Introduction

Greece Before 478

Two large peninsulas project into the Mediterranean from Europe: Italy, dividing the whole into a western half and an eastern half, and Greece, subdividing the eastern half. What was to be the Greek world until the end of the fourth century BC comprised mainland Greece, with the islands off the west coast; and also the Aegean Sea, between mainland Greece and Asia Minor (present-day Turkey), with the coast of Asia Minor to the east, the coast of Thrace (part of present-day Greece) to the north, and the island of Crete (part of present-day Greece) closing it to the south. Mainland Greece is divided by mountains into many, mostly small, habitable areas, and by sea inlets (the Gulf of Corinth on the west and the Saronic Gulf on the east) into northern and central Greece and the southern part known as the Peloponnese, linked by the Isthmus of Corinth (where there is now a canal from one side to the other). Advanced civilisations developed earlier to the south and east of this area, in Egypt and the near east, than to the north and west; and in Greece the most important settlements were towards the south and east, and there was a tendency to look for outside contacts to the civilisations to the south and east and to absorb influences from them.

The first advanced civilisations in the Greek region arose in the bronze age of the second millennium: the Minoan civilisation of Crete (from c.2000: given its modern name after the legendary king Minos), the Cycladic civilisation of the Aegean (already important before c.2000 and flourishing after: named after the Cyclades, the large group of islands in the southern Aegean) and the Mycenaean civilisation of the mainland (from c.1600, with palaces from c.1400: named after Mycenae, near Argos, one of the main centres); from c.1400 Crete and the Cyclades came under the influence of the Mycenaens. Life was based on substantial kingdoms, centred on large and rich palaces and served by
bureaucratic administrations. The language of the Minoans was not Greek (their Linear A texts have not yet been deciphered); the language of the Mycenaeans was Greek (their Linear B texts were deciphered in the 1950’s); the Cycladic civilisation has not left texts of its own. This was the world in which the classical Greeks’ legends of their heroic past were ostensibly set (the Trojan War, the Oedipus story and so on).

That world broke up, in a period of destructions and population movements whose causes are still disputed, about 1200–1000. The classical Greeks believed that the Doriens, perceived as a separate strand of the Greek people, invaded from the north and drove out the earlier inhabitants to the islands and the coast of Asia Minor (e.g. Thuc. I. 2. vi, 12. iii). It is now thought unlikely that there was a phenomenon which deserves to be called the Dorian Invasion, but it does seem to be true that the Doriens were comparative newcomers in the Peloponnesse and that the Greeks began migrating from the mainland to the islands and the coast of Asia Minor – from north to south, the Aeolians and Ionians from c.1000 and the Doriens slightly later.

Thucydides wrote of a continuous progress from the earliest and most primitive condition of Greece to the climax of the fifth century (I. 1–19), but modern scholars have thought in terms of a dark age between the end of the bronze-age civilisations and the ‘archaic’ period from c.800 to c.500: dark both in the sense that the size of the population and the level of civilisation were lower than before and after and in the sense that we know less about it than about the periods before and after. There is still some justice in that view, though the dark age now seems less dark in both those respects than it did half a century ago.

By c.800 the revival was well under way; but, in contrast to the bronze age, there developed a large number of separate, small communities, which often, and particularly towards the south and east, took the form of poleis, ‘city states’, which comprised a town and the farm land around it and which aspired to a high degree of independence and self-sufficiency. If these communities were originally ruled by kings, the kings were not grand rulers like the oriental monarchs but more like the chief aristocrats depicted by Homer, and before long kings gave way to officials mostly appointed annually from within the aristocracy of families which had emerged from the dark age owning the largest quantities of good land.

Rising prosperity brought complications. The population was growing once more, over time not dramatically but significantly (though occasional bursts of more rapid increase are not to be ruled out), and even after extending the land which they controlled and cultivated communities reached the point where the population (even though it was later to become still larger) seemed too large to survive a run of bad years, or by comparison with a generation earlier. The Greeks therefore took to trading on a larger scale, with one another and with the outside world, to import what was not available in sufficient quantities locally, and they also started founding colonies around the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (sometimes joining with the pre-existing population) – in convenient places for gaining access to what they wanted to import, and in places
where men under pressure at home could make a new life and grow their own food. Most of the colonies became, technically, independent *poleis*, though they had familial and religious links with their mother states and the mother states hoped to retain influence over the colonies.

This process contributed to the pressures for political change. It was easier in a trading world than in self-sufficient agricultural communities for some men to become richer and others to become poorer, and for those who had become richer to think themselves as good as the established aristocracy. However, the citizen farmer was still a common ideal, and in many states many citizens continued to own some land and to live at least partly off the produce of their land. Coinage, convenient as a medium of exchange and of reckoning and storing non-landed wealth, was not invented until the sixth century, and it is in Athens in the second half of the fifth that we first find a monetary economy in which the average citizen is likely to possess coins and engage in monetary transactions on a regular basis. There was a change in fighting (though how great and sudden a change is disputed), as cities took to relying on the heavy infantry known as hoplites, organised in a phalanx whose success depended on the cohesion of the whole body rather than the prowess of individual stars, so that all who could afford the equipment and fight in the phalanx might think that they were equally important to their city. The invention of the alphabet, a system of about two dozen characters (in contrast to the scripts with much larger numbers of characters used in bronze-age Greece and in the near east), made it possible for literacy to become an accomplishment of citizens in general rather than of a specialised class of scribes, and for laws to be written down and placed in the public domain – a development which at first may have been as valuable to aristocrats afraid that one of their number would step out of line as to lower-class people afraid of unfair treatment by the aristocrats. In some places there may have been tension between inhabitants perceived as belonging to different racial groups, for instance between Dorians and others in some cities in the Peloponnese. And within the aristocracy or on the fringes of the aristocracy there will have been ambitious or disaffected individuals who thought that they did not do well enough out of the principle of holding office when their turn came round.

Different factors were of differing importance in different places, but in many states in the seventh and sixth centuries power was seized by a *tyrannos* (‘tyrant’), trading on whatever grounds for discontent and groups of discontented people there were locally. The position of tyrant was not a formal office with defined powers: some tyrants ruled autocratically, others by manipulating the existing framework; some ruled cruelly, others mildly (it is only with Plato and Aristotle in the fourth century that a tyrant was automatically seen as a cruel autocrat). Tyrants were bad for the aristocrats, since they, like the lesser citizens, became subject to the tyrant. Periods of tyrannical rule tended not to last longer than two or three generations, as the original discontents were dealt with or forgotten and the dominance of the tyrant came to be a new cause of discontent; by the end of the sixth century most states had régimes in which basic political rights
had been extended to all rich enough to fight as hoplites, and in several places pseudo-kinship organisations (tribes, phratries ['brotherhoods'] and the like) through which the aristocrats had controlled the populace had been supplanted by new organisations.

Two cities developed in unusual ways, so as to become much larger than most, and in the fifth century to become rivals for supremacy in Greece.

Sparta, in the south of the Peloponnese, had not one king but two, probably a result of the amalgamation of neighbouring communities; it retained these into the classical period and beyond, though many of their powers were transferred to an annually appointed board of five ephors ('overseers'). By the eighth century it had conquered the whole of its region of Laconia, making some of the inhabitants *perioikoi* ('dwellers-around', independent within their own communities but dependent on Sparta in foreign policy) and others helots (a word which probably means 'captives', a serf class working the land of its Spartan owners: they are the best-known but not the only instance of a serf class in early Greece). In the late eighth and seventh centuries it expanded westwards into Messenia, making *perioikoi* and helots of its inhabitants too, and thus coming to control an area of about 2,400 sq. miles = 6,200 km². It thus did not need to found colonies overseas, apart from Taras in Italy, to accommodate men judged not entitled to a share in the conquered land at home.

Probably early in the seventh century, after the first round of conquests in Messenia, tension led to the core of a settlement attributed to a man called Lycurgus. The aristocrats came to an arrangement with the Spartan citizens to maintain solidarity and preserve their superiority over the *perioikoi* and helots: politically, the *gerousia* (council of elders, comprising twenty-eight men plus the two kings) and assembly were given defined roles in the running of the state; economically, the conquered land and helots to work it were apportioned among the 'Spartiate' citizens (but, despite what scholars used to believe, it now appears that the distributed land became ordinary private property); socially, the existence of the lower orders made a full-time military life for the citizens both possible and necessary. For a long time this seemed to be a success: Sparta avoided tyranny and became the strongest state in Greece, and people who lived elsewhere professed admiration for its disciplined life.

In the sixth century Sparta's attempts to expand northwards into Arcadia were unsuccessful, and in the middle of the century there was a change of policy: instead of setting out to be a Dorian conqueror Sparta set out to be a Greek leader, binding other states to it by alliances. By the end of the century nearly all the Peloponnesian states (but not Argos, which could never accept Spartan leadership, and not Achaea, which had more to do with the north side of the Gulf of Corinth than with the rest of the Peloponnese) were linked to Sparta in an organisation for foreign policy which scholars call the Peloponnesian League, in which they were consulted about joint action and bound to accept majority decisions.

Originally Sparta's culture had been like its neighbours'; but owing to the conquest of Messenia and the need to keep the subject population under
control, and perhaps also to the failure to conquer Arcadia, austerity came to
be prized as a Spartan virtue. It was perhaps more that Sparta did not partici-
pate in developments enjoyed elsewhere than that Sparta became more austere,
but when Sparta and Athens became rivals in the fifth century each was proud
to emphasise that it was not like the other.

Athens itself was never totally abandoned during the dark age, and was one
of the first places to recover, but in the eighth and seventh centuries it was
overtaken by cities in the Peloponnese. Like Sparta it did not need to found
colonies but was able to expand into its own region, Attica (about 1,000 sq.
miles = 2,600 km²); but the other inhabitants were not made subject to a ruling
body of Athenians but all became Athenian citizens.

Athens rose to prominence in the sixth century. In the late seventh century
an unsuccessful attempt at tyranny by Cylon was followed by Draco’s publica-
tion of written laws. In 594/3 Solon tried to mediate between the advantaged
and the disadvantaged: he liberated a class of dependent peasants; made wealth
the sole qualification for office, enabling a wider range of rich men to challenge
the landed aristocrats; formalised the decision-making process by creating a
new council to prepare business for the citizens’ assembly; revised the laws, and
modified the judicial processes to make it easier for underdogs to obtain justice.
But his compromise was more than the rich aristocrats had feared yet less than
the discontented had hoped for. After two earlier attempts, from 546/5 to 511/0
Athens was subjected to the tyranny of Pisistratus and his sons, who on the
whole ruled constitutionally and mildly. During the sixth century Athens pros-
pered, welcoming trade rather than trying to remain self-sufficient, and becom-
ing the Greek world’s leading producer of fine pottery.

The tyranny was ended when the Alcmaeonid family, sometimes collaborat-
ing with but at other times opposed to the tyrants, put pressure on Sparta to
intervene. Rivalry between the Alcmaeonid Cleisthenes and another aristocrat
led to the victory of Cleisthenes (and a quarrel with Sparta): Cleisthenes gave
the Athenians a new, locally based articulation of the citizen body, in ten tribes,
 thirty trittyes (‘thirds’ of tribes) and 139 demes; and this supplanted the older
organisations as the basis of Athens’ public life, so that (for instance) the army
was organised in tribal regiments and the council which prepared the assembly’s
business became a council of five hundred, comprising fifty members for each
tribe, with the individual demes supplying members in proportion to their
population. He also introduced the institution of ostracism, first used in the
480’s, by which each year the citizens had the opportunity to send one man
into a kind of honourable exile for ten years without finding him guilty of any
offence (each voter would write the name of his preferred victim on a potsherd,
ostrakon).

In the course of the archaic period, as they had increasing contact with the
outside world, the Greeks became conscious of what they had in common as
Greeks in contrast to the barbarians (barbaroi, foreigners whose languages
sounded to Greeks like bar-bar). Of the civilised barbarians to the east and
south, those who impinged most on the Greeks were those who controlled
western Asia Minor, inland from the Greek cities on the coast. For most of the archaic period, these were the Lydians, whose capital was at Sardis: they acquired a kind of overlordship over the Asiatic Greeks, but though foreign were sympathetic, and made dedications at Greek temples. But Cyrus II of Persia, who had begun as a minor king to the east of the Persian Gulf, in 550 conquered the Medes to his north (with the help of Babylon to his west, but in 539 he was to conquer Babylon too), and then c. 546 conquered Croesus of Lydia, and with him the Asiatic Greeks; the islands near the coast perhaps made token submission at this point and were actually subjected c. 520–515.

In 525–522 the Persians conquered Egypt, which was a part of the Greeks’ world in the sense that Greek traders had operated there and Greek soldiers had been employed there as mercenaries since the seventh century. About 514 they penetrated Europe, going north of the Danube to campaign unsuccessfully against the Scythians (whom they believed to be a part of the same people that had troubled their northern frontier further east), and they established a rather insecure presence in Thrace, between the Aegean and the Danube. In 498–493 Miletus in Asia Minor (whose Persian-backed tyrant had incited the Persians to an unsuccessful attack on Naxos, in the middle of the Cyclades) led the Asiatic Greeks in the Ionian Revolt against Persia, and asked for support from mainland Greece. Sparta, which had solemnly forbidden Cyrus to harm the Asiatic Greeks but had taken no action against him, refused; but Athens, perhaps already regarding itself as the mother city of the Ionian Greeks in the Aegean and Asia Minor, did send help, and so did Eretria in Euboea. The Greeks started well, but were defeated when they failed to work together and the Persians brought in large forces.

The Persians wanted to expand anyway, and now had the excuse of revenge on Athens and Eretria for attacking Greece. In 492 an expedition sent into Thrace as the first stage of an attack on Greece from the north was abandoned when its ships were wrecked off Mount Athos. In 490 the Persians sailed through the Cyclades, captured Naxos and captured Eretria, but when they landed at Marathon in the north-east of Attica the Athenians, almost alone, defeated them. In 480 a full-scale force under King Xerxes invaded, once more around the north of the Aegean, and many but not all of the Greeks united to resist: Sparta acted as leader, and Athens, which had spent the profits from its silver mines on new warships, provided more than half of the Greek navy. The Persians proceeded successfully through Thrace, Macedon and Thessaly; attempts to halt their advance at Thermopylae on land and at Artemisium by sea were heroic but unsuccessful; but the Greek navy defeated the Persian in the strait between Attica and the island of Salamis. The Persians then withdrew their navy and most of their army; in 479 the remnant of the army was defeated at Plataea, while the Greek navy landed on Cape Mycale in Asia Minor and defeated the Persians there. Greece had been saved, but the Greeks must have assumed that the Persians would now be even more eager for revenge and would in due course return.
This book covers the classical period of Greece, from 478 to 323, in which the Greeks (and particularly the Athenians and others living in Athens: Athens in this period was culturally dominant, as it was not earlier or later) produced exceptionally good work in literature, philosophy and the visual arts. Politically, it is the period in which the concept of democracy appeared, as the culmination of what had been developing in the archaic period, and there was serious thought and discussion about how states ought to be governed and how states and individuals ought to behave.

In the half-century after the Persian Wars Sparta withdrew into the Peloponnese while Athens in an alliance known as the Delian League took over the continuing struggle against Persia but increasingly turned that League into an Athenian empire. There was an increasing polarisation between Athens, innovative, a naval power, democratic and cultured, and Sparta, conservative, a land power, a champion of oligarchy and becoming self-consciously uncultured. For a time it seemed that there might be room for the two leading states in Greece; but Athens became too powerful for Sparta to coexist with it, and so the years 431–404 saw the Peloponnesian War, in which Sparta and its allies set out to break the power of Athens. They did so, but only by enlisting the help of the former enemy Persia, which in return wanted to recover domination over the Greeks of Asia Minor.

After the Peloponnesian War Athens made a remarkable recovery. In the first forty years of the fourth century Sparta, Athens and an increasingly ambitious Thebes manoeuvred around one another and around the Persians, who finally regained the Asiatic Greeks in 387/6 and otherwise aimed for a Greece in which no state would be powerful enough to threaten Persia, and in which there would be peace so that Greek soldiers would be available to fight for Persia in its western provinces. Sparta was defeated by Thebes in 371, in fact irreversibly though it still hoped to recover its former power. But the Greek world was transformed by the rise of Macedon, a kingdom on its northern edge. Between 359 and 336 Philip II made Macedon a power to be reckoned with, and incorporated almost all of mainland Greece in a league of allies under his leadership; and between 336 and 323 Alexander the Great, with the forces of Macedon and of that league, conquered the Persian empire and brought it into an extended Greek world.

The survival of evidence for historians to work from was transformed by the invention of printing in the fifteenth century AD: there is a good chance that at any rate one copy will survive somewhere of work printed since then (but it will be for future generations to discover how much is retrievable of texts generated on and transmitted by computers in our own age). From the ancient world there survives only a fraction of the material which we know was written, and much more must have been written of which we know nothing. But, by the
standards of antiquity, the world of classical Greece is a world about which we
are comparatively well informed.

The histories survive of three men writing in successive generations. Herodotus, the western world’s first surviving serious historian, wrote in the
third quarter of the fifth century a history culminating in the Persian Wars at
the beginning of the century: he provides a continuous narrative from 500 to
479, with a fair amount of material on the second half of the sixth century, a
certain amount on earlier history, and a few allusions to later events down to
430. Thucydides in the last quarter of the fifth century wrote a history of the
Peloponnesian War from the incidents of 435 and after which led up to the
war, including also a short account of events from 478 onwards, designed to
illustrate the growth of Athenian power; though he lived beyond the end of the
war, his history breaks off abruptly in the autumn of 411. Xenophon, active in
the first half of the fourth century, was one of the historians who deliberately
started where Thucydides ended, and his Hellenica (Greek history) runs from
411 to 362. Later historical works include the Athenian Constitution written in
the 330’s–320’s in the school of the philosopher Aristotle, drawing on a range
of now-lost sources including local histories of Athens. There is the Library of
History of Diodorus Siculus (Diodorus of Sicily), written between 60 and 30,
of which not all survives but the portion from 478 to the end of the fourth
century does: for this period it was based on fourth-century sources which no
longer survive, particularly an Asiatic Greek, Ephorus; for 431–411 it is ulti-
mately dependent on Thucydides, but after that it provides an account which
is independent of Xenophon and derived from reputable sources, and which
therefore deserves to be taken seriously. Many leading figures of the fifth and
fourth centuries are among those given biographies in Plutarch’s series of
Parallel Lives of famous Greeks and famous Romans, written around AD 100;
and the career of Alexander the Great generated many accounts, though none
of those which survive is earlier than that of Diodorus.

Other kinds of literature are useful to historians too. Athenian fifth-century
drama is important: tragedies written throughout the century, and comedies
written in and after the 420’s. In the century between about 420 and 320 many
speeches for the Athenian lawcourts, and some speeches for the assembly, were
written up and put into circulation, and they provide a valuable body of mate-
rial. Some ‘speeches’, notably those of the long-lived Isocrates, are in fact
political pamphlets written in the form of speeches; and other pamphlets were
written too, of which a surviving specimen is the Athenian Constitution preserved
with the works of Xenophon.

In a world which lacked printing, broadcasting and the Internet, if texts were
to be publicised they had to be displayed in a prominent place. Temporary
notices tended to be written in charcoal on whitewashed boards, which have
not survived but are known about from literary references; permanent texts
were inscribed on stone slabs (stelai) or on bronze plates, and, conveniently for
historians, Athens took to publishing documents of various kinds on stone in
large quantities from the 450’s onwards. Coins – in the classical period the ‘owl’
coinage of Athens was the hardest currency of the Greek world – carried images but not much in the way of text: they usually identify the issuing state but not the date of issue, and linking changes in a state’s coinage with political changes is tempting but often dangerous. It is indeed true of archaeological finds in general that dates derived from purely archaeological criteria cannot be precise, and that buildings can be dated precisely only when we have evidence of other kinds, for instance dated accounts of expenditure, as with the buildings erected on the Athenian acropolis in the 440’s–430’s. Archaeologists are studying the same world as historians, but both sides have to be careful not to misapply material of one kind when interpreting material of another kind.

Greek communities, both cities and other kinds of state formation, were communities of citizens, free adult males of local parentage: women were excluded from political participation (as was universal until 1893 in New Zealand; in Europe Liechtenstein in 1984 finally allowed women to vote on national issues but still not on local issues), and so were children (as is still universal, though there were then and are now disagreements over the age at which adulthood begins). Unless a state was short of citizens, when it might be more generous, immigrants had no right to acquire citizenship of the state to which they had migrated, though individuals might be given citizenship as a reward for major services; unless elevated to a more privileged status, free non-citizens were usually not allowed to own land or a house in the state in which they lived. There were also various non-free categories: chattel slaves, commonly non-Greek, who were the possessions of their owners, and Greeks in various conditions of servitude, of whom Sparta’s helots are the best-known but not the only instance. Quantitatively, the gap between the richest and the poorest was enormous; but, although horse-breeding was a sign of wealth and there were some luxury items, there was not a very wide range of expensive goods, and to some extent the richest tended to have more possessions than the poorest rather than better possessions. A man who owned a large quantity of land would own a number of separate fields rather than a single large estate. Because there were slaves available for menial work, it tended to be thought degrading for a free man to work for another (though nearly all our evidence comes from the rich end of the spectrum, and we do not know how many poor men did in fact have to endure that degradation). There was no large-scale ‘industry’: on building projects, citizens, free non-citizens and slaves worked side by side, as sub-contractors rather than employees; there were workshops in which tens of men, mostly slaves, worked together, but not larger units; and a typical overseas trader was a man who owned one ship, and took other traders with him as passengers.

A typical city was governed by an assembly of citizens (which in an oligarchic as opposed to a democratic state would have its membership limited by a property qualification, and would have fewer matters referred to it and less freedom of debate), for which business would be prepared by a smaller council; officials were appointed annually, often (in oligarchies as well as democracies) with limits on reappointment to prevent a few men from becoming too powerful;
there were no professional administrators and no professional lawyers, but
administration and justice were included in the responsibilities shared among
the citizens.

Religion was polytheistic, and religious correctness was more a matter of
performing the correct rituals, in the community and in the household, than of
holding the correct beliefs or being in a healthy spiritual state. There were not
many (but there were some) professional religious specialists: religion was one
aspect of the state’s life; priesthhoods were among the state’s offices (though
some were hereditary in particular families); the state regulated temples, their
treasuries and so on (and could borrow from the temple treasuries for other
purposes in times of need). Major religious festivals were important occasions
for the whole community: they included not only what we should think of as
religious ceremonies but also competitions in athletics, drama and the like.

Schools existed, but education was a private matter in which the state was
not involved. Athens had institutions (the publication of documents; in the fifth
century ostracism, where one voted against a man by handing in a potsherd
with that man’s name written on it; in the fourth century the requirement for
all 59-year-old men on the military registers to serve as arbitrators in private
lawsuits in which evidence was submitted in writing) which presupposed that
the average citizen had a basic functional literacy, more so in the fourth century
than in the fifth. It is likely that that presupposition was justified for the citizens
who played an active part in politics; but we do not know what proportion of
the citizens had that degree of literacy, and we know even less about places
other than Athens. At the highest level, by the classical period there were skilful
writers of literature in both verse and prose (but no prose literature survives
from earlier than 450), and there were philosophers of great intellectual
accomplishment.

In the wider world, a man was identified by his own name, his father’s name
(patronymic) and his state, e.g. the historian Thucydides son of Olorus, of
Athens. Within his state, if it was a larger one, he would be identified by a
smaller unit to which he belonged, in Athens the deme (demotic): e.g.
Thucydides son of Olorus, of Halimus.

Each state had its own calendar, with its own irregularities (so that it was
hard to establish that an event on a particular date in one place occurred on
the same day as an event on a particular date in another place). Usually the
year consisted of twelve lunar months of 29–30 days, c.354 days in all, and
from time to time a thirteenth, ‘intercalary’ month had to be added to keep the
calendar in step with the seasons. Years were not numbered but were identified
by an annual, ‘eponymous’ official, in Athens the archon, or by the year of
reign/office of a ruler or priest. Many states, including Athens, began their year
in midsummer: a date in the form 478/7 denotes the Athenian (or other) official
year which by our reckoning began in 478 and ended in 477 (at Athens this
was the archonship of Timosthenes), and underlining, e.g. 478/7, is a conven-
tion to indicate the earlier or later part of that year.
Likewise different states had different standards of measurement, weight and currency (coins were of silver or, less often, gold or the alloy of gold and silver known as electrum, and took their names from the weight of precious metal which they contained). The main unit of distance was the stade, usually in the range 165–220 yards = 150–200 metres, and in Athens 193 yards = 176 metres (but usually estimated rather than precisely measured). As a measure of capacity the Athenian \textit{medimnos} was about $11\frac{1}{2}$ UK gallons = 14 US gallons = 52.5 litres. The Athenian scale of weights and coins was: 6 obols = 1 drachma, 100 drachmae = 1 mina, 60 minas = 1 talent (there were no coins of as high a value as the mina or the talent; sums of money are often expressed in drachmae and talents without the use of minas); a standard 4-drachma silver coin (cf. ill. 1) weighed about 0.6 oz. = 17.2 grammes, implying a talent of about 57 lb. = 25.8 kg., but by the fourth century Athens’ general weights were slightly heavier, with a talent of about 60 lb. = 27.6 kg. The difference in circumstances is so great that ancient currency cannot meaningfully be translated into modern, but the following will give some idea of the value of money in Athens. In the late fifth century an unskilled worker could earn $\frac{1}{2}$ drachma a day and a skilled 1 drachma; in the late fourth century an unskilled worker could earn $1\frac{1}{2}$ drachmae and a skilled $2-2\frac{1}{2}$. In the fourth century an invalid was entitled to a maintenance grant if his property was worth less than 300 drachmae; a man was considered rich enough to be liable for the burden of liturgies (cf. pp. 369–71) if his property was worth about 4 talents; one of the largest fifth-century estates is said to have been worth 200 talents, but there cannot have been many worth more than 20 talents. In the fourth century the total valuation of the property
of all Athenians or else of all liable to the property tax called eisphora was about 6,000 talents (cf. p. 369). At the beginning of the Peloponnesian War in 431, the total annual revenue of Athens, including the tribute paid by member states of the Delian League, was about 1,000 talents; at that time the largest annual tribute paid by an individual member state was 30 talents.

NOTE ON FURTHER READING

In the second edition of the Cambridge Ancient History, vol. v, entitled ‘The Fifth Century bc’, covers the period 478–404; vol. vi, entitled ‘The Fourth Century bc’, covers 404–323, and also includes regional surveys spanning the fifth century and the fourth. Of the standard histories from an earlier generation, the most reliable is J. B. Bury, rev. R. Meiggs, History of Greece. V. Ehrenberg, From Solon to Socrates [sixth and fifth centuries], makes the greatest effort to integrate political and cultural history. Hornblower, The Greek World, 479–323 bc, is the volume corresponding to this in a series comparable to that to which this book belongs. Sealey, History of the Greek City States, ca. 700–338 bc, has a political emphasis. Buckley, Aspects of Greek History, 750–323 bc, is not a systematic history but covers a series of topics; and Kinzl (ed.), A Companion to the Classical Greek World, contains a series of topic-based chapters. Davies, Democracy and Classical Greece, is a good stimulus to further thought on the fifth and fourth centuries for those who already know the basic outline. These books are important throughout, but will not normally be cited in the notes at the ends of individual chapters.

De Ste. Croix, The Origins of the Peloponnesian War, ranges more widely over the fifth century and even the fourth than its title might lead one to expect. The four volumes by Kagan – The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, The Archidamian War, The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition, The Fall of the Athenian Empire – together provide a detailed history from 478 (and on some topics before) to 404 which usefully surveys the work of earlier scholars. Powell, Athens and Sparta, is of general relevance to the fifth century.

For the fourth century, Buckler, Aegean Greece in the Fourth Century bc, is a detailed diplomatic and military history. Tritle (ed.), The Greek World in the Fourth Century, contains chapters by different authors on the main fourth-century themes.

As for the source material, the main collections of Greek and Latin texts are the Oxford Classical Texts (texts), the Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (texts), the Collection des Universités de France, often referred to as the Budé series (texts, French translations, short notes), and the Loeb Classical Library (texts, English translations, short notes). The more popular texts are translated into English in the Penguin Classics series and in various other series; some texts which are less popular but of particular use to historians are translated with commentaries in the Clarendon Ancient History Series (Oxford University Press). On the problems of using texts of different kinds as historical sources Pelling, Literary Texts and the Greek Historian, provides a discussion based on test cases from the fifth century.

Commentaries on literary texts include: those on Thucydides by Gomme, Andrewes and Dover, and by Hornblower; that on the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia (lacking the most recent, Cairo fragments) by Bruce, and an edition of all the fragments with translation
and commentary by McKechnie and Kern; a now elderly commentary on Xenophon’s *Hellenica* by Underhill; that on Diod. Sic. XV by Stylianou; that on the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* by Rhodes; that on Arrian’s *Anabasis* by Bosworth.

There are collections, with commentaries, of Greek inscriptions of particular historical importance – Meiggs and Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century bc*; Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 bc* (the latter including translations) – and the two volumes by Fornara (to the end of the fifth century) and Harding (fourth century) in the series *Translated Documents of Greece and Rome* provide translations, with a few notes, of inscriptions and some other texts. Osborne, *The Athenian Empire*, translates and discusses inscribed and other texts relevant to that subject; and the revised edition of Hill, *Sources for Greek History, 478–431 bc*, provides a well-indexed collection of Greek and Latin texts. Bodel (ed.), *Epigraphic Evidence*, is an account of the uses of inscriptions, based largely on Roman material but relevant to Greek history too; Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions*, is the standard handbook on that subject. The standard handbook on Greek coins is Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*.

Among classical encyclopaedias in English the most authoritative is the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. An exhaustive study of the many city states in the Greek world is Hansen and Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. There are chapters on various aspects of warfare in van Wees, *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*, and in Sabin et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare*, vol. i.

The largest-scale and most authoritative classical atlas, of an austere kind showing topography and locating sites, is Talbert (ed.), *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Smaller and cheaper, and containing in addition some thematic maps and plans of battle sites, is Hammond (ed.), *Atlas of the Greek and Roman World in Antiquity*.

---

1 In this book I number the chapters as in the most recent Teubner text, ed. M. H. Chambers. However, McKechnie & Kern use the numbering of the previous Teubner text, ed. V. Bartoletti, in which Chambers’ ch. 4 is their ch. 1 and his chs. 6, 7, 8 are their chs. 5, 3, 4; Bruce has chs. 1–5 as in McKechnie & Kern and then (following the oldest editions) starts again from ch. 1 = 6 McKechnie & Kern = 9 Chambers.