previous concert with the oligarchical party, they overcame the Samian democracy as well as the Athenian garrison, who were sent over as prisoners to Pissuthnes. They were further lucky enough to succeed in stealing away from Lemnos their own recently deposited hostages, and they then proclaimed open revolt against Athens, in which Byzantium also joined. It seems remarkable, that though by such a proceeding they would of course draw upon themselves the full strength of Athens, yet their first step was to resume aggressive hostilities against Milêtus,¹ whither they sailed with a powerful force of seventy ships, twenty of them carrying troops.

Immediately on the receipt of this grave intelligence, a fleet of sixty triremes—probably all that were in complete readiness—was despatched to Samos under ten generals, two of whom were Periklês himself and the poet Sophoklês,² both seemingly included among the ten ordinary Stratêgi of the year. But it was necessary to employ sixteen of these ships, partly in summoning contingents from Chios and Lesbos, to which islands Sophoklês went in person;³ partly in keeping watch off the coast of Karia for the arrival of the Phœnician fleet, which report stated to be approaching; so that Periklês had only forty-four ships remaining in his squadron. Yet he did not hesitate to attack the Samian fleet of seventy ships on his way back from Milêtus, near the island of Tragia, and was victorious in the action. Presently he was reinforced by forty ships from Athens and by twenty-five from Chios and Lesbos, so as to be able to disembark at Samos, where he overcame the Samian land-force and blocked up the harbour with a portion of his fleet, surrounding the city on the land-side with a triple wall. Meanwhile the Samians had sent Stesagoras with five ships to press the coming of the Phœnician fleet, and the report of

¹ Thucyd. i. 114, 115.

² Strabo, xiv. p. 638; Schol. Aristeidês, t. iii. p. 485, Dindorf.

³ See the interesting particulars recounted respecting Sophoklês by the Chian poet Ion, who met and conversed with him during the course of this expedition (Athenæus, xiii. p. 603). He represents the poet as uncommonly pleasing and graceful in society, but noway distinguished for active capacity. Sophoklês was at this time in peculiar favour, from the success of his tragedy *Antigonê* the year before. See the chronology of these events discussed and elucidated in Boeckh's preliminary Dissertation to the *Antigonê*, c. 6-9.

their approach became again so prevalent that Periklēs felt obliged to take sixty ships (out of the total 125) to watch for them off the coast of Kaunos and Karia, where he cruised for about fourteen days. The Phoenician fleet¹ never came in sight, though Diodorus affirms that it was actually on its voyage. Pissuthnes certainly seems to have promised, and the Samians to have expected it. Yet I incline to believe that, though willing to hold out hopes and encourage revolt among the Athenian allies, the satrap did not choose openly to violate the convention of Kallias, whereby the Persians were forbidden to send a fleet westward of the Chelidonian promontory. The departure of Periklēs, however, so much weakened the Athenian fleet off Samos, that the Samians, suddenly sailing out of their harbour in an opportune moment, at the instigation and under the command of one of their most eminent citizens, the philosopher Melissus—surprised and disabled the blockading squadron, and even gained a victory over the remaining fleet before the ships could be fairly got clear of the land.² For fourteen days they remained masters of the sea, carrying in and out all that they thought proper. It was not until the return of Periklēs that they were again blockaded. Reinforcements however were now multiplied to the investing squadron—from Athens, forty ships under Thucydidēs,³ Agnon, and

¹ Diodor. xi. 27.

² Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 26. Plutarch seems to have had before him accounts respecting this Samian campaign not only from Ephorus, Stesimbrotus, and Duris, but also from Aristotle: and the statements of the latter must have differed thus far from Thucydidēs, that he affirmed Melissus the Samian general to have been victorious over Periklēs himself, which is not to be reconciled with the narrative of Thucydidēs.

The Samian historian Duris, living about a century after this siege, seems to have introduced many falsehoods respecting the cruelties of Athens; see Plutarch, *l. c.*

³ It appears very improbable that this Thucydidēs can be the historian himself. If it be Thucydidēs son of Melēsius, we must suppose him to have been restored from ostracism before the regular time—a supposition indeed noway inadmissible in itself, but which there is nothing else to countenance. The author of the Life of Sophoklēs, as well as most of the recent critics, adopt this opinion.

On the other hand, it may have been a third person named Thucydidēs; for the name seems to have been common, as we might guess from the two words of which it is compounded. We find a third Thucydidēs mentioned viii. 92—a native of Pharsalus: and the biographer Marcellinus seems to have read of many persons so called (Θουκυδίδαι πολλοί, p. xvi. ed. Arnold). The subsequent history of Thucydidēs son of Melēsius is involved in complete obscurity. We do not know the incident to which the remarkable passage in Aristophanēs (Acharn. 703) alludes—compare Vespaë, 946: nor can we confirm the statement which the Scholiast cites from Idomeneus,

Athens before Peloponnesian War 75

Phormion, and twenty under Tlepolemus and Antiklês, besides thirty from Chios and Lesbos—making altogether near two hundred sail. Against this overwhelming force Melissus and the Samians made an unavailing attempt at resistance, but were presently quite blocked up, and remained so for nearly nine months until they could hold out no longer. They then capitulated, being compelled to raze their fortifications, to surrender all their ships of war, to give hostages for their future conduct, and to make good by stated instalments the whole expense of the enterprise, said to have reached 1000 talents. The Byzantines too made their submission at the same time.¹

Two or three circumstances deserve notice respecting this revolt, as illustrating the existing condition of the Athenian empire. First, that the whole force of Athens, together with the contingents from Chios and Lesbos, was necessary in order to crush it, so that Byzantium, which joined in the revolt, seems to have been left unassailed. Now it is remarkable that none of the dependent allies near Byzantium or anywhere else, availed themselves of so favourable an opportunity to revolt also: a fact which seems plainly to imply that there was little positive discontent then prevalent among them. Had the revolt spread to other cities, probably Pissuthnes might have realised his promise of bringing up the Phœnician fleet, which would have been a serious calamity for the Ægean Greeks, and was only kept off by the unbroken maintenance of the Athenian empire.

Next, the revolted Samians applied for aid, not only to Pissuthnes, but also to Sparta and her allies; among whom at a special meeting the question of compliance or refusal was formally debated. Notwithstanding the Thirty years' truce then subsisting, of which only six years had elapsed, and which had been noway violated by Athens—many of the allies of Sparta voted for assisting the Samians. What part Sparta herself took, we do not know—but the Corinthians were the

to the effect that Thucydidês was banished and fled to Artaxerxes: see Bergk. Reliq. Com. Att. p. 61.

¹ Thucyd. i. 117; Diodor. xii. 27, 28; Isokratês, De Permutat. Or. xv. sect. 118; Cornel. Nepos, Vit. Timoth. c. 1.

The assertion of Ephorus (see Diodorus, xii. 28, and Ephori Fragm. 117, ed. Marx, with the note of Marx) that Periklês employed battering machines against the town, under the management of the Klazomenian Artemon, was called in question by Herakleidês Ponticus, on the ground that Artemon was a contemporary of Anakreon, near a century before: and Thucydidês represents Periklês to have captured the town altogether by blockade.

main and decided advocates for the negative. They not only contended that the truce distinctly forbade compliance with the Samian request, but also recognised the right of each confederacy to punish its own recusant members. And this was the decision ultimately adopted, for which the Corinthians afterwards took credit in the eyes of Athens, as its chief authors.¹ Certainly, if the contrary policy had been pursued, the Athenian empire might have been in great danger—the Phœnician fleet would probably have been brought in also—and the future course of events greatly altered.

Again, after the reconquest of Samos, we should assume it almost as a matter of certainty that the Athenians would renew the democratical government which they had set up just before the revolt. Yet if they did so, it must have been again overthrown, without any attempt to uphold it on the part of Athens. For we hardly hear of Samos again, until twenty-seven years afterwards, towards the latter division of the Peloponnesian war, in 412 B.C., and it then appears with an established oligarchical government of Geomori or landed proprietors, against which the people make a successful rising during the course of that year.² As Samos remained, during the interval between 439 B.C. and 412 B.C., unfortified, deprived of its fleet, and enrolled among the tribute-paying allies of Athens—and as it nevertheless either retained, or acquired, its oligarchical government; so we may conclude that Athens cannot have systematically interfered to democratise by violence the subject-allies, in cases where the natural tendency of parties ran towards oligarchy. The condition of Lesbos at the time of its revolt (hereafter to be related) will be found to confirm this conclusion.³

On returning to Athens after the reconquest of Samos, Periklês was chosen to pronounce the funeral oration over the citizens slain in the war, to whom, according to custom, solemn and public obsequies were celebrated in the suburb called Kerameïkus. This custom appears to have been introduced shortly after the Persian war,⁴ and would doubtless contribute

¹ Thucyd. i. 40, 41.

² Thucyd. viii. 21.

³ Compare Wachsmuth, *Hellenische Alterthumskunde*, sect. 58, vol. ii. p. 82.

⁴ See Westermann, *Geschichte der Beredsamkeit in Griechenland und Rom*; Diodor. xi. 33; Dionys. Hal. A. R. v. 17.

Periklês, in the funeral oration preserved by Thucydides (ii. 35–40), begins by saying—Οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ τῶν ἐνθάδε εἰρηκότων ἤδη ἐπαινοῦσι τὸν πρὸς θέντα τῷ νόμῳ τὸν λόγον τόνδε, &c.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 77

to stimulate the patriotism of the citizens, especially when the speaker elected to deliver it was possessed of the personal dignity as well as the oratorical powers of Periklês. He was twice public funeral orator by the choice of the citizens; once after the Samian success, and a second time in the first year of the Peloponnesian war. His discourse on the first occasion has not reached us,¹ but the second has been fortunately preserved (in substance at least) by Thucydidês, who also briefly describes the funeral ceremony—doubtless the same on all occasions. The bones of the deceased warriors were exposed in tents three days before the ceremony, in order that the relatives of each might have the opportunity of bringing offerings. They were then placed in coffins of cypress and carried forth on carts to the public burial-place at the Kerameikus; one coffin for each of the ten tribes, and one empty couch, formally laid out, to represent those warriors whose bones had not been discovered or collected. The female relatives of each followed the carts, with loud wailings, and after them a numerous procession both of citizens and strangers. So soon as the bones had been consigned to the grave, some distinguished citizen, specially chosen for the purpose, mounted on an elevated stage and addressed to the multitude an appropriate discourse. Such was the effect produced by that of Periklês after the Samian expedition, that when he had concluded, the audience present testified their emotion in the liveliest manner, and the women especially crowned him with garlands like a victorious athlete.² Only Elpinikê, sister of the deceased Kimon, reminded him that the victories of her brother had been more felicitous, as gained over Persians and Phœnicians, and not over Greeks and kinsmen. And the contemporary poet Ion, the friend of Kimon, reported what he thought an unseemly boast of Periklês—to the effect that Agamemnon had spent ten years in taking a foreign city, while *he* in nine months had reduced the first

The Scholiast, and other commentators (K. F. Weber and Westermann among the number), make various guesses as to *what* celebrated man is here designated as the introducer of the custom of a funeral harangue. The Scholiast says, Solon: Weber fixes on Kimon: Westermann, on Aristeidês: another commentator on Themistoklês. But we may reasonably doubt whether *any* one very celebrated man is specially indicated by the words *τὸν προσθέντα*. To commend the introducer of the practice, is nothing more than a phrase for commending the practice itself.

¹ Some fragments of it seem to have been preserved, in the time of Aristotle: see his treatise de Rhetoricâ, i. 7; iii. 10, 3.

² Compare the enthusiastic demonstrations which welcomed Brasidas at Skiônê (Thucyd. iv. 121).

and most powerful of all the Ionic communities.¹ But if we possessed the actual speech pronounced, we should probably find that he assigned all the honour of the exploit to Athens and her citizens generally, placing their achievement in favourable comparison with that of Agamemnon and his host—not himself with Agamemnon.

Whatever may be thought of this boast, there can be no doubt that the result of the Samian war not only rescued the Athenian empire from great peril,² but rendered it stronger than ever: while the foundation of Amphipolis, which was effected two years afterwards, strengthened it still further. Nor do we hear, during the ensuing few years, of any further tendencies to disaffection among its members, until the period immediately before the Peloponnesian war. The feeling common among them towards Athens, seems to have been neither attachment nor hatred, but simple indifference and acquiescence in her supremacy. Such amount of positive discontent as really existed among them, arose, not from actual hardships suffered, but from the general political instinct of the Greek mind—desire of separate autonomy; which manifested itself in each city, through the oligarchical party, whose power was kept down by Athens—and was stimulated by the sentiment communicated from the Grecian communities without the Athenian empire. According to that sentiment, the condition of a subject-ally of Athens was treated as one of degradation and servitude. In proportion as fear and hatred of Athens became predominant among the allies of Sparta, these latter gave utterance to the sentiment more and more emphatically, so as to encourage discontent artificially among the subject-allies of the Athenian empire. Possessing complete mastery of the sea, and every sort of superiority requisite for holding empire over islands, Athens had yet no sentiment to appeal to in her subjects, calculated to render her empire popular, except that of common democracy, which seems at first to have acted without any care on her part to encourage it, until the progress of the Peloponnesian war made such encouragement a part of her policy. And even had she tried to keep up in the allies the feeling of a common interest and the attachment to a permanent confederacy, the instinct of political separation would

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 28; Thucyd. ii. 34.

² A short fragment remaining from the comic poet Eupolis (Κόλακες, Fr. xvi. p. 493, ed. Meineke) attests the anxiety at Athens about the Samian war, and the great joy when the island was reconquered: compare Aristophan. Vesp. 283.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 79

probably have baffled all her efforts. But she took no such pains. With the usual morality that grows up in the minds of the actual possessors of power, she conceived herself entitled to exact obedience as her right. Some of the Athenian speakers in Thucydidês go so far as to disdain all pretence of legitimate power, even such as might fairly be set up; resting the supremacy of Athens on the naked plea of superior force.¹ As the allied cities were mostly under democracies—through the indirect influence rather than the systematic dictation of Athens—yet each having its own internal aristocracy in a state of opposition; so the movements for revolt against Athens originated with the aristocracy or with some few citizens apart; while the people, though sharing more or less in the desire for autonomy, had yet either a fear of their own aristocracy or a sympathy with Athens, which made them always backward in revolting, sometimes decidedly opposed to it. Neither Periklês nor Kleon indeed lays stress on the attachment of the people as distinguished from that of the Few, in these dependent cities. But the argument is strongly insisted on by Diodotus² in the discussion respecting Mitylênê after its surrender: and as the war advanced, the question of alliance with Athens or Sparta became more and more identified with the internal preponderance of democracy or oligarchy in each.³

We shall find that in most of those cases of actual revolt where we are informed of the preceding circumstances, the step is adopted or contrived by a small number of oligarchical malcontents, without consulting the general voice; while in those cases where the general assembly is consulted beforehand, there is manifested indeed a preference for autonomy, but nothing like a hatred of Athens or decided inclination to break with her. In the case of Mitylênê,⁴ in the fourth year of the war, it was the aristocratical government which revolted, while the people, as soon as they obtained arms, actually declared in favour of Athens. And the secession of Chios, the

¹ Thucyd. iii. 37; ii. 63. See the conference, at the island of Melos in the sixteenth year of the Peloponnesian war (Thucyd. v. 89 *seq.*), between the Athenian commissioners and the Melians. I think however that this conference is less to be trusted as based in reality, than the speeches in Thucydidês generally—of which more hereafter.

² Thucyd. iii. 47. Νῦν μὲν γὰρ ὑμῖν ὁ δῆμος ἐν ἀπάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν εὖρους ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ οὐ ξυναφίσταται τοῖς ὀλίγοις ἢ, ἐὰν βιασθῇ, ὑπάρχει τοῖς ἀποστήσασι πολέμιος εὐθὺς, &c.

³ See the striking observations of Thucydidês, iii. 82, 83; Aristotel. Politic. v. 6, 9.

⁴ Thucyd. iii. 27.

greatest of all the allies, in the twentieth year of the Peloponnesian war—even after all the hardships which the allies had been called upon to bear in that war, and after the ruinous disasters which Athens had sustained before Syracuse—was both prepared beforehand and accomplished by secret negotiations of the Chian oligarchy, not only without the concurrence, but against the inclination, of their own people.¹ In like manner, the revolt of Thasos would not have occurred, had not the Thasian democracy been previously subverted by the Athenian Peisander and his oligarchical confederates. So in Akanthus, in Amphipolis, in Mendê, and those other Athenian dependencies which were wrested from Athens by Brasidas—we find the latter secretly introduced by a few conspirators. The bulk of the citizens do not hail him at once as a deliverer, like men sick of Athenian supremacy: they acquiesce, not without debate, when Brasidas is already in the town, and his demeanour, just as well as conciliating, soon gains their esteem. But neither in Akanthus nor in Amphipolis would he have been admitted by the free decision of the citizens, if they had not been alarmed for the safety of their friends, their properties, and their harvest, still exposed in the lands without the walls.² These particular examples warrant us in affirming, that though the oligarchy in the various allied cities desired eagerly to shake off the supremacy of Athens, the people were always backward in following them, sometimes even opposed, and hardly ever willing to make sacrifices for the object. They shared the universal Grecian desire for separate autonomy,³ and felt the Athenian empire as an extraneous pressure which they would have been glad to shake off, whenever the change could be made with safety. But their condition was not one of positive hardship, nor did they overlook the hazardous side of such a change—partly from the coercive hand of Athens—partly from new enemies against whom Athens had hitherto protected them—and not least from their own oligarchy. Of course the different allied cities were not all animated by the same feelings, some being more averse to Athens than others.

The particular modes, in which Athenian supremacy pressed

¹ Thucyd. viii. 9–14. He observes also, respecting the Thasian oligarchy just set up in lieu of the previous democracy by the Athenian oligarchical conspirators who were then organising the revolution of the Four Hundred at Athens—that they immediately made preparations for revolting from Athens—*ξυνέβη οὖν αὐτοῖς μάλιστα ἃ ἐβούλοντο, τὴν πόλιν τε ἀκινδύνως ὁρθεύσθαι, καὶ τὸν ἐναντιωσόμενον δῆμον καταλελύσθαι* (viii. 64).

² Thucyd. iv. 86, 88, 106, 123.

³ See the important passage, Thucyd. viii. 48.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 81

upon the allies and excited complaints, appear to have been chiefly three. 1. The annual tribute. 2. The encroachments or other misdeeds committed by individual Athenians, taking advantage of their superior position : citizens either planted out by the city as Kleruchs (out-settlers), on the lands of those allies who had been subdued—or serving in the naval armaments—or sent round as inspectors—or placed in occasional garrison—or carrying on some private speculation. 3. The obligation under which the allies were laid of bringing a large proportion of their judicial trials to be settled before the dikasteries at Athens.

As to the tribute, I have before remarked that its amount had been but little raised from its first settlement down to the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, at which time it was 600 talents yearly.¹ It appears to have been reviewed, and the apportionment corrected, in every fifth year, at which period the collecting officers may probably have been changed. Afterwards, probably, it became more burdensome, though when, or in what degree, we do not know : but the alleged duplication of it (as I have already remarked) is both uncertified and improbable. The same gradual increase may probably be affirmed respecting the second head of inconvenience—vexation caused to the allies by individual Athenians, chiefly officers of armaments or powerful citizens.² Doubtless this was always more or less a real grievance, from the moment when the Athenians became despots in place of chiefs. But it was probably not very serious in extent until after the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, when revolt on the part of the allies

¹ Xenophon, *Repub. Athen.* iii. 5. πλὴν αἱ τάξεις τοῦ φόρου· τοῦτο δὲ γίγνεται ὡς τὰ πολλὰ δι' ἔτους πέμπτου.

² Xenophon, *Repub. Athen.* i. 14. Περὶ δὲ τῶν συμμάχων, οἱ ἐκπλέοντες συκοφαντοῦσιν, ὡς δοκοῦσι, καὶ μισοῦσι τοὺς χρηστούς, &c.

Who are the persons designated by the expression οἱ ἐκπλέοντες, appears to be specified more particularly a little farther on (i. 18) ; it means the generals, the officers, the envoys, &c., sent forth by Athens.

In respect to the Kleruchies, or out-settlements of Athenian citizens on the lands of allies revolted and reconquered—we may remark that they are not noticed as a grievance in this treatise of Xenophon, nor in any of the anti-Athenian orations of Thucydides. They appear, however, as matters of crimination after the extinction of the empire, and at the moment when Athens was again rising into a position such as to inspire the hope of reviving it. For at the close of the Peloponnesian war, which was also the destruction of the empire, all the Kleruchs were driven home again, and deprived of their outlying property, which reverted to various insular proprietors. These latter were terrified at the idea that Athens might afterwards try to resume these lost rights : hence the subsequent outcry against the Kleruchies.

became more apprehended, and when garrisons, inspectors, and tribute-gathering ships became more essential in the working of the Athenian empire.

But the third circumstance above noticed—the subjection of the allied cities to the Athenian dikasteries—has been more dwelt upon as a grievance than the second, and seems to have been unduly exaggerated. We can hardly doubt that the beginning of this jurisdiction exercised by the Athenian dikasteries dates with the synod of Delos, at the time of the first formation of the confederacy. It was an indispensable element of that confederacy, that the members should forego their right of private war among each other, and submit their differences to peaceable arbitration—a covenant introduced even into alliances much less intimate than this was, and absolutely essential to the efficient maintenance of any common action against Persia.¹ Of course many causes of dispute, public as well as private, must have arisen among these wide-spread islands and seaports of the Ægean, connected with each other by relations of fellow-feeling, of trade, and of common apprehensions. The synod of Delos, composed of the deputies of all, was the natural board of arbitration for such disputes. A habit must thus have been formed, of recognising a sort of federal tribunal,—to decide peaceably how far each ally had faithfully discharged its duties, both towards the confederacy collectively, and towards other allies with their individual citizens separately,—as well as to enforce its decisions and punish refractory members, pursuant to the right which Sparta and her confederacy also claimed and exercised.² Now from

¹ See the expression in Thucydides (v. 27), describing the conditions required when Argos was about to extend her alliances in Peloponnesus. The conditions were two. 1. That the city should be autonomous. 2. Next, that it should be willing to submit its quarrels to equitable arbitration—*ἥτις αὐτόνομός τε ἐστὶ, καὶ δίκας ἴσας καὶ ὁμοίας δίδωσι*.

In the oration against the Athenians, delivered by the Syracusan Hermokratēs at Kamarina, Athens is accused of having enslaved her allies partly on the ground that they neglected to perform their military obligations, partly because they made war upon each other (Thucyd. vi. 76), partly also on other specious pretences. How far this charge against Athens is borne out by the fact, we can hardly say; in all those particular examples which Thucydides mentions of subjugation of allies by Athens, there is a cause perfectly definite and sufficient—not a mere pretence devised by Athenian ambition.

² According to the principle laid down by the Corinthians shortly before the Peloponnesian war—*τοὺς προσήκοντας ἐνυμμάχους αὐτὸν τινα κολάζειν* (Thucyd. i. 40-43).

The Lacedæmonians, on preferring their accusation of treason against Themistoklēs, demanded that he should be tried at Sparta, before the

Athens before Peloponnesian War 83

the beginning the Athenians were the guiding and enforcing presidents of this synod. When it gradually died away, they were found occupying its place as well as clothed with its functions. It was in this manner that their judicial authority over the allies appears first to have begun, as the confederacy became changed into an Athenian empire,—the judicial functions of the synod being transferred along with the common treasure to Athens, and doubtless much extended. And on the whole, these functions must have been productive of more good than evil to the allies themselves, especially to the weakest and most defenceless among them.

Among the thousand towns which paid tribute to Athens (taking this numerical statement of Aristophanês not in its exact meaning, but simply as a great number), if a small town, or one of its citizens, had cause of complaint against a larger, there was no channel except the synod of Delos, or the Athenian tribunal, through which it could have any reasonable assurance of fair trial or justice. It is not to be supposed that *all* the private complaints and suits between citizen and citizen, in each respective subject town, were carried up for trial to Athens: yet we do not know distinctly how the line was drawn, between matters carried up thither, and matters tried at home. The subject cities appear to have been interdicted from the power of capital punishment, which could only be inflicted after previous trial and condemnation at Athens:¹ so that the latter reserved to herself the cognisance of most of the grave crimes—or what may be called “the higher justice” generally. And the political accusations preferred by citizen against citizen, in any subject city, for alleged treason, corruption, non-fulfilment of public duty, &c., were doubtless carried to Athens for trial—perhaps the most important part of her jurisdiction.

But the maintenance of this judicial supremacy was not intended by Athens for the substantive object of amending the administration of justice in each separate allied city. It went rather to regulate the relations between city and city—between citizens of different cities—between Athenian citizens or officers, and any of these allied cities with which they had relations—between each city itself, as a dependent government with

common Hellenic synod which held its sitting there, and of which Athens was then a member; that is, the Spartan confederacy or alliance—*ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ συνεδρίου τῶν Ἑλλήνων* (Diodor. xi. 55).

¹ Antipho, *De Cæde Herôdis*, c. 7, p. 135. ὁ οὐδὲ πόλει ἔξεστιν, ἀνευ Ἀθηναίων, οὐδένα θανάτῳ ζημιῶσαι.

contending political parties, and the imperial head Athens. All these being problems which imperial Athens was called on to solve, the best way of solving them would have been through some common synod emanating from all the allies. Putting this aside, we shall find that the solution provided by Athens was perhaps the next best, and we shall be the more induced to think so when we compare it with the proceedings afterwards adopted by Sparta, when she had put down the Athenian empire. Under Sparta, the general rule was, to place each of the dependent cities under the government of a Dekarchy (or oligarchical council of ten) among its chief citizens, together with a Spartan harmost or governor having a small garrison under his orders. It will be found when we come to describe the Spartan maritime empire that these arrangements exposed each dependent city to very great violence and extortion, while, after all, they solved only a part of the problem. They served only to maintain each separate city under the dominion of Sparta without contributing to regulate the dealings between the citizens of one and those of another, or to bind together the empire as a whole. Now the Athenians did not, as a system, place in their dependent cities governors analogous to the harmosts, though they did so occasionally under special need. But their fleets and their officers were in frequent relation with these cities; and as the principal officers were noways indisposed to abuse their position, so the facility of complaint, constantly open, to the Athenian popular dikastery, served both as redress and guarantee against misrule of this description. It was a guarantee which the allies themselves sensibly felt and valued, as we know from Thucydides. The chief source from whence they had to apprehend evil was, the misconduct of the Athenian officials and principal citizens, who could misemploy the power of Athens for their own private purposes—but they looked up to the “Athenian Demos as a chastener of such evil-doers and as a harbour of refuge to themselves.”¹ If the popular dikasteries at Athens had not

¹ Thucyd. viii. 48. *Τοὺς τε καλοὺς καὶ γαθοὺς ὀνομαζομένους οὐκ ἐλάσσω αὐτοὺς* (that is, the subject-allies) *νομίζειν σφίσι· πράγματα παρέχειν τοῦ δήμου, ποριστὰς ὄντας καὶ ἐσηγητὰς τῶν κακῶν τῷ δήμῳ, ἐξ ὧν τὰ πλείω αὐτοὺς ὠφελεῖσθαι· καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐπ’ ἐκείνοις εἶναι, καὶ ἄκριτοι ἂν καὶ βιαιότερον ἀποθνήσκειν, γόν τε δήμῳ σφῶν τε καταφυγὴν εἶναι καὶ ἐκείνων σωφρονιστήν. Καὶ ταῦτα παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων ἐπισταμένας τὰς πόλεις σαφῶς αὐτὸς εἰδέναι, ὅτι οὕτω νομίζουσι.* This is introduced as the deliberate judgement of the Athenian commander, the oligarch Phrynichus, whom Thucydides greatly commends for his sagacity, and with whom he seems in this case to have concurred.

Xenophon (Rep. Ath. i. 14, 15) affirms that the Athenian officers on

Athens before Peloponnesian War 85

been thus open, the allied cities would have suffered much more severely from the captains and officials of Athens in their individual capacity. And the maintenance of political harmony, between the imperial city and the subject-ally, was ensured by Athens through the jurisdiction of her dikasteries with much less cost of injustice and violence than by Sparta. For though oligarchical leaders in these allied cities might sometimes be unjustly condemned at Athens, yet such accidental wrong was immensely overpassed by the enormities of the Spartan harmosts and Dekarchies, who put numbers to death without any trial at all.

So again, it is to be recollected that Athenian private citizens, not officially employed, were spread over the whole range of the empire as kleruchs, proprietors, or traders. Of course therefore disputes would arise between them and the natives of the subject cities, as well as among these latter themselves, in cases where both parties did not belong to the same city. Now in such cases the Spartan imperial authority was so exercised as to afford little or no remedy, since the action of the harmost or the Dekarchy was confined to one separate city; while the Athenian dikasteries, with universal competence and public trial, afforded the best redress which the contingency admitted. If a Thasian citizen believed himself aggrieved by the historian Thucydides, either as commander of the Athenian fleet on that station, or as proprietor of gold mines in Thrace,—he had his remedy against the latter by accusation before the Athenian dikasteries, to which the most powerful Athenian was amenable not less than the meanest Thasian. To a citizen of any allied city it might be an occasional hardship to be sued before the courts at Athens; but it was also often a valuable privilege to him to be able to service passed many unjust sentences upon the oligarchical party in the allied cities—fines, sentences of banishment, capital punishments, and that the Athenian people, though they had a strong public interest in the prosperity of the allies in order that their tribute might be larger, nevertheless thought it better that any individual citizen of Athens should pocket what he could out of the plunder of the allies, and leave to the latter nothing more than was absolutely necessary for them to live and work, without any superfluity such as might tempt them to revolt.

That the Athenian officers on service may have succeeded too often in unjust peculation at the cost of the allies, is probable enough: but that the Athenian people were pleased to see their own individual citizens so enriching themselves, is certainly not true. The large jurisdiction of the dikasteries was intended, among other effects, to open to the allies a legal redress against such misconduct on the part of the Athenian officers: and the passage above cited from Thucydides proves that it really produced such an effect.

sue, before those courts, others whom else he could not have reached. He had his share of the benefit as well as of the hardship. Athens, if she robbed her subject-allies of their independence, at least gave them in exchange the advantage of a central and common judiciary authority; thus enabling each of them to enforce claims of justice against the rest, in a way which would not have been practicable (to the weaker at least) even in a state of general independence.

Now Sparta seems not even to have attempted anything of the kind with regard to her subject-allies, being content to keep them under the rule of a harmost and a partisan oligarchy. And we read anecdotes which show that no justice could be obtained at Sparta even for the grossest outrages committed by the harmost, or by private Spartans out of Laconia. The two daughters of a Bœotian named Skedasus (of Leuktra in Bœotia) had been first violated and then murdered by two Spartan citizens: the son of a citizen of Oreus in Eubœa had been also outraged and killed by the harmost Aristodêmus:¹ in both cases the fathers went to Sparta to lay the enormity before the ephors and other authorities, and in both cases a deaf ear was turned to their complaints. But such crimes, if committed by Athenian citizens or officers, might have been brought to a formal exposure before the public sitting of the dikastery, and there can be no doubt that both would have been severely punished. We shall see hereafter that an enormity of this description, committed by the Athenian general Pachês at Mitylênê, cost him his life before the Athenian dikasts.² Xenophon, in the dark and one-sided representation which he gives of the Athenian democracy, remarks, that if the subject-allies had not been made amenable to justice at Athens, they would have cared little for the people of Athens, and would have paid court only to those individual Athenians, generals, trierarchs, or envoys, who visited the islands on service; but under the existing system, the subjects were compelled to visit Athens either as plaintiffs or defendants, and were thus under the necessity of paying court to the bulk of the people also—that is, to those humbler citizens out of whom the dikasteries were formed; they supplicated the dikasts in court for favour or lenient dealing.³ But this is only an invidious manner of discrediting what

¹ Plutarch, Pelopidas, c. 20; Plutarch, Amator. Narrat. c. 3, p. 773.

² See *infra*, chap. xlix.

³ Xenophon, Rep. Athen. i. 18. Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, εἰ μὲν μὴ ἐπὶ δίκας ᾔεσαν οἱ σύμμαχοι, τοὺς ἐκπλέοντας Ἀθηναίων ἐτίμων ἂν μόνους, τοὺς τε στρατηγούς καὶ τοὺς τριηράρχους καὶ πρέσβεις· νῦν δ' ἡνάγκασται τὸν δῆμον κολακεύειν τῶν Ἀθηναίων εἰς ἕκαστος τῶν συμμάχων, γινώσκων ὅτι δεῖ μὲν

Athens before Peloponnesian War 87

was really a protection to the allies, both in purpose and in reality. For it was a lighter lot to be brought for trial before the dikastery, than to be condemned without redress by the general on service, or to be forced to buy off his condemnation by a bribe. Moreover the dikastery was open not merely to receive accusations against citizens of the allied cities, but also to entertain complaints which they preferred against others.

Assuming the dikasteries at Athens to be ever so defective as tribunals for administering justice, we must recollect that they were the same tribunals under which every Athenian citizen held his own fortune or reputation, and that the native of any subject city was admitted to the same chance of justice as the native of Athens. Accordingly we find the Athenian envoy at Sparta, immediately before the Peloponnesian war, taking peculiar credit to the imperial city on this ground, for equal dealing with her subject-allies. "If our power (he says) were to pass into other hands, the comparison would presently show how moderate we are in the use of it: but as regards us, our very moderation is unfairly turned to our disparagement rather than to our praise. For even though we put ourselves at disadvantage in matters litigated with our allies, and though we have appointed such matters to be judged among ourselves, and under laws equal to both parties, we are represented as animated by nothing better than a love of litigation."¹ "Our allies (he

ἀφικόμενον Ἀθήναζε δίκην δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν, οὐκ ἐν ἄλλοις τισίν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ δῆμῳ, ὅς ἐστι δὴ νόμος Ἀθηνησιν. Καὶ ἀντιβολῆσαι ἀναγκάζεται ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις, καὶ εἰσιόντος του, ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς χειρός. Διὰ τοῦτο οὖν οἱ σύμμαχοι δοῦλοι τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων καθεστᾶσι μᾶλλον.

¹ Thucyd. i. 76, 77. "Ἄλλους γ' ἂν οὖν οἰόμεθα τὰ ἡμέτερα λαβόντας δεῖξαι ἂν μάλιστα εἰ τι μετριάζομεν· ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐπαινοῦς ἀδοξία τὸ πλεόν ἢ ἔπαινος οὐκ εἰκότως περιέστη. Καὶ ἐλασσούμενοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαῖς πρὸς τοὺς ξυμμάχους δίκαις, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς ὁμοίοις νόμοις ποιήσαντες τὰς κρίσεις, φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν, &c.

I construe *ξυμβολαῖς δίκαις* as connected in meaning with *ξυμβόλαια* and not with *ξύμβολα*—following Duker and Bloomfield in preference to Poppo and Goller: see the elaborate notes of the two latter editors. *Δικαὶ ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* indicated the arrangements concluded by special convention between two different cities, by consent of both, for the purpose of determining controversies between their respective citizens: they were something essentially apart from the ordinary judicial arrangements of either state. Now what the Athenian orator here insists upon is exactly the contrary of this idea: he says that the allies were admitted to the benefit of Athenian trial and Athenian laws, in like manner with the citizens themselves. The judicial arrangements by which the Athenian allies were brought before the Athenian dikasteries cannot with propriety be said to be *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*; unless the act of original incorporation into the confederacy of Delos is to be regarded as a *ξύμβολον* or agreement—which in a large sense it might be, though not in the proper sense in which *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* are

adds) would complain less if we made open use of our superior force with regard to them; but we discard such maxims, and

commonly mentioned. Moreover I think that the passage of Antipho (De Cæde Herodis, p. 745) proves that it was the citizens of places *not in alliance with Athens* who litigated with Athenians according to *δικαί ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*—not the allies of Athens while they resided in their own native cities; for I agree with the interpretation which Boeckh puts upon this passage, in opposition to Platner and Schömann (Boeckh, *Public Econ.* of Athens, book iii. ch. xvi. p. 403, Eng. transl.; Schömann, *Der Attisch. Prozess*, p. 778; Platner, *Prozess und Klagen bei den Attikern*, ch. iv. 2, p. 110–112, where the latter discusses both the passages of Antipho and Thucydides).

The passages in Demosthenês, *Orat. de Halones.* c. 3, pp. 98, 99; and *Andokidês cont. Alkibiad.* c. 7, p. 121 (I quote this latter oration, though it is undoubtedly spurious, because we may well suppose the author of it to be conversant with the nature and contents of *ξύμβολα*), give us a sufficient idea of these judicial conventions, or *ξύμβολα*—special and liable to differ in each particular case. They seem to me essentially distinct from that systematic scheme of proceeding whereby the dikasteries of Athens were made cognisant of all, or most, important controversies among or between the allied cities, as well as of political accusations.

M. Boeckh draws a distinction between the *autonomous* allies (Chios and Lesbos, at the time immediately before the Peloponnesian war) and the *subject*-allies; “the former class (he says) retained possession of unlimited jurisdiction, whereas the latter were compelled to try all their disputes in the courts of Athens.” Doubtless this distinction would prevail to a certain degree, but how far it was pushed we can hardly say. Suppose that a dispute took place between Chios and one of the subject-islands—or between an individual Chian and an individual Thasian—would not the Chian plaintiff sue, or the Chian defendant be sued before the Athenian dikastery? Suppose that an Athenian citizen or officer became involved in dispute with a Chian, would not the Athenian dikastery be the competent court, whichever of the two were plaintiff or defendant? Suppose a Chian citizen or magistrate to be suspected of fomenting revolt, would it not be competent to any accuser, either Chian or Athenian, to indict him before the dikastery at Athens? Abuse of power, or peculation, committed by Athenian officers at Chios, must of course be brought before the Athenian dikasteries, just as much as if the crime had been committed at Thasos or Naxos. We have no evidence to help us in regard to these questions; but I incline to believe that the difference in respect to judicial arrangement, between the autonomous and the subject-allies, was less in degree than M. Boeckh believes. We must recollect that the arrangement was not all pure hardship to the allies—the liability to be prosecuted was accompanied with the privilege of prosecuting for injuries received.

There is one remark however which appears to me of importance for understanding the testimonies on this subject. The Athenian empire, properly so called, which began by the confederacy of Delos after the Persian invasion, was completely destroyed at the close of the Peloponnesian war, when Athens was conquered and taken. But after some years had elapsed, towards the year 377 B.C., Athens again began to make maritime conquests, to acquire allies, to receive tribute, to assemble a synod, and to resume her footing of something like an imperial city. Now her power over her allies during this second period of empire was not near so great

deal with them upon an equal footing : and they are so accustomed to this that they think themselves entitled to complain at every trifling disappointment of their expectations.¹ They suffered worse hardships under the Persians before our empire began, and they would suffer worse under you (the Spartans) if you were to succeed in conquering us and making our empire yours."

History bears out the boast of the Athenian orator, both as to the time preceding and following the empire of Athens.² And an Athenian citizen indeed might well regard it not as a hardship, but as a privilege to the subject-allies, that they should be allowed to sue him before the dikastery, and to defend themselves before the same tribunal either in case of wrong done to him, or in case of alleged treason to the imperial authority of Athens : they were thereby put upon a level with himself. Still more would he find reason to eulogise the universal competence of these dikasteries in providing a common legal authority for all disputes of the numerous distinct communities of the empire one with another, and for the safe navigation and general commerce of the Ægean. That complaints were raised against it among the subject-allies is noway surprising. For the empire of Athens generally was inconsistent with that separate autonomy to which every town thought itself entitled; and this central judicature was one of its prominent and constantly operative institutions, as well as a striking mark of dependence

as it had been during the first, between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars : nor can we be at all sure that what is true of the second is also true of the first. And I think it probable, that those statements of the grammarians, which represent the allies as carrying on *δικας ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* in ordinary practice with the Athenians, may really be true about the second empire or alliance. Bekker, *Anecdota*, p. 436. 'Αθηναῖοι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων ἐδίκασον τοῖς ὑπηκόοις· οὕτως Ἀριστοτέλης. Pollux, viii. 63. 'Απὸ ξυμβόλων δὲ δίκη ἦν, ὅτε οἱ σύμμαχοι ἐδικάζοντο. Also Hesychius, i. 489. The statement here ascribed to Aristotle may very probably be true about the second alliance, though it cannot be held true for the first. In the second, the Athenians may really have had *ξύμβολα*, or special conventions for judicial business, with many of their principal allies, instead of making Athens the authoritative centre, and heir to the Delian synod, as they did during the first. It is to be remarked however that Harpokration, in the explanation which he gives of *ξύμβολα*, treats them in a perfectly general way, as conventions for settlement of judicial controversy between city and city, without any particular allusion to Athens and her allies. Compare Heffter, *Athenäische Gerichtsverfassung*, iii. 1, 3, p. 91.

¹ Thucyd. i. 77. Οἱ δὲ (the allies) *εἰθισμένοι πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου δμικεῖν*, &c.

² Compare Isokratēs, Or. iv. Panegyric. pp. 62, 66, sect. 116-138; and Or. xii. Panathenaic. p. 247-254, sect. 72-111; Or. viii. De Pace, p. 178, sect. 119 *seqq.*; Plutarch, Lysand. c. 13; Cornel. Nepos, Lysand. c. 2, 3.

to the subordinate communities. Yet we may safely affirm that if empire was to be maintained at all, no way of maintaining it could be found at once less oppressive and more beneficial than the superintending competence of the *dikasteries*—a system not taking its rise in the mere “love of litigation” (if indeed we are to reckon this a real feature in the Athenian character, which I shall take another opportunity of examining), much less in those petty collateral interests indicated by Xenophon,¹ such as the increased customs duty, rent of houses, and hire of slaves at Peiræus, and the larger profits of the heralds, arising from the influx of suitors. It was nothing but the power, originally inherent in the confederacy of Delos, of arbitration between members and enforcement of duties towards the whole—a power inherited by Athens from that synod, and enlarged to meet the political wants of her empire; to which end it was essential, even in the view of Xenophon himself.² It may be that the *dikastery* was not always impartial between Athenian citizens privately, or the Athenian commonwealth collectively, and the subject-allies,—and in so far the latter had good reason to complain. But on the other hand we have no ground for suspecting it of deliberate or standing unfairness, or of any other defects than such as were inseparable from its constitution and procedure, whoever might be the parties under trial.

We are now considering the Athenian empire as it stood before the Peloponnesian war; before the increased exactions and the multiplied revolts, to which that war gave rise—before the cruelties which accompanied the suppression of those revolts, and which so deeply stained the character of Athens—before that aggravated fierceness, mistrust, contempt of obligation, and rapacious violence, which Thucydides so emphatically indicates as having been infused into the Greek bosom by the fever of an all-pervading contest.³ There had been before this time many revolts of the Athenian dependencies, from the earliest at Naxos down to the latest at Samos. All had been

¹ Xenophon, *Repub. Ath.* i. 17.

² Xenophon, *Repub. Ath.* i. 16. He states it as one of the advantageous consequences, which induced the Athenians to bring the suits and complaints of the allies to Athens for trial—that the *prytaneia*, or fees paid upon entering a cause for trial, became sufficiently large to furnish all the pay for the *dikasts* throughout the year.

But in another part of his treatise (iii. 2, 3) he represents the Athenian *dikasteries* as overloaded with judicial business, much more than they could possibly get through; insomuch that there were long delays before causes could be brought on for trial. It could hardly be any great object therefore to multiply complaints artificially, in order to make fees for the *dikasts*.

³ See his well-known comments on the seditions at Korkyra, iii. 82, 83.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 91

successfully suppressed, but in no case had Athens displayed the same unrelenting rigour as we shall find hereafter manifested towards Mitylênê, Skiônê, and Mêlos. The policy of Periklês, now in the plenitude of his power at Athens, was cautious and conservative, averse to forced extension of empire as well as to those increased burdens on the dependent allies which such schemes would have entailed, and tending to maintain that assured commerce in the Ægean by which all of them must have been gainers—not without a conviction that the contest must arise sooner or later between Athens and Sparta, and that the resources as well as the temper of the allies must be husbanded against that contingency. If we read in Thucydidês the speech of the envoy from Mitylênê¹ at Olympia, delivered to the Lacedæmonians and their allies in the fourth year of the Peloponnesian war, on occasion of the revolt of the city from Athens—a speech imploring aid and setting forth the strongest impeachment against Athens which the facts could be made to furnish—we shall be surprised how weak the case is and how much the speaker is conscious of its weakness. He has nothing like practical grievances and oppressions to urge against the imperial city. He does not dwell upon enormity of tribute, unpunished misconduct of Athenian officers, hardship of bringing causes for trial to Athens, or other sufferings of the subjects generally. He has nothing to say except that they were defenceless and degraded subjects, and that Athens held authority over them without and against their own consent: and in the case of Mitylênê, not so much as this could be said, since she was on the footing of an equal, armed, and autonomous ally. Of course this state of forced dependence was one which the allies, or such of them as could stand alone, would naturally and reasonably shake off whenever they had an opportunity.² But the negative evidence, derived from the speech of the Mitylenæan orator, goes far to make out the point contended for by the Athenian speaker at Sparta immediately before the war—that, beyond the fact of such forced dependence, the allies had little practically to complain of. A city like Mitylênê might be strong enough to protect itself and its own commerce without the help of Athens. But to the weaker allies, the breaking up of the Athenian empire would have greatly lessened the security

¹ Thucyd. iii. 11–14.

² So the Athenian orator Diodotus puts it in his speech deprecating the extreme punishment about to be inflicted on Mitylênê—*ἢν τινα ἐλεύθερον καὶ βία ἀρχόμενον εἰκότως πρὸς αὐτονομίαν ἀποστάντα χεῖρωσώμεθα* (Thucyd. iii. 46).

both of individuals and of commerce, in the waters of the Ægean, and their freedom would thus have been purchased at the cost of considerable positive disadvantages.¹

¹ It is to be recollected that the Athenian empire was essentially a *government of dependencies*; Athens as an imperial state exercising authority over subordinate governments. To maintain beneficial relations between two governments,—one supreme—the other subordinate—and to make the system work to the satisfaction of the people in the one as well as of the people in the other—has always been found a problem of great difficulty. Whoever reads the instructive volume of Sir. G. C. Lewis (*Essay on the Government of Dependencies*), and the number of instances of practical misgovernment in this matter which are set forth therein—will be inclined to think that the empire of Athens over her allies makes comparatively a creditable figure. It will most certainly stand full comparison with the government of England over dependencies in the last century; as illustrated by the history of Ireland, with the penal laws against the Catholics—by the declaration of independence published in 1776 by the American colonies, setting forth the grounds of their separation—and by the pleadings of Mr. Burke against Warren Hastings.

A statement and legal trial alluded to by Sir George Lewis (p. 367) elucidates further two points not unimportant on the present occasion: 1. The illiberal and humiliating vein of sentiment which is apt to arise in citizens of the supreme government towards those of the subordinate. 2. The protection which English Jury-trial, nevertheless, afforded to the citizens of the dependency against oppression by English officers.

“An action was brought in the Court of Common Pleas, in 1773, by Mr. Anthony Fabrigas a native of Minorca, against General Mostyn the governor of the island. The facts proved at the trial were, that Governor Mostyn had arrested the plaintiff, imprisoned him, and transported him to Spain without any form of trial, on the ground that the plaintiff had presented to him a petition for redress of grievances in a manner which he deemed improper. Mr. Justice Gould left it to the jury to say, whether the plaintiff's behaviour was such as to afford a just conclusion that he was about to stir up sedition and mutiny in the garrison, or whether he meant no more than earnestly to press his suit and obtain a redress of grievances. If they thought the latter, the plaintiff was entitled to recover in the action. The jury gave a verdict for the plaintiff *with £3000 damages*. In the following term an application was made for a new trial, which was refused by the whole court.

“The following remarks of the counsel for Governor Mostyn on this trial contain a plain and *naïve* statement of the doctrine, *that a dependency is to be governed not for its own interest, but for that of the dominant state*. ‘Gentlemen of the jury (said the counsel), it will be time for me now to take notice of another circumstance, notorious to all the gentlemen who have been settled in the island, that the natives of Minorca are but ill-affected to the English and to the English government. It is not much to be wondered at. They are the descendants of Spaniards; and they consider Spain as the country to which they ought naturally to belong: it is not at all to be wondered at that they are indisposed to the English whom they consider as their conquerors.—Of all the Minorquins in the island, the plaintiff perhaps stands singularly and eminently the most seditious, turbulent, and dissatisfied subject to the crown of Great Britain that is to be found in Minorca. Gentlemen, *he is, or chooses to be, called the patriot of*

Athens before Peloponnesian War 93

Nearly the whole of the Grecian world (putting aside Italian, Sicilian, and African Greek) was at this time included either in the alliance of Lacedæmon or in that of Athens, so that the truce of thirty years ensured a suspension of hostilities everywhere. Moreover the Lacedæmonian confederates had determined by a majority of votes to refuse the request of Samos for aid in her revolt against Athens: whereby it seemed established, as practical international law, that neither of these two great aggregate bodies should intermeddle with the other, and that each should restrain or punish its own disobedient members.¹

Of this refusal, which materially affected the course of events, the main advisers had been the Corinthians, in spite of that fear and dislike of Athens which prompted many of the allies to vote for war.² The position of the Corinthians was peculiar; for while Sparta and her other allies were chiefly land-powers,

Minorca. Now patriotism is a very pretty thing among ourselves, and we owe much to it: we owe our liberties to it; but we should have but little to value, and perhaps we should have but little of what we now enjoy, were it not for our trade. *And for the sake of our trade, it is not fit that we should encourage patriotism in Minorca:* for it is there destructive of our trade, and there is an end to our trade in the Mediterranean, if it goes there. But *here it is very well:* for the body of the people in this country will have it: they have demanded it—and in consequence of their demands, they have enjoyed liberties which they will transmit to their posterity—and it is not in the power of this government to deprive them of it. But they will take care of all our conquests abroad. If that spirit prevailed in Minorca, the consequence would be the loss of that country, and of course of our Mediterranean trade. We should be sorry to set all our slaves free in our plantations."

The prodigious sum of damages awarded by the jury shows the strength of their sympathy with this Minorquin plaintiff against the English officer. I doubt not that the feeling of the dikastery at Athens was much of the same kind, and often quite as strong; sincerely disposed to protect the subject-allies against misconduct of Athenian trierarchs or inspectors.

The feelings expressed in the speech above cited would also often find utterance from Athenian orators in the assembly: and it would not be difficult to produce parallel passages, in which these orators imply discontent on the part of the allies to be the natural state of things, such as Athens could not hope to escape. The speech here given shows that such feelings arise, almost inevitably, out of the uncomfortable relation of two governments, one supreme, and the other subordinate. They are not the product of peculiar cruelty and oppression on the part of the Athenian democracy, as Mr. Mitford and so many others have sought to prove.

¹ See the important passage already adverted to in a prior note.

Thucyd. i. 40. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς Σαμίων ἀποστάντων ψῆφον προσθέμεθα ἐναντίαν ὑμῖν, τῶν ἄλλων Πελοποννησίων δίχα ἐψηφισμένων εἰ χρὴ αὐτοῖς ἀμύνειν, φανερώς δὲ ἀντεῖπομεν τοὺς προσήκοντας ξυμμάχους αὐτόν τινα κολάζειν.

² Thucyd. i. 33.

Corinth had been from early times maritime, commercial, and colonising. She had indeed once possessed the largest navy in Greece, along with Ægina ; but either she had not increased it at all during the last forty years, or if she had, her comparative naval importance had been sunk by the gigantic expansion of Athens. The Corinthians had both commerce and colonies—Leukas, Anaktorium, Ambrakia, Korkyra, &c., along or near the coast of Epirus: they had also their colony Potidæa, situated on the isthmus of Pallênê in Thrace, and intimately connected with them: and the interest of their commerce made them averse to collision with the superior navy of the Athenians. It was this consideration which had induced them to resist the impulse of the Lacedæmonian allies towards war on behalf of Samos. For though their feelings both of jealousy and hatred against Athens were even now strong,¹ arising greatly out of the struggle a few years before the acquisition of Megara to the Athenian alliance—prudence indicated that in a war against the first naval power in Greece, they were sure to be the greatest losers.

So long as the policy of Corinth pointed towards peace, there was every probability that war would be avoided, or at least accepted only in a case of grave necessity, by the Lacedæmonian alliance. But a contingency, distant as well as unexpected, which occurred about five years after the revolt of Samos, reversed all these chances, and not only extinguished the dispositions of Corinth towards peace, but even transformed her into the forward instigator of war.

Amidst the various colonies planted from Corinth along the coast of Epirus, the greater number acknowledged on her part an hegemony or supremacy.² What extent of real power and interference this acknowledgement implied, in addition to the honorary dignity, we are not in a condition to say. But the Corinthians were popular, and had not carried their interference beyond the point which the colonists themselves found acceptable. To these amicable relations, however, the powerful Korkyra formed a glaring exception—having been generally at variance, sometimes in the most aggravated hostility, with its mother-city, and withholding from her even the accustomed tributes of honorary and filial respect. It was amidst such relations of habitual ill-will between Corinth and Korkyra that a dispute grew up respecting the city of Epidamnus (known afterwards in the Roman times as Dyrrachium, hard by the

¹ Thucyd. i. 42.

² Thucyd. i. 38. *ἡγεμόνες τε εἶναι καὶ τὰ εἰκότα θαυμάζεσθαι.*

Athens before Peloponnesian War 95

modern Durazzo)—a colony founded by the Korkyræans on the coast of Illyria in the Ionic Gulf, considerably to the north of their own island. So strong was the sanctity of Grecian custom in respect to the foundation of colonies, that the Korkyræans, in spite of their enmity to Corinth, had been obliged to select the Œkist (or Founder-in-Chief) of Epidamnus from that city—a citizen of Herakleid descent named Phalius—along with whom there had also come some Corinthian settlers. And thus Epidamnus, though a Korkyræan colony, was nevertheless a recognised grand-daughter (if the expression may be allowed) of Corinth, the recollection of which was perpetuated by the solemnities periodically celebrated in honour of the Œkist.¹

Founded on the isthmus of an outlying peninsula on the sea-coast of the Illyrian Taulantii, Epidamnus was at first prosperous, and acquired a considerable territory as well as a numerous population. But during the years immediately preceding the period which we have now reached, it had been exposed to great reverses. Internal sedition between the oligarchy and the people, aggravated by attacks from the neighbouring Illyrians, had crippled its power; and a recent revolution, in which the people put down the oligarchy, had reduced it still further—since the oligarchical exiles, collecting a force and allying themselves with the Illyrians, harassed the city grievously both by sea and land. The Epidamnian democracy was in such straits as to be forced to send to Korkyra for aid. Their envoys sat down as suppliants at the temple of Hêrê, cast themselves on the mercy of the Korkyræans, and besought them to act both as mediators with the exiled oligarchy, and as auxiliaries against the Illyrians. Though the Korkyræans, themselves democratically governed, might have been expected to sympathise with these suppliants and their prayers, yet their feeling was decidedly opposite. For it was the Epidamnian oligarchy who were principally connected with Korkyra, from whence their forefathers had emigrated, and where their family burial-places as well as their kinsmen were still to be found:² while the Demos, or small proprietors and tradesmen of Epidamnus, may perhaps have been of miscellaneous origin, and at any rate had no visible memorials of ancient lineage in the mother-island. Having been refused aid

¹ Thucyd. i. 24, 25.

² Thucyd. i. 26. ἦλθον γὰρ εἰς τὴν Κέρκυραν οἱ τῶν Ἐπιδαμνίων φυγάδες, τάφους τε ἀποδεικνύντες καὶ συγγένειαν ἣν προΐσχύμενοι ἐδέοντο σφᾶς κατὰγειν.

from Korkyra, and finding their distressed condition insupportable, the Epidamnians next thought of applying to Corinth. But as this was a step of questionable propriety, their envoys were directed first to take the opinion of the Delphian god. His oracle having given an unqualified sanction, they proceeded to Corinth with their mission; describing their distress as well as their unavailing application at Korkyra—tendering Epidamnus to the Corinthians as to its Ækists and chiefs, with the most urgent entreaties for immediate aid to preserve it from ruin—and not omitting to insist on the divine sanction just obtained. It was found easy to persuade the Corinthians, who, looking upon Epidamnus as a joint colony from Corinth and Korkyra, thought themselves not only authorised, but bound, to undertake its defence—a resolution much prompted by their ancient feud against Korkyra. They speedily organised an expedition, consisting partly of intended new settlers, partly of a protecting military force—Corinthian, Leukadian, and Ambrakiôtic: which combined body, in order to avoid opposition from the powerful Korkyræan navy, was marched by land as far as Apollônia, and transported from thence by sea to Epidamnus.¹

The arrival of such a reinforcement rescued the city for the moment, but drew upon it a formidable increase of peril from the Korkyræans; who looked upon the interference of Corinth as an infringement of their rights, and resented it in the strongest manner. Their feelings were further inflamed by the Epidamnian oligarchical exiles, who, coming to the island with petitions for succour and appeals to the tombs of their Korkyræan ancestors, found a ready sympathy. They were placed on board a fleet of twenty-five triremes, afterwards strengthened by a further reinforcement, which was sent to Epidamnus with the insulting requisition that they should be forthwith restored and the new-comers from Corinth dismissed. No attention being paid to such demands, the Korkyræans commenced the blockade of the city with forty ships and with an auxiliary land-force of Illyrians—making proclamation that any person within, citizen or not, might depart safely if he chose, but would be dealt with as an enemy if he remained. How many persons profited by this permission we do not know; but at least enough to convey to Corinth the news that their troops in Epidamnus were closely besieged. The Corinthians immediately hastened the equipment of a second expedition—sufficient not only for the rescue of the place, but to surmount that resistance which

¹ Thucyd. i. 26.

the Korkyræans were sure to offer. In addition to thirty triremes, and three thousand hoplites, of their own, they solicited aid both in ships and money from many of their allies. Eight ships fully manned were furnished by Megara, four by Palês in the island of Kephallenia, five by Epidaurus, two by Trœzen, one by Hermionê, ten by Leukas, and eight by Ambrakia—together with pecuniary contributions from Thebes, Phlius, and Elis. They further proclaimed a public invitation for new settlers to Epidamnus, promising equal political rights to all; an option being allowed to any one, who wished to become a settler without being ready to depart at once, to ensure future admission by depositing the sum of fifty Corinthian drachmas. Though it might seem that the prospects of these new settlers were full of doubt and danger, yet such was the confidence entertained in the metropolitan protection of Corinth, that many were found as well to join the fleet, as to pay down the deposit for liberty of future junction.

All these proceedings on the part of Corinth, though undertaken with intentional hostility towards Korkyra, had not been preceded by any formal proposition such as was customary among Grecian states—a harshness of dealing arising not merely from her hatred towards Korkyra, but also from the peculiar political position of that island, which stood alone and isolated, not enrolled either in the Athenian or in the Lacedæmonian alliance. The Korkyræans, well aware of the serious preparation now going on at Corinth and of the union among so many cities against them, felt themselves hardly a match for it alone, in spite of their wealth and their formidable naval force of 120 triremes, inferior only to that of Athens. They made an effort to avert the storm by peaceable means, prevailing upon some mediators from Sparta and Sikyon to accompany them to Corinth; where, while they required that the forces and settlers recently despatched to Epidamnus should be withdrawn, denying all right on the part of Corinth to interfere in that colony—they at the same time offered, if the point were disputed, to refer it for arbitration either to some impartial Peloponnesian city, or to the Delphian oracle; such arbiter to determine to which of the two cities Epidamnus as a colony really belonged—and the decision to be obeyed by both. They solemnly deprecated recourse to arms, which, if persisted in, would drive them as a matter of necessity to seek new allies such as they would not willingly apply to. To this the Corinthians answered that they could entertain no proposition until the Korkyræan besieging force was withdrawn from

Epidamnus. Whereupon the Korkyræans rejoined that they would withdraw it at once, provided the new settlers and the troops sent by Corinth were removed at the same time. Either there ought to be this reciprocal retirement, or the Korkyræans would acquiesce in the *status quo* on both sides, until the arbiters should have decided.¹

Although the Korkyræans had been unwarrantably harsh in rejecting the first supplication from Epidamnus, yet in their propositions made at Corinth, right and equity were on their side. But the Corinthians had gone too far, and assumed an attitude too decidedly aggressive, to admit of listening to arbitration. Accordingly, so soon as their armament was equipped, they set sail for Epidamnus, despatching a herald to declare war formally against the Korkyræans. When the armament, consisting of seventy-five triremes under Aristeus, Kallikratês, and Timanor, with 2000 hoplites under Archetimus and Isarchidas, had reached Cape Aktium at the mouth of the Ambrakian Gulf, it was met by a Korkyræan herald in a little boat forbidding all further advance—a summons of course unavailing, and quickly followed by the appearance of the Korkyræan fleet. Out of the 120 triremes which constituted the naval establishment of the island, forty were engaged in the siege of Epidamnus, but all the remaining eighty were now brought into service; the older ships being specially repaired for the occasion. In the action which ensued, they gained a complete victory, destroying fifteen Corinthian ships, and taking a considerable number of prisoners. And on the very day of the victory, Epidamnus surrendered to their besieging fleet, under covenant that the Corinthians within it should be held as prisoners, and that the other new-comers should be sold as slaves. The Corinthians and their allies did not long keep the sea after their defeat, but retired home, while the Korkyræans remained undisputed masters of the neighbouring sea. Having erected a trophy on Leukimmê, the adjoining promontory of their island, they proceeded, according to the melancholy practice of Grecian warfare, to kill all their prisoners²—except

¹ Thucyd. i. 28.

² To illustrate this treatment of prisoners of war among the ancient Greeks, I transcribe an incident from the more recent history of Europe. It is contained in Bassompierre's description of his campaign in Hungary in 1603, with the German and Hungarian army under Count de Rossworm, against the Turks :—

“Après cette victoire, nous repassâmes toute l'armée de l'autre côté du Danube en notre camp. Le général commanda que l'on tuât tous les prisonniers du jour précédent, parcequ'ils embarrassoient l'armée : qui fut une

Athens before Peloponnesian War 99

the Corinthians, who were carried home and detained as prizes of great value for purposes of negotiation. They next began to take vengeance on those allies of Corinth who had lent assistance to the recent expedition : they ravaged the territory of Leukas, burnt Kyllênê the seaport of Elis, and inflicted so much damage that the Corinthians were compelled towards the end of the summer to send a second armament to Cape Aktium, for the defence of Leukas, Anaktorium, and Ambrakia. The Korkyræan fleet was again assembled near Cape Leukimmê, but no further action took place, and at the approach of winter both armaments were disbanded.¹

Deeply were the Corinthians humiliated by their defeat at sea, together with the dispersion of the settlers whom they had brought together : and though their original project was frustrated by the loss of Epidamnus, they were only the more bent on complete revenge against their old enemy Korkyra. They employed themselves for two entire years after the battle in building new ships and providing an armament adequate to their purposes : and in particular, they sent round not only to the Peloponnesian seaports, but also to the islands under the empire of Athens, in order to take into their pay the best class of seamen. By such prolonged efforts, ninety well-manned Corinthian ships were ready to set sail in the third year after the battle. The entire fleet, when reinforced by the allies, amounted to not less than 150 sail ; twenty-seven triremes from Ambrakia, twelve from Megara, ten from Elis, as many from Leukas, and one from Anaktorium. Each of these allied squadrons had officers of its own, while the Corinthian Xenokleidês and four others were commanders-in-chief.²

But the elaborate preparations going on at Corinth were no secret to the Korkyræans, who well knew, besides, the numerous allies which that city could command, and her extensive influence throughout Greece. So formidable an attack was more than they could venture to brave, alone and unaided. They had never yet enrolled themselves among the allies either of Athens or of Lacedæmon. It had been their pride and policy to maintain a separate line of action, which, by means of their wealth, their power, and their very peculiar position, they had hitherto been enabled to do with safety. That they had been able so to proceed with safety, however, was considered both by friends and enemies as a peculiarity belonging to their

chose bien cruelle, de voir tuer de sangfroid plus de huit cents hommes rendus."—*Mémoires de Bassompierre*, p. 308 : collect. Pétitot.

¹ Thucyd. i. 29, 30.

² Thucyd. i. 31-46.

island ; from whence we may draw an inference how little the islands in the *Ægean*, now under the Athenian empire, would have been able to maintain any real independence, if that empire had been broken up. But though *Korkyra* had been secure in this policy of isolation up to the present moment, such had been the increase and consolidation of forces elsewhere throughout Greece, that even she could pursue it no longer. To apply for admission into the Lacedæmonian confederacy, wherein her immediate enemy exercised paramount influence, being out of the question, she had no choice except to seek alliance with Athens. That city had as yet no dependencies in the Ionic Gulf ; she was not of kindred lineage, nor had she had any previous amicable relations with the Dorian *Korkyra*. But if there was thus no previous fact or feeling to lay the foundation of alliance, neither was there anything to forbid it ; for in the truce between Athens and Sparta, it had been expressly stipulated, that any city not actually enrolled in the alliance of either, might join the one or the other at pleasure.¹ While the proposition of alliance was thus formally open either for acceptance or refusal, the time and circumstances under which it was to be made rendered it full of grave contingencies to all parties. The *Korkyræan* envoys, who now for the first time visited Athens for the purpose of making it, came thither with doubtful hopes of success, though to their island the question was one of life or death.

According to the modern theories of government, to declare war, to make peace, and to contract alliances, are functions proper to be entrusted to the executive government apart from the representative assembly. According to ancient ideas, these were precisely the topics most essential to submit for the decision of the full assembly of the people : and in point of fact they were so submitted, even under governments only partially democratical ; much more, of course, under the complete democracy of Athens. The *Korkyræan* envoys on reaching that city would first open their business to the *Stratêgi* or generals of the state, who would appoint a day for them to be heard before the public assembly, with full notice beforehand to the citizens. The mission was no secret, for the *Korkyræans* had themselves intimated their intention at Corinth, at the time when they proposed reference of the quarrel to arbitration. Even without such notice, the political necessity of the step was obvious enough to make the Corinthians anticipate it. Lastly, their *proxeni* at Athens (Athenian citizens who watched over

¹ Thucyd. i. 35-40.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 101

Corinthian interests public and private, in confidential correspondence with that government—and who, sometimes by appointment, sometimes as volunteers, discharged partly the functions of ambassadors in modern times) would communicate to them the arrival of the Korkyræan envoys. So that, on the day appointed for the latter to be heard before the public assembly, Corinthian envoys were also present to answer them and to oppose the granting of their prayer.

Thucydides has given in his history the speeches of both; that is, speeches of his own composition, but representing in all probability the substance of what was actually said, and of what he perhaps himself heard. Though pervaded throughout by the peculiar style and harsh structure of the historian, these speeches are yet among the plainest and most business-like in his whole work; bringing before us thoroughly the existing situation; which was one of doubt and difficulty, presenting reasons of considerable force on each of the opposite sides.

The Korkyræans, after lamenting their previous improvidence which had induced them to defer seeking alliance until the hour of need arrived, presented themselves as claimants for the friendship of Athens on the strongest grounds of common interest and reciprocal usefulness. Though their existing danger and need of Athenian support was now urgent, it had not been brought upon them in an unjust quarrel or by disgraceful conduct. They had proposed to Corinth a fair arbitration respecting Epidamnus, and their application had been refused—which showed where the right of the case lay: moreover they were now exposed single-handed, not to Corinth alone, whom they had already vanquished, but to a formidable confederacy organised under her auspices, including choice mariners hired even from the allies of Athens. In granting their prayer, Athens would in the first place neutralise this misemployment of her own mariners, and would at the same time confer an indelible obligation, protect the cause of right, and secure to herself an important reinforcement. For next to her own, the Korkyræan naval force was the most powerful in Greece, and this was now placed within her reach. If by declining the present offer, she permitted Korkyra to be overcome, that naval force would pass to the side of her enemies: for such were Corinth and the Peloponnesian alliance—and such they would soon be openly declared. In the existing state of Greece, a collision between that alliance and Athens could not long be postponed. It was with a view to this contingency that the Corinthians were now seeking to seize Korkyra

along with her naval force.¹ The policy of Athens therefore imperiously called upon her to frustrate such a design, by now assisting the Korkyræans. She was permitted to do this by the terms of the Thirty years' truce. And although some might contend that in the present critical conjuncture, acceptance of Korkyra was tantamount to a declaration of war with Corinth, yet the fact would falsify such predictions; for Athens would so strengthen herself that her enemies would be more than ever unwilling to attack her. She would not only render her naval force irresistibly powerful, but would become mistress of the communication between Sicily and Peloponnesus, and thus prevent the Sicilian Dorians from sending reinforcements to the Peloponnesians.²

To these representations on the part of the Korkyræans, the Corinthian speakers made reply. They denounced the selfish and iniquitous policy pursued by Korkyra, not less in the matter of Epidamnus than in all former time³—which was the real reason why she had ever been ashamed of honest allies. Above all things, she had always acted undutifully and wickedly towards Corinth her mother city, to whom she was bound by those ties of colonial allegiance which Grecian morality recognised, and which the other Corinthian colonies cheerfully obeyed.⁴ Epidamnus was not a Korkyræan, but a Corinthian colony. The Korkyræans, having committed wrong in besieging

¹ Thucyd. i. 33. Τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους φόβῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ πολεμῶντας, καὶ τοὺς Κορινθίους δυναμένους παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ὑμῖν ἐχθροὺς ὄντας καὶ προκαταλαμβάνοντας ἡμᾶς νῦν ἐς τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐπιχείρησιν, ἵνα μὴ τῷ κοινῷ ἔχθῃ κατ' αὐτῶν μετ' ἀλλήλων στῶμεν, &c.

² Thucyd. i. 32-36.

³ The description given by Herodotus (vii. 168; compare Diodor. xi. 15) of the duplicity of the Korkyræans when solicited to aid the Grecian cause at the time of the invasion of Xerxes, seems to imply that the unfavourable character of them given by the Corinthians coincided with the general impression throughout Greece.

Respecting the prosperity and insolence of the Korkyræans, see Aristotle apud Zenob. Proverb. iv. 49.

⁴ Thucyd. i. 38. ἄποικοι δὲ ὄντες ἀφροσύνῃ τε διὰ παντὸς καὶ νῦν πολέμοισι, λέγοντες ὡς οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ κακῶς πάσχειν ἐκπεμφθῆσαν. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐδ' αὐτοὶ φάμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπὸ τούτων ὑβρίζεσθαι κατοικίσαι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ ἡγεμόνες τε εἶναι καὶ τὰ εἰκότα θαυμάζεσθαι αἱ γοῦν ἄλλαι ἀποικίαι τιμῶσιν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀλίσις τὰ ὑπὸ ἀποίκων στεργόμεθα.

This is a remarkable passage in illustration of the position of a metropolis in regard to her colony. The relation was such as to be comprised under the general word *hegemony*: superiority and right to command on the one side, inferiority with duty of reverence and obedience on the other—limited in point of extent, though we do not know where the limit was placed, and varying probably in each individual case. The Corinthians sent annual magistrates to Potidæa, called Epidemiurgi (Thucyd. i. 56).

it, had proposed arbitration without being willing to withdraw their troops while arbitration was pending : they now impudently came to ask Athens to become accessory after the fact, in such injustice. The provision of the 'Thirty years' truce might seem indeed to allow Athens to receive them as allies : but that provision was not intended to permit the reception of cities already under the tie of colonial allegiance elsewhere—still less the reception of cities engaged in an active and pending quarrel, where any countenance to one party in the quarrel was necessarily a declaration of war against the opposite. If either party had a right to invoke the aid of Athens on this occasion, Corinth had a better right than Korkyra. For the latter had never had any transactions with the Athenians, while Corinth was not only still under covenant of amity with them, through the 'Thirty years' truce—but had also rendered material service to them by dissuading the Peloponnesian allies from assisting the revolted Samos. By such dissuasion, the Corinthians had upheld the principle of Grecian international law, that each alliance was entitled to punish its own refractory members. They now called upon Athens to respect this principle by not interfering between Corinth and her colonial allies,¹ especially as the violation of it would recoil inconveniently upon Athens herself with her numerous dependencies. As for the fear of an impending war between the Peloponnesian alliance and Athens, such a contingency was as yet uncertain—and might possibly never occur at all, if Athens dealt justly, and consented to conciliate Corinth on this critical occasion. But it would assuredly occur if she refused such conciliation, and the dangers thus entailed upon Athens would be far greater than the promised naval co-operation of Korkyra would compensate.²

Such was the substance of the arguments urged by the contending envoys before the Athenian public assembly, in this momentous debate. For two days did the debate continue, the assembly being adjourned over to the morrow ; so considerable was the number of speakers, and probably also the divergence of their views. Unluckily Thucydidēs does not give us any of these Athenian discourses—not even that of Periklês, who determined the ultimate result.

Epidamnus with its disputed question of metropolitan right occupied little the attention of the Athenian assembly. But the Korkyræan naval force was indeed an immense item, since the question was whether it should stand on their side or against

¹ Thucyd. i. 40. *φανερῶς δὲ ἀντείπομεν τοὺς προσήκοντας συμμαχούς αὐτόν τινα κολᾷζειν.*

² Thucyd. i. 37-43.

them—an item which nothing could counterbalance except the dangers of a Peloponnesian war. “Let us avoid this last calamity (was the opinion of many) even at the sacrifice of seeing Korkyra conquered, and all her ships and seamen in the service of the Peloponnesian league.” “You will not really avoid it, even by that great sacrifice (was the reply of others). The generating causes of war are at work—and it will infallibly come whatever you may determine respecting Korkyra : avail yourselves of the present opening, instead of being driven ultimately to undertake the war at great comparative disadvantage.” Of these two views, the former was at first decidedly preponderant in the assembly ;¹ but they gradually came round to the latter, which was conformable to the steady conviction of Periklês. It was however resolved to take a sort of middle course, so as to save Korkyra, and yet, if possible, to escape violation of the existing truce and the consequent Peloponnesian war. To comply with the request of the Korkyræans, by adopting them unreservedly as allies, would have laid the Athenians under the necessity of accompanying them in an attack of Corinth, if required—which would have been a manifest infringement of the truce. Accordingly nothing more was concluded than an alliance for purposes strictly defensive, to preserve Korkyra and her possessions in case they were attacked : nor was any greater force equipped to back this resolve than a squadron of ten triremes, under Lacedæmonius son of Kimon. The smallness of this force would satisfy the Corinthians that no aggression was contemplated against their city, while it would save Korkyra from ruin, and would in fact feed the war so as to weaken and cripple the naval force of both parties²—which was the best result that Athens could hope for. The instructions to Lacedæmonius and his two colleagues were express : not to engage in fight with the Corinthians unless they were actually approaching Korkyra or some Korkyræan possession with a view to attack ; but in that case to do his best on the defensive.

¹ Thucyd. i. 44. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἀμφοτέρων, γενομένης καὶ δις ἐκκλησίας, τῇ μὲν προτέρᾳ οὐχ ἦσσαν τῶν Κορινθίων ἀπεδέξαντο τοὺς λόγους, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ μετέγνωσαν, &c.

Οὐχ ἦσσαν in the language of Thucydidês usually has the positive meaning of *more*.

² Thucyd. i. 44. Plutarch (Periklês, c. 29) ascribes the smallness of the squadron despatched under Lacedæmonius to a petty spite of Periklês against that commander, as the son of his old political antagonist Kimon. From whomsoever he copied this statement, the motive assigned seems quite unworthy of credit.

Athens before Peloponnesian War 105

The great Corinthian armament of 150 sail soon took its departure from the Gulf, and reached a harbour on the coast of Epirus at the Cape called Cheimerium, nearly opposite to the southern extremity of Korkyra. They there established a naval station and camp, summoning to their aid a considerable force from the friendly Epirotic tribes in the neighbourhood. The Korkyræan fleet of 110 sail, under Meikiadês and two others, together with the ten Athenian ships, took station at one of the adjoining islands called Sybota, while the land-force and 1000 Zakynthian hoplites were posted on the Korkyræan Cape Leukimmê. Both sides prepared for battle: the Corinthians, taking on board three days' provisions, sailed by night from Cheimerium, and encountered in the morning the Korkyræan fleet advancing towards them, distributed into three squadrons, one under each of the three generals, and having the ten Athenian ships at the extreme right. Opposed to them were ranged the choice vessels of the Corinthians, occupying the left of their aggregate fleet: next came the various allies, with Megarians and Ambrakiots on the extreme right. Never before had two such numerous fleets, both Grecian, engaged in battle. But the tactics and manœuvring were not commensurate to the numbers. The decks were crowded with hoplites and bowmen, while the rowers below, on the Korkyræan side at least, were in great part slaves. The ships on both sides, being rowed forward so as to drive in direct impact prow against prow, were grappled together, and a fierce hand-combat was then commenced between the troops on board of each, as if they were on land—or rather, like boarding-parties: all upon the old-fashioned system of Grecian sea-fight, without any of those improvements introduced into the Athenian navy during the last generation. In Athenian naval attack, the ship, the rowers, and the steersman, were of much greater importance than the armed soldiers on deck. By strength and exactness of rowing, by rapid and sudden change of direction, by feints calculated to deceive, the Athenian captain sought to drive the sharp beak of his vessel, not against the prow, but against the weaker and more vulnerable parts of his enemy—side, oars, or stern. The ship thus became in the hands of her crew the real weapon of attack, which was intended first to disable the enemy and leave him unmanageable on the water; and not until this was done did the armed men on deck begin their operations.¹ Lacedæmonius

¹ Πεζομαχεῖν ἀπὸ νεῶν—to turn the naval battle into a land-battle on ship-board—was a practice altogether repugnant to Athenian feeling—as we see remarked also in Thucyd. iv. 14: compare also vii. 61.

with his ten Athenian ships, though forbidden by his instructions to share in the battle, lent as much aid as he could by taking position at the extremity of the line and by making motions as if about to attack ; while his seamen had full leisure to contemplate what they would despise as lubberly handling of the ships on both sides. All was confusion after the battle had been joined. The ships on both sides became entangled, the oars broken and unmanageable,—orders could neither be heard nor obeyed—and the individual valour of the hoplites and bowmen on deck became the decisive point on which victory turned.

On the right wing of the Corinthians, the left of the Korkyræans was victorious. Their twenty ships drove back the Ambrakiot allies of Corinth, and not only pursued them to the shore, but also landed and plundered the tents. Their rashness in thus keeping so long out of the battle proved incalculably mischievous, the rather as their total number was inferior ; for their right wing, opposed to the best ships of Corinth, was after a hard struggle thoroughly beaten. Many of the ships were disabled, and the rest obliged to retreat as they could—a retreat which the victorious ships on the other wing might have protected, had there been any effective discipline in the fleet, but which now was only imperfectly aided by the ten Athenian ships under Lacedæmonius. Though at first they obeyed the instructions from home in abstaining from actual blows, yet—when the battle became doubtful, and still more, when the Corinthians were pressing their victory—the Athenians could no longer keep aloof, but attacked the pursuers in good earnest, and did much to save the defeated Korkyræans. As soon as the latter had been pursued as far as their own island, the victorious Corinthians returned to the scene of action, which was covered with crippled and water-logged ships, of their own and their enemies, as well as with seamen, soldiers, and wounded men, either helpless aboard the wrecks or keeping above water as well as they could—among the number, many of their own citizens and allies, especially on their defeated right wing. Through these disabled vessels they sailed, not attempting to tow them off, but looking only to the crews aboard, and making some of them prisoners, but putting the greater number to death. Some even of their own allies were thus slain, not being easily distinguishable. The Corinthians, having picked

The Corinthian and Syracusan ships ultimately came to counteract the Athenian manœuvring by constructing their prows with increased solidity and strength, and forcing the Athenian vessel to a direct shock which its weaker prow was unable to bear (Thucyd. vii. 36).

up their own dead bodies as well as they could, transported them to Sybota, the nearest point of the coast of Epirus; after which they again mustered their fleet, and returned to resume the attack against the Korkyræans on their own coast. The latter got together as many of their ships as were seaworthy, together with the small reserve which had remained in harbour, in order to prevent at any rate a landing on the coast: and the Athenian ships, now within the strict letter of their instructions, prepared to co-operate with full energy in the defence. It was already late in the afternoon: but the Corinthian fleet, though their pæan had already been shouted for attack, were suddenly seen to back water instead of advancing; presently they pulled round, and steered direct for the Epirotic coast. The Korkyræans did not comprehend the cause of this sudden retreat, until at length it was proclaimed that an unexpected relief of twenty fresh Athenian ships was approaching, under Glaukon and Andokidês; which the Corinthians had been the first to descry, and had even believed to be the forerunners of a larger fleet. It was already dark when these fresh ships reached Cape Leukimmê, having traversed the waters covered with wrecks and dead bodies.¹ At first the Korkyræans even mistook them for enemies. The reinforcement had been sent from Athens, probably after more accurate information of the comparative force of Corinth and Korkyra, under the impression that the original ten ships would prove inadequate for the purpose of defence—an impression more than verified by the reality.

Though the twenty Athenian ships were not, as the Corinthians had imagined, the precursors of a larger fleet, they were found sufficient to change completely the face of affairs. In the preceding action the Korkyræans had had seventy ships sunk or disabled—the Corinthians only thirty—so that the superiority of numbers was still on the side of the latter, who were however encumbered with the care of 1000 prisoners (800 of them slaves) captured, not easy either to lodge or to guard in the narrow accommodations of an ancient trireme. Even apart from this embarrassment, the Corinthians were in no temper to hazard a second battle against thirty Athenian ships in addition to the remaining Korkyræan. And when their enemies sailed across to offer them battle on the Epirotic coast, they not only refused it, but thought of nothing but immediate retreat—with serious alarm lest the Athenians should now act

¹ Thucyd. i. 51. διὰ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ναυαγίων προσκομισθεῖσαι κατέπλεον ἐς τὸ στραπέδον.

aggressively, treating all amicable relations between Athens and Corinth as practically extinguished by the events of the day before. Having ranged their fleet in line not far from shore, they tested the dispositions of the Athenian commanders by sending forward a little boat with a few men to address to them the following remonstrance. The men carried no herald's staff (*we* should say, no flag of truce), and were therefore completely without protection against an enemy. "Ye act wrongfully, Athenians (they exclaimed), in beginning the war and violating the truce; for ye are using arms to oppose us in punishing our enemies. If it be really your intention to hinder us from sailing against Korkyra or anywhere else that we choose, in breach of the truce, take first of all us who now address you, and deal with us as enemies." It was not the fault of the Korkyræans that this last idea was not instantly realised: for such of them as were near enough to hear, instigated the Athenians by violent shouts to kill the men in the boat. But the latter, far from listening to such an appeal, dismissed them with the answer: "We neither begin the war nor break the truce, Peloponnesians: we have come simply to aid these Korkyræans our allies. If ye wish to sail anywhere else, we make no opposition: but if ye are about to sail against Korkyra or any of her possessions, we shall use our best means to prevent you." Both the answer, and the treatment of the men in the boat, satisfied the Corinthians that their retreat would be unopposed, and they accordingly commenced it as soon as they could get ready, staying however to erect a trophy at Sybota on the Epirotic coast, in commemoration of their advantage on the preceding day. In their voyage homeward they surprised Anaktorium at the mouth of the Ambrakiotic Gulf, which they had hitherto possessed jointly with the Korkyræans, planting in it a reinforcement of Corinthian settlers as guarantee for future fidelity. On reaching Corinth, the armament was dismissed, and the great majority of the prisoners taken, 800 slaves, were sold; but the remainder, 250 in number, were detained, and treated with peculiar kindness. Many of them were of the first and richest families in Korkyra, and the Corinthians designed to gain them over, so as to make them instruments for effecting a revolution in the island. The calamitous incidents arising from their subsequent return will appear in another chapter.

Relieved now from all danger, the Korkyræans picked up the dead bodies and the wrecks which had floated during the night on to their island, and even found sufficient pretence to erect a trophy, chiefly in consequence of their partial success on the

left wing. In truth, they had been only rescued from ruin by the unexpected coming of the last Athenian ships: but the last result was as triumphant to them, as it was disastrous and humiliating to the Corinthians, who had incurred an immense cost, and taxed all their willing allies, only to leave their enemy stronger than she was before. From this time forward they considered the 'Thirty years' truce as broken, and conceived a hatred, alike deadly and undisguised, against Athens; so that the latter gained nothing by the moderation of her admirals in sparing the Corinthian fleet off the coast of Epirus. An opportunity was not long wanting for the Corinthians to strike a blow at their enemy through one of her wide-spread dependencies.

On the isthmus of that lesser peninsula called Pallênê, (which forms the westernmost of the three prongs of the greater Thracian peninsula called Chalkidikê, between the Thermaic and the Strymonic Gulfs,) was situated the Dorian town of Potidæa, one of the tributary allies of Athens, but originally colonised from Corinth and still maintaining a certain metropolitan allegiance towards the latter: insomuch that every year certain Corinthians were sent thither as magistrates under the title of Epidemiurgi. On various points of the neighbouring coast also there were several small towns belonging to the Chalkidians and Bottiæans, enrolled in like manner in the list of Athenian tributaries. The neighbouring inland territory, Mygdonia and Chalkidikê,¹ was held by the Macedonian king Perdikkas, son of that Alexander who had taken part fifty years before in the expedition of Xerxes. These two princes appear gradually to have extended their dominions, after the ruin of Persian power in Thrace by the exertions of Athens, until at length they acquired all the territory between the rivers Axios and Strymon. Now Perdikkas had been for some time the friend and ally of Athens; but there were other Macedonian princes, his brother Philip, and Derdas, holding independent principalities in the upper country² (apparently on the higher course of the Axios near the Pæonian tribes), with whom he was in a state of dispute. These princes having been accepted as the allies of Athens, Perdikkas from that time became her active enemy, and it was from his intrigues that all the difficulties of Athens

¹ See the geographical Commentary of Gatterer upon Thrace, embodied in Poppo, Prolegg. ad Thucyd. vol. ii. ch. 29.

The words *τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁρίκῃ*—*τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁρίκῃ χωρία* (Thucyd. ii. 29) denote generally the towns in Chalkidikê—places *in the direction or in the skirts* of Thrace, rather than parts of Thrace itself.

² Thucyd. i. 57; ii. 100.

on that coast took their first origin. The Athenian empire was much less complete and secure over the seaports on the mainland than over the islands.¹ For the former were always more or less dependent on any powerful land-neighbour, sometimes more dependent on him than upon the mistress of the sea; and we shall find Athens herself cultivating assiduously the favour of Sitalkes and other strong Thracian potentates, as an aid to her dominion over the seaports.² Perdikkas immediately began to incite and aid the Chalkidians and Bottiæans to revolt from Athens; and the violent enmity against the latter, kindled in the bosoms of the Corinthians by the recent events at Korkyra, enabled him to extend the same projects to Potidæa. Not only did he send envoys to Corinth in order to concert measures for provoking the revolt of Potidæa, but also to Sparta, instigating the Peloponnesian league to a general declaration of war against Athens.³ And he further prevailed on many of the Chalkidian inhabitants to abandon their separate small town on the sea-coast, for the purpose of joint residence at Olynthus, which was several stadia from the sea. Thus that town, as well as the Chalkidian interest, became much strengthened, while Perdikkas further assigned some territory near Lake Bolbê to contribute to the temporary maintenance of the concentrated population.

The Athenians were not ignorant both of his hostile preparations and of the dangers which awaited them from Corinth. Immediately after the Korkyræan sea-fight they sent to take precautions against the revolt of Potidæa; requiring the inhabitants to take down their wall on the side of Pallênê, so as to leave the town open on the side of the peninsula, or on what may be called the sea-side, and fortified only towards the mainland—requiring them further both to deliver hostages and to

¹ See two remarkable passages illustrating this difference, Thucyd. iv. 120–122.

² Thucyd. ii. 29–98. Isokratês has a remarkable passage on this subject in the beginning of Or. v. ad Philippum, sect. 5–7. After pointing out the imprudence of founding a colony on the skirts of the territory of a powerful potentate, and the excellent site which had been chosen for Kyrênê, as being near only to feeble tribes—he goes so far as to say that the possession of Amphipolis would be injurious rather than beneficial to Athens, because it would render her dependent upon Philip, through his power of annoying her colonists—just as she had been dependent before upon Medokus the Thracian king in consequence of her colonists in the Chersonese—*ἀναγκασθῆσόμεθα τὴν αὐτὴν εὐνοίαν ἔχειν τοῖς σοῖς πράγμασι διὰ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα (at Amphipolis) κατοικοῦντας, ὅταν περ εἴχομεν Μηδόκῳ τῷ παλαιῷ διὰ τοὺς ἐν Χερρόνησφ γεωργοῦντας.*

³ Thucyd. i. 56, 57.

Athens before Peloponnesian War III

dismiss the annual magistrates who came to them from Corinth. An Athenian armament of thirty triremes and 1000 hoplites, under Archestratus and ten others, despatched to act against Perdikkas in the Thermaic Gulf, was directed at the same time to enforce these requisitions against Potidæa, and to repress any dispositions to revolt among the neighbouring Chalkidians. Immediately on receiving the requisitions, the Potidæans sent envoys both to Athens, for the purpose of evading and gaining time—and to Sparta, in conjunction with Corinth, in order to determine a Lacedæmonian invasion of Attica, in the event of Potidæa being attacked by Athens. From the Spartan authorities they obtained a distinct affirmative promise, in spite of the Thirty years' truce still subsisting. At Athens they had no success, and they accordingly openly revolted (seemingly about Midsummer 432 B.C.), at the same time that the armament under Archestratus sailed. The Chalkidians and Bottiæans revolted also, at the express instigation of Corinth, accompanied by solemn oaths and promises of assistance.¹ Archestratus with his fleet, on reaching the Thermaic Gulf, found them all in proclaimed enmity, but was obliged to confine himself to the attack of Perdikkas in Macedonia, not having numbers enough to admit of a division of his force. He accordingly laid siege to Therma, in co-operation with the Macedonian troops from the upper country under Philip and the brothers of Derdas; after taking that place, he next proceeded to besiege Pydna. But it would probably have been wiser had he turned his whole force instantly to the blockade of Potidæa; for during the period of more than six weeks that he spent in the operations against Therma, the Corinthians conveyed to Potidæa a reinforcement of 1600 hoplites and 400 light-armed, partly their own citizens, partly Peloponnesians hired for the occasion—under Aristæus son of Adeimantus, a man of such eminent popularity, both at Corinth and at Potidæa, that most of the soldiers volunteered on his personal account. Potidæa was thus put in a state of complete defence shortly after the news of its revolt reached Athens, and long before any second armament could be sent to attack it. A second armament however was speedily sent forth—forty triremes and 2000 Athenian hoplites under Kallias son of Kalliades,² with four other commanders—who on reaching the Thermaic Gulf, joined the former body at the siege of

¹ Thucyd. v. 30.

² Kallias was a young Athenian of noble family, who had paid the large sum of 100 minæ to Zeno of Elea the philosopher, for rhetorical, philosophical, and sophistical instruction (Plato, *Alkibiadēs*, i. c. 31, p. 119).

Pydna. After prosecuting the siege in vain for a short time, they found themselves obliged to patch up an accommodation on the best terms they could with Perdikkas, from the necessity of commencing immediate operations against Aristeus and Potidæa. They then quitted Macedonia, first crossing by sea from Pydna to the eastern coast of the Thermaic Gulf—next attacking, though without effect, the town of Berœa—and then marching by land along the eastern coast of the Gulf, in the direction of Potidæa. On the third day of easy march, they reached the seaport called Gigônus, near which they encamped.¹

¹ Thucyd. i. 61. The statement of Thucydides presents some geographical difficulties which the critics have not adequately estimated. Are we to assume as certain, that the *Berœa* here mentioned must be the Macedonian town of that name, afterwards so well known, distant from the sea westward 160 stadia, or nearly twenty English miles (see Tafel, *Historia Thessalonicae*, p. 58), on a river which flows into the Haliakmon, and upon one of the lower ridges of Mount Bermius?

The words of Thucydides here are—“Ἐπειτα δὲ ξύμβασις ποιησάμενοι καὶ ξυμμαχίαν ἀναγκαίαν πρὸς τὸν Περδίκκαν, ὥς αὐτοὺς κατήπειγεν ἡ Ποτίδαια καὶ ὁ Ἀριστεὺς παρελθυσθῶς, ἀπανίστανται ἐκ τῆς Μακεδονίας, καὶ ἀφικόμενοι ἐς Βέροιαν κἀκεῖθεν ἐπιστρέψαντες, καὶ πειράσαντες πρῶτον τοῦ χωρίου καὶ οὐχ ἑλόντες, ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ γῆν πρὸς τὴν Ποτίδαιαν—ἅμα δὲ νῆες παρέπλεον ἑβδομήκοντα.

“The natural route from Pydna to Potidæa (observes Dr. Arnold in his note) lay along the coast; and Berœa was *quite out of the way*, at some *distance to the westward*, near the fort of the Bermian mountains. But the hope of surprising Berœa induced the Athenians to deviate from their direct line of march; then after the failure of this treacherous attempt, they returned again to the sea-coast, and continued to follow it till they arrived at Gigônus.”

I would remark upon this—1. The words of Thucydides imply that Berœa was *not in* Macedonia, but *out* of it (see Poppo, *Proleg. ad Thucyd.* vol. ii. p. 408–418). 2. He uses no expression which in the least implies that the attempt on Berœa on the part of the Athenians was *treacherous*, that is, contrary to the convention just concluded; though had the fact been so, he would naturally have been led to notice it, seeing that the deliberate breach of the convention was the very first step which took place after it was concluded. 3. What can have induced the Athenians to leave their fleet and march near twenty miles inland to Mount Bermius and Berœa, to attack a Macedonian town which they could not possibly hold—when they cannot even stay to continue the attack on Pydna, a position maritime, useful, and tenable—in consequence of the pressing necessity of taking immediate measures against Potidæa? 4. If they were compelled by this latter necessity to patch up a peace on any terms with Perdikkas, would they immediately endanger this peace by going out of their way to attack one of his forts? Again, Thucydides says “that, proceeding by slow land-marches, they reached Gigônus, and encamped *on the third day*”—κατ’ ὀλίγον δὲ προϊόντες τριταῖοι ἀφίκοντο ἐς Γίγανον καὶ ἐστρατοπεδεύσαντο. The computation of time must here be made either from Pydna, or from Berœa; and the reader who examines the map in the *Classical Atlas*, *Everyman’s Library*, will see that neither from the one

Athens before Peloponnesian War 113

In spite of the convention concluded at Pydna, Perdikkas, whose character for faithlessness we shall have more than one

nor the other (assuming the Berœa on Mount Bermius) would it be possible for an army to arrive at Gigônus on the third day, marching round the head of the Gulf with easy day's marches; the more so as they would have to cross the rivers Lydias, Axios, and Echeidôrus, all not far from their mouths—or if these rivers could not be crossed, to get on board the fleet and re-land on the other side.

This clear mark of time laid down by Thucydidês (even apart from the objections which I have just urged in reference to Berœa on Mount Bermius) made me doubt whether Dr. Arnold and the other commentators have correctly conceived the operations of the Athenian troops between Pydna and Gigônus. The *Berœa* which Thucydidês means cannot be more distant from Gigônus, at any rate, than a third day's easy march, and therefore cannot be the Berœa on Mount Bermius. But there was another town named Berœa either in Thrace or in Emathia, though we do not know its exact site (see Wasse ad Thucyd. i. 61; Steph. Byz. v. *Βέρης*; Tafel, Thessalonica, Index). This other Berœa, situated somewhere between Gigônus and Therna, and out of the limits of that Macedonia which Perdikkas governed, may probably be the place which Thucydidês here indicates. The Athenians, raising the siege of Pydna, crossed the Gulf *on shipboard* to Berœa, and after vainly trying to surprise that town, marched along *by land* to Gigônus. Whoever inspects the map will see that the Athenians would naturally employ their large fleet to transport the army by the short transit across the Gulf from Pydna (see Livy, xlv. 10), and thus avoid the fatiguing land-march round the head of the Gulf. Moreover the language of Thucydidês would seem to make the land-march *begin at Berœa*, and not at Pydna—*ἀπανίστανται ἐκ τῆς Μακεδονίας, καὶ ἀφικόμενοι ἐς Βέροιαν κακείθεν ἐπιστρέψαντες, καὶ πειράσαντες πρῶτον τοῦ χωρίου καὶ οὐχ ἔλδοντες, ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ γῆν πρὸς τὴν Ποτιδαίαν*—*ἄμα δὲ νῆες παρέπλεον ἐβδομήκοντα. Κατ' ὀλίγον δὲ προΐοντες τριταῖοι ἀφίκοντο ἐς Γίγωνον καὶ ἐστρατοπεδεύσαντο.* The change of tense between *ἀπανίστανται* and *ἐπορεύοντο*—and the connexion of the participle *ἀφικόμενοι* with the latter verb,—seems to divide the whole proceeding into two distinct parts; first, departure from Macedonia to Berœa, as it would seem, by sea—next, a land-march from Berœa to Gigônus, of three short days.

This is the best account, as it strikes me, of a passage, the real difficulties of which are imperfectly noticed by the commentators.

The site of Gigônus cannot be exactly determined, since all that we know of the towns on the coast between Potidæa and Æneia, is derived from their enumerated names in Herodotus (vii. 123); nor can we be absolutely certain that he has enumerated them all in the exact order in which they were placed. But I think that both Colonel Leake and Kiepert's map place Gigônus too far from Potidæa; for we see, from this passage of Thucydidês, that it formed the camp from which the Athenian general went forth immediately to give battle to an enemy posted between Olynthus and Potidæa; and the Scholiast says of Gigônus—*οὐ πολὺ ἔπεχον Ποτιδαίας*: and Stephan. Byz. *Γίγωνος, πόλις Θράκης προσεχῆς τῇ Παλλήνῃ*.

See Colonel Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, vol. iii. ch. xxxi. p. 452. That excellent observer calculates the march from Berœa on Mount Bermius to Potidæa, as being one of four days, about twenty miles each day. Judging by the map, this seems lower than the reality; but admitting

occasion to notice, was now again on the side of the Chalkidians, and sent 200 horse to join them under the command of Iolaus. Aristeus posted his Corinthians and Potidæans on the isthmus near Potidæa, providing a market without the walls in order that they might not stray in quest of provisions. His position was on the side towards Olynthus—which was about seven miles off, but within sight, and in a lofty and conspicuous situation. He here awaited the approach of the Athenians, calculating that the Chalkidians from Olynthus would, upon the hoisting of a given signal, assail them in the rear when they attacked him. But Kallias was strong enough to place in reserve his Macedonian cavalry and other allies as a check against Olynthus; while with his Athenians and the main force he marched to the isthmus and took position in front of Aristeus. In the battle which ensued, Aristeus and the chosen band of Corinthians immediately about him were completely successful, breaking the troops opposed to them, and pursuing for a considerable distance. But the remaining Potidæans and Peloponnesians were routed by the Athenians and driven within the walls. On returning from pursuit, Aristeus found the victorious Athenians between him and Potidæa, and was reduced to the alternative either of cutting his way through them into the latter town, or of making a retreating march to Olynthus. He chose the former as the least of two hazards, and forced his way through the flank of the Athenians, wading into the sea in order to turn the extremity of the Potidæan wall, which reached entirely across the isthmus with a mole running out at each end into the water. He effected this daring enterprise and saved his detachment, though not without considerable difficulty and some loss. Meanwhile the auxiliaries from Olynthus,

it to be correct, Thucydidēs would never describe such a march as *κατ' ὀλίγον δὲ προϊόντες τριταῖοι ἀφίκοντο ἐς Γίγωνον*: it would be a march rather rapid and fatiguing, especially as it would include the passage of the rivers. Nor is it likely, from the description of this battle in Thucydidēs (i. 62), that Gigōnus could be anything like a full day's march from Potidæa. According to his description, the Athenian army advance by three very easy marches; then arriving at Gigōnus, they encamp, being now near the enemy, who on their side are already encamped expecting them—*προσδεχόμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο πρὸς Ὀλύνθου ἐν τῇ ἰσθμῷ*: the imperfect tense indicates that they were already there at the time when the Athenians took camp at Gigōnus; which would hardly be the case if the Athenians had come by three successive marches from Berœa on Mount Bermius.

I would add, that it is no more wonderful that there should be one Berœa in Thrace and another in Macedonia—than that there should be one Methone in Thrace and another in Macedonia (Steph. B. *Μεθώνη*).

though they had begun their march on seeing the concerted signal, had been kept in check by the Macedonian horse, so that the Potidæans had been beaten and the signal again withdrawn, before they could make any effective diversion : nor did the cavalry on either side come into action. The defeated Potidæans and Corinthians, having the town immediately in their rear, lost only 300 men, while the Athenians lost 150, together with the general Kallias.¹

The victory was however quite complete, and the Athenians, after having erected their trophy and given up the enemy's dead for burial, immediately built their blockading wall across the isthmus on the side of the mainland, so as to cut off Potidæa from all communication with Olynthus and the Chalkidians. To make the blockade complete, a second wall across the isthmus was necessary, on the other side towards Pallênê : but they had not force enough to detach a completely separate body for this purpose, until after some time they were joined by Phormio with 1600 fresh hoplites from Athens. That general, landing at Aphytis in the peninsula of Pallênê, marched slowly up to Potidæa, ravaging the territory in order to draw out the citizens to battle. But the challenge not being accepted, he undertook and finished without obstruction the blockading wall on the side of Pallênê, so that the town was now completely enclosed and the harbour watched by the Athenian fleet. The wall once finished, a portion of the force sufficed to guard it, leaving Phormio at liberty to undertake aggressive operations against the Chalkidic and Bottiæan townships. The capture of Potidæa being now only a question of more or less time, Aristeus, in order that the provisions might last longer, proposed to the citizens to choose a favourable wind, get on shipboard, and break out suddenly from the harbour, taking their chance of eluding the Athenian fleet, and leaving only 500 defenders behind. Though he offered himself to be among those left, he could not determine the citizens to so bold an enterprise, and therefore sallied forth, in the way proposed, with a small detachment, in order to try and procure relief from without—especially some aid or diversion from Peloponnesus. But he was able to accomplish nothing beyond some partial warlike operations among the Chalkidians,² and a successful ambushade against the citizens of Sermylus, which did nothing for the relief of the blockaded town. It had however been so well-provisioned that it held out for two whole years—a period full of important events elsewhere.

¹ Thucyd. i. 62, 63.

² Thucyd. i. 65.

From these two contests between Athens and Corinth, first indirectly at Korkyra, next distinctly and avowedly at Potidæa, sprang those important movements in the Lacedæmonian alliance which will be recounted in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XLVIII

FROM THE BLOCKADE OF POTIDÆA DOWN TO THE END OF THE FIRST YEAR OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

EVEN before the recent hostilities at Korkyra and Potidæa, it had been evident to reflecting Greeks that prolonged observance of the 'Thirty years' truce was becoming uncertain, and that the mingled hatred, fear, and admiration, which Athens inspired throughout Greece would prompt Sparta and the Spartan confederacy to seize any favourable opening for breaking down the Athenian power. That such was the disposition of Sparta, was well understood among the Athenian allies, however considerations of prudence, and general slowness in resolving, might postpone the moment of carrying it into effect. Accordingly not only the Samians when they revolted had applied to the Spartan confederacy for aid, which they appear to have been prevented from obtaining chiefly by the pacific interests then animating the Corinthians—but also the Lesbians had endeavoured to open negotiations with Sparta for a similar purpose, though the authorities to whom alone the proposition could have been communicated, since it long remained secret and was never executed—had given them no encouragement.¹

The affairs of Athens had been administered, under the ascendancy of Periklês, without any view to extension of empire or encroachment upon others, though with constant reference to the probabilities of war, and with anxiety to keep the city in a condition to meet it. But even the splendid internal ornaments, which Athens at that time acquired, were probably not without their effect in provoking jealousy on the part of other Greeks as to her ultimate views.

The only known incident, wherein Athens had been brought into collision with a member of the Spartan confederacy prior to the Korkyræan dispute, was, her decree passed in regard to

¹ Thucyd. iii. 2-13. This proposition of the Lesbians at Sparta must have been made before the collision between Athens and Corinth at Korkyra.

Megara—prohibiting the Megarians, on pain of death, from all trade or intercourse as well with Athens as with all ports within the Athenian empire. This prohibition was grounded on the alleged fact, that the Megarians had harboured runaway slaves from Athens, and had appropriated and cultivated portions of land upon her border; partly land, the property of the goddesses of Eleusis—partly a strip of territory disputed between the two states, and therefore left by mutual understanding in common pasture without any permanent enclosure.¹ In reference to this latter point, the Athenian herald Anthemokritus had been sent to Megara to remonstrate, but had been so rudely dealt with, that his death shortly afterwards was imputed to the Megarians.² We may reasonably suppose that

¹ Thucyd. i. 139. ἐπικαλοῦντες ἐπεργασίαν Μεγαρεῦσι τῆς γῆς τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ τῆς ἀορίστου, &c. Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 30; Schol. ad Aristophan. Pac. 609.

I agree with Göller that two distinct violations of right are here imputed to the Megarians: one, that they had cultivated land the property of the goddesses at Eleusis—the other, that they had appropriated and cultivated the unsettled pasture land on the border. Dr. Arnold's note takes a different view, less correct in my opinion: "The land on the frontier was consecrated to prevent it from being inclosed: in which case the boundaries might have been a subject of perpetual dispute between the two countries," &c. Compare Thucyd. v. 42, about the border territory round Panaktum.

² Thucydides (i. 139), in assigning the reasons of this sentence of exclusion passed by Athens against the Megarians, mentions only the two allegations here noticed—wrongful cultivation of territory, and reception of runaway slaves. He does not allude to the herald Anthemokritus: still less does he notice that gossip of the day which Aristophanes and other comedians of this period turn to account in fastening the Peloponnesian war upon the personal sympathies of Periklēs, viz. that first, some young men of Athens stole away the courtesan Simætha from Megara: next, the Megarian youth revenged themselves by carrying off from Athens "two engaging courtezans," one of whom was the mistress of Periklēs; upon which the latter was so enraged that he proposed the sentence of exclusion against the Megarians (Aristoph. Acharn. 501-516; Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 30).

Such stories are chiefly valuable as they make us acquainted with the political scandal of the time. But the story of the herald Anthemokritus and his death cannot be altogether rejected. Though Thucydides, not mentioning the fact, did not believe that the herald's death had really been occasioned by the Megarians; yet there probably was a popular belief at Athens to that effect, under the influence of which the deceased herald received a public burial near the Thriasian gate of Athens, leading to Eleusis: see Philippi Epistol. ad Athen. ap. Demosthen. p. 159 R.; Pausan. i. 36, 3; iii. 4, 2. The language of Plutarch (Periklēs, c. 30) is probably literally correct—"the herald's death appeared to have been caused by the Megarians"—αἰτία τῶν Μεγαρέων ἀποθανεῖν ἔδοξε. That neither Thucydides, nor Periklēs himself, believed that the Megarians had really caused his death, is pretty certain: otherwise the fact would have been urged when the Lacedæmonians sent to complain of the sentence of exclusion—being a deed so notoriously repugnant to all Grecian feeling.

ever since the revolt of Megara fourteen years before—which caused to Athens an irreparable mischief—the feeling prevalent between the two cities had been one of bitter enmity, manifesting itself in many ways, but so much exasperated by recent events as to provoke Athens to a signal revenge.¹ Exclusion from Athens and all the ports in her empire, comprising nearly every island and seaport in the Ægean, was so ruinous to the Megarians, that they loudly complained of it at Sparta, representing it as an infraction of the Thirty years' truce; though it was undoubtedly within the legitimate right of Athens to enforce—and was even less harsh than the systematic expulsion of foreigners by Sparta, with which Periklês compared it.

These complaints found increased attention after the war of Korkyra and the blockade of Potidæa by the Athenians. The sentiments of the Corinthians towards Athens had now become angry and warlike in the highest degree. It was not simply resentment for the past which animated them, but also the anxiety further to bring upon Athens so strong a hostile pressure as should preserve Potidæa and its garrison from capture. Accordingly they lost no time in endeavouring to rouse the feelings of the Spartans against Athens, and in inducing them to invite to Sparta all such of the confederates as had any grievances against that city. Not merely the Megarians, but several other confederates, came thither as accusers; while the Æginetans, though their insular position made it perilous for them to appear, made themselves vehemently heard through the mouths of others, complaining that Athens withheld from them the autonomy to which they were entitled under the truce.²

¹ Thucyd. i. 67. Μεγαρῆς, δηλοῦντες μὲν καὶ ἕτερα οὐκ ὀλίγα διάφορα, μάλιστα δὲ λιμένων τε εἶργεσθαι τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων ἀρχῇ, &c.

² Thucyd. i. 67. λέγοντες οὐκ εἶναι αὐτόνομοι κατὰ τὰς σπονδάς. O. Müller (Æginet. p. 180) and Göller in his note, think that the *truce* (or *covenant* generally) here alluded to is, not the Thirty years' truce concluded fourteen years before the period actually present, but the ancient alliance against the Persians, solemnly ratified and continued after the victory of Plataea. Dr. Arnold on the contrary thinks that the Thirty years' truce is alluded to, which the Æginetans interpreted (rightly or not) as entitling them to independence.

The former opinion might seem to be countenanced by the allusion to Ægina in the speech of the Thebans (iii. 64): but on the other hand, if we consult i. 115, it will appear possible that the wording of the Thirty years' truce may have been general, as—Ἀποδοῦναι δὲ Ἀθηναίους ὅσα ἔχουσιν Πελοποννησίων: at any rate, the Æginetans may have pretended, that by the same rule as Athens gave up Nisæa, Pégæ, &c., she ought also to renounce Ægina.

However, we must recollect that the one plea does not exclude the

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 119

According to the Lacedæmonian practice, it was necessary first that the Spartans themselves, apart from their allies, should decide whether there existed a sufficient case of wrong done by Athens against themselves or against Peloponnesus—either in violation of the 'Thirty years' truce, or in any other way. If the determination of Sparta herself were in the negative, the case would never even be submitted to the vote of the allies. But if it were in the affirmative, then the latter would be convoked to deliver their opinion also: and assuming that the majority of votes coincided with the previous decision of Sparta, the entire confederacy stood then pledged to the given line of policy—if the majority was contrary, the Spartans would stand alone, or with such only of the confederates as concurred. Each allied city, great or small, had an equal right of suffrage. It thus appears that Sparta herself did not vote as a member of the confederacy, but separately and individually as leader—and that the only question ever submitted to the allies was, whether they would or would not go along with her previous decision. Such was the course of proceeding now followed. The Corinthians, together with such other of the confederates as felt either aggrieved or alarmed by Athens, presented themselves before the public assembly of Spartan citizens, prepared to prove that the Athenians had broken the truce and were going on in a course of wrong towards Peloponnesus.¹ Even in the oligarchy of Sparta, such a question as this could only be decided by a general assembly of Spartan citizens, qualified both by age, by regular contribution to the public mess, and by obedience to Spartan discipline. To the assembly so constituted the deputies of the various allied cities addressed themselves, each setting forth his case against Athens. The Corinthians chose to reserve themselves to the last, after the assembly had been inflamed by the previous speakers.

Of this important assembly, on which so much of the future fate of Greece turned, Thucydidēs has preserved an account unusually copious. First, the speech delivered by the Corinthian envoys. Next, that of some Athenian envoys, who happening to be at the same time in Sparta on some other matters, and being present in the assembly so as to have heard

other: the Æginetans may have taken advantage of *both* in enforcing their prayer for interference. This seems to have been the idea of the Scholiast, when he says—κατὰ τὴν συμφωνίαν τῶν σπονδῶν.

¹ Thucyd. i. 67. κατεβόων ἐλθόντες τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὅτι σπονδὰς τε λευκότες εἶεν καὶ ἀδικοῖεν τὴν Πελοπόννησον. The change of tense in these two verbs is to be noticed.

the speeches both of the Corinthians and of the other complainants, obtained permission from the magistrates to address the assembly in their turn. Thirdly, the address of the Spartan king Archidamus, on the course of policy proper to be adopted by Sparta. Lastly, the brief, but eminently characteristic, address of the Ephor Sthenelaidas, on putting the question for decision. These speeches, the composition of Thucydides himself, contain substantially the sentiments of the parties to whom they are ascribed. Neither of them is distinctly a reply to that which has preceded, but each presents the situation of affairs from a different point of view.

The Corinthians knew well that the audience whom they were about to address had been favourably prepared for them—for the Lacedæmonian authorities had already given an actual promise, to them and to the Potidæans at the moment before Potidæa revolted, that they would invade Attica. Great was the revolution in sentiment of the Spartans, since they had declined lending aid to the much more powerful island of Lesbos when it proposed to revolt—a revolution occasioned by the altered interests and sentiments of Corinth. Nevertheless, the Corinthians also knew that their positive grounds of complaint against Athens, in respect of wrong or violation of the existing truce, were both few and feeble. Neither in the dispute about Potidæa nor about Korkyra, had Athens infringed the truce or wronged the Peloponnesian alliance. In both she had come into collision with Corinth, singly and apart from the confederacy. She had a right, both according to the truce and according to the received maxims of international law, to lend defensive aid to the Korkyræans, at their own request: she had a right also, according to the principles laid down by the Corinthians themselves on occasion of the revolt of Samos, to restrain the Potidæans from revolting. She had committed nothing which could fairly be called an aggression. Indeed the aggression both in the case of Potidæa and in that of Korkyra, was decidedly on the side of the Corinthians: and the Peloponnesian confederacy could only be so far implicated as it was understood to be bound to espouse the separate quarrels, right or wrong, of Corinth. All this was well known to the Corinthian envoys; and accordingly we find that, in their speech at Sparta, they touch but lightly and in vague terms on positive or recent wrongs. Even that which they do say completely justifies the proceedings of Athens about the affair of Korkyra, since they confess without hesitation the design of seizing the large Korkyræan navy for the use of the Peloponnesian

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 121

alliance : while in respect of Potidæa, if we had only the speech of the Corinthian envoy before us without any other knowledge, we should have supposed it to be an independent state, not connected by any permanent bonds with Athens—we should have supposed that the siege of Potidæa by Athens was an unprovoked aggression upon an autonomous ally of Corinth¹—we should never have imagined that Corinth had deliberately instigated and aided the revolt of the Chalkidians as well as of the Potidæans against Athens. It might be pretended that she had a right to do this, by virtue of her undefined metropolitan relations with Potidæa. But at any rate the incident was not such as to afford any decent pretext for charge against the Athenians either of outrage towards Corinth,² or of wrongful aggression against the Peloponnesian confederacy.

To dwell much upon specific allegations of wrong, would not have suited the purpose of the Corinthian envoy ; for against such, the 'Thirty years' truce expressly provided that recourse should be had to amicable arbitration—to which recourse he never once alludes. He knew, that as between Corinth and Athens, war had already begun at Potidæa ; and his business, throughout nearly all of a very emphatic speech, is, to show that the Peloponnesian confederacy, and especially Sparta, is bound to take instant part in it, not less by prudence than by duty. He employs the most animated language to depict the ambition, the unwearied activity, the personal effort abroad as well as at home, the quick resolves, the sanguine hopes never dashed by failure—of Athens : as contrasted with the cautious, home-keeping, indolent, scrupulous routine of Sparta. He reproaches the Spartans with their backwardness and timidity, in not having repressed the growth of Athens before she reached this formidable height : especially in having allowed her to fortify her city after the retreat of Xerxes and afterwards to build the long walls from the city to the sea.³ The Spartans (he observes) stood alone among all Greeks in the notable system of keeping down an enemy not by acting, but by delaying to act—not arresting his growth, but putting him down when his force was doubled. Falsely indeed had they acquired the reputation of being sure, when they were in reality merely slow.⁴

¹ Thucyd. i. 68. οὐ γὰρ ἂν Κέρκυραν τε ὑπολαβόντες βία ἡμῶν εἶχον, καὶ Ποτιδαίαν ἐπολιόρκουν, ὧν τὸ μὲν ἐπικαιρότατον χωρίον πρὸς τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης ἀποχωρῆσθαι, ἣ δὲ ναυτικὸν ἂν μέγιστον παρέσχε τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις.

² Thucyd. i. 68. ἐν οἷς προσήκει ἡμᾶς οὐχ ἥκιστα εἰπεῖν, ὅσῳ καὶ μέγιστα ἐγκλήματα ἔχομεν, ὑπὸ μὲν Ἀθηναίων ὑβριζόμενοι, ὑπὸ δὲ ὑμῶν ἀμελούμενοι.

³ Thucyd. i. 69.

⁴ Thucyd. i. 69. ἡσυχάζετε γὰρ μόνοι Ἑλλήνων, ὧ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὐ τῇ

In resisting Xerxes, as in resisting Athens, they had always been behindhand, disappointing and leaving their friends to ruin; while both these enemies had only failed of complete success through their own mistakes.

After half apologising for the tartness of these reproofs—which however, as the Spartans were now well disposed to go to war forthwith, would be well-timed and even agreeable—the Corinthian orator vindicates the necessity of plain-speaking by the urgent peril of the emergency, and the formidable character of the enemy who threatened them. “You do not reflect (he says) how thoroughly different the Athenians are from yourselves. *They* are innovators by nature, sharp both in devising, and in executing what they have determined: *you* are sharp only in keeping what you have got, in determining on nothing beyond, and in doing even less than absolute necessity requires.¹ *They* again dare beyond their means, run risks beyond their own judgement, and keep alive their hopes even in desperate circumstances: *your* peculiarity is, that your performance comes short of your power—you have no faith even in what your judgement guarantees—when in difficulties, you despair of all escape. *They* never hang back—you are habitual laggards: *they* love foreign service—you cannot stir from home: for *they* are always under the belief that their movements will lead to some further gain, while *you* fancy that new products will endanger what you already have. When successful, they make the greatest forward march; when defeated, they fall back the least. Moreover they task their bodies on behalf of their city as if they were the bodies of others—while their minds are most of all their own, for exertion in her service.² When their plans for acquisition do not come successfully out, they

δυνάμει τινὰ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μελλήσει ἀμυνόμενοι, καὶ μόνοι οὐκ ἀρχομένην τὴν ἀβήσιν τῶν ἐχθρῶν, διπλασιουμένην δὲ καταλύοντες. Καίτοι ἐλέγεσθε ἀσφαλεῖς εἶναι, ὧν ἄρα ὁ λόγος τοῦ ἔργου ἐκράτει· τὸν τε γὰρ Μῆδον, &c.

¹ Thucyd. i. 70. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ νεωτεροποιοὶ καὶ ἐπινοῆσαι ὀρεῖσθαι καὶ ἐπιτελεῖσαι ἔργα ὃ ἂν γινώσκιν· ὑμεῖς δὲ τὰ ὑπάρχοντά τε σώζειν, καὶ ἐπιγινώσκαι μηδὲν, καὶ ἔργα οὐδὲ τὰναγκαῖα ἐξικέσθαι.

The meaning of the word *ὀρεῖσθαι*—*sharp*—when applied to the latter half of the sentence, is in the nature of a sarcasm. But this is suitable to the character of the speech. Göller supposes some such word as *ικανοί*, instead of *ὀρεῖσθαι*, to be understood: but we should thereby both depart from the more obvious syntax, and weaken the general meaning.

² Thucyd. i. 70. ἔτι δὲ τοῖς μὲν σώμασιν ἀλλοτριωτάτοις ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως χρώνται, τῇ δὲ γνώμῃ οἰκειοτάτῃ ἐς τὸ πράσσειν τι ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς.

It is difficult to convey in translation the antithesis between *ἀλλοτριωτάτοις* and *οἰκειοτάτῃ*—not without a certain conceit, which Thucydides is occasionally fond of.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 123

feel like men robbed of what belongs to them : yet the acquisitions when realised appear like trifles compared with what remains to be acquired. If they sometimes fail in an attempt, new hopes arise in some other direction to supply the want : for with them alone the possession and the hope of what they aim at is almost simultaneous, from their habit of quickly executing all that they have once resolved. And in this manner do they toil throughout all their lives amidst hardship and peril, disregarding present enjoyment in the continual thirst for increase—knowing no other festival recreation except the performance of active duty—and deeming inactive repose a worse condition than fatiguing occupation. To speak the truth in two words, such is their inborn temper, that they will neither remain at rest themselves, nor allow rest to others.¹

“Such is the city which stands opposed to you, Lacedæmonians—yet ye still hang back from action. . . . Your continual scruples and apathy would hardly be safe, even if ye had neighbours like yourselves in character : but as to dealings with Athens, your system is antiquated and out of date. In politics as in art, it is the modern improvements which are sure to come out victorious : and though unchanged institutions are best, if a city be not called upon to act—yet multiplicity of active obligations requires multiplicity and novelty of contrivance.² It is through these numerous trials that the means of Athens have acquired so much more new development than yours.”

The Corinthians concluded by saying, that if, after so many previous warnings, now repeated for the last time, Sparta still refused to protect her allies against Athens—if she delayed to perform her promise made to the Potidæans of immediately invading Attica—they (the Corinthians) would forthwith look for safety in some new alliance, which they felt themselves fully justified in doing. They admonished her to look well to the case, and to carry forward Peloponnesus, with undiminished dignity, as it had been transmitted to her from her predecessors.³

¹ Thucyd. *l. c.* καὶ ταῦτα μετὰ πόνων πάντα καὶ κινδύνων δι' ὅλου τοῦ αἰῶνος μοχθοῦσιν, καὶ ἀπολαύουσιν ἐλάχιστα τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, διὰ τὸ αἰετᾶσθαι καὶ μῆτε ἔορτὴν ἄλλο τι ἡγεῖσθαι ἢ τὸ τὰ δέοντα πρᾶξαι, συμφορὰν δὲ οὐχ ἥσσον ἡσυχίαν ἀπράγμονα ἢ ἀσχολίαν ἐπίπονον· ὥστε εἰ τις αὐτοὺς ξυνηλὼν φαλὴ πεφυκέναι ἐπὶ τῷ μῆτε αὐτοὺς ἔχειν ἡσυχίαν μῆτε τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ἔαν, ὀρθῶς ἂν εἴποι.

² Thucyd. *i. 71.* ἀρχαιότροπα ὕμῶν τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔστιν. Ἀνάγκη δὲ, ὥσπερ τέχνης, αἰετᾶ τὰ ἐπιγιγνόμενα κρατεῖν· καὶ ἡσυχάζουσα μὲν πόλει τὰ ἀκίνητα νόμιμα ἄριστα, πρὸς πολλὰ δὲ ἀναγκαζομένοις ἵέναι, πολλῆς καὶ τῆς ἐπιτεχνήσεως δεῖ.

³ Thucyd. *i. 71.*

Such was the memorable picture of Athens and her citizens, as exhibited by her fiercest enemy before the public assembly at Sparta. It was calculated to impress the assembly, not by appeal to recent or particular misdeeds, but by the general system of unprincipled and endless aggression which was imputed to Athens during the past—and by the certainty held out that the same system, unless put down by measures of decisive hostility, would be pushed still further in future to the utter ruin of Peloponnesus. And to this point did the Athenian envoy (staying in Sparta about some other negotiation and now present in the assembly) address himself in reply, after having asked and obtained permission from the magistrates. The empire of Athens was now of such standing that the younger men present had no personal knowledge of the circumstances under which it had grown up: and what was needed as information for them would be impressive as a reminder even to their seniors.¹

He began by disclaiming all intention of defending his native city against the charges of specific wrong or alleged infractions of the existing truce. This was no part of his mission; nor did he recognise Sparta as a competent judge in dispute between Athens and Corinth. But he nevertheless thought it his duty to vindicate Athens against the general character of injustice and aggression imputed to her, as well as to offer a solemn warning to the Spartans against the policy towards which they were obviously tending. He then proceeded to show that the empire of Athens had been honourably earned and amply deserved—that it had been voluntarily ceded, and even pressed upon her—and that she could not abdicate it without imperilling her own separate existence and security. Far from thinking that the circumstances under which it was acquired needed apology, he appealed to them with pride, as a testimony of the genuine Hellenic patriotism of that city which the Spartan congress now seemed disposed to run down as an enemy.² He then dwelt upon the circumstances attending the Persian invasion, setting forth the superior forwardness and the unflinching endurance of Athens, in spite of ungenerous neglect from the Spartans and other Greeks—the preponderance of her naval force in the entire armament—the directing genius of her general Themistoklês, complimented even by

¹ Thucyd. i. 72.

² Thucyd. i. 73. *βηθήσεται δὲ οὐ παραιτήσεως μᾶλλον ἕνεκα ἡ μαρτυρίου, καὶ δηλώσεως πρὸς ὅταν ὑμῖν πόλιν μὴ εὖ βουλευομένοις ὁ ἀγὼν καταστήσεται.*

Sparta herself—and the title of Athens to rank on that memorable occasion as the principal saviour of Greece. This alone ought to save her empire from reproach ; but this was not all—for that empire had been tendered to her by the pressing instance of the allies, at a time when Sparta had proved herself both incompetent and unwilling to prosecute the war against Persia.¹ By simple exercise of the constraining force inseparable from her presidential obligations, and by the reduction of various allies who revolted, Athens had gradually become unpopular, while Sparta too had become her enemy instead of her friend. To relax her hold upon her allies would have been to make them the allies of Sparta against her ; and thus the motive of fear was added to those of ambition and revenue, in inducing Athens to maintain her imperial dominion by force. In her position, no Grecian power either would or could have acted otherwise:—no Grecian power, certainly not Sparta, would have acted with so much equity and moderation, or given so little ground of complaint to her subjects. Worse they *had* suffered, while under Persia ; worse they *would* suffer, if they came under Sparta, who held her own allies under the thraldom of an oligarchical party in each city ; and if they hated Athens, this was only because subjects always hated the *present* dominion, whatever that might be.²

Having justified both the origin and the working of the Athenian empire, the envoy concluded by warning Sparta to consider calmly, without being hurried away by the passions and invectives of others, before she took a step from which there was no retreat, and which exposed the future to chances such as no man on either side could foresee. He called on her not to break the truce mutually sworn to, but to adjust all differences, as Athens was prepared to do, by the amicable arbitration which that truce provided. Should she begin war, the Athenians would follow her lead and resist her, calling to witness those gods under whose sanction the oaths were taken.³

¹ Thucyd. i. 75. Ἄρ' ἄξιοι ἐσμεν, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, καὶ προθυμίας ἕνεκα τῆς τότε καὶ γνώμης ξυνέσεως, ἀρχῆς γε ἧς ἔχομεν τοῖς Ἕλλησι μὴ οὕτως ἄγαν ἐπιφθόνως διακείσθαι ; καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴν τήνδε ἐλάβομεν οὐ βιασάμενοι, ἀλλ' ὑμῶν μὲν οὐκ ἐθελησάντων παραμείναι πρὸς τὰ ὑπόλοιπα τοῦ βαρβάρου, ἡμῖν δὲ προσελθόντων τῶν ξυμμάχων, καὶ αὐτῶν δεηθέντων ἡγεμόνας καταστήναι· ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἔργου κατηναγκάσθημεν τὸ πρῶτον προαγαγεῖν αὐτὴν ἐς τὸδε, μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ δέους, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τιμῆς, ὕστερον καὶ ὠφελίας.

² Thucyd. i. 77.

³ Thucyd. i. 78. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ πω τοιαύτῃ ἀμαρτίᾳ ὄντες, οὐτ' αὐτοὶ οὐθ' ὑμᾶς ὀρώντες, λέγομεν ὑμῖν, ἕως ἔτι αὐθαίρετος ἀμφοτέροις ἡ

The facts recounted in the preceding chapters will have shown, that the account given by the Athenian envoy at Sparta of the origin and character of the empire exercised by his city (though doubtless the account of a partisan) is in substance correct and equitable. The envoys of Athens had not yet learned to take the tone which they assumed in the sixteenth and seventeenth years of the coming war, at Melos and Kamarina. At any time previous to the affair of Korkyra, the topics insisted upon by the Athenian would probably have been profoundly listened to at Sparta. But now the mind of the Spartans was made up. Having cleared the assembly of all "strangers," and even all allies, they proceeded to discuss and determine the question among themselves. Most of their speakers held but one language¹—expatiating on the wrongs already done by Athens, and urging the necessity of instant war. There was however one voice, and that a commanding voice, raised against this conclusion: the ancient and respected king Archidamus opposed it.

The speech of Archidamus is that of a deliberate Spartan, who, setting aside both hatred to Athens and blind partiality to allies, looks at the question with a view to the interests and honour of Sparta only—not however omitting her imperial as well as her separate character. The preceding native speakers, indignant against Athens, had probably appealed to Spartan pride, treating it as an intolerable disgrace that almost the entire land-force of Dorian Peloponnesus should be thus bullied by one single Ionic city, and should hesitate to commence a war which one invasion of Attica would probably terminate. As the Corinthians had tried to excite the Spartans by well-timed taunts and reproaches, so the subsequent speakers had aimed at the same objects by panegyric upon the well-known valour and discipline of the city. To all these arguments Archidamus set himself to reply. Invoking the experience of the elders his contemporaries around him, he impressed upon the assembly the grave responsibility, the uncertainties, difficulties, and perils, of the war into which they were hurrying without preparation.² He reminded them of the wealth, the population (greater than that of any other Grecian city), the

εὐβουλία, σπονδὰς μὴ λύειν μηδὲ παραβαίνειν τοὺς ὅρκους, τὰ δὲ διάφορα δίκη λύεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ξυνηθίην· ἢ θεοὺς τοὺς ὀρκίους μάρτυρας ποιούμενοι, πειρασόμεθα ἀμύνεσθαι πολέμου ἄρχοντας ταύτη ἢ ἐν ὑψηλῇσθε.

¹ Thucyd. i. 79. *καὶ τῶν μὲν πλείονων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ αἱ γυνῶμαι ἔφερον, ἀδικεῖν τε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἤδη, καὶ πολεμητέα εἶναι ἐν τάχει.*

² Thucyd. i. 80.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 127

naval force, the cavalry, the hoplites, the large foreign dominion of Athens,—and then asked by what means they proposed to put her down?¹ Ships, they had few; trained seamen, yet fewer; wealth, next to none. They could indeed invade and ravage Attica, by their superior numbers and land-force. But the Athenians had possessions abroad sufficient to enable them to dispense with the produce of Attica, while their great navy would retaliate the like ravages upon Peloponnesus. To suppose that one or two devastating expeditions into Attica would bring the war to an end, would be a deplorable error: such proceedings would merely enrage the Athenians, without impairing their real strength, and the war would thus be prolonged, perhaps for a whole generation.² Before they determined upon war, it was absolutely necessary to provide more efficient means for carrying it on; and to multiply their allies not merely among the Greeks, but among foreigners also. While this was in process, envoys ought to be sent to Athens to remonstrate and obtain redress for the grievances of the allies. If the Athenians granted this—which they very probably would do, when they saw the preparations going forward, and when the ruin of the highly-cultivated soil of Attica was held over them *in terrorem* without being actually consummated—so much the better: if they refused, in the course of two or three years war might be commenced with some hopes of success. Archidamus reminded his countrymen that their allies would hold *them* responsible for the good or bad issue of what was now determined;³ admonishing them, in the true spirit of a conservative Spartan, to cling to that cautious policy which had been ever the characteristic of the state, despising both taunts on their tardiness and panegyric on their valour. “We Spartans owe both our bravery and our prudence to our admirable public discipline: it makes us warlike, because the sense of shame is most closely connected with discipline, as valour is with the sense of shame: it makes us prudent, because our training keeps us too ignorant to set ourselves above our own institutions, and holds us under sharp restraint so as not to disobey

¹ Thucyd. i. 80. πρὸς δὲ ἄνδρας, οἳ γῆν τε ἐκάς ἔχουσι καὶ προσέτι θαλάσσης ἐμπειρότατοί εἰσι, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἄριστα ἐξήρτννται, πλούτῳ τε ἰδίῳ καὶ δημοσίῳ καὶ ναυσὶ καὶ ἵπποις καὶ ὕπλοις, καὶ ὄχλῳ, ὅσος οὐκ ἐν ἄλλῳ ἐνὶ γε χωρίῳ Ἑλληνικῷ ἐστίν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ξυμμάχους πολλοὺς φόρου ὑποτελεῖς ἔχουσι, πῶς χρὴ πρὸς τούτους βᾶδὺς πόλεμον ἄρασθαι, καὶ τίνι πιστεύσαντας ἀπαρασκεύους ἐπειχθῆναι;

² Thucyd. i. 81. δέδοικα δὲ μᾶλλον μὴ καὶ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτὸν ὑπολιπώμεν, &c.

³ Thucyd. i. 82, 83.

them.¹ And thus, not being otherwise in unprofitable accomplishments, we Spartans are not given to disparage our enemy's strength in clever speech, and then meet him with shortcomings in reality. We think that the capacity of neighbouring states is much on a par, and that the chances in reserve for both parties are too uncertain to be discriminated beforehand by speech. We always make real preparations against our enemies, as if they were proceeding wisely on their side: we must count upon security through our own precautions, not upon the chance of their errors. Indeed there is no great superiority in one man as compared with another: he is the stoutest who is trained in the severest trials. Let us for our parts not renounce this discipline, which we have received from our fathers and which we still continue, to our very great profit: let us not hurry on in one short hour a resolution upon which depend so many lives, so much property, so many cities, and our own reputation besides. Let us take time to consider, since our strength puts it fully in our power to do so. Send envoys to the Athenians on the subject of Potidæa and of the other grievances alleged by our allies—and that too the rather as they are ready to give us satisfaction: against one who offers satisfaction, custom forbids you to proceed, without some previous application, as if he were a proclaimed wrong-doer.

¹ Thucyd. i. 84. Πολεμικοί τε καὶ εὐβουλοὶ διὰ τὸ εὐκοσμον γιγνόμεθα, τὸ μὲν ὅτι αἰδῶς σωφροσύνης πλείστον μετέχει, αἰσχύνῃς δὲ εὐψυχία· εὐβουλοὶ δὲ ἀμαθέστερον τῶν νόμων τῆς ὑπεροψίας παιδευόμενοι, καὶ ξὺν χαλεπότητι σωφρονέστερον ἢ ὥστε αὐτῶν ἀνηκουστεῖν· καὶ μὴ τὰ ἀχρεΐα ξυνετοὶ ἄγαν ὄντες, τὰς τῶν πολεμίων παρασκευὰς λόγῳ καλῶς μεμφόμενοι, ἀνομοίως ἔργῳ ἐπεξίεναι, νομίζειν δὲ τὰς τε διανοίας τῶν πέλας παραπλησίους εἶναι, καὶ τὰς προσπιπτούσας τύχας οὐ λόγῳ διαιρετάς.

In the construction of the last sentence, I follow Haack and Poppo, in preference to Goller and Dr. Arnold.

The wording of this part of the speech of Archidamus is awkward and obscure, though we make out pretty well the general sense. It deserves peculiar attention, as coming from a king of Sparta, personally too a man of superior judgement. The great points of the Spartan character are all brought out. 1. A narrow, strictly-defined, and uniform range of ideas. 2. Compression of all other impulses and desires, but an increased sensibility to their own public opinion. 3. Great habits of endurance as well as of submission.

The way in which the features of Spartan character are deduced from Spartan institutions, as well as the pride which Archidamus expresses in the ignorance and narrow mental range of his countrymen, are here remarkable. A similar championship of ignorance and narrow-mindedness is not only to be found among those who deride the literary and oratorical tastes of the Athenian democracy (see Aristophanês, *Ran.* 1070: compare Xenophon. *Memorab.* i. 2, 9-49), but also in the speech of Kleon (Thucyd. iii. 37).

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 129

But at the same time make preparation for war ; such will be the course of policy at once the best for your own power and the most terror-striking to your enemies.”¹

The speech of Archidamus was not only in itself full of plain reason and good sense, but delivered altogether from the point of view of a Spartan ; appealing greatly to Spartan conservative feeling and even prejudice. But in spite of all this, and in spite of the personal esteem entertained for the speaker, the tide of feeling in the opposite direction was at that moment irresistible. Sthenelaidas—one of the five Ephors, to whom it fell to put the question for voting—closed the debate. His few words mark at once the character of the man—the temper of the assembly—and the simplicity of speech, though without the wisdom of judgement, for which Archidamus had taken credit to his countrymen.

“I don’t understand (he said) these long speeches of the Athenians. They have praised themselves abundantly, but they have never rebutted what is laid to their charge—that they are guilty of wrong against our allies and against Peloponnesus. Now if in former days they were good men against the Persians, and are now evil-doers against us, they deserve double punishment as having become evil-doers instead of good.² But *we* are the same now as we were then : we know better than to sit still while our allies are suffering wrong : we shall not adjourn our aid, while they cannot adjourn their sufferings.³ Others have in abundance wealth, ships and horses—but *we* have good allies, whom we are not to abandon to the mercy of the Athenians : nor are we to trust our redress to arbitration and to words, when our wrongs are not confined to words. We must help them speedily and with all our strength. Let no one tell us that we can with honour deliberate when we are actually suffering wrong : it is rather for those who intend to do the wrong, to deliberate well beforehand. Resolve upon war then, Lacedæmonians, in a manner worthy of Sparta. Suffer not the Athenians to become greater than they are : let us not betray our allies to ruin, but march with the aid of the gods against the wrong-doers.”

¹ Thucyd. i. 84, 85.

² Compare a similar sentiment in the speech of the Thebans against the Plataeans (Thucyd. iii. 67).

³ Thucyd. i. 86. ἡμεῖς δὲ ὁμοῖοι καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν ἔσμεν, καὶ τοὺς ἐυμάχους, ἣν σωφρονῶμεν, οὐ περιοφόμεθα ἀδικουμένους, οὐδὲ μελλήσομεν τιμωρεῖν· οἳ δ’ οὐκέτι μέλλουσι κακῶς πάσχειν.

There is here a play upon the word μέλλειν which it is not easy to preserve in a translation.

With these few words, so well calculated to defeat the prudential admonitions of Archidamus, Sthenelâidas put the question for the decision of the assembly—which at Sparta was usually taken neither by show of hands, nor by deposit of balls in an urn, but by cries analogous to the *Ay* or *No* of the English House of Commons—the presiding Ephor declaring which of the cries predominated. On this occasion the cry for war was manifestly the stronger.¹ Yet Sthenelâidas affected inability to determine which of the two was the louder, in order that he might have an excuse for bringing about a more impressive manifestation of sentiment and a stronger apparent majority—since a portion of the minority would probably be afraid to show their real opinions as individuals openly. He therefore directed a division—like the Speaker of the English House of Commons when his decision in favour of *Ay* or *No* is questioned by any member—“Such of you as think that the truce has been violated and that the Athenians are doing us wrong, go to *that* side; such as think the contrary, to the other side.” The assembly accordingly divided, and the majority was very great on the warlike side of the question.

The first step of the Lacedæmonians, after coming to this important decision, was to send to Delphi and inquire of the oracle whether it would be beneficial to them to undertake the war. The answer brought back (Thucydîdês seems hardly certain that it was really given²) was—that if they did their best they would be victorious, and that the god would help them, invoked or uninvoked. They at the same time convened a general congress of their allies to Sparta, for the purpose of submitting their recent resolution to the vote of all.

To the Corinthians, in their anxiety for the relief of Potidæa, the decision to be given by this congress was not less important than that which the Spartans had just taken separately. They sent round envoys to each of the allies, entreating them to authorise war without reserve. Through such instigations, acting upon the general impulse then prevalent, the congress came together in a temper decidedly warlike. Most of the speakers were full of invective against Athens and impatient for action, while the Corinthians, waiting as before to speak the last, wound up the discussion by a speech well calculated to ensure a hearty vote. Their former speech had been directed to shame, exasperate, and alarm the Lacedæmonians;

¹ Thucyd. i. 87. βουλόμενος αὐτοὺς φανερώς ἀποδεικνυμένους τὴν γνώμην εἰς τὸ πολεμεῖν μᾶλλον ὀρμῆσαι, &c.

² Thucyd. i. 118. ὁ δὲ ἀνείλεν αὐτοῖς, ὡς λέγεται, &c.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 131

this point having now been carried, they had to enforce, upon the allies generally, the dishonour as well as the impolicy of receding from a willing leader. The cause was one in which all were interested, the inland states not less than the maritime, for both would find themselves ultimately victims of the encroaching despot-city. Whatever efforts were necessary for the war, ought cheerfully to be made, since it was only through war that they could arrive at a secure and honourable peace. There were good hopes that this might soon be attained, and that the war would not last long—so decided was the superiority of the confederacy, in numbers, in military skill, and in the equal heart and obedience of all its members.¹ The naval superiority of Athens depended chiefly upon hired seamen—so that the confederacy, by borrowing from the treasuries of Delphi and Olympia, would soon be able to overbid her, take into pay her best mariners, and equal her equipment at sea. They would excite revolt among her allies, and establish a permanent fortified post for the ruin of Attica. To make up a common fund for this purpose, was indispensably necessary; for Athens was far more than a match for each of them single-handed. Nothing less than hearty union could save them all from successive enslavement—the very supposition of which was intolerable to Peloponnesian freemen, whose fathers had liberated Greece from the Persian. Let them not shrink from endurance and sacrifice in such a cause—it was their hereditary pride to purchase success by laborious effort. The Delphian god had promised them his co-operation; and the whole of Greece would sympathise in the cause, either from fear of the despotism of Athens, or from hopes of profit. They would not be the first to break the truce, for the Athenians had already

¹ Thucyd. i. 120, 121. Κατὰ πολλὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς εἰκὸς ἐπικρατῆσαι, πρῶτον μὲν πλῆθει προὔχοντας καὶ ἐμπειρίᾳ πολεμικῇ, ἔπειτα ὁμοίως πάντας ἐς τὰ παραγγελλόμενα ἰόντας.

I conceive that the word *ὁμοίως* here alludes to the equal interest of all the confederates in the quarrel, as opposed to the Athenian power, which was composed partly of constrained subjects, partly of hired mercenaries—to both of which points, as weaknesses in the enemy, the Corinthian orator goes on to allude. The word *ὁμοίως* here designates the same fact as Periklēs, in his speech at Athens (i. 141), mentions under the words *πάντες ἰσόψηφοι*: the Corinthian orator treats it as an advantage to have all confederates equal and hearty in the cause: Periklēs, on the contrary, looking at the same fact from the Athenian point of view, considers it as a disadvantage, since it prevented unity of command and determination.

Poppo's view of this passage seems to me erroneous.

The same idea is reproduced, c. 124. εἴπερ βεβαίωτατον τὸ ταῦτα ὑμυφέροντα καὶ πόλεσι καὶ ιδιώταις εἶναι, &c.

broken it, as the declaration of the Delphian god distinctly implied. Let them lose no time in sending aid to the Potidæans, a Dorian population now besieged by Ionians, as well as to those other Greeks whom Athens had enslaved. Every day the necessity for effort was becoming stronger, and the longer it was delayed, the more painful it would be when it came. "Be ye persuaded then (concluded the orator), that this city, which has constituted herself despot of Greece, has her means of attack prepared against all of us alike, some for present rule, others for future conquest. Let us assail and subdue her, that we may dwell securely ourselves hereafter, and may emancipate those Greeks who are now in slavery."¹

If there were any speeches delivered at this congress in opposition to the war, they were not likely to be successful in a cause wherein even Archidamus had failed. After the Corinthian had concluded, the question was put to the deputies of every city, great and small indiscriminately: and the majority decided for war.² This important resolution was adopted about the end of 432 B.C., or the beginning of January 431 B.C.: the previous decision of the Spartans separately, may have been taken about two months earlier, in the preceding October or November 432 B.C.

Reviewing the conduct of the two great Grecian parties at this momentous juncture, with reference to existing treaties and positive grounds of complaint, it seems clear that Athens was in the right. She had done nothing which could fairly be called a violation of the Thirty years' truce: while for such of her acts as were alleged to be such, she offered to submit them to that amicable arbitration which the truce itself prescribed. The Peloponnesian confederates were manifestly the aggressors in the contest. If Sparta, usually so backward, now came forward in a spirit so decidedly opposite, we are to ascribe it partly to her standing fear and jealousy of Athens, partly to the pressure of her allies, especially of the Corinthians.

Thucydides, recognising these two as the grand determining motives, and indicating the alleged infractions of truce as simple occasions or pretexts, seems to consider the fear and hatred of Athens as having contributed more to determine Sparta than the urgency of her allies.³ That the extraordinary aggrandisement

¹ Thucyd. i. 123, 124.

² Thucyd. i. 125. *καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἐψηφίσαντο πολεμεῖν*. It seems that the decision was not absolutely unanimous.

³ Thucyd. i. 88. *Ἐψηφίσαντο δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰς σπονδὰς λελῦσθαι καὶ πολεμητέα εἶναι, οὐ τοσοῦτον τῶν συμμαχῶν πεισθέντες τοῖς*

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 133

of Athens, during the period immediately succeeding the Persian invasion, was well calculated to excite alarm and jealousy in Peloponnesus, is indisputable. But if we take Athens as she stood in 432 B.C., it deserves notice that she had neither made, nor (so far as we know) tried to make, a single new acquisition during the whole fourteen years which had elapsed since the conclusion of the 'Thirty years' truce,¹—and moreover that that truce marked an epoch of signal humiliation and reduction of her power. The triumph which Sparta and the Peloponnesians then gained, though not sufficiently complete to remove all fear of Athens, was yet great enough to inspire them with the hope that a second combined effort would subdue her. This mixture of fear and hope was exactly the state of feeling out of which war was likely to grow. We see that even before the quarrel between Corinth and Korkyra, sagacious Greeks everywhere anticipated war as not far distant.² It was near breaking out even on occasion of the revolt of Samos;³ peace being then preserved partly by the commercial and nautical interests of Corinth, partly by the quiescence of Athens. But the quarrel of Corinth and Korkyra, which Sparta might have appeased beforehand had she thought it her interest to do so,—and the junction of Korkyra with Athens—exhibited the

λόγοις, ὅσον φοβούμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, μὴ ἐπὶ μείζον δυνήθωσιν, δρῶντες αὐτοῖς τὰ πολλὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑποχείρια ἤδη ὄντα: compare also c. 23 and 118.

¹ Plutarch's biography of Periklēs is very misleading from its inattention to chronology, ascribing to an earlier time feelings and tendencies which really belong to a later. Thus he represents (c. 20) the desire for acquiring possession of Sicily, and even of Carthage and the Tyrrhenian coast, as having become very popular at Athens even before the revolt of Megara and Eubœa, and before those other circumstances which preceded the 'Thirty years' truce: and he gives much credit to Periklēs for having repressed such unmeasured aspirations. But ambitious hopes directed towards Sicily could not have sprung up in the Athenian mind until after the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. It was impossible that they could make any step in that direction until they had established their alliance with Korkyra, and this was only done in the year before the Peloponnesian war—done too, even then, in a qualified manner and with much reserve. At the first outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, the Athenians had nothing but fears, while the Peloponnesians had large hopes of aid, from the side of Sicily. While it is very true, therefore, that Periklēs was eminently useful in discouraging rash and distant enterprises of ambition generally, we cannot give him the credit of keeping down Athenian desires of acquisition in Sicily, or towards Carthage (if indeed this latter ever was included in the catalogue of Athenian hopes)—for such desires were hardly known until after his death—in spite of the assertion again repeated by Plutarch, Alkibiadēs, c. 17.

² Thucyd. i. 33-36.

³ Thucyd. i. 40, 41.

latter as again in a career of aggrandisement, and thus again brought into play the warlike feelings of Sparta ; while they converted Corinth from the advocate of peace into a clamorous organ of war. The revolt of Potidæa—fomented by Corinth and encouraged by Sparta in the form of a positive promise to invade Attica—was in point of fact the first distinct violation of the truce, and the initiatory measure of the Peloponnesian war. The Spartan meeting, and the subsequent congress of allies at Sparta, served no other purpose than to provide such formalities as were requisite to ensure the concurrent and hearty action of numbers, and to clothe with imposing sanction a state of war already existing in reality, though yet unproclaimed.

The sentiment in Peloponnesus at this moment was not the fear of Athens, but the hatred of Athens,—and the confident hope of subduing her. And indeed such confidence was justified by plausible grounds. Men might well think that the Athenians could never endure the entire devastation of their highly-cultivated soil,—or at least that they would certainly come forth to fight for it in the field, which was all that the Peloponnesians desired. Nothing except the unparalleled ascendancy and unshaken resolution of Periklēs induced the Athenians to persevere in a scheme of patient defence, and to trust to that naval superiority, which the enemies of Athens, save and except the judicious Archidamus, had not yet learned fully to appreciate. Moreover the confident hopes of the Peloponnesians were materially strengthened by the widespread sympathy in favour of their cause, proclaiming as it did the intended liberation of Greece from a despot city.¹

To Athens, on the other hand, the coming war presented itself in a very different aspect ; holding out nothing less than the certainty of prodigious loss and privation—even granting that at this heavy cost, her independence and union at home, and her empire abroad, could be upheld. By Periklēs, and by the more long-sighted Athenians, the chance of unavoidable war was foreseen even before the Korkyræan dispute.² But Periklēs was only the first citizen in a democracy, esteemed, trusted, and listened to, more than any one else, by the body of citizens, but warmly opposed in most of his measures, under the free speech and latitude of individual action which reigned at Athens,—and even bitterly hated by many active political

¹ Thucyd. ii. 8.

² Thucyd. i. 45 ; Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 8.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 135

opponents. The formal determination of the Lacedæmonians, to declare war, must of course have been made known at Athens, by those Athenian envoys who had entered an unavailing protest against it in the Spartan assembly. No steps were taken by Sparta to carry this determination into effect until after the congress of allies and their pronounced confirmatory vote. Nor did the Spartans even then send any herald, or make any formal declaration. They despatched various propositions to Athens, not at all with a view of trying to obtain satisfaction, or of providing some escape from the probability of war ; but with the contrary purpose—of multiplying demands, and enlarging the grounds of quarrel.¹ Meanwhile the deputies, retiring home from the congress to their respective cities, carried with them the general resolution for immediate warlike preparations to be made with as little delay as possible.²

The first requisition addressed by the Lacedæmonians to Athens was a political manœuvre aimed at Periklês, their chief opponent in that city. His mother Agaristê belonged to the great family of the Alkmæônids, who were supposed to be under an inexpiable hereditary taint, in consequence of the sacrilege committed by their ancestor Megaklês nearly two centuries before, in the slaughter of the Kylonian suppliants near the altar of the Venerable Goddesses.³ Ancient as this transaction was, it still had sufficient hold on the mind of the Athenians to serve as the basis of a political manœuvre. About seventy-seven years before, shortly after the expulsion of Hippias from Athens, it had been so employed by the Spartan king Kleomenês, who at that time exacted from the Athenians a clearance of the ancient sacrilege, to be effected by the banishment of Kleisthenês (the founder of the democracy) and his chief partisans. This demand, addressed by Kleomenês to the Athenians at the instance of Isagoras the rival of Kleisthenês,⁴ had been then obeyed, and had served well the purposes of those who sent it. A similar blow was now aimed by the Lacedæmonians at Periklês (the grand-nephew of Kleisthenês), and doubtless at the instance of his political enemies. Religion required, it was pretended, that “the abomination of

¹ Thucyd. i. 126. ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ἐπρεσβεύοντο τῷ χρόνῳ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐγκλήματα ποιοῦμενοι, ὅπως σφίσιςιν ὅτι μεγίστη πρόφασις εἴη τοῦ πολεμεῖν, ἢν μὴ τι ἑσακούωσι.

² Thucyd. i. 125.

³ See the account of the Kylonian troubles, and the sacrilege which followed, in this History, ch. x.

⁴ See Herodot. v. 70 : compare vi. 131 ; Thucyd. i. 126 ; and ch. xxxi. of this History.

the goddess should be driven out.”¹ If the Athenians complied with this demand, they would deprive themselves, at this critical moment, of their ablest leader. But the Lacedæmonians, not expecting compliance, reckoned at all events upon discrediting Periklēs with the people, as being partly the cause of the war through family taint of impiety²—and this impression would doubtless be loudly proclaimed by his political opponents in the assembly.

The influence of Periklēs with the Athenian public had become greater and greater as their political experience of him was prolonged. But the bitterness of his enemies appears to have increased along with it. Not long before this period, he had been indirectly assailed through the medium of accusations against three different persons, all more or less intimate with him—his mistress Aspasia, the philosopher Anaxagoras, and the sculptor Phidias.

We cannot make out either the exact date, or the exact facts of either of these accusations. Aspasia, daughter of Axiochus, was a native of Miletus, beautiful, well-educated, and aspiring. She resided at Athens, and is affirmed (though upon very doubtful evidence) to have kept slave-girls to be let out as courtezans. Whatever may be the case with this report, which is most probably one of the scandals engendered by political animosity against Periklēs,³ it is certain that so remarkable were

¹ Thucyd. i. 126. ἐκέλευον τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὸ ἄγος ἐλαύνειν τῆς θεοῦ.

² Thucyd. i. 127.

³ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 24. Respecting Aspasia, see Plato, Menexenus, c. 3, 4; Xenophon, Memorab. ii. 6, 36; Harpokration, v. Ἀσπασία. Aspasia was doubtless no uncommon name among Grecian women: we know of one Phokæan girl who bore it, the mistress of Cyrus the younger (Plutarch, Artaxer. c. 26). The story about Aspasia having kept slave-girls for hire, is stated by both Plutarch and Athenæus (xiii. p. 570); but we may reasonably doubt whether there is any better evidence for it than that which is actually cited by the latter—the passage in Aristophanēs, Acharn. 497–505—

Κἄθ' οἱ Μεγαρήs δδύναις πεφυσιγγωμένοι
Ἀντεῖκέλεψαν Ἀσπασίας πόρνᾱ δύο or πόρνᾱs δύο.

Athenæus reads πόρνᾱs, but the reading πόρνᾱ δύο appears in the received text of Aristophanēs. Critics differ whether Ἀσπασίας is the genitive case singular of Ἀσπασία, or the accusative plural of the adjective ἀσπᾶσιος. I believe that it is the latter; but intended as a play on the word, capable of being understood either as a substantive or as an adjective—ἀσπᾶσιος πόρνᾱs δύο or Ἀσπασίας πόρνᾱs δύο. There is a similar play on the word, in a line of Kratinus, quoted by Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 24.

At the time, if ever, when this theft of the Megarian youth took place, Aspasia must have been the beloved mistress and companion of Periklēs; and it is inconceivable that she should have kept slave-girls for hire *then*, whatever she may have done before.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 137

her own fascinations, her accomplishments, and her powers not merely of conversation, but even of oratory and criticism,—that the most distinguished Athenians of all ages and characters, Sokratēs among the number, visited her, and several of them took their wives along with them to hear her also. The free citizen women of Athens lived in strict and almost oriental recluseness, as well after being married as when single. Everything which concerned their lives, their happiness, or their rights, was determined or managed for them by male relatives : and they seem to have been destitute of all mental culture and accomplishments. Their society presented no charm nor interest, which men accordingly sought for in the company of a class of women called Hetærae or Courtezans, literally Female Companions, who lived a free life, managed their own

That reading and construction of the verse above cited, which I think the less probable of the two, has been applied by the commentators of Thucydides to explain a line of his history, and applied in a manner which I am persuaded is erroneous. When the Lacedæmonians desired the Athenians to repeal the decree excluding the Megarians from their ports, the Athenians refused, alleging that the Megarians had appropriated some lands which were disputed between the two countries, and some which were even sacred property—and also that “*they had received runaway slaves from Athens*”—καὶ ἀνδραπόδων ὑποδοχὴν τῶν ἀφισταμένων (i. 139). The Scholiast gives a perfectly just explanation of these last words—ὥς ὅτι δούλους αὐτῶν ἀποφεύγοντας ἐδέχοντο. But Wasse puts a note to the passage to this effect—“*Aspasiae servos*, v. Athenæum. p. 570 ; Aristoph. Acharn. 525, et Schol.” This note of Wasse is adopted and transcribed by the three best and most recent commentators on Thucydides—Poppo, Göller, and Dr. Arnold. Yet with all respect to their united authority, the supposition is neither natural as applied to the words, nor admissible as regards the matter of fact. Ἀνδράποδα ἀφιστάμενα mean naturally (not *Aspasiae servos*, or more properly *servas*, for the very gender ought to have made Wasse suspect the correctness of his interpretation—but) the runaway slaves of proprietors generally in Attica ; of whom the Athenians lost so prodigious a number after the Lacedæmonian garrison was established at Dekelcia (Thucyd. vii. 28 : compare i. 142 ; and iv. 118, about the αὐτόμολοι). Periklēs might fairly set forth the reception of such runaway slaves as a matter of complaint against the Megarians, and the Athenian public assembly would feel it so likewise : moreover the Megarians are charged not with having *stolen away* the slaves, but with *harbouring* them (ὑποδοχήν). But to suppose that Periklēs, in defending the decree of exclusion against the Megarians, would rest the defence on the ground that some Megarian youth had run away with two girls of the *cortège* of Aspasia, argues a strange conception both of him and of the people. If such an incident ever really happened, or was even supposed to have happened, we may be sure that it would be cited by his opponents, as a means of bringing contempt upon the real accusation against the Megarians—the purpose for which Aristophanes produces it. This is one of the many errors in respect to Grecian history arising from the practice of construing passages of comedy as if they were serious and literal facts.

affairs, and supported themselves by their powers of pleasing. These women were numerous, and were doubtless of every variety of personal character. The most distinguished and superior among them, such as Aspasia and Theodotê,¹ appear to have been the only women in Greece, except the Spartan, who either inspired strong passion or exercised mental ascendancy.

Periklês had been determined in his choice of a wife by those family considerations which were held almost obligatory at Athens, and had married a woman very nearly related to him, by whom he had two sons, Xanthippus and Paralus. But the marriage having never been comfortable, was afterwards dissolved by mutual consent, according to that full liberty of divorce which the Attic law permitted. Periklês concurred with his wife's male relations (who formed her legal guardians) in giving her away to another husband.² He then took Aspasia to live with him, had a son by her who bore his name, and continued ever afterwards on terms of the greatest intimacy and affection with her. Without adopting those exaggerations which represent Aspasia as having communicated to Periklês his distinguished eloquence, or even as having herself composed orations for public delivery, we may reasonably believe her to have been qualified to take interest and share in that literary and philosophical society which frequented the house of Periklês, and which his unprincipled son Xanthippus,—disgusted with his father's regular expenditure, as withholding from him the means of supporting an extravagant establishment—reported abroad with exaggerated calumnies, and turned into derision. It was from that worthless young man, who died of the Athenian epidemic during the lifetime of Periklês, that his political enemies and the comic writers of the day obtained the pretended revelations, which served them as matter for scandalous libel on the privacy of this distinguished man.³

¹ The visit of Sokratês with some of his friends to Theodotê, his dialogue with her, and the description of her manner of living, are among the most curious remnants of Grecian antiquity, on a side very imperfectly known to us (Xenophon, Memorab. iii. 11).

Compare the citations from Eubulus and Antiphanês, the comic writers, apud Athenæum, xiii. p. 571, illustrating the differences of character and behaviour between some of these *Iletæxæ* and others—and Athenæ. xiii. p. 589.

² Plutarch, Periklês, c. 24. *Εἶτα τῆς συμβιώσεως οὐκ οὔσης αὐτοῖς ἀρεστῆς, ἐκείνην μὲν ἐτέρῃ βουλομένην συνεξέδωκεν, αὐτὸς δὲ Ἀσπασίαν λαβὼν ἑσπερὲ διαφερόντως.*

³ Plutarch, Periklês, c. 13-36.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 139

While the comic writers attacked Periklēs himself for alleged intrigues with different women, they treated the name of Aspasia as public property without any mercy or reserve: she was the Omphalē, the Deianeira, or the Hērē, to this great Hēraklēs or Zeus of Athens. At length one of these comic writers, Hermippus, not contented with scenic attacks, indicted her before the dikastery for impiety, as participant in the philosophical discussions held, and the opinions professed, among the society of Periklēs, by Anaxagoras and others. Against Anaxagoras himself, too, a similar indictment is said to have been preferred, either by Kleon or by Thucydidēs son of Melesias, under a general resolution recently passed in the public assembly at the instance of Diopeithēs. And such was the sensitive antipathy of the Athenian public, shown afterwards fatally in the case of Sokratēs, and embittered in this instance by all the artifices of political faction, against philosophers whose opinions conflicted with the received religious dogmas—that Periklēs did not dare to place Anaxagoras on his trial. The latter retired from Athens, and a sentence of banishment was passed against him in his absence.¹ But Periklēs himself defended Aspasia before the dikastery. In fact the indictment was as much against him as against her: one thing alleged against her (and also against Pheidias) was, the reception of free women to facilitate the intrigues of Periklēs. He defended her successfully and procured a verdict of acquittal: but we are not surprised to hear that his speech was marked by the strongest personal emotions and even by tears.² The dikasts were accustomed to such appeals to their sympathies, sometimes even to extravagant excess, from ordinary accused persons. In Periklēs, however, so manifest an outburst of emotion stands out as something quite unparalleled: for constant self-mastery was one of the most prominent features in his character.³ And we shall find him, near the close of his political life, when he had become for the moment unpopular with the Athenian people, distracted as they were at the moment with the terrible sufferings of the pestilence,—bearing up against their unmerited anger not merely with dignity, but with a pride of conscious innocence

¹ This seems the more probable story; but there are differences of statement, and uncertainties upon many points: compare Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 16–32; Plutarch, Nikias, c. 23; Diogen. Laërt. ii. 12, 13. See also Schaubach, Fragment. Anaxagoræ, p. 47–52.

² Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 32.

³ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 7, 36–39.

and desert which rises almost into defiance ; insomuch that the rhetor Dionysius, who criticises the speech of Periklēs as if it were simply the composition of Thucydidēs, censures that historian for having violated dramatic propriety by a display of insolence where humility would have been becoming.¹

It appears also, as far as we can judge amidst very imperfect data, that the trial of the great sculptor Pheidias, for alleged embezzlement in the contract for his celebrated gold and ivory statue of Athênē,² took place nearly at this period. That statue had been finished and dedicated in the Parthenon in 437 B.C., since which period Pheidias had been engaged at Olympia in his last and great masterpiece, the colossal statue of the Olympian Zeus. On his return to Athens from the execution of this work, about 433 or 432 B.C., the accusation of embezzlement was instituted against him by the political enemies of Periklēs.³ A slave of Pheidias, named Menon, planted himself as a suppliant at the altar, professing to be cognisant of certain facts which proved that his master had committed peculation. Motion was made to receive his depositions and to ensure to his person the protection of the people ; upon which he revealed various statements so greatly impeaching the pecuniary probity of Pheidias, that the latter was put in prison, awaiting the day for his trial before the dikastery. The gold employed and charged for in the statue, however, was all capable of being taken off and weighed, so as to verify its accuracy, which Periklēs dared the accusers to do. Besides the charge of embezzlement, there were other circumstances which rendered Pheidias unpopular. It had been discovered that, in the reliefs on the frieze of the Parthenon, he had introduced the portraits of himself and Periklēs in conspicuous positions. It seems that Pheidias died in prison before the day of trial ; and some even said that he had been poisoned by the enemies of Periklēs, in order that the suspicions against the latter, who was the real object of attack, might be aggravated. It is said also that Drakontidēs proposed and carried a decree in the public assembly, that Periklēs should be called on to give an account of the money which he had

¹ Thucyd. ii. 60, 61 : compare also his striking expressions, c. 65 ; Dionys. Halikarn. De Thucydid. Judic. c. 44, p. 924.

² Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 31. *Φειδίας—ἐργολάβος τοῦ ἀγάλματος.*

This tale, about protecting Pheidias under the charge of embezzlement, was the story most widely in circulation against Periklēs—*ἡ χειρόστη αἰτία πασῶν, ἔχουσα δὲ πλείστους μάρτυρας* (Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 31).

³ See the Dissertation of O. Müller (De Phidiae Vita, c. 17, p. 35), who lays out the facts in the order in which I have given them.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 141

expended, and that the dikasts, before whom the account was rendered, should give their suffrage in the most solemn manner from the altar. This latter provision was modified by Agnon, who, while proposing that the dikasts should be 1500 in number, retained the vote by pebbles in the urn according to ordinary custom.¹

If Periklēs was ever tried on such a charge, there can be no doubt that he was honourably acquitted: for the language of Thucydidēs respecting his pecuniary probity is such as could not have been employed if a verdict of guilty on a charge of speculation had been publicly pronounced. But we cannot be certain that he ever was tried. Indeed another accusation urged by his enemies, and even by Aristophanēs in the sixth year of the Peloponnesian war, implies that no trial took place: for it was alleged that Periklēs, in order to escape this danger, "blew up the Peloponnesian war," and involved his country in such confusion and peril as made his own aid and guidance indispensably necessary to her; especially, that he passed the decree against the Megarians by which the war was really brought on.² We know enough, however, to be certain that such a supposition is altogether inadmissible. The enemies of

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 13-32.

² Aristophan. Pac. 587-603: compare Acharn. 512; Ephorus, ap. Diodor. xii. 38-40; and the Scholia on the two passages of Aristophanēs; Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 32.

Diodorus (as well as Plutarch, Alkibiad. c. 7) relates another tale, that Alkibiadēs once approached Periklēs when he was in evident low spirits and embarrassment, and asked him the reason: Periklēs told him that the time was near at hand for rendering his accounts, and that he was considering how this could be done: upon which Alkibiadēs advised him to consider rather, how he could evade doing it. The result of this advice was that Periklēs plunged Athens into the Peloponnesian war: compare Aristophan. Nub. 855, with the Scholia—and Ephorus, Fragm. 118, 119, ed. Marx, with the notes of Marx.

It is probable enough that Ephorus copied the story which ascribes the Peloponnesian war to the accusations against Pheidias and Periklēs, from Aristophanēs or other comic writers of the time. But it deserves remark that even Aristophanēs is not to be considered as certifying it. For if we consult the passage above referred to in his comedy *Pax*, we shall find that, first, Hermēs tells the story about Pheidias, Periklēs, and the Peloponnesian war; upon which both Trygæus, and the Chorus, remark that *they never heard a word of it before*: that it is quite *new* to them.

Tryg. Ταῦτα τοίνυν, μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, γὰρ πεπύσμεν οὐδενός,
οὐδ' ὅπως αὐτῇ (Εἰρήνῃ) προσήκοι Φειδίας ἡκηκόη.

Chorus. Οὐδ' ἔγωγε, πλήν γε νυνί.

If Aristophanēs had stated the story ever so plainly, his authority could only have been taken as proving that it was a part of the talk of the time: but the lines just cited make him as much a contradicting as an affirming witness.

Periklēs were far too eager, and too expert in Athenian political warfare, to have let him escape by such a stratagem. Moreover, we learn from the assurance of Thucydidēs that the war depended upon far deeper causes—that the Megarian decree was in no way the real cause of it—that it was not Periklēs, but the Peloponnesians, who brought it on, by the blow struck at Potidæa.

All that we can make out, amidst these uncertified allegations, is, that in the year or two immediately preceding the Peloponnesian war, Periklēs was hard-pressed by the accusations of political enemies—perhaps even in his own person, but certainly in the persons of those who were most in his confidence and affection.¹ And it was in this turn of his political position, that the Lacedæmonians sent to Athens the above-mentioned requisition, that the ancient Kylonian sacrilege might be at length cleared out; in other words, that Periklēs and his family might be banished. Doubtless his enemies, as well as the partisans of Lacedæmon at Athens, would strenuously support this proposition. And the party of Lacedæmon at Athens was always strong, even during the middle of the war:—to act as proxenus to the Lacedæmonians was accounted an honour even by the greatest Athenian families.² On this occasion, however, the manœuvre did not succeed, nor did the Athenians listen to the requisition for banishing the sacrilegious Alkmæônids. On the contrary, they replied that the Spartans too had an account of sacrilege to clear off; for they had violated the sanctuary of Poseidon at Cape Tænarus, in dragging from it some helot suppliants to be put to death—and the sanctuary of Athênê Chalkiœkus at Sparta, in blocking up and starving to death the guilty regent Pausanias. To require that Laconia might be cleared of these two acts of sacrilege—was the only answer which the Athenians made to the demand sent for the banishment of Periklēs.³ Probably the actual effect of that demand was, to strengthen him in the public esteem:⁴ very

¹ It would appear that not only Aspasia and Anaxagoras, but also the musician and philosopher Damon, the personal friend and instructor of Periklēs, must have been banished at a time when Periklēs was old—perhaps somewhere near about this time. The passage in Plato, *Alkibiadēs*, i. c. 30, p. 118, proves that Damon was in Athens and intimate with Periklēs when the latter was of considerable age—*καὶ νῦν ἐτι τηλικούτος ἂν Δάμωνι σύνεστιν αὐτοῦ τούτου ἕνεκα*.

Damon is said to have been ostracised—perhaps he was tried and condemned to banishment: for the two are sometimes confounded.

² See Thucyd. v. 43; vi. 89.

³ Thucyd. i. 128, 135, 139.

⁴ Plutarch, *Periklēs*, c. 33.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 143

different from the effect of the same manœuvre when practised before by Kleomenês against Kleisthenês.

Other Spartan envoys shortly afterwards arrived with fresh demands. The Athenians were now required—1. To withdraw their troops from Potidæa. 2. To replace Ægina in its autonomy. 3. To repeal the decree of exclusion against the Megarians.

It was upon the latter that the greatest stress was laid; an intimation being held out that war might be avoided if such repeal were granted. We see plainly from this proceeding that the Lacedæmonians acted in concert with the anti-Periklêan leaders at Athens. To Sparta and her confederacy the decree against the Megarians was of less importance than the rescue of the Corinthian troops now blocked up in Potidæa. But on the other hand, the party opposed to Periklês would have much better chance of getting a vote of the assembly against him on the subject of the Megarians: and this advantage, if gained, would serve to enfeeble his influence generally. No concession was obtained however on either of the three points: even in respect to Megara, the decree of exclusion was vindicated and upheld against all the force of opposition. At length the Lacedæmonians—who had already resolved upon war and had sent these envoys in mere compliance with the exigencies of ordinary practice, not with any idea of bringing about an accommodation—sent a third batch of envoys with a proposition which at least had the merit of disclosing their real purpose without disguise. Rhamphias and two other Spartans announced to the Athenians the simple injunction: "The Lacedæmonians wish the peace to stand; and it *may* stand, if you will leave the Greeks autonomous." Upon this demand, so very different from the preceding, the Athenians resolved to hold a fresh assembly on the subject of war or peace, to open the whole question anew for discussion, and to determine once for all on a peremptory answer.¹

The last demands presented on the part of Sparta, which went to nothing less than the entire extinction of the Athenian empire—combined with the character, alike wavering and insincere, of the demands previously made, and with the

¹ Thucyd. i. 139. It rather appears, from the words of Thucydides, that these various demands of the Lacedæmonians were made by *one* embassy, joined by new members arriving with fresh instructions, but remaining during a month or six weeks between January and March 431 B.C. installed in the house of the proxenus of Sparta at Athens: compare Xenophon, Hellenic. v. 4, 22.

knowledge that the Spartan confederacy had pronounced peremptorily in favour of war—seemed likely to produce unanimity at Athens, and to bring together this important assembly under the universal conviction that war was inevitable. Such however was not the fact. The reluctance to go to war was sincere amidst the large majority of the assembly; while among a considerable portion of them it was so preponderant, that they even now reverted to the opening which the Lacedæmonians had before held out about the anti-Megarian decree, as if that were the chief cause of war. There was much difference of opinion among the speakers, several of whom insisted upon the repeal of this decree, treating it as a matter far too insignificant to go to war about, and denouncing the obstinacy of Periklēs for refusing to concede such a trifle.¹ Against this opinion Periklēs entered his protest, in an harangue decisive and encouraging, which Dionysius of Halikarnassus ranks among the best speeches in Thucydidēs. The latter historian may probably himself have heard the original speech.

“I continue, Athenians, to adhere to the same conviction, that we must not yield to the Peloponnesians—though I know that men are in one mood, when they sanction the resolution to go to war, and in another, when actually in the contest—their judgements then depending upon the turn of events. I have only to repeat now what I have said on former occasions—and I adjure you who follow my views to adhere to what we jointly resolve, though the result should be partially unfavourable; or else not to take credit for wisdom in the event of success.² For it is very possible that the contingencies of events may depart more from all reasonable track than the counsels of man: such are the unexpected turns which we familiarly impute to Fortune. The Lacedæmonians have before now manifested their hostile aims against us, but on this last occasion more than ever. While the truce prescribes that we are to give and receive amicable satisfaction for our

¹ Thucyd. i. 139; Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 31.

² Thucyd. i. 140. ἐνδέχεται γὰρ τὰς ξυμφορὰς τῶν πραγμάτων οὐχ ἥσσον ἀμαθῶς χωρῆσαι ἢ καὶ τὰς διανοίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· διόπερ καὶ τὴν τύχην ὕσα ἂν παρὰ λόγον ξυμβῇ, εἰώθαμεν αἰτιᾶσθαι. I could have wished in the translation to preserve the play upon the words ἀμαθῶς χωρῆσαι which Thucydidēs introduces into this sentence, and which seems to have been agreeable to his taste. Ἀμαθῶς when referred to ξυμφορὰς is used in a passive sense by no means common—“in a manner which cannot be learned, departing from all reasonable calculation.” Ἀμαθῶς when referred to διανοίας bears its usual meaning—“ignorant, deficient in learning or in reason.”

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 145

differences, and each to retain what we possess—they not only have not asked for such satisfaction, but repudiate it when tendered. They choose to settle complaints by war and not by discussion: they have got beyond the tone of complaint, and are here already with that of command. For they enjoin us to withdraw from Potidæa, to leave Ægina free, and to rescind the decree against the Megarians: nay, these last envoys are even come to proclaim to us, that we must leave all the Greeks free. Now let none of you believe, that we shall be going to war about a trifle, if we refuse to rescind the Megarian decree—which they chiefly put forward, as if its repeal would avert the war. Let none of you take blame to yourselves as if we had gone to war about a small matter. For this small matter contains in itself the whole test and trial of your mettle: if ye yield it, ye will presently have some other greater exaction put upon you, like men who have already truckled on one point from fear: whereas if ye hold out stoutly, ye will make it clear to them that they must deal with you more upon a footing of equality.”¹

Periklēs then examined the relative strength of parties and the chances of war. The Peloponnesians were a self-working population, with few slaves, and without wealth, either private or public: they had no means of carrying on distant or long-continued war. They were ready to expose their persons, but not at all ready to contribute from their very narrow means.² In a border-war, or a single land-battle, they were invincible, but for systematic warfare against a power like Athens, they had neither competent headship, nor habits of concert and punctuality, nor money to profit by opportunities, always rare and accidental, for successful attack. They might perhaps establish a fortified post in Attica, but it would do little serious mischief; while at sea, their inferiority and helplessness would be complete, and the irresistible Athenian navy would take care to keep it so. Nor would they be able to reckon on tempting away the able foreign seamen from Athenian ships by means of funds borrowed from Olympia or Delphi.³ For

¹ Thucyd. i. 140.

² Thucyd. i. 141. αὐτοῦργοί τε γὰρ εἰσι Πελοποννήσιοι, καὶ οὔτε ἰδίᾳ οὔτε ἐν κοινῷ χρήματά ἐστιν αὐτοῖς· ἔπειτα χρόνιων πολέμων καὶ διαποντίων ἀπειροί, διὰ τὸ βραχέως αὐτοὶ ἐπ’ ἀλλήλους ὑπὸ πένιᾳ ἐπιφέρειν.

³ Thucyd. i. 143. εἴτε καὶ κινήσαντες τῶν Ὀλυμπιασίων ἢ Δελφοῖς χρημάτων μισθῷ μείζονι πειρῶντο ἡμῶν ὑπολαβεῖν τοὺς ξένους τῶν ναυτῶν, μὴ ὄντων μὲν ἡμῶν ἀντιπάλων, ἐσθάντων αὐτῶν τε καὶ τῶν μετοίκων, δεινὸν ἂν ᾔην· νῦν δὲ τόδε τε ὑπάρχει, καὶ, ὅπερ κράτιστον, κυβερνήτας ἔχομεν πολίτας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ὑπηρεσίαν πλείους καὶ ἀμείνους ἢ πᾶσα ἢ ἅλλη Ἑλλάς.

besides that the mariners of the dependent islands would find themselves losers even by accepting a higher pay, with the certainty of Athenian vengeance afterwards—Athens herself would suffice to man her fleet in case of need, with her own citizens and metics: she had within her own walls steersmen and mariners better, as well as more numerous, than all Greece besides. There was but one side on which Athens was vulnerable: Attica unfortunately was not an island—it was exposed to invasion and ravage. To this the Athenians must submit, without committing the imprudence of engaging a land battle to avert it. They had abundant lands out of Attica, insular as well as continental, to supply their wants, while they could in their turn, by means of their navy, ravage the Peloponnesian territories, whose inhabitants had no subsidiary lands to recur to.¹

“Mourn not for the loss of land and houses (continued the orator). Reserve your mourning for men: houses and land acquire not men, but men acquire them.² Nay, if I thought I could prevail upon you, I would exhort you to march out and ravage them yourselves, and thus show to the Peloponnesians that for them at least ye will not truckle. And I could exhibit many further grounds for confidently anticipating success, if ye will only be willing not to aim at increased dominion when we are in the midst of war, and not to take upon yourselves new self-imposed risks; for I have ever been more afraid of our own blunders than of the plans of our enemy.³ But these are matters for future discussion, when we come to actual operations: for the present, let us dismiss these envoys with the answer:—That we will permit the Megarians to use our markets and harbours, if the Lacedæmonians on their side will discontinue their (*xenêlasy* or) summary expulsions of ourselves and our allies from their own territory—for there is nothing in the truce to prevent either one or the other: That we will leave the Grecian cities autonomous, if we *had* them as autonomous

This is in reply to those hopes which we know to have been conceived by the Peloponnesian leaders, and upon which the Corinthian speaker in the Peloponnesian congress had dwelt (i. 121). Doubtless Periklēs would be informed of the tenor of all these public demonstrations at Sparta.

¹ Thucyd. i. 141, 142, 143.

² Thucyd. i. 143. *τὴν τε δόρυρσιν μὴ οἰκιῶν καὶ γῆς ποιῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ τῶν σωμάτων· οὐ γὰρ τὰδε τοὺς ἄνδρας, ἀλλ’ οἱ ἄνδρες τὰυτὰ κτῶνται.*

³ Thucyd. i. 144. *πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἔχω ἐς ἐλπίδα τοῦ περιέσεσθαι, ἣν ἐθέλητε ἀρχὴν τε μὴ ἐπικτᾶσθαι ἑμα πολέμουντες, καὶ κινδύνους αὐθαιρέτους μὴ προστίθεσθαι· μᾶλλον γὰρ πεφύβημαι τὰς οἰκέας ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίας ἢ τὰς τῶν ἐναντίων διανοίας.*

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 147

at the time when the truce was made,—and as soon as the Lacedæmonians shall grant to *their* allied cities autonomy such as each of them shall freely choose, not such as is convenient to Sparta: That while we are ready to give satisfaction according to the truce, we will not begin war, but will repel those who do begin it. Such is the reply at once just and suitable to the dignity of this city. We ought to make up our minds that war is inevitable: the more cheerfully we accept it, the less vehement shall we find our enemies in their attack: and where the danger is greatest, there also is the final honour greatest, both for a state and for a private citizen. Assuredly our fathers, when they bore up against the Persians—having no such means as we possess to start from, and even compelled to abandon all that they did possess—both repelled the invader and brought matters forward to our actual pitch, more by advised operation than by good fortune, and by a daring courage greater than their real power. We ought not to fall short of them: we must keep off our enemies in every way, and leave an unimpaired power to our successors.”¹

These animating encouragements of Periklēs carried with them the majority of the assembly, so that answer was made to the envoys, such as he recommended, on each of the particular points in debate. It was announced to them, moreover, on the general question of peace or war, that the Athenians were prepared to discuss all the grounds of complaint against them, pursuant to the truce, by equal and amicable arbitration—but that they would do nothing under authoritative demand.² With this answer the envoys returned to Sparta, and an end was put to negotiation.

It seems evident, from the account of Thucydidēs, that the Athenian public was not brought to this resolution without much reluctance, and great fear of the consequences, especially destruction of property in Attica; and that a considerable minority took opposition on the Megarian decree—the ground skilfully laid by Sparta for breaking the unanimity of her enemy, and strengthening the party opposed to Periklēs. But we may also decidedly infer from the same historian—especially from the proceedings of Corinth and Sparta as he sets them forth—that Athens could not have avoided the war without such an

¹ Thucyd. i. 143, 144.

² Thucyd. i. 145. καὶ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀπεκρίναντο τῇ ἐκείνου γνώμῃ, καθ’ ἑκάστῃ τε ὡς ἔφρασε, καὶ τὸ ξύμπαν οὐδὲν κελεύόμενοι ποιῆσειν, δίκῃ δὲ κατὰ τὰς ξυνθήκας ἐτοίμοι εἶναι διαλύεσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἐπὶ ἴσῃ καὶ δμοίᾳ.

abnegation both of dignity and power as no nation under any government will ever submit to, and as would even have left her without decent security for her individual rights. To accept the war tendered to her was a matter not merely of prudence but of necessity: the tone of exaction assumed by the Spartan envoys would have rendered concession a mere evidence of weakness and fear. As the account of Thucydidēs bears out the judgement of Periklēs on this important point,¹ so it also shows us that Athens was not less in the right upon the received principles of international dealing. It was not Athens, (as the Spartans² themselves afterwards came to feel,) but her enemies, who broke the provisions of the truce, by encouraging the revolt of Potidæa, and by promising invasion of Attica: it was not Athens, but her enemies, who after thus breaking the truce, made a string of exorbitant demands, in order to get up as good a case as possible for war.³ The case made out by Periklēs, justifying the war on grounds both of right and prudence, is in all its main points borne out by the impartial voice of Thucydidēs. And though it is perfectly true, that the ambition of Athens had been great, and the increase of her power marvellous, during the thirty-five years between the repulse of Xerxes and the Thirty years' truce—it is not less true that by that truce she lost very largely, and that she acquired nothing to compensate such loss during the fourteen years between the truce and the Korkyræan alliance. The policy of Periklēs had not been one of foreign aggrandisement, or of increasing vexation and encroachment towards other Grecian powers. Even the Korkyræan alliance was noway courted by him, and was in truth accepted with paramount regard to the obligations of the existing truce; while the circumstances, out of which that alliance grew, testify a more forward ambition on the part of Corinth than on that of Athens,

¹ In spite of the contrary view taken by Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 31: and in his comparison of Perikl. and Fab. Max. c. 3.

² Thucyd. iv. 21. Οἱ μὲν οὖν Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοσαῦτα εἶπον, νομίζοντες τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐν τῷ πρὶν χρόνῳ σπονδῶν ἐπιθυμεῖν, σφῶν δὲ ἐναντιουμένων καλύεσθαι, δεδομένης δὲ εἰρήνης ἀσμένως δέξεσθαι τε καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀποδώσειν.

See also an important passage (vii. 18) about the feelings of the Spartans. The Spartans thought, says Thucydidēs, ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ πολέμῳ (the beginning of the Peloponnesian war) σφέτερον τὸ παρανόμημα μάλλον γενέσθαι, ὅτι τε ἐς Πλάταιαν ἦλθον Θηβαῖοι ἐν σπονδαῖς, καὶ εἰρημένον ἐν ταῖς πρότερον ξυνηθείαις ὅπλα μὴ ἐπιφέρειν ἦν δίκας θέλωσι διδόναι, αὐτοὶ οὐχ ὑπήκουον ἐς δίκας προκαλουμένων τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰκότως δυστυχεῖν τε ἐνόμιζον, &c.

³ Thucyd. i. 126. ὅπως σφίσις ὅτι μεγίστη πρόφασις εἴη τοῦ πολεμεῖν.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 149

to appropriate to herself the Korkyræan naval force. It is common to ascribe the Peloponnesian war to the ambition of Athens, but this is a partial view of the case. The aggressive sentiment, partly fear, partly hatred, was on the side of the Peloponnesians, who were not ignorant that Athens desired the continuance of peace, but were resolved not to let her stand as she was at the conclusion of the Thirty years' truce. It was their purpose to attack her and break down her empire, as dangerous, wrongful, and anti-Hellenic. The war was thus partly a contest of principle, involving the popular proclamation of the right of every Grecian state to autonomy, against Athens: partly a contest of power, wherein Spartan and Corinthian ambition was not less conspicuous, and far more aggressive in the beginning, than Athenian.

Conformably to what is here said, the first blow of the war was struck, not by Athens, but against her. After the decisive answer given to the Spartan envoys, taken in conjunction with the previous proceedings, and the preparations actually going on, among the Peloponnesian confederacy—the truce could hardly be said to be still in force, though there was no formal proclamation of rupture. A few weeks passed in restricted and mistrustful intercourse;¹ though individuals who passed the borders did not yet think it necessary to take a herald with them, as in time of actual war. Had the excess of ambition been on the side of Athens compared with her enemies, this was the time for her to strike the first blow, carrying with it of course great probability of success, before their preparations were completed. But she remained strictly within the limits of the truce, while the disastrous series of mutual aggressions, destined to tear in pieces the entrails of Hellas, was opened by her enemy and her neighbour.

The little town of Plataea, still hallowed by the memorable victory over the Persians as well as by the tutelary consecration received from Pausanias, was the scene of this unforeseen enterprise. It stood in Bœotia, immediately north of Kithærôn; with the borders of Attica on one side, and the Theban territory (from which it was separated by the river Asôpus) on the other: the distance between Plataea and Thebes being about seventy stadia, or eight miles. Though Bœotian by descent, the Plataeans were completely separated from the Bœotian league, and in hearty alliance (as well as qualified

¹ Thucyd. i. 146. ἐπεμίνυντο δ' ὁμῶς ἐν αὐταῖς καὶ παρ' ἀλλήλους ἐφοίτων, ἀκηρύκτως μὲν, ἀνυπόπτως δ' οὐ· σπονδῶν γὰρ ξύγχυσις τὰ γιγνόμενα ἦν, καὶ πρόφασις τοῦ πολεμεῖν.

communion of civil rights) with the Athenians, who had protected them against the bitter enmity of Thebes, for a period of now nearly three generations. But in spite of this long prescription, the Thebans, as chiefs of the Bœotian league, still felt themselves wronged by the separation of Plataea. An oligarchical faction of wealthy Plataeans espoused their cause,¹ with a view of subverting the democratical government of the town—of destroying its leaders, their political rivals—and of establishing an oligarchy with themselves as the chiefs. Naukleidês, and others of this faction, entered into a secret conspiracy with Eurymachus and the oligarchy of Thebes. To both it appeared a tempting prize, since war was close at hand, to take advantage of this ambiguous interval, before watches had been placed and the precautions of a state of war commenced. They resolved to surprise the town of Plataea in the night, during a period of religious festival, in order that the population might be most completely off their guard.² Accordingly on a rainy night towards the close of March, 431 B.C.,³ a body of rather more than 300 Theban hoplites, commanded by two of the Bœotarchs, Pythangelus and Diemporus, and including Eurymachus in the ranks, presented themselves at the gate of Plataea during the first sleep of the citizens. Naukleidês and his partisans opened the gate and conducted them to the agora, which they reached and occupied in military order without the least resistance. The best part of the Theban military force was intended to arrive at Plataea by break of day, in order to support them.⁴

¹ Thucyd. ii. 2. βουλόμενοι ἰδίᾳς ἕνεκα δυνάμεως ἄνδρας τε τῶν πολιτῶν τοὺς σφόδρῳ ὑπεναντίους διαφθεῖραι, καὶ τὴν πόλιν τοῖς Θηβαίοις προσποιῆσαι : also iii. 65, ἄνδρες οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ χρήμασι καὶ γένει, &c.

² Thucyd. iii. 56.

³ Thucyd. ii. 2. ἔμα ἤρι ἀρχομένη—seems to indicate a period rather before than after the first of April : we may consider the bisection of the Thucydidean year into θέρος and χειμῶν as marked by the equinoxes. His summer and winter are each a half of the year (Thucyd. v. 20), though Poppo erroneously treats the Thucydidean winter as only four months (Poppo, Proleg. i. c. v. p. 72, and ad Thucyd. ii. 2 : see F. W. Ullrich, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Thukydides, p. 32, Hamburg, 1846).

⁴ Thucyd. ii. 2–5. θέμενοι δὲ ἐς τὴν ἀγορὰν τὰ ὅπλα. . . . καὶ ἀνείπεν ὁ κήρυξ, εἴ τις βούλεται κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τῶν πάντων Βοιωτῶν ξυμμαχεῖν, τίθεσθαι παρ' αὐτοὺς τὰ ὅπλα.

Dr. Arnold has a note upon this passage, explaining τίθεσθαι or θέσθαι τὰ ὅπλα to mean, “piling the arms,” or getting rid of their spears and shields by piling them all in one or more heaps. He says—“The Thebans, therefore, as usual on a halt, proceeded to pile their arms, and by inviting the Plataeans to come and pile theirs with them, they meant that they should come in arms from their several houses to join them, and

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 151

Naukleidēs and his friends, following the instincts of political antipathy, were eager to conduct the Thebans to the houses of their opponents the democratical leaders, in order that the latter might be seized or despatched. But to this the Thebans would not consent. Believing themselves now masters of the town, and certain of a large reinforcement at daylight, they thought they could overawe the citizens into an apparently willing acquiescence in their terms, without any actual violence. They wished moreover rather to soften and justify, than to aggravate, the gross public wrong already committed. Accordingly their herald was directed to invite by public proclamation all Plateans who were willing to return to their ancient sympathies of race and to the Boeotian confederacy, that they should come forth and take station as brethren in the armed ranks of the Thebans. And the Plateans, suddenly roused

thus naturally pile their spears and shields with those of their friends, to be taken up together with theirs, whenever there should be occasion either to march or to fight." The same explanation of the phrase had before been given by Wesseling and Larcher, ad Herodot. ix. 52; though Bähr on the passage is more satisfactory.

Both Poppo and Gölter also sanction Dr. Arnold's explanation: yet I cannot but think that it is unsuitable to the passage before us, as well as to several other passages in which *τίθεςθαι τὰ ὅπλα* occurs: there may be other passages in which it will suit, but as a general explanation it appears to me inadmissible. In most cases the words mean "*armati consistere*"—to ground arms—to maintain rank, resting the spear and shield (see Xenoph. Hellen. ii. 4, 12) upon the ground. In the incident now before us, the Theban hoplites enter Plataea, a strange town, with the population decidedly hostile, and likely to be provoked more than ever by this surprise; add to which, that it is pitch dark and a rainy night. Is it likely that the first thing which they do will be to pile their arms? The darkness alone would render it a slow and uncertain operation to resume the arms: so that when the Plateans attacked them, as they did quite suddenly and unexpectedly, and while it was yet dark, the Thebans would have been (upon Dr. Arnold's supposition) altogether defenceless and unarmed (see ii. 3. *προέβαλόν τε εὐθύς (οἱ Πλαταιῆς) καὶ ἐς χεῖρας ἤεσαν κατὰ τάχος*)—which certainly they were not. Dr. Arnold's explanation may suit the case of the soldier in camp, but certainly not that of the soldier in presence of an enemy, or under circumstances of danger: the difference of the two will be found illustrated in Xenophon, Hellenic. ii. 4, 5, 6.

Nor do the passages referred to by Dr. Arnold himself bear out his interpretation of the phrase *τίθεςθαι τὰ ὅπλα*. That interpretation is moreover not conveniently applicable either to Thucyd. vii. 3, or viii. 25—decidedly inapplicable to iv. 68 (*θηρόμενον τὰ ὅπλα*), in the description of the night attack on Megara, very analogous to this upon Plataea—and not less decidedly inapplicable to two passages of Xenophon's Anabasis, i. 5, 14; iv. 3, 7.

Schneider, in the Lexicon appended to his edition of Xenophon's Anabasis, has a long but not very distinct article upon *τίθεςθαι τὰ ὅπλα*.

from sleep by the astounding news that their great enemy was master of the town, supposed amidst the darkness that the number of assailants was far greater than the reality: so that in spite of their strong attachment to Athens, they thought their case hopeless, and began to open negotiations. But finding out soon, in spite of the darkness, as the discussion proceeded, that the real numbers of the Thebans were not greater than could be dealt with—they speedily took courage and determined to attack them; establishing communication with each other by breaking through the walls of their private houses, in order that they might not be detected in moving about in the streets or ways¹—and forming barricades with waggons across such of these ways as were suitable.

A little before daybreak, when their preparations were fully completed, they sallied forth from their houses to the attack, and immediately came to close quarters with the Thebans. The latter, still fancying themselves masters of the town and relying upon a satisfactory close to the discussions when daylight should arrive, now found themselves surprised in their turn, and under great disadvantages. Having been out all night under a heavy rain—they were enclosed in a town which they did not know, with narrow, crooked, and muddy ways, such as they would have had difficulty in tracking out even by daylight. Nevertheless, on finding themselves suddenly assailed they got as well as they could into close order, and repelled the Plataeans two or three times. The attack was repeated with loud shouts, while the women also screamed, howled, and threw tiles from the flat-roofed houses, until at length the Thebans

¹ Thucyd. ii. 3. ἐδόκει οὖν ἐπιχειρητέα εἶναι, καὶ ξυνελέγοντο διορύσσοντες τοὺς κοινούς τοίχους παρ' ἀλλήλους, ὅπως μὴ διὰ τῶν ὁδῶν φανεροὶ ᾖσιν ἰόντες, ἀμάξας δὲ ἐνευ τῶν ὑποζυγίων εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καθίστασαν, ἵνα ἀντὶ τείχους ᾖ, καὶ τὰλλα ἐξήρτυον, &c.

I may illustrate this by a short extract from the letter of M. Mariast, mayor of Paris, to the National Assembly, written during the formidable insurrection of June 25, 1848, in that city, and describing the proceedings of the insurgents: "Dans la plupart des rues longues, étroites, et couvertes de barricades qui vont de l'Hotel de Ville à la Rue St. Antoine, la garde nationale mobile, et la troupe de ligne, ont dû faire le siège de chaque maison; et ce qui rendait l'œuvre plus périlleuse, c'est que les insurgés avaient établi, de chaque maison à chaque maison, des communications intérieures qui reliaient les maisons entre elles, en sorte qu'ils pouvaient se rendre, comme par une allée couverte, d'un point éloigné jusqu'au centre d'une suite de barricades qui les protégeaient." (Lettre publiée dans le journal, *Le National*, June 26, 1848.)

A similar establishment of internal communication between adjoining houses in the street, was one of the most memorable features of the heroic defence of Saragossa against the French, in the Peninsular War.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 153

became dismayed and broken. But flight was not less difficult than resistance ; for they could not find their way out of the city, and even the gate by which they entered, the only one open, had been closed by a Plataean citizen who thrust into it the point of a javelin in place of the peg whereby the bar was commonly held fast. Dispersed about the city and pursued by men who knew every inch of the ground, some ran to the top of the wall, and jumped down on the outside, most of them perishing in the attempt—a few others escaped through an unguarded gate, by cutting through the bar with a hatchet which a woman gave to them—while the greater number ran into the open doors of a large barn or building in conjunction with the wall, mistaking these doors for an approach to the town-gate. They were here blocked up without a chance of escape, and the Plataeans at first thought of setting fire to the building. But at length a convention was concluded, whereby they, as well as the other Thebans in the city, agreed to surrender at discretion.¹

Had the reinforcements from Thebes arrived at the expected hour, this disaster would have been averted. But the heavy rain and dark night retarded their whole march, while the river Asôpus was so much swollen as to be with difficulty fordable : so that before they reached the gates of Plataea, their comrades within were either slain or captured. Which fate had befallen them, the Thebans without could not tell : but they immediately resolved to seize what they could find, persons as well as property, in the Plataean territory (no precautions having been taken as yet to guard against the perils of war by keeping within the walls), in order that they might have something to exchange for such Thebans as were prisoners. Before this step could be executed, however, a herald came forth from the town to remonstrate with them upon their unholy proceeding in having so flagrantly violated the truce, and especially to warn them not to do any wrong without the walls. If they retired without inflicting further mischief, their prisoners within should be given up to them ; if otherwise, these prisoners would be slain immediately. A convention having been concluded and sworn to on this basis, the Thebans retired without any active measures.

Such at least was the Theban account of what preceded their retirement. But the Plataeans gave a different statement ; denying that they had made any categorical promise or sworn

¹ Thucyd. ii. 3, 4.

any oath—and affirming that they had engaged for nothing except to suspend any decisive step with regard to the prisoners, until discussion had been entered into to see if a satisfactory agreement could be concluded.

As Thucydides records both of these statements, without intimating to which of the two he himself gave the preference, we may presume that both of them found credence with respectable persons. The Theban story is undoubtedly the most probable: but the Plataeans appear to have violated the understanding, even upon their own construction of it. For no sooner had the Thebans retired, than they (the Plataeans) hastily brought in their citizens and the best of their moveable property within the walls, and then slew all their prisoners forthwith, without even entering into the formalities of negotiation. The prisoners thus put to death, among whom was Eurymachus himself, were 180 in number.¹

On the first entrance of the Theban assailants at night, a messenger had started from Plataea to carry the news to Athens: a second messenger followed him to report the victory and capture of the prisoners, as soon as it had been achieved. The Athenians sent back a herald without delay, enjoining the Plataeans to take no step respecting the prisoners until consultation should be had with Athens. Periklēs doubtless feared what turned out to be the fact; for the prisoners had been slain before his messenger could arrive. Apart from the terms of the convention, and looking only to the received practice of

¹ Thucyd. ii. 5, 6; Herodot. vii. 233. Demosthenēs (cont. Neæram, c. 25, p. 1379) agrees with Thucydides in the statement that the Plataeans slew their prisoners. From whom Diodorus borrowed his inadmissible story, that the Plataeans gave up their prisoners to the Thebans, I cannot tell (Diodor. xii. 41, 42).

The passage in this Oration against Neæra is also curious, both as it agrees with Thucydides on many points and as it differs from him on several others: in some sentences, even the words agree with Thucydides (*ὁ γὰρ Ἀσσιπὸς ποταμὸς μέγας ἐρρύη, καὶ διαβῆναι οὐ ῥᾶδιον ἦν*, &c.: compare Thucyd. ii. 2); while on other points there is discrepancy. Demosthenēs (or the Pseudo-Demosthenēs) states that Archidamus king of Sparta planned the surprise of Plataea—that the Plataeans only discovered, when morning dawned, the small real number of the Thebans in the town—that the larger body of Thebans, when they at last did arrive near Plataea after the great delay in their march, were forced to retire by the numerous force arriving from Athens, and that the Plataeans then destroyed their prisoners in the town. Demosthenēs mentions nothing about any convention between the Plataeans and the Thebans without the town, respecting the Theban prisoners within.

On every point on which the narrative of Thucydides differs from that of Demosthenēs, the former stands out as the most coherent and credible.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 155

ancient warfare, their destruction could not be denounced as unusually cruel, though the Thebans afterwards, when fortune was in their favour, chose to designate it as such.¹ But impartial contemporaries would notice, and the Athenians in particular would deeply lament, the glaring impolicy of the act. For Thebes, the best thing of all would of course be to get back her captured citizens forthwith: but next to that, the least evil would be, to hear that they had been put to death. In the hands of the Athenians and Plataeans, they would have been the means of obtaining from her much more valuable sacrifices than their lives, considered as a portion of Theban power, were worth: so strong was the feeling of sympathy for imprisoned citizens, several of them men of rank and importance,—as may be seen by the past conduct of Athens after the battle of Korôneia, and by that of Sparta (hereafter to be recounted) after the taking of Sphaktêria. The Plataeans, obeying the simple instinct of wrath and vengeance, threw away this great political advantage, which the more long-sighted Periklês would gladly have turned to account.

At the time when the Athenians sent their herald to Plataea, they also issued orders for seizing all Boeotians who might be found in Attica; while they lost no time in sending forces to provision Plataea and placing it on the footing of a garrison town, removing to Athens the old men and sick, with the women and children. No complaint or discussion respecting the recent surprise, was thought of by either party. It was evident to both that the war was now actually begun—that nothing was to be thought of except the means of carrying it on—and that there could be no further personal intercourse except under the protection of heralds.² The incident at Plataea, striking in all its points, wound up all parties to the full pitch of warlike excitement. A spirit of resolution and enterprise was abroad everywhere, especially among those younger citizens, yet unacquainted with the actual bitterness of war, whom the long truce but just broken had raised up. And the contagion of high-strung feeling spread from the leading combatants into every corner of Greece, manifesting itself partly in multiplied oracles, prophecies, and religious legends adapted to the moment.³ A recent earthquake at Delos, too, as well as various other extraordinary physical phænomena, were construed as prognostics of the awful struggle impending—

¹ Thucyd. iii. 66.

² Thucyd. ii. 1-6.

³ Thucyd. ii. 7, 8. *ἡ τε ἅλλη Ἑλλὰς πᾶσα μετέωρος ἦν, ξυνιουσῶν τῶν πρώτων πόλεων.*

a period fatally marked not less by eclipses, earthquakes, drought, famine, and pestilence, than by the direct calamities of war.¹

An aggression so unwarrantable as the assault on Plataea tended doubtless to strengthen the unanimity of the Athenian assembly, to silence the opponents of Periklēs, and to lend additional weight to those frequent exhortations² whereby the great statesman was wont to sustain the courage of his countrymen. Intelligence was sent round to forewarn and hearten up the numerous allies of Athens, tributary as well as free. The latter, with the exception of the Thessalians, Akarnanians, and Messenians at Naupaktus, were all insular—Chians, Lesbians, Korkyraeans, and Zakynthians. To the island of Kephallenia, the Athenians sent envoys, but it was not actually acquired to their alliance until a few months afterwards.³ With the Akarnanians, too, their connexion had only been commenced a short time before, seemingly during the preceding summer, arising out of the circumstances of the town of Argos in Amphilochia.

That town, situated on the southern coast of the Ambrakian Gulf, was originally occupied by a portion of the Amphilochi, a non-Hellenic tribe, whose lineage apparently was something intermediate between Akarnanians and Epirots. Some colonists from Ambrakia, having been admitted as co-residents with the Amphilochian inhabitants of this town, presently expelled them, and retained the town with its territory exclusively for themselves. The expelled inhabitants, fraternising with their fellow tribes around as well as with the Akarnanians, looked out for the means of restoration; and in order to obtain it, invited the assistance of Athens. Accordingly the Athenians sent an expedition of thirty triremes under Phormio, who, joining the Amphilochians and Akarnanians, attacked and carried Argos, reduced the Ambrakiots to slavery, and restored the town to the Amphilochians and Akarnanians. It was on this occasion that the alliance of the Akarnanians with Athens was first concluded, and that their personal attachment to the Athenian admiral Phormio commenced.⁴

¹ Thucyd. i. 23.

² Thucyd. ii. 13. *ἀπερ καὶ πρότερον, &c. ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ ἄλλα, οἷά περ ἰώθει, Περικλῆς ἐς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ περιέσεσθαι τῷ πολέμῳ.*

³ Thucyd. ii. 7, 22, 30.

⁴ Thucyd. ii. 68. The time at which this expedition of Phormio and the capture of Argos happened, is not precisely marked by Thucydides. But his words seem to imply that it was before the commencement of the war, as Poppo observes. Phormio was sent to Chalkidikē about October

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 157

The numerous subjects of Athens, whose contributions stood embodied in the annual tribute, were distributed all over and around the Ægean, including all the islands north of Krete, with the exception of Melos and Thera.¹ Moreover the elements of force collected in Athens itself were fully worthy of the metropolis of so great an empire. Periklês could make a report to his countrymen of 300 triremes fit for active service; 1200 horsemen and horse-bowmen; 1600 bowmen; and the great force of all, not less than 29,000 hoplites—mostly citizens, but in part also metics. The chosen portion of these hoplites, both as to age and as to equipment, were 13,000 in number; while the remaining 16,000, including the elder and younger citizens and the metics, did garrison duty on the walls of Athens and Peiræus—on the long line of wall which connected Athens both with Peiræus and Phalêrum—and in the various fortified posts both in and out of Attica. In addition to these large military and naval forces, the city possessed in the acropolis an accumulated treasure of coined silver amounting to not less than 6000 talents, or about £1,400,000, derived from annual laying by of tribute from the allies and perhaps of other revenues besides. The treasure had at one time been as large as 9700 talents, or about £2,230,000, but the cost of the recent religious and architectural decorations at Athens, as well as the siege of Potidæa, had reduced it to 6000. Moreover the acropolis and the temples throughout the city were rich in votive offerings, deposits, sacred plate, and silver implements for the processions and festivals, &c., to an amount estimated at more than 500 talents, while the great statue of the goddess recently set up by Pheidias in the Parthenon, composed of ivory and gold, included a quantity of the latter metal not less than 40 talents in weight—equal in value to more than 400 talents of silver—and all of it so arranged that it could be taken off from the statue at pleasure. In alluding to these sacred valuables among the resources of the state, Periklês spoke of them only as open to be so applied in case of need, with the firm resolution of replacing them during the first season of prosperity, just as the Corinthians had proposed to borrow from Delphi and Olympia. Besides the hoard thus actually in hand, there came in a large annual revenue, amounting

or November 432 B.C. (i. 64): and the expedition against Argos probably occurred between that event and the naval conflict of Korkyræans and Athenians against Corinthians with their allies, Ambrakiots included—which conflict had happened in the preceding spring.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 9.

under the single head of tribute from the subject-allies, to 600 talents, equal to about £138,000; besides all other items,¹ making up a general total of at least 1000 talents, or about £230,000.

To this formidable catalogue of means for war, were to be added other items not less important, but which did not admit of being weighed and numbered; the unrivalled maritime skill and discipline of the seamen—the democratical sentiment, alike fervent and unanimous, of the general mass of citizens—and the superior development of directing intelligence. And when we consider that the enemy had indeed on his side an irresistible land-force, but scarcely anything else—few ships, no trained seamen, no funds, no powers of combination or headship—we may be satisfied that there were ample materials for an orator like Periklês to draw an encouraging picture of the future. He could depict Athens as holding Peloponnesus under siege by means of her navy and a chain of insular posts;² and he could guarantee success³ as the sure reward of persevering, orderly, and well-considered exertion, combined with firm endurance under a period of temporary, but unavoidable suffering; and combined too with another condition hardly less difficult for Athenian temper to comply with—abstinence from seductive speculations of distant enterprise, while their force was required by the necessities of war near home.⁴ But such prospects were founded upon a long-sighted calculation, looking beyond immediate loss and therefore ill-calculated to take hold of the mind of an ordinary citizen—or at any rate likely to be overwhelmed for the moment by the pressure of actual hardship. Moreover, the best which Periklês could promise was a successful resistance—the unimpaired maintenance of that great empire to which Athens had become accustomed; a policy purely conservative, without any stimulus from the hope of positive acquisition—and not only without the sympathy of other states, but with feelings of simple acquiescence on the part of most of her allies—of strong hostility everywhere else.

On all these latter points the position of the Peloponnesian

¹ Thucyd. ii. 13; Xenophon, Anab. vii. 4.

² Thucyd. ii. 7. *ὡς βεβαίως περίξ τὴν Πελοπόννησον καταπολεμήσονται.*
vi. 90. *περίξ τὴν Πελοπόννησον πολιορκοῦντες.*

³ Thucyd. ii. 65. *τοσοῦτον τῷ Περικλεῖ ἐπερίσσευσε τότε ἀφ' ὧν αὐτὸς προέγνω, καὶ πάντῃ ἂν ῥαδίως περιγενέσθαι τῶν Πελοποννησίων αὐτῶν τῷ πολέμῳ.*

⁴ Thucyd. i. 144. *ἦν ἐθέλητε ἀρχὴν τε μὴ ἐπικτᾶσθαι ἅμα πολεμοῦντες, καὶ κινδύνους ἀνθάρετους μὴ προστίθεσθαι.*

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 159

alliance was far more encouraging. So powerful a body of confederates had never been got together—not even to resist Xerxes. Not only the entire strength of Peloponnesus (except Argeians and Achæans, both of whom were neutral at first, though the Achæan town of Pellênê joined even at the beginning, and all the rest subsequently) was brought together, but also the Megarians, Bœotians, Phokians, Opuntian Lokrians, Ambrakiots, Leukadians and Anaktorians. Among these, Corinth, Megara, Sikyon, Pellênê, Elis, Ambrakia, and Leukas furnished maritime force, while the Bœotians, Phokians, and Lokrians supplied cavalry. Many of these cities however supplied hoplites besides; but the remainder of the confederates furnished hoplites only. It was upon this latter force, not omitting the powerful Bœotian cavalry, that the main reliance was placed; especially for the first and most important operation of the war—the devastation of Attica. Bound together by the strongest common feeling of active antipathy to Athens, the whole confederacy was full of hope and confidence for this immediate forward march—gratifying at once both to their hatred and to their love of plunder, by the hand of destruction laid upon the richest country in Greece—and presenting a chance even of terminating the war at once, if the pride of the Athenians should be so intolerably stung as to provoke them to come out and fight. Certainty of immediate success, at the first outset—a common purpose to be accomplished and a common enemy to be put down, with favourable sympathies throughout Greece—all these circumstances filled the Peloponnesians with sanguine hopes at the beginning of the war. And the general persuasion was, that Athens, even if not reduced to submission by the first invasion, could not possibly hold out more than two or three summers against the repetition of this destructive process.¹ Strongly did this confidence contrast with the proud and resolute submission to necessity, not without desponding anticipations of the result, which reigned among the auditors of Periklês.²

But though the Peloponnesians entertained confident belief

¹ Thucyd. vii. 28. ὅσοι κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ πολέμου, οἱ μὲν ἐνιαυτόν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ τριῶν γε ἔτων οὐδεὶς πλεῖω χρόνον, ἐνδομίζον περιόλσειν αὐτούς (the Athenians), εἰ οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι ἐσβάλοιν ἐς τὴν χώραν: compare v. 14.

² Thucyd. vi. 11, διὰ τὸ παρὰ γνώμην αὐτῶν, πρὸς ἃ ἐφοβείσθε τὸ πρῶτόν, περιγεγενῆσθαι, καταφρονήσαντες ἤδη καὶ τῆς Σικελίας ἐφίσθε. It is Nikias, who, in dissuading the expedition against Syracuse, reminds the Athenians of their past despondency at the beginning of the war.

of carrying their point by simple land-campaign, they did not neglect auxiliary preparations for naval and prolonged war. The Lacedæmonians resolved to make up the naval force already existing among themselves and their allies to an aggregate of 500 triremes; chiefly by the aid of the friendly Dorian cities on the Italian and Sicilian coast. Upon each of them a specific contribution was imposed, together with a given contingent; orders being transmitted to them to make such preparations silently without any immediate declaration of hostility against Athens, and even without refusing for the present to admit any single Athenian ship into their harbours.¹ Besides this, the Lacedæmonians laid their schemes for sending envoys to the Persian king and to other barbaric powers—a remarkable evidence of melancholy revolution in Grecian affairs, when that potentate, whom the common arm of Greece had so hardly repulsed a few years before, was now invoked to bring the Phœnician fleet again into the Ægean for the purpose of crushing Athens.

The invasion of Attica however without delay was the primary object to be accomplished; and for that the Lacedæmonians issued circular orders immediately after the attempted surprise of Plataea. Though the vote of the allies was requisite to sanction any war, yet when that vote had once been passed, the Lacedæmonians took upon themselves to direct all the measures of execution. Two-thirds of the hoplites of each confederate city—apparently two-thirds of a certain assumed rating for which the city was held liable in the books of the confederacy, so that the Bœotians and others who furnished cavalry, were not constrained to send two-thirds of their entire force of hoplites—were summoned to be present on a certain day at the isthmus of Corinth, with provisions and equipment for an expedition of some length.² On the day named, the entire force was found duly assembled. The Spartan king Archidamus, on taking the command, addressed to the commanders and principal officers from each city a discourse of solemn warning as well as encouragement. His remarks were directed chiefly to abate the tone of sanguine over-confidence which reigned in the army. After adverting to the magnitude of the occasion, the mighty impulse agitating all Greece, and the general good wishes which accompanied them against an

¹ Thucyd. ii. 7. Diodorus says that the Italian and Sicilian allies were required to furnish 200 triremes (xii. 41). Nothing of the kind seems to have been actually furnished.

² Thucyd. ii. 10-12.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 161

enemy so much hated—he admonished them not to let their great superiority of numbers and bravery seduce them into a spirit of rash disorder. “We are about to attack (he said) an enemy admirably equipped in every way, so that we may expect certainly that they will come out and fight,¹ even if they be not now actually on the march to meet us at the border, at least when they see us in their territory ravaging and destroying their property. All men exposed to any unusual indignity become incensed, and act more under passion than under calculation, when it is actually brought under their eyes: much more will the Athenians do so, accustomed as they are to empire, and to ravage the territory of others rather than to see their own so treated.”

Immediately on the army being assembled, Archidamus sent Melésippus as envoy to Athens to announce the coming invasion, being still in hopes that the Athenians would yield. But a resolution had been already adopted, at the instance of Periklês, to receive neither herald nor envoy from the Lacedæmonians when once their army was on its march: so that Melésippus was sent back without even being permitted to enter the city. He was ordered to quit the territory before sunset, with guides to accompany him and prevent him from addressing a word to any one. On parting from his guides at the border, Melésippus exclaimed,² with a solemnity but too accurately justified by the event—“This day will be the beginning of many calamities to the Greeks.”

Archidamus, as soon as the reception of his last envoy was made known to him, continued his march from the isthmus into Attica—which territory he entered by the road of Cēnoë, the frontier Athenian fortress of Attica towards Bœotia. His march was slow, and he thought it necessary to make a regular attack on the fort of Cēnoë, which had been put into so good a state of defence, that after all the various modes of assault, in which the Lacedæmonians were not skilful, had been tried in vain³—and after a delay of several days before the place,—he was compelled to renounce the attempt.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 11. ὥστε χρή καὶ πάνυ ἐλπίζειν διὰ μάχης ἵεναὶ αὐτοὺς, εἰ μὴ καὶ νῦν ὤρμηται, ἐν ᾧ οὐπω πάρεσμεν, ἀλλ’ ὅταν ἐν τῇ γῇ ὁρῶσιν ἡμᾶς δροῦντάς τε καὶ τάκείνων φθείροντας.

These reports of speeches are of great value as preserving a record of the feelings and expectations of actors, apart from the result of events. What Archidamus so confidently anticipated did *not* come to pass.

² Thucyd. ii. 12.

³ Thucyd. ii. 19. πᾶσαν ἰδέαν πειράσαντες οὐκ ἐδύναντο ἐλεῖν. The situation of Cēnoë is not exactly agreed upon by topographical inquirers:

The want of enthusiasm on the part of the Spartan king—his multiplied delays, first at the isthmus, next in the march, and lastly before Cēnoê—were all offensive to the fiery impatience of the army, who were loud in their murmurs against him. He acted upon the calculation already laid down in his discourse at Sparta¹—that the highly-cultivated soil of Attica was to be looked upon as a hostage for the pacific dispositions of the Athenians, who would be more likely to yield when devastation, though not yet inflicted, was nevertheless impending and at their doors. In this point of view, a little delay at the border was no disadvantage; and perhaps the partisans of peace at Athens may have encouraged him to hope that it would enable them to prevail.

Nor can we doubt that it was a moment full of difficulty to Periklēs at Athens. He had to proclaim to all the proprietors in Attica the painful truth, that they must prepare to see their lands and houses overrun and ruined; and that their persons, families, and moveable property must be brought in for safety either to Athens, or to one of the forts in the territory—or carried across to one of the neighbouring islands. It would indeed make a favourable impression when he told them that Archidamus was his own family friend, yet only within such limits as consisted with duty to the city: in case therefore the invaders, while ravaging Attica, should receive instruction to spare his own lands, he would forthwith make them over to the state as public property. Such a case was likely enough to arise, if not from the personal feeling of Archidamus, at least from the deliberate manœuvre of the Spartans, who would seek thus to set the Athenian public against Periklēs, as they had tried to do before by demanding the banishment of the sacrilegious Alkmæōnid race.² But though this declaration from Periklēs would doubtless provoke a hearty cheer, yet the lesson which he had to inculcate—not simply for admission as prudent

it was near Eleutheræ, and on one of the roads from Attica into Bœotia (Harpokration, v. Οἰώνη; Herodot. v. 74). Archidamus marched probably from the Isthmus over Geraneia, and fell into this road in order to receive the junction of the Bœotian contingent after it had crossed Kithæron.

¹ Thucyd. i. 82; ii. 18.

² Thucyd. ii. 13: compare Tacitus, *Histor.* v. 23. "*Cerealis, insulam Batavorum hostiliter populatus, agros Civilis, nolâ arte ducum, intactos sinebat.*" Also Livy, ii. 39.

Justin affirms that the Lacedæmonian invaders actually did leave the lands of Periklēs uninjured, and that he made them over to the people (iii. 7). Thucydides does not say whether the case really occurred: see also Polyænus, i. 36.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 163

policy, but for actual practice—was one revolting alike to the immediate interest, the dignity, and the sympathies of his countrymen. To see their lands all ravaged, without raising an arm to defend them—to carry away their wives and families, and to desert and dismantle their country residences, as they had done during the Persian invasion—all in the confidence of compensation in other ways and of remote ultimate success—were recommendations which probably no one but Periklês could have hoped to enforce. They were moreover the more painful to execute, inasmuch as the Athenian citizens had very generally retained the habits of residing permanently, not in Athens, but in the various demes of Attica; many of which still preserved their temples, their festivals, their local customs, and their limited municipal autonomy, handed down from the day when they had once been independent of Athens.¹ It was but recently that the farming, the comforts, and the ornaments, thus distributed over Attica, had been restored from the ruin of the Persian invasion, and brought to a higher pitch of improvement than ever. Yet the fruits of this labour, and the scenes of these local affections, were now to be again deliberately abandoned to a new aggressor, and exchanged for the utmost privation and discomfort. Archidamus might well doubt whether the Athenians would nerve themselves up to the pitch of resolution necessary for this distressing step, when it came to the actual crisis; and whether they would not constrain Periklês against his will to make propositions for peace. His delay on the border, and postponement of actual devastation, gave the best chance for such propositions to be made; though, as this calculation was not realised, the army raised plausible complaints against him for having allowed the Athenians time to save so much of their property.

From all parts of Attica the residents flocked within the spacious walls of Athens, which now served as shelter for the houseless, like Salamis forty-nine years before—entire families with all their moveable property, and even with the woodwork of their houses. The sheep and cattle were conveyed to Eubœa and the other adjoining islands.² Though a few among the fugitives obtained dwellings or reception from friends, the greater number were compelled to encamp in the vacant spaces of the city and Peiræus, or in and around the numerous temples of the city—always excepting the acropolis and the Eleusinion, which were at all times strictly closed to profane occupants. But even the ground called *the Pelasgikon* immediately under

¹ Thucyd. ii. 15, 16.

² Thucyd. ii. 14.

the acropolis, which by an ancient and ominous tradition was interdicted to human abode,¹ was made use of under the present necessity. Many too placed their families in the towers and recesses of the city walls,² or in sheds, cabins, tents, or even tubs, disposed along the course of the long walls to Peiræus. In spite of so serious an accumulation of losses and hardships, the glorious endurance of their fathers in the time of Xerxes was faithfully copied, and copied too under more honourable circumstances, since at that time there had been no option possible; whereas the march of Archidamus might perhaps now have been arrested by submissions, ruinous indeed to Athenian dignity, yet not inconsistent with the security of Athens, divested of her rank and power. Such submissions, if suggested as they probably may have been by the party opposed to Periklēs, found no echo among the suffering population.

After having spent several days before Cœnoë without either taking the fort or receiving any message from the Athenians, Archidamus marched onward to Eleusis and the Thriasian plain—about the middle of June, eighty days after the surprise of Plataea. His army was of irresistible force, not less than 60,000 hoplites, according to the statement of Plutarch,³ or of 100,000 according to others. Considering the number of constituent allies, the strong feeling by which they were prompted, and the shortness of the expedition combined with the chance of plunder—even the largest of these two numbers is not incredibly great, if we take it to include not hoplites only, but cavalry and light-armed also. But since Thucydidēs, though comparatively full in his account of this march, has stated no

¹ Thucyd. ii. 17. *καὶ τὸ Πελασγικὸν καλούμενον τὸ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, ὃ καὶ ἐπάρατόν τε ἦν μὴ οἰκεῖν καὶ τι καὶ Πυθικοῦ μαντείου ἀκροτελεύτιον τοιόνδε διεκώλυε, λέγον ὡς τὸ Πελασγικὸν ἀργὸν ἡμείνων, ὅμως ὑπὸ τῆς παραχρῆμα ἀνάγκης ἐξῆκῃθη.*

Thucydidēs then proceeds to give an explanation of his own for this ancient prophecy, intended to save its credit, as well as to show that his countrymen had not, as some persons alleged, violated any divine mandate by admitting residents into the Pelasgikon. When the oracle said,—“The Pelasgikon is better unoccupied”—these words were not meant to interdict the occupation of the spot, but to foretell that it would never be occupied until a time of severe calamity arrived. The necessity of occupying it grew only out of national suffering. Such is the explanation suggested by Thucydidēs.

² Aristophanēs, *Equites*, 789. *οἰκοῦντ' ἐν ταῖς πιθάκκαισι κἄν γυπαρίοις καὶ πυργιδίοις.* The philosopher Diogenēs, in taking up his abode in a tub, had thus examples in history to follow.

³ Plutarch, *Periklēs*, c. 33.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 165

general total, we may presume that he had heard none upon which he could rely.

As the Athenians had made no movement towards peace, Archidamus anticipated that they would come forth to meet him in the fertile plain of Eleusis and Thria, which was the first portion of territory that he sat down to ravage. Yet no Athenian force appeared to oppose him, except a detachment of cavalry, who were repulsed in a skirmish near the small lakes called Rheiti. Having laid waste this plain without any serious opposition, Archidamus did not think fit to pursue the straight road which from Thria conducted directly to Athens across the ridge of Mount Ægaleos, but turned off to the eastward, leaving that mountain on his right hand until he came to Krôpeia, where he crossed a portion of the line of Ægaleos over to Acharnæ. He was here about seven miles from Athens, on a declivity sloping down into the plain which stretches westerly and north-westerly from Athens, and visible from the city walls. Here he encamped, keeping his army in perfect order for battle, but at the same time intending to damage and ruin the place and its neighbourhood. Acharnæ was the largest and most populous of all the demes in Attica, furnishing no less than 3000 hoplites to the national line, and flourishing as well by its corn, vines, and olives, as by its peculiar abundance of charcoal-burning from the forests of ilex on the neighbouring hills. Moreover, if we are to believe Aristophanês, the Acharnian proprietors were not merely sturdy "hearts of oak," but peculiarly vehement and irritable.¹ It illustrates the condition of a Grecian territory under invasion, when we find this great deme—which could not have contained less than 12,000 free inhabitants of both sexes and all ages, with at least an equal number of slaves—completely deserted. Archidamus calculated that when the Athenians actually saw his troops so close to their city, carrying fire and sword over their wealthiest canton, their indignation would become uncontrollable, and they would march out forthwith to battle. The Acharnian proprietors especially (he thought) would be foremost in inflaming this temper and insisting upon protection to their own properties—or if the remaining citizens refused to march out along with them, they would, after having been thus left undefended to

¹ See the *Acharneis* of Aristophanês, represented in the sixth year of the Peloponnesian war, v. 34, 180, 254, &c.

πρεσβυταί τινες
Ἀχαρνικοί, στιπτοὶ γέροντες, πρίνινοι,
ἀτεράμονες, Μαραθωνομάχαι, σφενδάμνινοι, &c.

ruin, become discontented and indifferent to the general weal.¹

Though his calculation was not realised, it was nevertheless founded upon most rational grounds. What Archidamus anticipated was on the point of happening, and nothing prevented it except the personal ascendancy of Periklēs, strained to its very utmost. So long as the invading army was engaged in the Thriasian plain, the Athenians had some faint hope that it might (like Pleistoanax fourteen years before) advance no farther into the interior. But when it came to Acharnæ within sight of the city walls—when the ravagers were actually seen destroying buildings, fruit-trees, and crops, in the plain of Athens, a sight strange to every Athenian eye except to those very old men who recollected the Persian invasion—the exasperation of the general body of citizens rose to a pitch never before known. The Acharnians first of all—next the youthful citizens generally—became madly clamorous for arming and going forth to fight. Knowing well their own great strength, but less correctly informed of the superior strength of the enemy, they felt confident that victory was within their reach. Groups of citizens were everywhere gathered together,² angrily debating the critical question of the moment; while the usual concomitants of excited feeling—oracles and prophecies of diverse tenor, many of them doubtless promising success against the enemy at Acharnæ—were eagerly caught up and circulated.

In this inflamed temper of the Athenian mind, Periklēs was naturally the great object of complaint and wrath. He was denounced as the cause of all the existing suffering. He was reviled as a coward for not leading out the citizens to fight, in his capacity of general. The rational convictions as to the necessity of the war and the only practicable means of carrying it on, which his repeated speeches had implanted, seemed to be altogether forgotten.³ This burst of spontaneous discontent was of course fomented by the numerous political enemies of Periklēs, and particularly by Kleon,⁴ now rising into importance as an opposition speaker; whose talent for invective was thus first exercised under the auspices of the high aristocratical party, as well as of an excited public. But no manifestations,

¹ Thucyd. ii. 20.

² Thucyd. ii. 21. *κατὰ ξυστάσεις δὲ γιγνόμενοι ἐν πολλῇ ἔριδι ἦσαν*: compare Euripidēs, *Herakleidæ*, 416; and *Andromachē*, 1077.

³ Thucyd. ii. 21. *παντί τε τρόπῳ ἀνθρώπιστο ἡ πόλις καὶ τὸν Περικλέα ἐν ὀργῇ εἶχον, καὶ ὧν παρήνεσε πρότερον ἐμέμνητο οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἐκάκιζον ὅτι στρατηγὸς ὧν οὐκ ἐπετάγοι, αἰτιὸν τε σφίσις ἐνόμιζον πάντων ὧν ἐπασχον.*

⁴ Plutarch, *Periklēs*, c. 33.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 167

however violent, could disturb either the judgement or the firmness of Periklês. He listened unmoved to all the declarations made against him, resolutely refusing to convene any public assembly, or any meeting invested with an authorised character, under the present irritated temper of the citizens.¹ It appears that he as general, or rather the Board of ten Generals among whom he was one, must have been invested constitutionally with the power not only of calling the Ekklesia when they thought fit, but also of preventing it from meeting,² and of postponing even those regular meetings which commonly took place at fixed times, four times in the prytany. No assembly accordingly took place, and the violent exasperation of the people was thus prevented from realising itself in any rash public resolution. That Periklês should have held firm against this raging force, is but one among the many honourable points in his political character; but it is far less wonderful than the fact, that his refusal to call the Ekklesia was efficacious to prevent the Ekklesia from being held. The entire body of Athenians were now assembled within the walls, and if he refused to convoke the Ekklesia, they might easily have met in the Pnyx without him; for which it would not have been difficult at such a juncture to provide plausible justification. The inviolable respect which the Athenian people manifested on this occasion for the forms of their democratical constitution—assisted doubtless by their long-established esteem for Periklês, yet opposed to an excitement alike intense and pervading, and to a demand apparently reasonable, in so far as regarded the calling of an assembly for discussion—is one of the most memorable incidents in their history.

While Periklês thus decidedly forbade any general march out for battle, he sought to provide as much employment as possible for the compressed eagerness of the citizens. The cavalry were sent forth, together with the Thessalian cavalry their allies, for the purpose of restraining the excursions of the enemy's light troops, and protecting the lands near the city from plunder.³

¹ Thucyd. ii. 22.

² See Schömann, *De Comitiis*, c. iv. p. 62. The Prytanes (*i.e.* the Fifty Senators belonging to that tribe whose turn it was to preside at the time), as well as the Stratêgi, had the right of convoking the Ekklesia: see Thucyd. iv. 118, in which passage however they are represented as convoking it in conjunction with the Stratêgi: probably a discretion on the point came gradually to be understood as vested in the latter.

³ Thucyd. ii. 22. The funeral monument of these slain Thessalians was among those seen by Pausanias near Athens, on the side of the Academy (Pausan. i. 29, 5).

At the same time he fitted out a powerful expedition, which sailed forth to ravage Peloponnesus, even while the invaders were yet in Attica.¹ Archidamus, after having remained engaged in the devastation of Acharnæ long enough to satisfy himself that the Athenians would not hazard a battle, turned away from Athens in a north-westerly direction towards the demes between Mount Brilëssus and Mount Parnês, on the road passing through Dekeleia. The army continued ravaging these districts until their provisions were exhausted, and then quitted Attica by the north-western road near Orôpus, which brought them into Bœotia. As the Oropians, though not Athenians, were yet dependent upon Athens—the district of Græa, a portion of their territory, was laid waste; after which the army dispersed and retired back to their respective homes.² It would seem that they quitted Attica towards the end of July, having remained in the country between thirty and forty days.

Meanwhile the Athenian expedition, under Karkinus, Prôteas, and Sokratês, joined by fifty Korkyræan ships and by some other allies, sailed round Peloponnesus, landing in various parts to inflict damage, and among other places at Methônê (Modon) on the south-western peninsula of the Lacedæmonian territory.³ The place, neither strong nor well-garrisoned, would have been carried with little difficulty, had not Brasidas the son of Tellis—a gallant Spartan now mentioned for the first time, but destined to great celebrity afterwards—who happened to be on guard at a neighbouring post, thrown himself into it with 100 men by a rapid movement, before the dispersed Athenian troops could be brought together to prevent him. He infused such courage into the defenders of the place that every attack was repelled, and the Athenians were forced to re-embark—an act of prowess which procured for him the first public honours bestowed by the Spartans during

¹ Diodorus (xii. 42) would have us believe, that the expedition sent out by Periklês, ravaging the Peloponnesian coast, induced the Lacedæmonians to hurry away their troops out of Attica. Thucydides gives no countenance to this—nor is it at all credible.

² Thucyd. ii. 23. The reading Γραϊκὴν, belonging to Γραῖα, seems preferable to Περραικὴν. Poppo and Gôller adopt the former, Dr. Arnold the latter. Græa was a small maritime place in the vicinity of Orôpus (Aristotel. ap. Stephan. Byz. v. Τάναγρα)—known also now as an Attic Deme belonging to the tribe Pandionis: this has been discovered for the first time by an inscription published in Professor Ross's work (Ueber die Deme von Attika, p. 3-5). Orôpus was not an Attic Deme: the Athenian citizens residing in it were probably enrolled as Γραῖς.

³ Thucyd. ii. 25; Plutarch, Periklês, c. 34; Justin, iii. 7, 5.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 169

this war. Sailing northward along the western coast of Peloponnesus, the Athenians landed again on the coast of Elis, a little south of the promontory called Cape Ichthys: they ravaged the territory for two days, defeating both the troops in the neighbourhood and 300 chosen men from the central Eleian territory. Strong winds on a harbourless coast now induced the captains to sail with most of the troops round Cape Ichthys, in order to reach the harbour of Pheia on the northern side of it; while the Messenian hoplites, marching by land across the promontory, attacked Pheia and carried it by assault. When the fleet arrived, all were re-embarked—the full force of Elis being under march to attack them. They then sailed northward, landing on various other spots to commit devastation, until they reached Sollium, a Corinthian settlement on the coast of Akarnania. They captured this place, which they handed over to the inhabitants of the neighbouring Akarnanian town of Palærus—as well as Astakus, from whence they expelled the despot Euarchus, and enrolled the town as a member of the Athenian alliance. From hence they passed over to Kephallênia, which they were fortunate enough also to acquire as an ally of Athens without any compulsion—with its four distinct towns or districts, Palês, Kranii, Samê, and Pronê. These various operations took up near three months from about the beginning of July, so that they returned to Athens towards the close of September¹—the beginning of the winter half of the year, according to the distribution of Thucydides.

This was not the only maritime expedition of the summer. Thirty more triremes, under Kleopompus, were sent through the Euripus to the Lokrian coast opposite to the northern part of Eubœa. Some disembarkations were made, whereby the Lokrian towns of Thronium and Alopê were sacked, and further devastation inflicted; while a permanent garrison was planted, and a fortified post erected, in the uninhabited island of Atalanta, opposite to the Lokrian coast, in order to restrain privateers from Opus and the other Lokrian towns in their excursions against Eubœa.² It was further determined to expel the Æginetan inhabitants from Ægina, and to occupy the island with Athenian colonists. This step was partly rendered prudent by the important position of the island midway between Attica and Peloponnesus. But a concurrent motive, and probably the stronger motive, was the gratification

¹ Thucyd. ii. 25-30; Diodor. xii. 43, 44.

² Thucyd. ii. 26-32; Diodor. xii. 44.

of ancient antipathy and revenge against a people who had been among the foremost in provoking the war and in inflicting upon Athens so much suffering. The Æginetans with their wives and children were all put on shipboard and landed in Peloponnesus—where the Spartans permitted them to occupy the maritime district and town of Thyrea, their last frontier towards Argos: some of them, however, found shelter in other parts of Greece. The island was made over to a detachment of Athenian kleruchs, or citizen proprietors sent thither by lot.¹

To the sufferings of the Æginetans, which we shall hereafter find still more deplorably aggravated, we have to add those of the Megarians. Both had been most zealous in kindling the war, but upon none did the distress of war fall so heavily. Both probably shared the premature confidence felt among the Peloponnesian confederacy, that Athens could never hold out more than a year or two—and were thus induced to overlook their own undefended position against her. Towards the close of September, the full force of Athens, citizens and metics, marched into the Megarid, under Periklês, and laid waste the greater part of the territory: while they were in it, the hundred ships which had been circumnavigating Peloponnesus, having arrived at Ægina on their return, went and joined their fellow-citizens in the Megara, instead of going straight home. The junction of the two formed the largest Athenian force that had ever yet been seen together: there were 10,000 citizen hoplites (independent of 3000 others who were engaged in the siege of Potidæa), and 3000 metic hoplites—besides a large number of light troops.² Against so large a force the Megarians could of course make no head, so that their territory was all laid waste, even to the city walls. For several years of the war, the Athenians inflicted this destruction once, and often twice in the same year. A decree was proposed in the Athenian Ekklesia by Charinus, though perhaps not carried, to the effect that the Stratêgi every year should swear, as a portion of their oath of office,³ that they would twice invade and ravage the Megarid. As the Athenians at the same time kept the port of Nisæa blocked up, by means of their superior naval force and of the neighbouring coast of Salamis, the privations imposed on the Megarians became extreme and intolerable.⁴ Not merely their corn and fruits, but even their

¹ Thucyd. ii. 27.

² Thucyd. ii. 31; Diodor. xii. 44.

³ Plutarch, Periklês, c. 30.

⁴ See the striking picture in the *Acharneis* of Aristophanês (685–781) of

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 171

garden vegetables near the city, were rooted up and destroyed, and their situation seems often to have been that of a besieged city hard pressed by famine. Even in the time of Pausanias, five centuries afterwards, the miseries of the town during these years were remembered and communicated to him, being assigned as the reason why one of their most memorable statues had never been completed.¹

To the various military operations of Athens during the course of this summer, some other measures of moment are to be added. Moreover, Thucydides notices an eclipse of the sun, which modern astronomical calculations refer to the third of August: had this eclipse happened three months earlier, immediately before the entrance of the Peloponnesians into Attica, it might probably have been construed as an unfavourable omen, and caused the postponement of the scheme.

Expecting a prolonged struggle, the Athenians now made arrangements for placing Attica in a permanent state of defence, both by sea and land. What these arrangements were, we are not told in detail, but one of them was sufficiently remarkable to be named particularly. They set apart one thousand talents out of the treasure in the acropolis as an inviolable reserve, not to be touched except on the single contingency—of a hostile naval force about to assail the city, with no other means at hand to defend it. They further enacted that if any citizen should propose, or any magistrate put the question, in the public assembly, to make a different application of this reserve, he should be punishable with death. Moreover, they resolved every year to keep back one hundred of their best triremes, and trierarchs to command and equip them, for the same special necessity.² It may be doubted whether this latter provision was placed under the same stringent sanction, or observed with the same rigour, as that concerning the money; which latter was not departed from until the twentieth year of the war, after all the disasters of the Sicilian expedition, and on the terrible news of the revolt of Chios. It was on that occasion that the Athenians, having first repealed the sentence of capital punishment against any proposer of the forbidden the distressed Megarian selling his hungry children into slavery with their own consent: also Aristoph. *Pac.* 482.

The position of Megara, as the ally of Sparta and enemy of Athens, was uncomfortable in the same manner (though not to the same intense pitch of suffering) in the war which preceded the battle of Leuktra—near fifty years after this (Demosthen. *cont. Neer.*, p. 1357, c. 12).

¹ Pausan. i. 40, 3.

² Thucyd. ii 24.

change, appropriated the money to meet the then imminent peril of the commonwealth.¹

The resolution here taken about this sacred reserve, and the rigorous sentence interdicting contrary propositions, is pronounced by Mr. Mitford to be an evidence of the indelible barbarism of democratical government.² But we must recollect, first, that the sentence of capital punishment was one which could hardly by possibility come into execution; for no citizen would be so mad as to make the forbidden proposition, while this law was in force. Whoever desired to make it, would first begin by proposing to repeal the prohibitory law, whereby he would incur no danger, whether the assembly decided in the affirmative or negative. If he obtained an affirmative decision, he would then, and then only, proceed to move the re-appropriation of the fund. To speak the language of English parliamentary procedure, he would first move the suspension or abrogation of the standing order whereby the proposition was forbidden—next, he would move the proposition itself. In fact such was the mode actually pursued, when the thing at last came to be done.³ But though the capital sentence could hardly come into effect, the proclamation of it *in terrorem* had a very distinct meaning. It expressed the deep and solemn conviction which the people entertained of the importance of their own resolution about the reserve—it forewarned all assemblies and all citizens to come, of the danger of diverting it to any other purpose—it surrounded the reserve with an artificial sanctity, which forced every man who aimed at the re-appropriation to begin with a preliminary proposition formidable on the very face of it, as removing a guarantee which previous assemblies had deemed of immense value, and opening

¹ Thucyd. viii. 15.

² Mitford, Hist. of Greece, ch. xiv. sect. I, vol. iii. p. 100. "Another measure followed, which taking place at the time when Thucydidēs wrote and Periklēs spoke, and while Periklēs held the principal influence in the administration, strongly marks both the inherent weakness and the indelible barbarism, of democratical government. A decree of the people directed. . . . But so little confidence was placed in a decree so important, sanctioned only by the present will of that giddy tyrant the multitude of Athens, against whose caprices, since the depression of the court of Areopagus, no balancing power remained—that the denunciation of capital punishment was proposed against whosoever should propose, and whosoever should *concur in* (?) any decree for the disposal of that money to any other purpose, or in any other circumstances."

³ Thucyd. viii. 15. τὰ δὲ χίλια τέλαντα, ὧν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ πολέμου ἐγλίχοντο μὴ ἄσασθαι, εὐθὺς ἔλυσαν τὰς ἐπικειμένας ζημίας τῷ εἰπόντι ἢ ἐπιψηφίσαντι, ὑπὸ τῆς παρούσης ἐκπλήξεως, καὶ ἐψηφίσαντο κινεῖν.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 173

the door to a contingency which they had looked upon as treasonable. The proclamation of a lighter punishment, or a simple prohibition without any definite sanction whatever, would neither have announced the same emphatic conviction, nor produced the same deterring effect. The assembly of 431 B.C. could not in any way enact laws which subsequent assemblies could not reverse; but it could so frame its enactments, in cases of peculiar solemnity, as to make its authority strongly felt upon the judgement of its successors, and to prevent them from entertaining motions for repeal except under necessity at once urgent and obvious.

Far from thinking that the law now passed at Athens displayed barbarism, either in the end or in the means, I consider it principally remarkable for its cautious and long-sighted view of the future—qualities the exact reverse of barbarism—and worthy of the general character of Periklês, who probably suggested it. Athens was just entering into a war which threatened to be of indefinite length, and was certain to be very costly. To prevent the people from exhausting all their accumulated fund, and to place them under a necessity of reserving something against extreme casualties, was an object of immense importance. Now the particular casualty, which Periklês (assuming him to be the proposer) named as the sole condition of touching this one thousand talents, might be considered as of all others the most improbable, in the year 431 B.C. So immense was then the superiority of the Athenian naval force, that to suppose it defeated, and a Peloponnesian fleet in full sail for Peiræus, was a possibility which it required a statesman of extraordinary caution to look forward to, and which it is wonderful that the people generally could have been induced to contemplate. Once tied up to this purpose, however, the fund lay ready for any other terrible emergency. We shall find the actual employment of it incalculably beneficial to Athens, at a moment of the gravest peril, when she could hardly have protected herself without some such special resource. The people would scarcely have sanctioned so rigorous an economy, had it not been proposed to them at a period so early in the war that their available reserve was still much larger. But it will be for ever to the credit of their foresight as well as constancy, that they should first have adopted such a precautionary measure, and afterwards adhered to it for nineteen years, under severe pressure for money, until at length a case arose which rendered further abstinence really, and not constructively, impossible.

To display their force and take revenge by disembarking and ravaging parts of Peloponnesus, was doubtless of much importance to Athens during this first summer of the war: though it might seem that the force so employed was quite as much needed in the conquest of Potidæa, which still remained under blockade—and of the neighbouring Chalkidians in Thrace, still in revolt. It was during the course of this summer that a prospect opened to Athens of subduing these towns, through the assistance of Sitalkês king of the Odrysian Thracians. That prince had married the sister of Nymphodôrus, a citizen of Abdêra, who engaged to render him and his son Sadokus, allies of Athens. Sent for to Athens and appointed proxenus of Athens at Abdêra, which was one of the Athenian subject-allies, Nymphodôrus made this alliance, and promised in the name of Sitalkês that a sufficient Thracian force should be sent to aid Athens in the reconquest of her revolted towns: the honour of Athenian citizenship was at the same time conferred upon Sadokus.¹ Nymphodôrus further established a good understanding between Perdikkas of Macedonia and the Athenians, who were persuaded to restore to him Therma, which they had before taken from him. The Athenians had thus the promise of powerful aid against the Chalkidians and Potidæans: yet the latter still held out, with little prospect of immediate surrender. Moreover the town of Astakus in Akarnania, which the Athenians had captured during the summer in the course of their expedition round Peloponnesus, was recovered during the autumn by the deposed despot Euarchus, assisted by forty Corinthian triremes and 1000 hoplites. This Corinthian armament, after restoring Euarchus, made some unsuccessful descents both upon other parts of Akarnania and upon the island of Kephallênia. In the latter they were entrapped into an ambushade and obliged to return home with considerable loss.²

It was towards the close of autumn also that Periklês, chosen by the people for the purpose, delivered the funeral oration at the public interment of those warriors who had fallen during the campaign. The ceremonies of this public token of respect have already been described in a former chapter, on occasion of the conquest of Samos. But that which imparted to the present scene an imperishable interest, was the discourse of the chosen statesman and orator; probably heard by Thucydides himself, and in substance reproduced. A large crowd of citizens and foreigners, of both sexes and all ages, accompanied

¹ Thucyd. ii. 29.

² Thucyd. ii. 33.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 175

the funeral procession from Athens to the suburb called the outer Kerameikus, where Periklês, mounted upon a lofty stage prepared for the occasion, closed the ceremony with his address. The law of Athens not only provided this public funeral and commemorative discourse, but also assigned maintenance at the public expense to the children of the slain warriors until they attained military age: a practice which was acted on throughout the whole war, though we have only the description and discourse belonging to this single occasion.¹

The eleven chapters of Thucydidês which comprise this funeral speech are among the most memorable relics of antiquity; considering that under the language and arrangement of the historian—always impressive, though sometimes harsh and peculiar, like the workmanship of a powerful mind misled by a bad or an unattainable model—we possess the substance and thoughts of the illustrious statesman. A portion of it, of course, is and must be commonplace, belonging to all discourses composed for a similar occasion. Yet this is true only of a comparatively small portion. Much of it is peculiar, and every way worthy of Periklês—comprehensive, rational, and full not less of sense and substance than of earnest patriotism. It thus forms a strong contrast with the jejune, though elegant, rhetoric of other harangues, mostly² not composed for actual

¹ Thucyd. ii. 34-45. Sometimes also the allies of Athens, who had fallen along with her citizens in battle, had a part in the honours of the public burial (Lysias, *Orat. Funer.* c. 13).

² The critics, from Dionysius of Halikarnassus downward, agree for the most part in pronouncing the feeble *λόγος Ἐπιτάφιος*, ascribed to Demosthenês, to be not really his. Of those ascribed to Plato and Lysias also, the genuineness has been suspected, though upon far less grounds. The Menexenus, if it be really the work of Plato, however, does not add to his fame; but the harangue of Lysias, a very fine composition, may well be his, and may perhaps have been really delivered—though probably not delivered by him, as he was not a qualified citizen.

See the general instructions, in Dionys. Hal. *Ars Rhetoric.* c. 6, p. 258-268, Reisk, on the contents and composition of a funeral discourse—Lysias is said to have composed several—Plutarch, *Vit. X. Orator.* p. 836.

Compare respecting the funeral discourse of Periklês, K. F. Weber, *Über die Stand-Rede des Periklês* (Darmstadt, 1827); Westermann, *Geschichte der Beredsamkeit in Griechenland und Rom.* sect. 35, 63, 64; Kutzen, *Perikles als Staatsman*, p. 158, sect. 12 (Grimma, 1834).

Dahlmann (*Historische Forschungen*, vol. i. p. 23) seems to think that the original oration of Periklês contained a large sprinkling of mythical allusions and stories out of the antiquities of Athens, such as we now find in the other funeral orations above alluded to; but that Thucydidês himself deliberately left them out in his report. There seems no foundation for this suspicion. It is much more consonant to the superior tone of dignity which reigns throughout all this oration, to suppose that the mythical

delivery. And it deserves, in comparison with the funeral discourses remaining to us from Plato, and the pseudo-Demosthenês, and even Lysias, the honourable distinction which Thucydidês claims for his own history—an ever-living possession, not a mere show-piece for the moment.

In the outset of his speech Periklês distinguishes himself from those who had preceded him in the same function of public orator, by dissenting from the encomiums which it had been customary to bestow on the law enjoining these funeral harangues. He thinks that the publicity of the funeral itself, and the general demonstrations of respect and grief by the great body of citizens, tell more emphatically in token of gratitude to the brave dead, when the scene passes in silence—than when it is translated into the words of a speaker, who may easily offend either by incompetency or by apparent feebleness, or perhaps even by unseasonable exaggeration. Nevertheless, the custom having been embodied in law, and elected as he has been by the citizens, he comes forward to discharge the duty imposed upon him in the best manner he can.¹

One of the remarkable features in this discourse is, its business-like, impersonal character. It is Athens herself who undertakes to commend and decorate her departed sons, as well as to hearten up and admonish the living.

After a few words on the magnitude of the empire and on the glorious efforts as well as endurance whereby their forefathers and they had acquired it—Periklês proceeds to sketch the plan of life, the constitution, and the manners, under which such achievements were brought about.²

“We live under a constitution such as noway to envy the laws of our neighbours,—ourselves an example to others, rather than mere imitators. It is called a democracy, since its permanent aim tends towards the Many and not towards the Few. As to private matters and disputes, the laws deal

narratives and even the previous historical glories of Athens never found any special notice in the speech of Periklês—nothing more than a general recognition, with an intimation that he does not dwell upon them at length because they were well known to his audience—*μακρηγορεῖν ἐν εἰδόσιν οὐ βουλόμενος ἐάσω* (ii. 36).

¹ Thucyd. ii. 35.

² Thucyd. ii. 36. Ἀπὸ δὲ ὅας τε ἐπιτηδεύσεως ἤλθομεν ἐπ' αὐτὰ καὶ μεθ' ὅας πολιτείας καὶ τρόπων ἐξ ὧν μέγала ἐγένετο, ταῦτα δηλώσας πρῶτον εἶμι, &c.

In the Demosthenic or pseudo-Demosthenic Orat. Funerbris, c. 8, p. 1397—*χρηστῶν ἐπιτηδεύματων συνήθεια, τῆς δλης πολιτείας ὑπόθεσις, &c.*

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 177

equally with every man : while in regard to public affairs and to claims of individual influence, every man's chance of advancement is determined not by party favour but by real worth, according as his reputation stands in his own particular department. Neither poverty, nor obscure station, keep him back,¹ if he really has the means of benefiting the city. Moreover our social march is free, not merely in regard to public affairs, but also in regard to intolerance of each other's diversity of daily pursuits. For we are not angry with our neighbour for what he may do to please himself, nor do we ever put on those sour looks,² which, though they do no positive damage, are not the less sure to offend. Thus conducting our private social intercourse with reciprocal indulgence, we are restrained from wrong on public matters by fear and reverence of our magistrates for the time being and of our laws—especially such laws as are instituted for the protection of wrongful sufferers, and even such others as, though not written, are enforced by a common sense of shame. Besides this, we have provided for our minds numerous recreations from toil, partly by our customary solemnities of sacrifice and festival throughout the year, partly by the elegance of our private establishments,—the daily charm of which banishes the sense of discomfort. From the magnitude of our city, the products of the whole earth are brought to us, so that our enjoyment of foreign luxuries is as much our own and assured as those which we grow at home. In respect to training for war, we differ from our opponents (the Lacedæmonians) on several material points. First, we lay open our city as a common resort: we apply no *xenêlasy* to exclude even an enemy either from any lesson or any spectacle, the full view of which he may think advantageous to him. For military efficiency, we trust less to manœuvres and quackery than to our own native bravery. Next, in regard to education, while the Lacedæmonians even from their earliest youth subject themselves to an irksome exercise for the attainment of courage, we with our easy habits of life are not less prepared than they, to encounter all perils within the measure of our strength. The

¹ Thucyd. ii. 37. οὐδ' αὖ κατὰ πέναν, ἔχων δέ τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι τὴν πόλιν, ἀξιώματος ἀφανεία κεκώλυται: compare Plato, Menexenus, c. 8.

² Thucyd. ii. 37. ἐλευθέρως δὲ τὰ τε πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν πολιτεύομεν, καὶ ἐς τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὑποψίαν, οὐ δι' ὀργῆς τὸν πέλας, εἰ καθ' ἡδονὴν τι δρᾷ, ἔχοντες, οὐδὲ ἀζημίους μὲν, λυπηρὰς δὲ τῇ ὕψει ἀχθῆδόντας προστιθέμενοι. Ἀνεπαχθῶς δὲ τὰ ἴδια προσομιλοῦντες τὰ δημόσια διὰ δέος μάλιστα οὐ παρανομοῦμεν, τῶν τε αἰὲ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντων ἀκροάσει καὶ τῶν νύμων, καὶ μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὅσοι τε ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ τῶν ἀδικουμένων κείνται, καὶ ὅσοι ἀγραφοὶ ὄντες αἰσχύνην ὁμολογουμένην φέρουσι.

proof of this is, that the Peloponnesian confederates do not attack us one by one, but with their whole united force ; while we, when we attack them at home, overpower for the most part all of them who try to defend their own territory. None of our enemies has ever met and contended with our entire force ; partly in consequence of our large navy—partly from our dispersion in different simultaneous land-expeditions. But when they chance to be engaged with any part of it, if victorious, they pretend to have vanquished us all—if defeated, they pretend to have been vanquished by all.

“Now, if we are willing to brave danger, just as much under an indulgent system as under constant toil, and by spontaneous courage as much as under force of law—we are gainers in the end by not vexing ourselves beforehand with sufferings to come, yet still appearing in the hour of trial not less daring than those who toil without ceasing.

“In other matters, too, as well as in these, our city deserves admiration. For we combine elegance of taste with simplicity of life, and we pursue knowledge without being enervated :¹ we employ wealth not for talking and ostentation, but as a real help in the proper season : nor is it disgraceful to any one who is poor to confess his poverty, though he *may* rather incur reproach for not actually keeping himself out of poverty. The magistrates who discharge public trusts fulfil their domestic duties also—the private citizen, while engaged in professional business, has competent knowledge on public affairs : for we stand alone in regarding the man who keeps aloof from these latter not as harmless, but as useless. Moreover, we always hear and pronounce on public matters, when discussed by our leaders—or perhaps strike out for ourselves correct reasonings about them : far from accounting discussion an impediment to action, we complain only if we are not told what is to be done before it becomes our duty to do it. For in truth we combine in the most remarkable manner these two qualities—extreme boldness in execution with full debate beforehand on that which we are going about : whereas with others, ignorance alone imparts boldness—debate introduces hesitation. Assuredly those men are properly to be regarded as the stoutest of heart, who, knowing most precisely both the terrors of war

¹ Thucyd. ii. 40. φιλοκαλοῦμεν γὰρ μετ' εὐτελείας, καὶ φιλοσοφοῦμεν ἄνευ μαλακίας· πλοῦτις τε ἔργου μᾶλλον καιρῷ ἢ λόγῳ κόμπη χρώμεθα, καὶ τὸ πένεσθαι οὐχ ὁμολογεῖν τινὶ ἀσχρόν, ἀλλὰ μὴ διαφεύγειν ἔργῳ ἀσχιον.

The first strophe of the Chorus in Euripid. *Medea*, 824–841, may be compared with the tenor of this discourse of Periklēs : the praises of Attica are there dwelt upon, as a country too good to receive the guilty *Medea*.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 179

and the sweets of peace, are still not the less willing to encounter peril.

"In fine, I affirm that our city, considered as a whole, is the schoolmistress of Greece;¹ while viewed individually, we enable the same man to furnish himself out and suffice to himself in the greatest variety of ways and with the most complete grace and refinement. This is no empty boast of the moment, but genuine reality: and the power of the city, acquired through the dispositions just indicated, exists to prove it. Athens alone of all cities stands forth in actual trial greater than her reputation: her enemy when he attacks her will not have his pride wounded by suffering defeat from feeble hands—her subjects will not think themselves degraded as if their obedience were paid to an unworthy superior.² Having thus put forth our power, not uncertified, but backed by the most evident proofs, we shall be admired not less by posterity than by our contemporaries. Nor do we stand in need either of Homer or of any other panegyrist, whose words may for the moment please, though the truth if known would confute their intended meaning. We have compelled all land and sea to become accessible to our courage, and have planted everywhere imperishable monuments of our kindness as well as of our hostility.

"Such is the city on behalf of which these citizens, resolved that it should not be wrested from them, have nobly fought and died³—and on behalf of which all of us here left behind must willingly toil. It is for this reason that I have spoken at length concerning the city, at once to draw from it the lesson that the conflict is not for equal motives between us and enemies who possess nothing of the like excellence—and to demonstrate by proofs the truth of my encomium pronounced upon her."

Periklês pursues, at considerable additional length, the same tenor of mixed exhortation to the living and eulogy of the dead; with many special and emphatic observations addressed to the relatives of the latter, who were assembled around and doubtless very near him. But the extract which I have already made

¹ Thucyd. ii. 41. *ξυνελών τε λέγω, τήν τε πᾶσαν πόλιν τῆς Ἑλλάδος παιδευσιν εἶναι, καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον δοκεῖν ἂν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα παρ' ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλείοστ' ἂν εἶδη καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστ' ἂν εὐτραπέλως τὸ σῶμα αὐταρκές παρέχεσθαι.*

The abstract word *παιδευσιν*, in place of the concrete *παιδεύτρια*, seems to soften the arrogance of the affirmation.

² Thucyd. ii. 41. *μόνη γὰρ τῶν νῦν ἀκοῆς κρείσσω ἐς πείραν ἔρχεται, καὶ μόνη οὔτε τῷ πολέμῳ ἐπελθόντι ἀγανάκτησιν ἔχει ὅφ' οἷων κακοπαθεῖ, οὔτε τῷ ὑπὲρ ἀνάγκης κατὰ μέμψιν ὥς οὐχ ὑπο ἀξίων ἄρχεται.*

³ Thucyd. ii. 41. *περὶ τοιαύτης οὖν πόλεως οἶδε τε γενναῖως, δικαιούντες μὴ ἀφαιρεθῆναι αὐτήν, μαχόμενοι ἐτελεύτησαν, &c.*

is so long, that no further addition would be admissible : yet it was impossible to pass over lightly the picture of the Athenian commonwealth in its glory, as delivered by the ablest citizen of the age. The effect of the democratical constitution, with its diffused and equal citizenship, in calling forth not merely strong attachment, but painful self-sacrifice, on the part of all Athenians—is nowhere more forcibly insisted upon than in the words above cited of Periklês, as well as in others afterwards—“Contemplating as you do daily before you the actual power of the state, and becoming passionately attached to it, when you conceive its full greatness, reflect that it was all acquired by men daring, acquainted with their duty, and full of an honourable sense of shame in their actions”¹—such is the association which he presents between the greatness of the state as an object of common passion, and the courage, intelligence, and mutual esteem, of individual citizens, as its creating and preserving causes ; poor as well as rich being alike interested in the partnership.

But the claims of patriotism, though put forward as essentially and deservedly paramount, are by no means understood to reign exclusively, or to absorb the whole of the democratical activity. Subject to these, and to those laws and sanctions which protect both the public and individuals against wrong, it is the pride of Athens to exhibit a rich and varied fund of human impulse—an unrestrained play of fancy and diversity of private pursuit, coupled with a reciprocity of cheerful indulgence between one individual and another—and an absence even of those “black looks” which so much embitter life, even if they never pass into enmity of fact. This portion of the speech of Periklês deserves peculiar attention, because it serves to correct an assertion, often far too indiscriminately made, respecting antiquity as contrasted with modern societies—an assertion that the ancient societies sacrificed the individual to the state, and that only in modern times has individual agency been left free to the proper extent. This is pre-eminently true of Sparta:—it is also true in a great degree of the ideal societies depicted by Plato and Aristotle : but it is pointedly untrue of the Athenian democracy, nor can we

¹ Thucyd. ii. 43. τὴν τῆς πόλεως δύναμιν καθ’ ἡμέραν ἔργῳ θεωμένους καὶ ἔραστὰς γιγνομένους αὐτῆς, καὶ ὅταν ὑμῖν μεγάλη δόξη εἶναι, ἐνθυμουμένους ὅτι τοὺς μὲν καὶ γινώσκοντες τὰ δέοντα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις αἰσχυρόμενοι, ἄνδρες αὐτὰ ἐκτίσαντο, &c.

Αἰσχυρόμενοι : compare Demosthen. Orat. Funebris, c. 7, p. 1396. Αἱ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τῶν ὀλίγων δυναστεῖαι θεός μὲν ἐνεργάζονται τοῖς πολίταις, αἰσχύνῃ δ’ οὐ παριστᾷσιν.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 181

with any confidence predicate it of the major part of the Grecian cities.

I shall hereafter return to this point when I reach the times of the great speculative philosophers: at present, I merely bespeak attention to the speech of Periklês as negating the supposition, that exorbitant interference of the state with individual liberty was universal among the ancient Greek republics. There is no doubt that he has present to his mind a comparison with the extreme narrowness and rigour of Sparta, and that therefore his assertions of the extent of positive liberty at Athens must be understood as partially qualified by such contrast. But even making allowance for this, the stress which he lays upon the liberty of thought and action at Athens, not merely from excessive restraint of law, but also from practical intolerance between man and man, and tyranny of the majority over individual dissenters in taste and pursuit—deserves serious notice, and brings out one of those points in the national character upon which the intellectual development of the time mainly depended. The national temper was indulgent in a high degree to all the varieties of positive impulse. The peculiar promptings in every individual bosom were allowed to manifest themselves and bear fruit, without being suppressed by external opinion or trained into forced conformity with some assumed standard: antipathies against any of them formed no part of the habitual morality of the citizen. While much of the generating causes of human hatred was thus rendered inoperative, and while society was rendered more comfortable, more instructive, and more stimulating—all its germs of productive fruitful genius, so rare everywhere, found in such an atmosphere the maximum of encouragement. Within the limits of the law, assuredly as faithfully observed at Athens as anywhere in Greece, individual impulse, taste, and even eccentricity, were accepted with indulgence, instead of being a mark as elsewhere for the intolerance of neighbours or of the public. This remarkable feature in Athenian life will help us in a future chapter to explain the striking career of Sokratês, and it further presents to us, under another face, a great part of that which the censors of Athens denounced under the name of “democratical licence.” The liberty and diversity of individual life in that city were offensive to Xenophon,¹ Plato, and Aristotle—

¹ Compare the sentiment of Xenophon, the precise reverse of that which is here laid down by Periklês, extolling the rigid discipline of Sparta, and denouncing the laxity of Athenian life (Xenophon, *Memorab.* iii. 5, 15 ;

attached either to the monotonous drill of Sparta, or to some other ideal standard, which, though much better than the Spartan in itself, they were disposed to impress upon society with a heavy-handed uniformity. That liberty of individual action, not merely from the over-restraints of law, but from the tyranny of jealous opinion, such as Periklēs depicts in Athens, belongs more naturally to a democracy, where there is no select One or Few to receive worship and set the fashion, than to any other form of government. But it is very rare even in democracies. None of the governments of modern times, democratical, aristocratical or monarchical, presents anything like the picture of generous tolerance towards social dissent, and spontaneity of individual taste, which we read in the speech of the Athenian statesman. In all of them, the intolerance of the national opinion cuts down individual character to one out of a few set types, to which every person, or every family, is constrained to adjust itself, and beyond which all exceptions meet either with hatred or with derision. To impose upon men such restraints either of law or of opinion as are requisite for the security and comfort of society, but to encourage rather than repress the free play of individual impulse subject to those limits—is an ideal, which if it was ever approached at Athens, has certainly never been attained, and has indeed comparatively been little studied or cared for, in any modern society.

Connected with this reciprocal indulgence of individual diversity, was not only the hospitable reception of all strangers at Athens, which Periklēs contrasts with the *xenêlasy* or jealous expulsion practised at Sparta—but also the many-sided activity, bodily and mental, visible in the former, so opposite to that narrow range of thought, exclusive discipline of the body, and never-ending preparation for war, which formed the system of the latter. His assertion that Athens was equal to Sparta even in her own solitary excellence—efficiency on the field of battle—is doubtless untenable. But not the less impressive is his sketch of that multitude of concurrent impulses which at this same time agitated and impelled the Athenian mind—the strength of one not implying the weakness of the remainder: the relish for all pleasures of art and elegance, and the appetite for intellectual expansion, coinciding in the same bosom with energetic promptitude as well as endurance: abundance of

iii. 12, 5). It is curious that the sentiment appears in this dialogue as put in the mouth of the younger Periklēs (illegitimate son of the great Periklēs) in a dialogue with Sokratēs.

Beginning of Peloponnesian War 183

recreative spectacles, yet noway abating the cheerfulness of obedience even to the hardest calls of patriotic duty : that combination of reason and courage which encountered danger the more willingly from having discussed and calculated it beforehand : lastly an anxious interest, as well as a competence of judgement, in public discussion and public action, common to every citizen rich and poor, and combined with every man's own private industry. So comprehensive an ideal of many-sided social development, bringing out the capacities for action and endurance, as well as those for enjoyment, would be sufficiently remarkable, even if we supposed it only existing in the imagination of a philosopher : but it becomes still more so when we recollect that the main features of it at least were drawn from the fellow-citizens of the speaker. It must be taken however as belonging peculiarly to the Athens of Periklês and his contemporaries. It would not have suited either the period of the Persian war fifty years before, or that of Demosthenês seventy years afterwards. At the former period, the art, the letters, and the philosophy, adverted to with pride by Periklês, were as yet backward, while even the active energy and democratical stimulus, though very powerful, had not been worked up to the pitch which they afterwards reached : at the latter period, although the intellectual manifestations of Athens subsist in full or even increased vigour, we shall find the personal enterprise and energetic spirit of her citizens materially abated. As the circumstances, which I have already recounted, go far to explain the previous upward movement, so those which fill the coming chapters, containing the disasters of the Peloponnesian war, will be found to explain still more completely the declining tendency shortly about to commence. Athens was brought to the brink of entire ruin, from which it is surprising that she recovered at all—but noway surprising that she recovered at the expense of a considerable loss of personal energy in the character of her citizens.

And thus the season at which Periklês delivered his discourse lends to it an additional and peculiar pathos. It was at a time when Athens was as yet erect and at her maximum. For though her real power was doubtless much diminished compared with the period before the Thirty years' truce, yet the great edifices and works of art, achieved since then, tended to compensate that loss, in so far as the sense of greatness was concerned : and no one, either citizen or enemy, considered Athens as having at all declined. It was at the commencement of the great struggle with the Peloponnesian confederacy, the

coming hardships of which Periklēs never disguised either to himself or to his fellow-citizens, though he fully counted upon eventual success. Attica had been already invaded; it was no longer "the unwasted territory," as Euripidēs had designated it in his tragedy *Medea*,¹ represented three or four months before the march of Archidamus. A picture of Athens in her social glory was well-calculated both to rouse the pride and nerve the courage of those individual citizens, who had been compelled once, and would be compelled again and again, to abandon their country-residence and fields for a thin tent or confined hole in the city.² Such calamities might indeed be foreseen: but there was one still greater calamity, which though actually then impending, could not be foreseen: the terrific pestilence which will be recounted in the coming chapter. The bright colours and tone of cheerful confidence, which pervade the discourse of Periklēs, appear the more striking from being in immediate antecedence to the awful description of this distemper: a contrast, to which Thucydidēs was doubtless not insensible, and which is another circumstance enhancing the interest of the composition.

¹ Euripidēs, *Medea*, 824. *ἱερὰς χώρας ἀπορθήτου τ'*, &c.

² The remarks of Dionysius Halikarnassus, tending to show that the number of dead buried on this occasion was so small, and the actions in which they had been slain so insignificant, as to be unworthy of so elaborate an harangue as this of Periklēs—and finding fault with Thucydides on that ground—are by no means well-founded or justifiable. He treats Thucydides like a dramatic writer putting a speech into the mouth of one of his characters, and he considers that the occasion chosen for this speech was unworthy. But though this assumption would be correct with regard to many ancient historians, and to Dionysius himself in his Roman history—it is not correct with reference to Thucydides. The speech of Periklēs was a real speech, heard, reproduced, and doubtless drest up, by Thucydides: if therefore more is said than the number of the dead or the magnitude of the occasion warranted, this is the fault of Periklēs and not of Thucydides. Dionysius says that there were many other occasions throughout the war much more worthy of an elaborate funeral harangue—especially the disastrous loss of the Sicilian army. But Thucydides could not have heard any of them, after his exile in the eighth year of the war: and we may well presume that none of them would bear any comparison with this of Periklēs. Nor does Dionysius at all appreciate the full circumstances of this first year of the war—which, when completely felt, will be found to render the splendid and copious harangue of the great statesman eminently seasonable. See Dionys. H. de Thucyd. Judic. p. 849–851.

Second and Third Years of War 185

CHAPTER XLIX

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND YEAR DOWN TO THE
END OF THE THIRD YEAR OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

AT the close of one year after the attempted surprise of Plataea by the Thebans, the belligerent parties in Greece remained in an unaltered position as to relative strength. Nothing decisive had been accomplished on either side, either by the invasion of Attica, or by the flying descents round the coast of Peloponnesus. In spite of mutual damage inflicted—doubtless in the greatest measure upon Attica—no progress was yet made towards the fulfilment of those objects which had induced the Peloponnesians to go to war. Especially the most pressing among all their wishes—the relief of Potidæa—was noway advanced; for the Athenians had not found it necessary to relax the blockade of that city. The result of the first year's operations had thus been to disappoint the hopes of the Corinthians and the other ardent instigators of war, while it justified the anticipations both of Periklês and of Archidamus.

A second devastation of Attica was resolved upon for the commencement of spring; and measures were taken for carrying it all over that territory, since the settled policy of Athens not to hazard a battle with the invaders was now ascertained. About the end of March or beginning of April, the entire Peloponnesian force (two-thirds from each confederate city as before) was assembled under the command of Archidamus and marched into Attica. This time they carried the work of systematic destruction not merely over the Thriasian plain and the plain immediately near to Athens, as before; but also to the more southerly portions of Attica, down even as far as the mines of Laurium. They traversed and ravaged both the eastern and the western coast, remaining not less than forty days in the country. They found the territory deserted as before, all the population having retired within the walls.¹

In regard to this second invasion, Periklês recommended the same defensive policy as he had applied to the first; and apparently the citizens had now come to acquiesce in it, if not

¹ Thucyd. ii. 47-55.

willingly, at least with a full conviction of its necessity. But a new visitation had now occurred, diverting their attention from the invader, though enormously aggravating their sufferings. A few days after Archidamus entered Attica, a pestilence or epidemic sickness broke out unexpectedly at Athens.

It appears that this terrific disorder had been raging for some time throughout the regions round the Mediterranean; having begun, as was believed, in Ethiopia—thence passing into Egypt and Libya, and overrunning a considerable portion of Asia under the Persian government. About sixteen years before, too, there had been a similar calamity in Rome and in various parts of Italy. Recently, it had been felt in Lemnos and some other islands of the Ægean, yet seemingly not with such intensity as to excite much notice generally in the Grecian world: at length it passed to Athens, and first showed itself in the Peiræus. The progress of the disease was as rapid and destructive as its appearance had been sudden; whilst the extraordinary accumulation of people within the city and long walls, in consequence of the presence of the invaders in the country, was but too favourable to every form of contagion. Families crowded together in close cabins and places of temporary shelter¹—throughout a city constructed (like most of those in Greece) with little regard to the conditions of salubrity—and in a state of mental chagrin from the forced abandonment and sacrifice of their properties in the country, transmitted the disorder with fatal facility from one to the other. Beginning as it did about the middle of April, the increasing heat of summer further aided the disorder, the symptoms of which, alike violent and sudden, made themselves the more remarked because the year was particularly exempt from maladies of every other description.²

¹ Thucyd. ii. 52; Diodor. xii. 45; Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 34. It is to be remarked, that the Athenians, though their persons and moveable property were crowded within the walls, had not driven in their sheep and cattle also, but had transported them over to Eubœa and the neighbouring islands (Thucyd. ii. 14). Hence they escaped a serious aggravation of their epidemic: for in the accounts of the epidemics which desolated Rome under similar circumstances, we find the accumulation of great numbers of cattle, along with human beings, specified as a terrible addition to the calamity (see Livy, iii. 66; Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom. x. 53: compare Niebuhr, Römisch. Gesch. vol. ii. p. 90).

² Thucyd. ii. 49. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔτος, ὥς ἀμολογεῖτο ἐκ πάντων, μάλιστα δὲ ἐκείνο ἔνοσον ἐς τὰς ἑλλας ἀσθενέας ἐτύγχανεν εἶναι. Hippokratēs, in his description of the epidemic fever at Thasos, makes a similar remark on the absence of all other disorders at the time (Epidem. i. 8, vol. ii. p. 640, ed. Littré).

Second and Third Years of War 187

Of this plague—or (more properly) eruptive typhoid fever,¹ distinct from, yet analogous to, the small-pox—a description no less clear than impressive has been left by the historian Thucydides, himself not only a spectator but a sufferer. It is not one of the least of his merits, that his notice of the symptoms, given at so early a stage of medical science and observation, is such as to instruct the medical reader of the present age, and to enable the malady to be understood and identified. The observations with which that notice is ushered in, deserve particular attention. “In respect to this distemper (he says), let every man, physician or not, say what he thinks respecting the source from whence it may probably have arisen, and respecting the causes which he deems sufficiently powerful to have produced so great a revolution. But I, having myself had the distemper, and having seen others suffering under it, will state *what it actually was*, and will indicate in addition such other matters, as will furnish any man, who lays them to heart, with knowledge and the means of calculation

¹ “La description de Thucydide (observe M. Littré, in his introduction to the works of Hippokratēs, t. i. p. 122) est tellement bonne qu'elle suffit pleinement pour nous faire comprendre ce que cette ancienne maladie a été: et il est fort à regretter que des médecins tels qu'Hippocrate et Galien n'aient rien écrit sur les grandes épidémies, dont ils ont été les spectateurs. Hippocrate a été témoin de cette peste racontée par Thucydide, et il ne nous en a pas laissé la description. Galien vit également la fièvre éruptive qui désola le monde sous Marc Aurèle, et qu'il appelle lui-même la longue peste. Cependant excepté quelques mots épars dans ses volumineux ouvrages, excepté quelques indications fugitives, il ne nous a rien transmis sur un évènement médical aussi important; à tel point que si nous n'avions pas le récit de Thucydide, il nous seroit fort difficile de nous faire une idée de celle qu'a vue Galien, et qui est la même (comme M. Hecker s'est attaché à le démontrer) que la maladie connue sous le nom de Peste d'Athènes. C'était une fièvre éruptive, différente de la variole, et éteinte aujourd'hui. On a cru en voir les traces dans les charbons (*ἀνθράκες*) des livres Hippocratiques.”

Both Krauss (*Disquisitio de naturâ morbi Atheniensium*, Stuttgart, 1831, p. 38) and Hauser (*Historisch. Patholog. Untersuchungen*, Dresden, 1839, p. 50) assimilate the pathological phenomena specified by Thucydides to different portions of the *Ἐπιδημίας* of Hippokratēs. M. Littré thinks that the resemblance is not close or precise, so as to admit of the one being identified with the other. “Le tableau si frappant qu'en a tracé ce grand historien ne se reproduit pas certainement avec une netteté suffisante dans les brefs détails donnés par Hippocrate. La maladie d'Athènes avoit un type si tranché, que tous ceux qui en ont parlé ont du le reproduire dans ses parties essentielles.” (Argument aux 2^{me} Livre des Epidémies, Œuvres d'Hippocrate, t. v. p. 64.) There appears good reason to believe that the great epidemic which prevailed in the Roman world under Marcus Aurelius (the *Pestis Antoniniana*) was a renewal of what is called the Plague of Athens.

beforehand, in case the same misfortune should ever again occur.”¹ To record past facts, as a basis for rational prevision in regard to the future—the same sentiment which Thucydides mentions in his preface,² as having animated him to the composition of his history—was at that time a duty so little understood, that we have reason to admire not less the manner in which he performs it in practice, than the distinctness with which he conceives it in theory. We may infer from his language that speculation in his day was active respecting the causes of this plague, according to the vague and fanciful physics, and scanty stock of ascertained facts, which was all that could then be consulted. By resisting the itch of theorising from one of those loose hypotheses which then appeared plausibly to explain everything, he probably renounced the point of view from which most credit and interest would be derivable at the time. But his simple and precise summary of observed facts carries with it an imperishable value, and even affords grounds for imagining that he was no stranger to the habits and training of his contemporary Hippokratēs, and the other Asklepiads of Kos.³

¹ Thucyd. ii. 48. λεγέτω μὲν οὖν περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἕκαστος γινώσκει, καὶ ἰατρὸς καὶ ἰδιώτης, ἀφ’ οὗτου εἰκὸς ἦν γενέσθαι αὐτὸ, καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἄστινας νομίζει τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἱκανὰς εἶναι δύναμιν ἐς τὸ μεταστῆσαι σχεῖν· ἐγὼ δὲ οἷόν τε ἐγίγνετο λέξω, καὶ ἀφ’ ὧν ἂν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστ’ ἂν ἔχοι τι προειδὼς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν, ταῦτα δηλώσω, αὐτὸς τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους πάσχοντας.

Demokritos, among others, connected the generation of these epidemics with his general system of atoms, atmospheric effluvia, and *εἶδωλα*: see Plutarch, *Symposiac*. viii. 9, p. 733; Demokriti Fragment., ed. Mullach. lib. iv. p. 409.

The causes of the Athenian epidemic as given by Diodorus (xii. 58)—unusual rains, watery quality of grain, absence of the Etesian winds, &c., may perhaps be true of the revival of the epidemic in the fifth year of the war, but can hardly be true of its first appearance; since Thucydides states that the year in other respects was unusually healthy, and the epidemic was evidently brought from foreign parts to Peiræus.

² Thucyd. i. 22.

³ See the words of Thucydides, ii. 49. καὶ ἀποκαθάρσεις χολῆς πᾶσαι ὑπὸ ἰατρῶν ὠνομασμέναι εἰσὶν, ἐπῆρσαν—which would seem to indicate a familiarity with the medical terminology:—compare also his allusion to the speculations of the physicians, cited in the previous note; and c. 51—τὰ πάσῃ διαίτῃ θεραπευόμενα, &c.

In proof how rare the conception was, in ancient times, of the importance of collecting and registering particular medical facts, I transcribe the following observations from M. Littré (*Œuvres d’Hippocrate*, t. iv. p. 646, *Remarques Retrospectives*).

“Toutefois ce qu’il importe ici de constater, ce n’est pas qu’Hippocrate a observé de telle ou telle manière, mais c’est qu’il a eu l’idée de recueillir et de consigner des faits particuliers. En effet, rien, dans l’antiquité, n’a

Second and Third Years of War 189

It is hardly within the province of an historian of Greece to repeat after Thucydidès the painful enumeration of symptoms, violent in the extreme and pervading every portion of the bodily system, which marked this fearful disorder. Beginning in Peiræus, it quickly passed into the city, and both the one and the other was speedily filled with sickness and suffering, the like of which had never before been known. The seizures were sudden, and a large proportion of the sufferers perished after deplorable agonies on the seventh or on the ninth day. Others, whose strength of constitution carried them over this period, found themselves the victims of exhausting and incurable diarrhoea afterwards: with others again, after traversing both these stages, the distemper fixed itself in some particular member, the eyes, the genitals, the hands, or the feet, which were rendered permanently useless, or in some cases amputated, even where the patient himself recovered. There were also some whose recovery was attended with a total loss of memory, so that they no more knew themselves or recognised their friends. No treatment or remedy appearing, except in accidental cases, to produce any beneficial effect, the physicians or surgeons whose aid was invoked became completely at fault. While trying their accustomed means without avail, they soon

été plus rare que ce soin : outre Hippocrate, je ne connois qu'Erasistrate qui se soit occupé de relater sous cette forme les résultats de son expérience clinique. Ni Galien lui-même, ni Arétée, ni Soranus, ni les autres qui sont arrivés jusqu'à nous, n'ont suivi un aussi louable exemple. Les observations consignées dans la collection Hippocratique constituent la plus grande partie, à beaucoup près, de ce que l'antiquité a possédé en ce genre : et si, en commentant le travail d'Hippocrate, on l'avait un peu imité, nous aurions des matériaux à l'aide desquels nous prendrions une idée bien plus précise de la pathologie de ces siècles reculés. . . . Mais tout en exprimant ce regret et en reconnaissant cette utilité relative à nous autres modernes et véritablement considérable, il faut ajouter que l'antiquité avoit dans les faits et la doctrine Hippocratiques un aliment qui lui a suffi — et qu'une collection, même étendue, d'histoires particulières n'auroit pas alors modifié la médecine, du moins la médecine scientifique, essentiellement et au delà de la limite que comportoit la physiologie. Je pourrai montrer ailleurs que la doctrine d'Hippocrate et de l'école de Cos a été la seule solide, la seule fondée sur un aperçu vrai de la nature organisée ; et que les sectes postérieures, méthodisme et pneumatisme, n'ont bâti leurs théories que sur des hypothèses sans consistance. Mais ici je me contente de remarquer, que la pathologie, en tant que science, ne peut marcher qu'à la suite de la physiologie, dont elle n'est qu'une des faces : et d'Hippocrate à Galien inclusivement, la physiologie ne fit pas assez de progrès pour rendre insuffisante la conception Hippocratique. Il en résulte, nécessairement, que la pathologie, toujours considérée comme science, n'auroit pu, par quelque procédé que ce fût, gagner que des corrections et des augmentations de détail."

ended by catching the malady themselves and perishing. The charms and incantations,¹ to which the unhappy patient resorted, were not likely to be more efficacious. While some asserted that the Peloponnesians had poisoned the cisterns of water, others referred the visitation to the wrath of the gods, and especially to Apollo, known by hearers of the Iliad as author of pestilence in the Greek host before Troy. It was remembered that this Delphian god had promised the Lacedæmonians, in reply to their application immediately before the war, that he would assist them whether invoked or uninvoked—and the disorder now raging was ascribed to the intervention of their irresistible ally; while the elderly men further called to mind an oracular verse sung in the time of their youth—"The Dorian war will come, and pestilence along with it."² Under the distress which suggested, and was reciprocally aggravated by, these gloomy ideas, prophets were consulted, and supplications with solemn procession were held at the temples, to appease the divine wrath.

When it was found that neither the priest nor the physician

¹ Compare the story of Thalêtas appeasing an epidemic at Sparta by his music and song (Plutarch, De Musicâ, p. 1146).

Some of the ancient physicians were firm believers in the efficacy of these charms and incantations. Alexander of Tralles says that having originally treated them with contempt, he had convinced himself of their value by personal observation, and altered his opinion (ix. 4)—*ἔνιοι γοῦν οἴονται τοῖς τῶν γραῶν μύθοις εἰκέναι τὰς ἐπιφθὰς, ὥσπερ καὶ γὰρ μέχρι πολλοῦ· τῷ χρόνῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐναργῶς φαινομένων ἐπελσθην εἶναι δύναμιν ἐν αὐταῖς*. See an interesting and valuable dissertation, *Origines Contagii*, by Dr. C. F. Marx (Stuttgart, 1824, p. 129).

The suffering Hêraklês, in his agony under the poisoned tunic, invokes the *ἄοιδός* along with the *χειροτέχνης ἰατρορίας* (Sophoklês, Trachin. 1005).

² Thucyd. ii. 54. *Φάσκοντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι πάσαι ἄδεσθαι—“Ἡξει Δωριακὸς πόλεμος καὶ λοιμὸς ἅμ’ αὐτῷ.”*

See also the first among the epistles ascribed to the orator Æschinês respecting a *λοιμός* in Delos.

It appears that there was a debate whether, in this Hexameter verse, *λιμός* (famine) or *λοιμός* (pestilence) was the correct reading: and the probability is, that it had been originally composed with the word *λιμός*—for men might well fancy beforehand that *famine* would be a sequel of the Dorian war, but they would not be likely to imagine *pestilence* as accompanying it. Yet (says Thucydides) the reading *λοιμός* was held decidedly preferable, as best fitting to the actual circumstances (*οἱ γὰρ ἀνθρώποι πρὸς ἃ ἔπασχον τὴν μὲν μὴν ἐποιοῦντο*). And “if (he goes on to say) there should ever hereafter come another Dorian war, and famine along with it, the oracle will probably be reproduced with the word *λιμός* as part of it.”

This deserves notice, as illustrating the sort of admitted licence with which men twisted the oracles or prophecies, so as to hit the feelings of the actual moment.

Second and Third Years of War 191

could retard the spread, or mitigate the intensity, of the disorder, the Athenians abandoned themselves to despair, and the space within the walls became a scene of desolating misery. Every man attacked with the malady at once lost his courage—a state of depression, itself among the worst features of the case, which made him lie down and die, without any attempt to seek for preservatives. And though at first friends and relatives lent their aid to tend the sick with the usual family sympathies, yet so terrible was the number of these attendants who perished, “like sheep,” from such contact, that at length no man would thus expose himself; while the most generous spirits, who persisted longest in the discharge of their duty, were carried off in the greatest numbers.¹ The patient was thus left to die alone and unheeded. Sometimes all the inmates of a house were swept away one after the other, no man being willing to go near it: desertion on one hand, attendance on the other, both tended to aggravate the calamity. There remained only those who, having had the disorder and recovered, were willing to tend the sufferers. These men formed the single exception to the all-pervading misery of the time—for the disorder seldom attacked any one twice, and when it did, the second attack was never fatal. Elate with their own escape, they deemed themselves out of the reach of all disease, and were full of compassionate kindness for others whose sufferings were just beginning. It was from them too that the principal attention to the bodies of deceased victims proceeded: for such was the state of dismay and sorrow, that even the nearest relatives neglected the sepulchral duties, sacred beyond all others in the eyes of a Greek. Nor is there any circumstance which conveys to us so vivid an idea of the prevalent agony and despair, as when we read in the words of an eye-witness, that the deaths took place among this close-packed crowd without the smallest decencies of attention²—that the dead and the dying lay piled one upon

¹ Compare Diodor. xiv. 70, who mentions similar distresses in the Carthaginian army besieging Syracuse, during the terrible epidemic with which it was attacked in 395 B.C.; and Livy, xxv. 26, respecting the epidemic at Syracuse when it was besieged by Marcellus and the Romans.

² Thucyd. ii. 52. Οἰκίῳν γὰρ οὐχ ὑπαρχουσῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν καλύβαις πνιγῆ-
ραῖς θρᾶ ἵτους διαιτωμένων, ὃ φθόρος ἐγένετο οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ νεκροὶ
ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις ἀποθνήσκοντες ἔκειντο, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐκαλινδοῦντο καὶ
περὶ τὰς κρήνας ἀπάσας ἡμιθνήτες, τοῦ ὕδατος ἐπιθυμία. Τὰ τε ἱερὰ ἐν
οἷς ἐσκήνηντο, νεκρῶν πλέα ἦν, αὐτοῦ ἐναποθνησκόντων· ὑπερβιαζομένου γὰρ
τοῦ κακοῦ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὐκ ἔχοντες ὅ τι γένωνται, ἐς ὀλιγοῖαν ἐτράποντο καὶ
ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων ὁμοίως.

another not merely in the public roads, but even in the temples, in spite of the understood defilement of the sacred building—that half-dead sufferers were seen lying round all the springs, from insupportable thirst—that the numerous corpses thus unburied and exposed, were in such a condition, that the dogs which meddled with them died in consequence, while no vultures or other birds of the like habits ever came near. Those bodies which escaped entire neglect were burnt or buried¹ without the customary mourning, and with unseemly carelessness. In some cases, the bearers of a body, passing by a funeral pile on which another body was burning, would put their own there to be burnt also ;² or perhaps, if the pile was prepared ready for a body not yet arrived, would deposit their own upon it, set fire to the pile, and then depart. Such indecent confusion would have been intolerable to the feelings of the Athenians, in any ordinary times.

To all these scenes of physical suffering, death, and reckless despair—was superadded another evil, which affected those who were fortunate enough to escape the rest. The bonds both of law and morality became relaxed, amidst such total uncertainty of every man both for his own life, and that of others. Men cared not to abstain from wrong, under circumstances in which punishment was not likely to overtake them—nor to put a check upon their passions, and endure privations, in obedience even to their strongest conviction, when the chance was so small of their living to reap reward or enjoy any future esteem. An interval, short and sweet, before their doom was realised—before they became plunged in the wide-spread misery which they witnessed around, and which affected indiscriminately the virtuous and the profligate—was all that they looked to enjoy ; embracing with avidity the immediate pleasures of sense, as well as such positive gains, however ill-gotten, as could be made the means of procuring them, and throwing aside all thought both of honour or of long-sighted advantage. Life and property being alike ephemeral, there was no hope left but to snatch a moment of enjoyment, before the outstretched hand of destiny should fall upon its victims.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 50 : compare Livy, xli. 21, describing the epidemic at Rome in 174 B.C. “*Cadavera, intacta à canibus et vulturibus, tabes assumebat : satisque constabat, nec illo, nec priore anno in tantâ strage boum hominumque vulturium usquam visum.*”

² Thucyd. ii. 52. From the language of Thucydides, we see that this was regarded at Athens as highly unbecoming. Yet a passage of Plutarch seems to show that it was very common, in his time, to burn several bodies on the same funeral pile (Plutarch, *Symposiac.* iii. 4, p. 651).

Second and Third Years of War 193

The picture of society under the pressure of a murderous epidemic, with its train of physical torments, wretchedness, and demoralisation, has been drawn by more than one eminent author, but by none with more impressive fidelity and conciseness than by Thucydides,¹ who had no predecessor, nor anything but the reality, to copy from. We may remark that amidst all the melancholy accompaniments of the time, there are no human sacrifices, such as those offered up at Carthage during pestilence to appease the anger of the gods—there are no cruel persecutions against imaginary authors of the disease, such as those against the Untori (anointers of doors) in the plague of Milan in 1630.²

Three years altogether did this calamity desolate Athens: continuously, during the entire second and third years of the war—after which followed a period of marked abatement for a year and a half: but it then revived again, and lasted for another year, with the same fury as at first. The public loss, over and above the private misery, which this unexpected enemy inflicted upon Athens, was incalculable. Out of 1200 horsemen, all among the rich men of the state, 300 died of the epidemic; besides 4400 hoplites out of the roll formally kept, and a number of the poorer population, so great as to defy computation.³ No efforts of the Peloponnesians could have done so much to ruin Athens, or to bring the war to a termination such as they desired: and the distemper told the more in their favour, as it never spread at all into Peloponnesus, though it passed from Athens to some of the more populous islands.⁴ The Lacedæmonian army was withdrawn from Attica somewhat earlier than it would otherwise have been, for fear of taking the contagion.⁵

¹ The description in the sixth book of Lucretius, translated and expanded from Thucydides—that of the plague at Florence in 1348, with which the Decameron of Boccaccio opens—and that of Defoe in his History of the Plague in London—are all well known.

² “Carthaginienses, cum inter cetera mala etiam peste laborarent, cruentâ sacrorum religionē, et scelere pro remedio, usi sunt: quippe homines ut victimas immolabant; pacem deorum sanguine eorum exposcentes, pro quorum vitâ Dii rogari maximè solent” (Justin, xviii. 6).

For the facts respecting the plague of Milan and the Untori, see the interesting novel of Manzoni—Promessi Sposi—and the historical work of the same author—Storia della Colonna Infame.

³ Thucyd. iii. 87. τοῦ δὲ ἄλλου ὄχλου ἀνεξέμετος ἀριθμός. Diodorus makes them above 10,000 (xii. 58) freemen and slaves together, which must be greatly beneath the reality.

⁴ Thucyd. ii. 54. τῶν ἄλλων χωρίων τὰ πολυανθρωπότατα. He does not specify what places these were:—perhaps Chios, but hardly Lesbos, otherwise the fact would have been noticed when the revolt of that island occurs.

⁵ Thucyd. ii. 57.

But it was while the Lacedæmonians were yet in Attica, and during the first freshness of the terrible malady, that Periklēs equipped and conducted from Peiræus an armament of 100 triremes and 4000 hoplites to attack the coasts of Peloponnesus: 300 horsemen were also carried in some horse-transport, prepared for the occasion out of old triremes. To diminish the crowd accumulated in the city, was doubtless of beneficial tendency, and perhaps those who went aboard might consider it as a chance of escape to quit an infected home. But unhappily they carried the infection along with them, which desolated the fleet not less than the city, and crippled all its efforts. Reinforced by fifty ships of war from Chios and Lesbos, the Athenians first landed near Epidaurus in Peloponnesus, ravaging the territory and making an unavailing attempt upon the city: next they made like incursions on the more southerly portions of the Argolic peninsula—Trœzen, Halieis, and Hermionê; and lastly attacked and captured Prasiæ, on the eastern coast of Laconia. On returning to Athens, the same armament was immediately conducted under Agnon and Kleopompus, to press the siege of Potidæa, the blockade of which still continued without any visible progress. On arriving there, an attack was made on the walls by battering engines and by the other aggressive methods then practised; but nothing whatever was achieved. In fact, the armament became incompetent for all serious effort, from the aggravated character which the distemper here assumed, communicated by the soldiers fresh from Athens even to those who had before been free from it at Potidæa. So frightful was the mortality, that out of the 4000 hoplites under Agnon, no less than 1050 died in the short space of forty days. The armament was brought back in this distressed condition to Athens, while the reduction of Potidæa was left as before to the slow course of blockade.¹

On returning from the expedition against Peloponnesus, Periklēs found his countrymen almost distracted² with their manifold sufferings. Over and above the raging epidemic, they had just gone over Attica and ascertained the devastations committed by the invaders throughout all the territory (except the Marathonian³ Tetrapolis and Dekeleia—districts spared, as we are told, through indulgence founded on an ancient legendary sympathy) during their long stay of forty days. The rich had

¹ Thucyd. ii. 56–58.

² Thucyd. ii. 59. *ἡλλοίωντο τὰς γνώμας.*

³ Diodor. xii. 45; Ister ap. Schol. ad Soph. Œdip. Colon. 689; Herodot. ix.

Second and Third Years of War 195

found their comfortable mansions and farms, the poor their modest cottages, in the various demes, torn down and ruined. Death,¹ sickness, loss of property, and despair of the future, now rendered the Athenians angry and intractable to the last degree. They vented their feelings against Periklês as the cause not merely of the war, but also of all that they were now enduring. Either with or without his consent, they sent envoys to Sparta to open negotiations for peace, but the Spartans turned a deaf ear to the proposition. This new disappointment rendered them still more furious against Periklês, whose long-standing political enemies now doubtless found strong sympathy in their denunciations of his character and policy. That unshaken and majestic firmness, which ranked first among his many eminent qualities, was never more imperiously required and never more effectively manifested.

In his capacity of Stratêgus or General, Periklês convoked a formal assembly of the people, for the purpose of vindicating himself publicly against the prevailing sentiment, and recommending perseverance in his line of policy. The speeches made by his opponents, assuredly very bitter, are not given by Thucydîdês; but that of Periklês himself is set down at considerable length, and a memorable discourse it is. It strikingly brings into relief both the character of the man and the impress of actual circumstances—an impregnable mind conscious not only of right purposes but of just and reasonable anticipations, and bearing up with manliness, or even defiance, against the natural difficulty of the case, heightened by an extreme of incalculable misfortune. He had foreseen,² while advising the war originally, the probable impatience of his countrymen under its first hardships, but he could not foresee the epidemic by which that impatience had been exasperated into madness: and he now addressed them not merely with unabated adherence to his own deliberate convictions, but also in a tone of reproachful remonstrance against their unmerited change of sentiment towards him—seeking at the same time to combat that uncontrolled despair which for the moment overlaid both their pride and their patriotism. Far from humbling himself before the present sentiment, it is at this time that he sets forth his titles to their esteem in the most direct and unqualified manner, and claims the continuance of that which they had so

¹ Thucyd. ii. 65. 'Ο μὲν δῆμος, ὅτι ἀπ' ἐλασσόνων δρῶμενος, ἐστέρητο καὶ τούτων· οἱ δὲ δυνατοὶ καλὰ κτήματα κατὰ τὴν χώραν οἰκοδομαῖς τε καὶ πολυτελέσι κατασκευαῖς ἀπολωλεκότες.

² Thucyd. i. 140.

long accorded, as something belonging to him by acquired right.

His main object, throughout this discourse, is to fill the minds of his audience with patriotic sympathy for the weal of the entire city, so as to counterbalance the absorbing sense of private woe. If the collective city flourishes (he argues), private misfortunes may at least be borne: but no amount of private prosperity will avail, if the collective city falls (a proposition literally true in ancient times and under the circumstances of ancient warfare—though less true at present). “Distracted by domestic calamity, ye are now angry both with me who advised you to go to war, and with yourselves who followed the advice. Ye listened to me, considering me superior to others in judgment, in speech, in patriotism, and in incorruptible probity¹—nor ought I now to be treated as culpable for giving such advice, when in point of fact the war was unavoidable and there would have been still greater danger in shrinking from it. I am the same man, still unchanged—but ye in your misfortunes cannot stand to the convictions which ye adopted when yet unhurt. Extreme and unforeseen, indeed, are the sorrows which have fallen upon you: yet inhabiting as ye do a great city, and brought up in dispositions suitable to it, ye must also resolve to bear up against the utmost pressure of adversity, and never to surrender your dignity. I have often explained to you that ye have no reason to doubt of eventual success in the war, but I will now remind you, more emphatically than before, and even with a degree of ostentation suitable as a stimulus to your present unnatural depression—that your naval force makes you masters not only of your allies, but of the entire sea²—one half of the visible field for action and employment. Compared with so vast a power as this, the temporary use of your houses and territory is a mere trifle—an ornamental accessory not worth considering: and this too, if ye preserve your freedom, ye will quickly recover. It was your fathers who first gained this empire, without any of the

¹ Thucyd. ii. 60. καίτοι ἐμοὶ τοιοῦτ' ἀνδρὶ ὀργίζεσθε, ὃς οὐδενὸς οἶομαι ἦσσαν εἶναι γνώμῃ τε τὰ δέοντα, καὶ ἐρμηνεύσαι τὰυτα, φιλόπολιν τε καὶ χρημάτων κρείσσων.

² Thucyd. ii. 62. δηλώσω δὲ καὶ τὸδε, ὃ μοι δοκεῖτε οὐτ' αὐτοὶ πώποτε ἐνθυμηθῆναι ὑπάρχον ὑμῖν μεγέθους περὶ ἐς τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐτ' ἐγὼ ἐν τοῖς πρὶν λόγοις· οὐδ' ἂν νῦν ἐχρησάμην κομπωδεστέραν ἔχοντι τὴν προσποίησιν, εἰ μὴ καταπεπληγμένους ὑμᾶς παρὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἑάρων. Οἴεσθε μὲν γὰρ τῶν συμμαχῶν μόνον ἄρχειν—ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαίνω δύο μερῶν τῶν ἐς χρῆσιν φανερῶν, γῆς καὶ θαλάττης, τοῦ ἑτέρου ὑμᾶς παντὸς κυριωτάτους ὄντας, ἐφ' ὅσον τε νῦν νέμεσθε, καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ πλέον βουλευθῆτε.

Second and Third Years of War 197

advantages which ye now enjoy ; ye must not disgrace yourselves by losing what they acquired. Delighting, as ye all do in the honour and empire enjoyed by the city, ye must not shrink from the toils whereby alone that honour is sustained : more-over ye now fight, not merely for freedom instead of slavery, but for empire against loss of empire, with all the perils arising out of imperial unpopularity. It is not safe for you now to abdicate, even if ye chose to do so ; for ye hold your empire like a despotism—unjust perhaps in the original acquisition, but ruinous to part with when once acquired. Be not angry with me, whose advice ye followed in going to war, because the enemy have done such damage as might be expected from them : still less on account of this unforeseen distemper : I know that this makes me an object of your special present hatred, though very unjustly, unless ye will consent to give me credit also for any unexpected good luck which may occur. Our city derives its particular glory from unshaken bearing up against misfortune : her power, her name, her empire of Greeks over Greeks, are such as have never before been seen : and if we choose to be great, we must take the consequence of that temporary envy and hatred which is the necessary price of permanent renown. Behave ye now in a manner worthy of that glory : display that courage which is essential to protect you against disgrace at present, as well as to guarantee your honour for the future. Send no further embassy to Sparta, and bear your misfortunes without showing symptoms of distress.”¹

The irresistible reason, as well as the proud and resolute bearing of this discourse, set forth with an eloquence which it was not possible for Thucydidês to reproduce—together with the age and character of Periklês—carried the assent of the assembled people ; who when in the Pnyx and engaged according to habit on public matters, would for a moment forget their private sufferings in considerations of the safety and grandeur of Athens. Possibly indeed, those sufferings, though still continuing, might become somewhat alleviated when the invaders quitted Attica, and when it was no longer indispensable for all the population to confine itself within the walls. Accordingly, the assembly resolved that no further propositions should be made for peace, and that the war should be prosecuted with vigour.

But though the public resolution thus adopted showed the

¹ Thucyd. ii. 60-64. I give a general summary of this memorable speech, without setting forth its full contents, still less the exact words.

ancient habit of deference to the authority of Periklès, the sentiments of individuals taken separately were still those of anger against him as the author of that system which had brought them into so much distress. His political opponents—Kleon, Simmias, or Lakratidas, perhaps all three in conjunction—took care to provide an opportunity for this prevalent irritation to manifest itself in act, by bringing an accusation against him before the dikastery. The accusation is said to have been preferred on the ground of pecuniary malversation, and ended by his being sentenced to pay a considerable fine, the amount of which is differently reported—fifteen, fifty, or eighty talents, by different authors.¹ The accusing party thus appeared to have carried their point, and to have disgraced, as well as excluded from re-election, the veteran statesman. The event however disappointed their expectations. The imposition of the fine not only satiated all the irritation of the people against him, but even occasioned a serious reaction in his

¹ Thucyd. ii. 65; Plato, Gorgias, p. 515, c. 71; Plutarch, Periklès, c. 35; Diodor. xii. c. 38–45. About Simmias, as the vehement enemy of Periklès, see Plutarch, Reipub. Ger. Præcept. p. 805.

Plutarch and Diodorus both state that Periklès was not only fined, but also removed from his office of Stratêgus. Thucydidès mentions the fine, but not the removal; and his silence leads me to doubt the reality of the latter event altogether. For with such a man as Periklès, a vote of removal would have been a penalty more marked and cutting than the fine: moreover, removal from office, though capable of being pronounced by vote of the public assembly, would hardly be inflicted as penalty by the dikastery.

I imagine the events to have passed as follows: The Stratêgi, with most other officers of the Commonwealth, were changed or re-elected at the beginning of Hekatombæon, the first month of the Attic year; that is, somewhere about Midsummer. Now the Peloponnesian army, invading Attica about the end of March or beginning of April, and remaining forty days, would leave the country about the first week in May. Periklès returned from his expedition against Peloponnesus shortly after they left Attica; that is, about the middle of May (Thucyd. ii. 57): there still remained therefore a month or six weeks before his office of Stratêgus naturally expired, and required renewal. It was during this interval (which Thucydidès expresses by the words *ἐν τῷ ἐσπαρήγῃ*, ii. 59) that he convoked the assembly and delivered the harangue recently mentioned.

But when the time for a new election of Stratêgi arrived, the enemies of Periklès opposed his re-election, and brought a charge against him in that trial of accountability to which every magistrate at Athens was exposed, after his period of office. They alleged against him some official misconduct in reference to the public money—and the dikastery visited him with a fine. His re-election was thus prevented, and with a man who had been so often re-elected, this might be loosely called “taking away the office of general”—so that the language of Plutarch and Diodorus, as well as the silence of Thucydidès, would on this supposition be justified.

Second and Third Years of War 199

favour, and brought back as strongly as ever the ancient sentiment of esteem and admiration. It was quickly found that those who had succeeded Periklēs as generals neither possessed nor deserved in an equal degree the public confidence. He was accordingly soon re-elected, with as much power and influence as he had ever in his life enjoyed.¹

But that life, long, honourable, and useful, had already been prolonged considerably beyond the sixtieth year, and there were but too many circumstances, besides the recent fine, which tended to hasten as well as to embitter its close. At the very moment when Periklēs was preaching to his countrymen, in a tone almost reproachful, the necessity of manful and unabated devotion to the common country, in the midst of private suffering—he was himself among the greatest of sufferers, and most hardly pressed to set the example of observing his own precepts. The epidemic carried off not merely his two sons (the only two legitimate, Xanthippus and Paralus), but also his sister, several other relatives, and his best and most useful political friends. Amidst this train of domestic calamities, and in the funeral obsequies of so many of his dearest friends, he remained master of his grief, and maintained his habitual self-command, until the last misfortune—the death of his favourite son Paralus, which left his house without any legitimate representative to maintain the family and the hereditary sacred rites. On this final blow, though he strove to command himself as before, yet at the obsequies of the young man, when it became his duty to place a wreath on the dead body, his grief became uncontrollable, and he burst out, for the first time in his life, into profuse tears and sobbing.²

In the midst of these several personal trials he received the intimation, through Alkibiadēs and some other friends, of the restored confidence of the people towards him, and of his re-election to the office of Stratēgus. But it was not without difficulty that he was persuaded to present himself again at the public assembly, and resume the direction of affairs. The regret of the people was formally expressed to him for the recent sentence—perhaps indeed the fine may have been repaid to him, or some evasion of it permitted, saving the forms of law³—in the present temper of the city; which was

¹ Thucyd. ii. 65.

² Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 36.

³ See Plutarch, Demosthen. c. 27, about the manner of bringing about such an evasion of a fine: compare also the letter of M. Boeckh, in Meineke, Fragment. Comic. Græcor. ad Fragn. Eupolid., ii. 527.

further displayed towards him by the grant of a remarkable exemption from a law of his own original proposition. He had himself, some years before, been the author of that law, whereby the citizenship of Athens was restricted to persons born both of Athenian fathers and Athenian mothers, under which restriction several thousand persons, illegitimate on the mother's side, are said to have been deprived of the citizenship, on occasion of a public distribution of corn. Invidious as it appeared to grant, to Periklès singly, an exemption from a law which had been strictly enforced against so many others, the people were now moved not less by compassion than by anxiety to redress their own previous severity. Without a legitimate heir, the house of Periklès, one branch of the great Alkmæonid Gens by his mother's side, would be left deserted, and the continuity of the family sacred rites would be broken—a misfortune painfully felt by every Athenian family, as calculated to wrong all the deceased members, and provoke their posthumous displeasure towards the city. Accordingly, permission was granted to Periklès to legitimise, and to inscribe in his own gens and phratry, his natural son by Aspasia, who bore his own name.¹

It was thus that Periklès was reinstated in his post of Stratêgus as well as in his ascendancy over the public counsels—seemingly about August or September—430 B.C. He lived about one year longer, and seems to have maintained his influence as long as his health permitted. Yet we hear nothing of him after this moment, and he fell a victim, not to the violent symptoms of the epidemic, but to a slow and wearing fever,² which undermined his strength as well as his capacity. To a friend who came to ask after him when in this disease, Periklès replied by showing a charm or amulet which his female relations had hung about his neck—a proof how low he was reduced, and how completely he had become a passive subject in the hands of others. And according to another anecdote which we read, yet more interesting and equally illustrative of his character—it was during his last moments, when he was lying apparently unconscious and insensible, that the friends around his bed were passing in review the acts of his life, and the nine trophies which he had erected at different

¹ Plutarch, Periklès, c. 37.

² Plutarch (Perik. c. 38) treats the slow disorder under which he suffered as one of the forms of the epidemic: but this can hardly be correct, when we read the very marked character of the latter, as described by Thucydidès.

times for so many victories. He heard what they said, though they fancied that he was past hearing, and interrupted them by remarking—"What you praise in my life, belongs partly to good fortune—and is, at best, common to me with many other generals. But the peculiarity of which I am most proud, you have not noticed—no Athenian has ever put on mourning through any action of mine."¹

Such a cause of self-gratulation, doubtless more satisfactory to recall at such a moment than any other, illustrates that long-sighted calculation, aversion to distant or hazardous enterprise, and economy of the public force, which marked his entire political career; a career long, beyond all parallel in the history of Athens—since he maintained a great influence, gradually swelling into a decisive personal ascendancy, for between thirty and forty years. His character has been presented in very different lights by different authors both ancient and modern, and our materials for striking the balance are not so good as we could wish. But his immense and long-continued supremacy, as well as his unparalleled eloquence, are facts attested not less by his enemies than by his friends—nay, even more forcibly by the former than by the latter. The comic writers, who hated him, and whose trade it was to deride and hunt down every leading political character, exhaust their powers of illustration in setting forth both the one and the other:² Telekleidēs, Kratīnus, Eupolis, Aristophanēs, all hearers and all enemies, speak of him like Olympian Zeus hurling thunder and lightning—like Heraklēs and Achilles—as the only speaker on whose lips persuasion sat and who left his sting in the minds of his audience: while Plato the philosopher,³ who disapproved of his political working and of the moral effects which he produced upon Athens, nevertheless extols his intellectual and oratorical ascendancy—"his majestic intelligence"—in language not less decisive than Thucydidēs. There is another point of eulogy, not less valuable, on which the testimony appears uncontradicted: throughout his long career, amidst the hottest political animosities, the conduct of Periklēs towards opponents was always mild and liberal.⁴ The conscious self-esteem and arrogance of manner, with which the

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 38.

² Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 4, 8, 13, 16; Eupolis. *Δῆμοι*, *Fragm.* vi. p. 459, ed. Meineke. Cicero (*De Orator.* iii. 34; Brutus, 9-11) and Quintilian (ii. 16, 19; x. 1, 82) count only as witnesses at second-hand.

³ Plato, *Gorgias*, c. 71, p. 516; Phædrus, c. 54, p. 270. *Περικλέα, τὸν οὕτω μεγαλοπρεπῶς σοφὸν ἀνδρα*. Plato, *Meno*, p. 94 B.

⁴ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 10-39.

contemporary poet Ion reproached him,¹ contrasting it with the unpretending simplicity of his own patron Kimon—though probably invidiously exaggerated, is doubtless in substance well founded, and those who read the last speech given above out of Thucydides will at once recognise in it this attribute. His natural taste, his love of philosophical research, and his unwearied application to public affairs, all contributed to alienate him from ordinary familiarity, and to make him careless, perhaps improperly careless, of the lesser means of conciliating public favour.

But admitting this latter reproach to be well-founded, as it seems to be, it helps to negative that greater and graver political crime which has been imputed to him, of sacrificing the permanent well-being and morality of the state to the maintenance of his own political power—of corrupting the people by distributions of the public money. “He gave the reins to the people (in Plutarch’s words²) and shaped his administration for their immediate favour, by always providing at home some public spectacle or festival or procession, thus nursing up the city in elegant pleasures—and by sending out every year sixty triremes manned by citizen-seamen on full pay, who were thus kept in practice and acquired nautical skill.”

Now the charge here made against Periklēs, and supported by allegations in themselves honourable rather than otherwise—of a vicious appetite for immediate popularity, and of improper concessions to the immediate feelings of the people against their permanent interests—is precisely that which Thucydides in the most pointed manner denies; and not merely denies, but contrasts Periklēs with his successors in the express circumstance that *they* did so, while *he* did not. The language of the contemporary historian³ well deserves to be

¹ Plutarch, *Pêriklês*, c. 5.

² Plutarch, *Periklês*, c. 11. Διὸ καὶ τότε μάλιστα τῷ δήμῳ τὰς ἡνίας ἀνέλθ' ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπολιτεύετο πρὸς χάριν—ἀεὶ μὲν τινα θέαν πανηγυρικὴν ἢ ἐστίασιν ἢ πομπὴν εἶναι μηχανώμενος ἐν ἄστει, καὶ διαπαιδαγωγῶν οὐκ ἀμούσοις ἡδοναῖς τὴν πόλιν—ἐξήκοντα δὲ τριήρεις καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκπέμπων, ἐν αἷς πολλοὶ τῶν πολιτῶν ἔπλεον ὁκτὼ μῆνας ἔμμιθοι, μελετῶντες ἅμα καὶ μαθηθάνοντες τὴν ναυτικὴν ἐμπειρίαν.

Compare c. 9, where Plutarch says that Periklēs, having no other means of contending against the abundant private largesses of his rival Kimon, resorted to the expedient of distributing the public money among the citizens, in order to gain influence; acting in this matter upon the advice of his friend Demonidēs, according to the statement of Aristotle.

³ Thucyd. ii. 65. Ἐκεῖνος μὲν (Περικλῆς) δυνατὸς ὢν τῷ τε ἀξιώματι καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ, χρημάτων τε διαφανῶς ἀδωρότατος γενόμενος, κατεῖχε τὸ πλῆθος ἐλευθέρως, καὶ οὐκ ἤγετο μᾶλλον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἢ αὐτὸς

cited—"Periklês, powerful from dignity of character as well as from wisdom, and conspicuously above the least tinge of corruption, held back the people with a free hand, and was their real leader instead of being led by them. For not being a seeker of power from unworthy sources, he did not speak with any view to present favour, but had sufficient sense of dignity to contradict them on occasion, even braving their displeasure. Thus whenever he perceived them insolently and unseasonably confident, he shaped his speeches in such manner as to alarm and beat them down: when again he saw them unduly frightened, he tried to counteract it and restore their confidence: so that the government was in name a democracy, but in reality an empire exercised by the first citizen in the state. But those who succeeded after his death, being more equal one with another, and each of them desiring pre-eminence over the rest, adopted the different course of courting the favour of the people and sacrificing to that object even important state-interests. From whence arose many other bad measures, as might be expected in a great and imperial city, and especially the Sicilian expedition," &c.

It will be seen that the judgement here quoted from Thucydides contradicts, in an unqualified manner, the reproaches commonly made against Periklês of having corrupted the Athenian people—by distributions of the public money, and by giving way to their unwise caprices—for the purpose of acquiring and maintaining his own political power. Nay, the historian particularly notes the opposite qualities—self-judgement, conscious dignity, indifference to immediate popular applause or wrath when set against what was permanently right and useful—as the special characteristic of that great statesman. A distinction might indeed be possible, and Plutarch professes

ἦγε, διὰ τὸ μὴ κτώμενος ἐξ οὐ προσηκόντων τὴν δύναμιν πρὸς ἡδονὴν τι λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἔχων ἐπ' ἀξιώσει καὶ πρὸς ὀργὴν τι ἀντειπεῖν. Ὅποτε γοῦν αἰσθοῖτο τὸ αὐτοῦ παρὰ καιρὸν ὕβρει θαρσοῦντας, λέγων κατέπλησεν ἐπὶ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι καὶ δεδιότας αὐτὸν ἀλόγως ἀντικαθίστη πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ θαρσεῖν. Ἐγίγνετο δὲ λόγῳ μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή. Οἱ δὲ ὕστερον ἴσοι μᾶλλον αὐτοὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὄντες, καὶ ὀρεγόμενοι τοῦ πρώτου ἕκαστος γίγνεσθαι, ἐτράποντο καθ' ἡδονὰς τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τὰ πράγματα ἐνδιδόναι. Ἐξ ὧν ἄλλα τε πολλὰ, ὡς ἐν μεγάλῃ πόλει καὶ ἀρχὴν ἐχούσῃ, ἡμαρτήθη, καὶ ὁ ἐς Σικελίαν πλοῦς ὅς οὐ τοσοῦτον γνώμης ἀμάρτημα ἦν, &c. Compare Plutarch, Nikias, c. 3.

'Αξίωσις and ἀξίωμα, as used by Thucydides, seem to differ in this respect: 'Αξίωσις signifies a man's dignity, or pretensions to esteem and influence, as felt and measured by himself; *his sense of dignity*; 'Αξίωμα means his *dignity*, properly so called; as felt and appreciated by others. See i. 37, 41, 69.

to note such distinction, between the earlier and the later part of his long political career. Periklès began (so that biographer says) by corrupting the people in order to acquire power; but having acquired it, he employed it in an independent and patriotic manner, so that the judgement of Thucydidès, true respecting the later part of his life, would not be applicable to the earlier. This distinction may be to a certain degree well-founded, inasmuch as the power of opposing a bold and successful resistance to temporary aberrations of the public mind necessarily implies an established influence, and can hardly ever be exercised even by the firmest politician during his years of commencement. He is at that time necessarily the adjunct of some party or tendency which he finds already in operation, and has to stand forward actively and assiduously before he can create for himself a separate personal influence. But while we admit the distinction to this extent, there is nothing to warrant us in restricting the encomium of Thucydidès exclusively to the later life of Periklès, or in representing the earlier life as something in pointed contrast with that encomium. Construing fairly what the historian says, he evidently did not so conceive the earlier life of Periklès. Either those political changes which are held by Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, and others, to demonstrate the corrupting effect of Periklès and his political ascendancy—such as the limitation of the functions of the Areopagus, as well as of the power of the magistrates, the establishment of the numerous and frequent popular dikasteries with regular pay, and perhaps also the assignment of pay to those who attended the Ekklesia, the expenditure for public works, religious edifices and ornaments, the Diobely (or distribution of two oboli per head to the poorer citizens at various festivals, in order that they might be able to pay for their places in the theatre), taking it as it then stood, &c.—did not appear to Thucydidès mischievous and corrupting, as these other writers thought them; or else he did not particularly refer them to Periklès.

Both are true, probably to some extent. The internal political changes at Athens, respecting the Areopagus and the dikasteries, took place when Periklès was a young man, and when he cannot be supposed to have yet acquired the immense personal weight which afterwards belonged to him (Ephialtès in fact seems in those early days to have been a greater man than Periklès, if we may judge by the fact that he was selected by his political adversaries for assassination)—so that they might with greater propriety be ascribed to the party with which

Periklês was connected, rather than to that statesman himself. But next, we have no reason to presume that Thucydîdês considered these changes as injurious, or as having deteriorated the Athenian character. All that he does say as to the working of Periklês on the sentiment and actions of his countrymen is eminently favourable. He represents the presidency of that statesman as moderate, cautious, conservative, and successful ; he describes him as uniformly keeping back the people from rash enterprises, and from attempts to extend their empire—as looking forward to the necessity of a war, and maintaining the naval, military, and financial forces of the state in constant condition to stand it—as calculating, with long-sighted wisdom, the conditions on which ultimate success depended. If we follow the elaborate funeral harangue of Periklês (which Thucydîdês, since he produces it at length, probably considered as faithfully illustrating the political point of view of that statesman), we shall discover a conception of democratical equality no less rational than generous ; an anxious care for the recreation and comfort of the citizens, but no disposition to emancipate them from active obligation, either public or private—and least of all, any idea of dispensing with such activity by abusive largesses out of the general revenue. The whole picture, drawn by Periklês, of Athens “as the schoolmistress of Greece,” implies a prominent development of private industry and commerce not less than of public citizenship and soldiership,—of letters, arts, and recreative varieties of taste.

Though Thucydîdês does not directly canvass the constitutional changes effected in Athens under Periklês, yet everything which he does say leads us to believe that he accounted the working of that statesman, upon the whole, on Athenian power as well as on Athenian character, eminently valuable, and his death as an irreparable loss. And we may thus appeal to the judgement of an historian who is our best witness in every conceivable respect, as a valid reply to the charge against Periklês of having corrupted the Athenian habits, character, and government. If he spent a large amount of the public treasure upon religious edifices and ornaments, and upon stately works for the city,—yet the sum which he left untouched, ready for use at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, was such as to appear more than sufficient for all purposes of defence, or public safety, or military honour. It cannot be shown of Periklês that he ever sacrificed the greater object to the less—the permanent and substantially valuable, to the transitory and showy—assured present possessions, to the lust

of new, distant, or uncertain conquests. If his advice had been listened to, the rashness which brought on the defeat of the Athenian Tolmidês at Korôneia in Bœotia would have been avoided, and Athens might probably have maintained her ascendancy over Megara and Bœotia, which would have protected her territory from invasion, and given a new turn to the subsequent history. Periklês is not to be treated as the author of the Athenian character: he found it with its very marked positive characteristics and susceptibilities, among which those which he chiefly brought out and improved were the best. The lust of expeditions against the Persians, which Kimon would have pushed into Egypt and Cyprus, he repressed, after it had accomplished all which could be usefully aimed at. The ambition of Athens he moderated rather than encouraged: the democratical movement of Athens he regularised, and worked out into judicial institutions which ranked among the prominent features of Athenian life, and worked, in my judgement, with a very large balance of benefit to the national mind as well as to individual security, in spite of the many defects in their direct character as tribunals. But that point in which there was the greatest difference between Athens, as Periklês found it and as he left it, is unquestionably, the pacific and intellectual development—rhetoric, poetry, arts, philosophical research, and recreative variety. To which if we add, great improvement in the cultivation of the Attic soil,—extension of Athenian trade—attainment and laborious maintenance of the maximum of maritime skill (attested by the battles of Phormio)—enlargement of the area of complete security by construction of the Long Walls—lastly, the clothing of Athens in her imperial mantle, by ornaments architectural and sculptural,—we shall make out a case of genuine progress realised during the political life of Periklês, such as the evils imputed to him, far more imaginary than real, will go but a little way to alloy. How little, comparatively speaking, of the picture drawn by Periklês in his funeral harangue of 431 B.C. would have been correct, if the harangue had been delivered over those warriors who fell at Tanagra twenty-seven years before!

It has been remarked by M. Boeckh,¹ that Periklês sacrificed

¹ Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens*, b. iii. ch. xv. p. 399, Eng. Trans. Kutzén, in the second Beylage to his treatise, *Periklês als Staatsmann* (p. 169–200), has collected and inserted a list of various characters of Periklês, from twenty different authors, English, French, and German. That of Wachsmuth is the best of the collection—though even he appears to think

Second and Third Years of War 207

the landed proprietors of Attica to the maritime interests and empire of Athens. This is of course founded on the destructive invasions of the country during the Peloponnesian war; for down to the commencement of that war the position of Attic cultivators and proprietors was particularly enviable: and the censure of M. Boeckh therefore depends upon the question, how far Periklēs contributed to produce, or had it in his power to avert, this melancholy war, in its results so fatal not merely to Athens, but to the entire Grecian race. Now here again, if we follow attentively the narrative of Thucydidēs, we shall see that, in the judgement of that historian, not only Periklēs did not bring on the war, but he could not have averted it without such concessions as Athenian prudence as well as Athenian patriotism peremptorily forbade. Moreover we shall see, that the calculations on which Periklēs grounded his hopes of success if driven to war, were (in the opinion of the historian) perfectly sound and safe. We may even go further, and affirm, that the administration of Periklēs during the fourteen years preceding the war, exhibits a "moderation" (to use the words of Thucydidēs¹) dictated chiefly by anxiety to avoid raising causes of war. If in the months immediately preceding the breaking out of the war, after the conduct of the Corinthians at Potidæa, and the resolutions of the congress at Sparta, he resisted strenuously all compliance with special demands from Sparta—we must recollect that these were demands essentially insincere, in which partial compliance would have lowered the dignity of Athens without ensuring peace. The stories about Pheidias, Aspasia, and the Megarians, even if we should grant that there is some truth at the bottom of them, must, according to Thucydidēs, be looked upon at worst as concomitants and pretexts, rather than as real causes, of the war: though modern authors in speaking of Periklēs are but too apt to use expressions which tacitly assume these stories to be well founded.

Seeing then that Periklēs did not bring on, and could not have averted, the Peloponnesian war—that he steered his course in reference to that event with the long-sighted prudence of one who knew that the safety and the dignity of imperial Athens were essentially interwoven—we have no right to throw upon him the blame of sacrificing the landed proprietors of

that Periklēs is to blame for having introduced a set of institutions which none but himself could work well.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 65. μετρίως ἐξηγεῖτο. i. 144. δίκας δὲ ὅτι ἐθέλομεν δοῦναι κατὰ τὰς ξυνήκας, πολέμου δὲ οὐκ ἄρξομεν, ἀρχομένους δὲ ἀμυνόμεθα.

Attica. These proprietors might indeed be excused for complaining, where they suffered so ruinously. But the impartial historian, looking at the whole of the case, cannot admit their complaints as a ground for censuring the Athenian statesman.

The relation of Athens to her allies, the weak point of her position, it was beyond the power of Periklês seriously to amend ; probably also beyond his will, since the idea of political incorporation, as well as that of providing a common and equal confederate bond sustained by effective federal authority, between different cities, was rarely entertained even by the best Greek minds.¹ We hear that he tried to summon at Athens a congress of deputies from all cities of Greece, the allies of Athens included ;² but the scheme could not be brought to bear, in consequence of the reluctance, noway surprising, of the Peloponnesians. Practically, the allies were not badly treated during his administration : and if among the other bad consequences of the prolonged war, they as well as Athens and all other Greeks come to suffer more and more, this depends upon causes with which he is not chargeable, and upon proceedings which departed altogether from his wise and sober calculations. Taking him altogether, with his powers of thought, speech, and action—his competence civil and military, in the council as well as in the field—his vigorous and cultivated intellect, and his comprehensive ideas of a community in pacific and many-sided development—his incorruptible public morality, caution, and firmness, in a country where all those qualities were rare, and the union of them in the same individual of course much rarer—we shall find him without a parallel throughout the whole course of Grecian history.

Under the great mortality and pressure of sickness at Athens, operations of war naturally languished ; while the enemies also, though more active, had but little success. A fleet of 100 triremes with 1000 hoplites on board, was sent by the Lacedæmonians under Knêmus to attack Zakynthus, but accomplished nothing beyond devastation of the open parts of the island ; and then returned home. And it was shortly after this, towards the month of September, that the Ambrakiots made an attack

¹ Herodotus (i. 170) mentions that previous to the conquest of the twelve Ionic cities in Asia by Cræsus, Thalês had advised them to consolidate themselves all into one single city-government at Teos, and to reduce the existing cities to mere demes or constituent, fractional, municipalities—*τὰς δὲ ἄλλας πόλεις οἰκεόμενας μὴδὲν ἥσσον νομίζεσθαι κατὰπερ εἰ δῆμοι εἴεν*. It is remarkable to observe that Herodotus himself bestows his unqualified commendation on this idea.

² Plutarch, Periklês, c. 17.

Second and Third Years of War 209

upon the Amphilochian town called Argos, situated on the southern coast of the Gulf of Ambrakia; which town, as has been recounted in the preceding chapter, had been wrested from them two years before by the Athenians under Phormio and restored to the Amphilochians and Akarnanians. The Ambrakiots, as colonists and allies of Corinth, were at the same time animated by active enmity to the Athenian influence in Akarnania, and by desire to regain the lost town of Argos. Procuring aid from the Chaonians and some other Epirotic tribes, they marched against Argos, and after laying waste the territory, endeavoured to take the town by assault, but were repulsed and obliged to retire.¹ This expedition appears to have impressed the Athenians with the necessity of a standing force to protect their interest in those parts; so that in the autumn Phormio was sent with a squadron of twenty triremes to occupy Naupaktus (now inhabited by the Messenians) as a permanent naval station, and to watch the entrance of the Corinthian Gulf.² We shall find in the events of the succeeding year ample confirmation of this necessity.

Though the Peloponnesians were too inferior in maritime force to undertake formal war at sea against Athens, their single privateers, especially the Megarian privateers from the harbour of Nisæa, were active in injuring her commerce³—and not merely the commerce of Athens, but also that of other neutral Greeks, without scruple or discrimination. Several merchantmen and fishing-vessels, with a considerable number of prisoners, were thus captured.⁴ Such prisoners as fell into the hands of the Lacedæmonians,—even neutral Greeks as well as Athenians,—were all put to death, and their bodies cast into clefts of the mountains. In regard to the neutrals, this capture was piratical, and the slaughter unwarrantably cruel, judged even by the received practice of the Greeks, deficient as that was on the score of humanity. But to dismiss these neutral prisoners, or to sell them as slaves, would have given publicity to a piratical capture and provoked the neutral towns; so that the prisoners were probably slain as the best way of getting rid of them and thus suppressing evidence.⁵

¹ Thucyd. ii. 68.

² Thucyd. ii. 69.

³ Thucyd. iii. 51.

⁴ Thucyd. ii. 67–69; Herodot. vii. 137. Respecting the Lacedæmonian privateering during the Peloponnesian war, compare Thucyd. v. 115: compare also Xenophon, Hellen. v. i. 29.

⁵ Thucyd. ii. 67. Οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ὑπῆρξαν, τοὺς ἐμποροὺς οὖς ἔλαβον Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων ἐν ὁλκάσι περὶ Πελοπόννησον πλέοντας ἀποκτείναντες καὶ ἐς φάραγγας ἐσβαλόντες. Πάντας γὰρ δὴ κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ πολέμου οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ὕσους λάβοιεν ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, ὥς πολεμίους

Some of these Peloponnesian privateers ranged as far as the south-western coast of Asia Minor, where they found temporary shelter, and interrupted the trading-vessels from Phasêlis and Phœnicia to Athens; to protect which the Athenians despatched in the course of the autumn a squadron of six triremes under Melêsander. He was further directed to ensure the collection of the ordinary tribute from Athenian subject-allies, and probably to raise such contributions as he could elsewhere. In the prosecution of this latter duty, he undertook an expedition from the sea-coast against one of the Lykian towns in the interior, but his attack was repelled with loss, and he himself slain.¹

An opportunity soon afforded itself to the Athenians of retaliating on Sparta for this cruel treatment of the maritime prisoners. In execution of the idea projected at the commencement of the war, the Lacedæmonians sent Anêristus and two others as envoys to Persia, for the purpose of soliciting from the Great King aids of money and troops against Athens; the dissensions among the Greeks thus gradually paving the way for him to regain his ascendancy in the Ægean. Timagoras of Tegea, together with an Argeian named Pollis without any formal mission from his city, and the Corinthian Aristeus, accompanied them. As the sea was in the power of Athens, they travelled overland through Thrace to the Hellespont. Aristeus, eager to leave nothing untried for the relief of Potidæa, prevailed upon them to make application to Sitalkês, king of the Odrysian Thracians. That prince was then in alliance with Athens, and his son Sadokus had even received the grant of Athenian citizenship. Yet the envoys thought it possible not only to detach him from the Athenian alliance, but even to obtain from him an army to act against the Athenians and raise the blockade of Potidæa. On being refused, they lastly applied to him for a safe escort to the banks of the Hellespont, in their way towards Persia. But Learchus and Ameiniadês, then Athenian residents near the person of Sitalkês, had influence enough not only to cause rejection of

διέφθειρον, καὶ τοὺς μετὰ Ἀθηναίων συμπολεμοῦντας καὶ τοὺς μὴδὲ μεθ' ἐτέρων.

The Lacedæmonian admiral Alkidas slew all the prisoners taken on board merchantmen, off the coast of Ionia, in the ensuing year (Thucyd. iii. 32). Even this was considered extremely rigorous, and excited strong remonstrance; yet the mariners slain were not neutrals, but belonged to the subject-allies of Athens: moreover Alkidas was in his flight, and obliged to make choice between killing his prisoners, or setting them free.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 69.

these requests, but also to induce Sadokus, as a testimony of zeal in his new character of Athenian citizen, to assist them in seizing the persons of Aristeus and his companions in their journey through Thrace. Accordingly the whole party were seized and conducted as prisoners to Athens, where they were forthwith put to death, without trial or permission to speak—and their bodies cast into rocky chasms, as a reprisal for the captured seamen slain by the Lacedæmonians.¹

Such revenge against Aristeus, the instigator of the revolt of Potidæa, relieved the Athenians from a dangerous enemy ;

¹ Thucyd. ii. 67. Dr. Thirlwall (Hist. Greece, vol. iii. ch. 20, p. 129) says that "the envoys were sacrificed chiefly to give a decent colour to the baseness" of killing Aristeus, from whom the Athenians feared subsequent evil, in consequence of his ability and active spirit. I do not think this is fairly contained in the words of Thucydides. He puts in the foreground of Athenian motive, doubtless, fear from the future energy of Aristeus ; but if that had been the only motive, the Athenians would probably have slain him singly without the rest : they would hardly think it necessary to provide themselves with any "decent colour" in the way that Dr. Thirlwall suggests. Thucydides names the special feeling of the Athenians against Aristeus (in my judgement) chiefly in order to explain the extreme haste of the Athenian sentence of execution—*αὐθημερόν—ἀκρίτους*, &c. : they were under the influence of combined motives—fear, revenge, retaliation.

The envoys here slain were sons of Sperthiês and Bulis, former Spartan heralds who had gone up to Xerxes at Susa to offer their heads as atonement for the previous conduct of the Spartans in killing the heralds of Darius. Xerxes dismissed them unhurt,—so that the anger of Talthybius (the heroic progenitor of the family of heralds at Sparta) remained still unsatisfied : it was only satisfied by the death of their two sons now slain by the Athenians. The fact that the two persons now slain were sons of those two (Sperthiês and Bulis) who had previously gone to Susa to tender their lives,—is spoken of as a "romantic and tragical coincidence." But there surely is very little to wonder at. The functions of herald at Sparta were the privilege of a particular gens or family : every herald therefore was *ex officio* the son of a herald. Now when the Lacedæmonians, at the beginning of this Peloponnesian war, were looking out for two members of the Heraldic Gens to send up to Susa, upon whom would they so naturally fix as upon the sons of those two men who had been to Susa before? These sons had doubtless heard their fathers talk a great deal about it—probably with interest and satisfaction, since they derived great glory from the unaccepted offer of their lives in atonement. There was a particular reason why these two men should be taken, in preference to any other heralds, to fulfil this dangerous mission : and doubtless when they perished in it, the religious imagination of the Lacedæmonians would group all the series of events as consummation of the judgement inflicted by Talthybius in his anger (Herodot. vii. 135—*ὡς λέγουσι Λακεδαιμόνιοι*).

It appears that Anêristus, the herald here slain, had distinguished himself personally in that capture of fishermen on the coast of Peloponnesus by the Lacedæmonians, for which the Athenians were now retaliating (Herodot. vii. 137). Though this passage of Herodotus is not clear, yet the sense here put upon it is the natural one—and clearer (in my judgement) than that which O. Müller would propose instead of it (Dorians, ii. p. 437).

and that blockaded city was now left to its fate. About mid-winter it capitulated, after a blockade of two years, and after going through the extreme of suffering from famine to such a degree, that some of those who died were even eaten by the survivors. In spite of such intolerable distress, the Athenian generals, Xenophon son of Euripidès and his two colleagues, admitted them to favourable terms of capitulation—allowing the whole population and the Corinthian allies to retire freely, with a specified sum of money per head, as well as with one garment for each man and two for each woman—so that they found shelter among the Chalkidic townships in the neighbourhood. These terms were singularly favourable, considering the desperate state of the city, which must very soon have surrendered at discretion. But the hardships, even of the army without, in the cold of winter, were very severe, and they had become thoroughly tired both of the duration and the expense of the siege. The cost to Athens had been not less than 2000 talents; since the assailant force had never been lower than 3000 hoplites, during the entire two years of the siege, and for a portion of the time considerably greater—each hoplite receiving two drachmas *per diem*. The Athenians at home, when they learnt the terms of the capitulation, were displeased with the generals for the indulgence shown,—since a little additional patience would have constrained the city to surrender at discretion; in which case the expense would have been partly made good by selling the prisoners as slaves—and Athenian vengeance probably gratified by putting the warriors to death.¹ A body of 1000 colonists were sent from Athens to occupy Potidæa and its vacant territory.²

Two full years had now elapsed since the actual commencement of war by the attack of the Thebans on Plataea. Yet the Peloponnesians had accomplished no part of what they expected. They had not rescued Potidæa, nor had their twice-repeated invasion, although assisted by the unexpected disasters arising from the epidemic, as yet brought Athens to any sufficient humiliation—though perhaps the envoys which she had sent during the foregoing summer with propositions for peace (contrary to the advice of Periklès) may have produced an impression that she could not hold out long. At the same time the Peloponnesian allies had on their side

¹ Thucyd. ii. 70; iii. 17. However, the displeasure of the Athenians against the commanders cannot have been very serious, since Xenophon was appointed to command against the Chalkidians in the ensuing year.

² Diodor. xii. 46.

Second and Third Years of War 213

suffered little damage, since the ravages inflicted by the Athenian fleet on their coast may have been nearly compensated by the booty which their invading troops gained in Attica. Probably by this time the public opinion in Greece had contracted an unhappy familiarity with the state of war, so that nothing but some decisive loss and humiliation on one side at least, if not on both, would suffice to terminate it. In this third spring, the Peloponnesians did not repeat their annual march into Attica—deterred, partly, we may suppose, by fear of the epidemic yet raging there—but still more, by the strong desire of the Thebans to take their revenge on Plataea.

To this ill-fated city, Archidamus marched forthwith at the head of the confederate army. No sooner had he entered and begun to lay waste the territory, than the Plataean heralds came forth to arrest his hand, and accosted him in the following terms:—"Archidamus, and ye men of Lacedæmon, ye act wrong and in a manner neither worthy of yourselves nor of your fathers, in thus invading the territory of Plataea. For the Lacedæmonian Pausanias son of Kleombrotus, after he had liberated Greece from the Persians, in conjunction with those Greeks who stood forward to bear their share of the danger, offered sacrifice to Zeus Eleutherius in the market-place of Plataea; and there, in presence of all the allies, assigned to the Plataeans their own city and territory to hold in full autonomy, so that none should invade them wrongfully or with a view to enslave them: should such invasion occur, the allies present pledged themselves to stand forward with all their force as protectors. While your fathers made to us this grant in consideration of our valour and forwardness in that perilous emergency, ye are now doing the precise contrary: ye are come along with our worst enemies the Thebans to enslave us. And we on our side now adjure you, calling to witness the gods who sanctioned that oath, as well as your paternal and our local gods, not to violate the oath by doing wrong to the Plataean territory, but to let us live on in that autonomy which Pausanias guaranteed."¹

Whereunto Archidamus replied—"Ye speak fairly, men of Plataea, if your conduct shall be in harmony with your words. Remain autonomous yourselves, as Pausanias granted, and help us to liberate those other Greeks, who, after having shared in the same dangers and sworn the same oath along with you, have now been enslaved by the Athenians. It is for their liberation and that of the other Greeks that this formidable

¹ Thucyd. ii. 71, 72.

outfit of war has been brought forth. Pursuant to your oaths, ye ought by rights, and we now invite you, to take active part in this object. But if ye cannot act thus, at least remain quiet, conformably to the summons which we have already sent to you. Enjoy your own territory, and remain neutral—receiving both parties as friends, but neither party for warlike purposes. With this we shall be satisfied.”

The reply of Archidamus discloses by allusion a circumstance which the historian had not before directly mentioned ; that the Lacedæmonians had sent a formal summons to the Plataeans to renounce their alliance with Athens and remain neutral. At what time this took place,¹ we know not, but it marks the peculiar sentiment attaching to the town. But the Plataeans did not comply with the invitation thus repeated. The heralds, having returned for instructions into the city, brought back for answer, that compliance was impossible, without the consent of the Athenians, since their wives and families were now harboured at Athens : besides, if they should profess neutrality, and admit both parties as friends, the Thebans might again make an attempt to surprise their city. In reply to their scruples, Archidamus again addressed them—“Well then—hand over your city and houses to us Lacedæmonians : mark out the boundaries of your territory : specify the number of your fruit-trees, and all your other property which admits of being numbered ; and then retire whithersoever ye choose, as long as the war continues. As soon as it is over, we will restore to you all that we have received—in the interim we will hold it in trust, and keep it in cultivation, and pay you such an allowance as shall suffice for your wants.”²

The proposition now made was so fair and tempting, that the general body of the Plataeans were at first inclined to accept it, provided the Athenians would acquiesce. They obtained from Archidamus a truce long enough to enable them to send envoys to Athens. After communication with the Athenian assembly, the envoys returned to Plataea bearing the following answer—“Men of Plataea, the Athenians say they have never yet permitted you to be wronged since the alliance first began,—nor will they now betray you, but will help you to the best of their power. And they adjure you, by the oaths which your fathers swore to them, not to depart in any way from the alliance.”

¹ This previous summons is again alluded to afterwards, on occasion of the slaughter of the Plataean prisoners (iii. 68) ; *διότι τὸν τε ἄλλον χρόνον ἡξίουν δῆθεν, &c.*

² Thucyd. ii. 73, 74.

Second and Third Years of War 215

This message awakened in the bosoms of the Plataëans the full force of ancient and tenacious sentiment. They resolved to maintain, at all cost, and even to the extreme of ruin, if necessity should require it, their union with Athens. It was indeed impossible that they could do otherwise (considering the position of their wives and families) without the consent of the Athenians. Though we cannot wonder that the latter refused consent, we may yet remark, that, in their situation, a perfectly generous ally might well have granted it. For the forces of Plataea counted for little as a portion of the aggregate strength of Athens; nor could the Athenians possibly protect it against the superior land-force of their enemies. In fact, so hopeless was the attempt, that they never even tried, throughout the whole course of the long subsequent blockade.

The final refusal of the Plataëans was proclaimed to Archidamus by word of mouth from the walls, since it was not thought safe to send out any messenger. As soon as the Spartan prince heard the answer, he prepared for hostile operations,—apparently with very sincere reluctance, attested in the following invocation emphatically pronounced:—

“Ye Gods and Heroes, who hold the Plataean territory, be ye my witnesses, that we have not in the first instance wrongfully—not until these Plataeans have first renounced the oaths binding on all of us—invaded this territory, in which our fathers defeated the Persians after prayers to you, and which ye granted as propitious for Greeks to fight in: nor shall we commit wrong in what we may do further, for we have taken pains to tender reasonable terms, but without success. Be ye now consenting parties: may those who are beginning the wrong receive punishment for it—may those who are aiming to inflict penalty righteously, obtain their object.”

It was thus that Archidamus, in language delivered probably under the walls, and within hearing of the citizens who manned them, endeavoured to conciliate the gods and heroes of that town which he was about to ruin and depopulate. The whole of this preliminary debate,¹ so strikingly and dramatically set forth by Thucydides, illustrates the respectful reluctance with which the Lacedæmonians first brought themselves to assail this scene of the glories of their fathers. What deserves remark is, that their direct sentiment attaches itself, not at all to the Plataean people, but only to the Plataean territory. It is purely local, though it becomes partially transferred to the people, as tenants of this spot, by secondary association. We see, indeed,

¹ Thucyd. ii. 71-75.

that nothing but the long-standing antipathy of the Thebans induced Archidamus to undertake the enterprise ; for the conquest of Plataea was of no avail towards the main objects of the war, though the exposed situation of the town caused it to be crushed between the two great contending forces in Greece.

Archidamus now commenced the siege forthwith, in full hopes that his numerous army, the entire strength of the Peloponnesian confederacy, would soon capture a place, of no great size, and probably not very well fortified—yet defended by a resolute garrison of 400 native citizens, with eighty Athenians.¹ There was no one else in the town, except 110 female slaves for cooking. The fruit-trees, cut down in laying waste the cultivated land, sufficed to form a strong palisade all round the town, so as completely to enclose the inhabitants. Next, Archidamus, having abundance of timber near at hand in the forests of Kithæron, began to erect a mound against a portion of the town wall, so as to be able to scale it by an inclined plane, and thus take the place by assault. Wood, stones, and earth, were piled up in a vast heap—cross palings of wood being carried on each side of it, in parallel lines at right angles to the town wall, for the purpose of keeping the loose mass of materials between them together. For seventy days and as many nights did the army labour at this work, without any intermission, taking turns for food and repose ; and through such unremitting assiduity, the mound approached near to the height of the town wall. But as it gradually mounted up, the Plataeans were not idle on their side: they constructed an additional wall of wood, which they planted on the top of their own town wall so as to heighten the part in contact with the enemy's mound ; sustaining it by brickwork behind, for which the neighbouring houses furnished materials. Hides, raw as well as dressed, were suspended in front of it, in order to protect the workmen against missiles, and the wood-work against fire-carrying arrows.² And as the besiegers still continued heaping up materials, to raise their mound to the height even of this recent addition, the Plataeans met them by breaking a hole in the lower part of their town wall, and pulling in the earth from the lower portion of the mound ; which then fell in at the top, and left a vacant space near the wall. This the besiegers filled up by letting down quantities of stiff clay rolled up in wattled reeds, which could not be pulled away in the same manner. Again, the Plataeans dug a subterranean passage from the interior of their town to the ground immediately under the mound, and

¹ Thucyd. iii. 68.

² Thucyd. ii. 75.

thus carried away unseen its earthy foundation ; so that the besiegers saw their mound continually sinking down, in spite of fresh additions at the top—yet without knowing the reason. Nevertheless it was plain that these stratagems would be in the end ineffectual, and the Platæans accordingly built a new portion of town wall in the interior, in the shape of a crescent, taking its start from the old town wall on each side of the mound. The besiegers were thus deprived of all benefit from the mound, assuming it to be successfully completed ; since when they had marched over it, there stood in front of them a new town wall requiring to be carried in like manner.

Nor was this the only method of attack employed. Archidamus further brought up battering engines, one of which greatly shook and endangered the additional height of wall built by the Platæans against the mound ; while others were brought to bear on different portions of the circuit of the town wall. Against these new assailants, various means of defence were used. The defenders on the walls let down ropes, got hold of the head of the approaching engine, and pulled it by main force out of the right line, either upwards or sideways ; or they prepared heavy wooden beams on the wall, each attached at both ends by long iron chains to two poles projecting at right angles from the wall, by means of which poles it was raised and held aloft : so that at the proper moment when the battering machine approached the wall, the chain was suddenly let go, and the beam fell down with great violence directly upon the engine, breaking off its projecting beak.¹ However rude these defensive processes may seem, they were found effective against the besiegers, who saw themselves, at the close of three months' unavailing efforts, obliged to renounce the idea of taking the town in any other way than by the process of blockade and famine—a process alike tedious and costly.²

Before they would incur so much inconvenience, however, they had recourse to one further stratagem—that of trying to set the town on fire. From the height of their mound, they threw down large quantities of fagots, partly into the space between the mound and the newly-built crescent wall—partly, as far as they could reach, into other parts of the city : pitch and other combustibles were next added, and the whole mass set on fire. The conflagration was tremendous, such as had

¹ The various expedients, such as those here described, employed both for offence and defence in the ancient sieges, are noticed and discussed in *Æneas Poliorketic.* c. 33 *seq.*

² Thucyd. ii. 76.

never been before seen : a large portion of the town became unapproachable, and the whole of it narrowly escaped destruction. Nothing could have preserved it, had the wind been rather more favourable. There was indeed a further story of an opportune thunder-storm coming to extinguish the flames, which Thucydidēs does not seem to credit.¹ In spite of much partial damage, the town remained still defensible, and the spirit of the inhabitants unsubdued.

There now remained no other resource except to build a wall of circumvallation round Plataea, and trust to the slow process of famine. The task was distributed in suitable fractions among the various confederate cities, and completed about the middle of September, a little before the autumnal equinox.² Two distinct walls were constructed, with sixteen feet of intermediate space all covered in, so as to look like one very thick wall. There were moreover two ditches, out of which the bricks for the wall had been taken—one on the inside towards Plataea, and the other on the outside against any foreign relieving force. The interior covered space between the walls was intended to serve as permanent quarters for the troops left on guard, consisting half of Boeotians and half of Peloponnesians.³

At the same time that Archidamus began the siege of Plataea, the Athenians on their side despatched a force of 2000 hoplites and 200 horsemen to the Chalkidic peninsula, under Xenophon son of Euripidēs (with two colleagues), the same who had granted so recently the capitulation of Potidæa. It was necessary doubtless to convoy and establish the new colonists who were about to occupy the deserted site of Potidæa. Moreover,

¹ Thucyd. ii. 77.

² Thucyd. ii. 78. *καὶ ἐπειδὴ πᾶν ἐξέλγαστο περὶ Ἀρκτοῦρου ἐπιτολῆς*, &c., at the period of the year when the star Arcturus rises immediately before sunrise—that is, some time between the 12th and 17th of September : see Göller's note on the passage. Thucydidēs does not often give any fixed marks to discriminate the various periods of the year, as we find here done. The Greek months were all lunar months, or nominally so : the names of months, as well as the practice of intercalation to rectify the calendar, varied from city to city ; so that if Thucydidēs had specified the day of the Attic month Boëdromion (instead of specifying the rising of Arcturus) on which this work was finished, many of his readers would not have distinctly understood him. Hippocratēs also, in indications of time for medical purposes, employs the appearance of Arcturus and other stars.

³ Thucyd. ii. 78 ; iii. 21. From this description of the double wall and covered quarters provided for what was foreknown as a long blockade, we may understand the sufferings of the Athenian troops (who probably had no double wall) in the two years' blockade of Potidæa—and their readiness to grant an easy capitulation to the besieged : see a few pages above.

the general had acquired some knowledge of the position and parties of the Chalkidic towns, and hoped to be able to act against them with effect. He first invaded the territory belonging to the Bottiæan town of Spartôlus, not without hopes that the city itself would be betrayed to him by intelligences within. But this was prevented by the arrival of an additional force from Olynthus, partly hoplites, partly peltasts. Such peltasts, a species of troops between heavy-armed and light-armed, furnished with a pelta (or light shield) and short spear or javelin, appear to have taken their rise among these Chalkidic Greeks, being equipped in a manner half Greek and half Thracian: we shall find them hereafter much improved and turned to account by some of the ablest Grecian generals. The Chalkidic hoplites are generally of inferior merit: on the other hand, their cavalry and their peltasts are very good. In the action which now took place under the walls of Spartôlus, the Athenian hoplites defeated those of the enemy, but their cavalry and their light troops were completely worsted by the Chalkidic. These latter, still further strengthened by the arrival of fresh peltasts from Olynthus, ventured even to attack the Athenian hoplites, who thought it prudent to fall back upon the two companies left in reserve to guard the baggage. During this retreat they were harassed by the Chalkidic horse and light-armed, who retired when the Athenians turned upon them, but attacked them on all sides when on their march, and employed missiles so effectively that the retreating hoplites could no longer maintain a steady order, but took to flight and sought refuge at Potidæa. Four hundred and thirty hoplites, near one-fourth of the whole force, together with all three generals, perished in this defeat, while the expedition returned in dishonour to Athens.¹

In the western parts of Greece, the arms of Athens and her allies were more successful. The Ambrakiots, exasperated by their repulse from the Amphilochian Argos, during the preceding year, had been induced to conceive new and larger plans of aggression against both the Akarnanians and Athenians. In concert with their mother-city Corinth, where they obtained warm support, they prevailed upon the Lacedæmonians to take part in a simultaneous attack of Akarnania, by land as well as by sea, which would prevent the Akarnanians from concentrating their forces in any one point, and would put each of their townships upon an isolated self-defence; so that all of them might be overpowered in succession, and detached, together

¹ Thucyd. ii. 79.

with Kephallenia and Zakynthus (Zante), from the Athenian alliance. The fleet of Phormio at Naupaktus, consisting only of twenty triremes, was accounted incompetent to cope with a Peloponnesian fleet such as might be fitted out at Corinth. There was even some hope that the important station at Naupaktus might itself be taken, so as to expel the Athenians completely from those parts.

The scheme of operations now projected was far more comprehensive than anything which the war had yet afforded. The land-force of the Ambrakiots, together with their neighbours and fellow-colonists the Leukadians and Anaktorians, assembled near their own city; while their maritime force was collected at Leukas, on the Akarnanian coast. The force at Ambrakia was joined, not only by Knêmus, the Lacedæmonian admiral, with 1000 Peloponnesian hoplites, who found means to cross over from Peloponnesus, eluding the vigilance of Phormio—but also by a numerous body of Epirotic and Macedonian auxiliaries, collected even from the distant and northernmost tribes. A thousand Chaonians were present, under the command of Photyus and Nikanor, two annual chiefs chosen from the regal gens. Neither this tribe, nor the Thesprotians who came along with them, acknowledged any hereditary king. The Molossians and Atintânes, who also joined the force, were under Sabylinthus, regent on behalf of the young prince Tharypas. There came, besides, the Parauæi, from the banks of the river Aôus, under their king Oroëdus, together with 1000 Orestæ, a tribe rather Macedonian than Epirot, sent by their king Antiochus. Even king Perdikkas, though then nominally in alliance with Athens, sent 1000 of his Macedonian subjects, who however arrived too late to be of any use.¹ This large and diverse body of Epirotic invaders, a new phænomenon in Grecian history, and got together doubtless by the hopes of plunder, proves the extensive relations of the tribes of the interior with the city of Ambrakia—a city destined to become in later days the capital of the Epirotic king Pyrrhus.

It had been concerted that the Peloponnesian fleet from Corinth should join that already assembled at Leukas, and act upon the coast of Akarnania at the same time that the land-force marched into that territory. But Knêmus, finding the land-force united and ready near Ambrakia, deemed it unnecessary to await the fleet from Corinth, and marched straight into Akarnania, through Limnæa, a frontier village territory belonging to the Amphilocheian Argos. He directed his march upon

¹ Thucyd. ii. 80.

Stratus—an interior town, the chief place in Akarnania—the capture of which would be likely to carry with it the surrender of the rest; especially as the Akarnanians, distracted by the presence of the ships at Leukas, and alarmed by the large body of invaders on their frontier, did not dare to leave their own separate homes, so that Stratus was left altogether to its own citizens. Nor was Phormio, though they sent an urgent message to him, in any condition to help them; since he could not leave Naupaktus unguarded, when the large fleet from Corinth was known to be approaching. Under such circumstances, Knêmus and his army indulged confident hopes of overpowering Stratus without difficulty. They marched in three divisions: the Epirots in the centre—the Leukadians and Anaktorians on the right—the Peloponnesians and Ambrakiots, together with Knêmus himself, on the left. So little expectation was entertained of resistance, that these three divisions took no pains to keep near, or even in sight of each other. Both the Greek divisions, indeed, maintained a good order of march, and kept proper scouts on the look-out; but the Epirots advanced without any care or order; especially the Chaonians, who formed the van. These men, accounted the most warlike of all the Epirotic tribes, were so full of conceit and rashness, that when they approached near to Stratus, they would not halt to encamp and assail the place conjointly with the Greeks; but marched along with the other Epirots right forward to the town, intending to attack it single-handed, and confident that they should carry it at the first assault before the Greeks came up, so that the entire glory would be theirs. The Stratians watched and profited by this imprudence. Planting ambuscades in convenient places, and suffering the Epirots to approach without suspicion near to the gates, they then suddenly sallied out and attacked them, while the troops in ambuscade rose up and assailed them at the same time. The Chaonians who formed the van, thus completely surprised, were routed with great slaughter; while the other Epirots fled, after but little resistance. So much had they hurried forward in advance of their Greek allies, that neither the right nor the left division were aware of the battle, until the flying barbarians, hotly pursued by the Akarnanians, made it known to them. The two divisions then joined, protected the fugitives, and restrained further pursuit—the Stratians declining to come to hand-combat with them until the other Akarnanians should arrive. They seriously annoyed the forces of Knêmus, however, by distant slinging, in which the Akarnanians were pre-eminently skilful. Knêmus did not

choose to persist in his attack under such discouraging circumstances. As soon as night arrived, so that there was no longer any fear of slingers, he retreated to the river Anapus, a distance of between nine and ten miles. Well aware that the news of the victory would attract other Akarnanian forces immediately to the aid of Stratus, he took advantage of the arrival of his own Akarnanian allies from Cēniadæ (the only town in the country which was attached to the Lacedæmonian interest) and sought shelter near their city. From thence his troops dispersed, and returned to their respective homes.¹

Meanwhile the Peloponnesian fleet from Corinth, which had been destined to co-operate with Knēmus off the coast of Akarnania, had found difficulties in its passage alike unexpected and insuperable. Mustering forty-seven triremes of Corinth, Sikyon, and other places, with a body of soldiers on board and with accompanying store-vessels—it departed from the harbour of Corinth and made its way along the northern coast of Achaia. Its commanders, not intending to meddle with Phormio and his twenty ships at Naupaktus, never imagined that he would venture to attack a number so greatly superior. The triremes were accordingly fitted out more as transports for numerous soldiers than with any view to naval combat—and with little attention to the choice of skillful rowers.²

Except in the combat near Korkyra, and there only partially—the Peloponnesians had never yet made actual trial of Athenian maritime efficiency, at the point of excellence which it had now reached. Themselves retaining the old unimproved mode of fighting and of working ships at sea, they had no practical idea of the degree to which it had been superseded by Athenian training. Among the Athenians, on the contrary, not only the seamen generally had a confirmed feeling of their own superiority—but Phormio especially, the ablest of all their captains, always familiarised his men with the conviction, that no Peloponnesian fleet, be its number ever so great, could possibly contend against them with success.³

¹ Thucyd. ii. 82; Diodor. xii. 48.

² Thucyd. ii. 83. οὐχ ὥς ἐπὶ ναυμαχίαν, ἀλλὰ στρατιωτικώτερον παρεσκευασμένοι: compare the speech of Knēmus, c. 87. The unskillfulness of the rowers is noticed (c. 84).

³ Thucyd. ii. 88. πρότερον μὲν γὰρ ἄει αὐτοῖς ἔλεγε (Phormio) καὶ προπαρασκεύαζε τὰς γνώμας, ὥς οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς πλήθος νεῶν τοσοῦτον, ἣν ἐπιπλέη, ὃ τι οὐχ ὑπομενετέον αὐτοῖς ἐστί· καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται ἐκ πολλοῦ ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀξίωσιν ταύτην εἰλήφεσαν, μηδένα ὄχλον Ἀθηναῖοις ὄντες Πελοποννησίων νεῶν ὑποχωρεῖν.

This passage is not only remarkable as it conveys the striking persuasion

Accordingly the Corinthian admirals, Machaon and his two colleagues, were surprised to observe that Phormio with his small Athenian squadron, instead of keeping safe in Naupaktus, was moving in parallel line with them and watching their progress until they should get out of the Corinthian Gulf into the more open sea. Having advanced along the northern coast of Peloponnesus as far as Patræ in Achaia, they then altered their course, and bore to the north-west in order to cross over towards the Ætolian coast, in their way to Akarnania. In doing this, however, they perceived that Phormio was bearing down upon them from Chalkis and the mouth of the river Euenus; and they now discovered for the first time that he was going to attack them. Disconcerted by the incident, and not inclined for a naval combat in the wide and open sea, they altered their plan of passage, returned to the coast of Peloponnesus, and brought to for the night at some point near to Rhium, the narrowest breadth of the strait. Their bringing to was a mere feint intended to deceive Phormio and induce him to go back for the night to his own coast: for during the course of the night, they left their station, and tried to get across the breadth of the Gulf, where it was near the strait and comparatively narrow, before Phormio could come down upon them. And if the Athenian captain had really gone back to take night-station on his own coast, they would probably have got across to the Ætolian or northern coast without any molestation in the wide sea. But he watched their movements closely, kept the sea all night, and was thus enabled to attack them in mid-channel, even during the shorter passage near the strait, at the first dawn of morning.¹ On seeing his approach, the Corinthian admirals

entertained by the Athenians of their own naval superiority, but also as it discloses the frank and intimate communication between the Athenian captain and his seamen—so strongly pervading and determining the feelings of the latter. Compare what is told respecting the Syracusan Hermokratēs, Xenoph. Hellen. i. 1, 30.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 83. Ἐπειδὴ μέντοι ἀντιπαραπλέοντας τε ἑάρων αὐτοὺς (that is, when the Corinthians saw the Athenian ships) παρὰ γῆν σφῶν κομιζομένων, καὶ ἐκ Πατρῶν τῆς Ἀχαιᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἀντιπέραν ἡπειρον διαβαλλόντων ἐπὶ Ἀκαρνανίας κατείδον τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀπὸ τῆς Χαλκίδος καὶ τοῦ Εὐήνου ποταμοῦ προσπλέοντας σφίσι, καὶ οὐκ ἔλαθον νυκτὸς ὑφορμισάμενοι, οὕτω δὲ ἀναγκάζονται ναυμαχεῖν κατὰ μέσον τὸν πορθμόν.

There is considerable difficulty in clearly understanding what was here done, especially what is meant by the words οὐκ ἔλαθον νυκτὸς ὑφορμισάμενοι, which words the Scholiast construed as if the nominative case to ἔλαθον were οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, whereas the natural structure of the sentence, as well as the probabilities of fact, lead the best commentators to consider οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι as the nominative case to that verb. The remark of the Scholiast,

ranged their triremes in a circle with the prows outwards—like the spokes of a wheel. The circle was made as large as it could

however, shows us, that the difficulty of understanding the sentence dates from ancient times.

Dr. Arnold (whose explanation is adopted by Poppo and Goller) says, "The two fleets were moving parallel to one another along the opposite shores of the Corinthian Gulf. But even when they had sailed out of the strait at Rhium, the opposite shores were still so near, that the Peloponnesians hoped to cross over without opposition, if they could so far deceive the Athenians as to the spot where they brought to for the night, as to induce them either to stop too soon, or to advance too far, that they might not be exactly opposite to them to intercept the passage. If they could lead the Athenians to think that they meant to advance in the night beyond Patræ, the Athenian fleet was likely to continue its own course along the northern shore to be ready to intercept them when they should endeavour to run across to Acarnania. But the Athenians, aware that they had stopped at Patræ, stopped themselves at Chalkis, instead of proceeding farther to the westward; and thus were so nearly opposite to them, that the Peloponnesians had not time to get more than half way across, before they found themselves encountered by their watchful enemy."

This explanation seems to me not satisfactory, nor does it take account of all the facts of the case. The first belief of the Peloponnesians was, that Phormio would not dare to attack them at all: accordingly, having arrived at Patræ, they stretched from thence across the Gulf to the mouth of the Euenus—the natural way of proceeding according to ancient navigation—going in the direction of Akarnania (ἐπὶ Ἀκαρνανίας). While they were thus stretching across, they perceived Phormio bearing down upon them from the Euenus: this was a surprise to them; and as they wished to avoid a battle in the mid-channel, they desisted from proceeding farther that day, in hopes to be able to deceive Phormio in respect of their night-station. They made a feint of taking night-station on the shore between Patræ and Rhium, near the narrow part of the strait; but, in reality, they "slipped anchor and put to sea during the night" (as Mr. Bloomfield says), in hopes of getting across the shorter passage under favour of darkness, before Phormio could come upon them. That they must have done this is proved by the fact, that the subsequent battle was fought on the morrow in the mid-channel *very little after daybreak* (we learn this from what Thucydides says about the gulf-breeze, for which Phormio waited before he would commence his attack—*ὅπερ ἀναμένων τε περιέπλει, καὶ εἰώθει γίγνεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἑω*). If Phormio had returned to Chalkis, they would probably have succeeded; but he must have kept the sea all night, which would be the natural proceeding of a vigilant captain determined not to let the Peloponnesians get across without fighting: so that he was upon them in the mid-channel immediately after day broke.

Putting all the statements of Thucydides together, we may be convinced that this is the way in which the facts occurred. But of the precise sense of *ὑφορμισάμενοι*, I confess I do not feel certain: Haack says it means "clam appellere ad littus," but here, I think, that sense will not do: for the Peloponnesians did not wish, and could indeed hardly hope, to conceal from Phormio the spot where they brought to for the night, and to make him suppose that they brought to at some point of the shore west of Patræ, when in reality they passed the night in Patræ—which is what Dr. Arnold supposes. The shore west of Patræ makes a bend to the south-west (forming

be without leaving opportunity to the Athenian assailing ships to practise the manœuvre of the *diekplus*,¹ and the interior space was sufficient not merely for the store-vessels, but also for five chosen triremes, who were kept as a reserve to dart out when required through the intervals between the outer triremes.

In this position they were found and attacked shortly after daybreak by Phormio, who bore down upon them with his ships in single file, all admirable sailers, and his own ship leading; all being strictly forbidden to attack until he should

the Gulf of Patras), so that the distance from the northern (or Ætolian and Akarnanian) side of the Gulf becomes for a considerable time longer and longer, and the Peloponnesians would thus impose upon themselves a longer crossing, increasing the difficulty of getting over without a battle. But *ὑφορμισάμενοι* may reasonably be supposed to mean (especially in conjunction with *οὐκ ἔλαθον*) "taking up a simulated or imperfect night-station," in which they did not really intend to stay all night, and which could be quitted at short notice and with ease. The preposition *ὑπό* in composition would thus have the sense not of *secrecy* (*clani*) but of *sham-performance*, or of mere going through the forms of an act for the purpose of making a false impression (like *ὑποφέρειν*, Xenoph. Hell. iv. 72). Mr. Bloomfield proposes conjecturally *ἀφορμισάμενοι*, meaning "that the Peloponnesians slipped their anchors in the night." I place no faith in the conjecture, but I believe him to be quite right in supposing, that the Peloponnesians *did actually* slip their anchors in the night.

Another point remains to be adverted to. The battle took place *κατὰ μέσον τὸν πορθμόν*. Now we need not understand this expression to allude to the narrowest part of the sea, or the strait, strictly and precisely; that is the line of seven stadia between Rhium and Antirrhium. But I think we must understand it to mean a portion of sea not far westward of the strait, where the breadth, though greater than that of the strait itself, is yet not so great as it becomes in the line drawn northward from Patræ. We cannot understand *πορθμός* (as Mr. Bloomfield and Poppo do—see the note of the latter on the Scholia) to mean *trajectus* simply—that is to say, the passage across even the widest portion of the Gulf of Patras: nor does the passage cited out of c. 86 require us so to understand it. *Πορθμός* in Thucydides means a strait, or narrow crossing of sea, and Poppo himself admits that Thucydides always uses it so: nor would it be reasonable to believe that he would call the line of sea across the Gulf, from Patræ to the mouth of the Euenus, a *πορθμός*. See the note of Goller on this point.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 86. *μὴ δίδυντες διέκπλουν*. The great object of the fast-sailing Athenian trireme was, to drive its beak against some weak part of the adversary's ship; the stern, the side, or the oars—not against the beak, which was strongly constructed as well for defence as for offence. The Athenian therefore, rowing through the intervals of the adversary's line, and thus getting in their rear, turned rapidly, and got the opportunity, before the ship of the adversary could change its position, of striking it either in the stern or some weak part. Such a manœuvre was called the *diekplus*. The success of it of course depended upon the extreme rapidity and precision of the movements of the Athenian vessel, so superior in this respect to its adversary, not only in the better construction of the ship, but the excellence of rowers and steersmen.

give the signal. He rowed swiftly round the Peloponnesian circle, nearing the prows of their ships as closely as he could, and making constant semblance of being about to come to blows. Partly from the intimidating effect of this manœuvre, altogether novel to the Peloponnesians—partly from the natural difficulty, well known to Phormio, of keeping every ship in its exact stationary position—the order of the circle, both within and without, presently became disturbed. It was not long before a new ally came to his aid, on which he calculated, postponing his actual attack until this favourable incident occurred. The strong land-breeze out of the Gulf of Corinth, always wont to begin shortly after daybreak, came down upon the Peloponnesian fleet with its usual vehemence, at a moment when the steadiness of their order was already somewhat giving way; and forced their ships more than ever out of proper relation one to the other. The triremes began to run foul of each other, or became entangled with the store-vessels: so that in every ship the men on board were obliged to keep pushing off their neighbours on each side with poles—not without loud clamour and mutual reproaches, which prevented both the orders of the captain, and the cheering sound or song whereby the *keleustês* animated the rowers and kept them to time, from being audible. Moreover, the fresh breeze had occasioned such a swell, that these rowers, unskilful under all circumstances, could not get their oars clear of the water, and the pilots thus lost command over their vessels.¹ The critical

¹ See Dr. Arnold's note upon this passage of Thucydides, respecting the *Keleustês* and his functions: to the passages which he indicates as reference, I will add two more of Plautus, *Mercat.* iv. 2, 5, and *Asinaria*, iii. 1, 15.

When we conceive the structure of an ancient trireme, we shall at once see, first, how essential the *keleustês* was, to keep the rowers in harmonious action—next, how immense the difference must have been between practised and unpractised rowers. The trireme had, in all, 170 rowers, distributed into three tiers. The upper tier, called *Thranitæ*, were sixty-two in number, or thirty-one on each side: the middle tier, or *Zygitæ*, as well as the lowest tier, or *Thalamitæ*, were each fifty-four in number, or twenty-seven on each side. Besides these, there were belonging to each trireme a certain number, seemingly about thirty, of supplementary oars (*κῶπαι περιέφαι*), to be used by the *epibatæ*, or soldiers serving on board, in case of rowers being killed, or oars broken. Each tier of rowers was distributed along the whole length of the vessel, from head to stern, or at least along the greater part of it; but the seats of the higher tiers were not placed in the exact perpendicular line above the lower. Of course the oars of the *thranitæ*, or uppermost tier, were the longest: those of the *thalamitæ*, or lowest tier, the shortest: those of the *zygitæ*, of a length between the two. Each oar was rowed only by one man. The *thranitæ*, as having the longest oars, were most hardly worked and most highly paid. What the length of

moment was now come, and Phormio gave the signal for attack. He first drove against and disabled one of the admiral's ships—his comrades next assailed others with equal success—so that the Peloponnesians, confounded and terrified, attempted hardly any resistance, but broke their order and sought safety in flight. They fled partly to Patræ, partly to Dymê, in Achaia, pursued by the Athenians; who with scarcely the loss of a man, captured twelve triremes—carried away almost the entire crews,—and sailed off with them to Molykreium or Antirrhium, the northern cape at the narrow mouth of the Corinthian Gulf, opposite to the corresponding cape called Rhium in Achaia. Having erected at Antirrhium a trophy for the victory, dedicating one of the captive triremes to Poseidon, they returned to Naupaktus; while the Peloponnesian ships sailed along the shore from Patræ to Kyllênê, the principal port in the territory of Elis. They were here soon afterwards joined by Knêmus, who passed over with his squadron from Leukas.¹

These two incidents, just recounted, with their details—the oars was, belonging to either tier, we do not know; but some of the supplementary oars appear to have been about fifteen feet in length.

What is here stated, appears to be pretty well ascertained, chiefly from the inscriptions discovered at Athens a few years ago, so full of information respecting the Athenian marine,—and from the instructive commentary appended to these inscriptions by M. Boeckh, *Seewesen der Athener*, ch. ix. pp. 94, 104, 115. But there is a great deal still respecting the equipment of an ancient trireme unascertained and disputed.

Now there was nothing but the voice of the *keleustês* to keep these 170 rowers all to good time with their strokes. With oars of different length, and so many rowers, this must have been no easy matter; and apparently quite impossible, unless the rowers were trained to act together. The difference between those who were so trained and those who were not, must have been immense. (Compare Xenophon, *Œconomic*. viii. 8.) We may imagine the difference between the ships of Phormio and those of his enemies, and the difficulty of the latter in contending with the swell of the sea—when we read this description of the ancient trireme.

About 200 men, that is to say, 170 rowers and thirty supernumeraries, mostly *epibatæ* or *hoplites* serving on board, besides the pilot, the man at the ship's bow, the *keleustês*, &c., probably some half-dozen officers—formed the crew of a trireme: compare Herodot. viii. 17; vii. 184—where he calculates the thirty *epibatæ* over and above the 200. Dr. Arnold thinks that at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, the *epibatæ* on board an Athenian trireme were no more than ten; but this seems not quite made out: see his note on Thucyd. iii. 95.

The Venetian galleys in the thirteenth century were manned by about the same number of men. "*Les galères Vénitiens du convoi de Flandre devaient être montées par deux cent hommes libres, dont 180 rameurs, et 12 archers. Les arcs ou balistes furent prescrits en 1333 pour toutes les galères de commerce armées*" (Depping, *Histoire du Commerce entre le Levant et l'Europe*, vol. i. p. 163).

¹ Thucyd. ii. 84.

repulse of Knêmus and his army from Stratus, and the defeat of the Peloponnesian fleet by Phormio—afford ground for some interesting remarks. The first of the two displays the great inferiority of the Epirots to the Greeks—and even to the less advanced portion of the Greeks—in the qualities of order, discipline, steadiness, and power of co-operation for a joint purpose. Confidence of success with them is exaggerated into childish rashness, so that they despise even the commonest precautions either in march or attack ; while the Greek divisions on their right and on their left are never so elate as to omit either. If, on land, we thus discover the inherent superiority of Greeks over Epirots involuntarily breaking out—so in the sea-fight we are no less impressed with the astonishing superiority of the Athenians over their opponents ; a superiority, indeed, noway inherent, such as that of Greeks over Epirots, but depending in this case on previous toil, training, and inventive talent, on the one side, compared with neglect and old-fashioned routine on the other. Nowhere does the extraordinary value of that seamanship, which the Athenians had been gaining by years of improved practice, stand so clearly marked as in these first battles of Phormio. It gradually becomes less conspicuous as we advance in the war, since the Peloponnesians improve, learning seamanship as the Russians under Peter the Great learnt the art of war from the Swedes under Charles XII. —while the Athenian triremes and their crews seem to become less choice and effective, even before the terrible disaster at Syracuse ; and are irreparably deteriorated after that misfortune.

To none did the circumstances of this memorable sea-fight seem so incomprehensible as to the Lacedæmonians. They had heard indeed of the seamanship of Athens, but had never felt it, and could not understand what it meant ; so that they imputed the defeat to nothing but disgraceful cowardice, and sent indignant orders to Knêmus at Kyllênê, to take the command, equip a larger and better fleet, and repair the dishonour. Three Spartan commissioners—Brasidas, Timokratês, and Lysiphron—were sent down to assist him with their advice and exertions in calling together naval contingents from the different allied cities. By this means, under the general resentment occasioned by the recent defeat, a large fleet of seventy-seven triremes was speedily mustered at Panormus,—a harbour of Achaia near to the promontory of Rhium and immediately within the interior gulf. A land-force was also collected at the same place ashore, to aid the operations of the fleet.

Such preparations did not escape the vigilance of Phormio,

who transmitted to Athens news of his victory, at the same time urgently soliciting reinforcements to contend with the increasing strength of the enemy. The Athenians immediately sent twenty fresh ships to join him. Yet they were induced by the instances of a Kretan named Nikias, their proxenus at Gortyna, to allow him to take the ships first to Krete, on the faith of his promise to reduce the hostile town of Kydonia. He had made this promise as a private favour to the inhabitants of Polichna, border enemies of Kydonia; but when the fleet arrived he was unable to fulfil it: nothing was effected except ravage of the Kydonian lands, and the fleet was long prevented by adverse winds and weather from getting away.¹ This ill-advised diversion of the fleet from its straight course to join Phormio is a proof how much the counsels of Athens were beginning to suffer from the loss of Periklês, who was just now in his last illness and died shortly afterwards. That liability to be seduced by novel enterprises and projects of acquisition, against which he so emphatically warned his countrymen,² was even now beginning to manifest its disastrous consequences.

Through the loss of this precious interval, Phormio found himself, with no more than his original twenty triremes, opposed to the vastly-increased forces of the enemy—seventy-seven triremes with a large force on land to back them: the latter no mean help in ancient warfare. He took up his station near the Cape Antirrhium, or the Molykric Rhium as it was called—the northern headland, opposite to the other headland also called Rhium, on the coast of Achaia. The line between these two capes, seemingly about an English mile in breadth, forms the entrance of the Corinthian Gulf. The Messenian force from Naupaktus attended him, and served on land. But he kept on the outside of the Gulf, anxious to fight in a large and open breadth of sea, which was essential to Athenian manœuvring; while his adversaries on their side remained on the inside of the Achaic cape, from the corresponding reason—feeling that to them the narrow sea was advantageous, as making the naval battle like to a land battle, effacing all superiority of nautical skill.³ If we revert back to the occasion

¹ Thucyd. ii. 85.

² Thucyd. i. 144. Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἔχω ἐς ἐλπίδα τοῦ περιέσεσθαι, ἣν ἐθέλητε ἀρχὴν τε μὴ ἐπικτᾶσθαι ὅμα πολεμοῦντες, καὶ κινδύνους αὐθαιρέτους μὴ προστίθεσθαι· μᾶλλον γὰρ πεφόβημαι τὰς οἰκείας ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίας ἢ τὰς τῶν ἐναντίων διανοίας.

³ Thucyd. ii. 86-89: compare vii. 36-49.

of the battle of Salamis, we find that narrowness of space was at that time accounted the best of all protection for a smaller fleet against a larger. But such had been the complete change of feeling, occasioned by the system of manœuvring introduced since that period in the Athenian navy, that amplitude of sea-room is now not less coveted by Phormio than dreaded by his enemies. The improved practice of Athens had introduced a revolution in naval warfare.

For six or seven days successively, the two fleets were drawn out against each other—Phormio trying to entice the Peloponnesians to the outside of the Gulf, while they on their side did what they could to bring him within it.¹ To him, every day's postponement was gain, since it gave him a new chance of his reinforcements arriving : for that very reason, the Peloponnesian commanders were eager to accelerate an action, and at length resorted to a well-laid plan for forcing it on. But in spite of immense numerical superiority, such was the discouragement and reluctance prevailing among their seamen—many of whom had been actual sufferers in the recent defeat—that Knêmus and Brasidas had to employ emphatic exhortations. They insisted on the favourable prospect before them—pointing out that the late battle had been lost only by mismanagement and imprudence, which would be for the future corrected—and appealing to the inherent bravery of the Peloponnesian warrior. They concluded by a hint, that while those who behaved well in the coming battle would receive due honour, the laggards would assuredly be punished : ² a topic rarely touched upon by ancient generals in their harangues on the eve of battle, and demonstrating conspicuously the reluctance of many of the Peloponnesian seamen, who had been brought to this second engagement chiefly by the ascendancy and strenuous commands of Sparta. To such reluctance Phormio pointedly alluded, in the encouraging exhortations which he on his side addressed to his men : for they too, in spite of their habitual confidence at sea, strengthened by the recent victory, were dispirited by the smallness of their numbers. He reminded them of their long practice and rational conviction of superiority at sea, such as no augmentation of numbers, especially with an enemy conscious of his own weakness, could overbalance. He called

¹ Thucyd. ii. 86.

² Thucyd. ii. 87. *Τῶν δὲ πρότερον ἡγεμόνων οὐ χεῖρον τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν ἡμεῖς παρασκευάσομεν, καὶ οὐκ ἐνδώσομεν πρόφασιν οὐδενὶ κακῷ γενέσθαι· ἣν δὲ τις ἄρα καὶ βουλευθῇ, κολασθήσεται τῇ πρεπούσῃ ζημίᾳ, οἳ δὲ ἀγαθοὶ τιμῇσονται τοῖς προσήκουσιν ἄλλοις τῆς ἀρετῆς.*

upon them to show their habitual discipline and quick apprehension of orders, and above all to perform their regular movements in perfect silence during the actual battle¹—useful in all matters of war, and essential to the proper conduct of a sea-fight. The idea of entire silence on board the Athenian ships while a sea-fight was going on, is not only striking as a feature in the picture, but is also one of the most powerful evidences of the force of self-control and military habits among these citizen-seamen.

The habitual position of the Peloponnesian fleet off Panormus was within the strait, but nearly fronting the breadth of it—opposite to Phormio who lay on the outer side of the strait, as well as off the opposite cape: in the Peloponnesian line, therefore, the right wing occupied the north or north-east side towards Naupaktus. Knêmus and Brasidas now resolved to make a forward movement up the Gulf, as if against that town, which was the main Athenian station. Knowing that Phormio would be under the necessity of coming to the defence of the place, they hoped to pin him up and force him to action close under the land, where Athenian manœuvring would be unavailing. Accordingly they commenced this movement early in the morning, sailing in line of four abreast towards the northern coast of the Inner Gulf. The right squadron, under the Lacedæmonian Timokratês, was in the van, according to its natural position,² and care had been taken to place in it twenty of the best-sailing ships, since the success of the plan of action was known beforehand to depend upon their celerity. As they had foreseen, Phormio, the moment he saw their movement, put his men on shipboard, and rowed into the interior of the strait, though with the greatest reluctance; for the Messenians were on land alongside of him, and he knew that Naupaktus, with their wives and families, and a long circuit of wall,³ was utterly undefended. He ranged his ships in line of battle ahead, probably his own the leading ship; and sailed close along the land towards Naupaktus, while the Messenians marching ashore kept near to him.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 89. *Καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ κόσμον καὶ σιγὴν περὶ πλείστον ἡγήσθε, ὃ ἔστι τε τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολεμικῶν ξυμφέρει, καὶ ναυμαχία οὐχ ἡκίστα, &c.*

² Thucyd. ii. 90. *ἐπὶ τεσσάρων ταξάμενοι τὰς ναῦς*. Matthiæ in his Grammar (sect. 584) states that *ἐπὶ τεσσάρων* means “four deep,” and cites this passage of Thucydides as an instance of it. But the words certainly mean here *four abreast*; though it is to be recollected that a column four abreast, when formed into line, becomes four deep.

³ Thucyd. iii. 102.

Both fleets were thus moving in the same direction, and towards the same point—the Athenian close along shore—the Peloponnesians somewhat farther off.¹ The latter had now got Phormio into the position which they wished, pinned up against the land, with no room for tactics. On a sudden the signal was given, and the whole Peloponnesian fleet, facing to the left, changed from column into line, and instead of continuing to move along the coast, rowed rapidly with their prows shoreward to come to close quarters with the Athenians. The right squadron of the Peloponnesians, occupying the side towards Naupaktus, was especially charged with the duty of cutting off the Athenians from all possibility of escaping thither; the best ships having been placed on the right for that important object. As far as the commanders were concerned, the plan of action completely succeeded: the Athenians were caught in a situation where resistance was impossible, and had no chance of escape except in flight. But so superior were they in rapid movement even to the best Peloponnesians, that eleven ships, the headmost out of the twenty, just found means to run by,² before the right wing of the enemy closed in upon the shore; and made the best of their way to Naupaktus. The remaining nine ships were caught and driven ashore with serious damage—their crews being partly slain, partly escaping by swimming. The Peloponnesians towed off one trireme with its entire crew, and some others empty. But more than one of them was rescued by the bravery of the Messenian hoplites, who, in spite of their heavy panoply, rushed into the water and got aboard them, fighting from the decks and driving off the enemy even after the rope had been actually made fast, and the process of towing off had begun.³

The victory of the Peloponnesians seemed assured. While their left and centre were thus occupied, the twenty ships of their right wing parted company with the rest, in order to pursue the eleven fugitive Athenian ships which they had failed

¹ In reference to the description of this movement, see the Appendix to the present chapter, with the plan at the end of the volume.

² Thucyd. ii. 90. How narrow the escape was, is marked in the words of the historian—*τῶν δὲ ἑνδεκα μὲν αἰπερ ἡγοῦντο ὑπεκφεύγουσι τὸ κέρας τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν εἰς τὴν εὐρυχωρίαν.*

The proceedings of the Syracusan fleet against that of the Athenians in the harbour of Syracuse, and the reflections of the historian upon them, illustrate this attack of the Peloponnesians upon the fleet of Phormio (Thucyd. vii. 36).

³ Compare the like bravery on the part of the Lacedæmonian hoplites at Pylus (Thucyd. iv. 14).

in cutting off. Ten of these got clear away into the harbour of Naupaktus, and there posted themselves in an attitude of defence near the temple of Apollo, before any of the pursuers could come near ; while the eleventh, somewhat less swift, was neared by the Lacedæmonian admiral, who, on board a Leukadian trireme, pushed greatly ahead of his comrades, in hopes of overtaking at least this one prey. There happened to lie moored a merchant-vessel, at the entrance of the harbour of Naupaktus. The Athenian captain in his flight observing that the Leukadian pursuer was for the moment alone, seized the opportunity for a bold and rapid manœuvre. He pulled swiftly round the trader-vessel, directed his trireme so as to meet the advancing Leukadian, and drove his beak against her, amidships, with an impact so violent as to disable her at once. Her commander, the Lacedæmonian admiral Timokratês, was so stung with anguish at this unexpected catastrophe, that he slew himself forthwith, and fell overboard into the harbour. The pursuing vessels coming up behind, too, were so astounded and dismayed by it, that the men, dropping their oars, held water, and ceased to advance ; while some even found themselves half aground, from ignorance of the coast. On the other hand, the ten Athenian triremes in the harbour were beyond measure elated by the incident, so that a single word from Phormio sufficed to put them in active forward motion, and to make them strenuously attack the embarrassed enemy ; whose ships, disordered by the heat of pursuit, and having been just suddenly stopped, could not be speedily got again under way, and expected nothing less than renewed attack. First, the Athenians broke the twenty pursuing ships on the right wing, next they pursued their advantage against the left and centre, who had probably neared to the right ; so that after a short resistance, the whole were completely routed, and fled across the Gulf to their original station at Panormus.¹ Not only did

¹ Thucyd. ii. 92. It is sufficiently evident that the Athenians defeated and drove off not only the twenty Peloponnesian ships of the right or pursuing wing—but also the left and centre. Otherwise they would not have been able to recapture those Athenian ships which had been lost at the beginning of the battle. Thucydides indeed does not expressly mention the Peloponnesian left and centre as following the right in their pursuit towards Naupaktus. But we may presume that they partially did so, probably careless of much order, as being at first under the impression that the victory was gained. They were probably therefore thrown into confusion without much difficulty, when the twenty ships of the right were beaten and driven back upon them—even though the victorious Athenian triremes were no more than eleven in number.

the eleven Athenian ships thus break, terrify, and drive away the entire fleet of the enemy, with the capture of six of the nearest Peloponnesian triremes—but they also rescued those ships of their own which had been driven ashore and taken in the early part of the action. Moreover the Peloponnesian crews sustained a considerable loss, both in killed and in prisoners.

Thus in spite not only of the prodigious disparity of numbers, but also of the disastrous blow which the Athenians had sustained at first, Phormio ended by gaining a complete victory; a victory, to which even the Lacedæmonians were forced to bear testimony, since they were obliged to ask a truce for burying and collecting their dead, while the Athenians on their part picked up the bodies of their own warriors. The defeated party, however, still thought themselves entitled, in token of their success in the early part of the action, to erect a trophy on the Rhium of Achaia, where they also dedicated the single Athenian trireme which they had been able to carry off. Yet they were so completely discomfited—and further so much in fear of the expected reinforcement from Athens—that they took advantage of the night to retire, and sail into the Gulf to Corinth; all except the Leukadians, who returned to their own home.

Presently the reinforcement arrived, after that untoward detention which had well nigh exposed Phormio and his whole fleet to ruin. It confirmed his mastery of the entrance of the Gulf and of the coast of Akarnania, where the Peloponnesians had now no naval force at all. To establish more fully the Athenian influence in Akarnania, he undertook during the course of the autumn an expedition, landing at Astakus, and marching into the Akarnanian inland country with 400 Athenian hoplites and 400 Messenians. Some of the leading men of Stratus and Koronta, who were attached to the Peloponnesian interest, he caused to be sent into exile, while a chief named Kynês, of Koronta, who seems to have been hitherto in exile, was re-established in his native town. The great object was, to besiege and take the powerful town of Cœniadæ, near the mouth of the Achelôus; a town at variance with the other Akarnanians, and attached to the Peloponnesians. But as the great spread of the waters of the Achelôus rendered this siege impracticable during the winter, Phormio returned to the station at Naupaktus. From hence he departed to Athens towards the end of the winter, carrying home both his prize-ships and such of his prisoners as were freemen. The latter

Second and Third Years of War 235

were exchanged man for man against Athenian prisoners in the hands of Sparta.¹

After abandoning the naval contest at Rhium, and retiring to Corinth, Knêmus and Brasidas were prevailed upon by the Megarians, before the fleet dispersed, to try the bold experiment of a sudden inroad upon Peiræus. Such was the confessed superiority of the Athenians at sea, that while they guarded amply the coasts of Attica against privateers, they never imagined the possibility of an attack upon their own main harbour. Accordingly, Peiræus was not only unprotected by any chain across the entrance, but destitute even of any regular guard-ships manned and ready. The seamen of the retiring Peloponnesian armament, on reaching Corinth, were immediately disembarked and marched, first across the isthmus, next to Megara—each man carrying his seat-cloth,² and his oar, together with the loop whereby the oar was fastened to the oar-hole in the side and thus prevented from slipping.

There lay forty triremes in Nisæa the harbour of Megara, which, though old and out of condition, were sufficient for so short a trip; and the seamen, immediately on arriving, launched these and got aboard. Yet such was the awe entertained of Athens and her power, that when the scheme came really to be executed, the courage of the Peloponnesians failed, though there was nothing to hinder them from actually reaching Peiræus. Pretending that the wind was adverse, they contented themselves with passing across to the station of Budorum, in the opposite Athenian island of Salamis, where they surprised and seized the three guard-ships which habitually blockaded the harbour of Megara, and then landed upon the island. They spread themselves over a large part of Salamis, ravaged the properties, and seized men as well as goods. Fire-signals immediately made known this unforeseen aggression

¹ Thucyd. ii. 102, 103.

² Thucyd. ii. 93. ἐδόκει δὲ λαβόντα τῶν ναυτῶν ἕκαστον τὴν κώπην, καὶ τὸ ὑπηρέσιον, καὶ τὸν τροπωτήρα, &c. On these words there is an interesting letter of Dr. Bishop's published in the Appendix to Dr. Arnold's Thucydidēs, vol. i. His remarks upon ὑπηρέσιον are more satisfactory than those upon τροπωτήρ. Whether the fulcrum of the oar was formed by a thowel, or a notch on the gunwale, or by a perforation in the ship's side, there must in both cases have been required (since it seems to have had nothing like what Dr. Bishop calls a *nut*) a thong to prevent it from slipping down towards the water; especially with the oars of the Thranitæ or upper tier of rowers, who pulled at so great an elevation (comparatively speaking) above the water. Dr. Arnold's explanation of τροπωτήρ is suited to the case of a boat, but not to that of a trireme. Dr. Bishop shows that the explanation of the purpose of the ὑπηρέσιον, given by the Scholiast, is not the true one.

both at Peiræus and at Athens, occasioning in both the extreme of astonishment and alarm; for the citizens in Athens, not conceiving distinctly the meaning of the signals, fancied that Peiræus itself had fallen into the hands of the enemy. The whole population rushed down to the Peiræus at break of day, and put to sea with all the triremes that were ready. But the Peloponnesians, aware of the danger which menaced them, made haste to quit Salamis with their booty and the three captured guard-ships. The lesson was salutary to the Athenians: from henceforward Peiræus was furnished with a chain across the mouth, and a regular guard, down to the end of the war.¹ Forty years afterwards, however, we shall find it just as negligently watched, and surprised with much more boldness and dexterity by the Lacedæmonian captain Teleutias.²

As, during the summer of this year, the Ambrakiots had brought down a numerous host of Epirotic tribes to the invasion of Akarnania, in conjunction with the Peloponnesians—so during the autumn the Athenians obtained aid against the Chalkidians of Thrace from the powerful barbaric prince before mentioned, Sitalkês king of the Odrysian Thracians.

Amidst the numerous tribes, between the Danube and the Ægean sea—who all bore the generic name of Thracians, though each had a special name besides—the Odrysians were at this time the most warlike and powerful. The Odrysian king Têrês, father of Sitalkês, had made use of this power to subdue³ and render tributary a great number of these different tribes, especially those whose residence was in the plain rather than in the mountains. His dominion, the largest existing between the Ionian sea and the Euxine, extended from Abdêra or the mouth of the Nestus in the Ægean sea, to the mouth of the Danube in the Euxine; though it seems that this must be understood with deductions, since many intervening tribes, especially mountain tribes, did not acknowledge his authority. Sitalkês himself had invaded and conquered some of the Pæonian tribes who joined the Thracians on the west, between the Axios and the Strymon.⁴ Dominion, in the sense of the Odrysian king, meant tribute, presents, and military force when required. With the two former, at least, we may conclude that he was amply supplied, since his nephew and successor Seuthes (under whom the revenue increased and attained its maximum) received 400 talents annually in gold and silver as tribute, and the like sum in various presents, over and above many other

¹ Thucyd. ii. 94.

² Xenophon, Hellen. v. 1, 19.

³ Thucyd. ii. 29, 95, 96.

⁴ Thucyd. ii. 99.

Second and Third Years of War 237

presents of manufactured articles and ornaments. These latter came from the Grecian colonies on the coast, which contributed moreover largely to the tribute, though in what proportions we are not informed. Even Grecian cities, not in Thrace, sent presents to forward their trading objects, as purchasers for the produce, the plunder, and the slaves, acquired by Thracian chiefs or tribes.¹ The residence of the Odrysians properly so called, and of the princes of that tribe now ruling over so many of the remaining tribes, appears to have been about twelve days' journey inland from Byzantium,² in the upper regions of the Hebrus and Strymon, south of Mount Hæmus, and north-east of Rhodopê. The Odrysian chiefs were connected by relationship more or less distant with those of the subordinate tribes, and by marriage even with the Scythian princes north of the Danube: the Scythian prince Ariapeithês³ had married the daughter of the Odrysian Têrês, the first who extended the dominion of his tribe over any considerable portion of Thrace.

The natural state of the Thracian tribes—in the judgement of Herodotus, permanent and incorrigible—was that of disunion and incapacity of political association; were such association possible (he says), they would be strong enough to vanquish every other nation—though Thucydidês considers them as far inferior to the Scythians. The Odrysian dominion had probably not reached, at the period when Herodotus made his inquiries, the same development which Thucydidês describes in the third year of the Peloponnesian war, and which imparted to these tribes a union, partial indeed, and temporary, but such as they never reached either before or afterwards. It has been already mentioned that the Odrysian prince Sitalkês had taken for his wife (or rather for one of his wives) the sister of Nymphodôrus, a Greek of Abdêra; by whose mediation he had been made the ally, and his son Sadokus even a citizen, of Athens. He had further been induced to promise that he would reconquer the Chalkidians of Thrace for the benefit of the Athenians,⁴—his ancient kinsmen, according to the mythe

¹ See Xenophon, *Anab.* vii. 3, 16; 4, 2. Diodorus (xii. 50) gives the revenue of Sitalkês as more than 1000 talents annually. This sum is not materially different from that which Thucydidês states to be the annual receipt of Seuthês successor of Sitalkês—revenue properly so called, and presents, both taken together.

Traders from Parium, on the Asiatic coast of the Propontis, are among those who come with presents to the Odrysian king Mêdokus (Xenophon, *ut supra*). ² Xenoph. *Anab.* i. c. ³ Herodot. iv. 80.

⁴ Xenophon, *Anab.* vii. 2, 31; Thucyd. ii. 29; Aristophan. *Aves*,

of Tereus as interpreted by both parties. At the same time, Perdikkas king of Macedonia had offended him by refusing to perform a promise made of giving him his sister in marriage—a promise made as consideration for the interference of Sitalkês and Nymphodôrus in procuring for Perdikkas peace with Athens, at a moment when he was much embarrassed by civil dissensions with his brother Philip. The latter prince, ruling in his own name (and seemingly independent of Perdikkas) over a portion of the Macedonians along the upper course of the Axios, had been expelled by his more powerful brother, and taken refuge with Sitalkês. He was now apparently dead, but his son Amyntas received from the Odrysian prince the promise of restoration. The Athenians, though they had ambassadors resident with Sitalkês, nevertheless sent Agnon as special envoy to concert arrangements, for his march against the Chalkidians, with which an Athenian armament was destined to co-operate. In treating with Sitalkês, it was necessary to be liberal in presents both to himself and to the subordinate chieftains who held power dependent upon him. Nothing could be accomplished among the Thracians except by the aid of bribes,¹ and the Athenians were more competent to

366. Thucydides goes out of his way to refute this current belief—a curious exemplification of ancient legend applied to the convenience of present politics.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 97. Φόρος δὲ ἐκ πάσης τῆς βαρβάρου καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων, ὅσον προσῆξαν ἐπὶ Σεύθου, ὃς ὕστερον Σιτάλκου βασιλεύσας πλείστον δὴ ἐποίησε, τετρακοσίων ταλάντων μάλιστα δύναιμις, ἃ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργυροῦ εἴη· καὶ δῶρα οὐκ ἐλάσσω τούτων χρυσοῦ τε καὶ ἀργύρου προσεφέρετο, χωρὶς δὲ ὅσα ὑφαντά τε καὶ λεία, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη κατασκευή, καὶ οὐ μόνον αὐτῷ ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς παραδυναστεύουσι καὶ γενναίοις Ὀδρυσῶν· κατεστήσαντο γὰρ τοὺνναντίον τῆς Περσῶν βασιλείας τὸν νόμον, ὅντα μὲν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Θραξί, λαμβάνειν μᾶλλον ἢ δίδοναι, καὶ αἰσχίον ἦν αἰτηθέντα μὴ δοῦναι ἢ αἰτήσαντα μὴ τυχεῖν· θμῶς δὲ κατὰ τὸ δύνασθαι ἐπὶ πλεόν αὐτῷ ἐχρήσαντο· οὐ γὰρ ἦν πράξαι οὐδὲν μὴ δίδοντα δῶρα· ὥστε ἐπὶ μέγα ἡ βασιλεία ἤλθεν ἰσχύος.

This universal necessity of presents and bribes may be seen illustrated in the dealings of Xenophon and the Cyreian army with the Thracian prince Seuthes, described in the *Anabasis*, vii. chapters 1 and 2. It appears that even at that time (B.C. 401) the Odrysian dominion, though it had passed through disturbances and had been practically enfeebled, still extended down to the neighbourhood of Byzantium. In commenting upon the venality of the Thracians, the Scholiast has a curious comparison with his own time—καὶ οὐκ ἦν τι πράξαι παρ' αὐτοῖς τὸν μὴ δίδοντα χρήματα· ὅπερ καὶ νῦν ἐν Ῥωμαίοις. The Scholiast here tells us that the venality in his time as to public affairs, in the Roman empire, was not less universal: of what century of the Roman empire he speaks, we do not know: perhaps about 500–600 A.D.

The contrast which Thucydides here draws between the Thracians and the Persians is illustrated by what Xenophon says respecting the habits of

Second and Third Years of War 239

supply this exigency than any other people in Greece. The joint expedition against the Chalkidians was finally resolved.

But the forces of Sitalkês, collected from many different portions of Thrace, were tardy in coming together. He summoned all the tribes under his dominion between Hæmus, Rhodopê, and the two seas: the Getæ between Mount Hæmus and the Danube, equipped like the Scythians (their neighbours on the other side of the river) with bow and arrow on horse-back, also joined him, as well as the Agrianes, the Lææi, and the other Pæonian tribes subject to his dominion. Lastly, several of the Thracian tribes called Dii, distinguished by their peculiar short swords, and maintaining a fierce independence on the heights of Rhodopê, were tempted by the chance of plunder, or the offer of pay, to flock to his standard. Altogether his army amounted, or was supposed to amount, to 150,000 men—one-third of it cavalry, who were for the most part Getæ and Odrysians proper. The most formidable warriors in his camp were the independent tribes of Rhodopê. The whole host, alike numerous, warlike, predatory, and cruel, spread terror amidst all those who were within even the remote possibilities of its march.

Starting from the central Odrysian territory, and bringing with him Agnon and the other Athenian envoys, he first crossed the uninhabited mountain called Kerkinê, which divided the Pæonians on the west from the Thracian tribes called Sinti and Mædi on the east, until he reached the Pæonian town or district called Dobêrus;¹ it was here that many troops and additional volunteers reached him, making up his full total. From Dobêrus, probably marching down along one of the tributary streams of the Axius, he entered into that portion of Upper Macedonia which lies along the higher Axius, and which had constituted the separate principality of Philip. The presence in his army of Amyntas, son of Philip, induced some of the fortified places, Gortyna, Atalantê, and others, to open their gates without resistance, while Eidomenê was taken by

the younger Cyrus (Anab. i. 9, 22): compare also the romance of the *Cyropædia*, viii. 14, 31, 32.

¹ See Gatterer (*De Herodoti et Thucydidis Thraciâ*), sect. 44-57; Poppo (*Prolegom. ad Thucydidem*), vol. ii. ch. 31, about the geography of this region, which is very imperfectly known, even in modern times. We can hardly pretend to assign a locality for these ancient names.

Thucydidês, in his brief statements respecting this march of Sitalkês, speaks like one who had good information about the inland regions; as he was likely to have from his familiarity with the coasts, and resident proprietorship in Thrace (Thucyd. ii. 100; Herodot. v. 16).

storm, and Eurôpus in vain attacked. From hence he passed still farther southward into Lower Macedonia, the kingdom of Perdikkas; ravaging the territory on both sides of the Axios even to the neighbourhood of the towns Pella and Kyrreus; and apparently down as far south as the mouth of the river and the head of the Thermaic Gulf. Farther south than this he did not go, but spread his force over the districts between the left bank of the Axios and the head of the Strymonic Gulf,—Mygdonia, Krestônia, and Anthemus—while a portion of his army was detached to overrun the territory of the Chalkidians and Bottiæans. The Macedonians under Perdikkas, renouncing all idea of contending on foot against so overwhelming a host, either fled or shut themselves up in the small number of fortified places which the country presented. The cavalry from Upper Macedonia, indeed, well-armed and excellent, made some orderly and successful charges against the Thracians, lightly armed with javelins, short swords, and the pelta or small shield,—but it was presently shut in, harassed on all sides by superior numbers, and compelled to think only of retreat and extrication.¹

Luckily for the enemies of the Odrysian king, his march was not made until the beginning of winter—seemingly about November or December. We may be sure that the Athenians, when they concerted with him the joint attack upon the Chalkidians, intended that it should be in a better time of the year. Having probably waited to hear that his army was in motion, and waited long in vain, they began to despair of his coming at all, and thought it not worth while to despatch any force of their own to the spot.² Some envoys and presents only were sent as compliments, instead of the co-operating armament. And this disappointment, coupled with the severity of the weather, the nakedness of the country, and the privations of his army at that season, induced Sitalkês soon to enter into negotiations with Perdikkas; who moreover gained over Seuthes, nephew of the Odrysian prince, by promising his sister Stratonikê in marriage, together with a sum of money, on condition that the Thracian host should be speedily withdrawn. This was accordingly done, after it had been distributed for thirty days over Macedonia; during eight of which days his detachment had ravaged the Chalkidic lands. But the interval had been quite long enough to diffuse terror all around. Such a host of fierce barbarians had never before been brought

¹ Thucyd. ii. 100; Xenophon, Memorab. iii. 9, 2.

² Thucyd. ii. 101. *ἐπειδὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οὐ παρέσαν ταῖς ναυσίν, ἀπιστοῦντες αὐτὸν μὴ ἔξειν, &c.*

together, and no one knew in what direction they might be disposed to carry their incursions. The independent Thracian tribes (Panæi, Odomantes, Drôî and Dersæi) in the plains on the north-east of the Strymon, and near Mount Pangæus, not far from Amphipolis, were the first to feel alarm lest Sitalkês should take the opportunity of trying to conquer them. On the other side, the Thessalians, Magnêtes, and other Greeks north of Thermopylæ, apprehensive that he would carry his invasion farther south, began to organise means for resisting him. Even the general Peloponnesian confederacy heard with uneasiness of this new ally whom Athens was bringing into the field, perhaps against them. All such alarms were dissipated, when Sitalkês, after remaining thirty days, returned by the way he came, and the formidable avalanche was thus seen to melt away. The faithless Perdikkas, on this occasion, performed his promise to Seuthes, having drawn upon himself much mischief by violating his previous similar promise to Sitalkês.¹

APPENDIX

Thucyd. ii. 90. Οἱ δὲ Πελοποννήσιοι, ἐπειδὴ αὐτοῖς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οὐκ ἐπέπλεον ἐς τὸν κόλπον καὶ τὰ στενά, βουλόμενοι ἄκοντας ἔσω προαγαγεῖν αὐτούς, ἀναγόμενοι ἅμα ἔφ' ἔπλεον, ἐπὶ τεσσάρων ταξάμενοι τὰς ναῦς. ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν ἔσω ἐπὶ τοῦ κόλπου, δεξιῶ κέρῳ ἡγουμένῳ, ὥσπερ καὶ ὠρμουν· ἐπὶ δ' αὐτῷ εἴκοσι ἔταξαν τὰς ἄριστα πλεούσας, ὅπως, εἰ ἔρα νομίσας ἐπὶ τὴν Ναύπακτον πλεῖν ὁ Φορμίων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιβοηθῶν ταύτῃ παραπλέοι, μὴ διαφύγοιεν πλείοντες τὸν ἐπίπλουν σφῶν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔξω τοῦ ἑαυτῶν κέρως, ἀλλ' αὐταὶ αἱ νῆες περιελήσειαν.

The above passage forms the main authority for my description (given above) of the movement of the Peloponnesian fleet, previous to the second battle against Phormio. The plan at the end of this volume will enable my reasoning to be understood.

The main question for consideration here is, What is the meaning of τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν? Does it mean the land of the Peloponnesians, south of the Gulf—or the land of the Athenians, north of the Gulf? The commentators affirm that it must mean the former. I thought that it might mean the latter: and in my previous editions, I adduced several examples of the use of the pronoun *ἐαυτοῦ*, tending to justify that opinion.

Finding that on this question of criticism, my opinion is opposed

¹ Thucyd. ii. 101.

to the best authorities, I no longer insist upon it, nor do I now reprint the illustrative passages. As to the facts, however, my conviction remains unchanged. The land here designated by Thucydides must be "the land of the Athenians north of the Strait:" it cannot be "the land of the Peloponnesians south of the Strait." The pronoun *ἐαυτῶν* must therefore be wrong, and ought to be altered into *αὐτῶν*, as Mr. Bloomfield proposes, or *ἐκείνων*.

The Scholiast says that *ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν* is here equivalent to *παρὰ τὴν γῆν*. Dr. Arnold, thoroughly approving the description of Mitford, who states that the Peloponnesian fleet were "moving eastward *along the Achaic coast*," says, "The Scholiast says that *ἐπὶ* is here used for *παρὰ*. It would be better to say that it has a mixed signification of motion towards a place and neighbourhood to it: expressing that the Peloponnesians sailed towards their own land (*i. e.* towards Corinth, Sicyon, and Pellênê, to which places the greater number of the ships belonged), instead of standing over to the opposite coast belonging to their enemies; and at the same time kept close *upon* their own land, in the sense of *ἐπὶ* with a dative case."

To discuss this interpretation first with reference to the verbal construction. Surely the meaning which the Scholiast puts upon *ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν* is one which cannot be admitted without examples to justify it. No two propositions can be more distinct than the two, *πλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*—and *πλεῖν παρὰ τὴν γῆν*? The Peloponnesian fleet, before it made any movement, was already moored close upon its own land—at the headland Rhium near Panormus where its land-force stood (Thucyd. ii. 86). In this position, if it moved at all, it must either sail away from the Peloponnesian coast, or along the Peloponnesian coast: and neither of these movements would be expressed by Thucydides under the words *πλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν*.

To obviate this difficulty, while the Scholiast changes the meaning of *ἐπὶ*, Dr. Arnold changes that of *τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν*; which words, according to him, denote, not the Peloponnesian coast as opposed to the northern shore occupied by Phormio, but Corinth, Sicyon, and Pellênê; to which places (he says) the greater number of the ships belonged. But I submit that this is a sense altogether unnatural. Corinth and Sicyon are so far off, that any allusion to them here is most improbable. Thucydides is describing the operations of two hostile fleets, one occupying the coast northward, the other the coast southward, of the Strait. The *own land* of the Peloponnesians was that southern line of coast which they occupied and on which their land-force was encamped: it is distinguished from the *enemies' land*, on the opposite side of the Strait. If Thucydides had wished to intimate that the Peloponnesian fleet sailed in the direction of Corinth and Sicyon, he would hardly have used such words as *ἐπλεον ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν*.

Professor Dunbar (in an article among the Critical Remarks annexed to the third edition of his Greek and English Lexicon) has contested my interpretation of this passage of Thucydides. He says, "The Peloponnesian fleet must have *proceeded along their own coast*—*ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν ἔσω ἐπὶ τοῦ κόλπου*. In this passage

we find *ἐπὶ* with two cases : the first with the accusative, the other with the genitive. The first appears to me to indicate *the locality to which* they were sailing : and that evidently was, the headland on the Achæan coast, nearly opposite Naupactus."

The headland, to which Mr. Dunbar alludes, will be seen on the plan, marked Drepanum. It is sufficiently near, not to be open to the objection which I have urged against Dr. Arnold's hypothesis of Corinth and Sicyon. But still I contend that it cannot be indicated by the words as they stand in Thucydides. On Mr. Dunbar's interpretation, the Peloponnesians must have moved from one point of their own land to another point of their own land. Now if Thucydides had meant to affirm this, he surely would not have used such words as *ἐπλεον ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτῶν γῆν*. He would either have specified by name the particular point of land (as in c. 86 *παρέπλευσεν ἐπὶ τὸ Ῥίον*)—or if he had desired to bring to our view that "they proceeded *along* their own coast," he would have said *παρά* instead of *ἐπὶ*.

Thus far I have been discussing simply the verbal interpretation of *ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτῶν γῆν*, for the purpose of showing, that though these words be admitted to mean the land of the Peloponnesians,—still, in order to reconcile such meaning with the facts, the commentators are obliged to advance suppositions highly improbable, and even to identify *ἐπὶ* with *παρά*. I now turn from the verbal construction to the facts, in order to show that the real movement of the Peloponnesian fleet *must have been* towards the Athenian coast and towards Naupaktus. Therefore, since *αὐτῶν* cannot have that meaning, *αὐτῶν* must be an error of the text.

The purpose of the Peloponnesians in effecting the movement, was to make Phormio believe that they were going to attack Naupaktus ; to constrain him to come within the Gulf with a view of protecting that place ; and at the same time, if Phormio did come within the Gulf, to attack him in a narrow space where his ships would have no room for manœuvring. This was what the Peloponnesians not only intended, but actually accomplished.

Now I ask, how this purpose could be accomplished by a movement along the coast of Peloponnesus from the headland of Rhium to the headland of Drepanum,—which last point the reader will see on the plan? How could such movement induce Phormio to think that the Peloponnesians were going to attack Naupaktus, or throw him into alarm for the safety of that place? When arrived at Drepanum, they would hardly be nearer to Naupaktus than they were at Rhium : they would still have the whole breadth of the Gulf to cross. Let us however suppose that their movement towards Drepanum did really induce Phormio to come into the Gulf for the protection of Naupaktus. If they attempted to cross the breadth of the Gulf from Drepanum towards Naupaktus, they would expose themselves to be attacked by Phormio midway in the open sea ; the very contingency which he desired, and which they were manœuvring to avoid.

Again, let us approach the question from another point of view.

It is certain, from the description of Thucydidēs, that the actual attack of the Peloponnesians upon Phormio, in which they cut off nine out of his twenty ships, took place on the *northern coast of the Gulf*, at some spot between the headland Antirrhium and Naupaktus; somewhere near the spot which I have indicated on the plan. The presence of the Messenian soldiers (who had come out from Naupaktus to assist Phormio, and who waded into the water to save the captured ships) would of itself place this beyond a doubt—if indeed any doubt could arise. It is further certain, that when the Peloponnesian fleet wheeled from column into line to attack Phormio, they were so near to this northern land, that Phormio was in the greatest danger of having his whole squadron driven ashore: only eleven out of his twenty ships could escape. The plan will illustrate what is here said.

Now I ask, how these facts are to be reconciled with the supposition that the Peloponnesian fleet, on quitting their moorings at Rhium, coasted along their own land towards Drepanum? If they did so, how did they afterwards get across the Gulf, to the place where the battle was fought? Every yard that they moved in the direction of Drepanum, only tended to widen the breadth of open gulf to be crossed afterwards. With the purpose which they had in view, to move from Rhium along their own coast in the direction of Drepanum would have been absurd. Supposing however that they did so, it could only have been preliminary to a second movement, in another direction, across the Gulf. But of this second movement, Thucydidēs says not one word. All that he tells us about the course of the Peloponnesians is contained in this phrase—ἐπλεον ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν ἔσω ἐπὶ τοῦ κόλπου, δεξιῇ κέρα ἡγουμένῃ, ὥσπερ καὶ ὤρμουν. If these words really designate a movement along the southern coast, we must assume, first that the historian has left unnoticed the second movement across the Gulf, which nevertheless must have followed—next, that the Peloponnesians made a first move for no purpose except to increase the distance and difficulty of the second.

Considering therefore the facts of the case, the localities and the purpose of the Peloponnesians, all of which are here clear—I contend that ἐπλεον ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν γῆν ἔσω ἐπὶ τοῦ κόλπου must denote a movement of the Peloponnesian fleet towards the land of the Athenians, or the northern shore of the Gulf; and that as ἑαυτῶν will not bear that sense, it must be altered to αὐτῶν or ἐκείνων.

It remains to explain ἔσω ἐπὶ τοῦ κόλπου, which bear a very distinct and important meaning. The land of the Athenians, on the northern side of the Strait, comprises the headland of Antirrhium with both the lines of coast which there terminate and make an angle; that is, one line of coast *fronting inside towards the Corinthian Gulf*—the other, *fronting outside towards the Gulf of Patras*. The reader who looks at the plan will see this at a glance. Now when Thucydidēs says that the Peloponnesians sailed "*upon the land of the Athenians inwards fronting the Gulf*,"—these last words are essential to make us understand towards

which of the two Athenian lines of coast the movement was turned. We learn from the words that the Peloponnesians did not sail towards that outer side of the headland where Phormio was moored, but towards the inner side of it, on the line which conducted to Naupaktus.

CHAPTER L

FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FOURTH YEAR OF THE
PELOPONNESIAN WAR DOWN TO THE REVOLUTIONARY
COMMOTIONS AT KORKYRA

THE second and third years of the war had both been years of great suffering with the Athenians, from the continuance of the epidemic, which did not materially relax until the winter of the third year (B.C. 429-428). It is no wonder that under the pressure of such a calamity their military efforts were enfeebled, although the victories of Phormio had placed their maritime reputation at a higher point than ever. To their enemies, the destructive effects of this epidemic—effects still felt, although the disorder itself was suspended during the fourth year of the war—afforded material assistance as well as encouragement to persevere. The Peloponnesians, under Archidamus, again repeated during this year their invasion and ravage of Attica, which had been intermitted during the year preceding. As before, they met with no serious resistance. Entering the country about the beginning of May, they continued the process of devastation until their provisions were exhausted.¹ To this damage the Athenians had probably now accustomed themselves: but they speedily received, even while the invaders were in their country, intelligence of an event far more embarrassing and formidable—the revolt of Mitylênê and of the greater part of Lesbos.

This revolt, indeed, did not come even upon the Athenians wholly unawares. Yet the idea of it was of longer standing than they suspected, for the Mitylenæan oligarchy had projected it before the war and had made secret application to Sparta for aid, but without success. Some time after hostilities broke out, they resumed the design, which was warmly promoted by the Bœotians, kinsmen of the Lesbians in Æolic lineage and dialect. The Mitylenæan leaders appear to have finally determined on revolt during the preceding autumn or winter. But they thought it prudent to make ample prepara-

¹ Thucyd. iii. 1.

tions before they declared themselves openly ; and moreover they took measures for constraining three other towns in Lesbos, —Antissa, Eresus, and Pyrrha,—to share their fortunes, to merge their own separate governments, and to become incorporated with Mitylênê. Methymna, the second town in Lesbos, situated on the north of the island, was decidedly opposed to them and attached to Athens. The Mitylenæans built new ships,—put their walls in an improved state of defence,—carried out a mole in order to narrow the entrance of their harbour and render it capable of being closed with a chain,—despatched emissaries to hire Scythian bowmen and purchase corn in the Euxine—and took such other measures as were necessary for an effective resistance.

Though the oligarchical character of their government gave them much means of secrecy, and above all, dispensed with the necessity of consulting the people beforehand,—still, measures of such importance could not be taken without provoking attention. Intimation was sent to the Athenians by various Mitylenæan citizens, partly from private feeling, partly in their capacity of *proxeni* (or *consuls*, to use a modern word which approaches to the meaning) for Athens—especially by a Mitylenæan named Doxander, incensed with the government for having disappointed his two sons of marriage with two orphan heiresses.¹ Not less communicative were the islanders of Tenedos, animated by ancient neighbourly jealousy towards Mitylênê ; so that the Athenians were thus forewarned both of the intrigues between Mitylênê and the Spartans, and of her certain impending revolt unless they immediately interfered.²

This news seems to have become certain about February or March 428 B.C. But such was then the dispirited condition of the Athenians—arising from two years' suffering under the epidemic, and no longer counteracted by the wholesome remonstrances of Periklês—that they could not at first bring themselves to believe what they were so much afraid to find true. Lesbos, like Chios, was their ally upon an equal footing,

¹ Aristotel. Politic. v. 2, 3. The fact respecting Doxander here mentioned is stated by Aristotle, and there is no reason to question its truth. But Aristotle states it in illustration of a general position—that the private quarrels of principal citizens are often the cause of great misfortune to the commonwealth. He represents Doxander and his private quarrel as having brought upon Mitylênê the resentment of the Athenians and the war with Athens—*Δόξανδρος—ἤρξε τῆς στάσεως, καὶ παρώχυνε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, πρόξενος ὢν τῆς πόλεως.*

Having the account of Thucydidês before us, we are enabled to say that this is an incorrect conception, so far as concerns the *cause* of the war—though the fact in itself may be quite true.

² Thucyd. iii. 2.

still remaining under those conditions which had been at first common to all the members of the confederacy of Delos. Mitylênê paid no tribute to Athens: it retained its walls, its large naval force, and its extensive landed possessions on the opposite Asiatic continent: its government was oligarchical, administering all internal affairs without reference to Athens. Its obligations as an ally were, that in case of war, it was held bound to furnish armed ships, whether in determinate number or not, we do not know. It would undoubtedly be restrained from making war upon Tenedos, or any other subject-ally of Athens: and its government or its citizens would probably be held liable to answer before the Athenian dikasteries, in case of any complaint of injury from the government or citizens of Tenedos or of any other ally of Athens—these latter being themselves also accountable before the same tribunals under like complaints from Mitylênê. That city was thus in practice all but independent, and so extremely powerful, that the Athenians, fearful of coping with it in their actual state of depression, were loath to believe the alarming intelligence which reached them. They sent envoys with a friendly message to persuade the Mitylenæans to suspend their proceedings, and it was only when these envoys returned without success, that they saw the necessity of stronger measures. Ten Mitylenæan triremes, serving as contingent in the Athenian fleet, were seized, and their crews placed under guard; while Kleippidês, then on the point of starting (along with two colleagues) to conduct a fleet of forty triremes round Peloponnesus, was directed to alter his destination and to proceed forthwith to Mitylênê.¹ It was expected that he would reach that town about the time of the approaching festival of Apollo Maloeis, celebrated in its neighbourhood—on which occasion the whole Mitylenæan population was in the habit of going forth to the temple: so that the town, while thus deserted, might easily be surprised and seized by the fleet. In case this calculation should be disappointed, Kleippidês was instructed to require that the Mitylenæans should surrender their ships of war and raze their fortifications, and in the event of refusal to attack them immediately.

But the publicity of debate at Athens was far too great to allow such a scheme to succeed. The Mitylenæans had their spies in the city, and the moment the resolution was taken, one of them set off to communicate it at Mitylênê. Crossing over to Geræstus in Eubœa, and getting aboard a merchantman

¹ Thucyd. iii. 3.

on the point of departure, he reached Mitylênê with a favourable wind on the third day from Athens: so that when Kleippidês arrived shortly afterwards, he found the festival adjourned and the government prepared for him. The requisition which he sent in was refused, and the Mitylenæan fleet even came forth from the harbour to assail him, but was beaten back with little difficulty: upon which, the Mitylenæan leaders, finding themselves attacked before their preparations were completed, and desiring still to gain time, opened negotiations with Kleippidês, and prevailed on him to suspend hostilities until ambassadors could be sent to Athens—protesting that they had no serious intention of revolting. This appears to have been about the middle of May, soon after the Lacedæmonian invasion of Attica.

Kleippidês was induced, not very prudently, to admit this proposition, under the impression that his armament was not sufficient to cope with a city and island so powerful. He remained moored off the harbour at the north of Mitylênê until the envoys (among whom was included one of the very citizens of Mitylênê who had sent to betray the intended revolt, but who had since changed his opinion) should return from Athens. Meanwhile the Mitylenæan government, unknown to Kleippidês, and well aware that the embassy would prove fruitless, took advantage of the truce to send secret envoys to Sparta imploring immediate aid. And on the arrival of the Lacedæmonian Meleas and the Theban Hermæondas (who had been despatched to Mitylênê earlier, but had only come in by stealth since the arrival of Kleippidês), a second trireme was sent along with them, carrying additional envoys to reiterate the solicitation. These arrivals and despatches were carried on without the knowledge of the Athenian admiral; chiefly in consequence of the peculiar site of the town, which had originally been placed upon a little islet divided from Lesbos by a narrow channel or *eurîpus*, and had subsequently been extended across into the main island—like Syracuse and so many other Grecian settlements. It had consequently two harbours, one north, the other south of the town: Kleippidês was anchored off the former, but the latter remained unguarded.¹

¹ Thucyd. iii. 3, 4: compare Strabo, xiii. p. 617; and Plehn, *Lesbiaca*, p. 12-18.

Thucydides speaks of the spot at the mouth of the northern harbour as being called Malea, which was also undoubtedly the name of the south-eastern promontory of Lesbos. We must therefore presume that there were two places on the seaboard of Lesbos which bore that name.

The easternmost of the two southern promontories of Peloponnesus was also called Cape Malea.

During the absence of the Mitylenæan envoys at Athens, reinforcements reached the Athenian admiral from Lemnos, Imbros, and some other allies, as well as from the Lesbian town of Methymna: so that when the envoys returned, as they presently did with an unfavourable reply, war was resumed with increased vigour. The Mitylenæans, having made a general sally with their full military force, gained some advantage in the battle; yet not feeling bold enough to maintain the field, they retreated back behind their walls. The news of their revolt, when first spread abroad had created an impression unfavourable to the stability of the Athenian empire. But when it was seen that their conduct was irresolute and their achievements disproportionate to their supposed power, a reaction of feeling took place. The Chians and other allies came in with increased zeal, in obedience to the summons of Athens for reinforcements. Kleippidês soon found his armament large enough to establish two separate camps, markets for provision, and naval stations, north and south of the town, so as to watch and block up both the harbours at once.¹ But he commanded little beyond the area of his camp, and was unable to invest the city by land; especially as the Mitylenæans had received reinforcements from Antissa, Pyrrha, and Eresus, the other towns of Lesbos which acted with them. They were even sufficiently strong to march against Methymna, in hopes that it would be betrayed to them by a party within. But this expectation was not realised, nor could they do more than strengthen the fortifications, and confirm the Mitylenæan supremacy, in the other three subordinate towns; in such manner that the Methymnæans, who soon afterwards attacked Antissa, were repulsed with considerable loss. In this undecided condition, the island continued, until (somewhere about the month of August B.C. 428) the Athenians sent Pachês to take the command, with a reinforcement of 1000 hoplites, who rowed themselves thither in triremes. The Athenians were now in force enough not only to keep the Mitylenæans within their walls, but also to surround the city with a single wall of circumvallation, strengthened by separate forts in suitable positions. By the beginning of October, Mitylênê was thus completely blockaded, by land as well as by sea.²

Meanwhile the Mitylenæan envoys, after a troublesome voyage, had reached Sparta a little before the Olympic festival, about the middle of June. The Spartans directed them to

¹ Thucyd. iii. 6.

² Thucyd. iii. 18.

come to Olympia at the festival, where all the members of the Peloponnesian confederacy would naturally be present—and there to set forth their requests, after the festival was concluded, in presence of all.¹

Thucydides has given us, at some length, his version of the speech wherein this was done—a speech not a little remarkable. Pronounced, as it was, by men who had just revolted from Athens, having the strongest interest to raise indignation against her as well as sympathy for themselves—and before an audience exclusively composed of the enemies of Athens, all willing to hear, and none present to refute, the bitterest calumnies against her—we should have expected a confident sense of righteous and well-grounded, though perilous effort, on the part of the Mitylenæans, and a plausible collection of wrongs and oppressions alleged against the common enemy. Instead of which the speech is apologetic and embarrassed. The speaker not only does not allege any extortion or severe dealing from Athens towards the Mitylenæans, but even admits the fact that they had been treated by her with marked honour;² and that too, throughout a long period of peace, during which she stood less in awe of her allies generally, and would have had much more facility in realising any harsh purposes towards them, than she could possibly enjoy now that the war had broken out, when their discontents would be likely to find powerful protectors.³ According to his own showing, the Mitylenæans, while they had been perfectly well treated by Athens during the past, had now acquired, by the mere fact of war, increased security for continuance of the like treatment during the future. It is upon the necessity of acquiring security for the future, nevertheless, that he rests the justification of the revolt, not pretending to have any subject of positive complaint. The Mitylenæans (he contends) could have no prospective security against Athens: for she had successively

¹ Thucyd. iii. 9.

² Thucyd. iii. 9. *μηδε τῶ χειρὺς δόξωμεν εἶναι, εἰ ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ τιμώμενοι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς ἀφιστάμεθα.*

The language in which the Mitylenæan envoys describe the treatment which their city had received from Athens, is substantially as strong as that which Kleon uses afterwards in his speech at Athens, when he reproaches them with their ingratitude—Kleon says (iii. 39), *αὐτόνομοί τε οἰκούντες, καὶ τιμώμενοι ἐς τὰ πρῶτα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, τοιαῦτα εἰργάσαντο, &c.*

³ Thucyd. iii. 11, 12. *οὐ μέντοι ἐπὶ πολὺ γ' ἂν ἐδοκοῦμεν δυνηθῆναι (περιγίγνεσθαι), εἰ μὴ ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε κατέστη, παραδείγμασι χρώμενοι τοῖς ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους. τίς οὖν αὐτῇ ἡ φιλία ἐγίγνετο ἢ ἐλευθερία πιστή, ἐν ᾗ παρὰ γνώμην ἀλλήλους ὑπεδεχόμεθα, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ δεδιότες ἐθεράπευον, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐκείνους ἐν τῇ ἡσυχίᾳ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐποιοῦμεν.*

and systematically brought into slavery all her allies, except Lesbos and Chios, though all had originally been upon an equal footing: and there was every reason for fearing that she would take the first convenient opportunity of reducing the two last remaining to the same level—the rather as their position was now one of privilege and exception, offensive to her imperial pride and exaggerated ascendancy. It had hitherto suited the policy of Athens to leave these two exceptions, as a proof that the other allies had justly incurred their fate, since otherwise Lesbos and Chios, having equal votes, would not have joined forces in reducing them.¹ But this policy was now no longer necessary, and the Mitylenæans, feeling themselves free only in name, were imperatively called upon by regard for their own safety to seize the earliest opportunity for emancipating themselves in reality. Nor was it merely regard for their own safety, but a further impulse of Pan-Hellenic patriotism; a desire to take rank among the opponents, and not among the auxiliaries, of Athens, in her usurpation of sovereignty over so many free Grecian states.² The Mitylenæans had however been compelled to revolt with preparations only half completed, and had therefore a double claim upon the succour of Sparta—the single hope and protectress of Grecian autonomy. And Spartan aid—if now lent immediately and heartily, in a renewed attack upon Attica during this same year, by sea as well as by land—could not fail to put down the common enemy, exhausted as she was by pestilence as well as by the cost of three years' war, and occupying her whole maritime force either in the siege of Mitylênê or round Peloponnesus. The orator concluded by appealing not merely to the Hellenic patriotism and sympathies of the Peloponnesians, but also to the sacred name of the Olympic Zeus, in whose precinct the meeting was held, that his pressing entreaty might not be disregarded.³

In following the speech of the orator, we see the plain confession that the Mitylenæans had no reason whatever to complain of the conduct of Athens towards themselves. She had respected alike their dignity, their public force, and their private security. This important fact helps us to explain, first, the indifference which the Mitylenæan people will be found to manifest in the

¹ Thucyd. iii. 11. *Αὐτόνομοι δὲ ἐλείφθημεν οὐ δι' ἄλλο τι ἢ ὅσον αὐτοῖς ἐς τὴν ἀρχὴν εὐπρεπείᾳ τε λόγου, καὶ γνώμης μᾶλλον ἐφόδῳ ἢ ἰσχύος, τὰ πράγματα ἐφαίνετο καταληπτὰ. Ἄμα μὲν γὰρ μαρτυρίῳ ἐχρῶντο, μὴ ἂν τοὺς γε ἰσοψήφους ἄκουσας, εἰ μὴ τι ἡδίκουν οἷς ἐπήεσαν, ἐυστρατεύειν.*

² Thucyd. iii. 13.

³ Thucyd. iii. 13, 14.

revolt; next, the barbarous resolution taken by the Athenians after its suppression.

The reasons given for the revolt are mainly two. 1. The Mitylenæans had no security that Athens would not degrade them into the condition of subject-allies like the rest. 2. They did not choose to second the ambition of Athens, and to become parties to a war for the sake of maintaining an empire essentially offensive to Grecian political instincts.

In both these two reasons there is force; and both touch the sore point of the Athenian empire. That empire undoubtedly contradicted one of the fundamental instincts of the Greek mind—the right of every separate town to administer its own political affairs apart from external control. The Peloponnesian alliance recognised this autonomy in theory, by the general synod and equal voting of all the members at Sparta, on important occasions; though it was quite true¹ (as Periklēs urged at Athens) that in practice nothing more was enjoyed than an autonomy confined by Spartan leading-strings—and though Sparta held in permanent custody hostages for the fidelity of her Arcadian allies, summoning their military contingents without acquainting them whither they were destined to march. But Athens proclaimed herself a despot, effacing the autonomy of her allies not less in theory than in practice. Far from being disposed to cultivate in them any sense of a real common interest with herself, she did not even cheat them with those forms and fictions which so often appease discontent in the absence of realities. Doubtless the nature of her empire, at once widely extended, maritime, and unconnected (or only partially connected) with kindred of race, rendered the forms of periodical deliberation difficult to keep up; at the same time that it gave to her as naval chief an ascendancy much more despotic than could have been exercised by any chief on land. It is doubtful whether she could have overcome—it is certain that she did not try to overcome—these political difficulties; so that her empire stood confessed as a despotism, opposed to the political instinct of the Greek mind; and the revolts against it, like this of Mitylênê,—in so far as they represented a genuine feeling and were not merely movements of an oligarchical party against their own democracy—were revolts of this offended

¹ Thucyd. i. 144. Καὶ ὅταν κακῆνοι (the Lacedæmonians) ταῖς ἐαυτῶν ἀποδῶσι πόλεσι, μὴ σφίσι τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐπιτηδείως αὐτονομεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἐκάστοις, ὡς βούλονται.

About the hostages detained by Sparta for the fidelity of her allies, see Thucyd. v. 54, 61.

instinct, much more than consequences of actual oppression. The Mitylenæans might certainly affirm that they had no security against being one day reduced to the common condition of subject-allies like the rest. Yet an Athenian speaker, had he been here present, might have made no mean reply to this portion of their reasoning. He would have urged, that had Athens felt any dispositions towards such a scheme, she would have taken advantage of the Fourteen years' truce to execute it; and he would have shown that the degradation of the allies by Athens, and the change in her position from president to despot, had been far less intentional and systematic than the Mitylenæan orator affirmed.

To the Peloponnesian auditors, however, the speech of the latter proved completely satisfactory. The Lesbians were declared members of the Peloponnesian alliance, and a second attack upon Attica was decreed. The Lacedæmonians, foremost in the movement, summoned contingents from their various allies, and were early in arriving with their own at the Isthmus. They there began to prepare carriages or trucks, for dragging across the Isthmus the triremes which had fought against Phormio, from the harbour of Lechæum into the Saronic Gulf, in order to employ them against Athens. But the remaining allies did not answer to the summons, remaining at home occupied with their harvest; while the Lacedæmonians, sufficiently disappointed with this languor and disobedience, were still further confounded by the unexpected presence of 100 Athenian triremes off the coast of the Isthmus.

The Athenians, though their own presence at the Olympic festival was forbidden by the war, had doubtless learned more or less thoroughly the proceedings which had taken place there respecting Mitylênê. Perceiving the general belief entertained of their depressed and helpless condition, they determined to contradict this by a great and instant effort. They accordingly manned forthwith 100 triremes, requiring the personal service of all men, citizens as well as metics, and excepting only the two richest classes of the Solonian census, *i. e.* the Pentakosio-medimni, and the Hippeis or Horsemen. With this prodigious fleet they made a demonstration along the Isthmus in view of the Lacedæmonians, and landed in various parts of the Peloponnesian coast to inflict damage. At the same time thirty other Athenian triremes, despatched some time previously to Akarnania under Asôpius son of Phormio, landed at different openings in Laconia for the same purpose. This news reached the Lacedæmonians at the Isthmus, while the other great

Athenian fleet was parading before their eyes.¹ Amazed at so unexpected a demonstration of strength, they began to feel how much they had been misled respecting the exhaustion of Athens, and how incompetent they were, especially without the presence of their allies, to undertake any joint effective movement by sea and land against Attica. They therefore returned home, resolving to send an expedition of forty triremes under Alkidas to the relief of Mitylênê itself; at the same time transmitting requisitions to their various allies, in order that these triremes might be furnished.²

Meanwhile Asôpius with his thirty triremes had arrived in Akarnania, from whence all the ships except twelve were sent home. He had been nominated commander as the son of Phormio, who appears either to have died, or to have become unfit for service, since his victories of the preceding year. The Akarnanians had preferred a special request that a son, or at least some relative, of Phormio, should be invested with the command of the squadron; so beloved was his name and character among them. Asôpius however accomplished nothing of importance, though he again undertook conjointly with the Akarnanians a fruitless march against Ceniadæ. Ultimately he was defeated and slain, in attempting a disembarkation on the territory of Leukas.³

The sanguine announcement made by the Mitylenæans at Olympia, that Athens was rendered helpless by the epidemic, had indeed been strikingly contradicted by her recent display; since, taking numbers and equipment together, the maritime force which she had put forth this summer, manned as it was by a higher class of seamen, surpassed all former years; although, in point of number only, it was inferior to the 250 triremes which she had sent out during the first summer of the war.⁴ But the assertion that Athens was impoverished in

¹ Thucyd. iii. 7-16.

² Thucyd. iii. 15, 16.

³ Thucyd. iii. 7.

⁴ Thucyd. iii. 17. Καὶ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τούτον, ὃν αἱ νῆες ἐπλεον, ἐν τοῖς πλεῖστοις δὴ νῆες ἅμ' αὐτοῖς ἐνεργοὶ κάλλει ἐγένοντο, παραπλήσια δὲ καὶ ἔτι πλείους ἀρχομένου τοῦ πολέμου. Τήν τε γὰρ Ἀττικὴν καὶ Εὐβοίαν καὶ Σαλαμῖνα ἑκατὸν ἐφύλασσον, καὶ περὶ Πελοπόννησον ἑτεραι ἑκατὸν ᾔσαν, χωρὶς δὲ αἱ περὶ Ποτιδαίαν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις χωρίοις, ὥστε αἱ πᾶσαι ἅμα ἐγγίγνοντο ἐν ἐνὶ θέρει διακόσiai καὶ πεντήκοντα. Καὶ τὰ χρήματα τοῦτο μάλιστα ὑπανάλωσε μετὰ Ποτιδαίας, &c.

I have endeavoured to render as well as I can this obscure and difficult passage; difficult both as to grammar and as to sense, and not satisfactorily explained by any of the commentators—if indeed it can be held to stand now as Thucydides wrote it. In the preceding chapter, he had mentioned that this fleet of 100 sail was manned largely from the hoplite class of citizens (iii. 16). Now we know from other passages in his work (see v. 8; vi, 31.

finances was not so destitute of foundation: for the whole treasure in the acropolis, 6000 talents at the commencement of the war, was now consumed, with the exception of that reserve of 1000 talents which had been solemnly set aside against the last exigencies of defensive resistance. This is not surprising when we learn that every hoplite engaged for near two years and a half in the blockade of Potidæa received two drachmas per day, one for himself and a second for an attendant. There were during the whole time of the blockade 3000 hoplites engaged there,—and for a considerable portion of the time, 4600; besides the fleet, all the seamen of which received one drachma per day per man. Accordingly, the Athenians were now for the first time obliged to raise a direct contribution among themselves, to the amount of 200 talents, for the purpose of prosecuting the siege of Mitylênê: and they at the same time despatched Lysiklês (with four colleagues) in command of twelve triremes to collect money. What relation these money-gathering ships bore to the regular tribute paid by the subject-allies, or whether they were allowed to visit these latter, we do not know. In the present case, Lysiklês landed at Myus near the mouth of the Mæander, and marched up the country to levy contributions on the Karian villages in the plain of that river: but he was surprised by the Karians, perhaps aided by the active Samian exiles at Anæa in the neighbourhood, and slain with a considerable number of his men.¹

While the Athenians thus held Mitylênê under siege, their faithful friends the Plateæans had remained closely blockaded by the Peloponnesians and Boeotians for more than a year, without any possibility of relief. At length provisions began to fail, and the general Eupompidês, backed by the prophet Theænetus (these prophets² were often among the bravest

how much difference there was in the appearance and efficiency of an armament, according to the class of citizens who served on it. We may then refer the word *κάλλος* to the excellence of outfit hence arising: I wish indeed that any instance could be produced of *κάλλος* in this sense, but we find the adjective *κάλλιστος* (Thucyd. v. 60) *στρατόπεδον γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο κάλλιστον Ἑλληνικὸν τῶν μέχρι τοῦδε συνηλθεν*. In v. 8 Thucydides employs the word *ἀξίωμα* to denote the same meaning: and in vi. 31 he says, *παρασκευὴ γὰρ αὕτη πρώτη ἐκπλεύσασα μῆς πόλεως δυνάμει Ἑλληνικῇ, πολυτελεστάτῃ δὴ καὶ εὐπρεπεστάτῃ τῶν ἐς ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ἐγένετο*. It may be remarked that in that chapter too, he contrasts the expedition against Sicily with two other Athenian expeditions, equal to it in number but inferior in equipment: the same comparison which I believe he means to take in this passage.

¹ Thucyd. iii. 19.

² Thucyd. iii. 20. Compare Xenophon, Hellen. ii. 4, 19; Herodot. ix. 37; Plutarch, Aratus, c. 25.

soldiers in the army), persuaded the garrison to adopt the daring, but seemingly desperate, resolution of breaking out over the blockading wall and in spite of its guards. So desperate, indeed, did the project seem, that at the moment of execution, one half of the garrison shrank from it as equivalent to certain death: the other half, about 212 in number, persisted and escaped. Happy would it have been for the remainder had they even perished in the attempt, and thus forestalled the more melancholy fate in store for them!

It has been already stated that the circumvallation of Plataea was accomplished by a double wall and a double ditch, one ditch without the encircling walls, another between them and the town; the two walls being sixteen feet apart, joined together, and roofed all round, so as to look like one thick wall, and to afford covered quarters for the besiegers. Both the outer and inner circumference were furnished with battlements, and after every ten battlements came a roofed tower, covering the whole breadth of the double wall—allowing a free passage inside, but none outside. In general, the entire circuit of the roofed wall was kept under watch night and day; but on wet nights the besiegers had so far relaxed their vigilance as to retire under cover of the towers, leaving the intermediate spaces unguarded: and it was upon this omission that the plan of escape was founded. The Plataeans prepared ladders of a proper height to scale the blockading double wall, ascertaining its height by repeatedly counting the ranges of bricks, which were near enough for them to discern, and not effectually covered with whitewash. On a cold and dark December night, amidst rain, sleet, and a roaring wind, they marched forth from the gates, lightly armed, some few with shields and spears, but most of them with breastplates, javelins, and bows and arrows. The right foot was naked, but the left foot shod, so as to give it a more assured footing on the muddy ground.¹ Taking care to sally out with the wind in their faces and at such a distance from each other as to prevent any clattering of arms, they crossed the inner ditch and reached the foot of the wall without

¹ Thucyd. iii. 22. Dr. Arnold, in his note, construes this passage as if the right or bare foot were the *least* likely to slip in the mud, and the left or shod foot the *most* likely. The Scholiast and Wasse maintain the opposite opinion, which is certainly the more obvious sense of the text, though the sense of Dr. Arnold would also be admissible. The naked foot is very liable to slip in the mud, and might easily be rendered less liable, by sandals or covering particularly adapted to that purpose. Besides, Wasse remarks justly, that the warrior who is to use his *right* arm requires to have his *left* foot firmly planted.

being discovered. The ladders, borne in the van, were immediately planted, and Ammeas son of Korœbus, followed by eleven others armed only with a short sword and breastplate, mounted the wall: others armed with spears followed him, their shields being carried and handed to them when on the top by comrades behind. It was the duty of this first company to master and maintain the two towers right and left, so as to keep the intermediate space free for passing over. This was successfully done, the guards in both towers being surprised and slain, without alarming the remaining besiegers. Many of the Plateans had already reached the top of the wall, when the noise of a tile accidentally knocked down by one of them betrayed what was passing. Immediately a general clamour was raised, alarm was given, and the awakened garrison rushed up from beneath to the top of the wall, yet not knowing where the enemy was to be found; a perplexity further increased by the Plateans in the town, who took this opportunity of making a false attack on the opposite side. Amidst such confusion and darkness, the blockading detachment could not tell where to direct their blows, and all remained at their posts, except a reserve of 300 men, kept constantly in readiness for special emergencies, who marched out and patrolled the outside of the ditch to intercept any fugitives from within. At the same time, fire-signals were raised to warn their allies at Thebes. But here again, the Plateans in the town had foreseen and prepared fire-signals on their part, which they hoisted forthwith in order to deprive this telegraphic communication of all special meaning.¹

Meanwhile the escaping Plateans, masters of the two adjoining towers—on the top of which some of them mounted, while others held the doorway through, so as to repel with spears and

¹ Thucyd. iii. 22. *φρυκτοί τε ἤρουντο ἐς τὰς Θήβας πολέμοι, &c.* It would seem by this statement that the blockaders must have been often in the habit of transmitting intelligence to Thebes by means of fire-signals; each particular combination of lights having more or less of a special meaning. The Plateans had observed this, and foresaw that the same means would be used on the night of the outbreak, to bring assistance from Thebes forthwith. If they had not observed it *before*, they could not have prepared for the moment when the new signal would be hoisted, so as to confound its meaning—*ὅπως ἀσαφὴ τὰ σημεῖα ᾖ*. . . .

Compare iii. 80. I agree with the general opinion stated in Dr. Arnold's note respecting these fire-signals, and even think that it might have been sustained more strongly.

"Non enim (observes Cicero in the fifth oration against Verres, c. 36), sicut erat nuper consuetudo, prædonum adventum significabat *ignis et speculâ sublatâ aut tumulo*: sed flamma ex ipso incendio navium et calamitatem acceptam et periculum reliquum nuntiabat."

darts all approach of the blockaders—prosecuted their flight without interruption over the space between, shoving down the battlements in order to make it more level and plant a greater number of ladders. In this manner they all successively got over and crossed the outer ditch. Every man, immediately after crossing, stood ready on the outer bank with bow and javelin to repel assailants and maintain safe passages for his comrades in the rear. At length, when all had descended, there remained the last and greatest difficulty—the escape of those who occupied the two towers and kept the intermediate portion of wall free: yet even this was accomplished successfully and without loss. The outer ditch was found embarrassing—so full of water from the rain as to be hardly fordable, yet with thin ice on it also, from a previous frost: for the storm, which in other respects was the main help to their escape, here retarded their passage of the ditch by an unusual accumulation of water. It was not however until all had crossed except the defenders of the towers—who were yet descending and scrambling through—that the Peloponnesian reserve of 300 were seen approaching the spot with torches. Their unshielded right side being turned towards the ditch, the Plataeans, already across and standing on the bank, immediately assailed them with arrows and javelins—in which the torches enabled them to take tolerable aim, while the Peloponnesians on their side could not distinguish their enemies in the dark, and had no previous knowledge of their position. They were thus held in check until the rearmost Plataeans had surmounted the difficulties of the passage: after which the whole body stole off as speedily as they could, taking at first the road towards Thebes, while their pursuers were seen with their torchlights following the opposite direction, on the road which led by the heights called Dryos-Kephalæ to Athens. After having marched about three-quarters of a mile on the road to Thebes (leaving the chapel of the Hero Androkratês on their right hand), the fugitives quitted it, and striking to the eastward towards Erythræ and Hysiaë, soon found themselves in safety among the mountains which separate Boëotia from Attica at that point; from whence they passed into the glad harbour and refuge of Athens.¹

Two hundred and twelve brave men thus emerged to life and liberty, breaking loose from that impending fate which too soon overtook the remainder, and preserving for future times the

¹ Thucyd. iii. 24. Diodorus (xii. 56) gives a brief summary of these facts, without either novelty or liveliness.

genuine breed and honourable traditions of Plataea. One man alone was taken prisoner at the brink of the outer ditch, while a few, who had enrolled themselves originally for the enterprise, lost courage and returned in despair even from the foot of the inner wall; telling their comrades within that the whole band had perished. Accordingly, at day-break, the Plataeans within sent out a herald to solicit a truce for burial of the dead bodies, and it was only by the answer made to this request, that they learnt the actual truth. The description of this memorable outbreak exhibits not less daring in the execution than skill and foresight in the design, and is the more interesting, inasmuch as the men who thus worked out their salvation were precisely the bravest men who best deserved it.

Meanwhile Pachês and the Athenians kept Mitylênê closely blocked up, the provisions were nearly exhausted, and the besieged were already beginning to think of capitulation—when their spirits were raised by the arrival of the Lacedæmonian envoy Salæthus, who had landed at Pyrrha on the west of Lesbos, and contrived to steal in through a ravine which obstructed the continuity of the blockading wall (about February 427 B.C.). He encouraged the Mitylenæans to hold out, assuring them that a Peloponnesian fleet under Alkidas was on the point of setting out to assist them, and that Attica would be forthwith invaded by the general Peloponnesian army. His own arrival, also, and his stay in the town, was in itself no small encouragement: we shall see hereafter, when we come to the siege of Syracuse by the Athenians, how much might depend upon the presence of one single Spartan. All thought of surrender was accordingly abandoned, and the Mitylenæans awaited with impatience the arrival of Alkidas, who started from Peloponnesus at the beginning of April, with forty-two triremes; while the Lacedæmonian army at the same time invaded Attica, in order to keep the attention of Athens fully employed. Their ravages on this occasion were more diligent, searching, and destructive to the country than before, and were continued the longer because they awaited the arrival of news from Lesbos. But no news reached them, their stock of provisions was exhausted, and the army was obliged to break up.¹

The tidings which at length arrived proved very unsatisfactory.

Salæthus and the Mitylenæans had held out until their provisions were completely exhausted, but neither relief nor encouragement reached them from Peloponnesus. At length

¹ Thucyd. iii. 25, 26.

even Salæthus became convinced that no relief would come ; he projected, therefore, as a last hope, a desperate attack upon the Athenians and their wall of blockade. For this purpose he distributed full panoplies among the mass of the people or commons, who had hitherto been without them, having at best nothing more than bows or javelins.¹

But he had not sufficiently calculated the consequences of this important step. The Mitylenæan multitude, living under an oligarchical government, had no interest in the present contest, which had been undertaken without any appeal to their opinion. They had no reason for aversion to Athens, seeing that they suffered no practical grievance from the Athenian alliance : and (to repeat what has been remarked in a previous chapter) we find that even among the subject-allies (to say nothing of a privileged ally like Mitylênê), the bulk of the citizens were never forward, sometimes positively reluctant, to revolt. The Mitylenæan oligarchy had revolted, in spite of the absence of practical wrongs, because they desired an uncontrolled town-autonomy as well as security for its continuance. But this was a feeling to which the people were naturally strangers, having no share in the government of their own town, and being kept dead and passive, as it was the interest of the oligarchy that they should be, in respect to political sentiment. A Grecian oligarchy might obtain from its people quiet submission under ordinary circumstances ; but if ever it required energetic effort, the genuine devotion under which alone such effort could be given, was found wanting. The Mitylenæan Demos, so soon as they found themselves strengthened and ennobled by the possession of heavy armour, refused obedience to the orders of Salæthus for marching out and imperiling their lives in a desperate struggle. They were under the belief—not unnatural under the secrecy of public affairs habitually practised by an oligarchy, but which assuredly the Athenian Demos would have been too well informed to entertain—that their governors were starving them, and had concealed stores of provision for themselves. Accordingly, the first use which they made of their arms was, to demand that these concealed stores should be brought out and fairly apportioned to all ; threatening, unless their demand was complied with at once, to enter into negotiations with the Athenians and surrender the city. The ruling Mitylenæans, unable to prevent this, but foreseeing that it would be their

¹ Thucyd. iii. 27. ὁ Σαλαῖθος, καὶ αὐτὸς οὐ προσδεχόμενος ἔτι τὰς ναῦς, δπλίζει τὸν δῆμον, πρότερον ψιλὸν ὄντα, ὡς ἐπεξίων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις.

irretrievable ruin, preferred the chance of negotiating themselves for a capitulation. It was agreed with Pachês, that the Athenian armament should enter into possession of Mitylênê; that the fate of its people and city should be left to the Athenian assembly, and that the Mitylenæans should send envoys to Athens to plead their cause: until the return of these envoys, Pachês engaged that no one should be either killed, or put in chains, or sold into slavery. Nothing was said about Salæthus, who hid himself as well as he could in the city. In spite of the guarantee received from Pachês, so great was the alarm of those Mitylenæans who had chiefly instigated the revolt, that when he actually took possession of the city, they threw themselves as suppliants upon the altars for protection. But being induced by his assurances to quit their sanctuary, they were placed in the island of Tenedos until answer should be received from Athens.¹

Having thus secured possession of Mitylênê, Pachês sent round some triremes to the other side of the island, and easily captured Antissa. But before he had time to reduce the two remaining towns of Pyrrha and Eresus, he received news which forced him to turn his attention elsewhere.

To the astonishment of every one, the Peloponnesian fleet of Alkidas was seen on the coast of Ionia. It ought to have been there much earlier, and had Alkidas been a man of energy, it would have reached Mitylênê even before the surrender of the city. But the Peloponnesians, when about to advance into the Athenian waters and brave the Athenian fleet, were under the same impression of conscious weakness and timidity (especially since the victories of Phormio in the preceding year) as that which beset land-troops when marching up to attack the Lacedæmonian heavy-armed.² Alkidas, though unobstructed by the Athenians, who were not aware of his departure—though pressed to hasten forward by Lesbian and Ionian exiles on board, and aided by expert pilots from those Samian exiles who had established themselves at Anæa³ on the Asiatic continent, and acted as zealous enemies of Athens—nevertheless, instead of sailing straight to Lesbos, lingered first near Peloponnesus, next at the island of Delos, making capture of private vessels with their crews; until at length, on reaching the islands of Ikarus and Mykonus, he heard the unwelcome tidings that the besieged town had

¹ Thucyd. iii. 28.

² Thucyd. iv. 34. τῇ γνώμῃ δεδουλωμένοι ὡς ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους.

³ Thucyd. iv. 75.

capitulated. Not at first crediting the report, he sailed onward to Embaton, in the Erythræan territory on the coast of Asia Minor, where he found the news confirmed. As only seven days had elapsed since the capitulation had been concluded, Teutiaplus, an Eleian captain in the fleet, strenuously urged the daring project of sailing on forthwith, and surprising Mitylênê by night in its existing unsettled condition: no preparation would have been made for receiving them, and there was good chance that the Athenians might be suddenly overpowered, the Mitylenæans again armed, and the town recovered.

Such a proposition, which was indeed something more than daring, did not suit the temper of Alkidas. Nor could he be induced by the solicitation of the exiles to fix and fortify himself either in any port of Ionia, or in the Æolic town of Kymê, so as to afford support and countenance to such subjects of the Athenian empire as were disposed to revolt; though he was confidently assured that many of them would revolt on his proclamation, and that the satrap Pissuthnês of Sardis would help him to defray the expense. Having been sent for the express purpose of relieving Mitylênê, Alkidas believed himself interdicted from any other project. He determined to return to Peloponnesus at once, dreading nothing so much as the pursuit of Pachês and the Athenian fleet. From Embaton accordingly he started on his return, coasting southward along Asia Minor as far as Ephesus. But the prisoners taken in his voyage were now an encumbrance to his flight; and their number was not inconsiderable, since all the merchant vessels in his route had approached the fleet without suspicion, believing it to be Athenian: a Peloponnesian fleet near the coast of Ionia was as yet something unheard of and incredible. To get rid of his prisoners, Alkidas stopped at Myonnêsus near Teos, and there put to death the greater number of them—a barbarous proceeding which excited lively indignation among the neighbouring Ionic cities to which they belonged; insomuch that when he reached Ephesus, the Samian exiles dwelling at Anæa, who had come forward so actively to help him, sent him a spirited remonstrance, reminding him that the slaughter of men neither engaged in war, nor enemies, nor even connected with Athens except by constraint, was disgraceful to one who came forth as the liberator of Greece—and that if he persisted, he would convert his friends into enemies, not his enemies into friends. So keenly did Alkidas feel this animadversion, that he at once liberated the

remainder of his prisoners, several of them Chians; and then departed from Ephesus, taking his course across sea towards Krete and Peloponnesus. After much delay off the coast of Krete from stormy weather, which harassed and dispersed his fleet, he at length reached in safety the harbour of Kyllênê in Elis, where his scattered ships were ultimately reunited.¹

Thus inglorious was the voyage of the first Peloponnesian admiral who dared to enter that *Mare clausum* which passed for a portion of the territory of Athens.² But though he achieved little, his mere presence excited everywhere not less dismay, than astonishment: for the Ionic towns were all unfortified, and Alkidas might take and sack any one of them by sudden assault, even though unable to hold it permanently. Pressing messages reached Pachês from Erythræ and from several other places, while the Athenian triremes called Paralus and Salaminia (the privileged vessels which usually carried public and sacred deputations) had themselves seen the Peloponnesian fleet anchored at Ikarus, and brought him the same intelligence. Pachês, having his hands now free by the capture of Mitylênê, set forth immediately in pursuit of the intruder, whom he chased as far as the island of Patmos. It was there ascertained that Alkidas had finally disappeared from the eastern waters, and the Athenian admiral, though he would have rejoiced to meet the Peloponnesian fleet in the open sea, accounted it fortunate that they had not taken up a position in some Asiatic harbour—in which case it would have been necessary for him to undertake a troublesome and tedious blockade,³ besides all the chances of revolt among the Athenian dependencies. We shall see how much, in this respect, depended upon the personal character of the Lacedæmonian commander, when we come hereafter to the expedition of Brasidas.

On his return from Patmos to Mitylênê, Pachês was induced to stop at Notium by the solicitations of some exiles. Notium was the port of Kolophon, from which it was at some little distance, as Peiræus was from Athens.⁴

¹ Thucyd. iii. 32, 33-69.

² Thucyd. v. 56. 'Αργεῖοι δ' ἐλθόντες παρ' Ἀθηναίους ἐπεκάλουν ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐν ταῖς σπονδαῖς διὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἐκάστους μὴ εἶναι πολεμίους διέναι, ἐάσειαν κατὰ θάλασσαν (λακεδαιμονίους) παραπλεύσαι.

We see that the sea is here reckoned as a portion of the Athenian territory; and even the portion of sea near to Peloponnesus—much more than on the coast of Ionia.

³ Thucyd. iii. 33.

⁴ The dissensions between Notium and Kolophon are noticed by Aristot. Politic. v. 3, 2.

About three years before, a violent internal dissension had taken place in Kolophon, and one of the parties, invoking the aid of the Persian Itamanes (seemingly one of the generals of the satrap Pissuthnès), had placed him in possession of the town; whereupon the opposite party, forced to retire, had established itself separately and independently at Notium. But the Kolophonians who remained in the town soon contrived to procure a party in Notium, whereby they were enabled to regain possession of it, through the aid of a body of Arcadian mercenaries in the service of Pissuthnès. These Arcadians formed a standing garrison at Notium, in which they occupied a separate citadel or fortified space, while the town became again attached as harbour to Kolophon. A considerable body of exiles, however, expelled on that occasion, now invoked the aid of Pachês to reinstate them, and to expel the Arcadians. On reaching the place, the Athenian general prevailed upon Hippias the Arcadian captain to come forth to a parley, under the promise that, if nothing mutually satisfactory could be settled, he would again replace him "safe and sound" in the fortification. But no sooner had the Arcadian come forth to this parley, than Pachês, causing him to be detained under guard but without fetters or ill-usage, immediately attacked the fortification while the garrison were relying on the armistice, carried it by storm, and put to death both the Arcadians and the Persians who were found within. Having got possession of the fortification, he next brought Hippias again into it—"safe and sound," according to the terms of the convention, which was thus literally performed—and then immediately afterwards caused him to be shot with arrows and javelins. Of this species of fraud, founded on literal performance and real violation, of an agreement, there are various examples in Grecian history; but nowhere do we read of a more flagitious combination of deceit and cruelty than the behaviour of Pachês at Notium. How it was noticed at Athens, we do not know: yet we remark, not without surprise, that Thucydidês recounts it plainly and calmly, without a single word of comment.¹

Notium was now separated from Kolophon, and placed in possession of those Kolophonians who were opposed to the Persian supremacy in the upper town. But as it had been, down to this time, a mere appendage of Kolophon and not a separate town, the Athenians soon afterwards sent Ækists and performed for it the ceremonies of colonisation according to

¹ Thucyd. iii. 34.

their own laws and customs, inviting from every quarter the remaining exiles of Kolophon.¹ Whether any new settlers went from Athens itself, does not appear. But the step was intended to confer a sort of Hellenic citizenship, and recognised collective personality, on the new-born town of Notium; without which, neither its Theôry or solemn deputation would have been admitted to offer public sacrifice, nor its private citizens to contend for the prize at Olympic and other great festivals.

Having cleared the Asiatic waters from the enemies of Athens, Pachês returned to Lesbos, reduced the towns of Pyrrha and Eresus, and soon found himself so completely master both of Mitylênê and the whole island as to be able to send home the larger part of his force; carrying with them as prisoners those Mitylenæans who had been deposited in Tenedos, as well as others prominently implicated in the late revolt, to the number altogether of rather more than a thousand. The Lacedæmonian Salæthus, being recently detected in his place of concealment, was included among the prisoners transmitted.

Upon the fate of these prisoners the Athenians had now to pronounce. They entered upon the discussion in a temper of extreme wrath and vengeance. As to Salæthus, their resolution to put him to death was unanimous and immediate. They turned a deaf ear to his promises, assuredly delusive, of terminating the blockade of Platea, in case his life were spared. What to do with Mitylênê and its inhabitants, was a point more doubtful, and was submitted to formal debate in the public assembly.

It is in this debate that Thucydidês first takes notice of Kleon, who is however mentioned by Plutarch as rising into importance some few years earlier, during the lifetime of Periklês. Under the great increase of trade and population in Athens and Peiræus during the last forty years, a new class of politicians seems to have grown up; men engaged in various descriptions of trade and manufacture, who began to rival more or less in importance the ancient families of Attic proprietors. This change was substantially analogous to that which took place in the cities of Mediæval Europe, when the merchants and traders of the various guilds gradually came to compete with, and ultimately supplanted, the patrician families in whom the supremacy had originally resided. In Athens, persons of ancient family and station enjoyed at this time no political privilege—since through the reforms of Ephialtês and

¹ Thucyd. iii. 34; C. A. Pertz, Colophonica, p. 36. (Göttingen, 1848.)

Periklês, the political constitution had become thoroughly democratical. But they still continued to form the two highest classes in the Solonian census founded on property—the Pentakosiomedimni, and the Hippeis or Knights. New men enriched by trade doubtless got into these classes, but probably only in minority, and imbibed the feeling of the class as they found it, instead of bringing into it any new spirit. Now an individual Athenian of this class, though without any legal title to preference, yet when he stood forward as candidate for political influence, continued to be decidedly preferred and welcomed by the social sentiment at Athens, which preserved in its spontaneous sympathies distinctions effaced from the political code.¹ Besides this place ready prepared for him in the public sympathy, especially advantageous at the outset of political life—he found himself further borne up by the family connexions, associations, and political clubs, &c., which exercised very great influence both on the politics and the judicature of Athens, and of which he became a member as a matter of course. Such advantages were doubtless only auxiliary, carrying a man up to a certain point of influence, but leaving him to achieve the rest by his own personal qualities and capacity. But their effect was nevertheless very real, and those who, without possessing them, met and buffeted him in the public assembly, contended against great disadvantages. A person of such low or middling station obtained no favourable presumptions or indulgence on the part of the public to meet him half-way; nor did he possess established connexions to encourage first successes, or help him out of early scrapes. He found others already in possession of ascendancy, and well-disposed to keep down new competitors; so that he had to win his own way unaided, from the first step to the last, by qualities personal to himself; by assiduity of attendance—by acquaintance with business—by powers of striking speech—and withal by unflinching audacity, indispensable to enable him to bear up against that opposition and enmity which he would incur from the high-born politicians and organised party-clubs, as soon as he appeared to be rising into importance.

The free march of political and judicial affairs raised up several such men, during the years beginning and immediately preceding the Peloponnesian war. Even during the life-time of Periklês, they appear to have risen in greater or less numbers.

¹ Thucyd. v. 43. Ἀλκιβιάδης—ἀνὴρ ἡλικία μὲν ὦν ἔτι τότε νέος, ὡς ἐν ἄλλῃ πόλει, ἀξιώματι δὲ προγόνων τιμώμενος. Compare Xenophon, Memorabil. i. 2, 25; iii. 6, 1.

But the personal ascendancy of that great man—who combined an aristocratical position with a strong and genuine democratic sentiment, and an enlarged intellect rarely found attached to either—impressed a peculiar character on Athenian politics. The Athenian world was divided into his partisans and his opponents, among each of whom there were individuals high-born and low-born—though the aristocratical party properly so called, the majority of wealthy and high-born Athenians, either opposed or disliked him. It is about two years after his death that we begin to hear of a new class of politicians—Eukratēs, the rope-seller—Kleon, the leather-seller—Lysiklēs, the sheep-seller—Hyperbolus, the lamp-maker;¹ the first two of whom must, however, have been already well known as speakers in the Ekklesia even during the life-time of Periklēs. Among them all, the most distinguished was Kleon, son of Kleænetus.

Kleon acquired his first importance among the speakers against Periklēs, so that he would thus obtain for himself, during his early political career, the countenance of the numerous and aristocratical anti-Perikleans. He is described by Thucydides in general terms as a person of the most violent temper and character in Athens—as being dishonest in his calumnies, and virulent in his invective and accusation.² Aristophanēs, in his comedy of the Knights, reproduces these features with others new and distinct, as well as with exaggerated details, comic, satirical, and contemptuous. His comedy depicts Kleon in the point of view in which he would appear to the knights of Athens—a leather-dresser, smelling of the tan-yard—a low-born brawler, terrifying opponents by the violence of his criminations, the loudness of his voice, the impudence of his gestures—moreover as venal in his politics—threatening men with accusations and then receiving money to withdraw them—a robber of the public treasury—persecuting merit as well as rank—and courting the favour of the assembly by the basest and most guilty cajolery. The general attributes set forth by Thucydides (apart from Aristophanēs, who does not profess to

¹ Aristophan. *Equit.* 130 *seq.*, and Scholia; Eupolis, *Demi*, *Fragm.* xv. p. 466, ed. Meineke. See the remark in Ranke, *Commentat. de Vitâ Aristophanis*, p. cccxxiv. *seq.*

² Thucyd. iii. 36. Κλέων—ὦν καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα βιαίτατος τῶν πολιτῶν, καὶ τῷ δήμῳ παρὰ πολὺ ἐν τῷ τότε πιθανώτατος.

He also mentions Kleon a second time two years afterwards, but in terms which also seem to imply a first introduction—μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐνήγγε Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, ἀνὴρ δημαγωγὸς κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ὦν καὶ τῷ πλήθει πιθανώτατος, iv. 21–28 : also v. 16. Κλέων—νομίζων καταφανέστερος ἢ εἶναι κακουργῶν, καὶ ἀπιστότερος διαβάλλων, &c.

write history), we may reasonably accept—the powerful and violent invective of Kleon, often dishonest—together with his self-confidence and audacity in the public assembly. Men of the middling class, like Kleon and Hyperbolus, who persevered in addressing the public assembly and trying to take a leading part in it, against persons of greater family pretension than themselves, were pretty sure to be men of more than usual audacity. Without this quality, they would never have surmounted the opposition made to them. It is probable enough that they had it to a displeasing excess—and even if they had not, the same measure of self-assumption which in Alkibiadēs would be tolerated from his rank and station, would in them pass for insupportable impudence. Unhappily we have no specimens to enable us to appreciate the invective of Kleon. We cannot determine whether it was more virulent than that of Demosthenēs and Æschinēs, seventy years afterwards; each of those eminent orators imputing to the other the grossest impudence, calumny, perjury, corruption, loud voice, and revolting audacity of manner, in language which Kleon can hardly have surpassed in intensity of vituperation, though he doubtless fell immeasurably short of it in classical finish. Nor can we even tell in what degree Kleon's denunciations of the veteran Periklēs were fiercer than those memorable invectives against the old age of Sir Robert Walpole, with which Lord Chatham's political career opened. The talent for invective possessed by Kleon, employed first against Periklēs, would be counted as great impudence by the partisans of that illustrious statesman, as well as by impartial and judicious citizens. But among the numerous enemies of Periklēs, it would be applauded as a burst of patriotic indignation, and would procure for the orator that extraneous support at first, which would sustain him until he acquired his personal hold on the public assembly.¹

By what degrees or through what causes that hold was gradually increased, we do not know. At the time when the question of Mitylênê came on for discussion, it had grown into a sort of ascendancy which Thucydidiēs describes by saying that Kleon was “at that time by far the most persuasive speaker in the eyes of the people.” The fact of Kleon's great power of speech and his capacity of handling public business in a popular manner, is better attested than anything else

¹ Plutarch, Periklēs, c. 33; Ἐπεφύετο δὲ καὶ Κλέων, ἥδη διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὀργῆς τῶν πολιτῶν πορευόμενος εἰς τὴν δημαγωγίαν.

Periklēs was δηχθεὶς αἰθῶνι Κλέωνι—in the words of the comic author Hermippus.

respecting him, because it depends upon two witnesses both hostile to him—Thucydîdês and Aristophanês. The assembly and the dikastery were Kleon's theatre and holding-ground: for the Athenian people taken collectively in their place of meeting—and the Athenian taken individually—were not always the same person and had not the same mode of judgement: Demos sitting in the Pnyx was a different man from Demos sitting at home.¹ The lofty combination of qualities possessed by Periklês exercised influence over both one and the other; but Kleon swayed considerably the former, without standing high in the esteem of the latter.

When the fate of Mitylênê and its inhabitants was submitted to the Athenian assembly, Kleon took the lead in the discussion. There never was a theme more perfectly suited to his violent temperament and power of fierce invective. Taken collectively, the case of Mitylênê presented a revolt as inexcusable and aggravated as any revolt could be. Indeed we have only to read the grounds of it, as set forth by the Mitylenæan speakers themselves before the Peloponnesians at Olympia, to be satisfied that such a proceeding, when looked at from the Athenian point of view, would be supposed to justify, and even to require, the very highest pitch of indignation. The Mitylenæans admit not only that they have no ground of complaint against Athens, but that they have been well and honourably treated by her, with special privilege. But they fear that she may oppress them in future: they hate the very principle of her empire, and eagerly instigate, as well as aid, her enemies to subdue her: they select the precise moment in which she has been worn down by a fearful pestilence, invasion, and cost of war. Nothing more than this would be required to kindle the most intense wrath in the bosom of an Athenian patriot. But there was yet another point which weighed as much as the rest, if not more. The revolted had been the first to invite a Peloponnesian fleet across the Ægean, and the first to proclaim, both to Athens and her allies, the precarious tenure of her empire.² The violent Kleon would on this occasion find in the assembly an audience hardly less violent than himself, and would easily be able to satisfy them that anything like mercy to the Mitylenæans was treason to Athens. He proposed to apply to the captive city the penalties tolerated by the custom of war, in their harshest and fullest measure: to kill the whole Mitylenæan

¹ Aristophan. Equit. 750.

² Thucyd. iii. 36. *προσξυμβάλετο οὐκ ἐλάχιστον τῆς δρμῆς, &c.*

male population of military age, probably about 6000 persons—and to sell as slaves all the women and children.¹ The proposition, though strongly opposed by Diodotus and others, was sanctioned and passed by the assembly, and a trireme was forthwith despatched to Mitylênê, enjoining Pachês to put it in execution.²

Such a sentence was, in principle, nothing more than a very rigorous application of the received laws of war. Not merely the reconquered rebel, but even the prisoner of war (apart from any special convention) was at the mercy of his conqueror to be slain, sold, or admitted to ransom. We shall find the Lacedæmonians carrying out the maxim without the smallest abatement towards the Plataean prisoners in the course of a very short time. And doubtless the Athenian people—so long as they remained in assembly, under that absorbing temporary intensification of the common and predominant sentiment which springs from the mere fact of multitude—and so long as they were discussing the principle of the case,—What had Mitylênê deserved?—thought only of this view. Less than the most rigorous measure of war (they would conceive) would be inadequate to the wrong done by the Mitylenæans.

But when the assembly broke up—when the citizen, no longer wound up by sympathising companions and animated speakers in the Pnyx, subsided into the comparative quiescence of individual life—when the talk came to be, not about the propriety of passing such a resolution, but about the details of executing it—a sensible change, and marked repentance became presently visible. We must also recollect—and it is a principle of no small moment in human affairs, especially among a democratical people like the Athenians, who stand charged with so many resolutions passed and afterwards unexecuted—that the sentiment of wrath against the Mitylenæans had been really in part discharged by the mere *passing* of the sentence, quite apart from its execution; just as a furious man relieves himself from overboiling anger by imprecations against others, which he would himself shrink from afterwards realising. The Athenians, on the whole the most humane people in Greece (though humanity, according to our ideas, cannot be predicated of any Greeks), became sensible that they had sanctioned a

¹ I infer this total number from the fact that the number sent to Athens by Pachês, as foremost instigators, was rather more than 1000 (Thucyd. iii. 50). The total of ἡβῶντες or males of military age must have been (I imagine) six times this number.

² Thucyd. iii. 36.

cruel and frightful decree. Even the captain and seamen¹ to whom it was given to carry, set forth on their voyage with mournful repugnance. The Mitylenæan envoys present in Athens (who had probably been allowed to speak in the assembly and plead their own cause), together with those Athenians who had been proxeni and friends of Mitylênê, and the minority generally of the previous assembly—soon discerned, and did their best to foster, this repentance; which became during the course of the same evening so powerful as well as so wide-spread, that the Stratêgi acceded to the prayer of the envoys, and convoked a fresh assembly for the morrow to reconsider the proceeding. By so doing, they committed an illegality, and exposed themselves to the chance of impeachment. But the change of feeling among the people was so manifest as to overbear any such scruples.²

Though Thucydidês has given us only a short summary without any speeches, of what passed in the first assembly—yet as to this second assembly, he gives us at length the speeches both of Kleon and Diodotus—the two principal orators of the first also. We may be sure that this second assembly was in all points one of the most interesting and anxious of the whole war; and though we cannot certainly determine what were the circumstances which determined Thucydidês in his selection of speeches, yet this cause, as well as the signal defeat of Kleon whom he disliked, may probably be presumed to have influenced him here.

That orator, coming forward to defend his proposition passed on the preceding day, denounced in terms of indignation the unwise tenderness and scruples of the people, who could not bear to treat their subject-allies, according to the plain reality, as men held only by naked fear. He dwelt upon the mischief and folly of reversing on one day what had been decided on the day preceding; also upon the guilty ambition of orators, who sacrificed the most valuable interests of the commonwealth, either to pecuniary gains, or to the personal credit of speaking with effect, triumphing over rivals, and setting up their own

¹ Thucyd. iii. 36. *Καὶ τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ μετάνοιά τις εὐθὺς ἦν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀναλογισμός, ὥμῶν τὸ βούλευμα καὶ μέγα ἐγνώσθαι, πόλιν ὅλην διαφθεῖραι μᾶλλον ἢ οὐ τοὺς αἰτίους.*

The feelings of the seamen, in the trireme appointed to carry the order of execution, are a striking point of evidence in this case: *τῆς προτέρας νεὼς οὐ σπουδῇ πλεούσης ἐπὶ πρᾶγμα ἀλλόκοτον, &c.* (iii. 49).

² Thucyd. iii. 36. As to the illegality, see Thucyd. vi. 14—which I think is good evidence to prove that there was illegality. I agree with Schömann on this point, in spite of the doubts of Dr. Arnold.

fancies in place of fact and reality. He deprecated the mistaken encouragement given to such delusions by a public "wise beyond what was written," who came to the assembly, not to apply their good sense in judging of public matters, but merely for the delight of hearing speeches.¹ He restated the heinous and unprovoked wrong committed by the Mitylenæans—and the grounds for inflicting upon them that maximum of punishment which "justice" enjoined. He called for "justice" against them, nothing less, but nothing more; warning the assembly that the imperial necessities of Athens essentially required the constant maintenance of a sentiment of fear in the minds of unwilling subjects, and that they must prepare to see their empire pass away if they suffered themselves to be guided either by compassion for those who, if victors, would have no compassion on them²—or by unseasonable moderation towards those who would neither feel nor requite it—or by the mere impression of seductive discourses. Justice against the Mitylenæans, not less than the strong political interests of Athens, required the infliction of the sentence decreed on the day preceding.³

The harangue of Kleon is in many respects remarkable. If we are surprised to find a man, whose whole importance resided in his tongue, denouncing so severely the licence and the undue influence of speech in the public assembly, we must recollect that Kleon had the advantage of addressing himself to the intense prevalent sentiment of the moment: that he could therefore pass off the dictates of this sentiment as plain, downright, honest, sense and patriotism—while the opponents, speaking against the reigning sentiment and therefore driven to collateral argument, circumlocution, and more or less of manoeuvre, might be represented as mere clever sophists, showing their talents in making the worse appear the better reason—if not actually bribed, at least unprincipled and

¹ Thucyd. iii. 37. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τῶν τε νόμων σοφώτεροι βούλονται φαίνεσθαι, τῶν τε αἰεὶ λεγομένων ἐς τὸ κοινὸν περιγίγνεσθαι . . . οἱ δ' ἀπιστοῦντες τῇ ἐαυτῶν ξυνέσει ἀμαθέστεροι μὲν τῶν νόμων ἀξιούσιν εἶναι, ἀδυνατώτεροι δὲ τοῦ καλῶς εἰπόντος μέμψασθαι λόγον.

Compare the language of Archidamus at Sparta in the congress, where he takes credit to the Spartans for being ἀμαθέστερον τῶν νόμων τῆς ὑπεροψίας παιδευόμενοι, &c. (Thucyd. i. 84)—very similar in spirit to the remarks of Kleon about the Athenians.

² Thucyd. iii. 40. μηδὲ τρισὶ τοῖς ἀξυμφορωτάτοις τῇ ἀρχῇ, οἴκῳ, καὶ ἡδονῇ λόγων, καὶ ἐπιεικείᾳ, ἁμαρτάνειν.

³ Thucyd. iii. 40. πιθόμενοι δὲ ἐμοὶ τὰ τε δίκαια ἐς Μυτιληναίους καὶ τὰ ξύμφορα ἅμα ποιήσετε· ἄλλως δὲ γνόντες τοῖς μὲν οὐ χαριεῖσθε, ὑμᾶς δὲ αὐτοὺς μάλλον δικαιοῦσεσθε.

without any sincere moral conviction. As this is a mode of dealing with questions, both of public concern and of private morality, not less common at present than it was in the time of the Peloponnesian war—to seize upon some strong and tolerably wide-spread sentiment among the public, to treat the dictates of that sentiment as plain common sense and obvious right, and then to shut out all rational estimate of coming good and evil as if it were unholy or immoral, or at best mere uncandid subtlety—we may well notice a case in which Kleon employs it to support a proposition now justly regarded as barbarous.

Applying our modern views to this proposition, indeed, the prevalent sentiment would not only not be in favour of Kleon, but would be irresistibly in favour of his opponents. To put to death in cold blood some six thousand persons, would so revolt modern feelings, as to overbalance all considerations of past misconduct in the persons to be condemned. Nevertheless the speech of Diodotus, who followed and opposed Kleon, not only contains no appeal to any such merciful predispositions, but even positively disclaims appealing to them: the orator deprecates, not less than Kleon, the influence of compassionate sentiment, or of a spirit of mere compromise and moderation.¹ He further discards considerations of justice or the analogies of criminal judicature²—and rests his

¹ Thucyd. iii. 48: compare the speech of Kleon, iii. 40. *ὁμοῖς δὲ γνόντες ἀμείνω τάδε εἶναι, καὶ μήτε οἴκτω πλεόνειμαντες μήτε ἐπιεικείᾳ, οἷς οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ἔω προσάγεσθαι, ἀπ' αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν παραινουμένων, &c.*

Dr. Arnold distinguishes *οἴκτος* (or *ἔλεος*) from *ἐπιεικεία*, by saying that “the former is a feeling, the latter, a habit: *οἴκτος*, pity or compassion, may occasionally touch those who are generally very far from being *ἐπιεικεῖς*—mild or gentle. *Ἐπιεικεία* relates to all persons—*οἴκτος*, to particular individuals.” The distinction here taken is certainly in itself just, and *ἐπιεικής* sometimes has the meaning ascribed to it by Dr. Arnold: but in this passage I believe it has a different meaning. The contrast between *οἴκτος* and *ἐπιεικεία* (as Dr. Arnold explains them) would be too feeble, and too little marked, to serve the purpose of Kleon and Diodotus. *Ἐπιεικεία* here rather means the disposition to stop short of your full rights; a spirit of fairness and adjustment; an abatement on your part likely to be requited by abatement on the part of your adversary: compare Thucyd. i. 76; iv. 19; v. 86; viii. 93.

² Thucyd. iii. 44. *ἐγὼ δὲ παρήλθον οὔτε ἀντερῶν περὶ Μυτιληναίων οὔτε κατηγορήσων· οὐ γὰρ περὶ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀδικίας ἡμῖν δ' ἀγών, εἰ σωφρονούμεν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐβουλίας . . . δικαιοῦς γὰρ ὢν αὐτοῦ (Κλέωνος) δ' λόγος πρὸς τὴν νῦν ἡμετέραν ὀργὴν ἐς Μυτιληναίους, τάχ' ἂν ἐπισπασαίτο· ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ δικαζόμεθα πρὸς αὐτούς, ὥστε τῶν δικαίων δεῖν, ἀλλὰ βουλευόμεθα περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅπως χρησίμως ἔξουσιν.*

So Mr. Burke, in his speech on Conciliation with America (Burke's Works, vol. iii. p. 69-74), in discussing the proposition of prosecuting the

opposition altogether upon reasons of public prudence, bearing upon the future welfare and security of Athens.

He begins by vindicating¹ the necessity of reconsidering the resolution just passed, and insists on the mischief of deciding so important a question in haste or under strong passion. He enters a protest against the unwarrantable insinuations of corruption or self-conceit by which Kleon had sought to silence or discredit his opponents;² and then, taking up the question on the ground of public wisdom and prudence, he proceeds to show that the rigorous sentence decreed on the preceding day was not to be defended. That sentence would not prevent any other among the subject-allies from revolting, if they saw, or fancied that they saw, a fair chance of success: but it might perhaps drive them,³ if once embarked in revolt, to persist even to desperation, and bury themselves under the ruins of their city. While every means ought to be employed to prevent them from revolting, by precautions beforehand—it was a mistaken reckoning to try to deter them by enormity of punishment, inflicted afterwards upon such as were reconquered. In developing this argument, the speaker gives some remarkable views on the theory of punishment generally, and on the small addition obtained in the way of preventive effect, even by the greatest aggravation of the suffering inflicted upon the condemned criminal—views which might have passed as rare and profound even down to the last century.⁴ And he

acts of the refractory colonies as criminal, “The thing seems a great deal too big for my ideas of jurisprudence. It should seem, to my way of conceiving such matters, that there is a wide difference in reason and policy, between the mode of proceeding on the irregular conduct of scattered individuals, or even of bands of men who disturb order within the state—and the civil dissensions which may from time to time agitate the several communities which compose a great empire. It looks to me to be narrow and pedantic, to apply the ordinary ideas of criminal justice to this great public contest. I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people,” &c.—“My consideration is narrow, confined, and wholly limited to the policy of the question.”

¹ Thucyd. iii. 42.

² Thucyd. iii. 43.

³ Thucyd. iii. 45, 46.

⁴ Compare this speech of Diodotus with the views of punishment implied by Xenophon in his *Anabasis*, where he is describing the government of Cyrus the younger—

“Nor can any man contend, that Cyrus suffered criminals and wrong-doers to laugh at him: he punished them with the most unmeasured severity (*ἀφειδέστατα πάντων ἐτιμωρεῖτο*). And you might often see along the frequented roads men deprived of their eyes, their hands, and their feet: so that in his government, either Greek or barbarian, if he had no criminal purpose, might go fearlessly through and carry whatever he found convenient.” (*Anabasis*, i. 9, 13.)

further supports his argument by emphatically setting forth the impolicy of confounding the Mitylenæan Demos in the same punishment with their oligarchy: the revolt had been the act exclusively of the latter, and the former had not only taken no part in it, but as soon as they obtained possession of arms, had surrendered the city spontaneously. In all the allied cities, it was the commons who were well-affected to Athens, and upon whom her hold chiefly depended against the doubtful fidelity of the oligarchies: ¹ but this feeling could not possibly continue, if it were now seen that all the Mitylenæans indiscriminately were confounded in one common destruction. Diodotus concludes by recommending that those Mitylenæans whom Pachês had sent to Athens as chiefs of the revolt, should be put upon their trial separately; but that the remaining population should be spared.²

This speech is that of a man who feels that he has the reigning and avowed sentiment of the audience against him, and that he must therefore win his way by appeals to their reason. The same appeals however might have been made, and perhaps had been made, during the preceding discussion, without success. But Diodotus knew that the reigning sentiment, though still ostensibly predominant, had been silently undermined during the last few hours, and that the reaction towards pity and moderation, which had been growing up under it, would work in favour of his arguments, though he might disclaim all intention of invoking its aid. After several other discourses, both for and against,—the assembly came to a vote, and the proposition of Diodotus was adopted; but adopted by so small a majority, that the decision seemed at first doubtful.³

The trireme carrying the first vote had started the day before, and was already twenty-four hours on its way to Mitylênê. A second trireme was immediately put to sea bearing the new decree; yet nothing short of superhuman exertions could enable it to reach the condemned city, before

The severity of the punishment is in Xenophon's mind the measure both of its effects in deterring criminals, and of the character of the ruler inflicting it.

¹ Thucyd. iii. 47. *Νῦν μὲν γὰρ ὑμῖν ὁ δῆμος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν εὖνους ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ οὐ ξυναφίσταται τοῖς ὀλίγοις ἢ, ἐὰν βιασθῇ, ὑπάρχει τοῖς ἀποστήσασσι πολέμιος εὐθύς, καὶ τῆς ἀντικαθισταμένης πόλεως τὸ πλῆθος ξύμμαχον ἔχοντες ἐς πόλεμον ἐπέρχεσθε.*

² Thucyd. iii. 48.

³ Thucyd. iii. 49. *ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ χειροτονίᾳ ἀγχώμαλοι, ἐκράτησε δ' ἡ τοῦ Διοδότου.*

the terrific sentence now on its way might be actually in course of execution. The Mitylenæan envoys stored the vessel well with provisions, promising large rewards to the crew if they arrived in time. An intensity of effort was manifested, without parallel in the history of Athenian seamanship. The oar was never once relaxed between Athens and Mitylênê—the rowers merely taking turns for short intervals of rest, with refreshment, of barley-meal steeped in wine and oil, swallowed on their seats. Luckily there was no unfavourable wind to retard them: but the object would have been defeated, if it had not happened that the crew of the first trireme were as slow and averse in the transmission of their rigorous mandate, as those of the second were eager for the delivery of the reprieve in time. And after all, it came only just in time. The first trireme had arrived, the order for execution was actually in the hands of Pachês, and his measures were already preparing. So near was the Mitylenæan population to this wholesale destruction: ¹ so near was Athens to the actual perpetration of an enormity which would have raised against her throughout Greece a sentiment of exasperation more deadly than that which she afterwards incurred even from the proceedings at Melos, Skiône and elsewhere. Had the execution been realised, the person who would have suffered most by it, and most deservedly, would have been the proposer Kleon. For if the reaction in Athenian sentiment was so immediate and sensible after the mere passing of the sentence, far more violent would it have been when they learnt that the deed had been irrevocably done, and when all its painful details were presented to their imaginations: and Kleon would have been held responsible as the author of that which had so disgraced them in their own eyes. As the case turned out, he was fortunate enough to escape this danger; and his proposition, to put to death those Mitylenæans whom Pachês had sent home as the active revolting party, was afterwards adopted and executed. It doubtless appeared so moderate, after the previous decree passed but rescinded, as to be adopted with little resistance, and to provoke no after-repentance: yet the men so slain were rather more than one thousand in number.²

Besides this sentence of execution, the Athenians razed the fortifications of Mitylênê, and took possession of all her ships of war. In lieu of tribute, they further established a new permanent distribution of the land of the island; all except Methymna,

¹ Thucyd. iii. 49. *παρὰ τοσούτον μὲν ἢ Μυτιλήνη ἤλαθε κινδύνου.*

² Thucyd. iii. 50.

which had remained faithful to them. They distributed it into 3000 lots, of which 300 were reserved for consecration to the gods, and the remainder assigned to Athenian kleruchs, or proprietary settlers, chosen by lot among the citizens; the Lesbian proprietors still remaining on the land as cultivating tenants, and paying to the Athenian kleruch an annual rent of two minæ (about seven pounds sixteen shillings sterling) for each lot. We should have been glad to learn more about this new land-settlement than the few words of the historian suffice to explain. It would seem that 2700 Athenian citizens with their families must have gone to reside, for the time at least, in Lesbos—as kleruchs; that is, without abnegating their rights as Athenian citizens, and without being exonerated either from Athenian taxation, or from personal military service. But it seems certain that these men did not continue long to reside in Lesbos. We may even suspect that the kleruchic allotment of the island must have been subsequently abrogated. There was a strip on the opposite mainland of Asia, which had hitherto belonged to Mitylênê; this was now separated from that town, and henceforward enrolled among the tributary subjects of Athens.¹

¹ Thucyd. iii. 50; iv. 52. About the Lesbian kleruchs, see Boeckh, *Public Econ. of Athens*, b. iii. c. 18; Wachsmuth, *Hell. Alt.* i, 2, p. 36. These kleruchs must originally have gone thither as a garrison, as M. Boeckh remarks; and may probably have come back, either all or a part, when needed for military service at home, and when it was ascertained that the island might be kept without them. Still however there is much which is puzzling in this arrangement. It seems remarkable that the Athenians, at a time when their accumulated treasure had been exhausted and when they were beginning to pay direct contributions from their private property, should sacrifice 5400 minæ (90 talents) annual revenue capable of being appropriated by the state, unless that sum were required to maintain the kleruchs as resident garrison for the maintenance of Lesbos. And as it turned out afterwards that their residence was not necessary, we may doubt whether the state did not convert the kleruchic grants into a public tribute, wholly or partially.

We may further remark, that if the kleruch be supposed a citizen resident at Athens, but receiving rent from his lot of land in some other territory—the analogy between him and the Roman colonist fails. The Roman colonists, though retaining their privileges as citizens, were sent out to reside on their grants of land, and to constitute a sort of resident garrison over the prior inhabitants, who had been despoiled of a portion of territory to make room for them.

See—on this subject and analogy—the excellent Dissertation of Madwig—*De jure et conditione coloniarum Populi Romani quæstio historica*—Madwig, *Opuscul.* Copenhag. 1834. Diss. viii. p. 246.

M. Boeckh and Dr. Arnold contend justly that at the time of the expedition of Athens against Syracuse and afterwards (Thucyd. vii. 57; viii. 23), there could have been but few, if any, Athenian kleruchs resident in Lesbos.

To the misfortunes of Mitylênê belongs, as a suitable appendix, the fate of Pachês the Athenian commander, whose perfidy at Notium has been recently recounted. It appears that having contracted a passion for two beautiful free women at Mitylênê, Hellânis and Lamaxis, he slew their husbands, and got possession of them by force. Possibly they may have had private friends at Athens, which must of course have been the case with many Mitylenæan families. At all events they repaired thither, bent on obtaining redress for this outrage, and brought their complaint against Pachês before the Athenian dikastery, in that trial of accountability to which every officer was liable at the close of his command. So profound was the sentiment which their case excited, in this open and numerous assembly of Athenian citizens, that the guilty commander, not waiting for sentence, slew himself with his sword in open court.¹

We might even push this argument further, and apply the same inference to an earlier period, the eighth year of the war (Thucyd. iv. 75), when the Mitylenæan exiles were so active in their aggressions upon Antandrus and the other towns, originally Mitylenæan possessions, on the opposite mainland. There was no force near at hand on the part of Athens to deal with these exiles except the ἀργυρολόγοι νῆες. But had there been kleruchs at Mitylênê, they would probably have been able to defeat the exiles in their first attempts, and would certainly have been among the most important forces to put them down afterwards—whereas Thucydidês makes no allusion to them.

Further, the oration of Antipho (De Cæde Hierod. c. 13) makes no allusion to Athenian kleruchs, either as resident in the island, or even as absentees receiving the annual rent mentioned by Thucydidês. The Mitylenæan citizen, father of the speaker of that oration, had been one of those implicated (as he says, unwillingly) in the past revolt of the city against Athens: since the deplorable termination of that revolt, he had continued possessor of his Lesbian property, and continued also to discharge his obligations as well (choregic obligations—χορηγίας) towards Mitylênê as (his obligations of pecuniary payment—τέλη) towards Athens. If the arrangement mentioned by Thucydidês had been persisted in, this Mitylenæan proprietor would have paid nothing towards the city of Athens, but merely a rent of two minæ to some Athenian kleruch or citizen; which can hardly be reconciled with the words of the speaker as we find them in Antipho.

¹ See the Epigram of Agathias, 57, p. 377, Agathias ed. Bonn.

Ἑλλανὶς τριμάκαιρα, καὶ ἁ χαριεσσα Δάμαξις,
ἦσθη μὲν πάτρας φέγγεα Λεσβιάδος.
Ὅκα δ' Ἀθηναῖσι σὺν ὀλκάσιν ἐνθάδε κέλσας
τὰν Μυτιληναίων γὰν ἀλάπαξε Πάχης,
τὰν κουρὰν ἀδίκως ἠράσσατο, τὼς δὲ συνεύνως
ἔκτανεν, ὡς τήνας τῆδε βησιόμενος.
Ταὶ δὲ κατ' Αἰγαίῳ ρόον πλατὺ λάϊτμα φερίσθη,
καὶ ποτὶ τὰν κραναῶν Μοιφονίαν δραμέτην,
Δάμῳ δ' ἀγγελέτην ἀλιτήμονος ἔργα Πάχηςτος
μέσφα μιν εἰς ὅλην κῆρα συνηλασάτην.

The surrender of Plataea to the Lacedæmonians took place not long after that of Mitylênê to the Athenians—somewhat later in the same summer. Though the escape of one-half of the garrison had made the provisions last longer for the rest, still their whole stock had now come to be exhausted, so that the remaining defenders were enfeebled and on the point of perishing by starvation. The Lacedæmonian commander of the blockading force, knowing their defenceless condition, could easily have taken the town by storm, had he not been forbidden by express orders from Sparta. For the Spartan government, calculating that peace might one day be concluded with Athens on terms of mutual cession of places acquired by war, wished to acquire Plataea, not by force but by capitulation and voluntary surrender, which would serve as an excuse for not giving it up: though such a distinction, between capture by force and by capitulation, not admissible in modern diplomacy, was afterwards found to tell against the Lacedæmonians quite as much as in their favour.¹ Acting upon these orders, the Lacedæmonian commander sent in a herald, summoning the Plataeans to surrender voluntarily, and submit themselves to the Lacedæmonians as judges—with a stipulation “that the

Τοῖα μὲν, ὦ κούρα, πεπονθήκατον· ἄψ δ' ἐπὶ πάτρην
ἤκετον, ἐν δ' αὐτᾷ κείσθον ἀποφθιμένα·
Ἐν δὲ πόρων ἀπόνασθον, ἐπεὶ ποτὶ σῶμα συνεύνων
εὐδετον, ἐς κλεινὰς μνάμα σοοφροσύνας·
Ὑμνεύσιν δ' ἐτι πάντες ὁμόφρονας ἡρώϊνας,
πάτρας καὶ ποσίων πῆματα τισαμένας.

Plutarch (Nikias, 6: compare Plutarch, Aristeidês, c. 26) states the fact of Pachês having slain himself before the dikastery on occasion of his trial of accountability. Πάχητα τὸν ἐλόντα Δέσβον, ὅς, εὐθύνας διδοὺς τῆς στρατηγίας, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ δικαστηρίῳ σπασάμενος ξίφος ἀνέειλεν ἑαυτόν, &c.

The statement in Plutarch, and that in the Epigram hang together so perfectly well, that each lends authority to the other, and I think there is good reason for crediting the Epigram. The suicide of Pachês, and that too before the dikasts, implies circumstances very different from those usually brought in accusation against a general on trial. It implies an intensity of anger in the numerous dikasts greater than that which acts of peculation would be likely to raise, and such as to strike a guilty man with insupportable remorse and humiliation. The story of Lamaxis and Hellânus would be just of a nature to produce this vehement emotion among the Athenian dikasts. Moreover the words of the Epigram—μέσφα μιν εἰς ὄλοην κῆρα συνηλασάτην—are precisely applicable to a self-inflicted death. It would seem by the Epigram, moreover, that even in the time of Agathias (A.D. 550—the reign of Justinian) there must have been preserved at Mitylênê a sepulchral monument commemorating this incident.

Schneider (ad Aristotel. Politic. v. 3, 2) erroneously identifies this story with that of Doxander and the two ἐπίκληροι whom he wished to obtain in marriage for his two sons.

¹ Thucyd. v. 17.

wrong-doers¹ should be punished, but that none should be punished unjustly." To the besieged, in their state of hopeless starvation, all terms were nearly alike, and they accordingly surrendered the city. After a few days' interval, during which they received nourishment from the blockading army, five persons arrived from Sparta to sit in judgement upon their fate—one Aristomenidas, a Herakleid of the regal family.²

The five Spartans having taken their seat as judges, doubtless in full presence of the blockading army, and especially with the Thebans, the great enemies of Platæa, by their side—the prisoners taken, 200 Platæans and twenty-five Athenians, were brought up for trial or sentence. No accusation was preferred against them by any one: but the simple question was put to them by the judges—"Have you during the present war rendered any service to the Lacedæmonians or to their allies?" The Platæans were confounded at a question alike unexpected and preposterous. It admitted but of one answer—but before returning any categorical answer at all, they entreated permission to plead their cause at length. In spite of the opposition of the Thebans,³ their request was granted. Astymachus and Lakon (the latter, proxenus of Sparta at Platæa) were appointed to speak on behalf of the body. Possibly both these delegates may have spoken: if so, Thucydidēs has blended the two speeches into one.

A more desperate position cannot be imagined. The interrogatory was expressly so framed as to exclude allusion to any facts preceding the Peloponnesian war. But the speakers, though fully conscious how slight was their chance of success, disregarded the limits of the question itself, and while upholding with unshaken courage the dignity of their little city, neglected no topic which could touch the sympathies of their judges. After remonstrating against the mere mockery of trial and judgement to which they were submitted, they appealed to the Hellenic sympathies, and lofty reputation for commanding virtue, of the Lacedæmonians. They adverted to the first alliance of Platæa with Athens, concluded at the recommendation of the Lacedæmonians themselves, who had then declined, though formally solicited, to undertake the protection of the

¹ Thucyd. iii. 52. προσπέμπει δ' αὐτοῖς κήρυκα λέγοντα, εἰ βούλονται παραδοῦναι τὴν πόλιν ἐκόντες τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις, καὶ δικασταῖς ἐκείνοις χρῆσασθαι, τοὺς τε ἀδίκους κολάζειν, παρὰ δίκην δὲ οὐδένα.

² Pausan. iii. 9, 1.

³ Thucyd. iii. 60. ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐκείνοις παρὰ γνώμην τὴν αὐτῶν μακρότερος λόγος ἐδόθη τῆς πρὸς τὸ ἐρώτημα ἀποκρίσεως. αὐτῶν *heie* means *the Thebans*.

town against Theban oppression. They next turned to the Persian war, wherein Plataean patriotism towards Greece was not less conspicuous than Theban treason¹—to the victory gained over the Persians on their soil, whereby it had become hallowed under the promises of Pausanias and by solemn appeals to the local gods. From the Persian war they passed on to the flagitious attack made by the Thebans on Plataea, in the midst of the truce. They did not omit to remind the judges of an obligation personal to Sparta—the aid which they had rendered, along with the Athenians, to Sparta, when pressed by the revolt of the Helots at Ithômé. This speech is as touching as any which we find in Thucydides; the skill of it consisting in the frequency with which the hearers are brought back, time after time and by well-managed transitions, to these same topics.² And such was the impression which it seemed to make on the five Lacedæmonian judges, that the Thebans near at hand found themselves under the necessity of making a reply to it: although we see plainly that the whole scheme of proceeding—the formal and insulting question, as well as the sentence destined to follow upon answer given—had been settled beforehand between them and the Lacedæmonians.

The Theban speakers contended that the Plataeans had deserved, and brought upon themselves by their own fault, the enmity of Thebes—that they had stood forward earnestly against the Persians, only because Athens had done so too—and that all the merit, whatever it might be, which they had thereby acquired, was counterbalanced and cancelled by their having allied themselves with Athens afterwards for the oppression and enslavement of the Æginetans, and of other Greeks

¹ See this point emphatically set forth in Orat. xiv. called *Λόγος Πλαταικός*, of Isokratês, p. 308, sect. 62.

The whole of that oration is interesting to be read in illustration of the renewed sufferings of the Plataeans near fifty years after this capture.

² Thucyd. iii. 54–59. Dionysius of Halikarnassus bestows especial commendation on the speech of the Plataean orator (De Thucyd. Hist. Judic. p. 921). Concurring with him as to its merits, I do not concur in the opinion which he expresses, that it is less artistically put together than those other harangues which he considers inferior.

Mr. Mitford doubts whether these two orations are to be taken as approximating to anything really delivered on the occasion. But it seems to me that the means possessed by Thucydides for informing himself of what was actually said at this scene before the captured Plataea, must have been considerable and satisfactory: I therefore place full confidence in them, as I do in most of the other harangues in his work, so far as *the substance* goes.

equally conspicuous for zeal against Xerxes, and equally entitled to protection under the promises of Pausanias. The Thebans went on to vindicate their nocturnal surprise of Plataea, by maintaining that they had been invited by the most respectable citizens of the town,¹ who were anxious only to bring back Plataea from its alliance with a stranger to its natural Boeotian home—and that they had abstained from anything like injurious treatment of the inhabitants, until constrained to use force in their own defence. They then reproached the Plataeans, in their turn, with that breach of faith whereby ultimately the Theban prisoners in the town had been put to death. And while they excused their alliance with Xerxes, at the time of the Persian invasion, by affirming that Thebes was then under a dishonest party-oligarchy, who took this side for their own factious purposes, and carried the people with them by force—they at the same time charged the Plataeans with permanent treason against the Boeotian customs and brotherhood.² All this was further enforced by setting forth the claims of Thebes to the gratitude of Lacedaemon, both for having brought Boeotia into the Lacedaemonian alliance at the time of the battle of Koroneia, and for having furnished so large a portion of the common force in the war then going on.³

The discourse of the Thebans, inspired by bitter and as yet unsatisfied hatred against Plataea, proved effectual: or rather it was superfluous—the minds of the Lacedaemonians having before been made up. After the proposition twice made by Archidamus to the Plataeans, inviting them to remain neutral and even offering to guarantee their neutrality—after the solemn apologetic protest tendered by him upon their refusal, to the gods, before he began the siege—the Lacedaemonians conceived themselves exonerated from all obligation to respect the sanctity of the place;⁴ looking upon the inhabitants as

¹ Thucyd. iii. 65.

² Thucyd. iii. 66. τὰ τῶν πάντων Βοιωτῶν πατρία—iii. 61. ἔξω τῶν ἄλλων Βοιωτῶν παραβαίνοντες τὰ πατρία.

³ Thucyd. iii. 61–68. It is probable that the slaughter of the Theban prisoners taken in the town of Plataea was committed by the Plataeans in breach of a convention concluded with the Thebans: and on this point therefore the Thebans had really ground to complain. Respecting this convention, however, there were two conflicting stories, between which Thucydides does not decide: see Thucyd. ii. 3, 4, and this History, above, chap. xlviii.

⁴ Thucyd. iii. 68; ii. 74. To construe the former of these passages (iii. 68) as it now stands, is very difficult, if not impossible: we can only pretend to give what seems to be its substantial meaning.

having voluntarily renounced their inviolability and sealed their own ruin. Hence the importance attached to that protest, and the emphatic detail with which it is set forth in Thucydides. The five judges, as their only reply to the two harangues, again called the Plataeans before them, and repeated to every one of them individually the same question which had before been put. Each of them, as he successively replied in the negative,¹ was taken away and killed, together with the twenty-five Athenian prisoners. The women captured were sold as slaves: and the town and territory of Plataea were handed over to the Thebans, who at first established in them a few oligarchical Plataean exiles, together with some Megarian exiles—but after a few months, recalled this step, and blotted out Plataea,² as a separate town and territory, from the muster-roll of Hellas. Having pulled down all the private buildings, they employed the materials to build a vast barrack all round the Heraeum or temple of Hêrê, 200 feet in every direction, with apartments of two stories above and below; partly as accommodation for visitors to the temple, partly as an abode for the tenant-farmers or graziers who were to occupy the land. A new temple, of 100 feet in length, was also built in honour of Hêrê, and ornamented with couches prepared from the brass and iron furniture found in the private houses of the Plataeans.³ The Plataean territory was let out for ten years, as public property belonging to Thebes, and was hired by private Theban cultivators.

Such was the melancholy fate of Plataea, after sustaining a blockade of about two years.⁴ Its identity and local traditions

¹ Diodorus (xii. 56) in his meagre abridgement of the siege and fate of Plataea, somewhat amplifies the brevity and simplicity of the question as given by Thucydides.

² Thucyd. iii. 57. ὑμᾶς δὲ (you Spartans) καὶ ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ πανοικησίᾳ διὰ Θηβαίων (Πλάταιαν) ἐξαλειψαί.

³ Thucyd. iii. 69.

⁴ Demosthenês (or the Pseudo-Demosthenês), in the oration against Neæra (p. 1380, c. 25), says that the blockade of Plataea was continued for *ten* years before it surrendered—ἐπολιόρκουν αὐτοὺς διπλῇ τείχει περιτείχισαντες δέκα ἔτη. That the real duration of the blockade was only *two* years, is most certain: accordingly several eminent critics—Palmerius, Wasse, Duker, Taylor, Auger, &c., all with one accord confidently enjoin us to correct the text of Demosthenês from δέκα to δύο. “Repone *fidenter* δύο”—says Duker.

I have before protested against corrections of the text of ancient authors grounded upon the reason which all these critics think so obvious and so convincing; and I must again renew the protest here. It shows how little the principles of historical evidence have been reflected upon, when critics can thus concur in forcing dissentient witnesses into harmony, and in

were extinguished, and the sacrifices, in honour of the deceased victors who had fought under Pausanias, suspended—which the Platæan speakers had urged upon the Lacedæmonians as an impiety not to be tolerated,¹ and which perhaps the latter would hardly have consented to under any other circumstances, except from an anxious desire of conciliating the Thebans in their prominent antipathy. It is in this way that Thucydidês explains the conduct of Sparta, which he pronounces to have been rigorous in the extreme.² And in truth it was more rigorous, considering only the principle of the case and apart from the number of victims, than even the first unexecuted sentence of Athens against the Mitylenæans. For neither Sparta, nor even Thebes, had any fair pretence for considering Platæa as a revolted town, whereas Mitylênê was a city which had revolted under circumstances peculiarly offensive to Athens. Moreover Sparta promised trial and justice to the Platæans on their surrender : Pachês promised nothing to the Mitylenæans except that their fate should be reserved for the decision of the Athenian people. This little city—interesting from its Hellenic patriotism, its grateful and tenacious attachments, and its unmerited suffering—now existed only in the persons of its citizens harboured at Athens. We shall find it hereafter restored, destroyed again, and finally again restored : so chequered was the fate of a little Grecian state swept away by the contending politics of greater neighbours. The slaughter of the twenty-five Athenian prisoners, like that of Salæthus by the Athenians, was not beyond the rigour admitted and tolerated, though not always practised, on both sides—towards prisoners of war.

We have now gone through the circumstances, painfully illustrating the manners of the age, which followed on the surrender of Mitylênê and Platæa. We next pass to the west of Greece—the island of Korkyra—where we shall find scenes not less bloody, and even more revolting.

substituting a true statement of their own in place of an erroneous statement which one of these witnesses gives them. And in the present instance, the principle adopted by these critics is the less defensible, because the Pseudo-Demosthenês introduces a great many other errors and inaccuracies respecting Platæa, besides his mistake about the duration of the siege. The ten years' siege of Troy was constantly present to the imagination of these literary Greeks.

¹ Thucyd. iii. 59.

² Thucyd. iii. 68. *σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ τὸ ξύμπαν περὶ Πλαταιῶν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὕτως ἀποτετραμμένοι ἐγένοντο Θηβαίων ἕνεκα, νομίζοντες ἐς τὸν πόλεμον αὐτοὺς ἄρτι τότε καθιστάμενον ὡφελίμους εἶναι.*

It has been already mentioned,¹ that in the naval combats between the Corinthians and Korkyræans during the year before the Peloponnesian war, the former had captured 250 Korkyræan prisoners, men of the first rank and consequence in the island. Instead of following the impulse of blind hatred in slaughtering their prisoners, the Corinthians displayed, if not greater humanity, at least a more long-sighted calculation. They had treated the prisoners well, and made every effort to gain them over, with a view of employing them on the first opportunity to effect a revolution in the island—to bring it into alliance with Corinth,² and disconnect it from Athens. Such an opportunity appears first to have occurred during the winter or spring of the present year, while both Mitylênê and Plataea were under blockade; probably about the time when Alkidas departed for Ionia, and when it was hoped that not only Mitylênê would be relieved, but the neighbouring dependencies of Athens excited to revolt, and her whole attention thus occupied in that quarter. Accordingly the Korkyræan prisoners were then sent home from Corinth, nominally under a heavy ransom of 800 talents, for which those Korkyræan citizens who acted as proxeni to Corinth made themselves responsible.³ The proxeni, lending themselves thus to the deception, were doubtless participant in the entire design.

But it was soon seen in what form the ransom was really to be paid. The new-comers, probably at first heartily welcomed after so long a detention, employed all their influence, combined with the most active personal canvass, to bring about a complete rupture of alliance with Athens. Intimation being sent to Athens of what was going on, an Athenian trireme arrived with envoys to try and defeat these manœuvres; while a Corinthian trireme also brought envoys from Corinth to aid the views of the opposite party. The mere presence of Corinthian envoys indicated a change in the political feeling of the island. But still more conspicuous did this change become, when a formal public assembly, after hearing both envoys, decided—that Korkyra would maintain her alliance with Athens according to the limited terms of simple mutual defence originally stipulated;⁴ but would at the same time be in relations of friendship with the Peloponnesians, as she had been before the Epidamnian quarrel. Since that event, however, the alliance between Athens and Korkyra had become practically more intimate, and the Korkyræan fleet had aided

¹ See above, chap. xlvii.

³ Thucyd. iii. 70: compare Diodor. xii. 57.

² Thucyd. i. 55.

⁴ Thucyd. i. 44.

the Athenians in the invasion of Peloponnesus.¹ Accordingly, the resolution now adopted abandoned the present to go back to the past—and to a past which could not be restored.

Looking to the war then raging between Athens and the Peloponnesians, such a declaration was self-contradictory. It was intended by the oligarchical party only as a step to a more complete revolution, both foreign and domestic. They followed it up by a political prosecution against Peithias, the citizen of greatest personal influence among the people, who acted by his own choice as proxenus to the Athenians. They accused him of practising to bring Korkyra into slavery to Athens. What were the judicial institutions of the island, under which he was tried, we do not know: but he was acquitted of the charge. He then revenged himself by accusing in his turn five of the richest among his oligarchical prosecutors, of the crime of sacrilege—of having violated the sanctity of the sacred grove of Zeus and Alkinous, by causing stakes, for their vine-props, to be cut in it.² This was an act distinctly forbidden by law, under a penalty of a stater or four drachms for every stake so cut. But it is no uncommon phenomenon, even in societies politically better organised than Korkyra, to find laws existing and unrepealed, yet habitually violated, sometimes even by every one, but still oftener by men of wealth and power, whom most people would be afraid to prosecute. Moreover in this case, no individual was injured by the act, so that any one who came forward to prosecute would incur the odium of an informer—which probably Peithias might not have chosen to brave under ordinary circumstances, though he thought himself justified in adopting this mode of retaliation against those who had prosecuted him. The language of Thucydides implies

¹ Thucyd. ii. 25.

² Thucyd. iii. 70. φάσκων τέμνειν χάρακας ἐκ τοῦ τε Διὸς τεμένους καὶ τοῦ Ἀλκίνου· ζημία δὲ καθ' ἐκάστην χάρακα ἐπέκειτο στατήρ.

The present tense *τέμνειν* seems to indicate that they were going on habitually making use of the trees in the grove for this purpose. Probably it is this cutting and fixing of stakes to support the vines, which is meant by the word *χαρακισμός* in Pherekratês, Pers. ap. Athenæum, vi. p. 269.

The Oration of Lysias (Or. vii.) against Nikomachus, *ὕπὲρ τοῦ σηκοῦ ἀπολογία*, will illustrate this charge made by Peithias at Korkyra. There were certain ancient olive trees near Athens, consecrated and protected by law, so that the proprietors of the ground on which they stood were forbidden to grub them up, or to dig so near as to injure the roots. The speaker in that oration defends himself against a charge of having grubbed up one of these and sold the wood. It appears that there were public visitors whose duty it was to watch over these old trees: see the note of Maikland on that oration, p. 270.

that the fact was not denied: nor is there any difficulty in conceiving that these rich men may have habitually resorted to the sacred property for vine-stakes. On being found guilty and condemned, they cast themselves as suppliants at the temples, and entreated the indulgence of being allowed to pay the fine by instalments. But Peithias, then a member of the (annual) senate, to whom the petition was referred, opposed it, and caused its rejection, leaving the law to take its course. It was moreover understood that he was about to avail himself of his character of senator—and of his increased favour, probably arising from the recent judicial acquittal—to propose in the public assembly a reversal of the resolution recently passed; together with a new resolution, to recognise only the same friends and the same enemies as Athens.

Pressed by the ruinous fine upon the five persons condemned, as well as by the fear that Peithias might carry his point and thus completely defeat their project of Corinthian alliance, the oligarchical party resolved to carry their point by violence and murder. They collected a party armed with daggers, burst suddenly into the senate-house during full sitting, and there slew Peithias with sixty other persons, partly senators, partly private individuals. Some others of his friends escaped the same fate by getting aboard the Attic trireme which had brought the envoys, and which was still in the harbour, but now departed forthwith to Athens. These assassins, under the fresh terror arising from their recent act, convoked an assembly, affirmed that what they had done was unavoidable to guard Korkyra against being made the slave of Athens, and proposed a resolution of full neutrality both towards Athens and towards the Peloponnesians—permitting no visit from either of the belligerents, except of a pacific character and with one single ship at a time. And this resolution the assembly was constrained to pass—it probably was not very numerous, and the oligarchical partisans were at hand in arms.¹ At the same time they sent envoys to Athens, to communicate the recent events with such colouring as suited their views, and to dissuade the fugitive partisans of Peithias from provoking any armed Athenian intervention, such as might occasion a counter-revolution in the island.² With some of the fugitives, representations of this sort, or perhaps the fear of compromising

¹ Thucyd. iii. 71. *ὡς δὲ εἶπον, καὶ ἐπικυρῶσαι ἡνάγκασαν τὴν γνώμην.*

² Thucyd. iii. 71. *καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖ καταπεφευγότας πείσοντας μηδὲν ἀνεπιτήδειον πράσσειν, ὅπως μὴ τις ἐπιστροφή γένηται.*

their own families left behind, prevailed. But most of them, and the Athenians along with them, appreciated better both what had been done and what was likely to follow. The oligarchical envoys, together with such of the fugitives as had been induced to adopt their views, were seized by the Athenians as conspirators, and placed in detention at Ægina; while a fleet of sixty Athenian triremes under Eurymedon was immediately fitted out to sail for Korkyra—for which there was the greater necessity, as the Lacedæmonian fleet under Alkidas, lately mustered at Kyllênê, after its return from Ionia, was understood to be on the point of sailing thither.¹

But the oligarchical leaders at Korkyra having little faith in the chances of this mission to Athens, proceeded in the execution of their conspiracy with that rapidity which was best calculated to ensure its success. On the arrival of a Corinthian trireme—which brought ambassadors from Sparta, and probably also brought news that the fleet of Alkidas would shortly appear—they organised their force, and attacked the people and the democratical authorities. The Korkyræan Demos were at first vanquished and dispersed. But during the night they collected together and fortified themselves in the upper parts of the town near the acropolis, and from thence down to the Hyllaic harbour—one of the two harbours which the town possessed; while the other harbour and the chief arsenal, facing the mainland of Epirus, was held by the oligarchical party, together with the market-place near to it, in and around which the wealthier Korkyræans chiefly resided. In this divided state the town remained throughout the ensuing day, during which the Demos sent emissaries round the territory soliciting aid from the working slaves, and promising to them emancipation as a reward; while the oligarchy also hired and procured 800 Epirotic mercenaries from the mainland. Reinforced by the slaves, who flocked in at the call received, the Demos renewed the struggle on the morrow more furiously than before. Both in position and numbers they had the advantage over the oligarchy, and the intense resolution with which they fought communicated itself even to the women, who, braving danger and tumult, took active part in the combat, especially by flinging tiles from the housetops. Towards the afternoon the people became decidedly victorious, and were even on the point of carrying by assault the lower town, together with the neighbouring arsenal. The oligarchy had no other chance of safety except the desperate resource of

¹ Thucyd. iii. 80.

setting fire to that part of the town, with the market-place, houses, and buildings all around it, their own among the rest. This proceeding drove back the assailants, but destroyed much property belonging to merchants in the warehouses, together with a large part of the town: indeed had the wind been favourable, the entire town would have been consumed. The people being thus victorious, the Corinthian trireme, together with most of the Epirotic mercenaries, thought it safer to leave the island; while the victors were still further strengthened on the ensuing morning by the arrival of the Athenian admiral Nikostratus, with twelve triremes from Naupaktus,¹ and 500 Messenian hoplites.

Nikostratus did his best to allay the furious excitement prevailing, and to persuade the people to use their victory with moderation. Under his auspices a convention of amnesty and peace was concluded between the contending parties, save only ten proclaimed individuals, the most violent oligarchs, who were to be tried as ringleaders. These men of course soon disappeared, so that there would have been no trial at all, which seems to have been what Nikostratus desired. At the same time an alliance offensive and defensive was established between Korkyra and Athens, and the Athenian admiral was then on the point of departing, when the Korkyræan leaders entreated him to leave with them, for greater safety, five ships out of his little fleet of twelve—offering him five of their own triremes instead. Notwithstanding the peril of this proposition to himself, Nikostratus acceded to it; and the Korkyræans, preparing the five ships to be sent along with him, began to enroll among the crews the names of their principal enemies. To the latter this presented the appearance of sending them to Athens, which they accounted a sentence of death. Under such impression they took refuge as suppliants in the temple of the Dioskuri, where Nikostratus went to visit them, and tried to reassure them by the promise that nothing was intended against their personal safety. But he found it impossible to satisfy them, and as they persisted in refusing to serve, the Korkyræan Demos began to suspect treachery. They took arms again, searched the houses of the recusants for arms, and were bent on putting some of them to death, if Nikostratus had not taken them under his protection. The principal men of the defeated party, to the number of about 400, now took sanctuary in the temple and sacred ground of Hêrê; upon which the leaders of the people, afraid that in this inviolable position they might still cause

¹ Thucyd. iii. 74, 75.

further insurrection in the city, opened a negotiation and prevailed upon them to be ferried across to the little island immediately opposite to the Heræum; where they were kept under watch, with provisions regularly transmitted across to them for four days.¹

At the end of these four days, while the uneasiness of the popular leaders still continued, and Nikostratus still adjourned his departure, a new phase opened in this melancholy drama. The Peloponnesian fleet under Alkidas arrived at the road of Sybota on the opposite mainland—fifty-three triremes in number, since the forty triremes brought back from Ionia had been reinforced by thirteen more from Leukas and Ambrakia. Moreover the Lacedæmonians had sent down Brasidas as advising companion—himself worth more than the new thirteen triremes, if he had been sent to supersede Alkidas, instead of bringing nothing but authority to advise.² Despising the small squadron of Nikostratus, then at Naupaktus, the Spartans were only anxious to deal with Korkyra before reinforcements should arrive from Athens; but the repairs necessary for the ships of Alkidas, after their disastrous voyage home, occasioned an unfortunate delay. When the Peloponnesian fleet was seen approaching from Sybota at break of day, the confusion in Korkyra was unspeakable. The Demos and the newly emancipated slaves were agitated alike by the late terrible combat and by fear of the invaders—the oligarchical party, though defeated, was still present, forming a considerable minority—and the town was half-burnt. Amidst such elements of trouble, there was little authority to command, and still less confidence or willingness to obey. Plenty of triremes were indeed at hand, and orders were given to man sixty of them forthwith—while Nikostratus, the only man who preserved the cool courage necessary for effective resistance, entreated the Korkyræan leaders to proceed with regularity, and to wait till all were manned, so as to sail forth from the harbour in a body. He offered himself with his twelve Athenian triremes to go forth first alone, and occupy the Peloponnesian fleet, until the Korkyræan sixty triremes could all come out in full array to support him. He accordingly went forth with his squadron, but the Korkyræans, instead of following his advice, sent their ships out one by one and without any selection of crews. Two of them deserted forthwith to the enemy, while others presented the spectacle of crews fighting among themselves: even those

¹ Thucyd. iii. 75, 76.

² Thucyd. iii. 69-76.

which actually joined battle came up by single ships, without the least order or concert.

The Peloponnesians soon seeing that they had little to fear from such enemies, thought it sufficient to set twenty of their ships against the Korkyræans, while with the remaining thirty-three they moved forward to contend with the twelve Athenians. Nikostratus, having plenty of sea-room, was not afraid of this numerical superiority; the more so as two of his twelve triremes were the picked vessels of the Athenian navy—the *Salaminia* and the *Paralus*.¹ He took care to avoid entangling himself with the centre of the enemy, and to keep rowing about their flanks; and as he presently contrived to disable one of their ships, by a fortunate blow with the beak of one of his vessels, the Peloponnesians, instead of attacking him with their superior numbers, formed themselves into a circle and stood on the defensive, as they had done in the first combat with Phormio in the middle of the Gulf at Rhium. Nikostratus (like Phormio) rowed round this circle, trying to cause confusion by feigned approach, and waiting to see some of the ships lose their places or run foul of each other, so as to afford him an opening for attack. And he might perhaps have succeeded, if the remaining twenty Peloponnesian ships, seeing the proceeding and recollecting with dismay the success of a similar manœuvre in the former battle, had not quitted the Korkyræan ships, whose disorderly condition they despised, and hastened to join their comrades. The whole fleet of fifty-three triremes now again took the aggressive, and advanced to attack Nikostratus, who retreated before them, but backing astern and keeping the head of his ships towards the enemy. In this manner he succeeded in drawing them away from the town, so as to leave to most of the Korkyræan ships opportunity for getting back to the harbour; while such was the superior manœuvring of the Athenian triremes, that the Peloponnesians were never able to come up with him or force him to action. They returned back in the evening to Sybota, with no greater triumph than their success against the Korkyræans, thirteen of whose triremes they carried away as prizes.²

It was the expectation in Korkyra, that they would on the morrow make a direct attack (which could hardly have failed

¹ These two triremes had been with Pachês at Lesbos (Thucyd. iii. 33); immediately on returning from thence, they must have been sent round to join Nikostratus at Naupaktus. We see in what constant service they were kept.

² Thucyd. iii. 77, 78, 79.

of success) on the town and harbour. We may easily believe (what report afterwards stated), that Brasidas advised Alkidas to this decisive proceeding. The Korkyræan leaders, more terrified than ever, first removed their prisoners from the little island to the Heræum, and then tried to come to a compromise with the oligarchical party generally, for the purpose of organising some effective and united defence. Thirty triremes were made ready and manned, wherein some even of the oligarchical Korkyræans were persuaded to form part of the crews.

But the slackness of Alkidas proved their best defence. Instead of coming straight to the town, he contented himself with landing in the island at some distance from it, on the promontory of Leukimnê: after ravaging the neighbouring lands for some hours, he returned to his station at Sybota. He had lost an opportunity which never again returned: for on the very same night the fire signals of Leukas telegraphed to him the approach of the fleet under Eurymedon from Athens—sixty triremes. His only thought was now for the escape of the Peloponnesian fleet, which was in fact saved by this telegraphic notice. Advantage was taken of the darkness to retire close along the land as far as the isthmus which separates Leukas from the mainland—across which isthmus the ships were dragged by hand or machinery, so that they might not fall in with, or be descried by, the Athenian fleet in sailing round the Leukadian promontory. From hence Alkidas made the best of his way home to Peloponnesus, leaving the Korkyræan oligarchs to their fate.¹

That fate was deplorable in the extreme. The arrival of Eurymedon opens a third unexpected transition in this chequered narrative—the Korkyræan Demos passing, abruptly and unexpectedly, from intense alarm and helplessness to elate and irresistible mastery. In the bosom of Greeks, and in a population seemingly amongst the least refined of all Greeks—including too a great many slaves just emancipated against the will of their masters, and of course the fiercest and most discontented of all the slaves in the island—such a change was but too sure to kindle a thirst for revenge almost ungovernable, as the only compensation for foregone terror and suffering.

As soon as the Peloponnesian fleet was known to have fled and that of Eurymedon was seen approaching, the Korkyræan leaders brought into the town the 500 Messenian hoplites who had hitherto been encamped without; thus providing a

¹ Thucyd. iii. 80.

resource against any last effort of despair on the part of their interior enemies. Next, the thirty ships recently manned—and held ready in the harbour facing the continent, to go out against the Peloponnesian fleet, but now no longer needed—were ordered to sail round to the other or Hyllaic harbour. Even while they were thus sailing round, some obnoxious men of the defeated party, being seen in public, were slain. But when the ships arrived at the Hyllaic harbour, and the crews were disembarked, a more wholesale massacre was perpetrated, by putting to death those individuals of the oligarchical faction who had been persuaded on the day before to go aboard as part of the crews.¹ Then came the fate of those suppliants, about 400 in number, who had been brought back from the islet opposite, and were still under sanctuary, in the sacred precinct of the Heraeum. It was proposed to them to quit sanctuary and stand their trial. Fifty of them accepted the proposition, were put on their trial—all condemned, and all executed. Their execution took place, as it seems, immediately on the spot, and within actual view of the unhappy men still remaining in the sacred ground;² who, seeing that their lot was desperate, preferred dying by their own hands to starvation or the sword of their enemies. Some hung themselves on branches of the trees surrounding the temple, others helped their friends in the work of suicide, and in one way or another the entire band thus perished. It was probably a consolation to them to believe, that this desecration of the precinct would bring down the anger of the gods upon their surviving enemies.

Eurymedon remained with his fleet for seven days, during all which time the victorious Korkyraeans carried on a sanguinary persecution against the party who had been concerned in the late oligarchical revolution. Five hundred of this party contrived to escape by flight to the mainland; while

¹ Thucyd. iii. 80, 81. καὶ ἐκ τῶν νεῶν, ὅσους ἔπεισαν ἐσβῆναι, ἐκβιβάζοντες ἀπεχώρησαν. It is certain that the reading ἀπεχώρησαν here must be wrong: no satisfactory sense can be made out of it. The word substituted by Dr. Arnold is ἀνεχρῶντο—that preferred by Goller is ἀπεχρῶντο—others recommend ἀπεχρήσαντο—Hermann adopts ἀπεχώρισαν—and Dionysius in his copy reads ἀνεχώρησαν. I follow the meaning of the words proposed by Dr. Arnold and Goller, which appear to be both equivalent to ἔκτεινον. This meaning is at least plausible and consistent; though I do not feel certain that we have the true sense of the passage.

² Thucyd. iii. 81. οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν ἱκετῶν, ὅσοι οὐκ ἐπέσθησαν, ὡς ἐώρων τὰ γιγνόμενα, διέφθειρον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀλλήλους, &c. The meagre abridgement of Diodorus (xii. 57), in reference to these events in Korkyra, is hardly worth notice.

those who did not, or could not, flee, were slain wherever they could be found. Some received their death-wounds even on the altar itself—others shared the same fate, after having been dragged away from it by violence. In one case a party of murderers having pursued their victims to the temple of Dionysus, refrained from shedding their blood, but built up the doorway and left them to starve; as the Lacedæmonians had done on a former occasion respecting Pausanias. Such was the ferocity of the time, that in one case a father slew his own son. It was not merely the oligarchical party who thus suffered: the flood-gates of private feud were also opened, and various individuals, under false charges of having been concerned in the oligarchical movements, were slain by personal enemies or debtors. This deplorable suspension of legal, as well as moral restraints, continued during the week of Eurymedon's stay—a period long enough to satiate the fierce sentiment out of which it arose;¹ yet without any apparent effort on his part to soften the victors or protect the vanquished. We shall see further reason hereafter to appreciate the baseness and want of humanity in his character. Had Nikostratus remained in command, we may fairly presume, judging by what he had done in the earlier part of the sedition with very inferior force, that he would have set much earlier limits to the Korkyrean butchery; unfortunately, Thucydidēs tells us nothing at all about Nikostratus, after the naval battle of the preceding day.²

¹ Thucyd. iii. 85. Οἱ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν Κερκυραῖοι τοιαύταις ὁργαῖς ταῖς πρώταις ἐς ἀλλήλους ἐχρήσαντο, &c.

² In reading the account of the conduct of Nikostratus, as well as that of Phormio in the naval battles of the preceding summer, we contract a personal interest respecting both of them. Thucydidēs does not seem to have anticipated that his account would raise such a feeling in the minds of his readers, otherwise he probably would have mentioned something to gratify it. Respecting Phormio, his omission is the more remarkable; since we are left to infer, from the request made by the Akarnanians to have his son sent as commander, that he must have died or become disabled: yet the historian does not distinctly say so (iii. 7).

The Scholiast on Aristophanēs (Pac. 347) has a story that Phormio was asked by the Akarnanians, but that he could not serve in consequence of being at that moment under sentence for a heavy fine, which he was unable to pay: accordingly the Athenians contrived a means of evading the fine, in order that he might be enabled to serve. It is difficult to see how this can be reconciled with the story of Thucydidēs, who says that the son of Phormio went instead of his father.

Compare Meineke, *Histor. Critic. Comicæ Græc.* vol. i. p. 144, and *Fragment. Eupolid.* vol. ii. p. 527. Phormio was introduced as a chief character in the *Ταξίλαρχοι* of Eupolis; as a brave, rough, straightforward soldier, something like Lamachus in the *Acharneis* of Aristophanēs.

We should have been glad to hear something about the steps taken in the way of restoration or healing, after this burst of murderous fury, in which doubtless the newly emancipated slaves were not the most backward—and after the departure of Eurymedon. But here again Thucydides disappoints our curiosity. We only hear from him, that the oligarchical exiles who had escaped to the mainland were strong enough to get possession of the forts and most part of the territory there belonging to Korkyra; just as the exiles from Samos and Mitylênê became more or less completely masters of the Perœa or mainland possessions belonging to those islands. They even sent envoys to Corinth and Sparta, in hopes of procuring aid to accomplish their restoration by force; but their request found no favour, and they were reduced to their own resources. After harassing for some time the Korkyræans in the island by predatory incursions, so as to produce considerable dearth and distress, they at length collected a band of Epirotic mercenaries, passed over to the island, and there established a fortified position on the mountain called Istônê, not far from the city. Having burnt their vessels in order to cut off all hopes of retreat, they maintained themselves for near two years by a system of ravage and plunder which inflicted great misery on the island.¹ This was a frequent way whereby, of old, invaders wore out and mastered a city, the walls of which they found impregnable. The ultimate fate of these occupants of Istônê, which belongs to a future chapter, will be found to constitute a close suitable to the bloody drama yet unfinished in Korkyra.

Such a drama could not be acted, in an important city belonging to the Greek name, without producing a deep and extensive impression throughout all the other cities. And Thucydides has taken advantage of it to give a sort of general sketch of Grecian politics during the Peloponnesian war; violence of civil discord in each city, aggravated by foreign war, and by the contending efforts of Athens and Sparta,—the former espousing the democratical party everywhere; the latter, the oligarchical. The Korkyræan sedition was the first case in which these two causes of political antipathy and exasperation were seen acting with full united force, and where the malignity of sentiment and demoralisation flowing from such a union was seen without disguise. The picture drawn by Thucydides of moral and political feeling under these influences, will ever remain memorable as the work of an

¹ Thucyd. iii. 85.

analyst and a philosopher. He has conceived and described the perverting causes with a spirit of generalisation which renders these two chapters hardly less applicable to other political societies far distant both in time and place (especially, under many points of view, to France between 1789 and 1799) than to Greece in the fifth century before the Christian æra. The deadly bitterness infused into intestine party contests by the accompanying dangers of foreign war and intervention of foreign enemies—the mutual fears between political rivals, where each thinks that the other will forestall him in striking a mortal blow, and where constitutional maxims have ceased to carry authority either as restraint or as protection—the superior popularity of the man who is most forward with the sword, or who runs down his enemies in the most unmeasured language, coupled with the disposition to treat both prudence in action and candour in speech as if it were nothing but treachery or cowardice—the exclusive regard to party ends, with the reckless adoption, and even admiring preference, of fraud or violence as the most effectual means—the loss of respect for legal authority as well as of confidence in private agreement, and the surrender even of blood and friendship to the overruling ascendancy of party-ties—the perversion of ordinary morality, bringing with it altered signification of all the common words importing blame or approbation—the unnatural predominance of the ambitious and contentious passions, overpowering in men's minds all real public objects, and equalising for the time the better and the worse cause, by taking hold of democracy on one side, and aristocracy on the other, as mere pretences to sanctify personal triumph—all these gloomy social phænomena, here indicated by the historian, have their causes deeply seated in the human mind, and are likely, unless the bases of constitutional morality shall come to be laid more surely and firmly than they have hitherto been, to recur from time to time, under diverse modifications, “so long as human nature shall be the same as it is now,” to use the language of Thucydides himself.¹ He has described, with fidelity not inferior to his sketch of the pestilence at Athens, the symptoms of a certain morbid political condition, wherein

¹ Thucyd. iii. 82. *γινόμενα μὲν καὶ αἰεὶ ἐσόμενα, ἕως ἂν ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις ἀνθρώπων ᾖ, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἡσυχαιτέρα καὶ τοῖς εἶδεσι διηλλαγμένα, ὥς ἂν ἐκάσταις αἱ μεταβολαὶ τῶν ξυντυχιῶν ἐφιστῶνται, &c.*

The many obscurities and perplexities of construction which pervade these memorable chapters, are familiar to all readers of Thucydides, ever since Dionysius of Halikarnassus, whose remarks upon them are sufficiently severe (Judic. de Thucyd. p. 883).

the vehemence of intestine conflict, instead of being kept within such limits as consists with the maintenance of one society among the contending parties, becomes for the time inflamed and poisoned with all the unscrupulous hostility of foreign war, chiefly from actual alliance between parties within the state and foreigners without. In following the impressive description of the historian, we have to keep in mind the general state of manners in his time, especially the cruelties tolerated by the laws of war, as compared with that greater humanity and respect for life which has grown up during the last two centuries in modern Europe. And we have further to recollect that if he had been describing the effects of political fury among Carthaginians and Jews, instead of among his contemporary Greeks, he would have added, to his list of horrors, mutilation, crucifixion, and other refinements on simple murder.

The language of Thucydides is to be taken rather as a generalisation and concentration of phenomena which he had observed among different communities, than as belonging altogether to any one of them. I do not believe—what a superficial reading of his opening words might at first suggest—that the bloodshed in Korkyra was only the earliest, but by no means the worst, of a series of similar horrors spread over the Grecian world. The facts stated in his own history suffice to show that though the same causes, which worked upon this unfortunate island, became disseminated and produced analogous mischiefs throughout many other communities—yet the case of Korkyra, as it was the first, so it was also the worst and most aggravated in point of intensity. Fortunately the account of Thucydides enables us to understand it from beginning to end, and to appreciate the degree of guilt of the various parties implicated, which we can seldom do with certainty; because when once the interchange of violence has begun, the feelings arising out of the contest itself presently overpower in the minds of both parties the original cause of dispute, as well as all scruples as to fitness of means. Unjustifiable acts in abundance are committed by both, and in comparing the two, we are often obliged to employ the emphatic language which Tacitus uses respecting Otho and Vitellius—“*deteriorem fore, quisquis vicisset*”—of two bad men all that the Roman world could foresee was, that the victor, whichever he was, would prove the worst.

But in regard to the Korkyræan revolution, we can arrive at a more discriminating criticism. We see that it is from the

beginning the work of a selfish oligarchical party, playing the game of a foreign enemy, and the worst and most ancient enemy, of the island,—aiming to subvert the existing democracy and acquire power for themselves—and ready to employ any measure of fraud or violence for the attainment of these objects. While the democracy which they attack is purely defensive and conservative, the oligarchical movers, having tried fair means in vain, are the first to employ foul means, which latter they find retorted with greater effect against themselves. They set the example of judicial prosecution against Peithias, for the destruction of a political antagonist ; in the use of this same weapon, he proves more than a match for them, and employs it to their ruin. Next, they pass to the use of the dagger in the senate-house against him and his immediate fellow-leaders, and to the wholesale application of the sword against the democracy generally. The Korkyræan Demos are thus thrown upon the defensive. Instead of the affections of ordinary life, all the most intense anti-social sentiments—fear, pugnacity, hatred, vengeance,—obtained unqualified possession of their bosoms ; exaggerated too through the fluctuations of victory and defeat, successively brought by Nikostratus, Alkidas, and Eurymedon. Their conduct as victors is such as we should expect under such maddening circumstances, from coarse men mingled with liberated slaves. It is vindictive and murderous in the extreme, not without faithless breach of assurances given. But we must remember that they are driven to stand upon their defence, and that all their energies are indispensable to make that defence successful. They are provoked by an aggression no less guilty in the end than in the means—an aggression, too, the more gratuitous, because, if we look at the state of the island at the time when the oligarchical captives were restored from Corinth, there was no pretence for affirming that it had suffered, or was suffering, any loss, hardship, or disgrace, from its alliance with Athens. These oligarchical insurgents find the island in a state of security and tranquillity—since the war imposed upon it little necessity for effort. They plunge it into a sea of blood, with enormities as well as suffering on both sides, which end at length in their own complete extermination. Our compassion for their final misery must not hinder us from appreciating the behaviour whereby it was earned.

In the course of a few years from this time, we shall have occasion to recount two political movements in Athens similar in principle and general result to this Korkyræan revolution ;

exhibiting oligarchical conspirators against an existing and conservative democracy—with this conspiracy at first successful, but afterwards put down, and the Demos again restored. The contrast between Athens and Korkyra under such circumstances will be found highly instructive, especially in regard to the Demos both in the hours of defeat and in those of victory. It will then be seen how much the habit of active participation in political and judicial affairs,—of open, conflicting discussion, discharging the malignant passions by way of speech, and followed by appeal to the vote—of having constantly present, to the mind of every citizen in his character of *Dikast* or *Ekklesiast*, the conditions of a pacific society, and the paramount authority of a constitutional majority—how much all these circumstances, brought home as they were at Athens more than in any other democracy to the feelings of individuals, contributed to soften the instincts of intestine violence and revenge, even under very great provocation.

But the case of Korkyra, as well as that of Athens, different in so many respects, conspire to illustrate another truth, of much importance in Grecian history. Both of them show how false and impudent were the pretensions set up by the rich and great men of the various Grecian cities, to superior morality, superior intelligence, and greater fitness for using honourably and beneficially the powers of government, as compared with the mass of the citizens. Though the Grecian oligarchies, exercising powerful sway over fashion, and more especially over the meaning of words, bestowed upon themselves the appellation of “the best men, the honourable and good, the elegant, the superior,” &c., and attached to those without their own circle epithets of a contrary tenor, implying low moral attributes—no such difference will be found borne out by the facts of Grecian history.¹ Abundance of infirmity, with occasional bad passions, was doubtless liable to work upon the people generally, often corrupting and misguiding even the Athenian democracy, the best apparently of all the democracies in Greece. But after all, the rich and great men were only a part of the people, and taking them as a class (apart from honourable individual exceptions) by no means the best part. If exempted by their position from some of the vices which beset smaller and poorer men, they imbibed from that same position an unmeasured self importance—and an excess of personal ambition as well as of personal appetite—peculiar to

¹ See the valuable preliminary discourse, prefixed to Welcker's edition of Theognis, page xxi. sect. 9 *seq.*

themselves, not less anti-social in tendency, and operating upon a much grander scale. To the prejudices and superstitions belonging to the age, they were noway superior, considering them as a class; while their animosities among one another, virulent and unscrupulous, were among the foremost causes of misfortune in Grecian commonwealths. Indeed many of the most exceptionable acts committed by the democracies, consisted in their allowing themselves to be made the tools of one aristocrat for the ruin of another. Of the intense party-selfishness which characterised them as a body, sometimes exaggerated into the strongest anti-popular antipathy, as we see in the famous oligarchical oath cited by Aristotle,¹—we shall find many illustrations as we advance in the history, but none more striking than this Korkyræan revolution.

CHAPTER LI

FROM THE TROUBLES IN KORKYRA, IN THE FIFTH YEAR OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR, DOWN TO THE END OF THE SIXTH YEAR

ABOUT the same time as the troubles of Korkyra occurred, Nikias the Athenian general conducted an armament against the rocky island of Minôa, which lay at the mouth of the harbour of Megara, and was occupied by a Megarian fort and garrison. The narrow channel, which separated it from the Megarian port of Nisæa and formed the entrance of the harbour, was defended by two towers projecting out from Nisæa, which Nikias attacked and destroyed by means of battering machines from his ships. He thus cut off Minôa from communication on that side with the Megarians, and fortified it on the other side, where it communicated with the main land by a lagoon bridged over with a causeway. Minôa, thus becoming thoroughly insulated, was more completely fortified and made an Athenian possession; since it was eminently convenient to keep up an effective blockade against the Megarian harbour, which the Athenians had hitherto done only from the opposite shore of Salamis.²

¹ Aristot. Politic. v. 7, 19. Καὶ τῇ δῆμῳ κακόνους ἔσομαι, καὶ βουλευσώ ὃ, τι ἂν ἔχω κακόν.

² Thucyd. iii. 51. See the note of Dr. Arnold, and the plan embodied in his work, for the topography of Minôa, which has now ceased to be an island, and is a hill on the mainland near the shore.

Fifth and Sixth Years of War 301

Though Nikias, son of Nikeratus, had been for some time conspicuous in public life, and is said to have been more than once Stratêgus along with Periklês, this is the first occasion on which Thucydîdês introduces him to our notice. He was now one of the Stratêgi or generals of the commonwealth, and appears to have enjoyed, on the whole, a greater and more constant personal esteem than any citizen of Athens, from the present time down to his death. In wealth and in family, he ranked among the first class of Athenians: in political character, Aristotle placed him, together with Thucydîdês son of Melêsias and Theramenês, above all other names in Athenian history—seemingly even above Periklês.¹

Such a criticism, from Aristotle, deserves respectful attention, though the facts before us completely belie so lofty an estimate. It marks, however, the position occupied by Nikias in Athenian politics, as the principal person of what may be called the oligarchical party, succeeding Kimon and Thucydîdês, and preceding Theramenês. In looking to the conditions under which this party continued to subsist, we shall see that during the interval between Thucydîdês (son of Melêsias) and Nikias, the democratical forms had acquired such confirmed ascendancy, that it would not have suited the purpose of any politician to betray evidence of positive hostility to them, prior to the Sicilian expedition and the great embarrassment in the foreign relations of Athens which arose out of that disaster. After that change, the Athenian oligarchs became emboldened and aggressive, so that we shall find Theramenês among the chief conspirators in the revolution of the Four Hundred. But Nikias represents the oligarchical party in its previous state of quiescence and torpidity, accommodating itself to a sovereign democracy, and existing in the form of common sentiment rather than of common purposes. And it is a remarkable illustration of the real temper of the Athenian people, that a man of this character, known as an oligarch but not feared as such, and doing his duty sincerely to the democracy, should have remained until his death the most esteemed and influential man in the city.

Nikias was a man of even mediocrity, in intellect, in education, and in oratory: forward in his military duties, and not only personally courageous in the field, but hitherto found competent as a general under ordinary circumstances:²

¹ Plutarch, Nikias, c. 2, 3.

² Καίτοι ἔγωγε καὶ τιμῶμαι ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου (says Nikias in the Athenian assembly, Thucyd. vi. 9) καὶ ἥσσον ἐτέρων περὶ τῷ ἑμαυτοῦ σώματι

assiduous, too, in the discharge of all political duties at home, especially in the post of Stratêgus or one of the ten generals of the state, to which he was frequently chosen and rechosen. Of the many valuable qualities combined in his predecessor Periklês, the 'recollection of whom was yet fresh in the Athenian mind, Nikias possessed two, on which, most of all, his influence rested,—though, properly speaking, that influence belongs to the sum total of his character, and not to any special attributes in it: First, he was thoroughly incorruptible as to pecuniary gains—a quality so rare in Grecian public men of all the cities, that when a man once became notorious for possessing it, he acquired a greater degree of trust than any superiority of intellect could have bestowed upon him: next, he adopted the Periklean view as to the necessity of a conservative or stationary foreign policy for Athens, avoiding new acquisitions at a distance, adventurous risks, or provocation to fresh enemies. With this important point of analogy there were at the same time material differences between them even in regard to foreign policy. Periklês was a conservative, resolute against submitting to loss or abstraction of empire, but at the same time refraining from aggrandisement: Nikias was in policy faint-hearted, averse to energetic effort for any purpose whatever, and disposed not only to maintain peace, but even to purchase it by considerable sacrifices. Nevertheless, he was the leading champion of the conservative party of his day, always powerful at Athens: and as he was constantly familiar with the details and actual course of public affairs, capable of giving full effect to the cautious and prudential point of view, and enjoying unqualified credit for honest purposes—his value as a permanent counsellor was steadily recognised, even though in particular cases his counsel might not be followed.

Besides these two main points, which Nikias had in common with Periklês, he was perfect in the use of minor and collateral modes of standing well with the people, which that great man had taken but little pains to practise. While Periklês attached himself to Aspasia, whose splendid qualities did not redeem in the eyes of the public either her foreign origin or her unchastity, the domestic habits of Nikias appear to have been strictly conformable to the rules of Athenian decorum. Periklês was surrounded by philosophers, Nikias by prophets

ὁ ῥῥωδῶ· νομίζων ὁμοίως ἀγαθὸν πολίτην εἶναι, ὅς ἂν καὶ τοῦ σώματος τι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας προνοῇται.

The whole conduct of Nikias before Syracuse, under the most trying circumstances, more than bears out this boast.

—whose advice was necessary both as a consolation to his temperament and as a guide to his intelligence under difficulties. One of them was constantly in his service and confidence, and his conduct appears to have been sensibly affected by the difference of character between one prophet and another,¹ just as the government of Louis XIV. and other Catholic princes has been modified by the change of confessors. To a life thus rigidly decorous and ultra-religious—both eminently acceptable to the Athenians—Nikias added the judicious employment of a large fortune with a view to popularity. Those liturgies (or expensive public duties undertaken by rich men, each in his turn, throughout other cities of Greece as well as in Athens) which fell to his lot, were performed with such splendour, munificence, and good taste, as to procure for him universal encomiums; and so much above his predecessors as to be long remembered and extolled. Most of these liturgies were connected with the religious service of the state, so that Nikias, by his manner of performing them, displayed his zeal for the honour of the gods at the same time that he laid up for himself a store of popularity. Moreover, the remarkable caution and timidity—not before an enemy, but in reference to his own fellow-citizens—which marked his character, rendered him pre-eminently scrupulous as to giving offence or making personal enemies. While his demeanour towards the poorer citizens generally was equal and conciliating, the presents which he made were numerous, both to gain friends and to silence assailants. We are not surprised to hear, that various bullies, whom the comic writers turn to scorn, made their profit out of this susceptibility. But most assuredly Nikias as a public man, though he might occasionally be cheated out of money, profited greatly by the reputation thus acquired.

The expenses unavoidable in such a career, combined with strict personal honesty, could not have been defrayed except by another quality, which ought not to count as discreditable to Nikias, though in this too he stood distinguished from Periklès. He was a careful and diligent money-getter; a speculator in the silver-mines of Laurium, and proprietor of one thousand slaves whom he let out for work in them, receiving a fixed sum per head for each. The superintending

¹ Thucyd. vii. 50; Plutarch, Nikias, c. 4, 5, 23. *Τῷ μέντοι Νικίᾳ συνηνέχθη τότε μηδὲ μάντιν ἔχειν ἐμπειρον· ὁ γὰρ συνήθης αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ πολὺ τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας ἀφαιρῶν Στιλβίδης ἐτεθήκει μικρὸν ἐμπροσθεν.* This is suggested by Plutarch as an excuse for mistakes on the part of Nikias.

slaves who managed the details of this business were men of great ability and high pecuniary value.¹ Most of the wealth of Nikias was held in this form, and not in landed property. Judging by what remains to us of the comic authors, this must have been considered as a perfectly gentlemanlike way of making money: for while they abound with derision of the leather-dresser Kleon, the lamp-maker Hyperbolus, and the vegetable-selling mother to whom Euripidēs owes his birth, we hear nothing from them in disparagement of the slave-letter Nikias.

The degree to which the latter was thus occupied with the care of his private fortune, together with the general moderation of his temper, made him often wish to abstract himself from public duty. But such unambitious reluctance, rare among the public men of the day, rather made the Athenians more anxious to put him forward and retain his services. In the eyes of the Pentakosiomedimni and the Hippeis, the two richest classes in Athens, he was one of themselves—and on the whole the best man, as being so little open to reproach or calumny, whom they could oppose to the leather-dressers and lamp-makers, who often out-talked them in the public assembly. The hoplites, who despised Kleon—and did not much regard even the brave, hardy, and soldierlike Lamachus, because he happened to be poor²—respected in Nikias the union of wealth and family with honesty, courage, and carefulness in command. The maritime and trading multitude esteemed him as a decorous, honest, religious gentleman, who gave splendid choregies, treated the poorest men with consideration, and never turned the public service into a job for his own profit—who moreover, if he possessed no commanding qualities, so as to give to his advice imperative and irresistible authority, was yet always worthy of being consulted, and a steady safeguard against public mischief. Before the fatal Sicilian expedition, he had never commanded on any very serious or difficult enterprise; but what he had done had been accomplished successfully; so that he enjoyed the reputation of a fortunate as well as a prudent commander.³

¹ Xenophon, Memorab. ii. 5, 2; Xenophon, De Vectigalibus, iv. 14.

² Thucyd. v. 7; Plutarch, Alkibiadēs, c. 21. Ὁ γὰρ Λάμαχος ἦν μὲν πολεμικὸς καὶ ἀνδρώδης, ἀξίωμα δ' οὐ προσήν οὐδ' ὕγκος αὐτῷ διὰ πέναν: compare Plutarch, Nikias, c. 15.

³ Thucyd. v. 16. Νικίας πλείστα τῶν τότε εὖ φερόμενος ἐν στρατηγίαις—Νικίας μὲν βουλόμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἀπαθὴς ἦν καὶ ἡξιούτο, διασώσασθαι τὴν εὐτυχίαν, &c.—vi. 17. ἕως ἐγώ τε (Alkibiadēs) ἐτι ἀκμάζω μετ' αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ Νικίας εὐτυχὴς δοκεῖ εἶναι, &c.

Fifth and Sixth Years of War 305

He appears to have acted as proxenus to the Lacedæmonians at Athens; probably by his own choice, and among several others.

The first half of the political life of Nikias,—after the time when he rose to enjoy full consideration in Athens, being already of mature age—was spent in opposition to Kleon; the last half, in opposition to Alkibiadēs. To employ terms which are not fully suitable to the Athenian democracy, but which yet bring to view the difference intended to be noted better than any others, Nikias was a minister or ministerial man, often actually exercising, and always likely to exercise, official functions—Kleon was a man of the opposition, whose province it was to supervise and censure official men for their public conduct. We must divest these words of that accompaniment which they are understood to carry in English political life—a standing parliamentary majority in favour of one party: Kleon would often carry in the public assembly resolutions, which his opponents Nikias and others of like rank and position—who served in the posts of Stratēgus, ambassador, and other important offices designated by the general vote—were obliged against their will to execute.

In attaining such offices they were assisted by the political clubs, or established *conspiracies* (to translate the original literally) among the leading Athenians to stand by each other both for acquisition of office and for mutual insurance under judicial trial. These clubs, or Hetæries, must have played an important part in the practical working of Athenian politics, and it is much to be regretted that we are possessed of no details respecting them. We know that in Athens they were thoroughly oligarchical in disposition¹—while equality, or

¹ Thucyd. viii. 54. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Πείσανδρος τὰς τε ξυνωμοσίας, αἵπερ ἐτύγχανον πρότερον ἐν τῇ πόλει οὖσαι ἐπὶ δίκαις καὶ ἀρχαῖς, ἀπάσας ἐπελθὼν καὶ παρακελευσάμενος ὅπως ξυστραφέντες καὶ κοινῇ βουλευσάμενοι καταλύουσιν τὸν δῆμον, καὶ τὰλλα παρασκευάσας, &c.

After having thus organised the Hetæries, and brought them into co-operation for his revolutionary objects against the democracy, Peisander departed from Athens to Samos: on his return he finds that these Hetæries have been very actively employed, and had made great progress towards the subversion of the democracy: they had assassinated the demagogue Androklēs and various other political enemies—οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν Πείσανδρον—ἦλθον ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας,—καὶ καταλαμβάνουσι τὰ πλείστα τοῖς ἐταίροις προειργασμένα, &c. (viii. 65).

The political *ἐταιρεία* to which Alkibiadēs belonged is mentioned in Isokratēs, De Bigis, Or. xvi. p. 348, sect. 6. λέγοντες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ συνάγοι τὴν ἑταιρείαν ἐπὶ νεωτέροις πράγμασι. Allusions to these *ἐταιρεῖαι* and to their well-known political and judicial purposes

something near to it, in rank and position, must have been essential to the social harmony of the members. In some towns, it appears that such political associations existed under the form of *gymnasia*¹ for the mutual exercise of the members, or of *syssitia* for joint banquets. At Athens they were numerous, and doubtless not habitually in friendship with each other; since the antipathies among different oligarchical men were exceedingly strong, and the union brought about between them at the time of the Four Hundred, arising only out of common desire to put down the democracy, lasted but a little while. But the designation of persons to serve in the capacity of *Stratêgus* and other principal offices greatly depended upon them—as well as the facility of passing through that trial of accountability to which every man was liable after his year of office. *Nikias*, and men generally of his rank and fortune, helped by these clubs and lending help in their turn, composed what may be called the ministers, or executive individual functionaries of Athens: the men who acted, gave orders as to specific acts, and saw to the execution of that which the senate and the public assembly resolved. Especially in regard to the military and naval force of the city, so large and so actively employed at this time, the powers of detail possessed by the *Stratêgi* must have been very great, and essential to the safety of the state.

While *Nikias* was thus in what may be called ministerial function, *Kleon* was not of sufficient importance to attain the same, but was confined to the inferior function of opposition. We shall see in the coming chapter how he became as it were promoted, partly by his own superior penetration, partly by the dishonest artifice and misjudgement of *Nikias* and other opponents, in the affair of *Sphakteria*. But his vocation was now to find fault, to censure, to denounce; his theatre of action

(unfortunately they are only allusions) are found in Plato, *Theætet.* c. 79, p. 173. *σπουδαὶ δὲ ἑταιρειῶν ἐπ' ἀρχάς*, &c.: also Plato, *Legg.* ix. c. 3, p. 856; Plato, *Republic.* ii. c. 8, p. 365, where they are mentioned in conjunction with *συνωμοσίαι*—*ἐπὶ γὰρ τὸ λαμβάνειν συνωμοσίας τε καὶ ἑταιρείας συνάγομεν*—also in Pseudo-Andokidês cont. *Alkibiad.* c. 2, p. 112. Compare the general remarks of *Thucydidês*, iii. 82, and *Demosthenês* cont. *Stephan.* ii. p. 1157.

Two Dissertations, by Messrs. Vischer and Büttner, collect the scanty indications respecting these *Heteries*, together with some attempts to enlarge and speculate upon them, which are more ingenious than trustworthy (*Die Oligarchische Partei und die Hetairen in Athen*, von W. Vischer, Basel, 1836; *Geschichte der politischen Hetairien zu Athen*, von Hermann Büttner, Leipsic, 1840).

¹ About the political workings of the *Syssitia* and *Gymnasia*, see Plato, *Legg.* i. p. 636; *Polybius*, xx. 6.

was the senate, the public assembly, the dikasteries ; his principal talent was that of speech, in which he must unquestionably have surpassed all his contemporaries. The two gifts which had been united in Periklês—superior capacity for speech, as well as for action—were now severed, and had fallen, though both in greatly inferior degree, the one to Nikias, the other to Kleon. As an opposition-man, fierce and violent in temper, Kleon was extremely formidable to all acting functionaries ; and from his influence in the public assembly, he was doubtless the author of many important positive measures, thus going beyond the functions belonging to what is called opposition. But though the most effective speaker in the public assembly, he was not for that reason the most influential person in the democracy. His powers of speech in fact stood out the more prominently, because they were found apart from that station and those qualities which were considered, even at Athens, all but essential to make a man a leader in political life.

To understand the political condition of Athens at this time, it has been necessary to take this comparison between Nikias and Kleon, and to remark, that though the latter might be a more victorious speaker, the former was the more guiding and influential leader. The points gained by Kleon were all noisy and palpable, sometimes however, without doubt, of considerable moment—but the course of affairs was much more under the direction of Nikias.

It was during the summer of this year (the fifth of the war—B.C. 427) that the Athenians began operations on a small scale in Sicily ; probably contrary to the advice both of Nikias and Kleon, neither of them seemingly favourable to these distant undertakings. I reserve however the series of Athenian measures in Sicily—which afterwards became the turning-point of the fortunes of the state—for a department by themselves. I shall take them up separately, and bring them down to the Athenian expedition against Syracuse, when I reach the date of that important event.

During the autumn of the same year, the epidemic disorder, after having intermitted for some time, resumed its ravages at Athens, and continued for one whole year longer, to the sad ruin both of the strength and the comfort of the city. And it seems that this autumn, as well as the ensuing summer, were distinguished by violent atmospheric and terrestrial disturbance. Numerous earthquakes were experienced at Athens, in Eubœa, in Bœotia, especially near Orchomenus. Sudden waves of the sea and unexampled tides were also felt on the coast of Eubœa

and Lokris, and the islands of Atalantê and Peparêthus; the Athenian fort and one of the two guard-ships at Atalantê were partially destroyed. The earthquakes produced one effect favourable to Athens. They deterred the Lacedæmonians from invading Attica. Agis king of Sparta had already reached the isthmus for that purpose; but repeated earthquakes were looked upon as an unfavourable portent, and the scheme was abandoned.¹

These earthquakes however were not considered sufficient to deter the Lacedæmonians from the foundation of Herakleia, a new colony near the strait of Thermopylæ. On this occasion, we hear of a branch of the Greek population not before mentioned during the war. The coast north-west of the strait of Thermopylæ was occupied by the three subdivisions of the Malians—Paralii, Hierês, and Trachinians. These latter, immediately adjoining Mount Ceta on its north side—as well as the Dorians (the little tribe properly so called, which was accounted the primitive hearth of the Dorians generally) who joined the same mountain range on the south—were both of them harassed and plundered by the predatory mountaineers, probably Ætolians, on the high lands between them. At first the Trachinians were disposed to throw themselves on the protection of Athens. But not feeling sufficiently assured as to the way in which she would deal with them, they joined with the Dorians in claiming aid from Sparta: in fact, it does not appear that Athens, possessing naval superiority only and being inferior on land, could have given them effective aid.

The Lacedæmonians, eagerly embracing the opportunity, determined to plant a strong colony in this tempting situation. There was wood in the neighbouring regions for ship-building,² so that they might hope to acquire a naval position for attacking the neighbouring island of Eubœa, while the passage of troops against the subject-allies of Athens in Thrace, would also be facilitated; the impracticability of such passage had forced them, three years before, to leave Potidæa to its fate. A considerable body of colonists, Spartans and Lacedæmonian Perioeki, was assembled under the conduct of three Spartan Cækists—Leon, Damagon, and Alkidas; the latter (we are to presume, though Thucydides does not say so) the same admiral who had met with such little success in Ionia and at Korkyra. Proclamation was further made to invite the junction

¹ Thucyd. iii. 87, 89, 90.

² Respecting this abundance of wood, as well as the site of Herakleia generally, consult Livy, xxxvi. 22.

Fifth and Sixth Years of War 309

of all other Greeks as colonists, excepting by name Ionians, Achæans, and some other tribes not here specified. Probably the distinct exclusion of the Achæans must have been rather the continuance of ancient sentiment than dictated by any present reasons; since the Achæans were not now pronounced enemies of Sparta. A number of colonists, stated as not less than 10,000, flocked to the place, having confidence in the stability of the colony under the powerful protection of Sparta. The new town, of large circuit, was built and fortified under the name of Herakleia;¹ not far from the site of Trachis, about two miles and a quarter from the nearest point of the Maliac Gulf, and about double that distance from the strait of Thermopylæ. Near to the latter, and for the purpose of keeping effective possession of it, a port with dock and accommodation for shipping was constructed.

A populous city, established under Lacedæmonian protection in this important post, alarmed the Athenians, and created much expectation in every part of Greece. But the Lacedæmonian Cækists were harsh and unskilful in their management; while the Thessalians, to whom the Trachinian territory was tributary, considered the colony as an encroachment upon their soil. Anxious to prevent its increase, they harassed it with hostilities from the first moment. The Cætean assailants were also active enemies; so that Herakleia, thus pressed from without and misgoverned within, dwindled down from its original numbers and promise, barely maintaining its existence.² We shall find it in later times, however, revived, and becoming a place of considerable importance.

The main Athenian armament of this summer, consisting of sixty triremes under Nikias, undertook an expedition against the island of Melos. Melos and Thera, both inhabited by ancient colonists from Lacedæmon, had never been from the beginning, and still refused to be, members of the Athenian alliance or subjects of the Athenian empire. They thus stood out as exceptions to all the other islands in the Ægean, and the Athenians thought themselves authorised to resort to constraint and conquest; believing themselves entitled to command over all the islands. They might indeed urge, and with considerable plausibility, that the Melians now enjoyed

¹ Diodor. xii. 59. Not merely was Hēraklēs the mythical progenitor of the Spartan kings, but the whole region near Cēta and Trachis was adorned by legends and heroic incidents connected with him: see the drama of the Trachiniæ by Sophoklēs.

² Thucyd. iii. 92, 93; Diodor. xi. 49; xii. 59.

their share of the protection of the *Ægean* from piracy, without contributing to the cost of it: but considering the obstinate reluctance and strong philo-Laonian prepossessions of the Melians, who had taken no part in the war and given no ground of offence to Athens, the attempt to conquer them by force could hardly be justified even as a calculation of gain and loss, and was a mere gratification to the pride of power in carrying out what, in modern days, we should call the principle of maritime empire. Melos and Thera formed awkward corners, which defaced the symmetry of a great proprietor's field; ¹ and the former ultimately entailed upon Athens the heaviest of all losses—a deed of blood which deeply dishonoured her annals. On this occasion, Nikias visited the island with his fleet, and after vainly summoning the inhabitants, ravaged the lands, but retired without undertaking a siege. He then sailed away, and came to Orôpus, on the north-east frontier of Attica bordering on Bœotia. The hoplites on board his ships, landing in the night, marched into the interior of Bœotia to the vicinity of Tanagra. They were here met, according to signal raised, by a military force from Athens which marched thither by land; and the joint Athenian army ravaged the Tanagræan territory, gaining an insignificant advantage over its defenders. On retiring, Nikias re-assembled his armament, sailed northward along the coast of Lokris with the usual ravages, and returned home without effecting anything further.²

About the same time that he started, thirty other Athenian triremes, under Demosthenês and Proklês, had been sent round Peloponnesus to act upon the coast of Akarnania. In conjunction with the whole Akarnanian force, except the men of *Œniadæ*—with fifteen triremes from Korkyra and some troops from Kephallenia and Zakynthos—they ravaged the whole territory of Leukas, both within and without the isthmus, and confined the inhabitants to their town, which was too strong to be taken by anything but a wall of circumvallation and a tedious blockade. And the Akarnanians, to whom the city was especially hostile, were urgent with Demosthenês to undertake this measure forthwith, since the opportunity might not again recur, and success was nearly certain.

But this enterprising officer committed the great imprudence of offending them on a matter of great importance, in order

¹ Horat. Sat. ii. 6. 8—

O ! si angulus iste
Proximus accedat, qui nunc denormat agellum !

² Thucyd. iii. 91.

to attack a country of all others the most impracticable—the interior of Ætolia. The Messenians of Naupaktus, who suffered from the depredations of the neighbouring Ætolian tribes, inflamed his imagination by suggesting to him a grand scheme of operations,¹ more worthy of the large force which he commanded than the mere reduction of Leukas. The various tribes of Ætolians—rude, brave, active, predatory, and unrivalled in the use of the javelin, which they rarely laid out of their hands—stretched across the country from between Parnassus and Ceta to the eastern bank of the Achelôus. The scheme suggested by the Messenians was that Demosthenês should attack the great central Ætolian tribes—the Apodôti, Ophioneis, and Eurytânes :—if they were conquered, all the remaining continental tribes between the Ambrakian Gulf and Mount Parnassus might be invited or forced into the alliance of Athens—the Akarnanians being already included in it. Having thus got the command of a large continental force,² Demosthenês contemplated the ulterior scheme of marching at the head of it on the west of Parnassus through the territory of the Ozolian Lokrians—inhabiting the north of the Corinthian Gulf, friendly to Athens, and enemies to the Ætolians, whom they resembled both in their habits and in their fighting—until he arrived at Kitynium in Doris, in the upper portion of the valley of the river Kephisus. He would then easily descend that valley into the territory of the Phokians, who were likely to join the Athenians if a favourable opportunity occurred, but who might at any rate be constrained to do so. From Phokis, the scheme was to invade from the northward the conterminous territory of Boeotia, the great enemy of Athens ; which might thus perhaps be completely subdued, if assailed at the same time from Attica. Any Athenian general, who could have executed this comprehensive scheme would have acquired at home a high and well-merited celebrity. But Demosthenês had been ill-informed both as to the invincible barbarians, and the pathless country, comprehended under the name of Ætolia. Some of the tribes spoke a language scarcely intelligible to

¹ Thucyd. iii. 94. Δημοσθένης δ' ἀναπείθεται κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον ὑπὸ Μεσσηνίων ὡς καλὸν αὐτῷ στρατιᾶς τοσαύτης ξυνειλεγμένης, &c.

² Thucyd. iii. 94. τὸ ἄλλο ἡπειρωτικὸν τὸ ταύτη. None of the tribes, properly called Epirots, would be comprised in this expression : the name ἡπειρώται is here a general name (not a proper name), as Poppe and Dr. Arnold remark. Demosthenês would calculate on getting under his orders the Akarnanians and Ætolians, and some other tribes besides ; but *what* other tribes, it is not easy to specify : perhaps the Agræi, east of Amphilochia, among them.

Greeks, and even ate their meat raw; while the country has even down to the present time remained not only unconquered, but untraversed by an enemy in arms.

Demosthenês accordingly retired from Leukas, in spite of the remonstrance of the Akarnanians, who not only could not be induced to accompany him, but went home in visible disgust. He then sailed with his other forces—Messenians, Kephallenians, and Zakynthians—to Æneon in the territory of the Ozolian Lokrians, a maritime township on the Corinthian Gulf, not far eastward of Naupaktus—where his army was disembarked, together with 300 epibatæ (or marines) from the triremes—including on this occasion, what was not commonly the case on shipboard,¹ some of the choice hoplites, selected all from young men of the same age, on the Athenian muster-roll. Having passed the night in the sacred precinct of Zeus Nemeus at Æneon, memorable as the spot where the poet Hesiod was said to have been slain, he marched early in the morning, under the guidance of the Messenian Chromon, into Ætolia. On the first day he took Potidania, on the second Krokyleium, on the third Teichium—all of them villages unfortified and undefended, for the inhabitants abandoned them and fled to the mountains above. He was here inclined to halt and await the junction of the Ozolian Lokrians, who had engaged to invade Ætolia at the same time, and were almost indispensable to his success, from their familiarity with Ætolian warfare, and their similarity of weapons. But the

¹ Thucyd. iii. 98. The Epibatæ, or soldiers serving on shipboard (marines), were more usually taken from the Thetes, or the poorest class of citizens, furnished by the state with a panoply for the occasion—not from the regular hoplites on the muster-roll. Maritime soldiery is therefore usually spoken of as something inferior: the present triremes of Demosthenês are noticed in the light of an exception (*ναυτικῆς καὶ φαύλου στρατιᾶς*, Thucyd. vi. 21).

So among the Romans, service in the legions was accounted higher and more honourable than that of the *classarii milites* (Tacit. *Histor.* i. 87).

The Athenian Epibatæ, though not forming a corps permanently distinct, correspond in function to the English marines, who seem to have been first distinguished permanently from other foot-soldiers about the year 1684. "It having been found necessary on many occasions to embark a number of soldiers on board our ships of war, and mere landmen being at first extremely unhealthy—and at first, until they had been accustomed to the sea, in a great measure unserviceable—it was at length judged expedient to appoint certain regiments for that service, who were trained to the different modes of sea-fighting and also made useful in some of those manœuvres of a ship where a great many hands were required. These from the nature of their duty were distinguished by the appellation of *maritime soldiers* or marines."—Grose's *Military Antiquities of the English Army*, vol. i. p. 186. (London, 1786.)

Messenians again persuaded him to advance without delay into the interior, in order that the villages might be separately attacked and taken before any collective force could be gathered together: and Demosthenês was so encouraged by having as yet encountered no resistance, that he advanced to Ægítium, which he also found deserted, and captured without opposition.

Here however was the term of his good fortune. The mountains round Ægítium were occupied not only by the inhabitants of that village, but also by the entire force of Ætolia, collected even from the distant tribes Bomiês and Kalliês, who bordered on the Maliac Gulf. The invasion of Demosthenês had become known beforehand to the Ætolians, who not only forewarned all their own tribes of the approaching enemy, but also sent ambassadors to Sparta and Corinth to ask for aid.¹ However they showed themselves fully capable of defending their own territory without foreign aid. Demosthenês found himself assailed in his position at Ægítium, on all sides at once by these active highlanders armed with javelins, pouring down from the neighbouring hills. Not engaging in any close combat, they retreated when the Athenians advanced forward to charge them—resuming their aggression the moment that the pursuers, who could never advance far in consequence of the ruggedness of the ground, began to return to the main body. The small number of bowmen along with Demosthenês for some time kept their unshielded assailants at bay. But the officer commanding the bowmen was presently slain; the stock of arrows became nearly exhausted; and what was still worse, Chromon the Messenian, the only man who knew the country and could serve as guide, was slain also. The bowmen became thus either ineffective or dispersed; while the hoplites exhausted themselves in vain attempts to pursue and beat off an active enemy, who always returned upon them and in every successive onset thinned and distressed them more and more. At length

¹ Thucyd. iii. 100. Προπέμψαντες πρότερον ἔς τε Κόρινθον καὶ ἔς Λακεδαίμονα πρέσβεις—πείθουσιν ὥστε σφίσι πέμψαι στρατιὰν ἐπὶ Ναύπακτον διὰ τὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπαγωγὴν.

It is not here meant, I think (as Göller and Dr. Arnold suppose), that the Ætolians sent envoys to Lacedæmon before there was any talk or thought of the invasion of Ætolia, simply in prosecution of the standing antipathy which they bore to Naupaktus; but that they had sent envoys immediately when they heard of the preparations for invading Ætolia—yet before the invasion actually took place. The words διὰ τὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπαγωγὴν show that this is the meaning.

The word ἐπαγωγή is rightly construed by Haack, against the Scholiast—"because the Naupaktians were bringing in the Athenians to invade Ætolia."

the force of Demosthenês was completely broken and compelled to take flight ; without beaten roads, without guides, and in a country not only strange to them, but impervious, from continual mountain, rock, and forest. Many of them were slain in the flight by pursuers, superior not less in rapidity of movement than in knowledge of the country : some even lost themselves in the forest, and perished miserably in flames kindled around them by the Ætolians. The fugitives were at length reassembled at Ceneon near the sea, with the loss of Proklês the colleague of Demosthenês in command, as well as of 120 hoplites, among the best armed and most vigorous in the Athenian muster-roll.¹ The remaining force was soon transported back from Naupaktus to Athens, but Demosthenês remained behind, being too much afraid of the displeasure of his countrymen to return at such a moment. It is certain that his conduct was such as justly to incur their displeasure ; and that the expedition against Ætolia, alienating an established ally and provoking a new enemy, had been conceived with a degree of rashness which nothing but the unexpected favour of fortune could have counterbalanced.

The force of the new enemy, whom his unsuccessful attack had raised into activity, soon made itself felt. The Ætolian envoys, who had been despatched to Sparta and Corinth, found it easy to obtain the promise of a considerable force to join them in an expedition against Naupaktus. About the month of September, a body of 3000 Peloponnesian hoplites, including 500 from the newly-founded colony of Herakleia, was assembled at Delphi, under the command of Eurylochus, Makarius, and Menedemus. Their road of march to Naupaktus lay through the territory of the Ozolian Lokrians, whom they proposed either to gain over or to subdue. With Amphissa, the largest Lokrian township and in the immediate neighbourhood of Delphi, they had little difficulty—for the Amphissians were in a state of feud with their neighbours on the other side of Parnassus, and were afraid that the new armament might become the instrument of Phokian antipathy against them. On the first application they joined the Spartan alliance, and gave hostages for their fidelity to it : moreover they persuaded many other Lokrian petty villages—among others the Myoncis, who were masters of the most difficult pass on the road—to do the same. Eurylochus received from these various townships reinforcements for his army, as well as hostages for their fidelity, whom he deposited at Kytinium in Doris : and he was thus

¹ Thucyd. iii. 98.

enabled to march through all the territory of the Ozolian Lokrians without resistance; except from Cēneon and Eupalion, both which places he took by force. Having arrived in the territory of Naupaktus, he was there joined by the full force of the Ætolians. Their joint efforts, after laying waste all the neighbourhood, captured the Corinthian colony of Molykreion, which had become subject to the Athenian empire.¹

Naupaktus, with a large circuit of wall and thinly defended, was in the greatest danger, and would certainly have been taken, had it not been saved by the efforts of the Athenian Demosthenēs, who had remained there ever since the unfortunate Ætolian expedition. Apprised of the coming march of Eurylochus, he went personally to the Akarnanians, and persuaded them to send a force to aid in the defence of Naupaktus. For a long time they turned a deaf ear to his solicitations in consequence of the refusal to blockade Leukas—but they were at length induced to consent. At the head of 1000 Akarnanian hoplites, Demosthenēs threw himself into Naupaktus, and Eurylochus, seeing that the town had been thus placed out of the reach of attack, abandoned all his designs upon it—marching farther westward to the neighbouring territories of Ætolia—Kalydon, Pleuron and Proschium, near the Achelōus and the borders of Akarnania.

The Ætolians, who had come down to join him for the common purpose of attacking Naupaktus, here abandoned him and retired to their respective homes. But the Ambrakiots, rejoiced to find so considerable a Peloponnesian force in their neighbourhood, prevailed upon him to assist them in attacking the Amphilochian Argos as well as Akarnania; assuring him that there was now a fair prospect of bringing the whole of the population of the mainland, between the Ambrakian and Corinthian Gulfs, under the supremacy of Lacedæmon. Having persuaded Eurylochus thus to keep his forces together and ready, they themselves with 3000 Ambrakiot hoplites invaded the territory of the Amphilochian Argos, and captured the fortified hill of Olpæ immediately bordering on the Ambrakian Gulf, about three miles from Argos itself; a hill employed in former days by the Akarnanians as a place for public judicial congress of the whole nation.²

This enterprise, communicated forthwith to Eurylochus, was the signal for movement on both sides. The Akarnanians, marching with their whole force to the protection of Argos,

¹ Thucyd. iii. 101, 102.

² Thucyd. iii. 102-105.

occupied a post called Krênæ in the Amphilochian territory, to prevent Eurylochus from effecting his junction with the Ambrakiots at Olpæ. They at the same time sent urgent messages to Demosthenês at Naupaktus, and to the Athenian guard-squadron of twenty triremes under Aristotelês and Hierophon, entreating their aid in the present need, and inviting Demosthenês to act as their commander. They had forgotten their displeasure against him arising out of his recent refusal to blockade at Leukas—for which they probably thought that he had been sufficiently punished by his disgrace at Ætolia; while they knew and esteemed his military capacity. In fact, the accident whereby he had been detained at Naupaktus now worked fortunately for them as well as for him. It secured to them a commander whom all of them respected, obviating the jealousies among their own numerous petty townships—it procured for him the means of retrieving his own reputation at Athens. Demosthenês, not backward in seizing this golden opportunity, came speedily into the Ambrakian Gulf with the twenty triremes, conducting 200 Messenian hoplites and sixty Athenian bowmen. Finding the whole Akarnanian force concentrated at the Amphilochian Argos, he was named general, nominally along with the Akarnanian generals, but in reality enjoying the whole direction of operations.

He found also the whole of the enemy's force, both the 3000 Ambrakiot hoplites and the Peloponnesian division under Eurylochus, already united and in position at Olpæ, about three miles off. For Eurylochus, as soon as he was apprised that the Ambrakiots had reached Olpæ, broke up forthwith his camp at Proschium in Ætolia, knowing that his best chance of traversing the hostile territory of Akarnania consisted in celerity: the whole Akarnanian force however had already gone to Argos, so that his march was unopposed through that country. He crossed the Acheiôus, marched westward of Stratus, through the Akarnanian townships of Phytia, Medeon, and Limnæa, then quitting both Akarnania and the direct road from Akarnania to Argos, he struck rather eastward into the mountainous district of Thyamus in the territory of the Agræans, who were enemies of the Akarnanians. From hence he descended at night into the territory of Argos, and passed unobserved, under cover of the darkness, between Argos itself and the Akarnanian force at Krênæ, so as to join in safety the 3000 Ambrakiots at Olpæ, to their great joy. They had feared that the enemy at Argos and Krênæ would have arrested his passage; and believing their force inadequate to contend alone, they had sent

pressing messages home to demand large reinforcements for themselves and their own protection.¹

Demosthenês, thus finding a united and formidable enemy, superior in number to himself, at Olpæ, conducted his troops from Argos and Krênæ to attack them. The ground was rugged and mountainous, and between the two armies lay a steep ravine, which neither liked to be the first to pass; so that they lay for five days inactive. If Herodotus had been our historian, he would probably have ascribed this delay to unfavourable sacrifices (which may indeed have been the case), and would have given us interesting anecdotes respecting the prophets on both sides; but the more positive and practical genius of Thucydidês merely acquaints us, that on the sixth day both armies put themselves in order of battle—both probably tired of waiting. The ground being favourable for ambuscade, Demosthenês hid in a bushy dell 400 hoplites and light-armed, so that they might spring up suddenly in the midst of the action upon the Peloponnesian left, which outflanked his right. He was himself on the right with the Messenians and some Athenians, opposed to Eurylochus on the left of the enemy: the Akarnanians with the Amphilochian akontists or darters occupied his left, opposed to the Ambrakiot hoplites: Ambrakiots and Peloponnesians were however intermixed in the line of Eurylochus, and it was only the Mantineans who maintained a separate station of their own towards the left centre. The battle accordingly began, and Eurylochus with his superior numbers was proceeding to surround Demosthenês, when on a sudden the men in ambush rose up and set upon his rear. A panic seized his men, who made no resistance worthy of their Peloponnesian reputation: they broke and fled, while Eurylochus, doubtless exposing himself with peculiar bravery in order to restore the battle, was early slain. Demosthenês, having near him his best troops, pressed them vigorously, and their panic communicated itself to the troops in the centre, so that all were put to flight and pursued to Olpæ. On the right of the line of Eurylochus, the Ambrakiots, the most warlike Greeks in the Epirotic regions, completely defeated the Akarnanians opposed to them, and carried their pursuit even as far as Argos. So complete however was the victory gained by Demosthenês over the remaining troops, that these Ambrakiots had great difficulty in fighting their way back to Olpæ, which was not accomplished without severe loss, and late in the evening. Among all the beaten troops, the Mantineans were

¹ Thucyd. iii. 105, 106, 107.

those who best maintained their retreating order.¹ The loss in the army of Demosthenês was about 300 ; that of the opponents much greater, but the number is not specified.

Of the three Spartan commanders, two, Eurylochus and Makarius, had been slain : the third, Menedæus, found himself beleaguered both by sea and land—the Athenian squadron being on guard along the coast. It would seem indeed that he might have fought his way to Ambrakia, especially as he would have met the Ambrakiot reinforcement coming from the city. But whether this were possible or not, the commander, too much dispirited to attempt it, took advantage of the customary truce granted for burying the dead, to open negotiations with Demosthenês and the Akarnanian generals, for the purpose of obtaining an unmolested retreat. This was peremptorily refused : but Demosthenês (with the consent of the Akarnanian leaders) secretly intimated to the Spartan commander and those immediately around him, together with the Mantineans and other Peloponnesian troops—that if they chose to make a separate and surreptitious retreat, abandoning their comrades, no opposition would be offered. He designed by this means not merely to isolate the Ambrakiots, the great enemies of Argos and Akarnania, along with the body of miscellaneous mercenaries who had come under Eurylochus—but also to obtain the more permanent advantage of disgracing the Spartans and Peloponnesians in the eyes of the Epirotic Greeks, as cowards and traitors to military fellowship. The very reason which prompted Demosthenês to grant a separate facility of escape, ought to have been imperative with Menedæus and the Peloponnesians around him, to make them spurn it with indignation. Yet such was their anxiety for personal safety, that this disgraceful convention was accepted, ratified, and carried into effect forthwith. It stands alone in Grecian history, as an example of separate treason in officers to purchase safety for themselves and their immediate comrades, by abandoning the general body under their command. Had the officers been Athenian, it would have been doubtless quoted as evidence of the pretended faithlessness of democracy. But as it was the act of a Spartan commander in conjunction with many leading Peloponnesians, we will only venture to remark upon it as a further manifestation of that intra-Peloponnesian selfishness, and carelessness of obligation towards extra-Peloponnesian Greeks, which we found so lamentably prevalent during the invasion of Xerxes ; in this case indeed heightened by the fact, that the

¹ Thucyd. iii. 107, 108 : compare Polyænus, iii. 1.

men deserted were fellow-Dorians and fellow-soldiers who had just fought in the same ranks. •

As soon as the ceremony of burying the dead had been completed, Menedæus, and the Peloponnesians who were protected by this secret convention, stole away slyly and in small bands under pretence of collecting wood and vegetables. On getting to a little distance, they quickened their pace and made off—much to the dismay of the Ambrakiots, who ran after them trying to overtake them. The Akarnanians pursued, and their leaders had much difficulty in explaining to them the secret convention just concluded. It was not without some suspicions of treachery, and even personal hazard from their own troops, that they at length caused the fugitive Peloponnesians to be respected; while the Ambrakiots, the most obnoxious of the two to Akarnanian feeling, were pursued without any reserve, and 200 of them were slain before they could escape into the friendly territory of the Agræans.¹ To distinguish Ambrakiots from Peloponnesians, similar in race and dialect, was however no easy task. Much dispute arose in individual cases.

Unfairly as this loss fell upon Ambrakia, a far more severe calamity was yet in store for her. The large reinforcement from the city, which had been urgently invoked by the detachment at Olpæ, started in due course as soon as they could be got ready, and entered the territory of Amphilochia about the time when the battle of Olpæ was fought; but ignorant of that misfortune, and hoping to arrive soon enough to stand by their friends. Their march was made known to Demosthenês, on the day after the battle, by the Amphilochians; who at the same time indicated to him the best way of surprising them in the rugged and mountainous road along which they had to march, at the two conspicuous peaks called Idomenê, immediately above a narrow pass leading farther on to Olpæ. It was known beforehand, by the line of march of the Ambrakiots, that they would rest for the night at the lower of these two peaks, ready to march through the pass on the next morning. On that same night a detachment of Amphilochians, under direction from Demosthenês, seized the higher of the two peaks; while that commander himself, dividing his forces into two divisions, started from his position at Olpæ in the evening after supper. One of these divisions, having the advantage of Amphilochian guides in their own country, marched by an unfrequented mountain road to Idomenê; the other, under Demosthenês himself, went directly through the pass leading

¹ Thucyd. iii. 111.

from Idomenê to Olpæ. After marching all night, they reached the camp of the Ambrakiots a little before daybreak—Demosthenês himself with his Messenians in the van. The surprise was complete. The Ambrakiots were found still lying down and asleep, while even the sentinels, uninformed of the recent battle—hearing themselves accosted in the Doric dialect by the Messenians, whom Demosthenês had placed in front for that express purpose—and not seeing very clearly in the morning twilight—mistook them for some of their own fellow-citizens coming back from the other camp. The Akarnanians and Messenians thus fell among the Ambrakiots sleeping and unarmed, and without any possibility of resistance. Large numbers of them were destroyed on the spot, and the remainder fled in all directions among the neighbouring mountains, none knowing the roads and the country. It was the country of the Amphilochians—subjects of Ambrakia, but subjects averse to their condition, and now making use of their perfect local knowledge and light-armed equipment, to inflict a terrible revenge on their masters. Some of the Ambrakiots became entangled in ravines—others fell into ambuscades laid by the Amphilochians. Others again, dreading most of all to fall into the hands of the Amphilochians—barbaric in race as well as intensely hostile in feeling—and seeing no other possibility of escaping them—swam off to the Athenian ships cruising along the shore. There were but a small proportion of them who survived to return to Ambrakia.¹

The complete victory of Idomenê, admirably prepared by Demosthenês, was achieved with scarce any loss. The Akarnanians, after erecting their trophy and despoiling the enemy's dead, prepared to carry off the arms thus taken to Argos.

On the morrow, however, before this was done, they were visited by a herald, coming from those Ambrakiots who had fled into the Agræan territory, after the battle of Olpæ and the subsequent pursuit. He came with the customary request from defeated soldiers, for permission to bury their dead who had fallen in that pursuit. Neither he, nor those from whom he came, knew anything of the destruction of their brethren at Idomenê—just as these latter had been ignorant of the defeat at Olpæ; while, on the other hand, the Akarnanians in the camp, whose minds were full of the more recent and capital advantage at Idomenê, supposed that the message referred to the men slain in that engagement. The numerous panoplies

¹ Thucyd. iii. 112.

just acquired at Idomenê lay piled up in the camp, and the herald, on seeing them, was struck with amazement at the size of the heap, so much exceeding the number of those who were missing in his own detachment. An Akarnanian present asked the reason of his surprise, and inquired how many of his comrades had been slain—meaning to refer to the slain at Idomenê. “About two hundred,” the herald replied.—“Yet these arms here show, not that number, but more than a thousand men.”—“Then they are not the arms of those who fought with us.”—“Nay—but they are—if ye were the persons who fought yesterday at Idomenê.”—“We fought with no one yesterday: it was the day before yesterday, in the retreat.”—“O, then—ye have to learn, that *we* were engaged yesterday with these others, who were on their march as reinforcement from the city of Ambrakia.”

The unfortunate herald now learnt for the first time that the large reinforcement from his city had been cut to pieces. So acute was his feeling of mingled anguish and surprise, that he raised a loud cry of woe, and hurried away at once, without saying another word; not even prosecuting his request about the burial of the dead bodies—which appears on this fatal occasion to have been neglected.¹

His grief was justified by the prodigious magnitude of the calamity, which Thucydides considers to have been the greatest that afflicted any Grecian city during the whole war prior to the peace of Nikias; so incredibly great, indeed, that though he had learnt the number slain, he declines to set it down, from fear of not being believed—a scruple which we his readers have much reason to regret. It appears that nearly the whole adult military population of Ambrakia was destroyed, and Demosthenês was urgent with the Akarnanians to march thither at once. Had they consented, Thucydides tells us positively that the city would have surrendered without a blow.² But they refused to undertake the enterprise, fearing

¹ Thucyd. iii. 113.

² Thucyd. iii. 113. πάθος γὰρ τοῦτο μὴ πόλει Ἑλληνίδι μέγιστον δὴ τῶν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε ἐγένετο. Καὶ ἀρωμὸν οὐκ ἔγραψα τῶν ἀποθανόντων, διότι ἄπιστον τὸ πλῆθος λέγεται ἀπολέσθαι, ὥς πρὸς τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως. Ἀμπρακίαν μέντοι οἶδα ὅτι εἰ ἐβουλήθησαν Ἀκαρνᾶνες καὶ Ἀμφιλοχοί, Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Δημοσθένει πειθόμενοι, ἐξελεῖν, αὐτοβοεῖ ἂν εἶλον· νῦν δ' ἔδεισαν μὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔχοντες αὐτὴν χαλεπώτεροι σφίσι πάροικοι ᾧσι.

We may remark that the expression κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε—when it occurs in the first, second, third, or first half of the fourth Book of Thucydides—seems to allude to the first ten years of the Peloponnesian war, which ended with the peace of Nikias.

In a careful dissertation, by Franz Wolfgang Ullrich, analysing the

(according to the historian) that the Athenians at Ambrakia would be more troublesome neighbours to them than the Ambrakiots. That this reason was operative we need not doubt: but it can hardly have been either the single, or even the chief reason; for had it been so, they would have been equally afraid of Athenian co-operation in the blockade of Leukas, which they had strenuously solicited from Demosthenês, and had quarrelled with him for refusing. Ambrakia was less near to them than Leukas—and in its present exhausted state, inspired less fear: but the displeasure arising from the former refusal of Demosthenês had probably never been altogether appeased, nor were they sorry to find an opportunity of mortifying him in a similar manner.

In the distribution of the spoil, three hundred panoplies were first set apart as the perquisite of Demosthenês: the remainder were then distributed, one-third for the Athenians, the other two-thirds among the Akarnanian townships. The immense reserve personally appropriated to Demosthenês enables us to make some vague conjecture as to the total loss of Ambrakiots. The fraction of one-third, assigned to the Athenian people, must have been, we may imagine, six times as great, and perhaps even in larger proportion, than the reserve of the general. For the latter was at that time under the displeasure of the people, and anxious above all things to regain their favour—an object which would be frustrated rather than promoted, if his personal share of the arms were not greatly disproportionate to the collective claim of the city. Reasoning upon this supposition, the panoplies assigned to Athens would be 1800, and the total of Ambrakiot slain whose arms became public property would be 5400. To which must be added some Ambrakiots killed in their flight from

structure of the history of Thucydides, it is made to appear that the first, second, and third Books, with the first half of the fourth—were composed during the interval between the peace of Nikias and the beginning of the last nine years of the war, called the Dekeleian war; allowing for two passages in these early books which must have been subsequently introduced.

The later books seem to have been taken up by Thucydides as a separate work, continuing the former. And a sort of separate preface is given for them (v. 26), *γέγραφε δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ὁ αὐτὸς Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ἐξῆς*, &c. It is in this later portion that he first takes up the view peculiar to him, of reckoning the whole twenty-seven years as one continued war only nominally interrupted (Ullrich, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Thukydides, pp. 85, 125, 138, &c. Hamburg, 1846).

Compare *ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷδε* (iii. 98), which in like manner means the war prior to the peace of Nikias.

Idomenê by the Amphilochians, in dells, ravines, and by-places: probably those Amphilochians, who slew them, would appropriate the arms privately, without bringing them into the general stock. Upon this calculation, the total number of Ambrakiot slain in both battles and both pursuits, would be about 6000; a number suitable to the grave expressions of Thucydidês, as well as to his statements, that the first detachment which marched to Olpæ was 3000 strong—and that the message sent home invoked as reinforcement the total force of the city. How totally helpless Ambrakia had become, is still more conclusively proved by the fact that the Corinthians were obliged shortly afterwards to send by land a detachment of 300 hoplites for its defence.¹

The Athenian triremes soon returned to their station at Naupaktus, after which a convention was concluded between the Akarnanians and Amphilochians, on the one side, and the Ambrakiots and Peloponnesians (who had fled after the battle of Olpæ into the territory of Salynthius and the Agræi) on the other—ensuring a safe and unmolested egress to both of the latter.² With the Ambrakiots a more permanent pacification was effected: the Akarnanians and Amphilochians concluded with them a peace and alliance for 100 years, on condition that they should surrender all the Amphilochian territory and hostages in their possession, and should bind themselves to furnish no aid to Anaktorium, then in hostility to the Akarnanians. Each party however maintained its separate alliance—the Ambrakiots with the Peloponnesian confederacy, the Akarnanians with Athens. It was stipulated that the Akarnanians should not be required to assist the Ambrakiots against

¹ Thucyd. iii. 114. Diodorus (xii. 60) abridges the narrative of Thucydidês.

² Thucyd. iii. 114. 'Ακαρνᾶνες δὲ καὶ Ἀμφίλοχοι, ἀπελθόντων Ἀθηναίων καὶ Δημοσθένους, τοῖς ὡς Σαλύνθιον καὶ Ἀγραίους καταφυγεῖσιν Ἀμπρακίω-ταις καὶ Πελοποννησίοις ἀναχώρησιν ἐσπέισαντο ἐξ Οἰνιαδῶν, οἵπερ καὶ μετανέστησαν παρὰ Σαλύνθιον.

This is a very difficult passage. Hermann has conjectured, and Poppe, Göller, and Dr. Arnold, all approve, the reading *παρὰ Σαλυνθίου* instead of the two last words of the sentence. The passage might certainly be construed with this emendation, though there would still be an awkwardness in the position of the relative *οἵπερ* with regard to its antecedent, and in the position of the particle *καί*, which ought then properly to come after *μετανέστησαν* and not before it. The sentence would then mean, that "the Ambrakiots and Peloponnesians, who had originally taken refuge with Salynthius, had moved away from his territory to Ceniadæ" from which place they were now to enjoy safe departure.

Athens, nor the Ambrakiots to assist the Akarnanians against the Peloponnesian league; but against all other enemies, each engaged to lend aid to the other.¹

To Demosthenês personally, the events on the coast of the Ambrakian Gulf proved a signal good fortune, well-earned indeed by the skill which he had displayed. He was enabled to atone for his imprudence in the Ætolian expedition, and to re-establish himself in the favour of the Athenian people. He sailed home in triumph to Athens, during the course of the winter, with his reserved present of 300 panoplies, which acquired additional value from the accident, that the larger number of panoplies, reserved out of the spoil for the Athenian people, were captured at sea, and never reached Athens. Accordingly, those brought by Demosthenês were the only trophy of the victory, and as such were deposited in the Athenian temples, where Thucydidês mentions them as still existing at the time when he wrote.²

It was in this same autumn that the Athenians were induced by an oracle to undertake the more complete purification of the sacred island of Delos. This step was probably taken to propitiate Apollo, since they were under the persuasion that the terrible visitation of the epidemic was owing to his wrath. And as it was about this period that the second attack of the epidemic, after having lasted a year, disappeared—many of them probably ascribed this relief to the effect of their pious cares at Delos. All the tombs in the island were opened; the dead bodies were then exhumed and re-interred in the neighbouring island of Rheneia; and orders were given that for the future neither deaths nor births should take place in the sacred island. Moreover the ancient Delian festival—once the common point of meeting and solemnity for the whole Ionic race, and celebrated for its musical contests, before the Lydian and Persian conquests had subverted the freedom and prosperity of Ionia—was now renewed. The Athenians celebrated the festival with its accompanying matches, even the chariot-race, in a manner more splendid than had ever been known in former times. They appointed a similar festival to be celebrated every fourth year. At this period they were excluded

¹ Thucyd. iii. 114.

² Thucyd. iii. 114. Τὰ δὲ νῦν ἀνακείμενα ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς ἱεροῖς Δημοσθένει ἐξηρέθησαν, τριακόσαι πανοπλῖαι, καὶ ἄγων αὐτὰς κατέπλευσε. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἅμα αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν τῆς Αἰτωλίας ξυμφορὰν ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς πράξεως ἀδεεστέρα ἢ καθόδος.

both from the Olympic and the Pythian games, which probably made the revival of the Delian festival more gratifying to them. The religious zeal and munificence of Nikias were strikingly displayed at Delos.¹

CHAPTER LII

SEVENTH YEAR OF THE WAR—CAPTURE OF SPHAKTERIA

THE invasion of Attica by the Lacedæmonians had now become an ordinary enterprise, undertaken in every year of the war except the third and sixth, and then omitted only from accidental causes: though the same hopes were no longer entertained from it as at the commencement of the war. During the present spring, Agis king of Sparta conducted the Peloponnesian army into the territory, seemingly about the end of April, and repeated the usual ravages.

It seemed however as if Korkyra were about to become the principal scene of the year's military operations. For the exiles of the oligarchical party, having come back to the island and fortified themselves on Mount Istônê, carried on war with so much activity against the Korkyræans in the city, that distress and even famine reigned there. Sixty Peloponnesian triremes were sent thither to assist the aggressors. As soon as it became known at Athens how hardly the Korkyræans in the city were pressed, orders were given to an Athenian fleet of forty triremes, about to sail for Sicily under Eurymedon and Sophoklês, to halt in their voyage at Korkyra, and to lend whatever aid might be needed.² But during the course of this voyage, an incident occurred elsewhere, neither foreseen nor imagined by any one, which gave a new character and promise to the whole war—illustrating forcibly the observations of Periklês and Archidamus before its commencement, on the impossibility of calculating what turn events might take.³

So high did Demosthenês stand in the favour of his countrymen after his brilliant successes in the Ambrakian Gulf, that they granted him permission at his own request to go aboard and to employ the fleet in any descent which he might think expedient on the coast of Peloponnesus. The attachment of

¹ Thucyd. iii. 104; Plutarch, Nikias, c. 3, 4; Diodor. xii. 58.

² Thucyd. iv. 2, 3.

³ Thucyd. i. 140; ii. 11.

this active officer to the Messenians at Naupaktus inspired him with the idea of planting a detachment of them on some well-chosen maritime post in the ancient Messenian territory, from whence they would be able permanently to harass the Lacedæmonians and provoke revolt among the Helots—the more so from their analogy of race and dialect. The Messenians, active in privateering, and doubtless well acquainted with the points of this coast, all of which had formerly belonged to their ancestors, had probably indicated to him Pylus on the south-western shore.

That ancient and Homeric name was applied specially and properly to denote the promontory which forms the northern termination of the modern bay of Navarino opposite to the island of Sphagia or Sphakteria; though in vague language the whole neighbouring district seems also to have been called Pylus. Accordingly, in circumnavigating Laconia, Demosthenês requested that the fleet might be detained at this spot long enough to enable him to fortify it, engaging himself to stay afterwards and maintain it with a garrison. It was an uninhabited promontory—about forty-five miles from Sparta, that is, as far distant as any portion of her territory—presenting rugged cliffs, and easy of defence both by sea and land. But its great additional recommendation, with reference to the maritime power of Athens, consisted in its overhanging the spacious and secure basin now called the bay of Navarino. That basin was fronted and protected by the islet called Sphakteria or Sphagia, untrodden, untenanted and full of wood: which stretched along the coast for about a mile and three quarters, leaving only two narrow entrances; one at its northern end, opposite to the position fixed on by Demosthenês, so confined as to admit only two triremes abreast—the other at the southern end about four times as broad; while the inner water approached by these two channels was both roomy and protected. It was on the coast of Peloponnesus, a little within the northern or narrowest of the two channels, that Demosthenês proposed to plant his little fort—the ground being itself eminently favourable, with a spring of fresh water¹ in the centre of the promontory.²

¹ Thucyd. iv. 26.

² Topography of Sphakteria and Pylus. The description given by Thucydides, of the memorable incidents in or near Pylus and Sphakteria, is perfectly clear, intelligible, and consistent with itself, as to topography. But when we consult the topography of the scene as it stands now, we find various circumstances which cannot possibly be reconciled with Thucydides. Both Colonel Leake (*Travels in the Morea*, vol. i. p. 402-415) and Dr.

But Eurymedon and Sophoklēs decidedly rejected all proposition of delay; and with much reason, since they had been

Arnold (Appendix to the second and third volume of his *Thucydids*, p. 444) have given plans of the coast, accompanied with valuable remarks.

The main discrepancy, between the statement of Thucydids and the present state of the coast, is to be found in the breadth of the two channels between Sphakteria and the mainland. The southern entrance into the bay of Navarino is now between 1300 and 1400 yards, with a depth of water varying from 5, 7, 28, 33 fathoms; whereas Thucydids states it as having only a breadth adequate to admit eight or nine triremes abreast. The northern entrance is about 150 yards in width, with a shoal or bar of sand lying across it on which there are not more than eighteen inches of water: Thucydids tells us that it afforded room for no more than two triremes, and his narrative implies a much greater depth of water, so as to make the entrance for triremes perfectly unobstructed.

Colonel Leake supposes that Thucydids was misinformed as to the breadth of the southern passage; but Dr. Arnold has on this point given a satisfactory reply—that the narrowness is not merely affirmed in the numbers of Thucydids, but is indirectly implied in his narrative, where he tells us that the Lacedæmonians intended to choke up both of them by triremes closely packed. Obviously this expedient could not be dreamt of, except for a very narrow mouth. The same reply suffices against the doubts which Bloomfield and Poppo (Comment. p. 10) raise about the genuineness of the numerals *δκτώ* or *ἐννέα* in Thucydids; a doubt which merely transfers the supposed error from Thucydids to the writer of the MS.

Dr. Arnold has himself raised a still graver doubt; whether the island now called Sphagia be really the same as Sphakteria, and whether the bay of Navarino be the real harbour of Pylus. He suspects that the Pale-Navarino, which has been generally understood to be Pylus, was in reality the ancient Sphakteria, separated from the mainland in ancient times by a channel at the north as well as by another at the south-east—though now it is not an island at all. He further suspects that the lake or lagoon called Lake of Osmyr Aga, north of the harbour of Navarino, and immediately under that which he supposes to have been Sphakteria—was the ancient harbour of Pylus, in which the sea-fight between the Athenians and Lacedæmonians took place. He does not indeed assert this as a positive opinion, but leans to it as the most probable—admitting that there are difficulties either way.

Dr. Arnold has stated some of the difficulties which beset this hypothesis (p. 447), but there is one which he has not stated, which appears to me the most formidable of all, and quite fatal to the admissibility of his opinion. If the Paleokastro of Navarino was the real ancient Sphakteria, it must have been a second island situated to the northward of Sphagia. There must therefore have been *two* islands close together off the coast and near the scene. Now if the reader will follow the account of Thucydids, he will see that there certainly was no more than *one* island—Sphakteria, without any other near or adjoining to it: see especially c. 13: the Athenian fleet under Eurymedon, on first arriving, was obliged to go back some distance to the island of Prôtê, because *the island* of Sphakteria was full of Lacedæmonian hoplites: if Dr. Arnold's hypothesis were admitted, there would have been nothing to hinder them from landing on Sphagia itself—the same inference may be deduced from c. 8. The statement of Pliny (H. N.

informed (though seemingly without truth) that the Peloponnesian fleet had actually reached Korkyra. They might well have remembered the mischief which had ensued three years before, from the delay of the reinforcement sent to Phormio in some desultory operations on the coast of Krete. The fleet accordingly passed by Pylus without stopping: but a terrible storm drove them back and forced them to seek shelter in the very harbour which Demosthenês had fixed upon—the only harbour anywhere near. That officer took advantage of this accident to renew his proposition, which however appeared to the commanders chimerical. There were plenty of desert capes round Peloponnesus (they said), if he chose to waste the resources of the city in occupying them.¹ They remained unmoved by his reasons in reply. Finding himself thus unsuccessful, Demosthenês presumed upon the undefined permission granted to him by the Athenian people, to address himself first to the soldiers, last of all to the taxiarchs or inferior officers—and to persuade them to second his project, even against the will of the commanders. Much inconvenience might well have arisen from such clashing of authority: but it happened that both the soldiers and the taxiarchs took the same view of the case as their commanders, and refused compliance. Nor can we be surprised at such reluctance, when we reflect upon the seeming improbability of being able to maintain such a post against the great real, and still greater supposed, superiority of Lacedæmonian land-force. It happened however that the fleet was detained there for some days by stormy weather; so that the soldiers, having nothing to do, were seized with the spontaneous impulse of occupying themselves with the fortification, and crowded around to execute it with all the emulation of eager volunteers. Having contemplated nothing of the kind

iv. 12) that there were *tres Spagiæ* off Pylus, unless we suppose with Hardouin that two of them were mere rocks, appears to me inconsistent with the account of Thucydidês.

I think that there is no alternative except to suppose that a great alteration has taken place in the two passages which separate Sphagia from the mainland, during the interval of 2400 years which separates us from Thucydidês. The mainland to the south of Navarino must have been much nearer than it is now to the southern portion of Sphagia, while the northern passage also must have been then both narrower and clearer. To suppose a change in the configuration of the coast to this extent, seems noway extravagant: any other hypothesis which may be started will be found involved in much greater difficulty.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 3. The account, alike meagre and inaccurate, given by Diodorus of these interesting events in Pylus and Sphakteria, will be found in Diodor. xii. 61–64.

on starting from Athens, they had neither tools for cutting stone, nor hods for carrying mortar.¹ Accordingly they were compelled to build their wall by collecting such pieces of rock or stones as they found, and putting them together as each happened to fit in: whenever mortar was needed, they brought it up on their bended backs, with hands joined behind them to prevent it from slipping away. Such deficiencies were made up, however, partly by the unbounded ardour of the soldiers, partly by the natural difficulties of the ground, which hardly required fortification except at particular points; the work was completed in a rough way in six days, and Demosthenês was left in garrison with five ships, while Eurymedon with the main fleet sailed away to Korkyra. The crews of the five ships (two of which, however, were sent away to warn Eurymedon afterwards) would amount to about 1000 men in all. But there presently arrived two armed Messenian privateers, from which Demosthenês obtained a reinforcement of forty Messenian hoplites, together with a supply of wicker shields, though more fit for show than for use, wherewith to arm his rowers. Altogether, it appears that he must have had about 200 hoplites, besides the half-armed seamen.²

Intelligence of this attempt to plant, even upon the Lacedæmonian territory, the annoyance and insult of a hostile post, was soon transmitted to Sparta. Yet no immediate measures were taken to march to the spot; as well from the natural slowness of the Spartan character, strengthened by a festival which happened to be then going on, as from the confidence entertained that, whenever attacked, the expulsion of the enemy was certain. A stronger impression however was made by the news upon the Lacedæmonian army invading Attica, who were at the same time suffering from want of provisions (corn not being yet ripe), and from an unusually cold spring: accordingly Agis marched them back to Sparta, and the fortification of Pylus thus produced the effect of abridging the invasion to the unusually short period of fifteen days. It operated in like manner to the protection of Korkyra: for the Peloponnesian fleet, recently arrived thither or still on its way, received orders immediately to return for the attack of Pylus. Having avoided the Athenian fleet by transporting the ships across the isthmus

¹ Thucyd. iv. 4.

² Thucyd. iv. 9. Demosthenês placed the *greater number* (τοὺς πολλοὺς) of his hoplites round the walls of his post, and selected *sixty* of them to march down to the shore. This implies a total which can hardly be less than 200.

at Leukas, it reached Pylus about the same time as the Lacedæmonian land-force from Sparta, composed of the Spartans themselves and the neighbouring Perioeki. For the more distant Perioeki, as well as the Peloponnesian allies, being just returned from Attica, though summoned to come as soon as they could, did not accompany this first march.¹

At the last moment before the Peloponnesian fleet came in and occupied the harbour, Demosthenês detached two out of his five triremes to warn Eurymedon and the main fleet, and to entreat immediate succour: the remaining ships he hauled ashore under the fortification, protecting them by palisades planted in front, and prepared to defend himself in the best manner he could. Having posted the larger portion of his force—some of them mere seamen without arms, and many only half-armed—round the assailable points of the fortification, to resist attacks from the land-force, he himself, with sixty chosen hoplites and a few bowmen, marched out of the fortification down to the sea-shore. It was on that side that the wall was weakest, for the Athenians, confident in their naval superiority, had given themselves little trouble to provide against an assailant fleet. Accordingly, Demosthenês foresaw that the great stress of the attack would lie on the sea-side. His only safety consisted in preventing the enemy from landing; a purpose, seconded by the rocky and perilous shore, which left no possibility of approach for ships except on a narrow space immediately under the fortification. It was here that he took post, on the water's edge, addressing a few words of encouragement to his men, and warning them that it was useless now to display acuteness in summing up perils which were but too obvious—and that the only chance of escape lay in boldly encountering the enemy before they could set foot ashore; the difficulty of effecting a landing from ships in the face of resistance being better known to Athenian mariners than to any one else.²

With a fleet of forty-three triremes under Thrasymelidas, and a powerful land-force, simultaneously attacking, the Lacedæmonians had good hopes of storming at once a rock so hastily converted into a military post. But as they foresaw that the first attack might possibly fail, and that the fleet of Eurymedon would probably return, they resolved to occupy forthwith the island of Sphakteria, the natural place where the Athenian fleet would take station for the purpose of assisting the garrison

¹ Thucyd. iv. 8.

² Thucyd. iv. 10.

ashore. The neighbouring coast on the mainland of Peloponnesus was both harbourless and hostile, so that there was no other spot near, where they could take station. And the Lacedæmonian commanders reckoned upon being able to stop up, as it were mechanically, both the two entrances into the harbour, by triremes lashed together from the island to the mainland, with their prows pointing outwards: so that they would be able at any rate, occupying the island as well as the two channels, to keep off the Athenian fleet, and to hold Demosthenês closely blocked up¹ on the rock of Pylus, where his provisions would quickly fail him. With these views they drafted off by lot some hoplites from each of the Spartan lochi, accompanied as usual by Helots, and sent them across to Sphakteria; while their land-force and their fleet approached at once to attack the fortifications.

Of the assault on the land-side we hear little. The Lacedæmonians were proverbially unskilful in the attack of anything like a fortified place, and they appear now to have made little impression. But the chief stress and vigour of the attack came on the sea-side, as Demosthenês had foreseen. The landing-place, even where practicable, was still rocky and difficult—and so narrow in dimensions, that the Lacedæmonian ships could only approach by small squadrons at a time; while the Athenians maintained their ground firmly to prevent a single man from setting foot on land. The assailing triremes rowed up with loud shouts and exhortations to each other, striving to get so placed as that the hoplites in the bow could effect a landing: but such were the difficulties arising partly from the rocks and partly from the defence, that squadron after squadron tried this in vain. Nor did even the gallant example of Brasidas procure for them any better success. That officer, commanding a trireme, and observing that some of the pilots near him were cautious in driving their ships close in shore for fear of staving them against the rocks, indignantly called to them not to spare the planks of their vessels when the enemy had insulted them by erecting a fort in the country: Lacedæmonians (he exclaimed) ought to carry the landing by force, even though their ships should be dashed to pieces: the Peloponnesian allies ought to be forward in sacrificing their ships for Sparta, in return for the many services which she had rendered to them.² Foremost in performance as well as in

¹ Thucyd. iv. 8. τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἔσπλους ταῖς ναυσὶν ἀντιπρώροις βύζην κλήσειν ἔμελλον.

² Thucyd. iv. 11, 12; Diodor. xii. Consult an excellent note of Dr.

exhortation, Brasidas constrained his own pilot to drive his ship close in, and advanced in person even on to the landing-steps, for the purpose of leaping first ashore. But here he stood exposed to all the weapons of the Athenian defenders, who beat him back and pierced him with so many wounds, that he fainted away and fell back into the bows (or foremost part of the trireme, beyond the rowers); while his shield, slipping away from the arm, dropped down and rolled over-board into the sea. His ship was obliged to retire, like the rest, without having effected any landing. All these successive attacks from the sea, repeated for one whole day and a part of the next, were repulsed by Demosthenês and his little band with victorious bravery. To both sides it seemed a strange reversal of ordinary relations,¹ that the Athenians, essentially maritime, should be fighting on land—and that too Lacedæmonian land—against the Lacedæmonians, the select land-warriors of Greece, now on ship-board, and striving in vain to compass a landing on their own shore. The Athenians, in honour of their success, erected a trophy, the chief ornament of which was the shield of Brasidas, cast ashore by the waves.

On the third day, the Lacedæmonians did not repeat their attack, but sent some of their vessels round to Asinê in the Messenian Gulf for timber to construct battering machines; which they intended to employ against the wall of Demosthenês on the side towards the harbour, where it was higher, and could not be assailed without machines, but where at the same time there was great facility in landing—for their previous attack had been made on the side fronting the sea, where the wall was lower, but the difficulties of landing insuperable.²

But before these ships came back, the face of affairs was seriously changed by the unwelcome return of the Athenian fleet from Zakynthus under Eurymedon, reinforced by four Chian ships and some of the guard-ships at Naupaktus, so as now to muster fifty sail. The Athenian admiral, finding the enemy's fleet in possession of the harbour, and seeing both the island of Sphacteria occupied, and the opposite shore covered

Arnold on this passage, in which he contrasts the looseness and exaggeration of Diodorus with the modest distinctness of Thucydidês.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 12. ἐπὶ πολὺ γὰρ ἐποίησεν τῆς δόξης ἐν τῷ τότε, τοῖς μὲν ἡπειρώταις μάλιστα εἶναι καὶ τὰ περὶ κρατίστοις, τοῖς δὲ θαλασσίοις τε καὶ ταῖς ναυσὶ πλείστον προέχειν.

² Thucyd. iv. 13. ἐλπίζοντες τὸ κατὰ τὸν λιμένα τεῖχος ὕψος μὲν ἔχειν, ἀποβάσεως δὲ μάλιστα οὐσης εἶναι μηχαναῖς. See Poppo's note upon this passage.

with Lacedæmonian hoplites¹—for the allies from all parts of Peloponnesus had now arrived—looked around in vain for a place to land. He could find no other night-station except the uninhabited island of Prôtê, not very far distant. From hence he sailed forth in the morning to Pylus, prepared for a naval engagement—hoping that perhaps the Lacedæmonians might come out to fight him in the open sea, but resolved, if this did not happen, to force his way in and attack the fleet in the harbour; the breadth of sea between Sphakteria and the mainland being sufficient to admit of nautical manœuvre.² The Lacedæmonian admirals, seemingly confounded by the speed of the Athenian fleet in coming back, never thought of sailing out of the harbour to fight, nor did they even realise their scheme of blocking up the two entrances of the harbour with triremes closely lashed together. Leaving both entrances open, they determined to defend themselves within: but even here, so defective were their precautions, that several of their triremes were yet moored, and the rowers not fully aboard, when the Athenian admirals sailed in by both entrances at once, to attack them. Most of the Lacedæmonian triremes, afloat and in fighting trim, resisted the attack for a certain time, but were at length vanquished and driven back to the shore, many of them with serious injury.³ Five of them were captured and towed off, one with all her crew aboard. The Athenians, vigorously pursuing their success, drove against such as took refuge on the shore, as well as those which were not manned

¹ Thucyd. iv. 14.

² Thucyd. iv. 13. The Lacedæmonians *παρεσκευάζοντο, ἣν ἐσπλήη τις, ὡς ἐν τῇ λιμένι ὄντι οὐ σμικρῇ ναυμαχῆσόντες.*

The expression “the harbour which was not small,” to designate the spacious bay of Navarino, has excited much remark from Mr. Bloomfield and Dr. Arnold, and was indeed one of the reasons which induced the latter to suspect that the harbour meant by Thucydides was *not* the bay of Navarino, but the neighbouring lake of Osmyn Aga.

I have already discussed that supposition in a former note: but in reference to the expression *οὐ σμικρῇ*, we may observe, first, that the use of negative expressions to convey a positive idea would be in the ordinary manner of Thucydides.

But further—I have stated in a previous note that it is indispensable, in my judgement, to suppose the island of Sphakteria to have touched the mainland much more closely in the time of Thucydides than it does now. At that time therefore, very probably, the basin of Navarino was not so large as we now find it.

³ Thucyd. iv. 14. *ἔτρωσαν μὲν πολλὰς, πέντε δ' ἔλαβον.* We cannot in English speak of *wounding* a trireme—though the Greek word is both lively and accurate, to represent the blow inflicted by the impinging beak of an enemy's ship.

at the moment when the attack began, and had not been able to get afloat or into action. Some of the vanquished triremes being deserted by their crews, who jumped out upon the land, the Athenians were proceeding to tow them off, when the Lacedæmonian hoplites on the shore opposed a new and strenuous resistance. Excited to the utmost pitch by witnessing the disgraceful defeat of their fleet, and aware of the cruel consequences which turned upon it—they marched all armed into the water, seized the ships to prevent them from being dragged off, and engaged in a desperate conflict to baffle the assailants. We have already seen a similar act of bravery, two years before, on the part of the Messenian hoplites accompanying the fleet of Phormio near Naupaktus.¹ Extraordinary daring and valour was here displayed on both sides, in the attack as well as in the defence, and such was the clamour and confusion, that neither the land-skill of the Lacedæmonians, nor the sea-skill of the Athenians, were of much avail: the contest was one of personal valour, and considerable suffering, on both sides. At length the Lacedæmonians carried their point, and saved all the ships ashore; none being carried away except those at first captured. Both parties thus separated: the Athenians retired to the fortress at Pylus, where they were doubtless hailed with overflowing joy by their comrades, and where they erected a trophy for their victory—giving up the enemy's dead for burial, and picking up the floating wrecks and pieces.²

But the great prize of the victory was neither in the five ships captured, nor in the relief afforded to the besieged at Pylus. It lay in the hoplites occupying the island of Sphacteria, who were now cut off from the mainland, as well as from all supplies. The Athenians, sailing round it in triumph, already looked upon them as their prisoners; while the Lacedæmonians on the opposite mainland, deeply distressed but not knowing what to do, sent to Sparta for advice. So grave was the emergency, that the Ephors came in person to the spot forthwith. Since they could still muster sixty triremes, a greater number than the Athenians—besides a large force on land, and the whole command of the resources of the country,—while the Athenians had no footing on shore except the contracted promontory of Pylus, we might have imagined that a strenuous effort to carry off the imprisoned detachment across the narrow strait to the mainland would have had a fair chance of success. And probably, if either Demosthenês or Brasidas had been in

¹ See above in this History, chap. xlix.

² Thucyd. iv. 13, 14.

command, such an effort would have been made. But Lacedæmonian courage was rather steadfast and unyielding than adventurous. Moreover the Athenian superiority at sea exercised a sort of fascination over men's minds analogous to that of the Spartans themselves on land; so that the Ephors, on reaching Pylus, took a desponding view of their position, and sent a herald to the Athenian generals to propose an armistice, in order to allow time for envoys to go to Athens and treat for peace.

To this Eurymedon and Demosthenês assented, and an armistice was concluded on the following terms. The Lacedæmonians agreed to surrender not only all their triremes now in the harbour, but also all the rest in their ports, altogether to the number of sixty; also to abstain from all attack upon the fortress at Pylus either by land or sea, for such time as should be necessary for the mission of envoys to Athens as well as for their return, both to be effected in an Athenian trireme provided for the purpose. The Athenians on their side engaged to desist from all hostilities during the like interval; but it was agreed that they should keep strict and unremitting watch over the island, yet without landing upon it. For the subsistence of the detachment in the island, the Lacedæmonians were permitted to send over every day two chœnikes of barley-meal in cakes ready baked, two kotylæ of wine,¹ and some meat, for each hoplite—together with half that quantity for each of the attendant Helots; but this was all to be done under the supervision of the Athenians, with peremptory obligations to send no secret additional supplies. It was moreover expressly stipulated that if any one provision of the armistice, small or great, were violated, the whole should be considered as null and void. Lastly, the Athenians engaged, on the return of the envoys from Athens, to restore the triremes in the same condition as they received them.

Such terms sufficiently attest the humiliation and anxiety of the Lacedæmonians; while the surrender of their entire naval force, to the number of sixty triremes, which was forthwith

¹ Thucyd. iv. 16. The Chœnix was equivalent to about two pints, English dry measure: it was considered as the usual daily sustenance for a slave. Each Lacedæmonian soldier had therefore double of this daily allowance, besides meat, in weight and quantity not specified: the fact that the quantity of meat is not specified seems to show that they did not fear abuse in this item.

The Kotyla contained about half a pint, English wine measure: each Lacedæmonian soldier had therefore a pint of wine daily. It was always the practice in Greece to drink the wine with a large admixture of water.

carried into effect, demonstrates at the same time that they sincerely believed in the possibility of obtaining peace. Well aware that they were themselves the original beginners of the war, at a time when the Athenians desired peace—and that the latter had besides made fruitless overtures while under the pressure of the epidemic—they presumed that the same disposition still prevailed at Athens, and that their present pacific wishes would be so gladly welcomed as to procure without difficulty the relinquishment of the prisoners in Sphakteria.¹

The Lacedæmonian envoys, conveyed to Athens in an Athenian trireme, appeared before the public assembly to set forth their mission, according to custom, prefacing their address with some apologies for that brevity of speech which belonged to their country. Their proposition was in substance a very simple one—"Give up to us the men in the island, and accept, in exchange for this favour, peace, with the alliance of Sparta." They enforced their cause by appeals, well-turned and conciliatory, partly indeed to the generosity, but still more to the prudential calculation of Athens; explicitly admitting the high and glorious vantage-ground on which she was now placed, as well as their own humbled dignity and inferior position.² They, the Lacedæmonians, the first and greatest power in Greece, were smitten by adverse fortune of war—and that too without misconduct of their own, so that they were for the first time obliged to solicit an enemy for peace; which Athens had the precious opportunity of granting, not merely with honour to herself, but also in such manner as to create in their minds an ineffaceable friendship. And it became Athens to make use of her present good fortune while she had it,—not to rely upon its permanence nor to abuse it by extravagant demands. Her own imperial prudence, as well as the present circumstances of the Spartans, might teach her how unexpectedly the most disastrous casualties occurred. By granting what was now asked, she might make a peace which would be far more durable than if it were founded on the extorted compliances of a weakened enemy, because it would rest on Spartan honour and gratitude; the greater the previous enmity, the stronger would be such reactionary sentiment.³ But if Athens should now refuse, and if, in the further prosecution of the war, the men in Sphakteria should perish—a new and inexpiable ground

¹ Thucyd. iv. 21 : compare vii. 18.

² Thucyd. iv. 18. γυνῶτε δὲ καὶ ἐς τὰς ἡμετέρας νῦν ξυμφορὰς ἀπιδόντες, &c.

³ Thucyd. iv. 19.

of quarrel,¹ peculiar to Sparta herself, would be added to those already subsisting, which rather concerned Sparta as the chief of the Peloponnesian confederacy. Nor was it only the goodwill and gratitude of the Spartans which Athens would earn by accepting the proposition tendered to her; she would further acquire the grace and glory of conferring peace on Greece, which all the Greeks would recognise as her act. And when once the two pre-eminent powers, Athens and Sparta, were established in cordial amity, the remaining Grecian states would be too weak to resist what they two might prescribe.²

Such was the language held by the Lacedæmonians in the assembly at Athens. It was discreetly calculated for their purpose, though when we turn back to the commencement of the war, and read the lofty declarations of the Spartan Ephors and assembly respecting the wrongs of their allies and the necessity of extorting full indemnity for them from Athens—the contrast is indeed striking. On this occasion, the Lacedæmonians acted entirely for themselves and from consideration of their own necessities; severing themselves from their allies, and soliciting a special peace for themselves, with as little scruple as the Spartan general Menedæus during the preceding year, when he abandoned his Ambrakiot confederates after the battle of Olpæ, to conclude a separate capitulation with Demosthenês.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 20. ἡμῖν δὲ καλῶς, εἴπερ ποτέ, ἔχει ἀμφοτέροις ἡ ξυλλαγή, πρὶν τι ἀνῆκεστον διὰ μέσου γερόμενον ἡμᾶς καταλαβεῖν, ἐν ᾧ ἀνάγκη αἰδίου ὑμῖν ἔχθραν πρὸς τῇ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίαν ἔχειν, ἡμᾶς δὲ στερηθῆναι ὧν νῦν προκαλούμεθα.

I understand these words κοινή and ἰδία agreeably to the explanation of the Scholiast, from whom Dr. Arnold, as well as Poppo and Gölter, depart, in my judgement, erroneously. The whole war had been begun in consequence of the complaints of the Peloponnesian allies, and of wrongs alleged to have been done to *them* by Athens: Sparta herself had no ground of complaint—nothing of which she desired redress.

Dr. Arnold translates it—"we shall hate you not only nationally, for the wound you will have inflicted on Sparta; but also individually, because so many of us will have lost our near relations from your inflexibility." "The Spartan aristocracy (he adds) would feel it a personal wound to lose at once so many of its members, connected by blood or marriage with its principal families: compare Thucyd. v. 15."

We must recollect however that the Athenians could not possibly know at this time that the hoplites inclosed in Sphacteria belonged in great proportion to the first families in Sparta. And the Spartan envoys would surely have the diplomatic prudence to abstain from any facts or arguments which would reveal, or even suggest, to them so important a secret.

² Thucyd. iv. 20. ἡμῶν γὰρ καὶ ὑμῶν ταῦτα λεγόντων τό γε ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ἵστε δτι ὑποδέεστερον ὢν τὰ μέγιστα τιμήσει.

Aristophanês, Pac. 1082. Ἐξδὸν σπεισασμένοις κοινῇ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἄρχειν.

The course proper to be adopted by Athens in reference to the proposition, however, was by no means obvious. In all probability, the trireme which brought the Lacedæmonian envoys also brought the first news of that unforeseen and instantaneous turn of events, which had rendered the Spartans in Sphakteria certain prisoners, (so it was then conceived) and placed the whole Lacedæmonian fleet in their power; thus giving a totally new character to the war. The sudden arrival of such prodigious intelligence—the astounding presence of Lacedæmonian envoys, bearing the olive-branch and in an attitude of humiliation—must have produced in the susceptible public of Athens emotions of the utmost intensity; an elation and confidence such as had probably never been felt since the reconquest of Samos. It was difficult at first to measure the full bearings of the new situation, and even Periklês himself might have hesitated what to recommend. But the immediate and dominant impression with the general public was, that Athens might now ask her own terms, as consideration for the prisoners in the island.¹

Of this reigning tendency Kleon² made himself the emphatic organ, as he had done three years before in the sentence passed on the Mitylenæans; a man who—like leading journals in modern times—often appeared to guide the public because he gave vehement utterance to that which they were already feeling, and carried it out in its collateral bearings and consequences. On the present occasion, he doubtless spoke with the most genuine conviction; for he was full of the sentiment of Athenian force and Athenian imperial dignity, as well as disposed to a sanguine view of future chances. Moreover, in a discussion like that now opened, where there was much room for doubt, he came forward with a proposition at once plain and decisive. Reminding the Athenians of the dishonourable truce of Thirty years to which they had been compelled by the misfortunes of the time to accede, fourteen years before the Peloponnesian war—Kleon insisted that now was the time for

¹ Thucyd. iv. 21.

² Thucyd. iv. 21. *μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐνήγε Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, ἀνὴρ δημαγωγὸς κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ὦν καὶ τῷ δήμῳ πιθανώτατος· καὶ ἔπεισεν ἀποκρίνασθαι, &c.*

This sentence reads like a first introduction of Kleon to the notice of the reader. It would appear that Thucydides had forgotten that he had before introduced Kleon on occasion of the Mitylenæan surrender, and that too in language very much the same—iii. 36. *καὶ Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, —ὦν καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα βιαίωτατος τῶν πολιτῶν, καὶ τῷ δήμῳ παρὰ πολὺ ἐν τῷ τότε πιθανώτατος, &c.*

Athens to recover what she had then lost—Nisæa, Pêgæ, Trœzen, and Achaia. He proposed that Sparta should be required to restore these to Athens, in exchange for the soldiers now blocked up in Sphakteria; after which a truce might be concluded for as long a time as might be deemed expedient.

This decree, adopted by the assembly, was communicated as the answer of Athens to the Lacedæmonian envoys, who had probably retired after their first address, and were now sent for again into the assembly to hear it. On being informed of the resolution, they made no comment on its substance, but invited the Athenians to name commissioners, who might discuss with them freely and deliberately suitable terms for a pacification. Here however Kleon burst upon them with an indignant rebuke. He had thought from the first (he said) that they came with dishonest purposes, but now the thing was clear—nothing else could be meant by this desire to treat with some few men apart from the general public. If they had really any fair proposition to make, he called upon them to proclaim it openly to all. But this the envoys could not bring themselves to do. They had probably come with authority to make certain concessions; but to announce these concessions forthwith, would have rendered negotiation impossible, besides dishonouring them in the face of their allies. Such dishonour would be incurred, too, without any advantage, if the Athenians should after all reject the terms, which the temper of the assembly before them rendered but too probable. Moreover they were totally unpractised in the talents for dealing with a public assembly, such discussions being so rare as to be practically unknown in the Lacedæmonian system. To reply to the denunciation of a vehement speaker like Kleon, required readiness of elocution, dexterity, and self-command, which they had had no opportunity of acquiring. They remained silent—abashed by the speaker and intimidated by the temper of the assembly. Their mission was thus terminated, and they were re-conveyed in the trireme to Pylus.¹

It is probable that if these envoys had been able to make an effective reply to Kleon and to defend their proposition against his charge of fraudulent purpose, they would have been sustained by Nikias and a certain number of leading Athenians, so that the assembly might have been brought at least to try the issue of a private discussion between diplomatic agents on both sides. But the case was one in which it was absolutely

¹ Thucyd. iv. 22.

necessary that the envoys should stand forward with some defence for themselves; which Nikias might effectively second, but could not originate: and as they were incompetent to this task, the whole affair broke down. We shall hereafter find other examples, in which the incapacity of Lacedæmonian envoys, to meet the open debate of Athenian political life, is productive of mischievous results. In this case, the proposition of the envoys to enter into treaty with select commissioners, was not only quite reasonable, but afforded the only possibility (though doubtless not a certainty) of some ultimate pacification: and the manœuvre whereby Kleon discredited it was a grave abuse of publicity—not unknown in modern, though more frequent in ancient, political life. Kleon probably thought that if commissioners were named, Nikias, Lachês, and other politicians of the same rank and colour, would be the persons selected; persons whose anxiety for peace and alliance with Sparta would make them over-indulgent and careless in securing the interests of Athens. It will be seen, when we come to describe the conduct of Nikias four years afterwards, that this suspicion was not ill-grounded.

Unfortunately Thucydides, in describing the proceedings of this assembly, so important in its consequences because it intercepted a promising opening for peace, is brief as usual—telling us only what was said by Kleon and what was decided by the assembly. But though nothing is positively stated respecting Nikias and his partisans, we learn from other sources, and we may infer from what afterwards occurred, that they vehemently opposed Kleon, and that they looked coldly on the subsequent enterprise against Sphakteria as upon his peculiar measure.¹

It has been common to treat the dismissal of the Lacedæmonian envoys on this occasion as a peculiar specimen of democratical folly. Yet over-estimation of the prospective chances arising out of success, to a degree more extravagant than that of which Athens was now guilty, is by no means peculiar to democracy. Other governments, opposed to democracy not less in temper than in form—an able despot like the Emperor Napoleon, and a powerful aristocracy like that of England²—have found success to the full as misleading.

¹ Plutarch, Nikias, c. 7; Philochorus, Fragm. 105, ed. Didot.

² Let us read some remarks of Mr. Burke on the temper of England during the American war.

“You remember that in the beginning of this American war, you were greatly divided; and a very strong body, if not the strongest, opposed itself

That Athens should desire to profit by this unexpected piece of good fortune, was perfectly reasonable: that she should make use of it to regain advantages which former misfortunes had compelled herself to surrender, was a feeling not unnatural. And whether the demand was excessive, or by how much—is a question always among the most embarrassing for any government—kingly, oligarchical, or democratical—to determine.

We may however remark that Kleon gave an impolitic turn to Athenian feeling, by directing it towards the entire and literal reacquisition of what had been lost twenty years before. Unless we are to consider his quadruple demand as a flourish, to be modified by subsequent negotiation, it seems to present some plausibility, but little of long-sighted wisdom. For while on the one hand, it called upon Sparta to give up much which was not in her possession, and must have been extorted by force from allies—on the other hand, the situation of Athens was not the same as it had been when she concluded the Thirty years' truce; nor does it seem that the restoration of Achaia and Trœzen would have been of any material value to her. Nisæa and Pêgæ—which would have been tantamount to the entire Megarid, inasmuch as Megara itself could hardly have been held with both its ports in the possession of an enemy—would indeed have been highly valuable, since she could then have protected her territory against invasion from Peloponnesus, besides possessing a port in the Corinthian Gulf. And it would seem that if able commissioners had now been named for private discussion with the Lacedæmonian

to the madness which every art and every power were employed to render popular, in order that the errors of the rulers might be lost in the general blindness of the nation. This opposition continued until after our great, but most unfortunate victory at Long Island. Then all the mounds and banks of our constancy were borne down at once; and the phrenzy of the American war broke in upon us like a deluge. This victory, which seemed to put an immediate end to all difficulties, perfected in us that spirit of domination which our unparalleled prosperity had but too long nurtured. We had been so very powerful, and so very prosperous, that even the humblest of us were degraded into the vices and follies of kings. We lost all measure between means and ends; and our headlong desires became our politics and our morals. All men who wished for peace, or retained any sentiments of moderation, were overborne or silenced; and this city (Bristol) was led by every artifice (and probably with the more management, because *I* was one of your members) to distinguish itself by its zeal for that fatal cause." Burke, Speech to the Electors of Bristol previous to the election (Works, vol. iii. p. 365).

Compare Mr. Burke's Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol, p. 174 of the same volume.

envoys, under the present urgent desire of Sparta coupled with her disposition to abandon her allies—this important point might possibly have been pressed and carried, in exchange for Sphakteria. Nay, even if such acquisition had been found impracticable, still the Athenians would have been able to effect some arrangement which would have widened the breach, and destroyed the confidence, between Sparta and her allies; a point of great moment for them to accomplish. There was therefore every reason for trying what could be done by negotiation, under the present temper of Sparta; and the step, by which Kleon abruptly broke off such hopes, was decidedly mischievous.

On the return of the envoys without success to Pylus,¹ twenty days after their departure from that place, the armistice immediately terminated; and the Lacedæmonians redemanded the triremes which they had surrendered. But Eurymedon refused compliance with this demand, alleging that the Lacedæmonians had during the truce made a fraudulent attempt to surprise the rock of Pylus, and had violated the stipulations in other ways besides; while it stood expressly stipulated in the truce, that the violation by either side even of the least among its conditions should cancel all obligation on both sides. Thucydides, without distinctly giving his opinion, seems rather to imply, that there was no just ground for the refusal: though if any accidental want of vigilance had presented to the Lacedæmonians an opportunity for surprising Pylus, they would be likely enough to avail themselves of it, seeing that they would thereby drive off the Athenian fleet from its only landing-place, and render the continued blockade of Sphakteria impracticable. However the truth may be, Eurymedon persisted in his refusal, in spite of loud protests of the Lacedæmonians against his perfidy. Hostilities were energetically resumed: the Lacedæmonian army on land began again to attack the fortifications of Pylus, while the Athenian fleet became doubly watchful in the blockade of Sphakteria, in which they were reinforced by twenty fresh ships from Athens, making a fleet of seventy triremes in all. Two ships were perpetually rowing round the island, in opposite directions, throughout the whole day; while at night the whole fleet were kept on watch, except on the sea-side of the island in stormy weather.²

The blockade, however, was soon found to be more full of privation in reference to the besiegers themselves, and more

¹ Thucyd. iv. 39.

² Thucyd. iv. 23.

difficult of enforcement in respect to the island and its occupants, than had been originally contemplated. The Athenians were much distressed for want of water. They had only one really good spring in the fortification of Pylus itself, quite insufficient for the supply of a large fleet: many of them were obliged to scrape the shingle and drink such brackish water as they could find; while ships as well as men were perpetually afloat, since they could take rest and refreshment only by relays successively landing on the rock of Pylus, or even on the edge of Sphakteria itself, with all the chance of being interrupted by the enemy—there being no other landing-place,¹ and the ancient trireme affording no accommodation either for eating or sleeping.

At first, all this was patiently borne, in the hopes that Sphakteria would speedily be starved out, and the Spartans forced to renew the request for capitulation. But no such request came, and the Athenians in the fleet gradually became sick in body as well as impatient and angry in mind. In spite of all their vigilance, clandestine supplies of provisions continually reached the island, under the temptation of large rewards offered by the Spartan government. Able swimmers contrived to cross the strait, dragging after them by ropes skins full of linseed and poppy-seed mixed with honey; while merchant-vessels, chiefly manned by Helots, started from various parts of the Laconian coast, selecting by preference the stormy nights, and encountering every risk in order to run their vessel with its cargo ashore on the sea-side of the island, at a time when the Athenian guardships could not be on the look-out.² They cared little about damage to their vessel in landing, provided they could get the cargo on shore; for ample compensation was ensured to them, together with emancipation to every Helot who succeeded in reaching the island with a supply. Though the Athenians redoubled their vigilance, and intercepted many of these daring smugglers, still there were others who eluded them. Moreover the rations supplied to the island by stipulation during the absence of the envoys in their journey to Athens had been so ample, that Epitadas the commander had been able to economise, and thus to make the stock hold out longer. Week after week passed without any symptoms of surrender.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 26. τῶν νεῶν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὄρμον. This does not mean (as some of the commentators seem to suppose, see Poppo's note) that the Athenians had not plenty of sea-room in the harbour: it means that they had no station ashore, except the narrow space of Pylus itself.

² Thucyd. iv. 26.

The Athenians not only felt the present sufferings of their own position, but also became apprehensive for their own supplies, all brought by sea round Peloponnesus to this distant and naked shore. They began even to mistrust the possibility of thus indefinitely continuing the blockade, against the contingencies of such violent weather as would probably ensue at the close of summer. In this state of weariness and uncertainty, the active Demosthenês began to organise a descent upon the island, with the view of carrying it by force. He not only sent for forces from the neighbouring allies, Zakynthus and Nau-paktus, but also transmitted an urgent request to Athens that reinforcements might be furnished to him for the purpose—making known explicitly both the uncomfortable condition of the armament and the unpromising chances of simple blockade.¹

The arrival of these envoys caused infinite mortification to the Athenians at home. Having expected to hear long before that Sphakteria had surrendered, they were now taught to consider even the ultimate conquest as a matter of doubt. They

¹ Thucyd. iv. 27, 29, 30.

(c. 27) 'Εν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις πυνθανόμενοι περὶ τῆς στρατιᾶς ὅτι ταλαιπωρεῖται, καὶ σίτος τοῖς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ὅτι ἐσπλεί, &c.

Κλέων δὲ γνοὺς αὐτῶν τὴν ἐς αὐτὸν ὑπόψιν περὶ τῆς κωλύμενης τῆς ξυμβάσεως, οὐ τάληθῃ ἔφη λέγειν τοὺς ἐξαγγέλλοντας. Παραινούντων δὲ τῶν ἀφικμένων, εἰ μὴ σφίσι πιστεύουσι, κατασκόπους τινὰς πέμψαι, &c.

(29) Τὸν δὲ Δημοσθένην προσέλαβε πυνθανόμενος τὴν ἀπόβασιν αὐτὸν ἐς τὴν νῆσον διανοεῖσθαι, &c.

(30) Δημοσθένης τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν παρεσκευάζετο, στρατιὰν τε μεταπέμπων ἐκ τῶν ἐγγύς ξυμμάχων καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐτοιμάζων. Κλέων δὲ ἐκείνῳ τε προπέμψας ἄγγελον ὡς ἤξων, καὶ ἔχων στρατιὰν ἣν ᾤτήσατο, ἀφικνεῖται ἐς Πύλον.

That these persons οἱ ἐξαγγέλλοντες—οἱ ἀφικόμενοι—were envoys sent from Demosthenês and the other Athenian generals at Pylus, to report to the Athenian assembly—I assume with perfect confidence. The Athenian people were not left to hear from casual comers the condition of their armament and the progress of this important enterprise. That Demosthenês had asked for a reinforcement, is here expressly stated ; and if it were not expressly stated, we might presume it with tolerable confidence, from the attack which he was meditating upon Sphakteria, and from the efforts which he was making in his own neighbourhood and among the allies. Besides, when it is said (c. 27) that the Athenians, on hearing the reports of the envoys, had already become inclined of themselves to send forces there (ὥρμημένους τι τὸ πλέον τῇ γνώμῃ στρατεύειν)—and when Kleon says to the people—"If you think the reports of the envoys true, send forces at once against Sphakteria"—(εἰ δοκεῖ αὐτοῖς ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ ἀγγελλόμενα, πλείν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας)—this is plain evidence to me, that the report as to matters of fact had been presented by the envoys as a ground for requesting reinforcements.

were surprised that the Lacedæmonians sent no fresh envoys to solicit peace, and began to suspect that such silence was founded upon well-grounded hopes of being able to hold out. But the person most of all discomposed was Kleon, who observed that the people now regretted their insulting repudiation of the Lacedæmonian message, and were displeased with him as the author of it; while on the contrary, his numerous political enemies were rejoiced at the turn which events had taken, as it opened a means of effecting his ruin. At first, Kleon contended that the envoys had misrepresented the state of facts. To which the latter replied by entreating, that if their accuracy were mistrusted, commissioners of inspection might be sent to verify it; and Kleon himself, along with Theogenês, was forthwith named for this function.

But it did not suit Kleon's purpose to go as commissioner to Pylus. His mistrust of the statement was a mere general suspicion, not resting on any positive evidence. Moreover he saw that the dispositions of the assembly tended to comply with the request of Demosthenês, and to despatch a reinforcing armament. He accordingly altered his tone at once: "If ye really believe the story (he said), do not waste time in sending commissioners, but sail at once to capture the men. It would be easy with a proper force, if our generals were *men* (here he pointed reproachfully to his enemy Nikias, then Stratêgus¹), to sail and take the solders in the island. That is what *I* at least would do if *I* were general." His words instantly provoked a hostile murmur from a portion of the assembly: "Why do you not sail then at once, if you think the matter so easy?" Nikias, taking up this murmur, and delighted to have caught his political enemy in a trap, stood forward in person and pressed him to set about the enterprise without delay; intimating the willingness of himself and his colleagues to grant him any portion of the military force of the city which he chose to ask for.

Kleon at first closed with this proposition, believing it to be a mere stratagem of debate and not seriously intended. But so soon as he saw that what was said was really meant, he tried to back out, and observed to Nikias—"it is your place to sail:

¹ Thucyd. iv. 27. Καὶ ἐς Νικίαν τὸν Νικηράτου στρατηγὸν ὄντα ἀπεσήμενεν, ἐχθρὸς ὢν καὶ ἐπιτιμιῶν—ῥάδιον εἶναι παρασκευῇ, εἰ ἄνδρες εἴεν οἱ στρατηγοί, πλεύσαντας λαβεῖν τοὺς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ, καὶ αὐτὸς γ' ἂν, εἰ ἤρχε, ποιῆσαι τοῦτο. Ὁ δὲ Νικίας τῶν τε Ἀθηναίων τι ὑποθορυβησάντων ἐς τὸν Κλέωνα, ὅτι οὐ καὶ νῦν πλεῖ, εἰ ῥάδιόν γε αὐτῷ φαίνεται καὶ ἅμα ὁρῶν αὐτὸν ἐπιτιμιῶντα, ἐκέλευεν ἥντινα βούλεται δύναμιν λαβόντα, τὸ ἐπὶ σφᾶς εἶναι, ἐπιχειρεῖν.

you are general, not I.”¹ Nikias only replied by repeating his exhortation, renouncing formally the command against Sphakteria, and calling upon the Athenians to recollect what Kleon had said, as well as to hold him to his engagement. The more Kleon tried to evade the duty, the louder and more unanimous did the cry of the assembly become that Nikias should surrender it to him, and that *he* should undertake it. At last, seeing that there was no possibility of receding, Kleon reluctantly accepted the charge, and came forward to announce his intention in a resolute address—“I am not at all afraid of the Lacedæmonians (he said): I shall sail without even taking with me any of the hoplites from the regular Athenian muster-roll, but only the Lemnian and Imbrian hoplites who are now here (that is, Athenian kleruchs or out-citizens who had properties in Lemnos and Imbros, and habitually resided there), together with some peltasts brought from Ænos in Thrace, and 400 bowmen. With this force, added to what is already at Pylus, I engage in the space of twenty days either to bring the Lacedæmonians in Sphakteria hither as prisoners, or to kill them in the island.” The Athenians (observes Thucydides) laughed somewhat at Kleon’s looseness of tongue; but prudent men had pleasure in reflecting that one or other of the two advantages was now certain: either they would get rid of Kleon, which they anticipated as the issue at once most probable and most desirable—or if mistaken on this point, the Lacedæmonians in the island would be killed or taken.² The vote was accordingly passed for the immediate departure of Kleon, who caused Demosthenês to be named as his colleague in command, and sent intelligence to Pylus at once that he was about to start with the reinforcement solicited.

This curious scene, interesting as laying open the interior

¹ Thucyd. iv. 28. Ὁ δὲ (Κλέων) τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, οἰόμενος αὐτὸν (Νικίαν) λόγῳ μόνον ἀφίεναι, ἐτοίμος ἦν, γνοὺς δὲ τῷ ὄντι παραδωσέοντα ἀνεχώρει, καὶ οὐκ ἔφη αὐτὸς ἀλλ’ ἐκείνον στρατηγεῖν, δειδῶς ἦδη καὶ οὐκ ἂν οἰόμενός οἱ αὐτὸν τολμῆσαι ὑποχωρῆσαι. Αὐθις δὲ ὁ Νικίας ἐκέλευε, καὶ ἐξίστατο τῆς ἐπὶ Πύλῳ ἀρχῆς, καὶ μάρτυρας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐποιεῖτο. Οἱ δέ, οἶον ὄχλος φιλεῖ ποιεῖν, ὅσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ Κλέων ὑπέφενγε τὸν πλοῦν καὶ ἐξανεχώρει τὰ εἰρημένα, τόσῳ ἐπεκελεύοντο τῷ Νικίᾳ παραδίδναι τὴν ἀρχήν, καὶ ἐκείνῳ ἐπεβόων πλεῖν. Ὡστε οὐκ ἔχων ὅπως τῶν εἰρημένων ἔτι ἐξαπαλλαγῇ, ὀφίσταται τὸν πλοῦν, καὶ παρελθὼν οὕτε φοβεῖσθαι ἔφη Λακεδαιμονίους, &c.

² Thucyd. iv. 28. Τοῖς δὲ Ἀθηναίοις ἐνέπεσε μὲν τι καὶ γέλωτος τῇ κουφολογίᾳ αὐτοῦ· ἀσμένους δ’ ὅμως ἐγένετο τοῖς σώφροσι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, λογιζομένοις δυοῖν ἀγαθοῖν τοῦ ἐτέρου τεύξεσθαι—ἢ Κλέωνος ἀπαλλαγῆσθαι, ἢ μᾶλλον ἡλπίζον, ἢ σφαλεῖσι γνώμῃς Λακεδαιμονίους σφίσι χειρώσεσθαι.

feeling of the Athenian assembly, suggests, when properly considered, reflections very different from those which have been usually connected with it. It seems to be conceived by most historians as a mere piece of levity or folly in the Athenian people, who are supposed to have enjoyed the excellent joke of putting an incompetent man against his own will at the head of this enterprise, in order that they might amuse themselves with his blunders: Kleon is thus contemptible, and the Athenian people ridiculous. Certainly, if that people had been disposed to conduct their public business upon such childish fancies as are here implied, they would have made a very different figure from that which history actually presents to us. The truth is, that in regard to Kleon's alleged looseness of tongue, which excited more or less of laughter among the persons present, there was no one really ridiculous except the laughers themselves. For the announcement which he made was so far from being extravagant, that it was realised to the letter—and realised too, let us add, without any peculiar aid from unforeseen favourable accident. To illustrate further what is here said, we have only to contrast the jesters before the fact with the jesters after it. While the former deride Kleon as a promiser of extravagant and impossible results, we find Aristophanês (in his comedy of the Knights about six months afterwards¹) laughing at him as having achieved nothing at all—as having cunningly put himself into the shoes of Demosthenês, and stolen away from that general the glory of taking Sphakteria, after all the difficulties of the enterprise had been already got over, and “the cake ready baked”—to use the phrase of the comic poet. Both of the jests are exaggerations in opposite directions; but the last in order of time, if it be good at all against Kleon, is a galling sarcasm against those who derided Kleon as an extravagant boaster.

¹ Aristophanês, *Equit.* 54—

... καὶ πρῶν γ' ἐμοῦ
Μᾶζαν μεμαχότος ἐν Πύλῳ Λακωνικῇν,
Πανουργότατά πως περιδραμών, ὑφαρπάσας
Αὐτὸς παρέθηκε τὴν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ μεμαγμένην.

It is Demosthenes who speaks in reference to Kleon—termed in that comedy the Paphlagonian slave of Demos.

Compare v. 391—

Κᾶτ' ἀνὴρ ἔδοξεν εἶναι, τᾷλλότριον ἁμῶν θέρος, &c.

and 740-1197.

So far from cunningly thrusting himself into the post of general, Kleon did everything he possibly could to avoid the post, and was only forced into it by the artifices of his enemies. It is important to notice how little the jests of Aristophanês can be taken as any evidence of historical reality.

If we intend fairly to compare the behaviour of Kleon with that of his political adversaries, we must distinguish between the two occasions: first, that in which he had frustrated the pacific mission of the Lacedæmonian envoys; next, the subsequent delay and dilemma which has been recently described. On the first occasion, his advice appears to have been mistaken in policy, as well as offensive in manner: his opponents, proposing a discussion by special commissioners as a fair chance for honourable terms of peace, took a juster view of the public interests. But the case was entirely altered when the mission for peace (wisely or unwisely) had been broken up, and when the fate of Sphakteria had been committed to the chances of war. There were then imperative reasons for prosecuting the war vigorously, and for employing all the force requisite to ensure the capture of that island. And looking to this end, we shall find that there was nothing in the conduct of Kleon either to blame or to deride; while his political adversaries (Nikias among them) are deplorably timid, ignorant, and reckless of the public interest; seeking only to turn the existing disappointment and dilemma into a party-opportunity for ruining him.

To grant the reinforcement asked for by Demosthenês was obviously the proper measure, and Kleon saw that the people would go along with him in proposing it. But he had at the same time good grounds for reproaching Nikias and the other Stratêgi, whose duty it was to originate that proposition, with their backwardness in remaining silent, and in leaving the matter to go by default, as if it were Kleon's affair and not theirs. His taunt—"This is what *I* would have done, if *I* were general"—was a mere phrase of the heat of debate, such as must have been very often used without any idea on the part of the hearers of construing it as a pledge which the speaker was bound to realise. It was no disgrace to Kleon to decline a charge which he had never sought, and to confess his incompetence to command. The reason why he was forced into the post, in spite of his own unaffected reluctance, was not (as some historians would have us believe) because the Athenian people loved a joke, but from two feelings, both perfectly serious, which divided the assembly—feelings opposite in their nature, but coinciding on this occasion to the same result. His enemies loudly urged him forward, anticipating that the enterprise under him would miscarry and that he would thus be ruined: his friends, perceiving this manœuvre, but not sharing in such anticipations, and ascribing his reluctance to

modesty, pronounced themselves so much the more vehemently on behalf of their leader, and repaid the scornful cheer by cheers of sincere encouragement. "Why do not you try your hand at this enterprise, Kleon, if you think it so easy? you will soon find that it is too much for you"—was the cry of his enemies: to which his friends would reply—"Yes, to be sure, try, Kleon: by all means, try: do not be backward; we warrant that you will come honourably out of it, and we will stand by you." Such cheer and counter-cheer is precisely in the temper of an animated multitude (as Thucydides¹ states it) divided in feeling. Friends as well as enemies, thus concurred to impose upon Kleon a compulsion not to be eluded. Of all the parties here concerned, those whose conduct is the most unpardonably disgraceful are, Nikias and his oligarchical supporters; who force a political enemy into the supreme command against his own strenuous protest, persuaded that he will fail so as to compromise the lives of many soldiers and the destinies of the state on an important emergency—but satisfying themselves with the idea that they shall bring him to disgrace and ruin.

It is to be remarked that Nikias and his fellow Stratēgi were backward on this occasion, partly because they were really afraid of the duty. They anticipated a resistance to the death at Sphakteria such as that at Thermopylæ: in which case, though victory might perhaps be won by a superior assailant force, it would not be won without much bloodshed and peril, besides an inextinguishable quarrel with Sparta. If Kleon took a more correct measure of the chances, he ought to have credit for it as one "*bene ausus vana contemnere*." And it seems probable, that if he had not been thus forward in supporting the request of Demosthenēs for reinforcement—or rather, if he had not been so placed that he was compelled to be forward—Nikias and his friends would have laid aside the enterprise, and reopened negotiations for peace under circumstances neither honourable nor advantageous to Athens. Kleon was in this matter one main author of the most important success which Athens obtained throughout the whole war.

On joining Demosthenēs with his reinforcement, Kleon found every preparation for attack made by that general, and the soldiers at Pylus eager to commence such aggressive measures as would relieve them from the tedium of a blockade. Sphakteria had become recently more open to assault in consequence of an accidental conflagration of the

¹ Thucyd. iv. 28. οἶον ὅχλος φιλεῖ ποιεῖν, &c.

wood, arising from a fire kindled by the Athenian seamen, while landing at the skirt of the island and cooking their food. Under the influence of a strong wind, most of the wood in the island had thus caught fire and been destroyed. To Demosthenês this was an accident especially welcome : for the painful experience of his defeat in the forest-covered hills of Ætolia had taught him how difficult it was for assailants to cope with an enemy whom they could not see, and who knew all the good points of defence in the country.¹ The island being thus stripped of its wood, he was enabled to survey the garrison, to count their number, and to lay his plan of attack on certain data. He now, too, for the first time discovered that he had underrated their real number, having before suspected that the Lacedæmonians had sent in rations for a greater total than was actually there. The island was occupied altogether by 420 Lacedæmonian hoplites, out of whom more than 120 were native Spartans, belonging to the first families in the city. The commander Epitadas, with the main body, occupied the centre of the island, near the only spring of water which it afforded :² an advanced guard of thirty hoplites was posted not far from the sea-shore in the end of the island farthest from Pylus ; while the end immediately fronting Pylus, peculiarly steep and rugged, and containing even a rude circuit of stones, of unknown origin, which served as a sort of defence—was held as a post of reserve.³

Such was the prey which Kleon and Demosthenês were anxious to grasp. On the very day of the arrival of the former, they sent a herald to the Lacedæmonian generals on the mainland, inviting the surrender of the hoplites on the island on condition of being simply detained under guard without any hardship, until a final pacification should take place. Of course the summons was refused ; after which, leaving only one day for repose, the two generals took advantage of the night to put all their hoplites aboard a few triremes, making show as if they were merely commencing the ordinary nocturnal circumnavigation, so as to excite no suspicion in the occupants of the island. The entire body of Athenian hoplites, 800 in number, were thus disembarked in two divisions, one on each side of the island, a little before daybreak : the outposts, consisting of thirty Lacedæmonians, completely unprepared, were

¹ Thucyd. iv. 30.

² Colonel Leake gives an interesting illustration of these particulars in the topography of the island, which may even now be verified (*Travels in Morea*, vol. i. p. 408).

³ Thucyd. iv. 31.

surprised even in their sleep, and all slain.¹ At the point of day, the entire remaining force from the seventy-two triremes was also disembarked, leaving on board none but the thalamii or lowest tier of rowers, and reserving only a sufficient number to man the walls of Pylus. Altogether there could not have been less than 10,000 troops employed in the attack of the island—men of all arms: 800 hoplites, 800 peltasts, 800 bowmen; the rest armed with javelins, slings, and stones. Demosthenês kept his hoplites in one compact body, but distributed the light-armed into separate companies of about 200 men each, with orders to occupy the rising grounds all round, and harass the flanks and rear of the Lacedæmonians.²

To resist this large force, the Lacedæmonian commander Epitadas had only 360 hoplites around him; for his outlying company of thirty men had been slain, and as many more must have been held in reserve to guard the rocky station in his rear. Of the Helots who were with him, Thucydidês says nothing during the whole course of the action. As soon as he saw the numbers and disposition of his enemies, Epitadas placed his men in battle array, and advanced to encounter the main body of hoplites whom he saw before him. But the Spartan march was habitually slow:³ moreover the ground was rough and uneven, obstructed with stumps, and overlaid with dust and ashes, from the recently burnt wood, so that a march at once rapid and orderly was hardly possible. He had to traverse the whole intermediate space, since the Athenian hoplites remained immovable in their position. No sooner had his march commenced, than he found himself assailed both in rear and flanks, especially in the right or unshielded flank, by the numerous companies of light-armed.⁴ Notwithstanding their extraordinary superiority of number, these men were at first awe-stricken at finding themselves in actual contest with Lacedæmonian hoplites.⁵ Still they began the fight, poured in their missile weapons, and so annoyed the march that the hoplites were obliged to halt, while Epitadas ordered the most active among them to spring out of their ranks and repel the assailants. But pursuers with spear and shield had little chance of overtaking men lightly clad and armed, who always retired, in whatever direction the pursuit was commenced—had the advantage of difficult ground—redoubled their

¹ Thucyd. iv. 31.

² Thucyd. iv. 32.

³ Thucyd. v. 71.

⁴ Thucyd. iv. 33.

⁵ Thucyd. iv. 34. ὥσπερ ὅτε πρῶτον ἀπέβαινον τῇ γνώμῃ δεδουλωμένοι
ὡς ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους, &c.

annoyance against the rear of the pursuers, as soon as the latter retreated to resume their place in the ranks—and always took care to get ground to the rear of the hoplites.

After some experience of the inefficacy of Lacedæmonian pursuit, the light-armed, becoming far bolder than at first, closed upon them nearer and more universally, with arrows, javelins, and stones,—raising shouts and clamour that rent the air, rendering the word of command inaudible by the Lacedæmonian soldiers—who at the same time were almost blinded by the thick clouds of dust, kicked up from the recently spread wood-ashes.¹ Such method of fighting was one for which the Lykurgæan drill made no provision. The longer it continued, the more painful did the embarrassment of the exposed hoplites become. Their repeated efforts, to destroy or even to reach nimble and ever-returning enemies, all proved abortive, whilst their own numbers were incessantly diminishing by wounds which they could not return. Their only offensive arms consisted of the long spear and short sword usual to the Grecian hoplite, without any missile weapons whatever; nor could they even pick up and throw back the javelins of their enemies, since the points of these javelins commonly broke off and stuck in the shields, or sometimes even in the body which they had wounded. Moreover, the bows of the archers, doubtless carefully selected before starting from Athens, were powerfully drawn, so that their arrows may sometimes have pierced and inflicted wounds even through the shield or the helmet—but at any rate, the stuffed doublet, which formed the only defence of the hoplite on his unshielded side, was a very inadequate protection against them.² Under this trying distress did the

¹ Thucyd. iv. 34: compare with this the narrative of the destruction of the Lacedæmonian mora near Lechæum, by Iphikratēs and the Peltastæ (Xenophon, Hellen. iv. 5, 11).

² Thucyd. iv. 34. Τὸ τε ἔργον ἐνταῦθα χαλεπὸν τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις καθίστατο· οὕτε γὰρ οἱ πῖλοι ἔστεγον τὰ τοξεύματα, δοράτια τε ἐναπεκέκλαστο βαλλομένων, εἶχον δὲ οὐδὲν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς χρήσασθαι, ἀποκεκλημένοι μὲν τῇ ὕψει τοῦ προορᾶν, ὅπδ δὲ τῆς μείζονος βοῆς τῶν πολεμίων τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς παραγγελλόμενα οὐκ ἔσακούοντες, κινδύνου δὲ πανταχόθεν περιεστῶτος, καὶ οὐκ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα καθ' ὅ, τι χρὴ ἀμυνομένους σωθῆναι.

There has been doubt and difficulty in this passage, even from the time of the Scholiasts. Some commentators have translated *πίλοι caps or hats*,—others, *padded cuirasses* of wool or felt, round the breast and back: see the notes of Duker, Dr. Arnold, Poppo, and Gœller. That the word *πίλος* is sometimes used for the helmet or head-piece, is unquestionable—sometimes even (with or without *χαλκοῦς*) for a brazen helmet (see Aristophan. Lysistr. 562; Antiphanēs ap. Athenæ. xi. p. 503): but I cannot think that on this occasion Thucydides would specially indicate the head of the Lacedæmonian hoplite as his chief vulnerable part. Dr. Arnold indeed

Lacedæmonians continue for a long time, poorly provided for defence, and in this particular case altogether helpless for aggression—without being able to approach at all nearer to the Athenian hoplites. At length the Lacedæmonian commander, seeing that his position grew worse and worse, gave orders to close the ranks and retreat to the last redoubt in the rear. But this movement was not accomplished without difficulty, for the light-armed assailants became so clamorous and forward, that many wounded men, unable to move, or at least to keep in rank, were overtaken and slain.¹

A diminished remnant, however, reached the last post in safety. Here they were in comparative protection, since the ground was so rocky and impracticable that their enemies could attack them neither in flank nor rear; though the position at any rate could not have been long tenable separately, inasmuch as the only spring of water in the island was in the centre, which they had just been compelled to abandon. The light-armed being now less available, Demosthenês and Kleon brought up their 800 Athenian hoplites, who had not before been engaged. But the Lacedæmonians were here at home² with their weapons, and enabled to display their well-known superiority against opposing hoplites, especially as they had the vantage-ground against enemies charging from beneath. Although the Athenians were double in numbers, and withal yet unexhausted, they were repulsed in many successive attacks. The besieged maintained their ground in spite of all previous fatigue and suffering, harder to be borne from the scanty diet on which they had recently subsisted. The struggle lasted so long that heat and thirst began to tell even upon the assailants, when the commander of the Messenians came to Kleon and Demosthenês, and intimated that they were now labouring in vain; promising at the same time that if they would confide to him a detachment of light troops and bowmen, he would find his way round to the higher cliffs in the rear of the assailants.³ offers a reason to prove that he might naturally do so; but in my judgement the reason is insufficient.

Πῖλοι means stuffed clothing of wool or felt, whether employed to protect head, body, or feet: and I conceive, with Poppo and others, that it here indicates the body-clothing of the Lacedæmonian hoplite; his body being the part most open to be wounded, on the side undefended by the shield, as well as in the rear. That the word πῖλοι will bear this sense may be seen in Pollux, vii. 171; Plato, Timæus, p. 74; and Symposium, p. 220, c. 35: respecting πῖλος as applied to the foot-covering—Bekker, Chariklês, vol. ii. p. 376.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 35.

² Thucyd. iv. 33. τῇ σφετέρᾳ ἐμπειρίᾳ χρῆσασθαι, &c.

³ Thucyd. iv. 36.

He accordingly stole away unobserved from the rear, scrambling round over pathless crags, and by an almost impracticable footing on the brink of the sea, through approaches which the Lacedæmonians had left unguarded, never imagining that they could be molested in that direction. He suddenly appeared with his detachment on the higher peak above them, so that their position was thus commanded, and they found themselves, as at Thermopylæ, between two fires, without any hope of escape. Their enemies in front, encouraged by the success of the Messenians, pressed forward with increased ardour, until at length the courage of the Lacedæmonians gave way, and the position was carried.¹

A few moments more, and they would have been all overpowered and slain,—when Kleon and Demosthenês, anxious to carry them as prisoners to Athens, constrained their men to halt, and proclaimed by herald an invitation to surrender, on condition of delivering up their arms, and being held at the disposal of the Athenians. Most of them, incapable of further effort, closed with the proposition forthwith, signifying compliance by dropping their shields and waving their hands above their heads. The battle being thus ended, Styphon the commander—originally only third in command, but now chief; since Epitadas had been slain, and the second in command, Hippagretês, was lying disabled by wounds on the field—entered into conference with Kleon and Demosthenês, and entreated permission to send across for orders to the Lacedæmonians on the mainland. The Athenian commanders, though refusing this request, sent a messenger of their own, inviting Lacedæmonian heralds over from the mainland, through whom communications were exchanged twice or three times between Styphon and the chief Lacedæmonian authorities. At length the final message came—"The Lacedæmonians direct you to take counsel for yourselves, but to do nothing disgraceful."² Their counsel was speedily taken; they surrendered themselves and delivered up their arms; 292 in number, the survivors of the original total of 420. And out of these no less than 120 were native Spartans, some of them belonging to the first families in the city.³ They were kept under guard during that night, and distributed on the morrow among the Athenian trierarchs to be conveyed as prisoners to

¹ Thucyd. iv. 37.

² Thucyd. iv. 38. Οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι κελεύουσιν ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς περὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν βουλευέσθαι, μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν ποιοῦντας.

³ Thucyd. iv. 38; v. 15.

Athens; while a truce was granted to the Lacedæmonians on shore, in order that they might carry across the dead bodies for burial. So careful had Epitadas been in husbanding the provisions, that some food was yet found in the island; though the garrison had subsisted for fifty-two days upon casual supplies, aided by such economies as had been laid by during the twenty days of the armistice, when food of a stipulated quantity was regularly furnished. Seventy-two days had thus elapsed, from the first imprisonment in the island to the hour of their surrender.¹

The best troops in modern times would neither incur reproach, nor occasion surprise, by surrendering, under circumstances in all respects similar to this gallant remnant in Sphakteria. Yet in Greece the astonishment was prodigious and universal, when it was learnt that the Lacedæmonians had consented to become prisoners.² For the terror inspired by their name, and the deep-struck impression of Thermopylæ had created a belief that they would endure any extremity of famine, and perish in the midst of any superiority of hostile force, rather than dream of giving up their arms and surviving as captives. The events of Sphakteria, shocking as they did this preconceived idea, discredited the military prowess of Sparta in the eyes of all Greece, and especially in those of her own allies. Even in Sparta itself, too, the same feeling prevailed—partially revealed in the answer transmitted to Styphon from the generals on shore, who did not venture to forbid surrender, yet discountenanced it by implication. It is certain that the Spartans would have lost less by their death than by their surrender. But we read with disgust the spiteful taunt of one of the allies of Athens (not an Athenian) engaged in the affair, addressed in the form of a question to one of the prisoners—"Have your best men then been all slain?" The reply conveyed an intimation of the standing contempt entertained by the Lacedæmonians for the bow and its chance-strokes in the line—"That would be a capital arrow which could single out the best man." The language which Herodotus puts into the mouth of Demaratus, composed in the early years of the Peloponnesian war, attests this same belief in Spartan valour—"The Lacedæmonians die, but never surrender."³ Such impression was from henceforward,

¹ Thucyd. iv. 39.

² Thucyd. iv. 40. *παρὰ γνώμην τε δὴ μάλιστα τῶν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτο τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐγένετο, &c.*

³ To adopt a phrase, the counterpart of that which has been ascribed to the Vieille Garde of the Emperor Napoleon's army: compare Herodot. vii. 104.

not indeed effaced, but sensibly enfeebled, nor was it ever again restored to its full former pitch.

But the general judgement of the Greeks respecting the capture of Sphakteria, remarkable as it is to commemorate, is far less surprising than that pronounced by Thucydides himself. Kleon and Demosthenes returning with a part of the squadron and carrying all the prisoners, started from Sphakteria on the next day but one after the action, and reached Athens within twenty days after Kleon had left it. Thus "the promise of Kleon, *insane as it was*, came true"—observes the historian.¹

¹ Thucyd. iv. 39. Καὶ τοῦ Κλέωνος καί περ μανιώδης οὕσα ἡ ὑπόσχεσις ἀπέβη· ἐντὸς γὰρ εἰκοσιν ἡμερῶν ἤγαγε τοὺς ἄνδρας, ὥσπερ ὑπέστη.

Mr. Mitford, in recounting these incidents, after having said respecting Kleon—"In a *very extraordinary train of circumstances* which followed, *his impudence and his fortune* (if in the want of another, we may use that term) wonderfully favoured him"—goes on to observe two pages farther—

"It however soon appeared, that though for a man like Kleon, unversed in military command, the undertaking was rash and the bragging promise abundantly ridiculous, yet the business was not so desperate as it was in the moment generally imagined: and in fact the folly of the Athenian people, in committing such a trust to such a man, far exceeded that of the man himself, whose impudence seldom carried him beyond the control of his cunning. He had received intelligence that Demosthenes had already formed the plan and was preparing for the attempt, with the forces upon the spot and in the neighbourhood. Hence his apparent moderation in the demand for troops; which he judiciously accommodated to the gratification of the Athenian people, by avoiding to require any Athenians. He further showed his judgment, when the decree was to be passed which was finally to direct the expedition, by a request which was readily granted, that Demosthenes might be joined with him in the command." (Mitford, Hist. of Greece, vol. iii. ch. xv. sect. vii. p. 250-253.)

It appears as if no historian could write down the name of Kleon without attaching to it some disparaging verb or adjective. We are here told in the same sentence that Kleon was an *impudent braggart* for *promising the execution of the enterprise*—and yet that the enterprise itself was *perfectly feasible*. We are told in one sentence that he was rash and ridiculous for promising this, *unversed as he was in military command*: a few words farther, we are informed that he expressly requested that the most competent man to be found, Demosthenes, might be named his colleague. We are told of the *cunning of Kleon*, and that *Kleon had received intelligence from Demosthenes*—as if this were some private communication to himself. But Demosthenes had sent no news to Kleon, nor did Kleon know anything, which was not equally known to every man in the assembly. *The folly of the people in committing the trust to Kleon* is denounced—as if Kleon had sought it himself, or as if his friends had been the first to propose it for him. If the folly of the people was thus great, what are we to say of the knavery of the oligarchical party, with Nikias at their head, who impelled the people into this folly, for the purpose of ruining a political antagonist, and who forced Kleon into the post against his own most unaffected reluctance? Against this manœuvre of the oligarchical party, neither Mr. Mitford nor any other historian says a word. When Kleon judges circumstances

Men with arms in their hands have always the option between death and imprisonment, and Grecian opinion was only mistaken in assuming as a certainty that the Lacedæmonians would choose the former. But Kleon had never promised to bring them home as prisoners: his promise was disjunctive—that they should be either so brought home, or slain, within twenty days. No sentence throughout the whole of Thucydides astonishes me so much as that in which he stigmatises such an expectation as “insane.” Here are 420 Lacedæmonian hoplites, without any other description of troops to aid them—without the possibility of being reinforced—without any regular fortification—without any narrow pass such as that of Thermopylæ—without either a sufficient or a certain supply of food—cooped up in a small open island less than two miles in length. Against them are brought 10,000 troops of divers arms, including 800 fresh hoplites from Athens, and marshalled by Demosthenês, a man alike enterprising and experienced. For the talents as well as the presence and preparations of Demosthenês are a part of the data of the case, and the personal competence of Kleon to command alone is foreign to the calculation. Now if, under such circumstances, Kleon engaged that this forlorn company of brave men should be either slain or taken prisoners, how could he be looked upon, I will not say as indulging in an insane boast, but even as overstepping a cautious and mistrustful estimate of probability? Even to doubt of this result, much more to pronounce such an opinion as that of Thucydides, implies an idea not only of superhuman power in the Lacedæmonian hoplites, but a disgraceful incapacity on the part of Demosthenês and the assailants. The interval of twenty days, named by Kleon, was not extravagantly narrow, considering the distance of Athens from Pylus. For the attack of this petty island could not possibly occupy more than one or two days at the utmost, though the blockade of it might by various accidents have been prolonged, or might even, by

rightly, as Mr. Mitford allows that he did in this case, he has credit for nothing better than *cunning*.

The truth is, that the people committed no folly in appointing Kleon—for he justified the best expectations of his friends. But Nikias and his friends committed great knavery in proposing it, since they fully believed that he would fail. And even upon Mr. Mitford’s statement of the case, the opinion of Thucydides which stands at the beginning of this note is thoroughly unjustifiable; not less unjustifiable than the language of the modern historian about the “extraordinary circumstances,” and the way in which Kleon was “favoured by fortune.” Not a single incident can be specified in the narrative to bear out these invidious assertions.

some terrible storm, be altogether broken off. If then we carefully consider this promise, made by Kleon in the assembly, we shall find that so far from deserving the sentence pronounced upon it by Thucydides, of being a mad boast which came true by accident—it was a reasonable and even a modest anticipation of the future :¹ reserving the only really doubtful point in the case—whether the garrison of the island would be ultimately slain or made prisoners. Demosthenês, had he been present at Athens instead of being at Pylus, would willingly have set his seal to the engagement taken by Kleon.

I repeat with reluctance, though not without relief, the statement made by one of the biographers of Thucydides²—that Kleon was the cause of the banishment of the latter as a general, and has therefore received from him harder measure than was due in his capacity of historian. But though this sentiment is not probably without influence in dictating the unaccountable judgement which I have just been criticising—as well as other opinions relative to Kleon, on which I shall say more in a future chapter—I nevertheless look upon that judgement not as peculiar to Thucydides, but as common to him with Nikias and those whom we must call, for want of a better name, the oligarchical party of the time at Athens. And it gives us some measure of the prejudice and narrowness of vision which prevailed among that party at the present memorable crisis ; so pointedly contrasting with the clear-sighted and resolute calculations, and the judicious conduct in action, of Kleon, who when forced against his will into the post of general, did the very best which could be done in his situation—he selected Demosthenês as colleague and heartily seconded his operations. Though the military attack of Sphakteria, one of the ablest specimens of generalship in the whole war, and distinguished not less by the dexterous employment of different

¹ The jest of an unknown comic writer (probably Eupolis or Aristophanês, in one of the many lost dramas) against Kleon—"that he showed great powers of prophecy after the fact"—(*Κλέων Προμθεύς ἐστὶ μετὰ τὰ πρῶματα*, Lucian, *Prometheus*, c. 2) may probably have reference to his proceedings about Sphakteria : if so, it is certainly undeserved.

In the letter which he sent to announce the capture of Sphakteria and the prisoners to the Athenians, it is affirmed that he began with the words—*Κλέων Ἀθηναίων τῇ Βουλῇ καὶ τῷ Δῆμῳ χαίρειν*. This was derided by Eupolis, and is even considered as a piece of insolence. We must therefore presume that the form was unusual in addressing the people : though it certainly seems neither insolent, nor in the least unsuitable, after so important a success (Schol. ad Aristophan. *Plut.* 322 ; Bergk, *De Reliquiis Comœdiæ Antiquæ*, p. 362).

² Vit. Thucydidis, p. xv. ed. Bekker.

descriptions of troops than by care to spare the lives of the assailants—belongs altogether to Demosthenês; yet if Kleon had not been competent to stand up in the Athenian assembly and defy those gloomy predictions which we see attested in Thucydîdês, Demosthenês would never have been reinforced nor placed in condition to land on the island. The glory of the enterprise therefore belongs jointly to both. Kleon, far from stealing away the laurels of Demosthenês (as Aristophanês represents in his comedy of the Knights), was really the means of placing them on his head, though he at the same time deservedly shared them. It has hitherto been the practice to look at Kleon only from the point of view of his opponents, through whose testimony we know him. But the real fact is that this history of the events of Sphakteria, when properly surveyed, is a standing disgrace to those opponents, and no inconsiderable honour to him; exhibiting them as alike destitute of political foresight and of straightforward patriotism—as sacrificing the opportunities of war, along with the lives of their fellow-citizens and soldiers, for the purpose of ruining a political enemy. It was the duty of Nikias, as Stratêgus, to propose, and undertake in person if necessary, the reduction of Sphakteria. If he thought the enterprise dangerous, that was a good reason for assigning to it a larger military force, as we shall find him afterwards reasoning about the Sicilian expedition—but not for letting it slip or throwing it off upon others.¹

The return of Kleon and Demosthenês to Athens, within the twenty days promised, bringing with them near 300 Lacedæmonian prisoners, must have been by far the most triumphant and exhilarating event which had occurred to the Athenians throughout the whole war. It at once changed the prospects, position, and feelings, of both the contending parties. Such a number of Lacedæmonian prisoners, especially 120 Spartans, was a source of almost stupefaction to the general body of Greeks, and a prize of inestimable value to the captors. The return of Demosthenês in the preceding year from the Ambrakian Gulf, when he brought with him 300 Ambrakian panoplies, had probably been sufficiently triumphant. But the entry into Peiræus on this occasion from Sphakteria, with 300 Lacedæmonian prisoners, must doubtless have occasioned emotions transcending all former experience. It is much to be regretted that no description is preserved to us of the scene, as well as of the elate manifestations of the people when the prisoners were marched up from Peiræus to Athens. We

¹ Plutarch, Nikias, c. 8; Thucyd. v. 7.

should be curious also to read some account of the first Athenian assembly held after this event—the overwhelming cheers heaped upon Kleon by his joyful partisans, who had helped to invest him with the duties of general, in confidence that he would discharge them well—contrasted with the silence or retraction of Nikias and the other humiliated political enemies. But all such details are unfortunately denied to us—though they constitute the blood and animation of Grecian history, now lying before us only in its skeleton.

The first impulse of the Athenians was to regard the prisoners as a guarantee to their territory against invasion.¹ They resolved to keep them securely guarded until the peace; but if at any time before that event the Lacedæmonian army should enter Attica, then to bring forth the prisoners, and put them to death in sight of the invaders. They were at the same time full of spirits in regard to the prosecution of the war, and became further confirmed in the hope, not merely of preserving their power undiminished, but even of recovering much of what they had lost before the Thirty years' truce. Pylus was placed in an improved state of defence, with the adjoining island of Sphakteria doubtless as a subsidiary occupation. The Messenians, transferred thither from Naupaktus, and overjoyed to find themselves once more masters even of an outlying rock of their ancestral territory, began with alacrity to overrun and ravage Laconia: while the Helots, shaken by the recent events, manifested inclination to desert to them. The Lacedæmonian authorities, experiencing evils before unfelt and unknown, became sensibly alarmed lest such desertions should spread through the country. Reluctant as they were to afford obvious evidence of their embarrassments, they nevertheless brought themselves (probably under the pressure of the friends and relatives of the Sphakterian captives) to send to Athens several missions for peace; but all proved abortive.² We are not told what they offered, but it did not come up to the expectations which the Athenians thought themselves entitled to indulge.

We, who now review these facts with a knowledge of the subsequent history, see that the Athenians could have concluded a better bargain with the Lacedæmonians during the six or eight months succeeding the capture of Sphakteria, than it was ever open to them to make afterwards: and they had reason to repent letting slip the opportunity. Perhaps indeed Periklês, had he been still alive, might have taken a more

¹ Thucyd. iv. 41.

² Thucyd. iv. 41; compare Aristophan. Equit. 648, with Schol.

prudent measure of the future, and might have had ascendancy enough over his countrymen to be able to arrest the tide of success at its highest point, before it began to ebb again.

But if we put ourselves back into the situation of Athens during the autumn which succeeded the return of Kleon and Demosthenês from Sphakteria, we shall easily enter into the feelings under which the war was continued. The actual possession of the captives now placed Athens in a far better position than she had occupied when they were only blocked up in Sphakteria, and when the Lacedæmonian envoys first arrived to ask for peace. She was now certain of being able to command peace with Sparta on terms at least tolerable, whenever she chose to invite it—she had also a fair certainty of escaping the hardship of invasion. Next—and this was perhaps the most important feature of the case—the apprehension of Lacedæmonian prowess was now greatly lowered, and the prospects of success to Athens considered as prodigiously improved,¹ even in the estimation of impartial Greeks; much more in the eyes of the Athenians themselves. Moreover the idea of a tide of good fortune—of the favour of the gods now begun and likely to continue—of future success as a corollary from past—was one which powerfully affected Grecian calculations generally. Why not push the present good fortune and try to regain the most important points lost before and by the Thirty years' truce, especially in Megara and Bœotia—points which Sparta could not concede by negotiation, since they were not in her possession? Though these speculations failed (as we shall see in the coming chapter), yet there was nothing unreasonable in acting upon them. Probably the almost universal sentiment of Athens was at this moment warlike. Even Nikias, humiliated as he must have been by the success in Sphakteria, would forget his usual caution in the desire of retrieving his own personal credit by some military exploit. That Demosthenês, now in full measure of esteem, would be eager to prosecute the war, with which his prospects of personal glory were essentially associated (just as Thucydides² observes about Brasidas on the Lacedæmonian side), can admit of no doubt. The comedy of Aristophanês called the *Acharnians* was acted about six months before the affair of Sphakteria, when no one could possibly look forward to such an event—the comedy of the *Knights* about six months after it.³ Now there is this

¹ Thucyd. iv. 79.

² Thucyd. v. 16.

³ The *Acharneis* was performed at the festival of the Lenæa at Athens—

remarkable difference between the two—that while the former breathes the greatest sickness of war, and presses in every possible way the importance of making peace, although at that time Athens had no opportunity of coming even to a decent accommodation—the latter, running down the general character of Kleon with unmeasured scorn and ridicule, talks in one or two places only of the hardships of war, and drops altogether that emphasis and repetition with which peace had been dwelt upon in the *Acharnians*—although coming out at a moment when peace was within the reach of the Athenians.

To understand properly the history of this period, therefore, we must distinguish various occasions which are often confounded. At the moment when *Sphakteria* was first blockaded, and when the Lacedæmonians first sent to solicit peace, there was a considerable party at Athens disposed to entertain the offer. The ascendancy of Kleon was one of the main causes why it was rejected. But after the captives were brought home from *Sphakteria*, the influence of Kleon, though positively greater than it had been before, was no longer required to procure the dismissal of Lacedæmonian pacific offers and the continuance of the war. The general temper of Athens was then warlike, and there were very few to contend strenuously for an opposite policy. During the ensuing year, however, the chances of war turned out mostly unfavourable to Athens, so that by the end of that year she had become much more disposed to peace.¹ The truce for one year was then concluded. But even after that truce was expired, Kleon still continued eager (and on good grounds, as will be shown hereafter) for renewing the war in Thrace, at a time when a large proportion of the Athenian public had grown weary of it. He was one of the main causes of that resumption of warlike operations, which ended in the battle of *Amphipolis*, fatal both to himself and to *Brasidas*. There were thus two distinct occasions on which the personal influence and sanguine character of Kleon seems to have been of sensible moment in determining the Athenian public to war instead of peace. But at the moment which we have now reached—that is, the year immediately following the capture of *Sphakteria*—the Athenians were sufficiently warlike without him; probably *Nikias* himself as well as the rest.

January, 425 B.C.; the Knights at the same festival in the ensuing year, 424 B.C.

The capture of *Sphakteria* took place about July, B.C. 425; between the two dates above. See Mr. Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, ad ann.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 117; v. 14.

It was one of the earliest proceedings of Nikias, immediately after the inglorious exhibition which he had made in reference to Sphakteria, to conduct an expedition, in conjunction with two colleagues, against the Corinthian territory. He took with him 80 triremes, 2000 Athenian hoplites, 200 horsemen aboard of some horse transports, and some additional hoplites from Milêtus, Andros, and Karystus.¹ Starting from Peiræus in the evening, he arrived a little before day-break on a beach at the foot of the hill and village of Solygeia,² about seven miles from Corinth, and two or three miles south of the Isthmus. The Corinthian troops, from all the territory of Corinth within the Isthmus, were already assembled at the Isthmus itself to repel him; for intelligence of the intended expedition had reached Corinth some time before from Argos, with which latter place the scheme of the expedition may have been in some way connected. The Athenians having touched the coast during the darkness, the Corinthians were only apprised of the fact by fire-signals from Solygeia. Not being able to hinder the landing, they despatched forthwith half their forces, under Battus and Lykophron, to repel the invader, while the remaining half were left at the harbour of Kenchreæ, on the northern side of Mount Oneion, to guard the port of Krommyon (outside of the Isthmus) in case it should be attacked by sea. Battus with one lochus of hoplites threw himself into the village of Solygeia, which was unfortified, while Lykophron conducted the remaining troops to attack the Athenians. The battle was first engaged on the Athenian right, almost immediately after its landing, on the point called Chersonesus. Here the Athenian hoplites, together with their Karystian allies, repelled the Corinthian attack, after a stout and warmly disputed hand-combat of spear and shield. Nevertheless the Corinthians, retreating up to a higher point of ground, returned to the charge, and with the aid of a fresh lochus, drove the Athenians back to the shore and to their ships: from hence the latter again turned, and again recovered a partial advantage.³ The battle was no less severe on the left wing of the Athenians. But here, after a contest of some length, the latter gained a more decided victory, greatly by the aid of their cavalry—pursuing the Corinthians, who fled in some disorder to a neighbouring hill and there took up a

¹ Thucyd. iv. 42. Τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ θέρου μετὰ ταῦτα ἐβόησεν, &c.

² See the geographical illustrations of this descent in Dr. Arnold's plan and note appended to the second volume of his Thucydidês—and in Colonel Leake—Travels in Morea, ch. xxviii. p. 235; xxix. p. 309.

³ Thucyd. iv. 43.

position.¹ The Athenians were thus victorious throughout the whole line, with the loss of about forty-seven men, while the Corinthians had lost 212, together with the general Lykophron. The victors erected their trophy, stripped the dead bodies and buried their own dead. The Corinthian detachment left at Kenchreæ could not see the battle, in consequence of the interposing ridge of Mount Oneion: but it was at last made known to them by the dust of the fugitives, and they forthwith hastened to afford help. Reinforcements also came both from Corinth and from Kenchreæ, and as it seems too, from the neighbouring Peloponnesian cities—so that Nikias thought it prudent to retire on board of his ships, and halt upon some neighbouring islands. It was here first discovered that two of the Athenians slain had not been picked up for burial; upon which he immediately sent a herald to solicit a truce, in order to procure these two missing bodies. We have here a remarkable proof of the sanctity attached to that duty; for the mere sending of the herald was tantamount to confession of defeat.²

From hence Nikias sailed to Krommyon, where after ravaging the neighbourhood for a few hours he rested for the night. On the next day he re-embarked, sailed along the coast of Epidaurus, upon which he inflicted some damage in passing, and stopped at last on the peninsula of Methana, between Epidaurus and Trœzen.³ On this peninsula he established a permanent garrison, drawing a fortification across the narrow neck of land which joined it to the Epidaurian peninsula. This was his last exploit. He then sailed home: but the post at Methana long remained as a centre for pillaging the neighbouring regions of Epidaurus, Trœzen, and Halieis.

While Nikias was engaged in this expedition, Eurymedon and Sophoklês had sailed forward from Pylus with a considerable portion of that fleet which had been engaged in the capture of Sphakteria, to the island of Korkyra. It has been already stated that the democratical government at Korkyra had been suffering severe pressure and privation from the oligarchical fugitives, who had come back into the island with a body of barbaric auxiliaries, and established themselves upon Mount

¹ Thucyd. iv. 44. *ἔθεντο τὰ ὅπλα*—an expression which Dr. Arnold explains, here as elsewhere, to mean “piling the arms:” I do not think such an explanation is correct, even here; much less in several other places to which he alludes. See a note on the surprise of Platæa by the Thebans, immediately before the Peloponnesian war.

² Plutarch, Nikias, c. 6.

³ Thucyd. iv. 45.

Istônê not far from the city.¹ Eurymedon and the Athenians, joining the Korkyræans in the city, attacked and stormed the post on Mount Istônê; while the vanquished, retiring first to a lofty and inaccessible peak, were forced to surrender themselves on terms to the Athenians. Abandoning altogether their mercenary auxiliaries, they only stipulated that they should themselves be sent to Athens, and left to the discretion of the Athenian people. Eurymedon, assenting to these terms, deposited the disarmed prisoners in the neighbouring islet of Ptychia, under the distinct condition, that if a single man tried to escape, the whole capitulation should be null and void.²

Unfortunately for these men, the orders given to Eurymedon carried him onward straight to Sicily. It was irksome therefore to him to send away a detachment of his squadron to convey prisoners to Athens; where the honours of delivering them would be reaped, not by himself, but by the officer to whom they might be confided. And the Korkyræans in the city, on their part, were equally anxious that the men should not be sent to Athens. Their animosity against them being bitter in the extreme, they were afraid that the Athenians might spare their lives, so that their hostility against the island might be again resumed. And thus a mean jealousy on the part of Eurymedon, combined with revenge and insecurity on the part of the victorious Korkyræans, brought about a cruel catastrophe, paralleled nowhere else in Greece, though too well in keeping with the previous acts of the bloody drama enacted in this island.

The Korkyræan leaders, seemingly not without the privity of Eurymedon, sent across to Ptychia fraudulent emissaries under the guise of friends to the prisoners. These emissaries,—assuring the prisoners that the Athenian commanders, in spite of the convention signed, were about to hand them over to the Korkyræan people for destruction,—induced some of them to attempt escape in a boat prepared for the purpose. By concert, the boat was seized in the act of escaping, so that the terms of the capitulation were really violated: upon which Eurymedon handed over the prisoners to their enemies in the island, who imprisoned them all together in one vast building, under guard of hoplites. From this building they were drawn out in companies of twenty men each, chained together in couples, and compelled to march between two lines of hoplites marshalled on each side of the road. Those who loitered in the march were hurried on by whips from behind: as they advanced, their

¹ Thucyd. iv. 2-45.

² Thucyd. iv. 46.

private enemies on both sides singled them out, striking and piercing them until at length they miserably perished. Three successive companies were thus destroyed—ere the remaining prisoners in the interior, who thought merely that their place of detention was about to be changed, suspected what was passing. As soon as they found it out, one and all refused either to quit the building or to permit any one else to enter. They at the same time piteously implored the intervention of the Athenians, if it were only to kill them and thus preserve them from the cruelties of their merciless countrymen. The latter, abstaining from attempts to force the door of the building, made an aperture in the roof, from whence they shot down arrows, and poured showers of tiles upon the prisoners within ; who sought at first to protect themselves, but at length abandoned themselves to despair, and assisted with their own hands in the work of destruction. Some of them pierced their throats with the arrows shot down from the roof : others hung themselves, either with cords from some bedding which happened to be in the building, or with strips torn and twisted from their own garments. Night came on, but the work of destruction, both from above and within, was continued without intermission, so that before morning, all these wretched men had perished, either by the hands of their enemies or by their own. At daybreak the Korkyræans entered the building, piled up the dead bodies on carts, and transported them out of the city : the exact number we are not told, but seemingly it cannot have been less than 300. The women who had been taken at Istônê along with these prisoners, were all sold as slaves.¹

Thus finished the bloody dissensions in this ill-fated island : for the oligarchical party were completely annihilated, the democracy was victorious, and there were no further violences throughout the whole war.² It will be recollected that these deadly feuds began with the return of the oligarchical prisoners from Corinth, bringing along with them projects both of treason and of revolution. They ended with the annihilation of that party, in the manner above described ; the interval being filled by mutual atrocities and retaliation, wherein of course the victors had most opportunity of gratifying their vindictive passions. Eurymedon, after the termination of these events, proceeded onward with the Athenian squadron to Sicily. What he did there will be described in a future chapter devoted to Sicilian affairs exclusively.

The complete prostration of Ambrakia during the campaign

¹ Thucyd. iv. 47, 48.

² Thucyd. iv. 48.

of the preceding year had left Anaktorium without any defence against the Akarnanians and Athenian squadron from Nau-paktus. They besieged and took it during the course of the present summer ;¹ expelling the Corinthian proprietors, and re-peopling the town and its territory with Akarnanian settlers from all the townships in the country.

Throughout the maritime empire of Athens matters continued perfectly tranquil, except that the inhabitants of Chios, during the course of the autumn, incurred the suspicion of the Athenians from having recently built a new wall to their city, as if it were done with the intention of taking the first opportunity to revolt.² They solemnly protested their innocence of any such designs, but the Athenians were not satisfied without exacting the destruction of the obnoxious wall. The presence on the opposite continent of an active band of Mitylenæan exiles, who captured both Rhœteium and Antandrus during the ensuing spring, probably made the Athenians more anxious and vigilant on the subject of Chios.³

The Athenian regular tribute-gathering squadron, circulating among the maritime subjects, captured, during the course of the present autumn, a prisoner of some importance and singularity. It was a Persian ambassador, Artaphernes, seized at Eion on the Strymon, in his way to Sparta with despatches from the Great King. He was brought to Athens, where his despatches, which were at some length and written in the Assyrian character, were translated and made public. The Great King told the Lacedæmonians, in substance, that he could not comprehend what they meant ; for that among the numerous envoys whom they had sent, no two told the same story. Accordingly he desired them, if they wished to make themselves understood, to send some envoys with fresh and plain instructions to accompany Artaphernes.⁴ Such was the substance of the despatch, conveying a remarkable testimony as to the march of the Lacedæmonian government in its foreign policy. Had any similar testimony existed respecting Athens, demonstrating that her foreign policy was conducted with half as much unsteadiness and stupidity, ample inferences would have been drawn from it to the discredit of democracy. But there has been no motive generally to discredit Lacedæmonian

¹ Thucyd. iv. 49.

² Thucyd. iv. 51.

³ Thucyd. iv. 52.

⁴ Thucyd. iv. 50. ἐν αἷς πολλῶν ἄλλων γεγραμμένων κεφάλαιον ἦν, πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, οὐκ εἶδέναι ὅτι βούλονται πολλῶν γὰρ ἐλθόντων πρέσβων οὐδένα ταῦτα λέγειν· εἰ οὖν τι βούλονται σαφὲς λέγειν, πέμψαι μετὰ τοῦ Πέρσου ἄνδρας ὡς αὐτόν.

institutions, which included kingship in double measure—two parallel lines of hereditary kings; together with an entire exemption from everything like popular discussion. The extreme defects in the foreign management of Sparta, revealed by the despatch of Artaphernes, seem traceable partly to an habitual faithlessness often noted in the Lacedæmonian character—partly to the annual change of Ephors, so frequently bringing into power men who strove to undo what had been done by their predecessors—and still more to the absence of everything like discussion or canvass of public measures among the citizens. We shall find more than one example, in the history about to follow, of this disposition on the part of Ephors not merely to change the policy of their predecessors, but even to subvert treaties sworn and concluded by them. Such was the habitual secrecy of Spartan public business, that in doing this they had neither criticism nor discussion to fear. Brasidas, when he started from Sparta on the expedition which will be described in the coming chapter, could not trust the assurances of the Lacedæmonian executive without binding them by the most solemn oaths.¹

The Athenians sent back Artaphernes in a trireme to Ephesus, and availed themselves of this opportunity for procuring access to the Great King. They sent envoys along with him, with the intention that they should accompany him up to Susa: but on reaching Asia, the news met them that King Artaxerxes had recently died. Under such circumstances, it was not judged expedient to prosecute the mission, and the Athenians dropped their design.²

Respecting the great monarchy of Persia, during this long interval of fifty-four years since the repulse of Xerxes from Greece, we have little information before us except the names of the successive kings. In the year 465 B.C., Xerxes was assassinated by Artabanus and Mithridates, through one of those plots of great household officers, so frequent in Oriental palaces. He left two sons, or at least two sons present and conspicuous among a greater number, Darius and Artaxerxes. But Artabanus persuaded Artaxerxes that Darius had been the murderer of Xerxes, and thus prevailed upon him to revenge

¹ Thucyd. iv. 86. ὅρκοις τε Λακεδαιμονίων καταλαβὼν τὰ τέλη τοῖς μεγίστοις, ἢ μὴν, &c.

² Thucyd. iv. 50; Diodor. xii. 64. The Athenians do not appear to have ever before sent envoys or courted alliance with the Great King; though the idea of doing so must have been noway strange to them, as we may see by the humorous scene of Pseudartabas in the Acharneis of Aristophanês, acted in the year before this event.

his father's death by becoming an accomplice in killing his brother Darius : he next tried to assassinate Artaxerxes himself, and to appropriate the crown. Artaxerxes however, being apprised beforehand of the scheme, either slew Artabanus with his own hand or procured him to be slain, and then reigned (known under the name of Artaxerxes Longimanus) for forty years, down to the period at which we are now arrived.¹

Mention has already been made of the revolt of Egypt from the dominion of Artaxerxes, under the Libyan prince Inarus, actively aided by the Athenians. After a few years of success, this revolt was crushed and Egypt again subjugated, by the energy of the Persian general Megabyzus—with severe loss to the Athenian forces engaged. After the peace of Kallias, erroneously called the Kimonian peace, between the Athenians and the king of Persia, war had not been since resumed. We read in Ktesias, amidst various anecdotes seemingly collected at the court of Susa, romantic adventures ascribed to Megabyzus, his wife Amytis, his mother Amestris, and a Greek physician of Kos, named Apollonides. Zopyrus son of Megabyzus, after the death of his father, deserted from Persia and came as an exile to Athens.²

At the death of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the family violences incident to a Persian succession were again exhibited. His son Xerxes succeeded him, but was assassinated, after a reign of a few weeks or months. Another son, Sogdianus, followed, who perished in like manner after a short interval.³ Lastly, a third son, Ochus (known under the name of Darius Nothus), either abler or more fortunate, kept his crown and life between nineteen and twenty years. By his queen, the savage Parysatis, he was father to Artaxerxes Mnemon and Cyrus the younger, both names of interest in reference to Grecian history, to whom we shall hereafter recur.

¹ Diodor. xi. 65 ; Aristotel. Polit. v. 8, 3 ; Justin, iii. 1 ; Ktesias, Persica, c. 29, 30. It is evident that there were contradictory stories current respecting the plot to which Xerxes fell a victim : but we have no means of determining what the details were.

² Ktesias, Persica, c. 38-43 ; Herodot. iii. 80.

³ Diodor. xii. 64-71 ; Ktesias, Persica, c. 44-46.

CHAPTER LIII

EIGHTH YEAR OF THE WAR

THE eighth year of the war, on which we now touch, presents events of a more important and decisive character than any of the preceding. In reviewing the preceding years we observe that though there is much fighting, with hardship and privation inflicted on both sides, yet the operations are mostly of a desultory character, not calculated to determine the event of the war. But the capture of Sphakteria and its prisoners, coupled with the surrender of the whole Lacedæmonian fleet, was an event full of consequences and imposing in the eyes of all Greece. It stimulated the Athenians to a series of operations, larger and more ambitious than anything which they had yet conceived—directed, not merely against Sparta in her own country, but also to the reconquest of that ascendancy in Megara and Bœotia which they had lost on or before the Thirty years' truce. On the other hand, it intimidated so much both the Lacedæmonians, the revolted Chalkidic allies of Athens in Thrace, and Perdikkas king of Macedonia—that between them the expedition of Brasidas, which struck so serious a blow at the Athenian empire, was concerted. This year is thus the turning-point of the war. If the operations of Athens had succeeded, she would have regained nearly as great a power as she enjoyed before the Thirty years' truce. But it happened that Sparta, or rather the Spartan Brasidas, proved successful, gaining enough to neutralise all the advantages derived by Athens from the capture of Sphakteria.

The first enterprise undertaken by the Athenians in the course of the spring was against the island of Kythêra, on the southern coast of Laconia. It was inhabited by Lacedæmonian Periœki, and administered by a governor, and garrison of hoplites, annually sent thither. It was the usual point of landing for merchantmen from Libya and Egypt; and as it lay very near to Cape Malea, immediately over against the Gulf of Gythium—the only accessible portion of the generally inhospitable coast of Laconia—the chance that it might fall into the hands of an enemy was considered as so menacing to Sparta, that some politicians are said to have wished the island at the bottom of the sea.¹ Nikias, in conjunction with Nikostratus

¹ Thucyd. iv. 53; Herodot. vii. 235. The manner in which Herodotus

and Autoklês, conducted thither a fleet of sixty triremes, with 2000 Athenian hoplites, some few horsemen, and a body of allies mainly Milesians.

There were in the island two towns—Kythêra, and Skandeia ; the former having a lower town close to the sea, fronting Cape Malea, and an upper town on the hill above ; the latter seemingly on the south or west coast. Both were attacked at the same time by order of Nikias : ten triremes and a body of Milesian¹ hoplites disembarked and captured Skandeia ; while the Athenians landed at Kythêra, and drove the inhabitants out of the lower town into the upper, where they speedily capitulated. A certain party among them had indeed secretly invited the coming of Nikias, through which intrigue easy terms were obtained for the inhabitants. Some few men, indicated by the Kytherians in intelligence with Nikias, were carried away as prisoners to Athens ; but the remainder were left undisturbed and enrolled among the tributary allies under

alludes to the dangers which would arise to Sparta from the occupation of Kythêra by an enemy, furnishes one additional probability tending to show that his history was composed before the actual occupation of the island by Nikias, in the eighth year of the Peloponnesian war. Had he been cognisant of this latter event, he would naturally have made some allusion to it.

The words of Thucydides in respect to the island of Kythêra are—the Lacedæmonians πολλὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐποιούντο· ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῖς τῶν τε ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου καὶ Λιβύης δλκᾶδων προσβολή, καὶ λησται ἅμα τὴν Λακωνικὴν ἥσσαν ἐλύπουν ἐκ θαλάσσης, ἥπερ μόνον ὅσον τ' ἦν κακουργεῖσθαι· πᾶσα γὰρ ἀνέχει πρὸς τὸ Σικελικὸν καὶ Κρητικὸν πέλαγος.

I do not understand this passage, with Dr. Arnold and Göller, to mean, that Laconia was unassailable by land, but very assailable by sea. It rather means that the only portion of the coast of Laconia where a maritime invader could do much damage, was in the interior of the Laconic Gulf, near Helos, Gythium, &c.—which is in fact the only plain portion of the coast of Laconia. The two projecting promontories, which end, the one in Cape Malea, the other in Cape Tænarus, are high, rocky, harbourless, and afford very little temptation to a disembarking enemy. “The whole Laconian coast is *high projecting cliff* where it fronts the Sicilian and Kretan seas”—πᾶσα ἀνέχει. The island of Kythêra was particularly favourable for facilitating descents on the territory near Helos and Gythium. The ἀλιμενότης of Laconia is noticed in Xenophon, Hellen. iv. 8, 7—where he describes the occupation of the island by Konon and Pharnabazus.

See Colonel Leake's description of this coast, and the high cliffs between Cape Matapan (Tænarus) and Kalamata, which front the Sicilian sea—as well as those eastward of Cape St. Angelo or Malea, which front the Kretan sea (Travels in Morea, vol. i. ch. vii. p. 261—“tempestuous, rocky, unsheltered coast of Mesamani”—ch. viii. p. 320 ; ch. vi. p. 205 ; Strabo, viii. p. 368 ; Pausan. iii. c. xxvi. 2).

¹ Thucyd. iv. 54. δισχιλίους Μιλησίων ὀπλίταις. It seems impossible to believe that there could have been so many as 2000 Milesian hoplites : but we cannot tell where the mistake lies.

obligation to pay four talents per annum ; an Athenian garrison being placed at Kythêra for the protection of the island. From hence Nikias employed seven days in descents and inroads upon the coast, near Helos, Asinê, Aphrodisia, Kotyrta, and elsewhere. The Lacedæmonian force was disseminated in petty garrisons, which remained each for the defence of its own separate post, without uniting to repel the Athenians, so that there was only one action, and that of little importance, which the Athenians deemed worthy of a trophy.

In returning home from Kythêra, Nikias first ravaged the small strip of cultivated land near Epidaurus Limêra, on the rocky eastern coast of Laconia, and then attacked the Æginetan settlement at Thyrea, the frontier strip between Laconia and Argolis. This town and district had been made over by Sparta to the Æginetans, at the time when they were expelled from their own island by Athens in the first year of the war. The new inhabitants, finding the town too distant from the sea¹ for their maritime habits, were now employed in constructing a fortification close on the shore ; in which work a Lacedæmonian detachment under Tantalus, on guard in that neighbourhood, was assisting them. When the Athenians landed, both Æginetans and Lacedæmonians at once abandoned the new fortification. The Æginetans, with the commanding officer Tantalus, occupied the upper town of Thyrea ; but the Lacedæmonian troops, not thinking it tenable, refused to take part in the defence, and retired to the neighbouring mountains, in spite of urgent entreaty from the Æginetans. Immediately after landing, the Athenians marched up to the town of Thyrea, and carried it by storm, burning or destroying everything within it. All the Æginetans were either killed or made prisoners, and even Tantalus, disabled by his wounds, became prisoner also. From hence the armament returned to Athens, where a vote was taken as to the disposal of the prisoners. The Kytherians brought home were distributed for safe custody among the dependent islands : Tantalus was retained along with the prisoners from Sphakteria ; but a harder fate was reserved for the Æginetans. They were all put to death, victims to the long-standing antipathy between Athens and Ægina. This

¹ Thucyd. iv. 56. He states that Thyrea was ten stadia, or about a mile and one-fifth, distant from the sea. But Colonel Leake (*Travels in the Morea*, vol. ii. ch. xxii. p. 492), who has discovered quite sufficient ruins to identify the spot, affirms "that it is at least three times that distance from the sea."

This explains to us the more clearly why the Æginetans thought it necessary to build their new fort.

cruel act was nothing more than a strict application of admitted customs of war in those days. Had the Lacedæmonians been the victors, there can be little doubt that they would have acted with equal rigour.¹

The occupation of Kythêra, in addition to Pylus, by an Athenian garrison, following so closely upon the capital disaster in Sphakteria, produced in the minds of the Spartans feelings of alarm and depression such as they had never before experienced. Within the course of a few short months their position had completely changed, from superiority and aggression abroad, to insult and insecurity at home. They anticipated nothing less than incessant foreign attacks on all their weak points, with every probability of internal defection, from the standing discontent of the Helots. It was not unknown to them probably that even Kythêra itself had been lost partly through betrayal. The capture of Sphakteria had caused peculiar emotion among the Helots, to whom the Lacedæmonians had addressed both appeals and promises of emancipation, in order to procure succour for their hoplites while blockaded in the island. If the ultimate surrender of these hoplites had abated the terrors of Lacedæmonian prowess throughout all Greece, such effect had been produced to a still greater degree among the oppressed Helots. A refuge at Pylus, and a nucleus which presented some possibility of expanding into regenerated Messenia, were now before their eyes; while the establishment of an Athenian garrison at Kythêra opened a new channel of communication with the enemies of Sparta, so as to tempt all the Helots of daring temper to stand forward as liberators of their enslaved race.² The Lacedæmonians, habitually cautious at all times, felt now as if the tide of fortune had turned decidedly against them, and acted with confirmed mistrust and dismay—confining themselves to measures strictly defensive, but organising a force of 400 cavalry, together with a body of bowmen, beyond their ordinary establishment.

The precautions which they thought it necessary to take in regard to the Helots afford the best measure of their apprehensions at the moment, and exhibit moreover a refinement of fraud and cruelty rarely equalled in history. Wishing to single out from the general body such as were most high-couraged and valiant, the Ephors made proclamation, that those Helots, who conceived themselves to have earned their liberty by distinguished services in war, might stand forward to claim it.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 58; Diodor. xii. 65.

² Thucyd. iv. 41, 55, 56.

A considerable number obeyed the call—probably many who had undergone imminent hazards during the preceding summer in order to convey provisions to the blockaded soldiers in Sphakteria.¹ After being examined by the government, 2000 of them were selected as fully worthy of emancipation; which was forthwith bestowed upon them in public ceremonial—with garlands, visits to the temples, and the full measure of religious solemnity. The government had now made the selection which it desired; presently every man among these newly-enfranchised Helots was made away with—no one knew how.² A stratagem at once so perfidious in the contrivance, so murderous in the purpose, and so complete in the execution, stands without parallel in Grecian history—we might almost say, without a parallel in any history. It implies a depravity far greater than the rigorous execution of a barbarous customary law against prisoners of war or rebels, even in large numbers. The Ephors must have employed numerous instruments, apart from each other, for the performance of this bloody deed. Yet it appears that no certain knowledge could be obtained of the details—a striking proof of the mysterious efficiency of this Council of

¹ Thucyd. iv. 80.

² Thucyd. iv. 80. *καὶ προκρίναντες ἐς δισχιλίους, οἱ μὲν ἐστεφανώσαντο τε καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ περιῆλθον ὡς ἡλευθερωμένοι· οἱ δὲ οὐ πολλῶ ὕστερον ἠφάνισάν τε αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐδὲς ἤσθετο ὅτι τρόπῳ ἕκαστος διεφθάρη*: compare Diodor. xii. 67.

Dr. Thirlwall (History of Greece, vol. iii. ch. xxiii. p. 244, 2nd edit. *note*) thinks that this assassination of Helots by the Spartans took place at some other time unascertained, and not at the time here indicated. I cannot concur in this opinion. It appears to me that there is the strongest probable reason for referring the incident to the time immediately following the disaster in Sphakteria, which Thucydides so especially marks (iv. 41) by the emphatic words—*Οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀμαθεῖς ὄντες ἐν τῷ πρὶν χρόνῳ ληστείας καὶ τοιοῦτου πολέμου, τῶν τε Εἰλώτων αὐτομολούντων καὶ φοβούμενοι μὴ καὶ ἐπὶ μακρότερον σφίσι τι νεωτερισθῇ τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν, οὐ ραδίως ἔφερον*. This was just after the Messenians were first established at Pylus, and began their incursions over Laconia, with such temptations as they could offer to the Helots to desert. And it was naturally just then that the fear, entertained by the Spartans of their Helots, became exaggerated to the maximum—leading to the perpetration of the act mentioned in the text. Dr. Thirlwall observes “that the Spartan government would not order the massacre of the Helots at a time when it could employ them on foreign service.” But to this it may be replied that the capture of Sphakteria took place in July or August, while the expedition under Brasidas was not organised until the following winter or spring. There was therefore an interval of some months, during which the government had not yet formed the idea of employing the Helots on foreign service. And this interval is quite sufficient to give a full and distinct meaning to the expression *καὶ τότε* (Thucyd. iv. 80) on which Dr. Thirlwall insists; without the necessity of going back to any more remote point of antecedent time.

Five, surpassing even that of the Council of Ten at Venice—as well as of the utter absence of public inquiry or discussion.

It was while the Lacedæmonians were in this state of uneasiness at home that envoys reached them from Perdikkas of Macedonia and the Chalkidians of Thrace, entreating aid against Athens; who was considered likely, in her present tide of success, to resume aggressive measures against them. There were moreover other parties, in the neighbouring cities¹ subject to Athens, who secretly favoured the application, engaging to stand forward in open revolt as soon as any auxiliary force should arrive to warrant their incurring the hazard. Perdikkas (who had on his hands a dispute with his kinsman Arrhibæus, prince of the Lynkestæ-Macedonians, which he was anxious to be enabled to close successfully) and the Chalkidians offered at the same time to provide the pay and maintenance, as well as to facilitate the transit, of the troops who might be sent to them. And—what was of still greater importance to the success of the enterprise—they specially requested that Brasidas might be invested with the command.² He had now recovered from his wounds received at Pylus, and his reputation for adventurous valour, great as it was from positive desert, stood out still more conspicuously, because not a single other Spartan had as yet distinguished himself. His other great qualities, apart from personal valour, had not yet been shown, for he had never been in any supreme command. But he burned with impatience to undertake the operation destined for him by the envoys; although at this time it must have appeared so replete with difficulty and danger, that probably no other Spartan except himself would have entered upon it with hopes of success. To raise up embarrassments for Athens in Thrace was an object of great consequence to Sparta, while she also obtained on opportunity of sending away another large detachment of dangerous Helots. Seven hundred of these latter were armed as hoplites and placed under the orders of Brasidas, but the Lacedæmonians would not assign to him any of their own proper forces. With the sanction of the Spartan name—with 700 Helot hoplites, and with such other hoplites as he could raise in Peloponnesus by means of the funds furnished from the Chalkidians—Brasidas prepared to undertake this expedition, alike adventurous and important.

Had the Athenians entertained any suspicion of his design,

¹ Thucyd. iv. 79.

² Thucyd. iv. 80. προϋθυμήθησαν δὲ καὶ οἱ Χαλκιδῆς ἄνδρα ἐν τε τῇ Σπάρτῃ δοκοῦντα δραστήριον εἶναι ἐς τὰ πάντα, &c.

they could easily have prevented him from ever reaching Thrace. But they knew nothing of it until he had actually joined Perdikkas, nor did they anticipate any serious attack from Sparta, in this moment of her depression—much less, an enterprise far bolder than any which she had ever been known to undertake. They were now elate with hopes of conquests to come on their own part—their affairs being so prosperous and promising, that parties favourable to their interests began to revive, both in Megara and in Bœotia; while Hippokratês and Demosthenês, the two chief Stratêgi for the year, were men of energy, well-qualified both to project and execute military achievements.

The first opportunity presented itself in regard to Megara. The inhabitants of that city had been greater sufferers by the war than any other persons in Greece. They had been the chief cause of bringing down the war upon Athens, and the Athenians revenged upon them all the hardships which they themselves endured from the Lacedæmonian invasion. Twice in every year they laid waste the Megarid, which bordered upon their own territory; and that too with such destructive efficacy throughout its limited extent, that they intercepted all subsistence from the lands near the town—at the same time keeping the harbour of Nisæa closely blocked up. Under such hard conditions the Megarians found much difficulty in supplying even the primary wants of life.¹ But their case had now, within the last few months, become still more intolerable by an intestine commotion in the city, ending in the expulsion of a powerful body of exiles, who seized and held possession of Pêgæ, the Megarian port in the Gulf of Corinth. Probably imports from Pêgæ had been their chief previous resource against the destruction which came on them from the side of Athens; so that it became scarcely possible to sustain themselves, when the exiles in Pêgæ not only deprived them of this resource, but took positive part in harassing them. These exiles were oligarchical, and the government in Megara had now become more or less democratical. But the privations in the city presently reached such a height, that several citizens began to labour for a compromise, whereby the exiles in Pêgæ might be readmitted. It was evident to the leaders in Megara that the bulk of the citizens could not long sustain the pressure of enemies from both sides—but it was also their feeling, that the exiles in Pêgæ, their bitter political rivals, were worse

¹ The picture drawn by Aristophanês (Acharn. 760) is a caricature, but of suffering probably but too real.

enemies than the Athenians, and that the return of these exiles would be a sentence of death to themselves. To prevent this counter-revolution, they opened a secret correspondence with Hippokratês and Demosthenês, engaging to betray both Megara and Nisæa to the Athenians; though Nisæa, the harbour of Megara, about one mile from the city, was a separate fortress, occupied by a Peloponnesian garrison, and by them exclusively, as well as the Long Walls—for the purpose of holding Megara fast to the Lacedæmonian confederacy.¹

The scheme for surprise was concerted, and what is more remarkable—in the extreme publicity of all Athenian affairs, and in a matter to which many persons must have been privy—was kept secret until the instant of execution. A large Athenian force, 4000 hoplites and 600 cavalry, was appointed to march at night by the high road through Eleusis to Megara: but Hippokratês and Demosthenês themselves went on ship-board from Peiræus to the island of Minoa, which was close against Nisæa, and had been for some time under occupation by an Athenian garrison. Here Hippokratês concealed himself with 600 hoplites, in a hollow out of which brick earth had been dug, on the mainland opposite to Minoa, and not far from the gate in the Long Wall which opened near the junction of that wall with the ditch and wall surrounding Nisæa; while Demosthenês, with some light-armed Plataeans and a detachment of active young Athenians (called Peripoli, and serving as the moveable guard of Attica) in their first or second year of military service, placed himself in ambush in the sacred precincts of Arês, still closer to the same gate.

To procure that the gate should be opened, was the task of the conspirators within. Amidst the shifts to which the Megarians had been reduced in order to obtain supplies (especially since the blockading force had been placed at Minoa), predatory sally by night was not omitted. Some of these conspirators had been in the habit, before the intrigue with Athens was projected, of carrying out a small sculler-boat by night upon a cart, through this gate, by permission of the Peloponnesian commander of Nisæa and the Long Walls. The boat, when thus brought out, was first carried down to the shore along the hollow of the dry ditch which surrounded the wall of Nisæa—then put to sea for some nightly enterprise—and

¹ Thucyd. iv. 66. Strabo (ix. p. 391) gives eighteen stadia as the distance between Megara and Nisæa; Thucydides only eight. There appears sufficient reason to prefer the latter: see Reinganum, *Das alte Megaris*, p. 121-180.

lastly, brought back again along the ditch before daylight in the morning ; the gate being opened, by permission, to let it in. This was the only way by which any Megarian vessel could get to sea, since the Athenians at Minoa were complete masters of the harbour.

On the night fixed for the surprise, this boat was carried out and brought back at the usual hour. But the moment that the gate in the Long Wall was opened to readmit it, Demosthenês with his comrades sprang forward to force their way in ; the Megarians along with the boat at the same time setting upon and killing the guards, in order to facilitate his entrance. This active and determined band were successful in mastering the gate, and keeping it open, until the 600 hoplites under Hippokratês came up, and got in to the interior space between the Long Walls. They immediately mounted the walls on each side, every man as he came in, with little thought of order, to drive off or destroy the Peloponnesian guards ; who, taken by surprise, and fancying that the Megarians generally were in concert with the enemy against them—confirmed too in such belief by hearing the Athenian herald proclaim aloud that every Megarian who chose might take his post in the line of Athenian hoplites¹—made at first some resistance, but were soon discouraged and fled into Nisæa. By a little after daybreak, the Athenians found themselves masters of all the line of the Long Walls, and under the very gates of Megara—as well as reinforced by the larger force, which having marched by land through Eleusis, arrived at the concerted moment.

Meanwhile the Megarians within the city were in the greatest tumult and consternation. But the conspirators, prepared with their plan, had resolved to propose that the gates should be thrown open and that the whole force of the city should be marched out to fight the Athenians. When once the gates should be open, they themselves intended to take part with the Athenians and facilitate their entrance—and they had rubbed their bodies over with oil in order to be visibly distinguished in the eyes of the latter. The plan was only frustrated the moment before it was about to be put in execution, by the divulgence of one of their own comrades. Their opponents in

¹ Thucyd. iv. 68. ξυνέπεσε γὰρ καὶ τὸν τῶν Ἀθηναίων κήρυκα ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ γνώμης κηρύξαι, τὸν βουλόμενον ἵεναι Μεγαρέων μετὰ Ἀθηναίων θησόμενον τὰ ὅπλα.

Here we have the phrase *τίθεσθαι τὰ ὅπλα* employed in a case where Dr. Arnold's explanation of it would be eminently unsuitable. There could be no thought of *piling arms* at a critical moment of actual fighting, with result as yet doubtful.

the city, apprised of what was in contemplation, hastened to the gate, and intercepted the men rubbed with oil as they were about to open it. Without betraying any knowledge of the momentous secret which they had just learned, these opponents loudly protested against opening the gate and going out to fight an enemy for whom they had never conceived themselves, even in moments of greater strength, to be a match in the open field. While insisting only on the public mischiefs of the measure, they at the same time planted themselves in arms against the gate, and declared that they would perish before they would allow it to be opened. For such obstinate resistance the conspirators were not prepared, so that they were forced to abandon their design and leave the gate closed.

The Athenian generals, who were waiting in expectation that it would be opened, soon perceived by the delay that their friends within had been baffled, and immediately resolved to make sure of Nisæa which lay behind them; an acquisition important not less in itself, than as a probable means for the mastery of Megara. They set about the work with the characteristic rapidity of Athenians. Masons and tools in abundance being forthwith sent for from Athens, the army distributed among themselves the wall of circumvallation round Nisæa in distinct parts. First, the interior space between the Long Walls themselves was built across, so as to cut off the communication with Megara; next, walls were carried out from the outside of both the Long Walls down to the sea, so as completely to enclose Nisæa with its fortifications and ditch. The scattered houses, which formed a sort of ornamented suburb to Nisæa, furnished bricks for this enclosing circle, or were sometimes even made to form a part of it as they stood, with the parapets on their roofs; while the trees were cut down to supply material wherever palisades were suitable. In a day and a half the work of circumvallation was almost completed, so that the Peloponnesians in Nisæa saw before them nothing but a hopeless state of blockade. Deprived of all communication, they not only fancied that the whole city of Megara had joined the Athenians, but they were moreover without any supply of provisions, which had been always furnished to them in daily rations from the city. Despairing of speedy relief from Peloponnesus, they accepted easy terms of capitulation offered to them by the Athenian generals.¹ After delivering up their arms, each man among them was to be ransomed for a stipulated price; we are not told how much, but doubtless a

¹ Thucyd. iv. 69.

moderate sum. The Lacedæmonian commander, and such other Lacedæmonians as might be in Nisæa, were however required to surrender themselves as prisoners to the Athenians, to be held at their disposal. On these terms Nisæa was surrendered to the Athenians, who cut off its communication with Megara, by keeping the intermediate space between the Long Walls effectively blocked up—walls, of which they had themselves, in former days, been the original authors.¹

Such interruption of communication by the Long Walls indicated in the minds of the Athenian generals a conviction that Megara was now out of their reach. But the town in its present distracted state would certainly have fallen into their hands² had it not been snatched from them by the accidental neighbourhood and energetic intervention of Brasidas. That officer, occupied in the levy of troops for his Thracian expedition, was near Corinth and Sikyon when he first learnt the surprise and capture of the Long Walls. Partly from the alarm which the news excited among these Peloponnesian towns, partly from his own personal influence, he got together a body of 2700 Corinthian hoplites, 600 Sikyonian, and 400 Phliasian, besides his own small army, and marched with this united force to Tripodiskus in the Megarid, half-way between Megara and Pêgæ, on the road over Mount Geraneia; having first despatched a pressing summons to the Boeotians, to request that they would meet him at that point with reinforcements. He trusted by a speedy movement to preserve Megara, and perhaps even Nisæa; but on reaching Tripodiskus in the night, he learnt that the latter place had already surrendered. Alarmed for the safety of Megara, he proceeded thither by a night-march without delay. Taking with him only a chosen band of 300 men, he presented himself, without being expected, at the gates of the city; entreating to be admitted, and offering to lend his immediate aid for the recovery of Nisæa. One of the two parties in Megara would have been glad to comply; but the other, knowing well that in that case the exiles from Pêgæ would be brought back upon them, was prepared for a strenuous resistance, in which case the Athenian force, still only one mile off, would have been introduced as auxiliaries.

¹ Thucyd. i. 103; iv. 69. *καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τὰ μακρὰ τεῖχη ἀποβόρῃσαντες ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Μεγαρέων πόλεως καὶ τὴν Νίσαιαν παραλαβόντες, τὰλλα παρεσκευάζοντο.*

Diodorus (xii. 66) abridges Thucydides.

² Thucyd. iv. 73. *εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ ὤφθησαν ἐλθόντες (Brasidas with his troops) οὐκ ἂν ἐν τύχῃ γίγνεσθαι σφίσιν, ἀλλὰ σαφῶς ἂν ὥσπερ ἡσσηθέντων στερηθῆναι εὐθὺς τῆς πόλεως.*

Under these circumstances the two parties came to a compromise and mutually agreed to refuse admittance to Brasidas. They expected that a battle would take place between him and the Athenians, and each calculated that Megara would follow the fortunes of the victor.¹

Returning back without success to Tripodiskus, Brasidas was joined there early in the morning by 2000 Bœotian hoplites and 600 cavalry; for the Bœotians had been put in motion by the same news as himself, and had even commenced their march before his messenger arrived, with such celerity as to have already reached Platæa.² The total force under Brasidas was thus increased to 6000 hoplites and 600 cavalry, with whom he marched straight to the neighbourhood of Megara. The Athenian light troops, dispersed over the plain, were surprised and driven in by the Bœotian cavalry; but the Athenian cavalry, coming to their aid, maintained a sharp action with the assailants, wherein, after some loss on both sides, a slight advantage remained on the side of the Athenians. They granted a truce for the burial of the Bœotian officer of cavalry, who was slain with some others. After this indecisive cavalry skirmish, Brasidas advanced with his main force into the plain between Megara and the sea, taking up a position near to the Athenian hoplites, who were drawn up in battle array hard by Nisæa and the Long Walls. He thus offered them battle if they chose it; but each party expected that the other would attack; and each was unwilling to begin the attack on his own side. Brasidas was well aware that if the Athenians refused to fight, Megara would be preserved from falling into their hands—which loss it was his main object to prevent, and which had in fact been prevented only by his arrival. If he attacked and was beaten, he would forfeit this advantage—while if victorious, he could hardly hope to gain much more. The Athenian generals on their side reflected, that they had already secured a material acquisition in Nisæa, which cut off Megara from their sea; that the army opposed to them was not only superior in number of hoplites, but composed of contingents from many different cities, so that no one city hazarded much in the action; while their own force was all Athenian and composed of the best hoplites in Athens, which would render a defeat severely ruinous to the city. They did not think it worth while to encounter this risk, even for the purpose of gaining possession of Megara. With such views in the leaders on both sides, the two armies remained for some time in

¹ Thucyd. iv. 71.

² Thucyd. iv. 72.

position, each waiting for the other to attack. At length the Athenians, seeing that no aggressive movement was contemplated by their opponents, were the first to retire into Nisæa. Thus left master of the field, Brasidas retired in triumph to Megara, the gates of which were now opened without reserve to admit him.¹

The army of Brasidas, having gained the chief point for which it was collected, speedily dispersed—he himself resuming his preparations for Thrace ; while the Athenians on their side also returned home, leaving an adequate garrison for the occupation both of Nisæa and of the Long Walls. But the interior of Megara underwent a complete and violent revolution. While the leaders friendly to Athens, not thinking it safe to remain, fled forthwith and sought shelter with the Athenians²—the opposite party opened communication with the exiles at Pêgæ and readmitted them into the city ; binding them however by the most solemn pledges to observe absolute amnesty of the past, and to study nothing but the welfare of the common city. The new-comers only kept their pledge during the interval which elapsed until they acquired power to violate it with effect. They soon got themselves placed in the chief commands of state, and found means to turn the military force to their own purposes. A review, and examination of arms, of the hoplites in the city, having been ordered, the Megarian lochi were so marshalled and tutored as to enable the leaders to single out such victims as they thought expedient. They seized many of their most obnoxious enemies—some of them suspected as accomplices in the recent conspiracy with Athens. The men thus seized were subjected to the forms of a public trial, before that which was called a public assembly ; wherein each voter, acting under military terror, was constrained to give his suffrage openly. All were condemned to death and executed, to the number of 100.³ The constitution of Megara was then shaped into an oligarchy of the closest possible kind, a few of the most violent men taking complete possession of

¹ Thucyd. iv. 73.

² We find some of them afterwards in the service of Athens, employed as light-armed troops in the Sicilian expedition (Thucyd. vi. 43).

³ Thucyd. iv. 74. οἱ δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ἐγένοντο, καὶ ἐξέτασιν θύλων ἐποίησαντο, διαστήσαντες τοὺς λόχους, ἐξελέξαντο τῶν τε ἐχθρῶν καὶ οἱ ἐδόκουν μάλιστα θυμπᾶσαι τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, ἀνδρας ὡς ἑκατόν· καὶ τούτων περὶ ἀναγκάσαντες τὸν δῆμον ψῆφον φανεράν διενεγκεῖν, ὡς κατεγνώσθησαν, ἔκτειναν, καὶ ἐς ὀλιγαρχίαν τὰ μάλιστα κατέστησαν τὴν πόλιν. καὶ πλείστον δὴ χρόνον αὕτη ὑπ' ἐλαχίστων γενομένη ἐκ στάσεως μετὰστασις θυμένειν.

the government. But they must probably have conducted it with vigour and prudence for their own purposes, since Thucydides remarks that it was rare to see a revolution accomplished by so small a party, and yet so durable. How long it lasted, he does not mention. A few months after these incidents, the Megarians regained possession of their Long Walls, by capture from the Athenians¹ (to whom indeed they could have been of no material service), and levelled the whole line of them to the ground: but the Athenians still retained Nisæa. We may remark, as explaining in part the durability of this new government, that the truce concluded at the beginning of the ensuing year must have greatly lightened the difficulties of any government, whether oligarchical or democratical, in Megara.

The scheme for surprising Megara had been both laid and executed with skill, and only miscarried through an accident to which such schemes are always liable, as well as by the unexpected celerity of Brasidas. It had moreover succeeded so far as to enable the Athenians to carry Nisæa—one of the posts which they had surrendered by the Thirty years' truce, and of considerable positive value to them: so that it counted on the whole as a victory, leaving the generals with increased encouragement to turn their activity elsewhere. Accordingly, very soon after the troops had been brought back from the Megarid,² Hippokratês and Demosthenês concerted a still more extensive plan for the invasion of Bœotia, in conjunction with some malcontents in the Bœotian towns, who desired to break down and democratise the oligarchical governments—and especially through the agency of a Theban exile named Ptœodôrus. Demosthenês, with forty triremes, was sent round Peloponnesus to Naupaktus, with instructions to collect an Akarnanian force—to sail into the inmost recess of the Corinthian or Krissæan Gulf—and to occupy Siphæ, a maritime town belonging to the Bœotian Thespiæ, where intelligences had been already established. On the same day, determined beforehand, Hippokratês engaged to enter Bœotia, with the main force of Athens, at the south-eastern corner of the territory near Tanagra, and to fortify Delium, the temple of Apollo on the coast of the Eubœan strait; while at the same time it was concerted that some Bœotian and Phokian malcontents should make themselves masters of Chæroneia on the borders of Phokis. Bœotia would thus be assailed on three sides at the same moment, so that the

¹ Thucyd. iv. 109.

² Thucyd. iv. 76. εὐθὺς μετὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς Μεγαρίδος ἀναχώρησιν, &c.

forces of the country would be distracted and unable to co-operate. Internal movements were further expected to take place in some of the cities, such as perhaps to establish democratical governments and place them at once in alliance with the Athenians.

Accordingly, about the month of August, Demosthenês sallied from Athens to Naupaktus, where he collected his Akarnanian allies—now stronger and more united than ever, since the refractory inhabitants of Æniadæ had been at length compelled to join their Akarnanian brethren: moreover the neighbouring Agræans with their prince Salynthius were also brought into the Athenian alliance. On the appointed day, seemingly about the beginning of October, he sailed with a strong force of these allies up to Siphæ, in full expectation that it would be betrayed to him.¹ But the execution of this enterprise was less happy than that against Megara. In the first place, there was a mistake as to the day understood between Hippokratês and Demosthenês: in the next place, the entire plot was discovered and betrayed by a Phokian of Phanoteus (bordering on Chæroneia) named Nikomachus—communicated first to the Lacedæmonians, and through them to the bæotarchs. Siphæ and Chæroneia were immediately placed in so good a state of defence, that Demosthenês, on arriving at the former place, found not only no party within it favourable to him, but a formidable Bæotian force which rendered attack unavailing. Moreover Hippokratês had not yet begun his march, so that the defenders had nothing to distract their attention from Siphæ.² Under these circumstances, while Demosthenês was obliged to withdraw without striking a blow, and to content himself with an unsuccessful descent upon the territory of Sikyon³—all the expected internal movements in Bæotia were prevented from breaking out.

It was not till after the Bæotian troops, having repelled the attack by sea, had retired from Siphæ, that Hippokratês commenced his march from Athens to invade the Bæotian territory near Tanagra. He was probably encouraged by false promises from the Bæotian exiles, otherwise it seems remarkable that he should have persisted in executing his part of the scheme alone, after the known failure of the other part. It was however executed in a manner which implies unusual alacrity and confidence. The whole military population of Athens was marched into Bæotia, to the neighbourhood of Delium, the eastern coast-extremity of the territory belonging to the Bæotian town

¹ Thucyd. iv. 77.

² Thucyd. iv. 89.

³ Thucyd. iv. 101.

of Tanagra ; the expedition comprising all classes, not merely citizens, but also metics or resident non-freemen, and even non-resident strangers then by accident at Athens. Of course this statement must be understood with the reserve of ample guards being left behind for the city : but besides the really effective force of 7000 hoplites, and several hundred horsemen, there appear to have been not less than 25,000 light-armed, half-armed, or unarmed, attendants accompanying the march.¹ The number of hoplites is here prodigiously great ; brought together by general and indiscriminate proclamation, not selected by a special choice of the Stratêgi out of the names on the muster-roll, as was usually the case for any distant expedition.² As to light-armed, there was at this time no trained force of that description at Athens, except a small body of archers. No pains had been taken to organise either darters or slingers : the hoplites, the horsemen, and the seamen, constituted the whole effective force of the city. Indeed it appears that the Bœotians also were hardly less destitute than the Athenians of native darters and slingers, since those which they employed in the subsequent siege of Delium were in great part hired from the Malian Gulf.³ To employ at one and the same time heavy-armed and light-armed was not natural to any Grecian community, but was a practice which grew up with experience and necessity. The Athenian feeling, as manifested in the Persæ of Æschylus a few years after the repulse of Xerxes, proclaims exclusive pride in the spear and shield, with contempt for the bow. It was only during this very year, when alarmed by the

¹ Thucyd. iv. 93, 94. He states that the Bœotian *ψιλοί* were above 10,000, and that the Athenian *ψιλοί* were *πολλαπλάσιοι τῶν ἐναντίων*. We can hardly take this number as less than 25,000, *ψιλῶν καὶ σκευοφόρων* (iv. 101).

The hoplites, as well as the horsemen, had their baggage and provision carried for them by attendants : see Thucyd. iii. 17 ; vii. 75.

² Thucyd. iv. 90. *ὁ δ' Ἰπποκράτης ἀναστήσας Ἀθηναίους πανδημέι, αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς μετοίκους καὶ ξένων ὅσοι παρήσαν*, &c. : also *πανστρατιάς* (iv. 94).

The meaning of the word *πανδημέι* is well illustrated by Nikias in his exhortation to the Athenian army near Syracuse, immediately antecedent to the first battle with the Syracusans—levy *en masse*, as opposed to hoplites specially selected (vi. 66–68) *ἄλλως τε καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρας πανδημέι τε ἀμυνομένους, καὶ οὐκ ἀπολέκτους, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμᾶς—καὶ προσέτι Σικελιώτας*, &c.

When a special selection took place, the names of the hoplites chosen by the generals to take part in any particular service, were written on boards, according to their tribes : each of these boards was affixed publicly against the statue of the Heros Eponymus of the tribe to which it referred : Aristophanês, *Equites*, 1369 ; Pac. 1184, with Scholiast ; Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthumsk.* ii. p. 312.

³ Thucyd. iv. 100.

Athenian occupation of Pylus and Kythêra, that the Lacedæmonians, contrary to their previous custom, had begun to organise a regiment of archers.¹ The effective manner in which Demosthenês had employed the light-armed in Sphakteria against the Lacedæmonian hoplites, was well calculated to teach an instructive lesson as to the value of the former description of troops.

The Bœotian Delium,² which Hippokratês now intended to occupy and fortify, was a temple of Apollo, strongly situated, overhanging the sea about five miles from Tanagra, and somewhat more than a mile from the border territory of Orôpus—a territory originally Bœotian, but at this time dependent on Athens, and even partly incorporated in the political community of Athens, under the name of the Deme of Græa.³ Orôpus itself was about a day's march from Athens—by the road which led through Dekeleia and Sphendalê, between the mountains Parnês and Phelleus: so that as the distance to be traversed was so inconsiderable, and the general feeling of the time was that of confidence, it is probable that men of all ages, arms, and dispositions, crowded to join the march—in part from mere curiosity and excitement. Hippokratês reached Delium on the day after he had started from Athens. On the succeeding day he began his work of fortification, which was completed—all hands aiding, and tools as well as workmen having been brought along with the army from Athens—in two days and a half. Having dug a ditch all round the sacred ground, he threw up the earth in a bank alongside of the ditch, planting stakes, throwing in fascines, and adding layers of stone and brick, to keep the work together and make it into a rampart of tolerable height and firmness. The vines⁴ round the

¹ Thucyd. iv. 55.

² Thucyd. iv. 90; Livy, xxxv. 51.

³ Dikæarch. *Bíos 'Ελλάδος*, Fragm. ed. Fuhr. p. 142-230; Pausan. i. 34, 2; Aristotle ap. Stephan. Byz. v. *Ἰσθμὸς*. See also Col. Leake, Athens and the Demi of Attica, vol. ii. sect. iv. p. 123; Mr. Finlay, Oropus and the Diakria, p. 38; Ross, Die Deme von Attica, p. 6, where the Deme of Græa is verified by an Inscription, and explained for the first time.

The road taken by the army of Hippocratês in the march to Delium, was the same as that by which the Lacedæmonian army in their first invasion of Attica had retired from Attica into Bœotia (Thucyd. ii. 23).

⁴ Dikæarchus (*Bíos 'Ελλάδος*, p. 142, ed. Fuhr.) is full of encomiums on the excellence of the wine drunk at Tanagra, and of the abundant olive-plantations on the road between Orôpus and Tanagra.

Since tools and masons were brought from Athens to fortify Nisæa—about three months before (Thucyd. iv. 69)—we may be pretty sure that similar apparatus was carried to Delium—though Thucydides does not state it.

temple, together with the stakes which served as supports to them, were cut to obtain wood ; the houses adjoining furnished bricks and stone : the outer temple-buildings themselves also, on some of the sides, served as they stood to facilitate and strengthen the defence. But there was one side on which the annexed building, once a portico, had fallen down : and here the Athenians constructed some wooden towers as a help to the defenders. By the middle of the fifth day after leaving Athens, the work was so nearly completed, that the army quitted Delium, and began its march homeward out of Bœotia ; halting, after it had proceeded about a mile and a quarter, within the Athenian territory of Orôpus. It was here that the hoplites awaited the coming of Hippokratês, who still remained at Delium stationing the garrison, and giving his final orders about future defence ; while the greater number of the light-armed and unarmed, separating from the hoplites, and seemingly without any anticipation of the coming danger, continued their return march to Athens.¹ The position of the hoplites was probably about the western extremity of the plain of Orôpus, on the verge of the low heights between that plain and Delium.²

During these five days, however, the forces from all parts of Bœotia had time to muster at Tanagra. Their number was just completed as the Athenians were beginning their march homeward from Delium. The contingents had arrived, not only from Thebes and its dependent townships around, but also from Haliartus, Korôneia, Orchomenus, Kôpæ, and Thespiæ : that of Tanagra joined on the spot. The government of the Bœotian confederacy at this time was vested in eleven bæotarchs—two chosen from Thebes, the rest in unknown proportion by the other cities, immediate members of the confederacy—and in four senates or councils, the constitution of which is not known.

Though all the bæotarchs, now assembled at Tanagra, formed a sort of council of war, yet the supreme command was vested

¹ Thucyd. iv. 90. That the vines round the temple had supporting-stakes, which furnished the *στυπὸς* used by the Athenians, we may reasonably presume : the same as those *χάρακες* which are spoken of in Korkyra, iii. 70 ; compare Pollux, i. 162.

² "The plain of Oropus (observes Colonel Leake) expands from its upper angle at *Oropô* towards the mouth of the Asopus, and stretches about five miles along the shore, from the foot of the hills of Markópulo on the east, to the village of Khalkúki on the west, where begin some heights extending westward towards Dhilisi, the ancient Delium."—"The plain of Oropus is separated from the more inland plain of Tanagra by rocky gorges, through which the Asopus flows." (Leake, *Athens and the Demi of Attica*, vol. ii. sect. iv. p. 112.)

in Pagondas and Arianthidês, the bæotarchs from Thebes—either in Pagondas, as the senior of the two, or perhaps in both, alternating with each other day by day.¹ As the Athenians were evidently in full retreat, and had already passed the border, all the other bæotarchs, except Pagondas, unwilling to hazard a battle² on soil not Bæotian, were disposed to let them return home without obstruction. Such reluctance is not surprising, when we reflect that the chances of defeat were considerable, and that probably some of these bæotarchs were afraid of the increased power which a victory would lend to the oppressive tendencies of Thebes. But Pagondas strenuously opposed this proposition, and carried the soldiers of the various cities along with him, even in opposition to the sentiments of their separate leaders, in favour of immediately fighting. He called them apart and addressed them by separate divisions, in order that all might not quit their arms at one and the same moment.³

¹ Thucyd. iv. 93 ; v. 38. Akraephia may probably be considered as either a dependency of Thebes, or included in the general expression of Thucydidês, after the word *Κωπαιῆς*—οἱ περὶ τὴν λίμνην. Anthêdon and Lebadeia, which are recognised as separate autonomous townships in various Bæotian inscriptions, are not here named in Thucydidês. But there is no certain evidence respecting the number of immediate members of the Bæotian confederacy : compare the various conjectures in Boeckh, ad Corp. Inscript. t. i. p. 727 ; O. Muller, Orchomenus, p. 402 ; Kruse, Hellas, t. ii. p. 548.

² Thucyd. iv. 91. τῶν ἄλλων βοιωταρχῶν, οἳ εἰσιν ἑνδεκα, οὓς συνεπαίνουόντων μάχεσθαι, &c.

The use of the present tense *εἰσιν* marks the number *eleven* as that of *all the bæotarchs* ; at this time—according to Boeckh's opinion, ad Corp. Inscript. I. vol. i. p. 729. The number however appears to have been variable.

³ Thucyd. iv. 91. προσκαλὼν ἐκάστους κατὰ λόχους, ὅπως μὴ ἀθρόοι ἐκλίποιεν τὰ ὄπλα, ἐπειθε τοὺς βοιωτοὺς ἵεναι ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ποιεῖσθαι.

Here Dr. Arnold observes, "This confirms and illustrates what has been said in the note on ii. 2, 5, as to the practice of the Greek soldiers piling their arms the moment they halted in a particular part of the camp, and always attending the speeches of their general without them."

In the case here before us, it appears that the Bæotians did come by separate lochi, pursuant to command, to hear the words of Pagondas,—and also that each lochus left its arms to do so : though even here it is not absolutely certain that τὰ ὄπλα does not mean *the military station*, as Duker interprets it. But Dr. Arnold generalises too hastily from hence to a customary practice as between soldiers and their general. The proceeding of the Athenian general Hippokratês, on this very occasion, near Delium (to be noticed a page or two forward), exhibits an arrangement totally different. Moreover, the note on ii. 2, 5, to which Dr. Arnold refers, has no sort of analogy to the passage here before us, which does not include the words *τίθεσθαι τὰ ὄπλα*—whereas these words are the main matters in chapter ii. 2, 5. Whoever attentively compares the two, will see that Dr. Arnold (followed by Poppo and Gœller) has stretched an explanation which

He characterised the sentiment of the other *bœotarchs* as an unworthy manifestation of weakness, which, when properly considered, had not even the recommendation of superior prudence. For the Athenians, having just invaded the country, and built a fort for the purpose of continuous devastation, were not less enemies on one side of the border than the other. Moreover they were the most restless and encroaching of all enemies; so that the *Bœotians* who had the misfortune to be their neighbours, could only be secure against them by the most resolute promptitude in defending themselves as well as in returning the blows first given. If they wished to protect their autonomy and their property against the condition of slavery under which their neighbours in *Eubœa* had long suffered, as well as so many other portions of Greece, their only chance was to march onward and beat these invaders, following the glorious example of their fathers and predecessors in the field of *Korôneia*. The sacrifices were favourable to an advancing movement; while *Apollo*, whose temple the Athenians had desecrated by converting it into a fortified place, would lend his cordial aid to the *Bœotian* defence.¹

Finding his exhortations favourably received, *Pagondas* conducted the army by a rapid march to a position close to the Athenians. He was anxious to fight them before they should have retreated farther; moreover the day was nearly spent—it was already late in the afternoon.

Having reached a spot where he was only separated from the Athenians by a hill, which prevented either army from seeing the other, he marshalled his troops in the array proper for fighting. The *Theban* *hoplites*, with their dependent allies, ranged in a depth of not less than twenty-five shields, occupied the right wing: the *hoplites* of *Haliartus*, *Korôneia*, *Kôpæ*, and its neighbourhood, were in the centre: those of *Thespiæ*, *Tanagra*, and *Orchomenus*, on the left; for *Orchomenus*, being the second city in *Bœotia* next to *Thebes*, obtained the second post of honour at the opposite extremity of the line. Each contingent adopted its own mode of marshalling the *hoplites*, and its own depth of files: on this point there was no uniformity—a remarkable proof of the prevalence of dissentient custom in Greece, and how much each town, even among confederates, stood apart as a separate unit.² *Thucydides* specifies

suits the passage here before us, to other passages where it is noway applicable.

¹ *Thucyd.* iv. 92.

² *Thucyd.* iv. 93. ἐπ' ἀσπίδας δὲ πέντε μὲν καὶ εἴκοσι *Θηβαῖοι* ἐτάξαντο, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι ὡς ἕκαστοι ἔτυχον.

only the prodigious depth of the Theban hoplites; respecting the rest, he merely intimates that no common rule was followed. There is another point also which he does not specify—but which, though we learn it only on the inferior authority of Diodorus, appears both true and important. The front ranks of the Theban heavy-armed were filled by 300 select warriors, of distinguished bodily strength, valour and discipline,—who were accustomed to fight in pairs, each man being attached to his neighbour by a peculiar tie of intimate friendship. These pairs were termed the Heniochi and Parabatai—charioteers and companions; a denomination probably handed down from the Homeric times, when the foremost heroes really combated in chariots in front of the common soldiers—but now preserved after it had outlived its appropriate meaning.¹ This band, composed of the finest men in the various palæstræ of Thebes, was in after-days placed under peculiar training (for the defence of the Kadmeia or citadel), detached from the front ranks of the phalanx, and organised into a separate regiment under the name of the Sacred Lochus or Band: we shall see how much it contributed to the shortlived military ascendancy of Thebes. On both flanks of this mass of Boeotian hoplites, about 7000 in total number, were distributed 1000 cavalry, 500 peltasts, and 10,000 light-armed or unarmed. The language of the historian seems to imply that the light-armed on the Boeotian side were something more effective than the mere multitude who followed the Athenians.

Such was the order in which Pagondas marched his army over the hill, halting them for a moment in front and sight of the Athenians, to see that the ranks were even, before he gave the word for actual charge.² Hippokrates, on his side, apprised

What is still more remarkable—in the battle of Mantinea in 418 B.C.—between the Lacedæmonians on the one side and the Athenians, Argeians, Mantinians, &c. on the other—the different lochi or divisions of the Lacedæmonian army were not all marshalled in the same depth of files. Each lochage, or commander of the lochus, directed the depth of his own division (Thucyd. v. 68).

¹ Diodor. xii. 70. Προεμάχοντο δὲ πάντων οἱ παρ' ἐκείνοις Ἡνίοχοι καὶ Παραβάται καλούμενοι, ἄνδρες ἐπίλεκτοι τριακῆσιοι . . . Οἱ δὲ Θηβαῖοι διαφέροντες ταῖς τῶν σωμάτων ῥώμας, &c.

Compare Plutarch, Pelopidas, c. 18, 19.

² Thucyd. iv. 93. Καὶ ἐπεὶ δὲ καλῶς αὐτοῖς εἶχεν, ὑπερεφάνησαν (the Boeotians) τοῦ λόφου καὶ ἔθεντο τὰ ὄπλα τεταγμένοι ὥσπερ ἔμελλον, &c.

I transcribe this passage for the purpose of showing how impossible it is to admit the explanation which Dr. Arnold, Poppo, and Gölter give of these words ἔθεντο τὰ ὄπλα (see Notes ad Thucyd. ii. 2). They explain the words to mean that the soldiers “piled their arms into a heap”—disarmed themselves for the time. But the Boeotians, in the situation here

while still at Delium that the Bœotians had moved from Tanagra, first sent orders to his army to place themselves in battle array, and presently arrived himself to command them; leaving 300 cavalry at Delium, partly as garrison, partly for the purpose of acting on the rear of the Bœotians during the battle. The Athenian hoplites were ranged eight deep along the whole line—with the cavalry, and such of the light-armed as yet remained, placed on each flank. Hippokratês, after arriving on the spot and surveying the ground occupied, marched along the front of the line briefly encouraging his soldiers; who, as the battle was just on the Oropian border, might fancy that they were not in their own country, and that they were therefore exposed without necessity. He too, in a strain similar to that adopted by Pagondas, reminded the Athenians, that on either side of the border they were alike fighting for the defence of Attica, to keep the Bœotians out of it; since the Peloponnesians would never dare to enter the country without the aid of the Bœotian horse.¹ He further called to their recollection the great name of Athens, and the memorable victory of Myronidês at Cœnophyta, whereby their fathers had acquired possession of all Bœotia. But he had scarcely half finished his progress along the line, when he was forced to desist by the sound of the Bœotian pæan. Pagondas, after a few additional sentences of encouragement, had given the word: the Bœotian hoplites were seen charging down the hill; and the Athenian hoplites, not less eager, advanced to meet them at a running step.²

described, cannot possibly have parted with their arms,—they were just on the point of charging the enemy—immediately afterwards, Pagondas gives the word, the pæan for charging is sung, and the rush commences. Pagondas had doubtless good reason for directing a momentary halt, to see that his ranks were in perfectly good condition before the charge began. But to command his troops to “pile their arms” would be the last thing that he would think of.

In the interpretation of *τεταγμένοι ὥσπερ ἔμελλον*, I agree with the Scholiast, who understands *μαχέσασθαι* or *μαχεῖσθαι* after *ἔμελλον* (compare Thucyd. v. 66),—dissenting from Dr. Arnold and Gôller, who would understand *τάσσεσθαι*; which, as it seems to me, makes a very awkward meaning, and is not sustained by the passage produced as parallel (viii. 51).

The infinitive verb, understood after *ἔμελλον*, need not necessarily be a verb actually occurring before: it may be a verb suggested by the general scope of the sentence: see *ἐμέλλησαν*, iv. 123.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 95.

² Thucyd. iv. 94, 96. *καθεστώτων δ' ἐς τὴν τάξιν καὶ ἤδη μελλόντων ξυνίεναι Ἱπποκράτης ὁ στρατηγὸς ἐπιπαρὼν τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν Ἀθηναίων παρεκελεύετό τε καὶ ἔλεγε τοιάδε . . . Τοιαῦτα τοῦ Ἱπποκράτους παρακελευομένου, καὶ μέχρι μὲν μέσου τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἐπελθόντος, τὸ δὲ πλεον οὐκέτι φθάσαντος, οἱ Βοιωτοὶ, παρακελευσαμένου καὶ σφίσιν ὡς διὰ ταχέων καὶ ἐνταῦθα Παγώνδου, παιωνίσαντες ἐπήεσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόφου, &c.*

At the extremity of the line on each side, the interposition of ravines prevented the actual meeting of the two armies: but throughout all the rest of the line, the clash was formidable and the conduct of both sides resolute. Both armies, maintaining their ranks compact and unbroken, came to the closest quarters; to the contact and pushing of shields against each other.¹ On the left half of the Bœotian line, consisting of hoplites from Thespiæ, Tanagra, and Orchomenus, the Athenians were victorious. The Thespians, who resisted longest, even after their comrades had given way, were surrounded and sustained the most severe loss from the Athenians; who in the ardour of success, while wheeling round to encircle the enemy, became disordered and came into conflict even with their own citizens, not recognising them at the moment: some loss of life was the consequence.

While the left of the Bœotian line was thus worsted and driven to seek protection from the right, the Thebans on that side gained decided advantage. Though the resolution and discipline of the Athenians was noway inferior, yet as soon as the action came to close quarters and to propulsion with shield and spear, the prodigious depth of the Theban column (more than triple of the depth of the Athenians, twenty-five against eight) enabled them to bear down their enemies by mere superiority of weight and mass. Moreover the Thebans appear to have been superior to the Athenians in gymnastic training and acquired bodily force, as they were inferior both in speech and in intelligence. The chosen Theban warriors in the front rank were especially superior: but apart from such superiority, if we assume simple equality of individual strength and resolution on both sides,² it is plain that when the two opposing columns came into conflict, shield against shield—

This passage contradicts what is affirmed by Dr. Arnold, Poppo, and Goller, to have been a *general practice*, that the soldiers “piled their arms and *always* attended the speeches of their generals without them.” (See his note ad Thucyd. iv. 91.)

¹ Thucyd. iv. 96. καρτερῇ μάχῃ καὶ ὀπισμῷ ἀσπίδων ξυνεστήκει, &c. Compare Xenophon, Cyropæd. vii. 1, 32.

² The proverbial expression of Βοιωτίαν ἔνν—“the Bœotian sow”—was ancient even in the time of Pindar (Olymp. vi. 90, with the Scholia and Boeckh’s note): compare also Ephorus, Fragment 67, ed. Marx: Δικæarchus, Βίος Ἑλλάδος, p. 143, ed. Fuhr; Plato, Legg. i. p. 636; and Symposion, p. 182—“pingues Thebani et valentes,” Cicero de Fato, iv. 7.

Xenophon (Memorab. iii. 5, 2, 15; iii. 12, 5; compare Xenoph. de Athen. Republ. i. 13) maintains the natural bodily capacity of Athenians to be equal to that of Bœotians, but deplores the want of σωμασκήα or bodily training.

the comparative force of forward pressure would decide the victory. This motive is sufficient to explain the extraordinary depth of the Theban column—which was increased by Epaminondas, half a century afterwards, at the battle of Leuktra, from a depth of twenty-five men to the still more astonishing depth of fifty. We need not suspect the correctness of the text, with some critics—or suppose with others, that the great depth of the Theban files arose from the circumstance that the rear ranks were too poor to provide themselves with armour.¹ Even in a depth of eight, which was that of the Athenian column in the present engagement,² and seemingly the usual depth in a battle—the spears of the four rear ranks could hardly have protruded sufficiently beyond the first line to do any mischief. The great use of all the ranks behind the first four, was partly to take the place of such of the foremost lines as might be slain—partly, to push forward the lines before them from behind. The greater the depth of the files, the more irresistible did this propelling force become. Hence the Thebans, at Delium as well as at Leuktra, found their account in deepening the column to so remarkable a degree,—a movement to which we may fairly presume that their hoplites were trained beforehand.

The Thebans on the right thus pushed back³ the troops on the left of the Athenian line, who retired at first slowly and for a short space, maintaining their order unbroken—so that the victory of the Athenians on their own right would have restored the battle, had not Pagondas detached from the rear two squadrons of cavalry; who, wheeling unseen round the hill behind, suddenly appeared to the relief of the Bœotian left, and produced upon the Athenians on that side, already deranged in their ranks by the ardour of pursuit, the intimidating effect of a fresh army arriving to reinforce the Bœotians. And thus, even on the right, the victorious portion of their line, the Athenians lost courage and gave way; while on the left, where they were worsted from the beginning, they found themselves pressed harder and harder by the pursuing Thebans: so that in the end, the whole Athenian army was broken and put to flight. The garrison of Delium, reinforced by 300 cavalry

¹ See the notes of Dr. Arnold and Poppo, ad Thucyd. iv. 96.

² Compare Thucyd. v. 68; vi. 67.

³ Thucyd. iv. 96. τὸ δὲ δεξιόν, ἧ οἱ Θηβαῖοι ἦσαν, ἐκράτει τε τῶν Ἀθηναίων, καὶ ὥσάμενοι κατὰ βραχὺ τὸ πρῶτον ἐπηκολούθουν.

The word ὥσάμενοι (compare iv. 35; vi. 70) exactly expresses the forward pushing of the mass of hoplites with shield and spear.

whom Hippokratês had left there to assail the rear of the Bœotians during the action, either made no vigorous movement, or were repelled by a Bœotian reserve stationed to watch them.

Flight having become general among the Athenians, the different parts of their army took different directions. The right sought refuge at Delium, the centre fled to Orôpus, and the left took a direction towards the high lands of Parnês. The pursuit of the Bœotians was vigorous and destructive. They had an efficient cavalry, strengthened by some Lokrian horse who had arrived even during the action: their peltasts also, and their light-armed would render valuable service against retreating hoplites.¹ Fortunately for the vanquished, the battle had begun very late in the afternoon, leaving no long period of daylight. This important circumstance saved the Athenian army from almost total destruction.² As it was, however, the general Hippokratês, together with nearly 1000 hoplites, and a considerable number of light-armed and attendants, were slain; while the loss of the Bœotians, chiefly on their defeated left wing, was rather under 500 hoplites. Some prisoners³ seem to have been made, but we hear little about them. Those who had fled to Delium and Orôpus were conveyed back by sea to Athens.

The victors retired to Tanagra, after erecting their trophy, burying their own dead, and despoiling those of their enemies. An abundant booty of arms from the stript warriors long remained to decorate the temples of Thebes, while the spoil in other ways is said to have been considerable. Pagondas also resolved to lay siege to the newly-established fortress at Delium. But before commencing operations—which might perhaps prove tedious, since the Athenians could always reinforce the garrison by sea—he tried another means of attaining the same object. He despatched to the Athenians a herald—who, happening in his way to meet the Athenian herald coming to ask the ordinary permission for burial of the slain, warned him that no such request would be entertained until the message of the Bœotian general had first been communicated, and thus induced him to come back to the Athenian

¹ Thucyd. iv. 96; Athenæus, v. p. 215. Diodorus (xii. 70) represents that the battle began with a combat of cavalry, in which the Athenians had the advantage. This is quite inconsistent with the narrative of Thucydides.

² Diodorus (xii. 70) dwells upon this circumstance.

³ Pyrilampês is spoken of as having been wounded and taken prisoner in the retreat by the Thebans (Plutarch, de Genio Socratis, c. 11, p. 581). See also Thucyd. v. 35—where allusion is made to some prisoners.

commanders. The Bœotian herald was instructed to remonstrate against the violation of holy custom committed by the Athenians in seizing and fortifying the temple of Delium ; wherein their garrison was now dwelling, performing numerous functions which religion forbade to be done in a sacred place, and using as their common drink the water especially consecrated to sacrificial purposes. The Bœotians therefore solemnly summoned them in the name of Apollo and the gods inmates along with them, to evacuate the place, carrying away all that belonged to them. Finally, the herald gave it to be understood, that unless this summons were complied with, no permission would be granted to bury their dead.

Answer was returned by the Athenian herald, who now went to the Bœotian commanders, to the following effect :—The Athenians did not admit that they had hitherto been guilty of any wrong in reference to the temple, and protested that they would persist in respecting it for the future as much as possible. Their object in taking possession of it had been no evil sentiment towards the holy place, but the necessity of avenging the repeated invasions of Attica by the Bœotians. Possession of the territory, according to the received maxims of Greece, always carried along with it possession of temples therein situated, under obligation to fulfil all customary observances to the resident god, as far as circumstances permitted. It was upon this maxim that the Bœotians had themselves acted when they took possession of their present territory, expelling the prior occupants and appropriating the temples : it was upon the same maxim that the Athenians would act in retaining so much of Bœotia as they had now conquered, and in conquering more of it, if they could. Necessity compelled them to use the consecrated water—a necessity not originating in the ambition of Athens, but in prior Bœotian aggressions upon Attica—a necessity which they trusted that the gods would pardon, since their altars were allowed as a protection to the involuntary offender, and none but he who sinned without constraint experienced their displeasure. The Bœotians were guilty of far greater impiety—in refusing to give back the dead, except upon certain conditions connected with the holy ground—than the Athenians, who merely refused to turn the duty of sepulture into an unseemly bargain. “Tell us unconditionally (concluded the Athenian herald) that we may bury our dead under truce, pursuant to the maxims of our forefathers. Do not tell us that we may do so, on condition of going out of

Bœotia—for we are no longer in Bœotia—we are in our own territory, won by the sword.”

The Bœotian generals dismissed the herald with a reply short and decisive:—“If you are in Bœotia, you may take away all that belongs to you, but only on condition of going out of it. If, on the other hand, you are in your own territory, you can take your own resolution without asking us.”¹

In this debate, curious as an illustration of Grecian manners and feelings, there seems to have been special pleading and evasion on both sides. The final sentence of the Bœotians was good as a reply to the incidental argument raised by the Athenian herald, who had rested the defence of Athens in regard to the temple of Delium on the allegation that the territory was Athenian, not Bœotian—Athenian by conquest and by the right of the strongest—and had concluded by affirming the same thing about Oropia, the district to which the battle-field belonged. It was only this same argument, of actual superior force, which the Bœotians retorted, when they said—“If the territory to which your application refers is yours by right of conquest (*i.e.* if you are *de facto* masters of it and are strongest within it)—you can of course do what you think best in it: you need not ask any truce at our hands; you can bury your dead without a truce.”² The Bœotians knew that at this moment the field of battle was under guard by a detachment of their army,³ and that the Athenians could not obtain the dead bodies without permission. But since the Athenian herald had asserted the reverse as a matter of fact, we can hardly wonder that they resented the production of such an argument; meeting it by a reply sufficiently pertinent in mere diplomatic fencing.

But if the Athenian herald, instead of raising the incidental point of territorial property, combined with an incautious definition of that which constituted territorial property, as a

¹ See the two difficult chapters, iv. 98, 99, in Thucydides.

² See the notes of Poppe, Göller, Dr. Arnold, and other commentators, on these chapters.

Neither these notes, nor the Scholiast, seem to me in all parts satisfactory, nor do they seize the spirit of the argument between the Athenian herald and the Bœotian officers, which will be found perfectly consistent as a piece of diplomatic interchange.

In particular, they do not take notice that it is the *Athenian* herald who first raises the question, what is Athenian territory and what is Bœotian; and that he defines Athenian territory to be that in which the force of Athens is superior. The retort of the Bœotians refers to that definition; not to the question of rightful claim to any territory, apart from actual superiority of force.

³ Thucyd. iv. 97.

defence against the alleged desecration of the temple of Delium, —had confined himself to the main issue—he would have put the Boeotians completely in the wrong. According to principles universally respected in Greece, the victor, if solicited, was held bound to grant to the vanquished a truce for burying his dead ; to grant and permit it absolutely, without annexing any conditions. On this, the main point in debate, the Boeotians sinned against the sacred international law of Greece, when they exacted the evacuation of the temple at Delium as a condition for consenting to permit the burial of the Athenian dead.¹ Ultimately, after they had taken Delium, we shall find that they did grant it unconditionally. We may doubt whether they would have ever persisted in refusing it, if the Athenian herald had pressed this one important principle separately and exclusively—and if he had not, by an unskilful plea in vindication of the right to occupy and live at Delium, both exasperated their feelings, and furnished them with a collateral issue as a means of evading the main demand.²

To judge this curious debate with perfect impartiality, we ought to add, in reference to the conduct of the Athenians in occupying Delium,—that for an enemy to make special choice of a temple, as a post to be fortified and occupied, was a proceeding certainly rare, perhaps hardly admissible, in Grecian warfare. Nor does the vindication offered by the Athenian herald meet the real charge preferred. It is one thing for an enemy of superior force to overrun a country, and to appropriate everything within it, sacred as well as profane : it is another thing for a border enemy, not yet in sufficient force for conquering the whole, to convert a temple of convenient site into a regular garrisoned fortress, and make it a base of operations against the neighbouring population. On this

¹ When we recollect, in connexion with this incident, and another in Xen. Hellen. iii. 5, 24, the legendary stories about the Thebans refusing burial to the bodies of slain enemies, in the cases of Polynikes and the other Six Chiefs against Thebes—we may almost suspect that in reality the Thebans were more disposed than other Greeks to override this obligation.

² Thucydides, in describing the state of mind of the Boeotians, does not seem to imply that they thought this a good and valid ground, upon which they could directly take their stand ; but merely that they considered it a fair diplomatic way of meeting the alternative raised by the Athenian herald ; for *εὐπρεπές* means nothing more than this.

Οὐδ' αὖ ἐσπένδοντο δῆθεν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκείνων ('Αθηναίων)· τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῶν (Βοιωτῶν) εὐπρεπὲς εἶναι ἀποκρίνασθαι, ἀπίοντας καὶ ἀπολαβεῖν ἃ ἀπαιτοῦσιν.

The adverb *δῆθεν* also marks the reference to the special question, as laid out by the Athenian herald.

ground, the Bœotians might reasonably complain of the seizure of Delium: though I apprehend that no impartial interpreter of Grecian international custom would have thought them warranted in requiring the restoration of the place, as a peremptory condition to their granting the burial-truce when solicited.

All negotiations being thus broken off, the Bœotian generals prepared to lay siege to Delium, aided by 2000 Corinthian hoplites, together with some Megarians and the late Peloponnesian garrison of Nisæa—who joined after the news of the battle. Though they sent for darters and slingers, probably Ceteans and Ætolians, from the Maliac Gulf, yet their direct attacks were at first all repelled by the garrison, aided by an Athenian squadron off the coast, in spite of the hasty and awkward defences by which alone the fort was protected. At length they contrived a singular piece of fire-mechanism, which enabled them to master the place. They first sawed in twain a thick beam, pierced a channel through it long-ways from end to end, sheathed most part of the channel with iron, and then joined the two halves accurately together. From the farther end of this hollowed beam they suspended by chains a large metal pot, full of pitch, brimstone, and burning charcoal; lastly, an iron-tube, projected from the end of the interior channel of the beam, so as to come near to the pot. Such was the machine, which, constructed at some distance, was brought on carts and placed close to the wall, near the palisading and the wooden towers. The Bœotians then applied great bellows to their own end of the beam, blowing violently a current of air through the interior channel, so as to raise an intense fire in the cauldron at the other end. The wooden portions of the wall, soon catching fire, became untenable for the defenders—who escaped in the best way they could, without attempting further resistance. Two hundred of them were made prisoners, and a few slain; but the greater number got safely on shipboard. This recapture of Delium took place on the seventeenth day after the battle, during all which interval the Athenians slain had remained on the field unburied. Presently however arrived the Athenian herald to make fresh application for the burial-truce; which was now forthwith granted, and granted unconditionally.¹

Such was the memorable expedition and battle of Delium—a fatal discouragement to the feeling of confidence and hope which had previously reigned at Athens, besides the painful

¹ Thucyd. iv. 100, 101.

immediate loss which it inflicted on the city. Among the hoplites who took part in the vigorous charge and pushing of shields, the philosopher Sokratês is to be numbered. His bravery, both in the battle and the retreat, was much extolled by his friends, and doubtless with good reason. He had before served with credit in the ranks of the hoplites at Potidæa, and he served also at Amphipolis; his patience under hardship, and endurance of heat and cold, being not less remarkable than his personal courage. He and his friend Lachês were among those hoplites who in the retreat from Delium, instead of flinging away their arms and taking to flight, kept their ranks, their arms, and their firmness of countenance; insomuch that the pursuing cavalry found it dangerous to meddle with them, and turned to an easier prey in the disarmed fugitives. Alkibiadês also served at Delium in the cavalry, and stood by Sokratês in the retreat. The latter was thus exposing his life at Delium nearly at the same time when Aristophanês was exposing him to derision in the comedy of the *Clouds*, as a dreamer alike morally worthless and physically incapable.¹

Severe as the blow was which the Athenians suffered at Delium, their disasters in Thrace about the same time, or towards the close of the same summer and autumn, were yet more calamitous. I have already mentioned the circumstances which led to the preparation of a Lacedæmonian force intended to act against the Athenians in Thrace, under Brasidas, in concert with the Chalkidians, revolted subjects of Athens, and with Perdikkas of Macedon. Having frustrated the Athenian designs against Megara (as described above),² Brasidas completed the levy of his division—1700 hoplites, partly Helots, partly Dorian Peloponnesians—and conducted them, towards the close of the summer, to the Lacedæmonian colony of Herakleia, in the Trachinian territory near the Maliac Gulf.

¹ See Plato (*Symposion*, c. 36, p. 221; Lachês, p. 181; Charmidês, p. 153; *Apolog. Sokratis*, p. 28), Strabo, ix. p. 403.

Plutarch, *Alkibiadês*, c. 7. We find it mentioned among the stories told about Sokratês in the retreat from Delium, that his life was preserved by the inspiration of his familiar dæmon or genius, which instructed him on one doubtful occasion which of two roads was the safe one to take (*Cicero, de Divinat.* i. 54; Plutarch, *de Genio Sokratis*, c. 11, p. 581).

The scepticism of Athenæus (v. p. 215) about the military service of Sokratês is not to be defended—but it may probably be explained by the exaggerations and falsehoods which he had read, ascribing to the philosopher superhuman gallantry.

² See above, page 383.

To reach Macedonia and Thrace, it was necessary for him to pass through Thessaly, which was no easy task; for the war had now lasted so long that every state in Greece had become mistrustful of the transit of armed foreigners. Moreover, the mass of the Thessalian population were decidedly friendly to Athens, and Brasidas had no sufficient means to force a passage; while, should he wait to apply for formal permission, there was much doubt whether it would be granted—and perfect certainty of such delay and publicity as would put the Athenians on their guard. But though such was the temper of the Thessalian people, yet the Thessalian governments, all oligarchical, sympathised with Lacedæmon. The federal authority or power of the tagus, which bound together the separate cities, was generally very weak. What was of still greater importance, the Macedonian Perdikkas, as well as the Chalkidians, had in every city powerful guests and partisans, whom they prevailed upon to exert themselves actively in forwarding the passage of the army.¹

To these men Brasidas sent a message at Pharsalus, as soon as he reached Herakleia. Nikonidas of Larissa with other Thessalian friends of Perdikkas, assembling at Melitæa in Achaia Phthiôtis, undertook to escort him through Thessaly. By their countenance and support, combined with his own boldness, dexterity, and rapid movements, he was enabled to accomplish the seemingly impossible enterprise of running through the country, not only without the consent, but against the feelings of its inhabitants—simply by such celerity as to forestall opposition. After traversing Achaia Phthiôtis, a territory dependent on the Thessalians, Brasidas began his march from Melitæa through Thessaly itself, along with his powerful native guides. Notwithstanding all possible secrecy and celerity, his march became so far divulged, that a body of volunteers from the neighbourhood, offended at the proceeding and unfriendly to Nikonidas, assembled to oppose his progress down the valley of the river Enipeus. Reproaching him with wrongful violation of an independent territory, by the introduction of armed forces without permission from the general government, they forbade him to proceed farther. His only chance of making progress lay in disarming their opposition by fair words. His guides excused themselves by saying that the suddenness of his arrival had imposed upon them as his guests the obligation of conducting him through, without waiting to ask for formal permission: to offend their countrymen,

¹Thucyd. iv. 78.

however, was the furthest thing from their thoughts—and they would renounce the enterprise if the persons now assembled persisted in their requisition. The same conciliatory tone was adopted by Brasidas himself. “He protested his strong feeling of respect and friendship for Thessaly and its inhabitants: his arms were directed against the Athenians, not against them: nor was he aware of any unfriendly relation subsisting between the Thessalians and Lacedæmonians, such as to exclude either of them from the territory of the other. Against the prohibition of the parties now before them, he could not possibly march forward, nor would he think of attempting it; but he put it to their good feeling whether they ought to prohibit him.” Such conciliatory language was successful in softening the opponents and inducing them to disperse. But so afraid were his guides of renewed opposition in other parts, that they hurried him forward still more rapidly,¹ and he “passed through the country at a running pace without halting.” Leaving Melitæa in the morning he reached Pharsalus on the same night, encamping on the river Apidanus: thence he proceeded on the next day to Phakium, and on the day afterwards into Perrhæbia²—a territory adjoining to and dependent on Thessaly, under the mountain range of Olympus. Here he was in safety, so that his Thessalian guides left him; while the Perrhæbians conducted him over the pass of Olympus (the same over which the army of Xerxes had marched), to Diium in Macedonia, in the territory of Perdikkas, on the northern edge of the mountain.³

The Athenians were soon apprised of this stolen passage, so ably and rapidly executed, in a manner which few other Greeks, certainly no other Lacedæmonian, would have conceived to be

¹ Thucyd. iv. 78. Ὁ δὲ κελεύοντων τῶν ἀγωγῶν, πρὶν τι πλέον ξυστῆναι τὸ κωλύσον, ἐχώρει οὐδὲν ἐπισχῶν δρόμῳ.

² The geography of Thessaly is not sufficiently known to enable us to verify these positions with exactness. That which Thucydides calls the Apidanus, is the river formed by the junction of the Apidanus and Enipeus. See Kiepert's map of ancient Thessaly—Colonel Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, ch. xlii. vol. iv. p. 470; and Dr. Arnold's note on this chapter of Thucydides.

We must suppose that Brasidas was detained a considerable time in parleying with the opposing band of Thessalians. Otherwise, it would seem that the space between Melitæa and Pharsalus would not be a great distance to get over in an entire day's march—considering that the pace was as rapid as the troops could sustain. The much greater distance, between Larissa and Melitæa, was traversed in one night by Philip king of Macedon (the son of Demetrius), with an army carrying ladders and other aids for attacking a town, &c. (Polyb. v. 97).

³ Thucyd. iv. 78.

possible. Aware of the new enemy thus brought within reach of their possessions in Thrace, they transmitted orders thither for greater vigilance, and at the same time declared open war against Perdikkas;¹ but unfortunately without sending any efficient force, at a moment when timely defensive intervention was imperiously required.

Perdikkas immediately invited Brasidas to join him in the attack of Arrhibæus, prince of the Macedonians called Lynkestæ, or of Lynkus; a summons which the Spartan could not decline, since Perdikkas provided half of the pay and maintenance of the army—but which he obeyed with reluctance, anxious as he was to commence operations against the allies of Athens. Such reluctance was still further strengthened by envoys from the Chalkidians of Thrace—who, as zealous enemies of Athens, joined him forthwith, but discouraged any vigorous efforts to relieve Perdikkas from embarrassing enemies in the interior, in order that the latter might be under more pressing motives to conciliate and assist them. Accordingly Brasidas, though he joined Perdikkas and marched along with the Macedonian army towards the territory of the Lynkestæ, was not only averse to active military operations, but even entertained with favour propositions from Arrhibæus—wherein the latter expressed his wish to become the ally of Lacedæmon, and offered to refer all his differences with Perdikkas to the arbitration of the Spartan general himself. Communicating these propositions to Perdikkas, Brasidas invited him to listen to an equitable compromise, admitting Arrhibæus into the alliance of Lacedæmon. But Perdikkas indignantly refused: “he had not called in Brasidas as a judge to decide disputes between him and his enemies, but as an auxiliary to put them down wherever he might point them out; and he protested against the iniquity of Brasidas in entering into terms with Arrhibæus, while the Lacedæmonian army was half paid and maintained by him” (Perdikkas).² Notwithstanding such remonstrance, and even a hostile protest, Brasidas persisted in his intended conference with Arrhibæus, and was so far satisfied with the propositions made, that he withdrew his troops without marching over the pass into Lynkus. Too feeble to act alone, Perdikkas loudly complained. He even contracted his allowance for the future, so as to provide for only one-third of the army of Brasidas instead of one-half.

To this inconvenience, however, Brasidas submitted, in haste to begin his march into Chalkidikê, and his operations jointly

¹ Thucyd. iv. 82.

² Thucyd. iv. 83.

with the Chalkidians, for seducing or subduing the subject-allies of Athens. His first operation was against Akanthus, on the isthmus of the peninsula of Athos, the territory of which he invaded a little before the vintage—probably about the middle of September; when the grapes were ripe, but still out, and the whole crop of course exposed to ruin at the hands of an enemy superior in force. So important was it to Brasidas to have escaped the necessity of wasting another month in conquering the Lynkestæ. There was within the town of Akanthus a party in concert with the Chalkidians, anxious to admit him and to revolt openly from Athens. But the mass of the citizens were averse to this step. It was only by dwelling on the terrible loss from exposure of the crop without, that the anti-Athenian party could persuade them even to grant the request of Brasidas to be admitted singly¹—so as to explain his purposes formally before the public assembly, which would take its own decision afterwards. “For a Lacedæmonian (says Thucydidês) he was no mean speaker.” If he is to have credit for that which we find written in Thucydidês, such an epithet would be less than his desert. Doubtless however the substance of the speech is genuine: and it is one of the most interesting in Grecian history—partly as a manifesto of professed Lacedæmonian policy—partly because it had a great practical effect in determining, on an occasion of paramount importance, a multitude which, though unfavourably inclined to him, was not beyond the reach of argument. I give the chief points of the speech, without binding myself to the words.

“Myself and my soldiers have been sent, Akanthians, to realise the purpose which we proclaimed on beginning the war—that we took arms to liberate Greece from the Athenians. Let no man blame us for having been long in coming, or for the mistake which we made at the outset in supposing that we should quickly put down the Athenians by operations against Attica, without exposing you to any risk. Enough, that we are now here on the first opportunity, resolved to put them down if you will lend us your aid. To find myself shut out of your town—nay, to find that I am not heartily welcomed—astonishes me. We Lacedæmonians undertook this long and perilous march, in the belief that we were coming to friends eagerly

¹ Thucyd. iv. 84. Οἱ δὲ περὶ τοῦ δέχεσθαι αὐτὸν κατ’ ἀλλήλους ἐστασίαζον, οἳ τε μετὰ τῶν Χαλκιδῆων συνεπάγοντες καὶ ὁ δῆμος· ὁμῶς δὲ διὰ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δέος ἔτι ἔξω ὄντος, πεισθῆναι τὸ πλῆθος ὑπὸ τοῦ Βρασίδου δέξασθαι τε αὐτὸν μόνον καὶ ἀκούσαντες βουλευσάσθαι, δέχεσθαι, &c.

expecting us. It would indeed be monstrous if you should now disappoint us, and stand out against your own freedom as well as against that of other Greeks. Your example, standing high as you do both for prudence and power, will fatally keep back other Greeks. It will make them suspect that I am wanting either in power to protect them against Athens, or in honest purpose. Now, in regard to power, my own present army was one which the Athenians, though superior in number, were afraid to fight near Nisæa ; nor are they at all likely to send an equal force hither against me by sea. And in regard to my purpose, it is not one of mischief, but of liberation—the Lacedæmonian authorities having pledged themselves to me by the most solemn oaths, that every city which joins me shall retain its autonomy. You have therefore the best assurance both as to my purposes and as to my power : you need not apprehend that I am come with factious designs, to serve the views of any particular men among you, and to remodel your established constitution to the disadvantage either of the Many or of the Few. That would be worse than foreign subjugation ; and by such dealing we Lacedæmonians should be taking trouble to earn hatred instead of gratitude. We should play the part of unworthy traitors, worse even than that high-handed oppression of which we accuse the Athenians : we should at once violate our oaths, and sin against our strongest political interests. Perhaps you may say, that though you wish me well, you desire for your parts to be let alone, and to stand aloof from a dangerous struggle. You will tell me to carry my propositions elsewhere, to those who can safely embrace them, but not to thrust my alliance upon any people against their own will. If this should be your language, I shall first call your local gods and heroes to witness that I have come to you with a mission of good, and have employed persuasion in vain ; I shall then proceed to ravage your territory and extort your consent, thinking myself justly entitled to do so, on two grounds. First, that the Lacedæmonians may not sustain actual damage from these good wishes which you profess towards me without actually joining—damage in the shape of that tribute which you annually send to Athens. Next, that the Greeks generally may not be prevented by you from becoming free. It is only on the ground of common good that we Lacedæmonians can justify ourselves for liberating any city against its own will. But as we are conscious of desiring only extinction of the empire of others, not acquisition of empire for ourselves,—we should fail in our duty if we suffered

you to obstruct that liberation which we are now carrying to all. Consider well my words, then: take to yourselves the glory of beginning the æra of emancipation for Greece—save your own properties from damage—and attach an ever-honourable name to the community of Akanthus.”¹

Nothing could be more plausible or judicious than this language of Brasidas to the Akanthians—nor had they any means of detecting the falsity of the assertion (which he afterwards repeated in other places besides²) that he had braved the forces of Athens at Nisæa with the same army as that now on the outside of the walls. Perhaps the simplicity of his speech and manner may even have lent strength to his assurances. As soon as he had retired, the subject was largely discussed in the assembly, with much difference of opinion among the speakers, and perfect freedom on both sides: and the decision, not called for until after a long debate, was determined partly by the fair promises of Brasidas, partly by the certain loss which the ruin of the vine-crop would entail. The votes of the citizens present being taken secretly, a majority resolved to accede to the propositions of Brasidas and revolt from Athens.³ Exacting the renewal of his pledge and that of the Lacedæmonian authorities, for the preservation of full autonomy to every city which should join him, they received his army into the town. The neighbouring city of Stageirus (a colony of Andros, as Akanthus also was) soon followed the example.⁴

There are few acts in history wherein Grecian political reason and morality appear to greater advantage than in this proceeding of the Akanthians. The habit of fair, free, and pacific discussion—the established respect to the vote of the majority—the care to protect individual independence of judgement by secret suffrage—the deliberate estimate of reasons on both sides by each individual citizen—all these main laws and conditions of healthy political action appear as a part of the confirmed character of the Akanthians. We shall not find Brasidas entering other towns in a way so creditable or so harmonious.

But there is another inference which the scene just described irresistibly suggests. It affords the clearest proof that the

¹ Thucyd. iv. 85, 86, 87.

² Thucyd. iv. 108.

³ Thucyd. iv. 88. Οἱ δὲ Ἀκάνθιοι, πολλῶν λεχθέντων πρότερον ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρω, κρύφα διαψηφισάμενοι, διὰ τε τὸ ἐπαγωγὰ εἰπεῖν τὸν Βρασίδαν καὶ περὶ τοῦ καρποῦ φόβῳ, ἔγνωσαν οἱ πλείους ἀφίστασθαι Ἀθηναίων.

⁴ Thucyd. iv. 88; Diodor. xii. 67.

Akanthians had little to complain of as subject-allies of Athens, and that they would have continued in that capacity, if left to their own choice without the fear of having their crop destroyed. Such is the pronounced feeling of the mass of the citizens: the party who desire otherwise are in a decided minority. It is only the combined effect, of severe impending loss and of tempting assurances held out by the worthiest representative whom Sparta ever sent out, which induces them to revolt from Athens. Nor even then is the resolution taken without long opposition, and a large dissentient minority, in a case where secret suffrage ensured free and genuine expression of preference from every individual. Now it is impossible that the scene in Akanthus at this critical moment could have been of such a character, had the empire of Athens been practically odious and burdensome to the subject-allies, as it is commonly depicted. Had such been the fact—had the Akanthians felt that the imperial ascendancy of Athens oppressed them with hardship or humiliation from which their neighbours, the revolted Chalkidians in Olynthus and elsewhere, were exempt—they would have hailed the advent of Brasidas with that cordiality which he himself expected, and was surprised not to find. The sense of present grievance, always acute and often excessive, would have stood out as their prominent impulse. They would have needed neither intimidation nor cajolery to induce them to throw open their gates to the liberator—who, in his speech within the town, finds no actual suffering to appeal to, but is obliged to gain over an audience, evidently unwilling, by alternate threats and promises.

As in Akanthus, so in most of the other Thracian subjects of Athens—the bulk of the citizens, though strongly solicited by the Chalkidians, manifest no spontaneous disposition to revolt from Athens. We shall find the party who introduce Brasidas to be a conspiring minority, who not only do not consult the majority beforehand, but act in such a manner as to leave no free option to the majority afterwards, whether they will ratify or reject; bringing in a foreign force to overawe them and compromise them without their own consent in hostility against Athens. Now that which makes the events of Akanthus so important as an evidence, is, that the majority is not thus entrapped and compressed, but pronounces its judgement freely after ample discussion. The grounds of that judgement are clearly set forth to us, so as to show, that hatred of Athens, if even it exists at all, is in no way a strong or

determining feeling. Had there existed any such strong feeling among the subject-allies of Athens in the Chalkidic peninsula, there was no Athenian force now present to hinder them all from opening their gates to the liberator Brasidas by spontaneous majorities ; as he himself, encouraged by the sanguine promises of the Chalkidians, evidently expected that they would do. But nothing of this kind happened.

That which I before remarked in recounting the revolt of Mitylênê, a privileged ally of Athens—is now confirmed in the revolt of Akanthus, a tributary, and subject-ally. The circumstances of both prove that imperial Athens neither inspired hatred nor occasioned painful grievance, to the population of her subject-cities generally. The movements against her arose from party-minorities, of the same character as that Platæan party which introduced the Theban assailants into Platæa at the commencement of the Peloponnesian war. There are of course differences of sentiment between one town and another ; but the conduct of the towns generally demonstrates that the Athenian empire was not felt by them to be such a scheme of plunder and oppression as Mr. Mitford and others would have us believe. It is indeed true that Athens managed her empire with reference to her own feelings and interests, and that her hold was rather upon the prudence than upon the affection of her allies ; except in so far as those among them who were democratically governed, sympathised with her democracy. It is also true that restrictions in any form on the autonomy of each separate city were offensive to the political instincts of the Greeks : moreover Athens took less and less pains to disguise or soften the real character of her empire, as one resting simply on established fact and superior force. But this is a different thing from the endurance of practical hardship and oppression, which, had it been real, would have inspired strong positive hatred among the subject-allies—such as Brasidas expected to find universal in Thrace, but did not really find, in spite of the easy opening which his presence afforded.

The acquisition of Akanthus and Stageirus enabled Brasidas in no very long time to extend his conquests ; to enter Argilus—and from thence to make the capital acquisition of Amphipolis.

Argilus was situated between Stageirus and the river Strymon, along the western bank of which river its territory extended. Along the eastern bank of the same river,—south of the lake which it forms under the name of Kerkinitis, and north of the town of Eion at its mouth,—was situated the town

and territory of Amphipolis, communicating with the lands of Argilus by the important bridge there situated. The Argilians were colonists from Andros, like Akanthus and Stageirus. The adhesion of those two cities to Brasidas gave him opportunity to cultivate intelligences in Argilus, wherein there had existed a standing discontent against Athens, ever since the foundation of the neighbouring city of Amphipolis.¹ The latter city had been established by the Athenian Agnon, at the head of a numerous body of colonists, on a spot belonging to the Edonian Thracians called Ennea Hodoi, or Nine Ways, about five years prior to the commencement of the war (B.C. 437); after two previous attempts to colonise it,—one by Histiaëus and Aristagoras at the period of the Ionic revolt, and a second by the Athenians about 465 B.C.—both of which lamentably failed. So valuable however was the site, from its vicinity to the gold and silver mines near Mount Pangæus and to large forests of ship-timber, as well as for command of the Strymon, and for commerce with the interior of Thrace and Macedonia—that the Athenians had sent a second expedition under Agnon, who founded the city and gave it the name of Amphipolis. The resident settlers there, however, were only in small proportion Athenian citizens; the rest of mixed origin, some of them Argilian—a considerable number Chalkidians. The Athenian general Euklês was governor in the town, though seemingly with no paid force under his command. His colleague Thucydidês the historian was in command of a small fleet on the coast.

Among these mixed inhabitants a conspiracy was organised to betray the town to Brasidas. The inhabitants of Argilus as well as the Chalkidians each tampered with those of the same race who resided in Amphipolis; while the influence of Perdikkas, not inconsiderable in consequence of the commerce of the place with Macedonia, was also employed to increase the number of partisans. Of all the instigators, however, the most strenuous as well as the most useful were the inhabitants of Argilus. Amphipolis, together with the Athenians as its founders, had been odious to them from its commencement. Its foundation had doubtless abridged their commerce and importance as masters of the lower course of the Strymon. They had been long laying snares against the city, and the arrival of Brasidas now presented to them an unexpected

¹ Thucyd. iv. 103. *μάλιστα δὲ οἱ Ἀργίλιοι, ἐγγύς τε προσοικούντες καὶ αἰεὶ ποτὲ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ὄντες ὑποπτοὶ καὶ ἐπιβουλευόντες τῇ χωρίῳ* (Amphipolis).

chance of success. It was they who encouraged him to attempt the surprise, deferring proclamation of their own defection from Athens until they could make it subservient to his conquest of Amphipolis.

Starting with his army from Arnê in the Chalkidic peninsula, Brasidas arrived in the afternoon at Aulon and Bromiskus, near the channel whereby the lake Bolbê is connected with the sea. From hence, after his men had supped, he began his night-march to Amphipolis, on a cold and snowy night of November or the beginning of December. He reached Argilus in the middle of the night, where the leaders at once admitted him, proclaiming their revolt from Athens. With their aid and guidance, he then hastened forward without delay to the bridge across the Strymon, which he reached before break of day.¹ It was guarded only by a feeble piquet—the town of Amphipolis itself being situated on the hill at some little distance higher up the river;² so that Brasidas, preceded by the Argilian conspirators, surprised and overpowered the guard without difficulty. Thus master of this important communication, he crossed with his army forthwith into the territory of Amphipolis, where his arrival spread the utmost dismay and terror. The governor Euklês, the magistrates, and the citizens, were all found wholly unprepared: the lands belonging to the city were occupied by residents with their families and property around them, calculating upon undisturbed security, as if there had been no enemy within reach. Such of these as were close

¹ Thucyd. iv. 103. Κατέστησαν τὸν στρατὸν πρὸ ἔω ἐπὶ τὴν γέφυραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ.

Bekker's reading of πρὸ ἔω appears to me preferable to πρόσω. The latter word really adds nothing to the meaning; whereas the fact that Brasidas got over the river before daylight is one both new and material: it is not necessarily implied in the previous words ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτί.

² Thucyd. iv. 103. Ἀπέχει δὲ τὸ πόλισμα πλεόν τῆς διαβάσεως, καὶ οὐ καθεῖτο τείχη ὥσπερ νῦν, φυλακὴ δὲ τις βραχεῖα καθεστῆκει, &c.

Dr. Arnold, with Dobree, Poppo, and most of the commentators, translate these words—"the town (of Amphipolis) is farther off (from Argilus) than the passage of the river." But this must be of course true, and conveys no new information, seeing that Brasidas had to cross the river to reach the town. Smith and Bloomfield are right, I think, in considering τῆς διαβάσεως as governed by ἀπέχει and not by πλεόν—"the city is at some distance from the crossing:" and the objection which Poppo makes against them, that πλεόν must necessarily imply a comparison with something, cannot be sustained: for Thucydides often uses ἐκ πλείονος (iv. 103; viii. 88) as precisely identical with ἐκ πολλοῦ (i. 68; iv. 67; v. 69); also περὶ πλείονος.

In the following chapter (vol. vii.), on occasion of the battle of Amphipolis, some further remarks will be found on the locality, with a plan at the end of that volume.

to the city succeeded in running thither with their families, though leaving their property exposed—but the more distant became in person as well as in property at the mercy of the invader. Even within the town, filled with the friends and relatives of these victims without, indescribable confusion reigned, of which the conspirators within tried to avail themselves in order to get the gates thrown open. And so complete was the disorganisation, that if Brasidas had marched up without delay to the gates and assaulted the town, many persons supposed that he would have carried it at once. Such a risk however was too great even for his boldness—the rather as repulse would have been probably his ruin. Moreover, confiding in the assurances of the conspirators that the gates would be thrown open, he thought it safer to seize as many persons as he could from the out-citizens, as a means of working upon the sentiments of those within the walls. Lastly, this process of seizure and plunder, being probably more to the taste of his own soldiers, could not well be hindered.

But he waited in vain for the opening of the gates. The conspirators in the city, in spite of the complete success of their surprise and the universal dismay around them, found themselves unable to carry the majority along with them. As in Akanthus, so in Amphipolis, those who really hated Athens and wished to revolt were only a party-minority. The greater number of citizens, at this critical moment, stood by Euklês and the few native Athenians around him in resolving upon defence, and in sending off an express to Thucydidês at Thasos (the historian), the colleague of Euklês, as general in the region of Thrace, for immediate aid. This step, of course immediately communicated to Brasidas from within, determined him to make every effort for enticing the Amphipolitans to surrender before the reinforcement should arrive; the rather as he was apprised that Thucydidês, being a large proprietor and worker of gold mines in the neighbouring region, possessed extensive personal influence among the Thracian tribes, and would be able to bring them together for the relief of the place, in conjunction with his own Athenian squadron. He therefore sent in propositions for surrender on the most favourable terms—guaranteeing to every citizen who chose to remain, Amphipolitan or even Athenian, continued residence with undisturbed property and equal political rights—and granting to every one who chose to depart, five days for the purpose of carrying away his effects.

Such easy conditions, when made known in the city,

produced presently a sensible change of opinion among the citizens—proving acceptable both to Athenians and Amphipolitans, though on different grounds.¹ The properties of the citizens without, as well as many of their relatives, were all in the hands of Brasidas. No one counted upon the speedy arrival of reinforcement—and even if it did arrive, the city might be preserved, but the citizens without would still be either slain or made captive: a murderous battle would ensue, and perhaps after all, Brasidas, assisted by the party within, might prove victorious. The Athenian citizens in Amphipolis, knowing themselves to be exposed to peculiar danger, were perfectly well-pleased with his offer, as extricating them from a critical position and procuring for them the means of escape, with comparatively little loss; while the non-Athenian citizens, partakers in the same relief from peril, felt little reluctance in accepting a capitulation which preserved both their rights and their properties inviolate, and merely severed them from Athens—towards which city they felt, not hatred, but indifference. Above all, the friends and relatives of the citizens exposed in the out-region were strenuous in urging on the capitulation, so that the conspirators soon became bold enough to proclaim themselves openly—insisting upon the moderation of Brasidas and the prudence of admitting him. Euklēs found that the tone of opinion, even among his own Athenians, was gradually turned against him. He could not prevent the acceptance of the terms, and the admission of the enemy into the city, on that same day.

No such resolution would have been adopted, had the citizens been aware how near at hand Thucydides' and his forces were. The message despatched early in the morning from Amphipolis found him at Thasos with seven triremes; with which he instantly put to sea, so as to reach Eion at the mouth of the Strymon, within three miles of Amphipolis, on the same evening. He hoped to be in time for saving Amphipolis: but the place had surrendered a few hours before. He arrived indeed only just in time to preserve Eion; for parties in that town were already beginning to concert the admission of Brasidas, who would probably have entered it at day-break the next morning. Thucydides, putting the place in a

¹ Thucyd. iv. 106. Οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ ἀκούσαντες ἄλλοιότεροι ἐγένοντο τὰς γνώμας, &c.

The word ἄλλοιότεροι seems to indicate both the change of view, compared with what had been before, and new divergence introduced among themselves.

condition of defence, successfully repelled an attack which Brasidas, made both by land and by boats on the river. He at the same time received and provided for the Athenian citizens who were retiring from Amphipolis.¹

The capture of this city, perhaps the most important of all the foreign possessions of Athens—and the opening of the bridge over the Strymon, by which even all her eastern allies became approachable by land—occasioned prodigious emotion throughout all the Grecian world. The dismay felt at Athens² was greater than had been ever before experienced. Hope and joy prevailed among her enemies, while excitement and new aspirations became widely spread among her subject-allies. The bloody defeat at Delium, and the unexpected conquests of Brasidas, now again lowered the *prestige* of Athenian success, sixteen months after it had been so powerfully exalted by the capture of Sphakteria. The loss of reputation, which Sparta had then incurred, was now compensated by a reaction against the unfounded terrors since conceived about the probable career of her enemy. It was not merely the loss of Amphipolis, serious as that was, which distressed the Athenians; but also their insecurity respecting the maintenance of their whole empire. They knew not which of their subject-allies might next revolt, in contemplation of aid from Brasidas, facilitated by the newly-acquired Strymonian bridge. And as the proceedings of that general counted in part to the credit of his country, it was believed that Sparta, now for the first time shaking off her languor,³ had taken to herself the rapidity and enterprise once regarded as the exclusive characteristic of Athens.

But besides all these chances of evil to the Athenians, there was another yet more threatening—the personal ascendancy and position of Brasidas himself. It was not merely the boldness, the fertility of aggressive resource, the quick movements,

¹ Thucyd. iv. 105, 106; Diodor. xii. 68.

² Thucyd. iv. 108. Ἐχομένης δὲ τῆς Ἀμφιπόλεως, οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐς μέγα δέος κατέστησαν, &c.

The prodigious importance of the site of Amphipolis, with its adjoining bridge forming the communication between the regions east and west of Strymon—was felt not only by Philip of Macedon (as will hereafter appear), but also by the Romans after their conquest of Macedonia. Of the four regions into which the Romans distributed Macedonia, “pars prima (says Livy, xlv. 30) habet opportunitatem Amphipoleos; quæ objecta claudit omnes ab oriente sole in Macedoniam aditus.”

³ Thucyd. iv. 108. Τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, διὰ τὸ ἡδονὴν ἔχον ἐν τῷ αὐτίκα, καὶ ὅτι τὸ πρῶτον Λακεδαιμονίων ὀργάντων ἔμελλον πειρᾶσθαι, κινδυνεύειν παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐτόιμοι ἦσαν (the subject-allies of Athens).

the power of stimulating the minds of soldiers—which lent efficiency to that general; but also his incorruptible probity, his good faith, his moderation, his abstinence from party-cruelty or corruption, and from all intermeddling with the internal constitutions of the different cities—in strict adherence to that manifesto whereby Sparta had proclaimed herself the liberator of Greece. Such talents and such official worth had never before been seen combined. Set off as they were by the full brilliancy of successes, such as were deemed incredible before they actually occurred, they inspired a degree of confidence, and turned a tide of opinion, towards this eminent man, which rendered him personally one of the first powers in Greece. Numerous solicitations were transmitted to him at Amphipolis from parties among the subject-allies of Athens, in their present temper, of large hopes from him and diminished fear of the Athenians. The anti-Athenian party in each was impatient to revolt, the rest of the population less restrained by fear.¹

Of those who indulged in these sanguine calculations, many had yet to learn by painful experience that Athens was still but little abated in power. Still her inaction during this important autumn had been such as may well explain their mistake. It might have been anticipated that on hearing the alarming news of the junction of Brasidas with the Chalkidians and Perdikkas so close upon their dependent allies, they would forthwith have sent a competent force to Thrace—which, if despatched at that time, would probably have obviated all the subsequent disasters. So they would have acted at any other time—and perhaps even then, if Periklês had been alive. But the news arrived just at the period when Athens was engaged in the expedition against Bœotia, which ended very shortly in the ruinous defeat of Delium. Under the discouragement arising from the death of the Stratêgus Hippokratês and 1000 citizens, the idea of a fresh expedition to Thrace would probably have been intolerable to Athenian hoplites. The hardships of a winter service in Thrace, as experienced a few years before in the blockade of Potidæa, would probably also aggravate their reluctance. In Grecian history, we must steadfastly keep in mind that we are reading about citizen soldiers, not about professional soldiers; and that the temper of the time, whether of confidence or dismay, modifies to an unspeakable degree all the calculations of military and political prudence. Even after the rapid successes of Brasidas, not merely at Akanthus and

¹ Thucyd. iv. 108.

Stageirus, but even at Amphipolis, they sent only a few inadequate guards¹ to the points most threatened—thus leaving to their enterprising enemy the whole remaining winter for his operations, without hindrance. Without depreciating the merits of Brasidas, we may see that his extraordinary success was in great part owing to the no less extraordinary depression which at that time pervaded the Athenian public: a feeling encouraged by Nikias and other leading men of the same party, who were building upon it their hopes of getting the Lacedæmonian proposals for peace accepted.

But while we thus notice the short-comings of Athens in not sending timely forces against Brasidas, we must at the same time admit, that the most serious and irreparable loss which she sustained—that of Amphipolis—was the fault of her officers more than her own. Euklēs and the historian Thucydidēs, the two joint Athenian commanders in Thrace, to whom was confided the defence of that important town, had means amply sufficient to place it beyond all risk of capture, had they employed the most ordinary vigilance and precaution beforehand. That Thucydidēs became an exile immediately after this event, and remained so for twenty years, is certain from his own statement. And we hear, upon what in this case is quite sufficient authority, that the Athenians condemned him (probably Euklēs also) to banishment, on the proposition of Kleon.²

In considering this sentence, historians³ commonly treat

¹ Thucyd. iv. 108. Οἱ μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι φυλακὰς ὡς ἐξ ὀλίγου καὶ ἐν χειμῶνι διέπεμπον ἐς τὰς πόλεις, &c.

² Thucyd. v. 26. See the biography of Thucydidēs by Marcellinus, prefixed to all the editions, p. 19, ed. Arnold.

³ I transcribe the main features from the account of Dr. Thirlwall, whose judgement coincides on this occasion with what is generally given (Hist. of Greece, ch. xxiii. vol. iii. p. 268).

“On the evening of the same day, Thucydidēs, with seven galleys which he happened to have with him at Thasos, when he received the despatch from Eucles, sailed into the mouth of the Strymon, and learning the fall of Amphipolis proceeded to put Eion in a state of defence. His timely arrival saved the place, which Brasidas attacked the next morning, both from the river and the land, without effect: and the refugees, who retired by virtue of the treaty from Amphipolis, found shelter at Eion, and contributed to its security. *The historian rendered an important service to his country: and it does not appear that human prudence and activity could have accomplished anything more under the same circumstances.* Yet his unavoidable failure proved the occasion of a sentence, under which he spent twenty years of his life in exile: and he was only restored to his country in the season of her deepest humiliation by the public calamities. So much only can be gathered with certainty from his language: for he has not condescended to mention

Thucydides as an innocent man, and find nothing to condemn except the calumnies of the demagogue, followed by the injustice of the people. But this view of the case cannot be sustained, when we bring together all the facts even as indicated by Thucydides himself.

At the moment when Brasidas surprised Amphipolis, Thucydides was at Thasos; and the event is always discussed as if he was there by necessity or duty—as if Thasos was his special mission. Now we know from his own statement that his command was not special or confined to Thasos. He was sent as joint commander along with Euklês generally to Thrace, and especially to Amphipolis.¹ Both of them were jointly and severally responsible for the proper defence of Amphipolis, with the Athenian empire and interests in that quarter. Such nomination of two or more officers, co-ordinate and jointly responsible, was the usual habit of Athens, wherever the scale or the area of military operations was considerable—instead of one supreme responsible commander, with subordinate officers

either the charge which was brought against him, or the nature of the sentence, which he may either have suffered, or avoided by a voluntary exile. A statement, very probable in itself, though resting on slight authority, attributes his banishment to Kleon's calumnies: *that the irritation produced by the loss of Amphipolis should have been so directed against an innocent object, would perfectly accord with the character of the people and of the demagogue.* Posterity has gained by the injustice of his contemporaries," &c.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 104. Οἱ δ' ἐναντίοι τοῖς προδιδούσι (that is, at Amphipolis) κρατούντες τῇ πλῇθει ὥστε μὴ αὐτίκα τὰς πύλας ἀνοίγεσθαι, πέμποισι μετὰ Εὐκλέους τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, ὃς ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηναίων παρῆν αὐτοῖς φύλαξ τοῦ χωρίου, ἐπὶ τὸν ἕτερον στρατηγὸν τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης, Θουκυδίδην τὸν Ὀλόρου, ὃς τὰδε ξυνέγραψεν, ὅντα περὶ Θάσον (ἔστι δ' ἡ νῆσος, Παρίων ἀποικία, ἀπέχουσα τῆς Ἀμφιπόλεως ἡμισείας ἡμέρας μάλιστα πλοῦν), κελεύοντες σφίσι βοηθεῖν.

Here Thucydides describes himself as "the other general along with Euklês, of the region of or towards Thrace." There cannot be a clearer designation of the extensive range of his functions and duties. The same words τοῦ ἑτέρου στρατηγοῦ are used respecting the two joint commanders Hippokratês and Demosthenês (Thucyd. iv. 67 and iv. 43).

I adopt here the reading τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης (the genitive case of the well-known Thucydidean phrase τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης) in preference to τὸν ἐπὶ Θράκης; which would mean in substance the same thing, though not so precisely, nor so suitably to the usual manner of the historian. Bloomfield, Bekker, and Göller have all introduced τῶν into the text, on the authority of various MSS.; Poppo and Dr. Arnold also both express a preference for it, though they still leave τὸν in the text.

Moreover the words of Thucydides himself in the passage where he mentions his own long exile, plainly prove that he was sent out as general, not to Thasos, but to Amphipolis—(v. 26) καὶ ξυνέβη μοι φεύγειν τὴν ἑμῶν ἐτη εἴκοσι μετὰ τὴν ἐς Ἀμφίπολιν στρατηγίαν, &c.

acting under him and responsible to him. If, then, Thucydides "was stationed at Thasos" (to use the phrase of Dr. Thirlwall) this was because he chose to station himself there, in the exercise of his own discretion.

Accordingly, the question which we have to put is, not whether Thucydides did all that could be done, after he received the alarming express at Thasos (which is the part of the case that *he* sets prominently before us), but whether he and Euklês jointly took the best general measures for the security of the Athenian empire in Thrace—especially for Amphipolis, the first jewel of her empire.

They suffer Athens to be robbed of that jewel,—and how? Had they a difficult position to defend? Were they overwhelmed by a superior force? Were they distracted by simultaneous revolts in different places, or assailed by enemies unknown or unforeseen? Not one of these grounds for acquittal can be pleaded. First, their position was of all others the most defensible. They had only to keep the bridge over the Strymon adequately watched and guarded—or to retain the Athenian squadron at Eion—and Amphipolis was safe. Either one or the other of these precautions would have sufficed: both together would have sufficed so amply, as probably to prevent the scheme of attack from being formed. Next, the force under Brasidas was in no way superior—not even adequate to the capture of the inferior place Eion, when properly guarded—much less to that of Amphipolis. Lastly, there were no simultaneous revolts to distract attention, nor unknown enemies to confound a well-laid scheme of defence. There was but one enemy, in one quarter, having one road by which to approach; an enemy of surpassing merit indeed, and eminently dangerous to Athens—but without any chance of success, except from the short-comings of the Athenian officers.

Now Thucydides and Euklês both knew that Brasidas had prevailed upon Akanthus and Stageirus to revolt, and that too in such a way as to extend his own personal influence materially. They knew that the population of Argilus was of Andrian origin,¹ like that of Akanthus and Stageirus, and therefore peculiarly likely to be tempted by the example of those two towns. Lastly, they knew (and Thucydides himself tells us²) that this Argilian population—whose territory

¹ Compare Thucyd. iv. 84, 88, 103.

² Thucyd. iv. 103. *μάλιστα δὲ οἱ Ἀργίλιοι, ἐγγύς τε προσκοῦντες καὶ αἰεὶ ποτὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ὄντες ὑποπτοὶ καὶ ἐπιβουλεύοντες τῇ χωρίῳ* (Amphipolis), *ἐπεὶδὴ παρέτυχεν ὁ καιρὸς καὶ*

bordered on the Strymon and the western foot of the bridge, and who had many connexions in Amphipolis—had been long disaffected to Athens, and especially to the Athenian possession of that city. Yet having such foreknowledge, ample warning for the necessity of a vigilant defence, Thucydîdês and Euklês withdraw, or omit, both the two precautions upon which the security of Amphipolis rested—precautions both of them obvious, either of them sufficient. The one leaves the bridge under a feeble guard,¹ and is caught so unprepared every way, that one might suppose Athens to be in profound peace; the other is found with his squadron, not at Eion, but at Thasos—an island out of all possible danger, either from Brasidas (who had no ships) or any other enemy. The arrival of Brasidas comes on both of them like a clap of thunder. Nothing more is required than this plain fact, under the circumstances, to prove their improvidence as commanders.

The presence of Thucydîdês on the station of Thrace was important to Athens, partly because he possessed valuable family-connexions, mining-property, and commanding influence among the continental population round Amphipolis.² This was one main reason why he was named. The Athenian people confide much in his private influence, over and above the public force under his command—looking to him even more than to his colleague Euklês for the continued security of the town: instead of which they find that not even their own squadron under him is at hand near the vulnerable point at the moment when the enemy comes. Of the two, perhaps, the conduct of Euklês admits of conceivable explanation more easily than that of Thucydîdês. For it seems that Euklês had no paid force in Amphipolis; no other force than the citizen hoplites, partly Athenian, partly of other lineage. Doubtless these men found it irksome to keep guard through the winter on the Strymonian bridge. Euklês might fancy,

Βρασιδᾶς ἦλθεν, ἐπράξαν τε ἐκ πλείονος πρὸς τοὺς ἐμπολιτεύοντας σφῶν ἐκεῖ ὅπως ἐνδοθήσεται ἡ πόλις, &c.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 103. φυλακὴ δὲ τις βραχεῖα καθειστήκει, ἣν βιάσάμενος ῥαδίως ὁ Βρασιδᾶς, ἅμα μὲν τῆς προδοσίας οὐσης, ἅμα δὲ καὶ χειμῶνος ὄντος καὶ ἀπροσδόκητος προσπεσών, διέβη τὴν γέφυραν, &c.

² Thucyd. iv. 105. καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δύνασθαι ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις τῶν ἡπειρωτῶν, &c.

Rotscher, in his *Life of Thucydîdês* (*Leben des Thukydidês*, Göttingen, 1842, sect. 4, p. 97–99), admits it to be the probable truth, that Thucydîdês was selected for this command expressly in consequence of his private influence in the region around. Yet this biographer still repeats the view generally taken, that Thucydîdês did everything which an able commander could do, and was most unjustly condemned.

that by enforcing a large perpetual guard, he ran the risk of making Athens unpopular. Moreover, strict constancy of watch, night after night, when no actual danger comes, with an unpaid citizen force—is not easy to maintain. This is an insufficient excuse, but it is better than anything which can be offered on behalf of Thucydides; who had with him a paid Athenian force, and might just as well have kept it at Eion as at Thasos.¹ We may be sure that the absence of Thucydides with his fleet, at Thasos, was one essential condition in the plot laid by Brasidas with the Argilians.

To say, with Dr. Thirlwall, that “human prudence and activity could not have accomplished more than Thucydides did *under the same circumstances*”—is true as matter of fact, and creditable as far as it goes. But it is wholly inadmissible as a justification, and meets only one part of the case. An officer in command is responsible not only for doing most “under the circumstances,” but also for the circumstances themselves, in so far as they are under his control. Now nothing is more under his control than the position which he chooses to occupy. If the Emperor Napoleon, or the Duke of Wellington, had lost by surprise of an enemy not very numerous, a post of supreme importance which they thought adequately protected, would they be satisfied to hear from the responsible officer in command—“Having no idea that the enemy would attempt any surprise, I thought that I might keep my force half a day’s journey off from the post exposed, at another post which it was physically impossible for the enemy to reach. But the moment I was informed that the surprise had occurred, I hastened to the scene, did all that human prudence and activity could do to repel the enemy; and though I found that he had already mastered the capital post of all, yet I beat him back from a second post which he was on the point of mastering also”? Does any one imagine that these illustrious chiefs, smarting under the loss of an inestimable position which alters the whole prospects of a campaign, would be satisfied with such a report, and would dismiss the officer with praises for his vigour and bravery “under the circumstances”? They would assuredly reply that he had done right in coming back—that his conduct after coming back had been that of a brave man—and that there was no impeachment on his courage. But they would at

¹ That the recognised station of the Athenian fleet was at Eion—and that the maintenance of the passage of the Strymon was inestimable to the Athenians (even apart from Amphipolis), as guarantee for the inaccessibility of her eastern empire—we see by Thucyd. iv. 108.

the same time add, that his want of judgement and foresight, in omitting to place the valuable position really exposed under sufficient guard beforehand, and leaving it thus open to the enemy, while he himself was absent in another place which was out of danger—and his easy faith that there would be no dangerous surprise, at a time when the character of the enemy's officer, as well as the disaffection of the neighbours (Argilus), plainly indicated that there *would* be, if the least opening were afforded—that these were defects meriting serious reproof, and disqualifying him from any future command of trust and responsibility. Nor can we doubt that the whole feeling of the respective armies, who would have to pay with their best blood the unhappy miscalculation of this officer, would go along with such a sentence; without at all suspecting themselves to be guilty of injustice, or of “directing the irritation produced by the loss against an innocent object.”

The vehement leather-seller in the Pnyx at Athens, when he brought forward what are called “his calumnies” against Thucydides and Euklês, as having caused through culpable omission a fatal and irreparable loss to their country, might perhaps state his case with greater loudness and acrimony. But it may be doubted whether he would say anything more really galling, than would be contained in the dignified rebuke of an esteemed modern general, to a subordinate officer under similar circumstances. In my judgement, not only the accusation against these two officers (I assume Euklês to have been included) was called for on the fairest *presumptive* grounds—which would be sufficient as a justification of the leather-seller Kleon—but the positive verdict of guilty against them was fully merited. Whether the banishment inflicted was a greater penalty than the case warranted, I will not take upon me to pronounce. Every age has its own standard of feeling for measuring what is a proper intensity of punishment: penalties which our grandfathers thought right and meet, would in the present day appear intolerably rigorous. But when I consider the immense value of Amphipolis to Athens, combined with the conduct whereby it was lost, I cannot think that there was a single Athenian, or a single Greek, who would deem the penalty of banishment too severe.

It is painful to find such strong grounds of official censure against a man who as an historian has earned the lasting admiration of posterity—my own, among the first and warmest. But in criticising the conduct of Thucydides the officer, we are bound in justice to forget Thucydides the historian.

He was not known in the latter character, at the time when this sentence was passed. Perhaps he never would have been so known (like the Neapolitan historian Colletta), if exile had not thrown him out of the active duties and hopes of a citizen.

It may be doubted whether he ever went home from Eion to encounter the grief, wrath, and alarm, so strongly felt at Athens, after the loss of Amphipolis. Condemned, either with or without appearance, he remained in banishment for twenty years;¹ not returning to Athens until after the conclusion of the Peloponnesian war. Of this long exile much is said to have been spent on his property in Thrace; yet he also visited most parts of Greece—enemies of Athens as well as neutral states. However much we may deplore such a misfortune on his account, mankind in general has, and ever will have, the strongest reason to rejoice at it. To this compulsory leisure we owe the completion, or rather the near approach to completion, of his history. And the opportunities which an exile enjoyed of personally consulting neutrals and enemies, contributed much to form that impartial, comprehensive, Pan-Hellenic spirit, which reigns generally throughout his immortal work.

Meanwhile Brasidas, installed in Amphipolis about the beginning of December 424 B.C., employed his increased power only the more vigorously against Athens. His first care was to reconstitute Amphipolis—a task wherein the Macedonian Perdikkas, whose intrigues had contributed to the capture, came and personally assisted. That city went through a partial secession and renovation of inhabitants; being now moreover cut off from the port of Eion and the mouth of the river, which remained in the hands of the Athenians. Many new arrangements must have been required, as well for its internal polity as for its external defence. Brasidas took measures for building ships of war, in the lake above the city, in order to force the lower part of the river:² but his most important step was to construct a palisade work,³ connecting the walls of the city with the bridge. He thus made himself permanently master of the crossing of the Strymon, so as to shut the door by which he himself had entered, and

¹ Thucyd. v. 26.

² Thucyd. iv. 104–108.

³ This is the *σταύρωμα*, mentioned (v. 10) as existing a year and a half afterwards, at the time of the battle of Amphipolis. I shall say more respecting the topography of Amphipolis, when I come to describe that battle.

at the same time to keep an easy communication with Argilus and the western bank of the Strymon. He also made some acquisitions on the eastern side of the river. Pittakus, prince of the neighbouring Edonian-Thracian township of Myrkinus, had been recently assassinated by his wife Brauro and by some personal enemies. He had probably been the ally of Athens, and his assassins now sought to strengthen themselves by courting the alliance of the new conqueror of Amphipolis. The Thasian continental colonies of Galepsus and Æsymê also declared their adhesion to him.

While he sent to Lacedæmon, communicating his excellent position as well as his large hopes, he at the same time, without waiting for the answer, began acting for himself, with all the allies whom he could get together. He marched first against the peninsula called Aktê—the narrow tongue of land which stretches out from the neighbourhood of Akanthus to the mighty headland called Mount Athos—near thirty miles long, and between four and five miles for the most part in breadth.¹ The long, rugged, woody ridge—covering this peninsula so as to leave but narrow spaces for dwelling, or cultivation, or feeding of cattle—was at this time occupied by many distinct petty communities, some of them divided in race and language. Sanê, a colony from Andros, was situated in the interior gulf (called the Singitic Gulf) between Athos and the Sithonian peninsula, near the Xerxeian canal. The rest of the Aktê was distributed among Bisaltians, Krestônians and Edonians, all fractions of the Thracian name—Pelasgians or Tyrrhenians, of the race which had once occupied Lemnos and Imbros—and some Chalkidians. Some of these little communities spoke habitually two languages. Thyssus, Kleônê, Olophyxus, and others, all submitted on the arrival of Brasidas; but Sanê and Dion held out, nor could he bring them to terms even by ravaging their territory.

He next marched into the Sithonian peninsula, to attack Torônê, situated near the southern extremity of that peninsula—opposite to Cape Kanastræum, the extreme headland of the peninsula of Pallênê.²

Torônê was inhabited by a Chalkidic population, but had not partaken in the revolt of the neighbouring Chalkidians against Athens. A small Athenian garrison had been sent there, probably since the recent dangers, and were now defending it as well as repairing the town-wall in various parts where

¹ See Grisebach, *Reise durch Rumelien und Brusa*, vol. i. ch. viii. p. 226.

² Thucyd. iv. 109.

it had been so neglected as to crumble down. They occupied as a sort of distinct citadel the outlying cape called Lēkythus, joining by a narrow isthmus the hill on which the city stood, and forming a port wherein lay two Athenian triremes as guardships. A small party in Torônê, without privity¹ or even suspicion of the rest, entered into correspondence with Brasidas, and engaged to provide for him the means of entering and mastering the town. Accordingly he advanced by a night-march to the temple of the Dioskuri (Kastor and Pollux) within about a quarter of a mile of the town-gates, which he reached a little before daybreak; sending forward 100 peltasts to be still nearer, and to rush upon the gate at the instant when signal was made from within. His Torônæan partisans, some of whom were already concealed on the spot awaiting his arrival, made their final arrangements with him, and then returned into the town—conducting with them seven determined men from his army, armed only with daggers, and having Lysistratus of Olynthus as their chief. Twenty men had been originally named for this service, but the danger appeared so extreme, that only seven of them were bold enough to go. This forlorn hope, enabled to creep in, through a small aperture in the wall towards the sea, were conducted silently up to the topmost watch-tower on the city hill, where they surprised and slew the guards, and set open a neighbouring postern gate, looking towards Cape Kanastræum, as well as the great gate leading towards the agora. They then brought in the peltasts from without, who, impatient with the delay, had gradually stolen close under the walls. Some of these peltasts kept possession of the great gate, others were led round to the postern at the top, while the fire-signal was forthwith lighted to invite Brasidas himself. He and his men hastened forward towards the city at their utmost speed and with loud shouts—a terror-striking notice of his presence to the unprepared citizens. Admission was easy through the open gates, but some also clambered up by means of beams or a sort of scaffolding, which was lying close to the wall as a help to the workmen repairing it. And while the assailants were thus active in every direction, Brasidas himself conducted a portion of them to assure himself of the high and commanding parts of the city.

So completely were the Torônæans surprised and thunder-

¹ Thucyd. iv. 110. καὶ αὐτὸν ἄνδρες ὀλίγοι ἐπήγον κρύφα, ἐτοίμοι ὄντες τὴν πόλιν παραδοῦναι—iv. 113. Τῶν δὲ Τορωναίων γιγνομένης τῆς ἀλώσεως τὸ μὲν πολλὸν οὐδὲν εἶδος ἐθορυβεῖτο, &c.

struck, that hardly any attempt was made to resist. Even the fifty Athenian hoplites who occupied the agora, being found still asleep, were partly slain, and partly compelled to seek refuge in the separately-garrisoned cape of Lêkythus, whither they were followed by a portion of the Torônæan population; some from attachment to Athens, others from sheer terror. To these fugitives Brasidas addressed a proclamation inviting them to return, and promising them perfect security for person, property, and political rights; while at the same time he sent a herald with a formal summons to the Athenians in Lêkythus, requiring them to quit the place as belonging to the Chalkidians, but permitting them to carry away their property. They refused to evacuate the place, but solicited a truce of one day for the purpose of burying their slain. Brasidas granted them two days, which were employed both by them and by him, in preparations for the defence and attack of Lêkythus; each party fortifying the houses on or near the connecting isthmus.

In the meantime he convened a general assembly of the Torônæan population, whom he addressed in the same conciliating and equitable language as he had employed elsewhere. "He had not come to harm either the city or any individual citizen. Those who had let him in, ought not to be regarded as bad men or traitors—for they had acted with a view to the benefit and the liberation of their city, not in order to enslave it, or to acquire profit for themselves. On the other hand, he did not think the worse of those who had gone over to Lêkythus, for their liking towards Athens: he wished them to come back freely, and he was sure that the more they knew the Lacedæmonians, the better they would esteem them. He was prepared to forgive and forget previous hostility; but while he invited all of them to live for the future as cordial friends and fellow-citizens—he should also for the future hold each man responsible for his conduct, either as friend or as enemy."

On the expiration of the Two days' truce, Brasidas attacked the Athenian garrison in Lêkythus, promising a recompense of thirty minæ to the soldier who should first force his way into it. Notwithstanding very poor means of defence—partly a wooden palisade, partly houses with battlements on the roof—this garrison repelled him for one whole day. On the next morning he brought up a machine, for the same purpose as that which the Bœotians had employed at Delium, to set fire to the woodwork. The Athenians on their side, seeing this

fire-machine approaching, put up, on a building in front of their position, a wooden platform, upon which many of them mounted, with casks of water and large stones to break it or to extinguish the flames. At last, the weight accumulated becoming greater than the supports could bear, it broke down with a prodigious noise; so that all the persons and things upon it rolled down in confusion. Some of these men were hurt, yet the injury was not in reality serious,—had not the noise, the cries, and the strangeness of the incident, alarmed those behind, who could not see precisely what had occurred, to such a degree, that they believed the enemy to have already forced the defences. Many of them accordingly took to flight, while those who remained were insufficient to prolong the resistance successfully; so that Brasidas, perceiving the disorder and diminished number of the defenders, relinquished his fire-machine and again renewed his attempt to carry the place by assault, which now fully succeeded. A considerable proportion of the Athenians and others in the fort escaped across the narrow Gulf to the peninsula of Pallênê, by means of the two triremes and some merchant-vessels at hand: but every man found in it was put to death. Brasidas, thus master of the fort, and considering that he owed his success to the sudden rupture of the Athenian scaffolding, regarded this incident as a divine interposition, and presented the thirty minæ (which he had promised as a reward to the first man who broke in) to the goddess Athênê for her temple at Lêkythus. He moreover consecrated to her the entire cape of Lêkythus; not only demolishing the defences, but also dismantling the private residences which it contained,¹ so that nothing remained except the temple, with its ministers and appurtenances.

What proportion of the Torônæans who had taken refuge at Lêkythus, had been induced to return by the proclamation of Brasidas, alike generous and politic—we are not informed. His language and conduct were admirably calculated to set this little community again in harmonious movement, and to obliterate the memory of past feuds. And above all, it inspired a strong sentiment of attachment and gratitude towards himself personally—a sentiment which gained strength with every successive incident in which he was engaged, and which enabled him to exercise a greater ascendancy than could ever be acquired by Sparta, and in some respects greater than

¹ Thucyd. iv. 114, 115. *νυμίσας ἅλλας τινὶ τρόπῳ ἢ ἀνθρωπεῖα τὴν ἄλωσιν γενέσθαι.*

'had ever been possessed by Athens. It is this remarkable development of commanding individuality, animated throughout by straightforward public purposes, and binding together so many little communities who had few other feelings in common—which lends to the short career of this eminent man, a romantic, and even an heroic, interest.

During the remainder of the winter Brasidas employed himself in setting in order the acquisitions already made, and in laying plans for further conquests in the spring.¹ But the beginning of spring—or the close of the eighth year, and beginning of the ninth year, of the war, as Thucydidēs reckons—brought with it a new train of events, which will be recounted in the following chapter

¹ Thucyd. iv. 116.

PLAN ILLUSTRATING THE BATTLE BETWEEN THE ATHENIAN FLEET (UNDER PHORMIO) AND THE PELOPONNESIAN FLEET.
DESCRIBED IN THUCYDIDES, II, 86, 92.



- A. First station of Phormio and the Athenian Fleet.
B. First station of the Peloponnesian Fleet.
C. Position of the Athenian Fleet at the moment before the battle.
D. Position of the Peloponnesian Fleet at the moment before the battle (in apparent course towards Naupaktus).

