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Introduction

While a hoplite fighting in the sixth century BCE could be transported through time several hundred years without ever seeing a clear disadvantage to his armor, a modern soldier could not be transported even fifty years without seeing himself at a clear disadvantage. While the modern soldier is not defined by their equipment, hoplites, defined by their equipment generally, were heavily armored “necessarily with spear, large round shield, and helmet, ideally also with breastplate and greaves to protect his legs.”¹ I find that this equipment changes very slowly. In order to study these changes, some of which are obvious while others are subtle, it is important to have an understanding of hoplite warfare. Without this understanding, what makes a soldier a hoplite is reduced to his equipment. Instead the evidence which I present in this paper seems to suggest that there is an underlying ideology contributing to how hoplitic warfare is conducted. Further, I would argue that this ideology is more important to understanding and defining a hoplite than the definition given above. This ideology, I will argue even further, contributed to the slow adaption and evolution of the hoplitic panoply by which we now generally define hoplites. Lastly, I will discuss how this ideology changes during the period between the Archaic and Classical periods, and how this change affects the use of equipment.

Therefore, there are two interesting questions which need to be answered in ways which synchronize well with one another: 1) What is the hoplite ideology? 2) What and how did the equipment change? To answer these questions, it is necessary to build a framework. This framework consists of an identification of the period within which hoplites are being analyzed, and a clear understanding of those facets of hoplite ideology which relate to equipment. Only after this framework is established can any evidence be analyzed concerning evolutions in

¹ Lendon 2005, p. 41
hoplite armor. After I establish this framework, I aim to make clear that hoplite equipment changed in ways which reflected their ideology throughout the centuries.

To set up this framework, the earliest hoplites who fought in a recognizably hoplitic way must be identified. The Chigi vase (Figure 1), which is normally dated to 630 BCE, showing clashing warriors in files with crested helmets, muscle cuirasses, greaves, and large shields, depicts this. A roughly contemporary fragment of Tyrtaeus, which seems very strongly to depict hoplite warfare, supports the Chigi vase:

καὶ πόδα πάρ ποδὶ θεὶς καὶ ἔπι ἀσπίδος ἀσπίδ’ ἐφείσας,
ἐν δὲ λόφον τε λόφῳ καὶ κυνέῃ κυνέῃ
καὶ στέρνον στέρνῳ πεπληγμένος ἄνδρι μαχεῖ σθοῦ,
ἡ ἀξίφεος κάπην ἢ δόρυ μαχρόν ἐλὼν.
and also, with foot placed alongside foot
and shield pressed against shield, let everyone draw
ear, crest to crest, helmet to helmet, and breast to
breast, and fight against a man, seizing the hilt of his
sword or his long spear. (Tyrtaeus, in Stob. 4.9.16, ll.31-35.
trans. Douglas E. Gerber p. .56-57)

This poetry fragment depicts the type of “shoulder to shoulder” fighting which scholars have
come to associate with the close ranked phalanx formation utilized by hoplites and by the
soldiers depicted on the Chigi vase. Furthermore, the body parts and pieces of equipment in this
fragment are the exact parts, and only those parts, which one would expect to be armored, and
can see as such on the Chigi vase. Given the fact that pieces of equipment are mentioned in the
poem at all, I find that a reading in favor of metonymy of the body parts for armor becomes clear
and helps support the picture on the Chigi vase. When read as metonymy, it can be read like
“greaves placed alongside greaves, shield unto shield, cuirass to cuirass, helmet to helmet,” and
this is very reminiscent of not only traditional hoplite images but also of the earliest image which
has been clearly identified as hoplitic, the Chigi vase. Given the relative contemporaneity of
Tyrtaeus (late seventh century BCE) to the dating of the Chigi vase, hoplitic warfare could be
assumed to have existed for a little while before 630.

Despite these examples, there does exist an earlier example of a polyandrion found on the
island of Paros which Agelarakis thinks is earlier evidence for hoplite warfare. While I am
convinced the images and bodies found do represent soldiers, I am not sure the images on the
vases found with the 120 some-odd male human remains, which are geometric in style,
necessarily depict hoplitic warfare given their armament. Likewise, another bit of evidence
which cannot be said to be definitive is the earliest use of φάλαγγα (from φάλαξ, phalanx) in

---

2 Agelarakis 2005, p. 34
Homer’s *Iliad*, suggesting perhaps that hoplitic warfare existed in the time of Homer. However, it is unclear if the phalanx referred only to “battle array,” or if Homer is actually referring to the specific array identified by us as a phalanx. These examples strongly attest to Cartledge’s “piecemeal” theory, which describes the slow integration of different elements of the hoplite panoply and techniques, insofar as they are evidence of an increasingly more hoplitic sentiment. However, they hardly suggest anything about battle itself, and do not give conclusive enough evidence to use them in a convincing way. Furthermore, these examples could also suggest, albeit superficially, evidence for a theory contradictory to Cartledge’s stating that the phalanx was adopted spontaneously. Ultimately, the event of the phalanx is not described explicitly enough in Homer or depicted realistically enough on the vases found in the graves of Paros to adequately accomplish this either.

Identifying a *terminus post quem* for the end of the hoplite period becomes problematic and relies greatly on whether or not Macedonians used hoplites. The implication seems to be that they did use a soldier with equipment resembling a modified hoplite, but by the time of Macedonian hegemony, there are questions concerning whether or not these soldiers fought with the same ideology as the Greek hoplites before them. It is hard to provide a compelling argument either way. Therefore, the approach that I will take is two-fold, assuming for the sake of argument on one hand that Macedonians are Greeks, and on the other assuming that Macedonians are not Greeks.

---

3 Ἀίας δὲ πρῶτος Τελαμώνιος, ἔρχος Ἀχαίων/Τρώων ὑήξε φάλαγγα, φῶς δ᾿ ἑτάροις ἔθηκεν/ἀνήφαλον ὃς ἄριστος ἐν Ἰ希腊ῇ τέτυκτο, ὁ γιός Εὐσσώρου Ἀκάμαντ᾿ ἐφητής ἐν τῇ μέγας. “Aias, son of Telamon, bulwark of the Achaeans, was first to break a battalion of the Trojans, and to bring a light of safety to his comrades, for he struck a man who was best among the Thracians, Eussorus’ son Acamas, a powerful man and tall.” Homer II. 6.5-8, trans. A. T. Murray, pp. 274-275

4 Cartledge 2002, p. 78; Cartledge 1977, p. 19
Given the first approach, the latest hoplite warfare should be extended for the purposes of this study is 200 BCE. Evidence for hoplite warfare this late is present in the Military Decree of Amphipolis, which suggests the use of hoplite equipment by the Macedonians,

> γειν τούς μὴ φέροντάς τι τῶν καθηκόντων αὐτοῖς ὀπλῶν ξημούτωσαν κατὰ τὰ γεγραμένα· κοτθύβου οβολοὺς δύο, κώνου τὸ ἵσον, σαρίσης οβολοὺς<ξ> τρεῖς, μαχαίρας τὸ ἵσον, κηνμίδων οβολοὺς δύο, ἀσπίδως δραχμήν.

shall punish, according to the regulations, those (found) not bearing any of the arms appropriate to them: two obols for the kotthybos, the same for the konos, three obols for the sarissa, the same for the dagger (machaira), two obols for the greaves, a drachma for the shield. In the case of officers, double the arms mentioned, two drachmas for the corselet, a drachma for the half-corselet. (Meletemata 22, Epig. App. 12, trans. Michael H. Crawford, David Whitehead p. 596)

In this list, the konos, aspis, thorax and hemithorax are the most relevant and represent the most common pieces of late hoplite equipment.\(^5\) The designation “late hoplite” implies that these pieces of equipment were different in terms of their specifics than the equipment used by early hoplites mentioned above but also represent the same sorts of body equipment referenced in the Tyrtaeus fragment. The soldiers reprimanded in this decree would, at least, resemble hoplites in their equipment.

If the stance taken is that Macedonians are not Greeks, then the date for the death of the hoplite becomes the Battle of Chaeronea in 338, the decisive victory won by Phillip II of Macedon which led to the formation of the League of Corinth and the establishment of Macedonian hegemony over Greece. The only exception would be Sparta. However, they too

---

\(^5\) I describe what these are in detail in Chapter 3. The konos is a type of helmet, the aspis is a shield, and the thorax and hemithorax are types of torso equipment.
were forced to join the league according to Savill, following the defeat of Spartan-King Agis III by Antipater in 331. Diodorus details this development,

ἀνῃρέθησαν δ’ ἐν τῇ μάχῃ τῶν μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων πλείους τῶν πεντακισχιλίων καὶ τριακοσίων, τῶν δὲ μετ’ Ἀντιπάτρου τρισχίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι.

More than five thousand three hundred of the Lacedaemonians and their allies were killed in the battle, and three thousand five hundred of Antipater’s troops. (Diod. 17.63.3, trans. C. Bradford Welles pp. 298-299)

Following this event, hoplite use would be implicitly Macedonian. This leaves a *terminus post quem* for the latter part of the hoplite period at either 200 or the 330s, dependent on the identification of Macedonians as Greek. This is a conflict which stems into modern times. When the Republic of Macedonia formed in 1991 after Yugoslavia was broken up, it angered modern Greece and a raging dispute ensued fueled by readings of ancient texts, whereby Herodotus, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and others were (and still are) used as weapons. For this reason, I will not engage with this discussion any more than I already have. It becomes logical between two uncertain dates to use the earlier one. Therefore, this analysis will not consider any evidence dated after the formation of the League of Corinth as relevant to the thesis. Similarly, the political and cultural landscape of ancient Greece is suggestive of a populace which often does not lend itself to a generalized study of ideological factors. In the periods which I intend to study, it is true that Greece was controlled by autonomous *poleis* governed by various types of government. Despite the differences in politics, these people spoke the same language, revered the same gods and shared cultural traditions, and relied on Homer as a sacred text. Wilson

---

6 Savill 1990, p. 44
suggests the rise of a Panhellenic ideal following the Persian War which did not exist in practice because some of the *poleis* were still allied with the Persians.\(^7\)

Therefore, this notion of a unified Greece could only intensify in the Classical period, whereas in the Archaic period, before the need to unite against a common threat, defining a standard Hellenic unity is impossible. For the sake of argument, in this paper I will be discussing Athenians, Lacedaemonians, Corinthians, *et al.* under the umbrella term “Greek” henceforth unless it is appropriate to differentiate them (such as when they are fighting one-another) or unless the distinction is important to understanding the issue at hand.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to describe the changes in hoplite equipment within the time period established above, which corresponds well with the beginning of the Archaic period until the end of the Classical period. This description will be set in the context of an ideology which was formed as a reflection of Homeric heroism in the Archaic period, grounded in a competitive desire for glory for both the individual and the *polis*, and permanently corrupted by the experiences in the Greco-Persian Wars. By describing this ideology and presenting evidence for the changes in equipment, I will argue that rather than a hoplite being defined by his gear, his gear is reflective of how hoplites thought warfare ought to be conducted.

---

\(^7\) Wilson 2006, pp. 555-556
Ideological Foundations

1.1 Terminology and Ideology

The idea of hoplitic ideology is not new, having been discussed since at least the late 19th century according to Dayton in *The Athletes of War*.\(^8\) It is also true that one single viewpoint on the issue does not exist. Scholarship on the issue has gone back and forth for more than a century, and it is not likely that the argument will be settled anytime soon. It is my theory that what we say about hoplite ideology must be fluid, entertaining the possibility that it could have changed over time. Therefore, I will discuss how hoplitic ideology very clearly changed during the transition from the Archaic to the Classical periods. Moving forward, an understanding of a fluid ideology will be necessary to my analysis of equipment change since it will act as the framework for my argument that equipment changes often reflected this ideology. When I analyzed these changes, I found that these changes can be wrongful attributed to protective, financial, or metallurgical, rather than ideological, innovation. This chapter will, therefore, be dedicated to describing this ideology in two parts: first I will discuss the themes of this ideology as it initially formed in the Archaic period; then I will address the transitionary events, namely the Battle of Thermopylae, which evidence suggests were transformative to the ideology and with this the altered ideology will later be rediscussed in the context of the Classical period.

Therefore, if it is my understanding that hoplitic ideology formed in the early Archaic period or earlier, an origin must be established. Evidence supports the notion that Homer was formative to the majority of ancient Greek customs, so that is where I will begin my study.\(^9\) In order to put Homer into the context of this study’s chronology, I look to Herodotus whose

\(^8\) Dayton 2006, p. 7.

\(^9\) Earp 1959, pp. 42-45
*Histories* are the crux of how the ideological changes going into the Classical period. While his reliability was occasionally criticized in antiquity,¹⁰ most scholars view him as reliable enough to consider him the best, and in many cases only, primary source for his time period.¹¹ In his *Histories*, he writes:

> Ἡσίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ὅμηρον ἣλικάνην τετρακοσίοις ἔτεσι ἔτεοι δοκέω μεν προεβιτέροις γενέσθαι καὶ οὐ πλέοι: οὕτω δὲ εἰσὶ οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἕλλην καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες καὶ τιμάς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες καὶ εἴδεα αὐτῶν σημήναντες.

for I suppose Hesiod and Homer flourished not more than four hundred years earlier than I; and these are the ones who taught the Greeks the descent of the gods, and gave the gods their names, and determined their spheres and functions, and described their outward forms. (Hdt. 2.53, trans. A. D. Godley pp. 340-341)

Assuming Herodotus’ estimation is correct, this places Homer in the middle of the 9th century, and anywhere between one and two centuries before the traditional dating of the Chigi vase (c. 630 BCE). This date from Herodotus also predates the age of the *polyandron* of Paros given by Agelarakis which may represent a geometric example of possibly very early hoplitic warriors;¹² but it is equally possible they do not, instead representing an earlier sort of “pre-hoplite” warrior wielding pieces of hoplitic equipment adopted in a “piece meal” fashion.¹³ And indeed, I find that Agelarakis’ description of the vase (Figure 2) found in the *polyandron* resemble Homeric

---

¹⁰ such as Lucian in the *Verae Historiae*


¹² Agelarakis 2005, pp. 32-33

¹³ Cartledge 2002, p. 78; Cartledge 1977, p. 19
warriors more than what scholars associate with hoplites,\textsuperscript{14} despite the connection Agelarakis makes:

The battle scene depicts the instance of a fight for claiming the body of a fallen warrior while cavalry men mounted with helmet, shield, and spear, supported by moderately equipped bowmen and flying arrows proceed against a team of lightly armed sling shooters, loading and throwing their missiles (the first and earliest time sling shooters are ever depicted in battle scenes in Greek vase paintings), situated in relative vanguard yet in formation with a larger group of heavily armed foot warriors each carrying two spears and a round shield, called the hoplon, the same basic type that would be used throughout the Classical period and would give its name to the citizen-soldier, the hoplite. Moreover, the soldiers are depicted acting in unison.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.png}
\caption{Figure 2}
\end{figure}

Having established in my introduction that the earliest \textit{terminus} we can convincingly assume for hoplitic warfare is the Chigi vase, it seems viable to suggest that the works of the renowned poet Homer could have been formative to the Greeks in ways extending beyond the naming of gods and the descriptions of their functions. More specifically, I mean to suggest that an ideology of hoplites and hoplitic warfare was formed, at least in part, as a reflection of and reaction against

\textsuperscript{14} Why I say this should become more clear later in the thesis, but the short version is due to the presence of a fight over the body, and the multitude of different equipment depicted.

\textsuperscript{15} Agelarakis 2005, p. 34
the types of heroism found throughout the *Iliad*. It is clear that Homeric epic was well-known into Herodotus’ time evidenced by his reference to both him and Hesiod. It is also a generally-known fact that Homer’s epics were used as sacred texts, or inspired them, throughout much of ancient Western history and were formative to realities in antiquity, and much scholarship exists on this issue.\(^{16}\)

The realities of hoplitic warfare are very different from the type of battle presented in much of the *Iliad*, however. Hoplites fought using a type of combat referred to as “phalangeal” or “hoplitic.”\(^ {17}\) Phalangeal warfare is fought in a phalanx while hoplitic warfare is fought by hoplites. These look to be synonymous on the outside, but phalangeal warfare is not exclusive to hoplites since other groups can be said to utilize phalangeal warfare outside of the sphere of Greeks I have established.\(^ {18}\) I will use these terms as such going forward when referring to hoplites fighting in the phalanx. These terms can also be recognized as pitched warfare.\(^ {19}\) Also of importance is an understanding of Homeric warfare which refers to the type of battle conducted in the *Iliad*, and in this paper is also referred to as “heroic warfare.” Some instances of Homeric warfare also resemble “champion warfare,” or *monomachia*, which is a type of battle where the outcome is decided through a duel or some other form of individual combat—e.g. the battle between Paris and Menelaus. Champion warfare contrasts with hoplitic warfare in the way a full army contrasts with a single individual.

---

16 Kostas 2008, p. xi-xix

17 Phalangeal means “relating to the phalanx.” Hoplitic means “relating to a hoplite.”

18 Such as the Macedonians, and to some extent the Romans. Macedonian armies utilized a modified version of a Greek phalanx, while Romans in *testudo* mimic the phalanx. Cassius Dio somewhat makes this connection in the *Historiae Romanae*, 49.30, referring to the formation as both a *phalanx* and *chelone*.

19 Oxford English Dictionary, Second edition 1989. battle, n. 1.b "With various qualifying attributes: … pitched battle, a battle which has been planned, and of which the ground has been chosen beforehand, by both sides ..."
I want to show how hoplitic warfare functioned mechanically in the context of these concepts and set this up in a way that demonstrates how much it both resembles and reacts against Homeric warfare. In order to emphasize this, I will be pointing to a few themes in the reality of hoplitic warfare which seem to be founded in Homeric heroism. As I move onto the transitionary period, I will draw attention to the Persian War, namely the Battle of Thermopylae, which scarred this ideology in a way from which it would never recover. I will then look at this corrupted ideology in the context of the Classical period.

1.2 Ideology in the Archaic Period

When trying to identify the ideology of the hoplite in the Archaic period, it is necessary to look at certain characteristics necessary to hoplitic combat. Some of these characteristics include Greek customs concerning the mechanics of battle, the acquisition of glory, and the clear delineation in how victory is measured. Some scholars, such as Peter Krentz, argue against the presence of agonistic, or competitive, characteristics in hoplitic warfare by providing examples of contradictory cases. These cases are not the norm and seem to be exceptions to the customs of the Greeks rather than indicative of any sort of notion towards the absence of these customs. Furthermore, if Krentz is correct to deny agonistic elements in hoplitic warfare, and Homer is indeed an “inspiration” to Archaic hoplites as I have suggested and will attempt to show more clearly, then the Archaic Greeks would have had to ignore the concept of kleos as an agonistic structure in the Iliad. If it is true that a sort of agon is not present in the minds and actions of Archaic Greeks, as Krentz suggests, then the Archaic Greeks would have ignored the weighty topic of kleos in the Iliad about which many scholars have written. Krentz in particular is

---

20 Krentz 2002, p. 25

arguing against Josiah Ober, who himself argues that the customs involved in hoplitic warfare were inspired by Homer and put into writing after 700, and that they had broken down after about 450, especially during the Peloponnesian War.\textsuperscript{22} I will argue later that the time which the ideology began to corrupt was earlier than the Peloponnesian War, but of the Archaic period regardless, Ober says the ideology of hoplites “helped to maintain the long-term practical workability of the hoplite dominated socio-military system.”\textsuperscript{23} Krentz argues against Hansen also, who shares a similar view to myself which attributes “the breakdown of this admirable system to the Persian Wars and the growth of the Athenian empire, a generation before the Peloponnesian War.”\textsuperscript{24}

Krentz, in arguing against agonistic elements of hoplitic ideology, also discusses the “customs of the Greeks” which appear in references in Euripides, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon.\textsuperscript{25} He argues against the validity of these “laws” as indicative of Archaic construct, by arguing that although a 5th century claim may call them ancient, the laws concerning public burial in Athens likely only date back a generation before the Peloponnesian War. However, public burial seems to be attested well before this, given at the very least the counterexample of a \textit{polyandron} of soldiers at Paros cited earlier. On this same topic, Adriaan Lanni writes that the laws of warfare were informal and more well-represented by definition as ‘customs’, but are often referred to by our sources “with such phrases as the “law of the Greeks,” “the common laws of the Greeks,” and “the laws common to all men” where the word for laws in each is most

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} Ober 1996
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ober 1996, pp. 60-61
\item \textsuperscript{24} Hanson 1999, p. 241
\item \textsuperscript{25} Euripides’ \textit{Herakleidai} 1010, \textit{Suppliants} 19 311, 526; Herodotus, 7.136.2, 7.9.1; Thucydides, 1.85.2, 3.9.1, 3.59.1, 4.97.2; Xenophon, \textit{Hell.} 3.2.22
\end{itemize}
often nomoi.\textsuperscript{26} Lanni’s focus is the customs relating to the protection of “sacred objects and observances.” However, I do not want to spend much time talking about these religious practices because of the already existing scholarly research on the topic done by Lanni, and because these religious customs only overlap in some coincidental ways with the application of these customs to warfare. Whether the ideology was written down as Ober suggests, or Lanni is correct to suggest these rules were informal, or Krentz is right to say that these “rules” did not actually exist but were anachronistically attributed by 5th century writers, becomes irrelevant until the Classical period without producing a lost work that has these laws written down.\textsuperscript{27} Therefore, what becomes clear is that the only way that I have left to learn anything about what an Archaic hoplite did, in fact, think about warfare must be ascertained by analyzing the practice of warfare in the Archaic period by studying Archaic writers.

Therefore, I think it best to take the approach of breaking the mechanics of hoplitic warfare into groups and parsing out the many themes which relate to how the Greeks determined their battles were going to be fought. The utilization of pitched warfare, and all that entails, and decrees between states on limitations for the battle lend itself to being broken apart into such themes.\textsuperscript{28} Pitched warfare is comprised of official declarations of war, a clear delineation of the battle setting to remove elements of the terrain that would give either side an advantage, and set decisions about the terms of loss and surrender. These are attributes which could have been ascertained from Homeric epic, as the Greeks of the Iliad practiced a type of champion warfare,

\textsuperscript{26} Lanni 2008, p. 472

\textsuperscript{27} Lanni is convincing in his argument, as is Ober. But Krentz does file some legitimate concerns, which open the issue of anachronism. When talking about the Archaic period henceforth, I will attempt to use only sources who wrote in the Archaic period.

\textsuperscript{28} These are commonly attributed to Archaic hoplitic warfare, so I start here and explain it further as the paper progresses.
otherwise called a duel or *monomachia*, which is reminiscent of the same sort of limitations placed on the participating armies in pitched battle, but on a smaller scale. The primary example of this is the *monomachia* between Paris and Menelaus. The battle of Paris and Menelaus occurs early in the *Iliad* and seems to hold some sort of formal regulation to it. There are terms regarding the outcome of the battle which are sanctified by sacrifices and oaths of a religious nature: should Menelaus win the Trojans would return Helen and compensate for losses, while should Paris win he would retain Helen and the Achaeans would be obligated to depart.\(^{29}\) The size of the battleground is chosen beforehand by members from each faction.\(^{30}\) Also, the combatants drew lots to decide who would make the first move which seems to be an effort for transparency in battle.\(^{31}\) A similar instance of this is present in the duel of Nestor and Ereuthalion which happened in the past at the time of Nestor’s speech. Later in the *Iliad*, these sorts of duels begin to deteriorate as time and weariness go-on, devolving into what I would argue is a more teleological form of warfare in the scope of full armies, despite being characterized by scholars as agonistic due to the theme of *kleos* on an individual basis.\(^{32}\) The difference I am pointing at here is somewhat obvious: in a *monomachia* the armies are represented by individuals while the armies fight as individuals for glory towards a common goal in the rest of warfare.

---

\(^{29}\) εἰ μὲν Κεν Μενέλαον Ἀλέξανδρος καταπέφνῃ, αὐτὸς ἔπειθ᾽ Ἑλένην ἔχετω καὶ κτήματα πάντα, ἡμεῖς δ᾽ ἐν νῆσσι νεώμεθα ποντοπόροις· ἐὰν δὲ Ἀλέξανδρον κτείνῃ ξανθὸς Μενέλαος, Ἑλένην καὶ κτήματα πάντ᾽ ἀποδοῦναι· τιμὴν δ᾽ Ἀργείοις ἀποτινέμεν ἥν τιν᾽ ἔοικεν, ἥ τε καὶ ἐσσομένοις μετ᾽ ἀνθρώπους πέληται. “If Alexander kills Menelaus, then let him keep Helen and all her treasure; and let us depart in our seafaring ships. But if tawny-haired Menelaus kills Alexander, then let the Trojans give back Helen and all her treasure, and pay to the Argives such recompense as is proper, such as will remain in the minds of men who are yet to be.” Homer *Il.* 3.281-287, trans. A. T. Murray, pp. 148-149

\(^{30}\) Ἕκτωρ δὲ Πριάμου παῖς καὶ δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀφείη χάλκεον ἔγχος· “But Hector, Priam’s son, and noble Odysseus first measured out a space,” Homer *Il.* 3.314-15, trans. A. T. Murray, pp. 150-151

\(^{31}\) δὴ πρόσθεν ἀφείη χάλκεον ἔγχος “which of the two would first let fly his spear of bronze” Homer *Il.* 3.317, trans. A. T. Murray, p. 150-151

\(^{32}\) Barker 2009
Despite the use of duels in Homer, Strabo felt the concept of the duel to be characteristic to Archaic warfare. He iterates on the issue that they, “in accordance with an ancient custom of the Greeks, advanced to single combat.”

Despite this practice seemingly having died before the end of the Archaic period, as the last known duel we have record of is the duel between Pittacus and Phrynon in 607 according to Dayton, what becomes indicative of hoplitic warfare is pitched warfare which is parallel in structure to how a duel is conducted. This parallelism relies on the symbolism of an individual as a representative of an entire army.

This duel in the Iliad closely resembles how pitched warfare is uniformly conducted throughout history, and pitched warfare was practiced quite uniformly by the Greeks in the Archaic period, if you look at each individual in the monomachia as representative of an entire phalanx. J. E. Lendon points at this in his book Soldiers and Ghosts, saying “… phalanx-fighting men acted as a body, not as individuals or temporary bands.” Lendon is making the point that physically the soldiers united to produce a stronger frontline, and Dayton solidifies this connection by comparing the Battle of Champions to several duels, including the duel between Paris and Menelaus. In pitched warfare, the odd practices of picking a place where neither side benefitted from the terrain, agreeing upon rules, and observing religious and cultural events of enemies rather than taking advantage of the situation are typified in Archaic hoplite battles. The

---

33 εἰς μονομαχίαν προελθεῖν κατὰ ἔθος τι παλαιῶν τῶν Ἑλλήνων - 8.3.33, trans. Horace Leonard Jones

34 Dayton 2006, p. 40, although he says less formal battles between individuals do occur from time-to-time after 607.

35 Lendon 2005, p. 41

36 Dayton 2006, pp. 36-41. Dayton makes the comparison based on 5 attributes: 1) they represent true judicial combats fought under terms; 2) among their causes is the desire to limit peril to those most directly concerned and spare the majority; 3) there is an effort to limit the space of the encounter, most immediately as a practical device to restrict flight and force action; 4) multiple combats are attested; 5) they testify to some agreement concerning the weapons to be used.
regulations of the duel which Homer describes are the same sort of regulations, as I detail below, which occur in the Archaic period.

The first regulation pertains to the arena. The terrain of a battle was important, and there are many reasons for a hoplite to be selective. Hoplites are thought by scholars to be particularly vulnerable to flanking maneuvers at the back and right, given the configuration of the phalanx and the usage of the Argive shield. The most common example given by scholars on the selection of a battlefield is shown by Greek hoplites in a (likely) mythological example of a conflict between Spartans and Argives where they chose three-hundred champions, decided upon a battlefield, and then fought to the death on it. According to Herodotus, the two sides fell into a dispute as to who should win this battle given the ambiguity of its end:

οἱ μὲν δὴ δύο τῶν Ἀργείων ὡς νεκρικμότες ἔθεον ἐς τὸ Ἀργος, ὁ δὲ τῶν Λακεδαίμονιῶν Ὄθρυάδης σκυλεύσας τοὺς Ἀργείων νεκροὺς καὶ προσφαίροντας πάλιν πρὸς τὸ ἑωτοῦ στρατόπεδον ἐν τῇ τάξι ἔχε ἑωτόν. ήμέρη δὲ δευτέρῃ παρῆσαν πυνθανόμενοι ἀμφότεροι. τέως μὲν δὴ αὐτοὶ ἑκάτεροι ἐκάτεροι ὡς ἔφασαν νικᾶν, λέγοντες οἳ μὲν ὡς ἑωτῶν πλεῖνος περιγεγόνασι, οἳ δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἀποφαίνοντες πεφευγότας, τὸν δὲ αφέτερον παραμείναντα καὶ σκυλεύσαντα τοὺς ἑκείνων νεκροὺς: τέλος δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔριδος συμπεσόντες ἔμαχοντο, πεσόντων δὲ καὶ ἀμφότερων πολλῶν ἑωτῶν Λακεδαίμονιοι.

Then the two Argives, deeming themselves victors, ran to Argos; but Othryades, the Lacedaemonian, spoiled the Argive dead, bore the armour to his own army’s camp and remained in his place. On the next day both armies came to learn the issue. For a while both claimed the victory, the Argives pleading that more of their men had survived, the Lacedaemonians showing that the Argives had fled, while their man had stood his ground and despoiled the enemy dead. At last the dispute so ended that they joined battle and

37 Matthew 2012, pp. 168-204
fought; many of both sides fell, but the Lacedaemonians had the victory. (Hdt. 1.82, trans. A. D. Godley pp. 102-103)

As Tomlinson points out, “The idea of two Greek cities of the sixth century deciding a territorial dispute by a battle of selected champions is, to say the least, odd.”\textsuperscript{38} Moreover, the historicity of such an event is questioned by the obviously mythological, etiological, and otherwise improbable elements. Nevertheless, this sort of mass duel is, according to Dayton, “especially common practice in Europe and elsewhere, and this aspect of Herodotus’ story cannot be dismissed outright.”\textsuperscript{39} I support Dayton in that this story cannot be dismissed as “simply mythological” because it still represents a preset engagement with rules which stipulate the weapons involved, the number of champions, the delineation of the arena, and the reward for victory. If it is not entirely factual, its etiological elements establish the same goal for the purposes of my study, in that the maintenance of a hoplite’s space is at the forefront of his mind. This is shown in the story well, since despite the ambiguity of the results of the Battle of Champions, the Spartans achieved victory because they maintained the arena of war which had been decided beforehand. The concept of standing ground, in this case, did not defy the agreement of the preset stage.

Moreover, it satisfied the ethos of the phalanx both on a group and an individual basis. Victory was claimed by Othryades for standing his ground, and therefore, victory was claimed for Sparta. The maintenance of the arena of war was therefore important to hoplites who viewed these “rules of warfare,” which I find similar to how Homer’s Greeks viewed their preset battleground during \textit{monomachia}. Violating this space was not an option without violating all of the preset and understood conditions of the fight.

\textsuperscript{38} Tomlinson 1972, p. 88; Dayton 2006, p. 35

\textsuperscript{39} Dayton 2006, p. 36. Dayton cites examples of this common practice in Europe as being the Combat of Thirty in Brittany (1351), the battle of sixty clansmen of MacDonald and Cuwhele fought before Robert III of Scotland (1396), the Challenge of Barletta (1503) and that it is also known among Australian and Siberian aboriginals.
In most cases, the concept of standing one’s ground on an individual basis in the phalanx is how they were able to acquire glory, and it also had the practical benefit of protecting those around you as unity promoted the integrity of the line. During othismos or “pushing,” which refers to a specific phalangeal engagement by which it is theorized both sides clashed in a way reminiscent of the scrum in rugby, a soldier who yielded ground would endanger those around him by creating an opening in the phalanx through which enemy hoplites could enter. As such, the concept of “holding ground,” during othismos in particular, was important towards the acquisition of glory, and is a concept acknowledged early on as important, as shown below in the Tyrtaeus fragment below:

ξυνὸν δ’ ἐσθλὸν τούτο πόλη τε παντὶ τε δήμῳ,
όστις ἀνήρ διαβάς ἐν προμάχοιοι μένῃ
νωλεμέως, αὑσχῆς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθηται,
ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος,
θαρσύνη δ’ ἐπεσεν τὸν πλησίον ἀνδράς παρεστῶς·
οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ.

This is a common benefit for the state and all the people, whenever a man with firm stance among the front ranks never ceases to hold his ground, is utterly unmindful of shameful flight, risking his life and displaying a steadfast spirit, and standing by the man next to him speaks encouragingly. This man is good in war. (Tyrtaeus in Stobaeus’ Anth. 4.10.1 (vv. 1–14) + 6 (vv. 15–44), 40 ll.15-20, trans. Douglas Gerber pp. 58-59)

In the reality of phalangeal warfare, this possibility was curbed and glory was awarded to those who stood their ground no matter what, and in a way they gain glory for the polis and for themselves in the same way that the soldiers in the Iliad gained glory for themselves—either

---

40 Plato, Laws 1.629a–630b, quotes vv. 1 and, with slight changes, most of 11–12 and paraphrases the contents of 1–20; in 660e–661a he again quotes v. 1 and paraphrases 1–12. We also have 13–16 in Theognis 1003–1006 (with σοφῷ in place of νέῳ) and much of 37–42 is repeated in Theognis 935–38.
through victory or through an honorable death. For the individual hoplite, *kleos* could be attained by doing one’s job with courage, and *aidos*, or “shame,” could be attained by fleeing. The acquisition of *aidos* through flight is something for which Archilochus was famously criticized.\(^{41}\) His assumed acquisition of *aidos* is immortalized in (perhaps) his most famous poem-fragment, below:

```
Ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαίων τις ἀγάλλεται, ἤν παρὰ θάμνῳ
ἐντος ἀμώμητον κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων·
αὐτὸν δὲ ἐξ μ' ἐσάωσε· τί μοι μέλει ἀσπίς ἑκείνης;
Ἐρρέτω· ἐξαὐτίς κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω.
```

Some Saian exults in my shield which I left—a faultless weapon—beside a bush against my will. But I saved myself. What do I care about that shield? To hell with it! I’ll get one that’s just as good another time.

(Archilochus in Plut. *instit. Lac.* 34.239b, trans. by Douglas E. Gerber pp. 80-81)

The criticism he received would only be present in a world where not yielding ground was valued, while the discarding of one’s shield for flight is rejected for being related to *aidos*.

Another aspect of pitched warfare is the practice by the Greeks to discuss formally both rules and regulations for combat which may limit the amount of champions, the type of weapons used, or the type of combat which is respected. This is most famously mentioned by Strabo concerning the Lelantine war between Chalkis and Eretria, about which he writes:

```
tὸ μὲν οὖν πλέον ὠμολόγουν ἀλλήλας αἰ πόλεις αὐταί, περὶ
δὲ Ληλάντον διενεχθεῖσα οὐδ’ οὕτω τελέως ἐπαύσαντο,
ὡστε τῷ πολέμῳ κατὰ αὐθάδειαν δράν ἐκαστα, ἀλλὰ
συνέθεντο, ἐφ’ οίς συντήσονται τὸν ἀγώνα. δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ
```

\(^{41}\) Athenian law called for loss of political rights for a citizen who threw away his shield to flee from battle (Andoc. myst. 74; Lys. 10.1); and the charge was taken so seriously that to assert that a citizen was a *ripsaspis* was an actionable slander (Lys. 10.9).
Strabo suggests that the Chalkidians and Eretrians determined their terms before the battle, and even went so far as to forbid the use of missiles. The inscription itself is, of course, debatable given Strabo’s period (ca1st Century CE); however, a poem by Archilochus supports the notion that missiles were abandoned in the Lelantine war:

Οὔ τοι πόλλ’ ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται οὐδὲ θαμειαὶ σφενδόναι, εὖτ’ ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἀρης συνάγῃ ἐν πεδίῳ, ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον· ταύτης γὰρ κεῖνοι δαίμονες εἰσὶ μάχης δεσπόται Εὔβοιας δουρικλυτοί.”

Not many bows indeed will be stretched tight, nor frequent slings Be whirled, when Ares joins men in the moil of war Upon the plain, but swords will do their mournful work; For this is the warfare wherein those men are expert Who lord it over Euboea and are famous with the spear.


In this poem, the Lelantine war was named after the Lelantine plain, and the warlike lords of Euboea refer to the Eretrians and Chalkidians who were both residents of the island of Euboea.

On one hand, it could be suggested that this regulation, if it did indeed exist, was to further “level the playing field,” while on the other it could be that the purpose of this was to emphasize the
acquisition of glory through phalangeal warfare rather than through archery, which was one of many Homeric practices.\textsuperscript{42} If the latter is the case it would imply that, to a hoplite, an archer gained less kleos or even gained avidos by using his bow. In the \textit{Iliad}, this does not seem to be the case as archers are abundant.

This sort of regulation is reminiscent of the duel between Paris and Menelaus once again, bringing back to mind the drawing of lots for first spear toss. However, the fact that there even was a javelin to be thrown implies that soldiers in the \textit{Iliad} did not bestow kleos or any less avidos on an archer or missile-thrower than on a infantryman. This highlights a difference in ideology between Homer’s heroes and hoplites of the Archaic period, and differences like these were acknowledged by hoplites. Tyrtaeus contrasts soldiers of his time to traditionally held beliefs of glory by his Homeric predecessors, when he writes:

\begin{quote}
οὔτ’ ἀν μνησώμην οὔτ’ ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα ἑθείμην οὐδὲ ποδὸν ἡρετῆς οὔτε παλαιομούνης, οὐδὲ ἐκ Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχω μέγεθος τε βίην τε, νικήθη δὲ θέους Ὁρηκίους Βορέην, οὐδὲ ἐκ Τιθυνοῦ φυῆν χαριέστερος εἶη, πλουτοῖθεν ἐκ Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον, οὐδὲ ἐκ Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλέυτερος εἶη, γλῶσσαν δὲ Άδρηστος μειλιχόγηρυν ἔχοι, οὐδὲ ἐκ πάσων ἔχοι δόξαιν πλῆς θούριδος ἁλκῆς, οὐ γὰρ ἁγαθὸς ἁγαθὸς γίγνεται ἐν πολέμῳ, εἰ μὴ τετλαίη μὲν ὄρον φόνον ἀματόεντα καὶ δηίων ὀρέγοιτ’ ἐγγύθεν ἰστάμενος.
\end{quote}

I would not mention or take account of a man for his prowess in running or in wrestling, not even if he had the size and strength of the Cyclopes and outstripped Thracian Boreas in the race, nor if he were more handsome than Tithonus in form and

\textsuperscript{42} Lendon 2005, pp. 17 & 39-57; Krentz 2002, p. 25
richer than Midas and Cinyras, nor if he were more kingly than Pelops, son of Tantalus, and had a tongue that spoke as winningly as Adrastus’, nor if he had a reputation for everything save furious valour. For no man is good in war unless he can endure the sight of bloody slaughter and, standing close, can lunge at the enemy. ((Tyrtaeus in Stobaeus’ Anth. 4.10.1 (vv. 1–14) + 6 (vv. 15–44), ll.1-12, trans. Douglas Gerber pp. 56-59)

In the Iliad, different attributes were utilized to further the war to victory, and anything that was successful in efficiently killing was lauded for it. The Homeric warrior was lauded for any skill he possessed which could effectively kill an enemy repeatedly, whereas the Archaic Greek hoplite would not be lauded if that skill included a bow or did not involve standing his ground. Hoplites are fighting as a group towards a victory for their polis, but the emphasis on regulations of how the battle is to be fought is meant as a way of emphasizing the measure of individual kleos. A hoplite does not gain kleos through just any skill which efficiently kills, but only through the skills allowed to him following a discussion of regulations. In doing this, Lendon argues, the hoplites fought in a way which emphasized “competitive ethics adapted to reality, which tended to simplify combat,” rather than “tradition sanctified by Homer, which tended to preserve a diversity of styles of fighting.” Those competitive ethics drove missiles from the phalanx—the depictions on vases, with the exception of a few outliers, overwhelmingly support this—and thus the phalanx supported only a single form of competitive combat.

On the other hand, Homer could accommodate any number of martial competitions. The reality of such is not a pretty picture since many of these could not coexist in a way which actually promoted “fair competition” as hoplitic warfare attempted, and thus the fair acquisition of kleos. There are too many competitors of other martial disciplines who can collide, and in that

---

43 Lendon 2005, p. 48
collision is an abrupt end to the ability to compete. Lendon gives us the example of Polydoros in the *Iliad*, saying “Polydoros… ran through the battle in the *Iliad* to show off his superb speed of foot. Achilles threw a spear at him as he ran by and killed him. Achilles’ desire to compete ruined Polydoros’: the logic of the real world has briefly invaded the poem.” While Polydoros technically was not successful as a Homeric warrior either, this is not because of a complete inability to compete as it would have been in hoplitic warfare, but because of the desire to compete by Achilles who, as the rest of the *Iliad* shows, is a very successful Homeric warrior. Therefore, I posit that this part of a hoplite ideology formed as a reaction to an illogicality in Homer which worked in epic, but does not appear that it could have in reality. Hoplite warfare reacted against this aspect of epic warfare, but this aspect of Homeric warfare was reflected in other areas of Greek society—Polydoros, for instance, might have competed in the Olympic games as a runner, but he would not have been successful as a hoplite who valued remaining in place over flight. In this way, Archaic Greek hoplitic ideology mirrors the *monomachia* in Homeric warfare, in that it has a list of preset rules of engagement and restrict the actions of combatants to allow for a “fair” way to “compete.” On the other hand, hoplitic ideology simultaneously reacts against Homer by utilizing mostly a single martial exploit in warfare and designating the rest to other areas where glory can be acquired.

---

44 Lendon 2005, pp. 48-49
2.1 The Violation of Ideology

During the Persian Wars of the early 5th century BCE, the type of warfare favored by the Greeks was utilized up until they realized the Persians did not play by the same rules. Before the Persian Wars, much of Greek combat was engaged against other Greeks, and therefore against armies who followed the same martial conventions as themselves. This disconnect was one which was felt by each and every Greek as he fought the Persians, and as a result the way of war was adapted. Some things did not change, while others were more directly challenged. One thing is clear, however: never again did the Archaic style of fighting and ideology fully return following the Persian war.

The most notable change was the shift in ideal from “standing one’s ground” to a more fluid and teleological approach than had been seen in the Archaic period. This shift is easily seen early on in the invasion of Xerxes during the Battle of Thermopylae in 480 BCE. The Archaic way of fighting enjoyed by the Greeks was initially effective at Thermopylae, and Leonidas held every bit of this same ideology. Herodotus relates this:

Οἱ μὲν νυν χώροι οὕτωι τοῖς Ἑλληνες εἶναι ἐφαίνοντο ἐπιτήδεοι· πάντα γὰρ προσκεψάμενοι καὶ ἐπιλογισθέντες ὅτι οὔτε πλήθει ξερουχοθαναιοι οὔτε ἰπποι, ταύτῃ ὑποδοθεὶ έκειοθα τόν ἑπόντα έπι τὴν Ἑλλάδα. ως δὲ ἐπύθοντο τὸν Πέρσην έλυντα ἐν Πιερίῃ, διαλυθέντες ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ ἐστρατεύοντο αὐτῶν οἶ μὲν ἐς Θερμοπύλαιας πεζής, ἄλλοι δὲ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἐπι Αρτέμισιον.

These places, then, were thought by the Greeks to suit their purpose; for after due survey they reckoned that the foreigners could not make use of their multitude, nor of their horsemen; and therefore they resolved, that here they would encounter the
invader of Hellas. Then, hearing that the Persian was in Pieria, they broke up from the Isthmus and set out with their army to Thermopylae and their fleet to Artemision. (Hdt. 7.177, trans. A. D. Godley pp. 494-495)

This passage clarifies that they carefully chose Thermopylae to prevent themselves from being vulnerable to flanking by the Persian cavalry, and aimed make up for their inferior numbers with a superior tactical position. This is a plan consistent with the ideology of any Archaic Greek hoplite—the arena was chosen so as to prevent any advantage on either side other than those given by the men themselves through training or armament. Other instances of Archaic ideology implemented at Thermopylae include the observance of the Carneia and the Olympiad, the refusal to flee, the Greeks’ staying in their ranks, and the possible use of othismos (though not used in this instance).


\[\text{Herodotus 7.212.2, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 528-529}\]
named as such) against the Persians.\footnote{πολλοὶ μὲν δὴ ἐοίπεπτον αὐτῶν ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ διεφθείροντο, πολλῷ δ’ ἐτὶ πλεῖνες κατεπατέοντο ζωοὶ ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων. "Many of them were thrust into the sea and there drowned, and more by far were trodden down bodily by each other, none regarding who it was that perished;" Herodotus 7.223.3, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 540-541}

Despite these instances of continuity, I argue that the events at Thermopylae become the turning point where Archaic ideology is shaken to its core. Once the Persians learn of the pass, they break the first rule of the Greeks by engaging the Phocians with arrows\footnote{οἱ δὲ Φωκέες ὡς ἐβάλλοντο τοῖσι τοξεύμασι πολλοῖσι τε καὶ πυκνοίσι, οἷς ἐσέπιπτον αὐτῶν ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ διεφθείροντο, ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀρέως τὸν κόρυμβον, ἐπιστάμενοι ὡς ἐπὶ σφέας ὁρμήθησαν ἀρχὴν, καὶ παρασκευάδατο ὡς ἀπολεόμενοι. "and the Phocians, assailed by showers of arrows, and supposing that it was they whom the Persians had meant from the first to attack, fled away up to the top of the mountain and prepared there to perish." Herodotus 7.218, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 534-535} rather than with their army, and thus debilitating the ability to compete for glory on the part of the Phocians. They then moved to flank the Greek army at Thermopylae, which caused changes in how the army fought that they had never witnessed before. The first change occurred when the Greeks advance into the wider pass, and thus forfeit their arena, albeit likely to regain an advantage. After this forfeiture, they also fought out of their rank and file in their desperation.\footnote{ἀπεδείκνυτο ῥώμης ὅσον εἶχον μέγιστο ἐς τοὺς βαρβάρους, παραχρεώμενοι τε καὶ ἀτέοντες. “they put forth the very utmost of their strength against the foreigners, in their recklessness and frenzy.” Herodotus 7.223.4, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 540-541}

It is after this point in the fighting at Thermopylae that many of the Archaic hoplitic ideological themes are fully abandoned. In Homeric fashion, such as occurs with Sarpedon and Patroklos in Book XVI, the Spartans fight over their fallen king Leonidas,\footnote{καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ νεκροῦ τοῦ Λεωνίδεω Περσέων τε καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων ὦθουμός ἐγένετο πολλός, ἐς ὅ τούτον τε ἀρετῇ οἱ Ἑλλῆνες ὑπεξείρυσαν καὶ ἔτρεψαν τοὺς ἐναντίους τετράκις. “and there was a great struggle between the Persians and Lacedaemonians over Leonidas’ body, till the Greeks of their valour dragged it away and four times put their enemies to flight.” Herodotus 7.225, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 542-543. The use of othismos here is interesting, referencing a term associated with hoplites in what I find to be a very Homeric context.} and then the Spartans undertook a collective aristeia, “they defended themselves with swords, if they still had...”
them, and with hands and teeth.” This resembles an aristeia more than anything else shown in hoplitic warfare because the acquisition of glory is directly linked to a form of fighting using any means necessary, in this case those means being their hands and teeth, and also because this point in the Battle of Thermopylae depicts the last, or best, stand the Spartans had to offer before dying. This is the moment when the Persians corrupt the ideology of the hoplite, as “the barbarians buried them with missiles, some attacking from the front and throwing down the defensive wall, others surrounding them on all sides.” This is a clear violation of the ideology held in the Archaic period, given that the flanking maneuver and the overwhelming use of non-hoplitic tactics completely removes the ability to compete from the Spartans through means of a different sport—one which the Greeks have not played since the time of Homer in any honorable militaristic fashion. This becomes evidence of a transition in martial ideology.

Even further supporting this moment as a transition, this battle is an instance where the hoplitic way of war falls apart completely, despite being utilized with initial success. The Persians were told by Demaratus “You are now attacking the fairest kingdom in Hellas and men who are the very best” and because of this the Persians necessarily had to break the rules of hoplitic warfare to defeat them by means of seeking help from a Greek who could lead them to a more advantageous position. The Spartans view this as a situation for the acquisition of glory,

---

52 ἐν τούτῳ σφέας τῷ χώρῳ ἀλέξομένους μαχαίρῃ, τοῖσι αὐτῶν ἐτύγχανον ἐπὶ περιεόουσι, καὶ χερσὶ καὶ στόμασι “In that place they defended themselves with their swords, as many as yet had such, as and with fists and teeth;” Herodotus 225.3, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 542-543

53 κατέχωσαν οἱ βάρβαροι βάλλοντες, οἳ μὲν ἐξ ἐναντίης ἐπισπόμενοι καὶ τὸ ἔρυμα τοῦ τείχεος συγχώσαντες, οἳ δὲ περιελθόντες πάντοθεν περισταδόν. “till the foreigners overwhelmed them with missile weapons, some attacking them in front and throwing down the wall of defence, and others standing around them in a ring.” Herodotus 225.3, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 542-543

54 The Greeks never violated the terms of their ideology, fought the way they ought to until they could no longer, and halted an army they should not have been able to halt for any stretch of time for a few days. While a total defeat, this is a successful utilization of the hoplitic ideology in practice.
clearly evidenced by the act of combing their hair before battle.\textsuperscript{55} While the Spartans are preparing to kill or be killed they are also preparing to kill and be killed well. The acquisition of glory, through what will be the ultimate version of standing one’s ground, is for what the three-hundred Spartans prepared. They were correct to do so, of course; for their efforts in Thermopylae, Simonides wrote a couplet,

\[\text{ὦ ξεῖν’, ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε κείμεθα, τοῖς κείνων ὄντα πειθόμενοι.}\]

Stranger, report to the Spartans that we lie here, obedient to their words.\textsuperscript{56} (Simonides in Herodotus 7.228, trans. David A. Campbell pp. 540-541)

Therefore, I posit that the Persians reformed the Archaic ideology in the Classical period since they were foreigners who gave a ‘united’ Greece its first common enemy.

The Persians’ clear violation of Greek ways and the lessons that the Greeks must have learned from such a violation are exactly what I think reformed hoplitic ideology going into the Classical period. The violation against the Spartans at Thermopylae resulted in a defeat which Herodotus refers to as \textit{trôma}, “misfortune” or “wound.”\textsuperscript{57} It seems apparent that this wound was struck deep, impacting even the way of thinking. I would say that a modern example of such a \textit{trôma} afflicted the Americans during 9/11. As much as Thermopylae was a defeat, it was also the Spartan’s finest hour in a way; Cartledge says on the matter of Thermopylae, “Yet it was none the

\textsuperscript{55} Hdt. 7.208. This is a preparation for battle as they had done in the past. It is said to be a preparation to kill or be killed, and the application of things which enhance their masculinity or their physique only contribute to their visage while competing. \textsuperscript{1}“τοὺς μὲν δὴ ὃρα γυμναζομένους τῶν ἀνδρῶν, τοὺς δὲ τὰς κόμας κτενιζομένους. (He saw some of the men exercising naked and others combing their hair.)”

\textsuperscript{56} Much quoted by later writers; ascribed to Sim. in \textit{Palatine Anthology} and by Cicero, who translated it (\textit{T.D.} 1. 42).

\textsuperscript{57} Ἐν δὲ τῷ διὰ μέσου χρόνῳ, ἐπείτε τὸ ἐν Θερμοπόλῃ τρῶμα ἐγέγονεν, αὐτίκα Θεσσαλοὶ πείμπουσι κήρυκα ἐς Φωκέας, ἅτε οἱ σφι ἔχοντες αἰεὶ χόλον, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ὑστάτου τρώματος καὶ τὸ κάρτα. “In the meantime, immediately after the misfortune at Thermopylae, the Thessalians sent a herald to the Phocians, inasmuch as they bore an old grudge against them, and more than ever by reason of their latest disaster.” Herodotus 8.27.1, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 26-27
less glorious or culturally significant for that, since it was soon converted into a moral, that is a morale, victory.”58 Americans who lived through 9/11 would understand this concept, that a great defeat could be turned into the most potent of rallying cries, shake an entire country to their core, and reform the way they think.

2.2 Ideological Shift in the Classical Period

The political environment of the Classical period was not conducive to the same ideology held in the Archaic period. Although Greeks were still fighting against Greeks such as in the Peloponnesian War, the scale of battle increased. It became much more complicated, much more involved, and victory became much more vital to the survival of your city-state’s entire legacy. As seen with Thermopylae, there were violations that took place which devastated Greek forces despite the successful utilization of Archaic hoplitic tactics. The difference between Archaic and Classical warfare in ancient Greece is easy to see. Runciman dubs later warfare to be more “sophisticated” because of its accompaniment of ambushes, pursuits, sieges, the destruction of property, campaigning, and the utilization of sophisticated military units, all of which became quickly present in Classical warfare.59 This is not to say that Archaic warfare did not hold a deadly purpose which in its own right was sophisticated, but that the Classical period was far more involved and far more advanced. Given the events of the Persian War, it is logical to suggest this change occurred in the fight against the Persians. With this in mind, the changes into the Classical period should be established. Since the end goal of this paper is to show changes in equipment as reflections of the ideology, determining how and into what the ideology changed is imperative. Above, I discussed the how; next, I aim to discuss the into what.

58 Cartledge 2007, p. 199
59 Runciman 1998, p. 731
The competitive nature of the Archaic period shifted from being a hoplitic ideology to a political one. With Athens turning to conquest, a whole new objective emerged in hoplitic warfare; to assert control over everything, to dominate everyone, and to enact Greek hegemony.

Plutarch explains in his life of Cimon that against Barbarians nothing was done,

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου τελευτὴν πρὸς μὲν τοὺς βαρβάρους οὐδὲν ἐτι λαμπρὸν ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς ἐπράξθη στρατηγοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ τραπέντες ὑπὸ δημαγωγῶν καὶ πολεμοποιῶν ἐπ’ ἅλληλους, οὐδενὸς τὰς χεῖρας ἐν μέσῳ διασχόντος, συνεφόραγησαν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον,

After his death no further brilliant exploit against the Barbarians was performed by any general of the Hellenes, who were swayed by demagogues and partisans of civil war, with none to hold a mediating hand between them, till they actually clashed together in war. (Plutarch Cim. 19.2, trans. Bernadotte Perrin 464-465)

This paints the picture of Greece which emerged in the beginning of the Classical period. This means that how hoplites thought battle ought to be conducted became multiform. Sieges began to be conducted, archers and cavalry employed and then improved, and other techniques utilized to further the goals of hegemony. With these things changing, the emphasis which was on the hoplite in the Archaic period shifted to emphasize a diverse military corps utilizing various martial disciplines to further political intrigue. In Euripides’ Heracles, Lykos begins to berate Heracles as a coward for using a bow; in retaliation, Amphitryon says,

τὸ πάνσοφον δ᾿ εὐρήμα, τοξήρη σαγήν, μὲμφη· κλυών νυν τάττ᾿ ἐμοῦ σοφὸς γενοῦ.

This paints the picture of Greece which emerged in the beginning of the Classical period. This means that how hoplites thought battle ought to be conducted became multiform. Sieges began to be conducted, archers and cavalry employed and then improved, and other techniques utilized to further the goals of hegemony. With these things changing, the emphasis which was on the hoplite in the Archaic period shifted to emphasize a diverse military corps utilizing various martial disciplines to further political intrigue. In Euripides’ Heracles, Lykos begins to berate Heracles as a coward for using a bow; in retaliation, Amphitryon says,

τὸ πάνσοφον δ᾿ εὐρήμα, τοξήρη σαγήν, μὲμφη· κλυών νυν τάττ᾿ ἐμοῦ σοφὸς γενοῦ.
You find fault with that cleverest of inventions, the bow. Hear then what I have to say and learn wisdom! The infantryman is the slave of his arms, and if he breaks his spear, he cannot ward off death from himself since that is his only defense. And because the men who are with him in the ranks are not brave, he is killed, and the cause is the cowardice of his neighbors. But the man who is skilled with the bow has this one great advantage: when he has shot countless arrows, he still has others to defend himself from death. He stands far off and avenges himself on his enemies by wounding them with arrows they cannot see even though their eyes are open. He does not expose his body to the enemy but keeps it well protected. This is the shrewdest thing in battle, to hurt the enemy and save your own life, being independent of fortune. (Euripides Her. 188-203 trans. David Kovacs pp. 326-329)

This passage shows a changing attitude not only towards archery, but also towards the effectiveness of hoplitic warfare. If archery is the wisest weapon, why not have an army full of archers? The idea that archery is wise, but cowardly, shows not only the Archaic ideals about missiles, but also the newly emerging Classical thought that perhaps there is a more efficient way of fighting. This shows a clear shift from the practice of limiting weapons to the idea that whatever is most efficient in killing is best. In practice, this is an evident shift. At the Battle of Plataea, a messenger of Pausanias uttered to the Athenians, “do us the service of sending us your archers.”

Aristotle talks further about the emergence of a diversifying Greek military in his Politics, saying, “and military forces are four, cavalry, hoplites, light-infantry, and the navy.”

---

60 ὑμεῖς δ᾽ ἠμιν τοὺς τοξότας ἀποπέμψαντες χάριν θέσθε “yet do us the service of sending us your archers.” Herodotus. 9.60.3, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 232-233

61 τέτταρα δὲ τὰ χρήσιμα πρὸς πόλεμον, ἵππων ὀπλιτικὸν ψυλὸν ναυτικόν, “and military forces are of four classes, cavalry, heavy infantry, light infantry and marines,” Aristotle. Pol. 6.1321a, trans. H. Rackham, pp. 514-515
While these are military units which were present in the Archaic period, they were not present in equal amounts; the cavalry was exclusive to the rich, the light-infantry was regarded as cowardly and secondary to the hoplites, and the navy was a completely separate force with entirely different functions. Furthermore, the Greeks in the Archaic period emphasize the phalanx-fighting soldier, i.e. the hoplite, while the Classical Greeks put their emphasis on what is most useful for any particular situation. Therefore, Aristotle seems to be hitting on a change in how these battles are being fought during his time, residing in the late Classical period. Rather than a strict change in how hoplites are being utilized, the change is in the diversification of the military unit towards a more Homeric approach, where on the field of battle a number of martial disciplines might be found. This must have changed before the Peloponnesian War since Thucydides describes this diversification in the Battle of Syracuse:

καὶ πρῶτον μὲν αὐτῶν ἐκατέρων οἱ τε λιθοβόλοι καὶ σφενδονήται καὶ τοξώται προμάχοντο καὶ τροπάς, οίας εἰκὸς ψιλοὺς, ἀλλὰ δὲ μάντεις τε οφάγα προύφερον τὰ νομίζομενα καὶ σαλπικταὶ ἔσποτρυνον τοῖς ὀπλίταις,

And at first the stone-throwers and slingers and bowmen skirmished, driving each other back, first one side and then the other, as light-armed troops would be likely to do. Afterwards the soothsayers brought forward the customary sacrifices and trumpeters stirred the hoplites to the charge. (Thucydides 6.69.2, trans. Charles Forster Smith pp. 304-305)

Accordingly, I note that this same level of diversification does not appear in similar context before the Persian Wars. Furthermore, in the Classical period, the “arena of war” becomes much larger, and less delineated. Further, the limitations of battle are not always discussed beforehand evidenced by the rise in popularity of sieges, such as the siege of Syracuse in 415 detailed in
Thucydides’ *Peloponnesian War*. The practice of sieging was fairly unknown to the Greeks before the Persian invasion, in which the Persians utilized the tactic several times, notably at Naxos in 499 and Eretria in 490.

This is not to say that the staged and very contractual battles of the Archaic period did not occur in the Classical period, but what did occur was denoted as being old-fashioned and not often employed in practice. In 420, for instance, when the Spartans and the Argives were debating over the Thyreatis, Thucydides tells us that the Argives requested from the Lacedaemonians that a land-dispute be settled,

ἐν μὲν τῷ παρόντι ὁπονδάς ποιήσωσθαι ἐτη πενήντα, ἐξείναι δ’ ὁπότεροιοιν προκαλεσαμένοις, μὴ τούτουν οὕσης μὴτε πολέμου Λακεδαίμονι καὶ Ἀργεί, διαμάχεσθαι περὶ τῆς γῆς ταύτης, ὠσπερ καὶ πρότερὸν ποτε ὅτε αὐτοὶ ἐκάτεροι ἡξίωσαν νυκὰν, διώκειν δὲ μὴ ἐξείναι περαιτέρω τῶν πρὸς Ἀργος καὶ Λακεδαίμονα ὠρων.

… for the present that a treaty should be made for fifty years; that, however, either Lacedaemon or Argos, provided there were at the time neither pestilence nor war in either place, might challenge the other to decide by battle the question about this territory—just as once before, when each had claimed to be victorious—but pursuit must not be made beyond the boundaries, between Argos and Lacedaemon. (Thucydides 5.41.2, trans. Charles Forster Smith pp. 78-81)

Settling a dispute in the same regard as the Champions dispute, which I referenced in chapter one, implies the Argives and Spartans participating in what was the Archaic custom of champion warfare. Evidence of the movement from this idea is given by the response of the Spartans, who only agreed to this to finally resolve the issue with Argos, despite that “at first this seemed to the Lacedaemonians mere folly.”

62 τοῖς δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοις τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔδοξει μωρία εἶναι ταύτα. Thucydides 5.41.2 trans. Charles Forster Smith pp. 80-81
These are the changes to a military ideology which took place following the Persian War. The Greeks as a whole began to diversify their military units to fight in a way which best furthered them to victory. By diversifying, the Classical Greeks moved towards a semblance of Homer’s field of multiple contests. The Classical Greeks utilized archers, cavalry, and other units on their field of battle, just as Homer’s Greeks did. Thucydides, before discussing the Peloponnesian War, even harkens back to Homer, saying of him,

The best evidence of this is given by Homer; for, though his time was much later even than the Trojan war, he nowhere uses this name of all, or indeed of any of them except the followers of Achilles of Phthiotis, who were in fact the first Hellenes, but designates them in his poems as Danaans and Argives and Achaeans. And he has not used the term Barbarians, either, for the reason, as it seems to me, that the Hellenes on their part had not yet been separated off so as to acquire one common name by way of contrast. However this may be, those who then received the name of Hellenes, whether severally and in succession, city by city, according as they understood one another’s speech, or in a body at a later time, engaged together in no enterprise before the Trojan war, on account of weakness and lack of intercourse with one another. (Thucydides 1.3.3-4, trans. Charles Forster Smith pp. 6-9)

Thucydides points to the Trojan War as an example of an “absence of mutual intercourse from displaying any collective action.” Despite the fact that there was not this absence in the Peloponnesian War altogether, Thucydides still points to the Trojan War as a historical parallel.
Innovation and Ideology

3.1 Head and Body Armor

Contrary to popular belief grounded, at least in part, in the unarmored Spartans of 300\textsuperscript{63} and the prevalence of the heroic nude at the forefront of exposure to Greek art, evidence derived from depictions on vase paintings heavily suggests Greek hoplites armored themselves during the entirety of their history. Further, hoplites fought in a specific way for much of their history and, as such, bore equipment which exemplified the ideals they held. The stores of evidence suggestive of Ancient Greek armament contain images of armored hoplites on pottery, remaining examples of these objects in bronze, and descriptions of hoplites in a variety of ancient authors. I mean to analyze several types of equipment—namely torso armor, helmets, and the shield and spear used in the field definition of a hoplite—within the framework of the hoplitic ideology which I have laid out in the previous two chapters. By doing this I hope to show a deeply-rooted connection between the objects being used to the ideals held by Ancient Greek hoplites.

I will start first by analyzing chest armor. In the earliest parts of hoplitic history, the most frequent type of armor depicted on vase painting is the bell cuirass, which can be clearly seen in Figure 3 worn by the figure on the left. The bell cuirass was a corselet which had some definition for the chest and abdomen, but was otherwise rounded and without the very detailed contours which are found in the muscle cuirass which emerged later when metallurgical techniques advanced enough to allow for such detail. Both of these types of armor would have been symbols of wealth and power given the sheer amount of skill required to construct such equipment and for the cost of bronze alone. The typology of the bell cuirass is laid out in more detail in Arnold

---

Hagemann’s *Griechische Panzerung, Ein entwicklungsgeschichtliche Studie zur antiken Bewaffnung, Teil I: Der Metallharnisch*, cited by Aldrete in his work on *linothorakes*, describing the development of the bell cuirass from 750 through 500 BCE at which time it can be recognizably defined as a muscle cuirass, an example of which can be seen in Figure 4. The muscle cuirass was typified by a more contoured piece of armor which was made to resemble the ideal peak of male anatomy, made in two-halves for the front and back.

Another type of torso armor attested is the linen corselet. Homer refers to it in the *Iliad* twice, once in reference to Ajax the Lesser and the other in reference to Adrastius and Araphius:

> ὀλίγος μὲν ἐην, λινοθώρηξ,
> ἐγχείη δ᾿ ἐκέκαστο Πανέλληνας καὶ Ἀχαιοῦς· …
> τῶν ἢρχ᾿ Ἀδριστὸς τε καὶ Ἀμφιος λινοθώρηξ,
υἷε δύω Μέροπος Περκωσίου, ὃς περὶ πάντων ἔγενε μαντοσύνας, οὐδὲ οὕς πάδας ἔασε οὐτείχεν ἐς πόλεμον φθιόνυρα.

Short he was, with corselet of linen, but with the spear he surpassed Panhellenes and Achaeans. … … these were led by Adrastus and Amphius, with corselet of linen, sons of Merops of Percote, who excelled all men in prophesying, and would not allow his sons to go into battle, the destroyer of men. (Homer Il. 2.529-530, 2.830-834, trans. A. T. Murray, pp. 100-101, 122-123)

This is an important mention for a couple of reasons, the most important being that this is a very early attestation of linen body armor, no matter the dating of Homer. The linen corselet is also attributed to the Argives in the Greek Anthology, where it is preserved in the response of a Delphic oracle to what seems to be “Who are the best of the Greeks?” Herodotus also mentions the dedication of a linen corselet to Athena. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the Archaic poet Alcaeus references linen body armor, saying “corselets of new linen.” This is an important reference because, unlike Homer, it is dated specifically to the early sixth century BCE and is a clear reference to the type of armor used in later periods.

64 The other being that this attribution is isolated to only a handful of soldiers, whereas bronze is not nearly as isolated.


66 τούτο δὲ τῇ ἐν Λίνδῳ Αθηναίῃ δύο τε ἄγαλματα λίθια καί θώρηκα λίνεον ἄξιοθέητον “to Athene of Lindus two stone images and a marvellous linen breast-plate,” Herodotus 2.81.5, trans. A. D. Godley, pp. 496-497

67 μαρμαίρει δὲ μέγας δόμοις/χάλκωι, παῖσα δ᾿ Ἀρην κεκόσμηται στέγα/λάμπραισιν κυνίαισι, κατά/τὰ λέυκα/πάρδα/κεφάλαισιν/ἄνδρώι ἄγαλματα·/χάλκιαι δὲ πασσάλοις/κρύπτοις·/περικείμεναι/λάμπραις περικείμεναί·/πάρδα/Χαλκίδικαι σπάθαι·/πάρδα/δὲ ζώματα πάλλα· καὶ κυπάσσιδες. “and the great hall gleams with bronze: the whole ceiling is dressed for the war-god with bright helmets, down from which nod white horse-hair plumes, adornments for men’s heads. Bright bronze greaves hide the pegs they hang on, defence against a strong arrow; there are corslets of new linen and hollow shields thrown on the floor. Beside them are swords from Chalcis and many belts and tunics.” Alcaeus Fr. 140, trans. David A. Campbell pp.304-307
These are important mentions of this equipment because this armor, which modern scholars such as Dr. Gregory Aldrete have called the *linothorax*, appears on a large scale first in the pictorial record of the Classical period but does not seem to hold many roots in the Archaic period. While it is impossible to know if the armor referred to by Homer is the same type of armor mentioned by Herodotus, what is clear during the fifth century is that the *linothorax* takes over as a predominant form of armor shown in Greek art. Aldrete has pioneered the study of the *linothorax* through the experimental practice of reconstruction, and has scoured the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* in search of depictions of this linen armor of which Figure 5 is one. Through experimentation and the manipulation of different variables, such as the type of linen used or the method used to laminate the layers, Aldrete found that his *linothorax* was able to completely withstand arrows and other types of damage up until c. 200 BCE, at which point he found it became obsolete due to better blacksmithing practices which produced sharper weapons. Furthermore, in his speech at the University of London in 2015, Aldrete made the point at length that the *linothorax* was a unique form of armor given that its simple and cheap construction allowed for mothers and wives to produce armor for their husbands and sons leaving for war. If, as Aldrete

---

68 Aldrete
suggests, these attributes can be associated with the *linothorax*, they become groundbreaking given the costliness of bronze and the required skill to work it.

In the Classical period, where larger armies are fielded and extended campaigning led to compulsory military service, the use of the *linothorax* as a predominant form of equipment is understandable. Xenophon attests the presence of these linen chest plates, writing in his *Anabasis*:

εἶχον δὲ θώρακας λινοὺς μέχρι τοῦ ἢτρου, ἀντὶ δὲ τῶν περφύγων σπάρτα πυκνὰ ἐστραμμένα.

They had corselets of linen reaching down to the groin, with a thick fringe of plaited cords instead of flaps. (Xenophon *Anab.* 4.7.15, trans. Carleton L. Brownson pp. 360-361)

Furthermore, a possible reference to the *linothorax* appears in Plato’s *Epistles* when a “soft armor” is referenced.\(^{69}\) Despite the positive attributes of the *linothorax* and its references in the Archaic period, it is not well-attested by art before the Classical period, and given its construction we may never know if it was used on a wide scale. In art of the Archaic period, the bell cuirass and the heroic nude are the Greek chest imagery of choice, and the muscle cuirass comes later in the Classical period. The *linothorax* can very strongly be attributed to the Classical and Hellenistic periods, however, and a very clear shift towards favoring this armor is preserved in Cornelius Nepos’ *Iphicrates*, who writes about military reforms which resulted in the arming of all hoplites with the *linothorax*.\(^{70}\) This supposed arming would have occurred in the early fourth century, approximately one-hundred years after the Greco-Persian Wars.

---

\(^{69}\) Κρατίνῳ τῷ Τιμοθέου μὲν ἀδελφῷ, ἐμῷ δ᾽ ἑταίρῳ, θώρακα δοθήσαμεν ὁπλιτικὸν τῶν μαλακῶν τῶν πεζῶν, “To Cratinus the brother of Timotheus, and my own companion, let us present a hoplite’s corslet, one of the soft kind for foot-soldiers;” Plato *Epistle* 13.363A, trans. R. G. Bury, pp. 624-625

\(^{70}\) *Idem genus loricarum mutavit* 1 et pro sertis atque aeneis linteas dedit. “he changed the character of their breastplates, giving them linen ones in place of bronze cuirasses or chain armour.” Cornelius Nepos, *Iphicrates* 1.4, trans. J. C. Rolfe pp. 126-127
I argue that the *linothorax* was not depicted due to bronze armor’s better association with wealth and virtue. As I suggested in the previous two chapters, the Greeks in the Archaic period fought in a way which valued staying in place, fought against enemies who held their same values, and fought using a very strict unity within their phalangeal organization. This differs from the Classical period, where the *linothorax* becomes more commonly depicted, where maneuverability, versatility, and the diversification of the military corps would require the attributes of the *linothorax*. It may be valid to suggest the *linothorax* was in use during the Archaic period and ancient Greek potters simply wanted to depict soldiers in a heroic way by wearing bronze. This suggestion is supported in part by the ratio of archaeological examples of Archaic breastplates to Archaic helmets. Aldrete conducted an exhaustive search for examples of the *linothorax* and came up with 684 examples across many mediums including black-, red-, and white-figure vases, sculpture, bronze objects, and painted frescos.\(^{71}\) When I conducted a search on the Beasley Pottery database,\(^{72}\) 4,987 depictions of soldiers became available. Even if I were to assume all 684 examples which Aldrete found could be eliminated from the five-thousand examples in the archive, the examples which do not depict *linothorakes* still outnumber those that do by a very large margin. However, while it is impossible to accurately gauge the usage of linen armor in the Archaic period on this alone because of the decomposition of linen, there is very clearly a difference between the amount of depictions of bronze armor and linen armor. That difference may very well hinge upon Greek attitudes concerning bronze and its relation to their ideological concepts of unity, immovability, and greatness.

\(^{71}\) Aldrete 2013, pp. 169-208

\(^{72}\) The Beazley archive is a fantastic source which contains photographs of ancient Greek painted pottery, as well as relevant books and offprints, extensive material on the history of gem-collecting, and thousands of other documents and photographs relating to classical archaeology and to Sir John Beazley. Much of the archive can be found online at [http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/pottery/default.htm](http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/pottery/default.htm)
Next, I will analyze helmets. In terms of helmets in ancient Greece, Peter Connoly says of their origins, “There are several forms of Greek helmet but they all seem to have evolved from two prototypes - the Kegel and the primitive Corinthian.” The Kegel style helmet did not outlast the eighth century, but other helmet types which are believed to be descendants of this type continued well into the Classical period. On the other hand, the Corinthian helmet, which is depicted worn by the soldiers in Figure 6, lasted well through the Archaic period, remaining the most popular helmet by far into the fifth century, at which point it is quickly replaced by the Illyrian helmet, which itself descends from the Kegel, along with the Chalcidian, and later the Thracian, Pilos, and Attic style helmets.

The Corinthian helmet was characterized by covering most of the head, including the nape of the neck in some cases. It included a nasal guard, and the extensions which protected the cheeks were very large, in some cases leaving little opening between them. The eyes were contoured into the helmet, and

---

73 Connoly 2012, p. 60
decorations often mimicked hair and eyebrows, but also included lotuses and other designs.

Figure 7 shows evidence of a rim being riveted to the edges, evidenced by the lines of holes which still have rivets driven into them. These designs become more common in the sixth century, while before the helmets were far simpler and in some cases did not conform to a very realistic head-shape. Until the fifth century, the Corinthian helmet is shown to be the most popular helmet in use, so much so that even Herodotus names it as the standard helmet of the Greeks, although in a story not about hoplites:

πρὶν δὲ ἀνεῖναι αὐτὰς μάχεσθαι, τάδε ποιεύοι κοινή· παρθένον τὴν καλλιστεύουσαν ἐκάστοτε κοσμήσαντες κυνέη τε Κορινθίη καὶ πανοπλή Ἑλληνική καὶ ἐπ’ ἀρμα ἀναβιβάσαντες περιάγουσι τὴν λίμνην κύκλῳ.

Before the girls are set fighting, the whole people choose ever the fairest maiden, and equip her with a Corinthian helmet and Greek panoply, to be then mounted on a chariot and drawn all along the lake shore. (Herodotus 4.180.3, trans. A. D. Godley pp. 382-383)

The use of the Corinthian helmet is understandable in the Archaic period because the limitations on hearing and vision mattered less when the playing-field was evened by total use of this helmet
given the standard heavy-infantry designation of hoplites. The hoplites could rely on their comrades, who were equally limited, to protect them in the phalanx, and they could also rely on the fact that the enemy would not use a lighter-armed unit to underhandedly attack them. The greater protection of the Corinthian helmet, therefore, only made sense in practice until the diversification of the military corps to include lighter-armed troops, such as archers and peltasts, who could take advantage of any hoplitic limitations. Despite this, even once the later helmets take its place in practice, the Corinthian helmet continues to be displayed in art. The ideology of the Archaic period was better equipped for the acknowledgement of glory than the Classical period, and for this reason it seems the Corinthian helmet became a symbol of glory going into the Classical period despite the fact that whatever restrictions body armor imposed on the most heavily armed hoplites were no longer in force by the late fifth century.

The helmets actually being utilized in the Classical period were diverse, and in a way paralleled the ideological shift towards a diverse military corps. The Corinthian helmet became obsolete because the Chalcidian helmet (Figure 8) did not restrict hearing or vision nearly as much, and for the very same reason the Illyrian helmet (Figure 9) was adopted. Their advancement lies in their versatility—in all of them, hearing and vision are not impaired nearly as much, if at all. Because the restrictions were reduced, the hoplites could still be utilized as a heavy-infantry unit. The adoption of these diverse helmets lends itself to the idea that the vulnerability of Archaic hoplites was removed in the Classical period, and that in the Archaic period this same vulnerability did not need removal because the cause for the vulnerability was not yet existent.

These shifts in armor are reflective of the shift which occurred in the ideology following the Persian War in that the emphasis changed on what was important while wearing or depicting
armor. Archaic art emphasized what was heroic and glorious, or what was high-status, because of the value Greeks placed on the relationship of the warrior to their efforts for glory. In the Classical period, the Greeks moved away from actually wearing this equipment because their needs changed from wanting to look good in war into wanting to become an efficient killing machine. This is a fact established in *Iphicrates* whereby the *linothorax* was wholly adopted, but again by the evolving design of the Greek helmet in which the diversification of the military corps is inherently practiced. This, however, did not stop the Classical Greeks from emphasizing the desire for glory in art; bronze continues to be displayed throughout, as in Figure 10 by the depiction of the Corinthian helmet.

Despite this, the ideological shift changed equipment in practice.

### 3.2 The Shield and Spear

Aside from this defensive equipment, I would now like to discuss the pieces of equipment which are arguably the most important pieces of equipment—the shield and spear. They show their importance well by their abundance in artistic representations, since only very rarely are hoplites depicted
without either a shield or at least one spear, and more often than not they are depicted with both, a fact holding true for both the Archaic and Classical periods. These weapons reflect the nature of hoplitic warfare since, through their construction and intended use, are telling of exactly how a hoplite conducted himself in war.

The hoplitic shield, called an *aspis* or sometimes a *hoplon* (which in the plural, *hopla*, refers to all of the hoplite’s equipment), has several traits which distinguish it from other sorts of shields, such as the earlier dipylon type. The most important aspect which scholars have fixated on since the 19th century is the double-grip composed of a metal armbands called a *porpax* and a rope circumnavigating the inside of the offset rim called the *antilabe*. In Figure 11, the *antilabe* can be clearly seen in the hand of the hoplite, and in Figure 10 the *porpax* can be seen as the band around the soldier’s arm. These elements are a standard for the *aspis* from its inception until the early Hellenistic period, while other elements also existed but were slightly more in flux. These elements include a level of concavity producing a dish-like shield, sometimes so concave that the rim was offset at a 90° angle in relation to the face of the shield. The *aspis* seems to have been sometimes covered with a bronze sheet, known because this bronze is often all that survives as in the case of Figure 12. Unfortunately, pop-culture has misconstrued what this shield looked like, for 300’s
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representation of all metal shields is not accurate—Krentz suggests that most shields were made of either willow or poplar, and that these woods would have provided for a lighter shield which was more resistant to cracking than if a harder wood had been used. Furthermore, Aldrete’s research on the *linothorax* showed that a sheet of fabric or hide could have had the same protective properties of bronze depending on how it was treated, and would have resulted in a lighter shield. The dimensions of the average *aspis* are given by Matthew, who says the wooden shield alone was “between 80cm and 122cm in diameter and 10cm deep with a 5-7cm offset rim…estimates for the weight of the shield range between 6kg and 8kg.”

The offensive portion of the hoplitic panoply was the spear, called the *doru*. Matthews gives a range of 183-305cm for the length of the *doru*, while the weight is dependent on the two characteristic attributes: the spearpoint and the butt-spike, or *sauroter*. Snodgrass reports that the “hoplite spear *par excellence,*” is the J-Style, which Matthews says “at Olympia average 279mm in length, 31 mm in width, and have an average weight of 153g. Many finds of spearheads at other locations also seem to fall within the parameters set by the ‘J style’.” Furthermore, some of these finds reportedly date back as far as the Greek Dark Ages, while Robinson suggests others may be from *sarissae*, which were much longer pikes used by Macedonian armies in the late Classical through the Hellenistic period. Matthews suggests differently, but says of the larger spearheads that they “were almost certainly used for throwing.” Regardless of any slight variance, which Matthews tells us include outliers as short
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as 93mm and as long as 290mm, the suggestion is that there was not much change in the average size of spearheads from the Archaic to the Classical period, at least not until the introduction of the *sarissae* which on their own are not well-understood or when the spearhead is actually from a javelin. These spearheads featured a tubular socket into which a shaft would be inserted. Either they would be connected with some sort of adhesive, or by a nail or a rivet secured through a single hole.\(^{80}\)

More problematic in attempting to distinguish characteristics is the *sauroter*, of which a more diverse variety exists. They are broken into two main categories based on their shape, and Matthews suggests that one category was used for spears while the other for javelins, a thought derived from a statement by Thucydides,

\[\text{τῶν δὲ Πλαταιῶν τις τὰς πύλας ἢ ἔσηλθον καὶ αὐτὸπ ὃσαν μόνας ἀνεῳγμέναι, ἔχλησε στυρακίῳ ἀκοντίου ἀντὶ βαλάνου χρησάμενος ἐς τὸν μοχλόν, ὡστε μηδὲ ταύτῃ ἔξοδον ἐτι εἶναι.}\]

One of the Plataeans, moreover, had closed the gates by which they had entered—the only gates which had been opened—using the spike of a javelin instead of a pin to fasten the bar, so that there was no longer a way out in that direction either. (Thucydides 2.4.3, trans. Charles Forster Smith, pp. 64-265)

In this case, Matthews suggests, the *styrakion* is a lighter and smaller *sauroter* which would allow for the javelin to be thrown more easily. Because of the disparity between these in the archaeological record, averages for this equipment therefore are difficult to parse. Matthews gives ranges for average length between 160mm and 301mm, and for weight between 237g and

\(^{80}\) Matthew 2012, p. 4
689g, but concedes that these numbers include individuals which could be classified as either a sauroter or a styracon. Furthermore, the sauroter is not featured prominently in Greek art, if at all in most cases, so determining any typological significance based on the sauroter towards specific types of spears is likely impossible.

Determining the difference in the artistic record is possible, however. This typology is established based on an observation of where a spear is most comfortable and efficient while held and the differences in realistic measurements of the point of balance between spears and javelins. The difference in the point of balance between the two lies in the design; the sauroter of the javelin would require a more central point of balance to allow for stability and ease of propulsion in a functionally similar way to rifle-barreling as shown in Figure 13 in the individual who is holding the javelin nearer to the center. Likewise, the sauroter of the spear places the point of balance further back on the shaft so that a greater usable range can be attributed to it as a thrusting weapon as seen in Figure 14, in which the three individuals are spear-hunting and
clearly holding the weapon near to the back. This observation becomes consistent with the pottery record when documenting where the shaft is held and then considering the length of the weapon. Matthews found that illustrators would depict weapons of a shorter length held in the center of the shaft and weapons of a longer length held towards the end. This, Matthews says:

… is one of the indicators that clearly demonstrates the presence of two different weapons within the artistic record. The first is the thrusting spear … gripped at its correct point of balance towards the rear of the shaft despite whether a sauroter is shown in the image or not. The second is a javelin that would possess a central point of balance regardless of the presence of a styraion.

These weapons are testaments to the nature of hoplite warfare insofar as they are reflections of exactly how Greeks thought warfare ought to be conducted, and their presence on the battlefield was directly related to glory for both the individual and the state. With this particular shield and spear as the primary weapons, it became necessary to have a tighter formation which is commonly associated with the phalanx and depicted in the aforementioned scrum of a rugby game.⁸¹ Euripides refers to something like this in the Hercules Furens in which he associates the grasping of the spear to a certain glory gained, saying “His brother in arms were you when you were both young and grasped the spear in the battles of your youth: you did not disgrace your glorious country.”⁸²

The tight formation reinforced the “standing one’s ground” concept as holes in the phalanx would result in enemies flooding that hole, making more holes, and inevitably killing the
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⁸¹ Some scholars, such as Matthew (2012), have disputed the necessity for a tight formation. Given the size of the shield and the vulnerability a loose formation would produce to each soldiers right side, I find these disputes to be unconvincing. A loose formation would cause the right side to be completely open to attack unless the soldier were to pivot his entire body, which would in turn put his ability to use the spear in an accurate and effective manner in question.

men around those holes. Since there is little functional evolution in this period of these pieces of equipment, what I can say of them in relation to ideology is that the Greeks saw these weapons as effective in achieving their ideological requirements in both periods. This implies that in the Archaic period, the Greeks saw the shield as glorious, and in the Classical period the spear was seen as versatile. What is also implied is that a field definition including these pieces of equipment is valid, as soldiers holding these and nothing else held the only pieces of equipment static to hoplites of both periods.
Conclusion

In book 3 of Homer’s *Iliad*, Paris and Menelaus compete in a *monomachia* under terms which could effectively end the Trojan war. Hector and Odysseus measure out the arena for them, they choose lots to determine priority in the use of missile-weapons, and the terms of their engagement are very clearly stated and agreed upon. In the Archaic period, Greek hoplites fought in pitched battles consisting of opposing phalanxes. These pitched battles were regulated in such a way as to promote the ability for hoplites to gain glory through the limitations of things which would hinder their ability to compete. Hoplites of the Archaic period limited themselves in regards to the arena, weapons, and terms of war because the act of gaining glory was connected to being a hoplite, and to fight as hoplites they could not fight in asymmetric wars. Hoplites, as a heavy-infantry unity, do not survive against more mobile enemies who can launch ranged assaults. While hoplite phalanxes often lost battles by being routed, Paris too was deemed the loser in the duel\(^3\) with Menelaus for his retreat via Aphrodite.\(^4\)

In 480 BCE, Leonidas and his hoplites went into the battle of Thermopylae prepared to defend it as hoplites: they chose Thermopylae, and the spot along the pass, because it afforded them to even the odds with the massive Persian army; they did not engage with ranged weapons; and the terms were very clearly defined beforehand in that each and every Greek knew they went to this battle to die well in protection of their family against a foreign invader. Despite this, the Spartans did not end fighting as hoplites did in the Archaic period at Thermopylae, instead
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\(^3\) νίκη μὲν δὴ φαίνετ’ ἀφημφίλου Μενελάου, “Victory is now clearly seen to rest with Menelaus, dear to Ares;” Homer *Il.* 3.457, trans. A. T. Murray, pp. 162-163

\(^4\) αὐτὰρ ὁ ὄψις ἐπόρουσε καταχτάμεναι μενεαίνων ἐνθείς χαλκείῳ· τὸν δ᾿ ἐξήρπαξ᾿ Ἀφροδίτη ἥεια μᾶλ´ ὡς τε θεός, ἐκάλυψε δ᾿ ἀρφόν τοί, καὶ δ᾿ εἶο ἐν θαλάμῳ εὐώδει ἀναιωντ. “but he sprang back again, eager to kill with his spear of bronze. But him Aphrodite snatched up, very easily as a goddess can, and shrouded him in thick mist, and set him down in his fragrant, vaulted chamber” Homer *Il.* 3.379-382, trans. A. T. Murray pp. 156-157
fighting using whatever was at their disposal in a last-ditch *aristeia*, an *othismos* over the body of their dead king, and eventually their death at the hands of asymmetrical warfare, in which the Persians surrounded them and shot at them with arrows:

ἐν τούτῳ σφέας τῷ χώρῳ ἀλεξομένοις μαχαίρῃσι, τοῖσι αὐτῶν ἑτύγχαν ἐτερεοῦσαι, καὶ χεροὶ καὶ στόμασι κατέχοσαν οἱ βάρβαροι βάλλοντες, οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἐναντίης ἐπισπόμενοι καὶ τὸ ἐρύμα τοῦ τείχος συγχώσαντες, οἱ δὲ περιελθόντες πάντοθεν περιστάδον.

In that place they defended themselves with their swords, as many as yet had such, ay and with fists and teeth; till the foreigners overwhelmed them with missile weapons, some attacking them in front and throwing down the wall of defence, and others standing around them in a ring. (Herodotus 7.225, trans. A. D. Godley pp. 542-543)

Likewise, after Menelaus had been determined the winner, the Trojan War could have ended. But the terms of the duel were violated by Pandarus, in a way which the violation by the Persians mimics very closely—via an arrow. The type of battle seen most commonly throughout the *Iliad* after this incident is diversified into including any sort of weapon which could effectively kill the enemy. Likewise, following the volley of arrows launched by the Persians at the Battle of Thermopylae, Greek warfare changed to emphasize a diverse military corps.

I found that hoplitic equipment mirrored this progression—from the Archaic to the Classical period—in a way which emphasized both practices and ideas held by the Greeks. The Archaic hoplite was typified by the bronze cuirass, the Corinthian helmet, the large *aspis*, and a spear. A similar thing cannot be said of Classical hoplites, where there was an increase in depictions of the more versatile *linothorax* and a proliferation of helmet styles. Because the progression of equipment mirrors the changes in ideology, I think that it is accurate to say that hoplitic warfare was fluid, and this fluidity directly reflected contemporary ideas concerning how warfare ought to be conducted.
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