

# 고대 그리스 역사의 소개

## 펠로폰네시아 전쟁, 파트2

- ✓ **Instructor:** Prof. Donald Kagan
- ✓ **Institution:** Learners TV
- ✓ **Dictated:** 전유진, 홍현석, 박금란, 구민지, 천지은

🔊 [00:00]

Considering the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, last thing we were talking about was the alliance that was may between Athens and Corcyra.

And the significance of that difficult decision the Athenian had to make which you were recalled was neither to accept the offer of Corcyrean of traditional offensive and defensive alliance nor to reject it.

But rather to make different kind of alliance than any we know before in Greek history, a purely defensive alliance which I suggest to you, really should be understood less as a military action than as a diplomatic gesture, diplomatic signal.

If the Pericles I have in my mind has anything to do with the real Pericles who is existed he is a man who is very sophisticated about the idea of sending diplomatic signals by action rather than merely by words.

And that is the intention here was to avoid the unacceptable change in the balance of the naval power which would be occurred if the Corcyrean had been defeated by Corinthians.

At the same time it tried to avoid blowing these whole things up into the major war against the Peloponnesian by preventing the fighting.

In fact I don't know if I said fatter out, but let me say no, I think he hoped when the Corinthians approach the Corcyra and so Athenian ships lined up with the Corcyreans.

The Corinthians would back off.

And there would be no battle, and the result would be some other way of getting out of this crisis.

As turned out his hopes would dashed.

At the battle of Sybota which took place in September 432 to which the Athenians you remember sent ten ships with three generals one of whom leading one was



Lacedaimonius who son of Cimon, who received orders that were the most difficult kinds of orders you can imagine giving an naval commander.

His orders were to stay there, and if the battle commences not to engage in that battle unless and until that moment when it appeared that the Corinthians were not going to win but were going to land on the island of Corcyra.

Then only then should Lacedaimonius bring the Athenian ships into come back.

Now, how in the world in the naval battle, especially where things don't stand still they're either moving around themselves or the sea is moving them around.

How can you be sure?

**🔊 [03:05]**

What's going to happen 10 minutes from now, half an hour from now?

It's impossible to be certain, so it would been a difficult con, I do think that Pericles anticipated they might be engagement which he would want to regret but he could blame Lacedaimonius in the generals for doing it.

However, that maybe that's all the Athenian sent.

Again, we auto realized the Athenians had 400 charvings.

They could have sent a couple of hundreds which would have guaranteed that if the Corinthians had fought the Corinthians would have been swept from the sea.

Why didn't he do that?

It was obvious again that his intention was not to frighten or anger the Spartan.

The head of the Peloponnesian league by such a crushing victory, but instead to employ the technique of deterrence.

Now, the decision to send only ten was debatable.

After those ten had been sent the question was raised again, and the Athenian assembly obviously by people who didn't agree with the Pericles' approach who assist they should be largely sent and Pericles apparently could not prevent them sending some more ships, but the most they could kept a vote for was twenty more ships.

So now there is a second Athenian detachment that it sent some days after the first which is a consist of twenty ships more keep that in mind.

But for the battle which their cities describes in great detail, works as follows Corinthians do attack against combine forces of a hundred and twenty, hundred and



ten... Corcyrean ships and ten Athenians stayed up there, and the Corcyrean are winning.

And at the critical moment, Lacedaimonius engages the Athenians in the fight, and so what Pericles hoped to avoid took place.

And the Corinthians would have succeeded in winning the battle, and would have landed on the island.

And then presumably ultimately take in charge of the Corcyrean fleet when something happened that if it wasn't very stern and factually determined capacity, but it was a Hollywood movie you wouldn't believe it.

Namely as all of this is happening you can imagine somebody on one of the Corcyrean ship suddenly looking behind and looking on the horizon and seeing ships coming, and then seeing that there were the Athenian ships at which point the Corinthians were panicked.

🔊 **[06:19]**

Pulled back, gave up their victory, and withdrew from the fight.

You can blame the Corinthians.

Once they knew there were Athenian ships they had every reason to think my god maybe this two hundred Athenian ships coming at us and so it turned out, of course, there was only twenty, but it was too late.

And so the battle of Sybota, this naval battle I described to you, ends in this way and it leaves things up on the air.

The Corinthians are have not been deterred they determined more than ever to continue the fight, and on the other hand the Corcyrean aren't backing down either.

And so here we have one of the issues that will be decisive in bringing on the war.

Over that winter, 433 to 432, two events of importance in this connection take place we can't not be sure precisely when in it that year took place and then we can't even be sure which of them came first.

I'm a... in turning first to Potidea. I'm doing what most scholars do, but none of us have any reason to believe it happen before the next thing I tell you about.

City of Potidea up in the Chalcidice peninsula those three fingers sticking out into the Aegean from there was you'll perhaps recall a Corinthian colony.

And it was extraordinary close to the Corinthians member when I was talking about colonies and the variety of relations with the mother city that they had.

I told you that Potidea had usually on close relation with Corinth.

Each year the Corinthians sent out the magistrate who in fact govern Potidea this was the voluntary on the Potidea part.

So you have very special Corinthian and Potidea thing.

Because of what it happened and what was happening, the Athenians fear, and it turned out the right belief feared that the Potidean might be planning to reveal against them and to join their Corinthian friends.

In fact, the Potidea war planning such a thing and in order to make their chances greater, they secretly sent a mission to Sparta in which they asked the Spartans just as you remember the Thesian had none back there 465.

If we reveal will you invade Erica and I assume it was the effort this is a secret thing it would not have been discussed in this part of assembly.

🔊 **[09:02]**

I believe... a majority of must have said we will, and so the Potidean went forward with their rebellion.

The Athenians before the rebellion broke out, but just suspecting such things is being in the cards.

Send a fleet. There was a fleet of the Athenian that was going to Mesadonian anyway for other reason and they were instructed by the assembly again I'm sure the Pericles calling the shots to stop by at Potidea on the way, and when they were in Potidea to take down the defensive balls at the Potidean had on the sea side, so that they would vulnerable to the Athenians without a question which would presumably deter a rebellion.

But when that fleet went out they found the Potidean already in rebellion they could not get at the Potidea, and the Athenians subsequently to barricaded the city and sent an army to barricade on the land side, and they were now war with the Potidea the colony of Pallene to suppress rebellion.

The Corinthians responded in an interesting complicated way a band of I think the number was 2000, I think it was 2000 Corinthians hoplites came to Potidea and helped defended against the Athenians attackers.

The subsidy describes them as a privately sent.

That is to say he wants to make the point that these were not sent officially as Corinthian soldiers.

They were what we've seen these games being the modern world do, they were volunteers just like the 4000 cubin volunteers they went to Angola in 1970.



You know volunteers paid for supplied and ordered by castero.

That's the kind of a volunteer I think we were in the Potidea at this point.

Why did the Corinthian go through this masquerade very easily penetrated masquerade because they knew that the Athenians under the treaty had every right to suppress the rebellion and the empire, but they didn't want it to happen if they had officially it's not their own force to help they would be guilty of regression, they would be guilty the breaking of the treaty by interfering in the other fellows zone, and that would have a very bad effect on what the Corinthian were clearly deeply concerned about now.

🔊 [12:04]

Getting the Spartans to get the Peloponnesian into the war against the Athens to achieve the goal in Corinth wanted that explains that tricky little business.

So now event number 2.

The Athenians are actually having fought the Corinthians at sea in that battle of Sybota.

When our engage in a seize of the city which contain thousands of Corinthian soldiers as well, and yet nobody had declared war on anybody.

This is all happening technically during peace time.

The other important event took place over that winter had to do with the town of Magro we've been hearing about that of course at least ever since the Peloponnesian war.

What happened here was that at a certain point in that winter the Athenians passed a decree of the assembly which for bad the Margarians from trading.

Let me back up.

Let me be right there technical from using the harbor of the parrots from being anywhere from using the agora of Athens for using any of the ports of the empire.

I will be extremely technical and careful about this.

If I were not, I would be simply saying that they would be barring the Margarian trade from anywhere in the Athenian empire.

I don't do so because one brilliant late Oxford scholar came up with a theory about the.. this event in which he tried to say "No, this is not a... what he called... embargo... but it was in fact merely an attempt to shame to disgrace the Margarians."



It was... when they... the bill says you may not use the agora of the Athens.

It means the agora is the civic center. This is has not nothing to do with the trade.

I just wanted to mention so that I've done justice. Nobody has believed that theory yet. I don't think they should.

It's an embargo. It's intention is again... well, that why are we doing anything against the agora.

I think the best explanation is that when the Corinthians had farth Corcyrean in two neighbor battles. You remember Leucimme is 435 and Sybota is 433.

After the first, in the first one, a number of Peloponnesian allies and other allies too had assisted the Corinthians in the battle.

## 🔊 [15:02]

Now, at the second battle, the number of allies assisting the Corinthians was cut down significantly.

In my opinion, that is because the Spartans had made clear that they wish for their allies to stay clear of this conflict that they didn't want to be dragged into the war over it.

And I think the evidence for that is that when you remember that the conference that the Corcyrean asked for to meet with Corinthians and see if they couldn't work this out.

The Spartans accompany them to that conference and clearly that means they wanted such a conference take place and would have light a peaceful outcome, but the Corinthians wouldn't have any.

And so I think that it was the clear signal that the Spartans gave that we want you to cool this.

That explains why fewer Peloponnesian allies showed up to help at the second battle.

But among those a few with the Magarians.

Why?

Because we know the Magarinas had a terrific gurage against the Athenians.

Of course through all out history more to the point at the end of the first Peloponnesian war when the Magarians had rebelled against the Athenians in their moment of greatest danger.

And then they had sluttered had the Athenian garison at the port.

There was tremendous ill will between the cities, and the Magarians would just gonna take a shot at giving the Athenian hard time.

And so it was important for the Athenians, let me case, led by Peloponnesian that was the way the assembly decided, not to allowed what the Margarians done to go on punished because they wanted to deter the other Peloponnesian allies from doing the same next time.

Well, what could they do? Well... the only thing that really two I could do.

Come to the think it before they came up with this idea is only two.

They could merchant the megora and fight, but of course that would be an attack directly on an important ally of Sparta. It would be a breach of the 30 years peace.

It would bring about the great Peloponnesian war. Pericles didn't want to do that.

But he didn't want to Margarian get away and got free, and so he invented the new thing again yet.

One more new idea which I again regard as fundamentally a diplomatic device meant to deter the kind of behavior that was necessarily deter.

And that was a decree, and scholars have farth forever in a day about war aspect of it and most importantly about what is for, why is going on, what's its purpose.

🔊 [18:01]

And unless you understand that I'm suggesting you should, it really is hard to tell.

Because it could not have done driven the Magarians out of the Peloponnesian league over to the Athenians so as it did not.

Magarians are absolutely determined and remain terribly hostile nothing no matter how much they suffered, couldn't make them change size.

This would be a alargarchic prosparchic outfit that around the place and hated Athenian terribly.

Pericles had to know that.

He wasn't trying to wipe them out and even not trying to take them out from the business.

He was trying to show not so much them.



But other Spartan allies that the Athenians could hurt them in ways that like had not been hurt before without going to war and dragging the Spartans end.

And any commercial Greek state in Peloponnese, and most of them had to do some kind of commerce, and some of the most important one is right on the sea shore, would have had to understand what the significance of this was.

So there, we have the Magarian decree, and it is the third of the provocations as the Corinthian thought that helped bring on the war.

We would use such terms as the an immediate causes that complaints of the official complaints as officiality they are speak of them which are seen by contemporaries as being the causes of the war.

And it's important to recognize that the concidity of the whole work at least is certainly book one is dedicated to correcting what it thinks in era about these things in his view it's not these particularities that matter of the truest cause that is the growing power of Athens and the fear that it in gendered among the Spartans.

And that's what all about.

Well, the Corinthians in reaction to these events called Corcyra, Potidea, Megodia.

Press the Spartans to take action, press them to call a meeting at which point which would allowed the allies to make their complaints to the Spartans and of course that wouldn't have any success if they had not been Spartans who themselves had been decided that the war against Athens was desirable.

I would prepared they would have to be influential Spartans who thought that members of Garantia efforts possibly King.

We know at least one that Sparta King was not in favor of it. In fact and the other Spartans was exile.

🔊 [21:00]

So this is could not been led by kings.

But rather led by the other 2 groups of people.

But it's also clear that the majority of Spartans were not convinced.

Because they would not have needed to do what they did if they had been true.

They called a meeting of Spartan assembly to which they invited all states that had any grivens against the Athenians.



And of course, you can see that the magistrate clearly wanted to stir the people to the war but there were not capable of delivering majority.

And so the assembly takes place, and I hope you read that section very very carefully that the Corinthians make the decisive speech, the essence of it is, some of it is just soft extreme and some of it is to make it...

Let's not worry about all these technicalities. Well they might not worry about technicalities.

None of the technicalities amount them of breach of the 30 years peace that were asking Spartans to violate their owns by launching a war that violated their previous commitments and that late in the war in Spartans themselves admitted that they were troubled by the fact that they were guilty of such a preach.

So what the Corinthians were asking was very very difficult, and so whenever they talked about particularities, they wanted to pass as fast as they could because they didn't work for that.

Instead, they brought in a larger issue that was much harder to defeat.

It was a statement about the Athenian character, the kind of people that the Athenians were.

So the war tided up phrase that the Corinthians use something like the Athenian were born neither to live themselves in peace nor to allowed to their neighbors to live in peace.


They painted a horrible picture of a people who had a state of incacible so ambitious that would always be a mantus to all its neighbors, no sense worrying about the details and particular moment that were growing stronger and stronger and stronger and it was only a matter of Peloponn neighbor and destroyed their freedom.

The Athenians sent ambassadors to Sparta they had not been invited they would have sensisity mysteriously on other businesses, what other businesses could they have had?

Or they negotiating a grand treaty was it the exchange for violinist or piano players I mean?

What in the world I don't know, because of course I think that was a cover story.

They would there with instructions.

 **[24:00]**

The instructions were go to that meeting.



Listen!

If you think that it is important to do so, I want you to make following set of statements to Spartans.

And so we have a speech delivered by Athens after all the other allies as I complained about at these on the other thing and the essence of the Athenians speech I think was, first of all, they did what they could to make a case for themselves but the hard they said was this.

It came at the end of their speech which was, don't imagine that if you go to that war against us, this is going to be an easy war for you.

And in fact, they was suggesting what is true, we're a different kind of state, Corinthians say we're different kind of state one sense, we're telling you that we're different kind of state that in another sense.

We don't need to do what's your defeated opponent regulate have to do.

That is tried to get out and fight you in the half-like battle.

Because of our navy wars and money in the empire we don't need you fight on the land at all.

And we own the sea you cannot hurt us.

So you'd been damn fool to take us on.

Don't think you going to win in this war or that's going to be quick and easy.

That part of the speech was meant to deter the Spartans, it is confused scholars who like so many people think that if you want to avoid a war what you need to do is very nice to the other fellow.

These no guarantee of that one way to the other.

But the other side of the Athenian argument is very important, too.

This set on the other hand.

Whatever Greevens is you and your allies have against us that have included all of these things I mentioned to you.

We are prepared to submit to arbitration as the treaty requires and in fact there would keep you owe, you must not attack us, you must submit all complaints to arbitration.



This Athenians and again I'm sure this is orchestrated entirely by \_\_\_\_\_.

Hope that this combination of approaches would get the Spartans to back off and allow the situation to cool down.

The Authenticity two speeches made by Spartans that assembly one by king Archimedes who was a personal friend of Pericles we learned from other sources and who clearly from what he says here does not want to go to the war now.

And I would suggest doesn't want to go to the war at any time at all, and he makes a case against the Corinthian argument and arguing for delaying going to war if one goes to war and any hope to matter off for several years.


Then only they had to do I think because he recognized that the speech of Corinthians had changed the move in Sparta.

And he thought that if the Spartan simply voted for on the question of the war now they would vote for.

So it would not just say it could let's not go to the war.

He felt only can say was this is not the time. Let's wait several years we need money, we need calculate all that kind of stuff.

And so that was the argument that he made, and he backed up the Athenian argument essentially saying this is not going to be a quick, easy war that's going to be custom to, if you go to war now, this is another memorable memory phrase implied "you will leave this war to your sons."

 [27:57]

That means this is not take a generation to fight.

That was his argument.

Then on comes the effort who is the president of the meeting on that days named as Sinolator, and he's wonderfully short Spartans like conic speech he says I've heard a lot of long speeches most of which I don't understand.

I'm just simple Spartan.

This is what he said implying conman unlike these listening to and what I know is these guys are now playing hands on our allies, and he was talking mainly about the Magarian decree.



Only question we going to let them to do or not and I say let's not; and then he called for the vote and the interesting thing happens there too. After you know how the Spartans vote, they bang on their shield and they yell.

So those in favor, those who believe in Athenians have broken the treaty.

That is the way the thing was put to them and indicate the usual way, and those who think not, same noise, and then he said I really couldn't tell which side was the louder.

So let's have the division and count which was unusual, very unusual for Spartans assembly at which time he found a very large majority in favor of the war.

You know I've got on both ways on the question of what did he hear and what didn't he hear?

The first time it is I still don't know for sure for one interpretation is he really couldn't tell very close.

But why wasn't it close under the vision?

Because in a place like Sparta you don't want to show yourself as being against the war when other guys are in favor of it.

That's not what brave man and Spartans do even though you think that wouldn't be a good idea.

🔊 **[30:00]**

The other possibility is he knew right away that was majority now, clear majority for, but he wanted everybody else to see how a big majority it was.

I don't know what I think.

I think I wrote one book, one thing in another book in another thing.

And so Spartans voted for the Athenians had broke the peace and implications was we should go to war.

That took place at the meeting in Sparta probably in July 432, but the war doesn't start or let me back up.

The Spartans don't go marching into Edica to fight Athenians until probably march of 431.

Why did it take so long for the Spartans to fulfill what they have just voted for?

There's no really good reason and why they couldn't begin immediately.

Some scholars point out July is too late to cut down the grain in Athens which would already have been harvested and put away.

Fine, but they were not all Spartans have to do in Athens.

One of the things they do is to go out into the farms, burn farm houses, destroy as many all of trees as they can, cut down the as many grape vines as they can, all of that can be done in July, August, and September just as well, it could be done at any other time.

So I just don't think that's a good reason.

I think what happened was that the heat that had been a stroke up by the Corinthian argument; Then those of their allies we only have to the Corinthian speech, but you can bet the Megarians and Potidaeans late on a pretty hot set of complaints a lot the island of giants.

So it was kind of in the heat of anger that the Spartans voted.

It must be I think that when they had chances to think it over, they thought that Arcadameus that what they were talking about, and they would better think again.

So there is time in stretch about 9 months for the negotiations that didn't they follow.

Missions were sent from Sparta to Athens to try to what?

The first mission sent to Athens maybe demand that they been on war if the Athenians with simply drive out the curse.

Well, we know what that is.

The curse of the Alcory undermine.

What Arcadameia we're talking about?

Pericles' mother.

It's the only other prominent Arcadameia in the round.

This is an attempt to you could figure to get the Pericles is out of there, you guys don't want the war leads to the Pericles.

They knew the Athenians do that.



🔊 [33:03]

The idea we are engaged to psychologically war fair to undermine Pericles to have see rightly as the driving force behind the Athenian policy, and they want a make his political situation more uncomfortable and cause trouble.

The Athenians basically said the take a walk and that's the first mission.

Next, the Spartans send a mission which ... so the first one as I said would not the serious effort avoiding the war.

But the second one in my view was this second mission said to the Athenians, we want you to withdraw your troops for Potidea, we want you to leave Ghina or Authnomous as you supposed to do, and we want you to withdraw Magarian decree.

In fact, if you will only withdraw the Magarian decree, there will be no war.

That really change the situation because now in Athens the issue could be boiled down by the opponents of the war and subsitivity lets us see that there was strong opposition to going to the war the part of some that why in the world allowing going to a war about these embargo we have late on the Magarians?

Who cares about that?

And so in the great final debate about this issue, what should we do and how should we end of the Spartan offer on this occasion?

Many speeches were remain it should tells us, but the only one he reports is that of Pericles and Pericles makes the case as to why it is necessary not to withdraw with the Magarians decree.

And it is the classic argument against a peacement out of fear.

If we do withdraw this, we will do so only because we're afraid that the Spartans will attack us, and we're afraid to fight them.

Now if we give on this way point, why should the Spartans ever do anything, but threaten us again when they want something that we don't want to do?

We will be under their power.

You cannot give way to power that kind of minute and still maintain a free hand or any level of equality with the potential opponent.

That I think was the essence of what we have to say along with the reminding the Athenians how wrong the Spartan war and how inappropriate was their behavior



because he said remember we have offered to submit every complaint that they have to arbitration.

🔊 [36:03]

They refuse to do that.

How can we in all honor and all sense of security and refuse to resist that kind of behavior?

And he won the day.

The Athenians refuse to withdraw Magarians decree, the course of war was clearly set. Even then it was month before the war began and it wasn't the Spartan who was began it.

It began when the [? 36: 33] begins early or late in winter I guess of 431 made a sneak attack on the ocean town put which was allied to Athens.

Why did they do it?

Either scholars suggest one of two possibilities either because they knew that they was going to be a war, and they wanted to gain prestigious advantage of having which is closed to the Athenian border.

And their control or flipside could be they were afraid there would not be a war and they were eager that they should be the war.

We just cannot be certain about it.

Can't be certain about it was the attack of the Appia led the Potians to ask their Athenians allies to help them. The Athenians at the very least had to say they would in the fact that they did not.

And that would compel that the Spartans to come in and help their Tyiban allies and that is indeed how the war began when in probably March of 431 these Spartan and Peloponnesian army we don't know how big but very much bigger than Athenian army came marching into Edica and the war...

I'm sorry I've forgotten one thing.

Before these the attack on the Politia, the Sparta sent one more mission to Athens in which they said forget everything we've said before if you want peace, you must free the Greeks that was understood to me, you must give up your empire.

The Spartans did not for a minute expect the Athenians to do that.

This was psychological warfare for what was to follow, the Spartans would fight the war on the program we are the liberators of the Greeks against these imperialistic, aggressive Athenians who are destroying everybody economy and making it impossible for everybody live comfortably, we're the liberators.

And that's what we're doing.

🔊 **[39:02]**

So now we've seen that the Athenians said refused to recent decree and the war had begun.

It's word asking why did the two sides make decisions they did?

The Spartans refused to arbitrate, why?

Because their whole systems depended upon the allies of Sparta being able to count on the Spartans to protect them from a third party when it was necessary.

So if the Spartans say that we're not going to do that and leave it to the arbitrary to take care of, they had to worry but fundamental reason for the league which gave them their power and their security would disappear.

And that would be the end of that.

They also had to worry that if they did not do what the Corinthians and Magarians and others wanted them to do, the Corinthians might leave the league.

That's what the Corinthians threaten them with, in their speech, as a matter of fact which itself might be something that would lead to the dissolution of Peloponnesians so crucial to Sparta.

So all of that was on their minds.

Another reason that the Spartans would not prepare to give away was that they really didn't believe, the majority didn't believe what the Athenians said about how the war would be fought or about what Arcademius says, which was backed up the Athenian claim.

They could say what they want.

But they was not no instance in Greek history ever in which state that they invaded on the state and the other state simply let them do what harm they wanted.

No matter what the Athenians might say, no matter what you might think that the Athenians had to capacity to do that, they wouldn't do that.





And Spartans could point what happened the last time we invaded that America 445 the Athenians came out and made a treaty with us, and they concede it, they backed off.

Why would it be otherwise this time?

I think you must always be aware of yourself when you thinking about outbreaks of war in anywhere that one of the powerful issues, one of the things help people decide one where and another, is their estimate of how that war would be fought and what the price of that war would be and what the chances of victory are.

That's always in your mind.

You much less likely to go a war if you feel very confidential to get you smashed.

🔊 **[41:56]**

Or that the cost of that war will be intolerable and so on. So that was an another issue.

There was a real link in other words between that the strategy that the Spartans expected to be able to employ and the policy that went with it.

Now, of course, their guess about how the war before turned out to be wrong and very costly to them.

What else could they have done?

Well, in theoretically, it could have called it Corinthians bloth instead.

No we're going to obey our owes in previous treaty, we're going to submit arbitration to bad if you don't like it.

What could the Corinthians says have done?

Well, they might have tried to withdraw from league and they own withdraw would not been critical only if they had been tried to bring with them, other states.

We can only guess as to how successful they might have been.

Perhaps, it's out of the question that the Magarian being upset as they were what if join them?

That would have been a real strategic problem because it's between two of them, they controlled [? 43:12] and it means the Spartans can't get out of Peloponnese, so I don't know how much of a choice that really was.

On the other hand, I'm sure that they must be the Sparta says who's in charge of this league anyway?

The Corinthians were us.

We make the policy they would what we tell them.

We don't get dragged around by them, but then the question would be what if one of these things do that?

So it would as always, not an easy course for either side.

After all, the Spartans always have to fear the helots and captivity makes the point I think that it is the fear of helots that it's always the core of Spartan policy decisions.

Recently, scholars have decided challenges that for I don't think they've been very successful with that.

Subcidity would subscribe motives that drives states to war.

It gives you wonderful fear, honor, and interest.

And in this case, usually some combination of the all these things in this case, all of them were engaged, but I think fear is legitimately the one that's prominent.

It's the one that subcidity puts at the head of the list, and you could see why it might be right.

What about Athens?

Why the Athenians behave these they did?

Pericles and Athenians follow all of these moderate policy of deterrence.

They insisted upon the terms of the treaty, they insist upon their equality with their Spartans and therefore, on arbitration, no dictation, no appeasement out of fear.

**🔊 [45:02]**

The Magarian decree it was intended as warning and I think Pericles relied on the fact very unusual situation.



Sparta has only one king in this time and that king is Archememius who is a friend of Pericles and who is in favor of peace.

Kings are very influential in Sparta, and so Pericles might well have thought with Arcamedian on my side the Spartans will understand.

I have no aggressive intentions against them, I don't want to recede, I don't want to do anything to them, but they will simply have to arbitrate these problems, and they will see that and he was wrong.

He has confidence same issue of having out of strategy policy, how do they connect with one another he believes that his strategy could not fail.

The Spartans could invade do harm when they like the Athenians would be able to live through whatever they did without taking any casual simply losing property because they have the empire that they could live off which would bring them the money they needed to buy everything they wanted and they had nothing to fear at sea.

So surely the Spartans after they cooled off with sea that they couldn't win.

And then why fight?

Because they just couldn't harm the Athenians.

It was a strategy that was totally rational, and that's what was wrong with it.

It didn't take account about irrationalities that govern human beings so much of the time.

It didn't take account of the fact that the Spartans was both angry and frightened and finally that the Spartans did not have imagination, I mean, I don't want to Spartans to put down as particularly blind in respects seems to me all Greeks would have had the same doubts, didn't have the imagination if they think what Pericles had in mind and even if it was explained to them they would say they won't do it.

Because to do so from the Spartan and Greek perspective would be cowardly.

And would the Athenians be willing to be shown up to be such cowards as they would have to be standing behind their walls, watching the Spartans ripping up their homes, destroying their crops and calling them every name in the book, as they shouted beneath their walls. They thought not.

And so, Pericles and the Athenians, I think went wrong as the Spartans did really, and anticipating what was going to happen.

And finally I would make this point, and make it as a general point about the outbreaks of wars anywhere, anytime.



And that is, if you are going to use the strategy of deterrence, you must have available to you a powerful, offensive threat.

🔊 **[48:09]**

It's one thing to say as Pericles was affectively saying you can't hurt me, so don't fight.

You have to be able to show the enemy I can hurt you, very badly, so don't fight.

And Pericles had no intention of implying anything like a very serious, offensive threat.

There were ways he might have been able to do this with that, but that was not what was on his mind.

He expected that the Spartans would behave fundamentally rationally.

They would calculate the chances of victory, they would see they had none, and they would negotiate which means accept arbitration and get out of this fest.

In my view, neither side wanted war.

But neither side was ready to yield for the reasons that I have suggested.

It's not that this was, in my view, an irrepressible conflict,

I use the terminology the american civil war, really because really that's what subcidity was saying about the peloponnesian war that it was an irrepressible conflict.

I think not. I think mistakes were made, mistakes have judged on both sides that produced the outcome.

Both sides said that they could not back down.

And as Lincoln would say of his great war, and the war came.

I don't really think it was the case of one side deciding let's have a war.

I think it was they both stumbled into it as a consequence of the situation and their misunderstandings of what was going on.

So, now to turn to the war itself, I have long ago concluded that running through the war at the pace that's available to me in time would be too superficial to be anything but silly, so I won't try to tell you what happened in the war, but you have pretty good informant there whose name is Thucydides and your textbook can fill the rest of it in.

What I'd like to do in time available to me to talk about the war is to pursue a couple of topics in some depth to help you understand some aspects of the war rather than the hopeless effort to describe the war to you briefly.

So I want to talk to you, first about the main source that we have for understanding the war and that the great historian who wrote it Thucydides in his History of the War.

🔊 **[51:09]**

When I give this to separate talk to people I use the title Thucydides the revisionist historian of the Peloponnesian War and let me just do that for you.

Now just that title ought to raise a number of questions.

Who is this guy?

Who is this Thucydides?

Why should we be interested in what he wrote over 2400 years ago?

Also, what is a revisionist?

And how can Thucydides be a revisionist when he seems to be the first person to write about the Peloponnesian war? What was there for him to revise?

Well, Thucydides was an Athenian aristocrat who came of age at the height of the greatness of the Periclean Athens.

He appears to have been born, let us say about 460 BC.

He was not yet thirty when the great war broke out with two interruptions that were last for 27 years and left Greece shattered, impoverished and permanently weakened.

Never again were the Greeks masters of their fate and that war was his subject.

But why should a war among the ancient Greeks interest us today?

One answer lies in Thucydides's definition of his task.

And in the skill in which he carried it out.

He said it may well be that my history seems less easy to read, and he means here less easy to read than Herodotos with his money-full funny stories he tells, because of the absence in it of a romantic element.

Take that Herodotos.

It will be enough for me, however, if these words of mine are judged useful for those who want to understand clearly the events that happened in the past and which human nature being what it is, will in some time, or other much the same ways be repeated in the future.

My work is not a piece of writing designed to meet the taste of an immediate public, like Herodotus's who read his history out in public readings, my work is a possession forever.

Now that may sound immodest, but his expectation was obviously justified.

For his work has lasted and judged useful to this very day.

Perhaps, more influential in our time than any time before.

But what's a revisionist?

In essence of course all historians are revisionists, for each tries to make some contributions that changes our understanding of the past.

## 🔊 [54:08]

When we use the term revisionist, we refer to a writer who tries to change the reader's mind in a major way, to provide a new general interpretation sharply and thoroughly change our way of looking at the matter.

The term seems to have been used first after the first world war.

Most people living in the allied nations believed that the central powers were responsible for bringing it on and they deserved to be punished for it.

Soon after the war some people began to argue that Germany and Austria were no more responsible than Russia, France, and England, and perhaps less.

Soon historians called revisionists argued in support of that position.

Before long, the new view captured the minds of educated people in England and America.

Even some Frenchmen were convinced and the bolshevik government of Russia did not need convincing of the wickedness of their czarist regime.

Since then, the phenomenon has been common.

A few writers, most notably H. A. P Taylor tried to revise the commonly held Hitler responsible for the second world war and had great success for a while.

Later, the causes of the cold war and the American war in Vietnam underwent similar treatment.



These attempt to reverse the opinion had great practical importance.

What happened in the past, and even more important what we think happened has a powerful influence on the way we respond to our current problems.

What historians say happened and what they say it means therefore, makes a great difference.

Let me just remind you about the controversy about the first world war to illustrate that point.

Americans and the English in particular, came to feel that Germany was wrongly blamed and therefore unjustly treated by the versailles treaty.

Americans used this as the main justification for rejecting that treaty, and then retreating into isolations from foreign affairs.

The English of course couldn't go that far, but their belief that Germany was falsely accused made it easy to permit and to justify Hitler's violations of the treaty.

Feelings of guilt, help support policy of disarmament, unpreparedness and appeasement

The English poet W. H. Auden responding to Hitler's invasion into Poland in a poem called September 1st 1939, a poem that was subsequently deleted from the collections of his poetry Revealed how deeply the idea had penetrated and how late, in spite of everything had lasted.

🔊 **[57:11]**

Here is what he said, accurate scholarship can on earth the whole offense from Luther until now that has driven a culture mad.

Find what occurred at Lindt.

What huge imago made psychopathic God.

I and the public know what all school children learn.

Those to whom evil is done, do evil in return

So what we ought to understand in Hitler and Nazi Germany is responding to a bad dealing they got at the battle of Versailles and that's all there is to share.

More recent scholarship has shown to most people's satisfaction that the opinions of contemporaries were more right than the revisionists that the general blame for the first world war can be laid at Germany's door, and that guilty feelings were unjustified, but it's too late.



The revisionist historians did their work so well, and it fits so nicely into the climate of opinion of the 1920's and 30's that these people captured the minds of generation and helped to move in a direction that they wanted to go.

So what historians write and what teachers teach can really matter.

Mostly in the negative.

I mean if we teach you anything rightly, you mostly forget it but if we get it wrong you remember.

Thucydides, as much as anyone who has ever written, believed in the practical importance of history.

So we should expect him to be eagerly set straight of any errors or interpretations that he found.

But is revisionist tendency clear on the long, large scale in detail.

He has the evidence of Homer for instance, he uses it.

That it was the poverty of the Greeks, not the bravery of the Trojans that made the siege of Troy so long.

He seems to have been the first one to present the view that the Peloponnesian war was one single conflict that began in 431 and ended in 427, not a series of separate wars.

But my question again is what was there to revise?

The answer I think is the same as in the modern instances I mentioned.

They're not yet fully formed written opinions of contemporaries.

In modern times, these are pretty easy to recover.

Some of us still remember them and in any case, modern revisionists always confront an argue against them.

Thucydides's method is different.

He argues with no one.

And he presents the alternative view, I'm sorry he invents no alternative view, even to refuted.

🔊 **[60:00]**





There are a couple of exceptions but even then he doesn't mention anybody who holds the view that he's going to refute he just puts forward the view.

He gives the reader only the necessary facts and conclusions that he has distilled from them after careful investigation and thought.

He has been so successful that for more than 2400 years, few readers have been aware that any other opinion existed.

But a careful reading of Thucydides himself, and of a few other ancient sources, shows that there were other opinions in Thucydides's time and that his history is a very powerful and effective polemic against them.

One interesting dispute involved the causes of and the responsibility of the war which I have been chatting about.

To the ordinary contemporary the war must have seemed the result of a series of incidents beginning about 436 BC at epidermis.

There a civil war brought about with Corsira, he quarell threaten general peace when Athens made an alliance, I'm sorry with Corsira, and Spartan Corinthian Ally, during the winter, Promedia, I'm not going to go through that because you know all about it.

The opposition to the war I remind you focused on the Magarian decree as its cause, and held Pericles responsible for both the decree and the war.


In 425, the comic poet Aristophanes presented a play called Acarnians.

The war by that time had dragged on for 6 long and painful years and his comic hero dekaipolis has decided to make a separate peace for himself.

The so angers the patriotic and bellicose Chorus that the hero is forced to explain that it was not the Spartans who began the war.

Here is what Dekaiopolis said. Some vice-ridden wretches, men of no honor, false men, not even real citizens they kept denouncing megora's little coax, and if everyone, anyone ever saw a cucumber, a hare, a suckling pig, a clove of garlic or a lump of salt, all was denounced as Magorian and confesticated.

Then he goes on, some drunken Athenians stole a Magorian woman. And in return, some Magorians stole 3 prostitutes from the house Aspasia, Pericles' mistress.

 **[63:00]**

Next, the infuriated Pericles, I quote again, enacted laws which sounded like drinking songs, that the megarians must leave our land, our market, our sea, our continent.

Then when the megarians were slowly starving, they begged the Spartans to get the law of the 300 harlots withdrawn.



We refused, though they asked often, and that came the clash of shields.

Now using the evidence of Athenian comedy to understand contemporary politics is a tricky business. Just imagine the trouble somebody 2000 years from now would have making sense of a J Lenold monologue or a skit from Saturday Night Live.

Aristophanes is clearly having fun but connecting the Megarian decree which we know was supported by Pericles with the rape of women which according to Homer Started the Trojan War, and according to Herodotos was said to have been the cause of the war between the Greece and Persia.

Still he does make the Megarian decree and the Athenian refusal to withdraw it central to the coming of the war both in Acarnians and in another comedy he wrote called Peace, performed in 421.

In the latter play, he makes Hermes, the God, explain to the war-weary Athenian farmers how the peace was lost in the first place.

I quote, the beginning of our trouble was the disgrace of Phidias. He's referring to the great sculptor who had been charged with impiety and in connection with the great Statue of Athena that he had constructed for the Parthenon.

Then, Pericles, fearing he might share in the misfortune, because Phidias was his close friend, dreading your ill nature, that is the Athenians, and your stubborn ways, Before he could feel the harm, set the city to flame, with that little spark, the Megarian decree.

Well the full context reveals that the connection between the attacks on the great sculptor Phidias, Pericles' friend and associate, and the Megarian decree was Aristophanes' own joke.

But it was taken seriously by other ancient writers, and it surely reflected charges that were made by real contemporary enemies of Pericles.

The hard colonel of opinion central to all this is the common belief that the cause of the war was the Margarian degree, and that Pericles was responsible for the war.

Well, of course, that view, at the very most, is an oversimplification.

🔊 **[66:01]**

And any good historians would have rejected it as a sufficient explanation.

Thucydides in fact, gives it very little attention.

He doesn't mention it in the natural place in the narrative, he doesn't give its date, he doesn't tell us the purpose and he doesn't tell us how it works in practice.



He does not conceal the fact that its peace was conditional on its withdrawal or that it became the center of the final debate in Athens.

His way of refuting the common opinion was to indicate its unimportance by the small place it occupies in his account. And to include all the amount of specific quarells he regards as insignificant.

His own explicit interpretation is a sweeping revision of the usual explanation and it's the one I've told you about before.

And he states that same explanation in other words twice more in his account of the war's origin. And the whole first book is a carefully organized unit, meant to support that interpretation.

And so skillfully and powerfully did he work, that his interpretation has convinced all but a few readers over the centuries.

I should point out that, in spite of my clearing up that error, it's been available for about 40 years now, I hate to tell you but most people still agrees with Thucydides and not with me.

The revisionist view quickly and last-thingly became orthodoxy.

Another controversy surrounds pericles' most unusual strategy for waging the war, and I'll talk about that next time.

So let me move onto the next point.

Here we go.

Sorry about this.

The point I want to make, in any case the other incident I want to bring to your attention is in the summary that Thucydides makes of Pericles' career and of his importance in Athens in chapter 65 of book 2, after Pericles' death, he interrupts the narratives to give this lengthy evaluation.

🔊 **[69:06]**

One of the things he says in that evaluation is that Athens in the time of Pericles was a democracy in name but the rule of the first citizen in fact.

That is a remarkably powerful statement he is saying that Periclean Athens was not a democracy and that it was in effect some kind of an autocratic government with Pericles as the autocrat.

I would say that, all the evidence that we have suggested that is not accurate.

Just a few points to illustrate why that is so I mean one way to do that is by comparison.

People have suggested that, what Thucydides is saying is like that the emperor of Rome said about himself that he ruled not by any particular power, not by protastus but by his auktoritas, that is to say by the influence that his persona, and his achievements and all those things had over his fellow citizens.

Well in the case of augustus it was a flat lie. Augustus had a monopoly of all the armed forces there was in the mediterranean.

He also had a vast treasury that he could use for his own purposes. He was, as all historians in the modern world made perfectly clear, he was an emperor who ruled. No matter what instrument he used, it was a one man rule.

And in the second you see in doesn't apply to Pericles.

Pericles had no armed forces that was available to him.

He could not enforce anything by pulling out some soldiers to do anything that he wanted to do.

Anything, any use of the armed force, always had to be voted by the assembly and debated and discussed and a majority determined whether it can be done.

Moreover, every month the question was raised as you know, is Pericles like any other generals, okay, or has he violated anything, charges could be brought against him, he could be brought to court, and that's what happened to him in the middle of the war in 430, his enemies did bring him, did bring charges against him, he was convicted, he was removed temporarily from the generalship, and he had to pay a very very heavy fine.

This is not the business of dictators. So very briefly, Thucydides is very wrong about that.

Why did he want to say that?

🔊 **[72:01]**

And this gets to my own explanation of how we can understand.

I made the argument that he is wrong about the origins of war next time i'll make the case that he was wrong in fully supporting Pericles' strategy in the Peloponnesian war as the correct one.

I'll make the claim that the opposite is true.

If I'm right, why in the world did he say the things he did?



I think we need to understand the situation.

In 424, he was a general commanding Athenian force naval forces in the north, he was away from the place where they expected him to be when there was a sudden surprise seizure of the important Athenian city of Amphipolis, a charge was brought against him, he was found guilty and sent into exile.

He spent the last 20 years of the war in exile.

Probably I would guess, among fellow exiles and fellow opponents of the Athenian democracy, because he is very clearly, a critic of the Athenian democracy.

And there we had him speak all the time to people who said, wait a minute, Thucydides, let me get this right, you think Pericles is a terrific guy, don't you?

Yeah I do, I would have to say that.

And besides, didn't you get elected a general in 424 and wasn't that the most radical year in the entire history of Athenian democracy?

Weren't you a great pal? How could it be a blue blood like you who knows what nonsense democracy is, how could you possibly hold those positions?

And in my view, his history is his answer to those questions.

You think that the war is about the Megarian Decree and that Pericles is responsible for it, you're completely wrong. The war was inevitable and it became so soon as the Athenian came on board to challenge the Spartan hegemony.

Your view is naive and ignorant. So please pay attention to my history when I get it fully written.

You think that Pericles was a democrat? You bloody Fool?

He was a man who ruled over others he did not take his orders from the assembly.

You think that we lost the war because we had a bad strategy? The truth is that the strategy was right.

And if his successors had not abandoned that, they would have held out and have won the war.

And so you see, all of your naive ideas about what's happened to us in the past are wrong and that is why I did what I did.

🔊 [75:01]



And I was right to do so every step of the way. That was his history and in my view it was not merely an account of the past, it was an *apologia provita sua*, a defense of his own life and the great decisions that were made in it.

And of course what I just said had a bit of controversy.

Next time we'll talk about the strategy in the war.