The War of the Peloponnesians and the Athenians
Thucydides of Athens wrote the war of the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, how they waged it against each other. He began writing at its very outset, in the expectation that this would be a great war and more worthy of account than any previous one. He based this judgement on the grounds that both sides came into the war at the height of their powers and in a full state of military readiness; and he also saw that the rest of the Greek world had either taken sides right at the start or was now planning to do so. This was certainly the greatest ever upheaval among the Greeks, and one which affected a good part of the barbarian world too – even, you could say, most of mankind. In respect of the preceding period and the

---

1 I have translated this first sentence very literally since this is effectively Thucydides' title-page. The key word is *sunegrapse*, 'he wrote', and 'the war' is its direct object; that is, 'he wrote the war' and he does not here or elsewhere call his work a 'history' (in contrast to Herodotus, see introduction, pp. xvi and xxiii), though he does go on to say that it is *axiólogotatos*, especially worthy of a *logos* (a discussion, description or reasoned account). See glossary (pp. 637 and 634) on *sungraphein* and *logos*.

2 He presumably has particularly in mind the non-Greek-speaking peoples immediately affected by the war (like the Thracians). The distinction between Greek and barbarian and the sense of identity that came from this was a matter both of language and culture and was largely formed in the fifth century in the aftermath of the Persian Wars. See further I 3.3 below and VI 18.2n; also 'barbarian' in glossary and more generally E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek definition through tragedy* (Oxford University Press, 1989) and E. S. Gruen, *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton University Press, 2012).
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still remoter past, the length of time that has elapsed made it impossible to ascertain clearly what happened; but from the evidence I find I can trust in pushing my enquiries back as far as possible, I judge that earlier events were not on the same scale, either as regards their wars or in other respects.

It is evident that long ago what is now called ‘Hellas’ had no stable settlements; instead there were various migrations in these early times and each group readily abandoned their own territory whenever forced to do so by those with superior numbers. For there was no commerce and people were insecure about making contact with each other either by land or sea, so they each lived off their own land just at subsistence level and neither produced any surplus goods nor planted the ground, since they had no walls and never knew when some invader might come and rob them. They took the view that they could secure their daily needs for sustenance anywhere, and so were not exercised about uprooting and moving on, with the consequence that they had no cities of any size or other general resources to make them strong. It was always the finest land that was most subject to changes of population: namely, what is now called Thessaly, Boeotia, most of the Peloponnese excluding Arcadia, and the best parts elsewhere. And the quality of the land gave some groups more power than others, and that led to internal conflict, which destroyed them and at the same time encouraged outsiders to have designs on them.

Attica, at any rate, has been free of such strife from the earliest times on account of its poor soil and has always been inhabited by the same people. This is a good illustration of my argument that it was because of relocations that other places did not develop in the same way as Attica; for the most powerful figures from other parts of Greece, who were driven out either by war or internal conflict, resorted to the safety of Athens, and by becoming citizens right from the very earliest times they so increased the city’s population that Attica could not contain them and the Athenians later sent out colonies to occupy Ionia as well.

A strong indication of the weakness of ancient peoples is this. Before the time of the Trojan War Greece appears not to have united in any common action. Indeed, as far as I know, there was as yet no name for the country of ‘Hellas’ as a whole, but before the time of Hellen son of Deucalion  

1 Hellas, the ancient as well as the modern Greek name for the country, which I use here because of the word-play on its origins in I 3.2 below. Elsewhere I use the more familiar ‘Greece’ and ‘Greeks’.  
2 Stasis, see further glossary p. 637; the classic discussion of stasis is at III 82–84.
that actual appellation did not even exist and different places took their names instead from the various tribes, predominantly the Pelasgians; however, when Hellen and his sons became powerful in Phthiotis and were called in to help other cities, one by one these now tended to be called ‘Hellenes’ by association, though it was a long time before that name prevailed among them all. Homer provides the best evidence for this. Though born much later even than the Trojan War he never uses this name to refer to them all collectively nor to any of them separately, except for the followers of Achilles from Phthiotis, who were in fact the first Hellenes; instead he calls them ‘Danaans’, ‘Argives’ and ‘Achaeans’ in his poems. Moreover, he does not speak of ‘barbarians’ either – in my view because the Hellenes had not yet been identified by some contrasting name. These various ‘Hellenes’, then – whether they acquired the name one by one as they came to understand the same language or were later called that collectively – because of their individual weakness and their lack of contact with each other, failed to achieve anything together before the Trojan War. And they only came together for this expedition because they were by then becoming more experienced seafarers.

Minos was the earliest known figure we hear about to acquire a navy and he made himself master over most of what is now called the Hellenic Sea; he ruled over the Cyclades and was in most cases the first to found colonies in them, driving out the Carians and installing his own sons as governors. He probably also cleared piracy from the seas as far as he was able, to enable his revenues to get through to him more easily. For in earlier times the Greeks and those of the barbarians who lived on the coast of the mainland or on the islands turned to piracy as soon as the passage of ships between them built up. They were led in this by their most powerful men, who acted both for their own gain and to provide for the needy. They directed their attacks at cities that were unwalled and consisted of village settlements and raided these, making most of their living from this activity, which was not yet regarded as anything to be ashamed of but had a certain prestige. The same attitude is illustrated by some people on the mainland even today who glory in such exploits, and by the early poets who invariably ask the same question of those arriving anywhere by sea – whether they are pirates, the assumption being that neither would those questioned disavow the practice nor would those concerned to know the answer blame them for it. On the mainland too

[1] That is, the present-day Aegean Sea.
men raided each other, and even up to the present day many parts of Greece live by the old ways: the Ozolian Locrians, the Acotolians, the Acarnanians and that part of the mainland generally. The habit of bearing arms in these mainland communities is a survival from the old practice of piracy. Indeed in the whole of Greece men used to go around armed, since their settlements were unprotected and travel between them was unsafe, and so they got used to carrying weapons in their everyday life, just as barbarians do. The parts of Greece that still live this way are an indication of practices once universal everywhere.

The Athenians were the first of the Greeks to put aside their arms and adopt a more relaxed and comfortable lifestyle. This taste for indulgence meant that only recently did the older men among the well-off give up wearing tunics of linen and pinning their hair back in a knot fastened with golden cicada brooches. The older generation of Ionians had, through their kinship with the Athenians, adopted the same style of dress and it persisted a long time among them. The Spartans on the other hand were the first to adopt a simpler form of dress in the modern fashion, and in other respects too the better off among them made every effort to share the lifestyle of the ordinary people. They were also the first to strip naked for exercise in public and anoint themselves with oil afterwards. The old way, including at the Olympic Games, was for athletes to compete wearing loincloths to cover their genitals and this practice only ceased a few years ago. There are still those among the barbarians even now, particularly those from Asia, who wear loincloths for their boxing and wrestling contests. Indeed, one might point to many other respects in which the customs of Greece long ago resemble those of the barbarians today.

1 Sections 3–4 may look like a curious digression on social mores and fashion, but several of the details connect with important later themes: cicadas were ‘earth-born’ and therefore symbolic of the Athenian belief that they were the aboriginal inhabitants of Attica (see I 2.5 and II 36.1); the ‘kinship’ with Ionians is frequently invoked later in the formation and management of political alliances (see glossary under suggeneia); and the comparison of the Spartans prefigures lengthier contrasts the interested parties on both sides will make between the Athenian and the Spartan cultures (most famously the Corinthians at I 68–71 and Pericles at II 36–41).

2 I translate Lakedaemonios as ‘Spartan’ throughout, as a more familiar term than ‘Lacedae-monian’ and often interchangeable with it; and in the relatively few (27) places where Thucydides uses Spartiates and may be intending a distinction I translate as ‘Spartiate’. Laconia or Lacedaemon was the district in the south-east Peloponnes in which Sparta was the dominant city.
The cities that were more recently established, at a time when seafaring was getting easier, were starting to have more ample resources and so were fortified with walls and were built right on the coastline; and they occupied isthmuses with a view to trade and to strengthen themselves against their neighbours. Ancient cities, by contrast, because of the long persistence of piracy were usually built away from the sea, whether on islands or on the mainland (since the pirates used to raid non-seafaring communities on the coast as well as plundering each other), and to this day these are still inland settlements. The islanders were just as much involved in piracy – these were Carians and Phoenicians, who had settled most of the islands. There is evidence for this. When Delos was purified by the Athenians in the course of this war and all the graves of the dead were dug up, they found that more than half of them were Carian, recognisable from the style of the weapons buried alongside them and the manner of their burial, which is still practised today. When the navy of Minos was established, however, travel between places by sea became easier (since he cleared the wrongdoers out of the islands in the process of colonising most of them). So those who lived on the coast were now more able to pursue the acquisition of wealth and lived in greater security, some even building walls round their cities on the basis of their newfound prosperity. In their desire for material gain the weaker submitted to the domination of the stronger, while the stronger, with the advantage of more resources, made the smaller cities subservient. This was already largely the situation when they later made the expedition against Troy.

In my view Agamemnon was able to assemble his expeditionary force more because he was the most powerful figure of his day than because the suitors of Helen whom he was leading were bound by oaths of loyalty to Tyndareus. According to the clearest traditional account of the Peloponnesians, Pelops was the first to achieve power there and, despite arriving as an immigrant, he gave his name to the place because of the great wealth he brought from Asia, coming to a people without means.

---

1 Examples of the newer cities on the coast would be colonies like Samos and Syracuse, and examples of the older ones on land would be Argos and Athens; but archaeological discoveries have since complicated this distinction (see Hornblower I, pp. 27–8 and his references).

2 An early signal (with 9.3) that Thucydides will look for explanations of events in more general terms than the sort of personal motives which figure so prominently in Homer, the tragedians and also in Herodotus. Tyndarus was the father of Helen of Troy and the suitors were supposed to have sworn to protect her.
And later his descendants were even better off. Eurystheus was killed in Attica by the Heracleidae, but Atreus was his uncle on his mother’s side (having been banished by his father Pelops for killing Chrysippus) and it was to Atreus as his kinsman that Eurystheus had entrusted Mycenae and his realm when he left on his expedition. But when Eurystheus failed to return Atreus took over Mycenae and the whole of Eurystheus’ kingdom. He was supported in this by the Mycenaeans, who feared the Heracleidae and also recognised Atreus’ abilities and his popularity with the masses that he had courted. And so the descendants of Pelops became more powerful than those of Perseus.\footnote{The essence of this complicated little story (made more complicated in the Greek by being just one long sentence through section 2) is that power shifted from the descendants of Perseus to those of Pelops through this sequence of family feuds and misfortunes. See the list of deities (pp. liv–lvi) for some of these figures.}

In my view then Agamemnon, with the combination of this inheritance and his superior naval strength, was enabled to put together and launch this expedition less by good will than by the fear he inspired.\footnote{Fear as a motivating political cause recurs repeatedly throughout Thucydides, though usually as the explanation for antagonism rather than compliance (see, for example, the notes on I 23.6 and 75.3 and under phobos in the glossary p. 635).} For he evidently came with the largest contingent of ships himself and in addition supplied the Arcadians with theirs, as Homer has stated clearly – if he constitutes sufficient evidence; and in his account of the handing-down of the royal sceptre he further says that Agamemnon was ‘lord over many islands and the whole of Argos’.\footnote{Homer, Iliad II 108. The sceptre was the symbol of royal power, passed in succession in this passage from Zeus to Pelops, Atreus, Thyestes and then to Agamemnon.} Being based on the mainland Agamemnon would not have held power over any islands except local offshore ones (which would not have been ‘many’), unless he possessed a significant navy. And it is on this expedition that we must base our assumptions about what earlier ones were like.

Now, just because Mycenae was a small place – or because some other township of that period does not now seem to amount to much, that is not a valid reason\footnote{Literally, ‘anyone using exact evidence (adribei semeio) would not doubt’, another reference to his self-consciously ‘scientific’ approach (see also I 22).} to doubt the size of the joint force as reported by the poets and as traditionally accepted. For just suppose the city of Sparta were wiped out and all that was left were its shrines and the foundations of its buildings, I think that years later future generations would find it hard to believe that its power matched up to its reputation. Yet in fact...
the Spartans occupy two-fifths of the Peloponnese and are leaders of the whole of it as well as of many allies beyond it. Nevertheless, because they are not united in one city and have no lavish shrines or public buildings but instead live in village settlements in the traditional Greek manner, they would be underestimated. On the other hand, if the Athenians were to suffer the same fate they would be thought twice as powerful as they actually are just on the evidence of what one can see. One should therefore keep an open mind and not judge cities by their appearances rather than by their actual power; and one should accept that the Trojan expedition was the greatest of any up to that time but smaller than modern ones, assuming again that we can trust Homer’s account here too, which as a poet he may well have exaggerated for effect, though even on his reckoning the expedition was comparatively small by our standards. He puts the size of the fleet at 1,200 ships and gives the Boeotian contribution as 120 men a ship and that of Philoctetes as fifty a ship, thereby indicating in my view the maximum and minimum figures – at any rate he has not recorded the size of any other vessels in his Catalogue of Ships. That the rowers were also all fighting men he has made clear in the case of Philoctetes’ ships, for he describes all the oarsmen as archers. It is unlikely that there were many passengers apart from kings and others of high office, especially since they were to make the sea-crossing with military equipment on board and their boats were not fitted with upper decks but were built in the old pirate style. So if you take a middle point between the largest and the smallest vessels you can see that not so many men went to Troy, considering that this was a combined expedition from the whole of Greece.

The reason for this was not so much shortage of men as shortage of means. Because of their lack of supplies they took quite a modest army, limited to the size they thought could live off the land while on active service. After they won a battle on arrival, as they clearly did – otherwise they could not have fortified their camp – even then they evidently did not exploit their power to the full but through their lack of provisions got diverted into farming the Chersonese and into plunder. With the Greek forces split this way the Trojans were enabled to resist them in battle for

---

1 A ‘synoecised’ city, here with the emphasis on being physically concentrated in one place rather than politically unified (see glossary on 

2 The inventory of the Greek fleet in Homer, Iliad II 484ff.
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ten years, since they were a match for whatever force remained behind. If the Greeks had come with additional supplies at the outset and had applied their whole force to the war continuously, without resorting to plunder and farming, they would easily have prevailed in battle and captured Troy, since even with less than their full force they held the Trojans off with whatever part of the army was to hand; and if they had been able to settle down to a siege they would have taken Troy in less time and with less effort. But instead, just as a lack of resources led to the weakness of previous expeditions so this particular expedition, despite its great celebrity, demonstrably fell well short of its reputation and of the received tradition derived from the poets.

Of course, even after the Trojan War Greece was still undergoing population changes and settlement, so there was no period of peaceful development. The long-delayed return of the Greeks from Troy caused great political turmoil, and there was widespread civil strife in cities, causing the departure of exiles, who founded new cities. For example, the present-day Boeotians were driven out of Arne by the Thessalians in the sixtieth year after the fall of Troy and settled the land that was once called Cadmeis and is now Boeotia (a proportion of them were settled in this land earlier and it was some of these who went on the expedition against Troy); and in the eightieth year after the fall of Troy the Dorians and the Heracleidae occupied the Peloponnese. After a long course of time Greece emerged from her difficulties to enjoy a period of peace and security with a stable population. They then started to send out colonies, the Athenians colonising Ionia and the majority of the islands, the Peloponnesians most of Italy and Sicily and some places in the rest of Greece. All these colonies were founded after the Trojan War.

As Greece grew more powerful and became more active than before in the acquisition of wealth, tyrannies were established in the cities in most places (where previously there were hereditary kingships based on fixed

---

1 Rather an offhand remark. The supply of fresh food must have been a problem for all invading armies of this period and all will have resorted to foraging to some degree. See V. D. Hanson, *A War Like No Other*, p. 329 n40, Gomme I, p. 16, and the difficulties reported at I 112.4, IV 27.1 and VII 13.
2 We don’t know exactly when Thucydides thought that was but inferences from other references suggest that he was assuming a date of about 1250 BC (see Hornblower I, p. 38 for the calculations).
3 *Turannoi* were autocratic rulers and were a common phenomenon in Greek cities during the seventh and sixth centuries. The word did not acquire a pejorative connotation, however, until late in the fifth century. See glossary.