

PACHES

H. D. WESTLAKE

THUCYDIDES is "the least biographical of historians."¹ Consequently it is no way remarkable that the chapters in the third book of the *History* recording the events in which Paches played a leading role (18, 25–36, 49–50)² convey hardly any impression of his personality or any discernible assessment of his ability. Paches is, however, an even less clearly defined figure than his contemporaries, Phormio, Cnemus, and Alcidas, whose impact upon the development of the Archidamian war was certainly no greater than his. The reason for this disparity of treatment seems to be that, whereas the military leadership of Phormio, Cnemus, and Alcidas illustrates general lessons to which Thucydides wishes to draw the attention of his readers,³ that of Paches apparently does not, even though the suppression of the Lesbian revolt was a major achievement which profoundly influenced the course of the war. Paches appears abruptly in the *History* when appointed to a highly important command; his discharge of his responsibilities at Mytilene does not seem to elicit from Thucydides approval or disapproval, explicit or implicit;⁴ he disappears no less abruptly as soon as his mission has been completed, and Thucydides does not mention him again. The two sections of this paper—they are largely independent of one another—will investigate the circumstances of his eclipse, which are not recorded by Thucydides and can be reconstructed only from much later evidence. The first section will consider the grounds for complaints directed against Paches after his return to Athens; the second will suggest that the sensational story of his suicide in public is almost certainly apocryphal, being the result of some misunderstanding. A necessary preliminary to the first section is to list very briefly his principal actions during his command as recorded by Thucydides.

I

Paches is mentioned for the first time when in the autumn of 428 he was sent with 1000 Athenian hoplites to Lesbos because the forces already operating there against the rebels were too weak to establish a total blockade of Mytilene (18.3). There is no evidence from any source that

¹A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass. 1971) 64.

²References are to the third book unless otherwise stated.

³Cf. my *Individuals in Thucydides* (Cambridge 1968) 43–59 (Phormio), 137–142 (Cnemus), and 142–147 (Alcidas).

⁴See below p. 110 with n.15 on the implied criticism of his behaviour at Notium.

he had previously been in command of an expeditionary force, even jointly with others, or indeed that he had served on the board of *strategoi*. He was, however, in sole charge of the reinforcement sent to Mytilene and apparently took over responsibility for the direction of operations there from the three generals who had been in command since the previous spring.⁵ The Athenians were soon successful in completing the blockade by land as well as by sea (18.4–5), and it was maintained throughout the winter (25.2). When the city capitulated in the summer of 427, Paches negotiated the terms whereby the rebels were permitted to send an embassy to Athens to present their case before the assembly, which was to decide what action should be taken (28.1). Meanwhile Paches occupied Mytilene and recovered other Lesbian cities which had been in revolt; he pursued but failed to catch the Peloponnesian fleet which had arrived off the Asiatic coast too late to save Mytilene (33); on his return from the pursuit he reestablished Athenian control of Notium (34). Acting apparently upon instructions from Athens, he dispatched thither the leaders of the revolt who were eventually executed there, and most of his expeditionary force was sent home with them (35.1). He himself remained in Lesbos to deal with the aftermath of the revolt. Later the initial decree of the assembly directing him to execute the entire adult male population was communicated to him, but when he was on the point of carrying out his orders, they were countermanded by the arrival of a second dispatch announcing that the assembly had altered its decision (49.4).⁶ From the account of Thucydides neither the military nor the diplomatic activities of Paches would appear to have merited serious criticism, and even readers of the *History* who appreciate the fickleness of the Athenian democracy must feel some surprise that his name does not occur again in its pages.

The explanation is that Paches incurred disgrace which Thucydides has not chosen to mention. According to a story twice told, with slight variations, by Plutarch (*Nic.* 6.1; *Arist.* 26.5) Paches was convicted at his *εἵθυνα* and committed suicide by falling on his sword in the lawcourt. In each passage the reference to his fate is associated with a list of distinguished Athenians harshly treated by the demos, though the two lists are not identical. Although, as will be suggested in the second section of this paper, the more sensational details of the story are highly suspect, it could hardly have come into existence if Paches had not been subjected

⁵Cf. Diod. 12.55.5, *τὴν προὔπαρχουσαν δύναμιν παραλαβὼν* (though the phrase may only represent an inference by Ephorus from the impression created by the narrative of Thucydides).

⁶The report of Diodorus (12.55.10) that he was pleased by the reprieve of most Mytileneans and called a meeting to announce the news seems to be no more than a free adaptation of the Thucydidean version.

to public censure for some alleged misdemeanour relating to his military command. Plutarch does not specify the nature of this alleged misdemeanour, which has been the subject of some dispute, as will be seen below. It must be remembered that the formal charge was not necessarily identical with the real cause of complaint; the latter is historically of much greater interest and importance than the former.

The sensational story of Plutarch is matched by an equally sensational story preserved in an epigram written by Agathias in the fifth century A.D. (*Anth. Pal.* 7.614). According to this epigram Paches violated two Mytilenean women after slaying their husbands; they denounced him to the Athenian demos with the result that "they together drove him to a deadly fate." At first sight the story of Agathias appears to be remarkably in accord with the story of Plutarch: a passionate crime leads to a passionate reaction when the guilty man is faced with disgrace. Such indeed was the view of Grote,⁷ but the "intensity of anger" which he attributes to the Athenian jury and the "insupportable remorse and humiliation" which he attributes to Paches reflect the moral climate of his own time, a moral climate totally different from that of fifth-century Athens⁸—and also from that of to-day. When the siege of Mytilene at last ended and the Athenian troops occupied the city, some of them doubtless conducted themselves as troops normally do in such circumstances after a long period of active service (cf. 30.2), and if their general chose to exploit his authority in pursuit of personal satisfaction, his action is unlikely to have aroused much reprobation, even after his return to Athens. It also seems highly improbable that an accusation of the kind alleged to have been brought against Paches on the evidence of the two Mytilenean women would have been dealt with at a *εἴθυνα*, which was concerned with the discharge of public responsibilities.⁹ The other Athenian leaders listed by Plutarch as victims of the democracy were charged with misdemeanours in public life. Most scholars have rightly rejected the story told in the epigram of Agathias not so much because it was written some nine hundred years after the fall of Mytilene but rather because of its inherent improbabilities.¹⁰

A more promising line of approach to the problem is to try to detect in the narrative of Thucydides some basis for criticism of Paches in con-

⁷G. Grote, *History of Greece* (London 1888) 5.163–164.

⁸Even Alcibiades, though the scandals of his private life aroused popular alarm (6.15.4), was not thought to be disqualified thereby from holding high office. It was only when he was implicated in acts of impiety that the demos turned against him.

⁹A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* 2 (Oxford 1971) 208–211, cf. his interpretation of Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.2 (ibid. 29 and 209).

¹⁰Cf. G. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* 3.2 (Gotha 1904) 1034 n. 2. A. W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 2 (Oxford 1956) 332, who is inclined to accept the story, does not consider the objection that according to Plutarch Paches was accused at his *εἴθυνα*.

ducting his mission which might have led to an accusation against him. One suggestion is that, because he is twice stated to have taken such measures as he thought desirable in Lesbos after the collapse of the revolt (28.3; 35.2), he might have been accused of having acted arbitrarily and without authority from Athens.¹¹ There seems, however, to be no implication in the phrase used in both passages (*καθίστατο ἢ αὐτῷ ἐδόκει*) that he overstepped his powers as a *strategos*. It was clearly his responsibility to restore law and order throughout the island with the least possible delay.¹² His procedure when he received overtures from the Mytileneans offering to surrender was conspicuously free from any trace of autocracy: he was careful to negotiate only a provisional truce, leaving the final settlement to the discretion of the Athenian assembly (28.1). He was doubtless influenced by a desire to avoid the criticisms incurred by the Athenian generals at Potidaea, who imposed their own terms of surrender without referring them to the assembly for approval (2.70.4).¹³

Another explanation of the problem has been suggested, also based on recorded actions of Paches which may have led to attacks upon him after he returned to Athens. It has been maintained that his callous treachery in regaining Notium, especially his treatment of an Arcadian mercenary captain who was first tricked and then murdered (34.3), gave rise to the accusations against him.¹⁴ Thucydides conveys to his readers a clear impression that the behaviour of Paches at Notium was abhorrent to him,¹⁵ but it is most unlikely to have been viewed in the same light at Athens at the time, much less to have been the subject of a charge against Paches. Accusations against generals were normally the outcome of dissatisfaction when they failed to achieve what was expected of them,

¹¹Busolt, *loc. cit.*, followed by T. Lenschau, *RE* 18.2 (1942) 2068.

¹²Busolt, *loc. cit.*, also cites, as evidence of arbitrary behaviour, 35.1, where Paches includes among the leading rebels sent to Athens, *εἰ τις ἄλλος αὐτῷ αἷτιος ἐδόκει εἶναι τῆς ἀποστάσεως*. He was, however, surely entitled, even under an obligation, to use his own judgement in making his choice, basing it upon information received from others.

¹³R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 313, makes this convincing suggestion.

¹⁴H. Swoboda, *Thuk. Quellenstudien* (Innsbruck 1881) 73 ff. (known to me only from a citation by Busolt, *loc. cit.*), cf. A. Ferrabino, *L'impero ateniese* (Turin 1927) 128.

¹⁵Cf. Steup, n. *ad loc.* Grote, (above, n. 7) 163–164, who condemns the action of Paches as a “flagitious combination of deceit and cruelty,” expresses surprise because Thucydides “recounts it plainly and calmly, without a single word of comment.” Here Grote exhibits a singular lack of perception in failing to appreciate that his own verdict is precisely the verdict that Thucydides wishes to convey to his readers by dwelling on the discreditable elements of an unimportant episode. The passage is an admirable example of Thucydidean technique. An interesting contrast is provided by a chapter of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (20, Bartoletti), where the author, who tends to admire unscrupulous cleverness, describes with evident approval how Conon crushed a mutiny of mercenary troops by adopting methods parallel with those of Paches.

and in this instance the Athenians, exhausted as they were by the war and the plague, can scarcely have been in the mood to condemn acts of treachery and atrocity which benefited their own cause. The more violent elements of the population, led by the demagogues who were usually the most bitter critics of the generals, were doubtless more inclined to applaud than to censure the unscrupulous brutality of Paches at Notium.

A third explanation of the problem under discussion, which does not appear to have been suggested before, can be deduced from the narrative of Thucydides and may perhaps be considered to be more convincing than the two explanations examined above. One of the factors to which Thucydides attributes the initial decision of the Athenian assembly to massacre the adult male population of Mytilene is anger because a Peloponnesian fleet had ventured to sail to Ionia in support of the revolt (36.2). The appearance of this fleet in Asiatic waters had caused panic among the allies of Athens, whose cities were unfortified (33.2, cf. 32.3). When Alcidas decided to bolt for home across the Aegean, Paches at first pursued him energetically as far as Patmos, but then, because there was seen to be no longer any prospect of catching the Peloponnesians, he abandoned the chase and returned to his base at Mytilene. Thucydides claims to know what Paches felt as he turned back from Patmos: *κέρδος δὲ ἐνόμισεν, ἐπειδὴ οὐ μετέωροις περιέτυχεν, ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ ἐγκαταληφθεῖσαι ἡναγκάσθησαν στρατόπεδόν τε ποιεῖσθαι καὶ φυλακὴν σφίσι καὶ ἐφόρμησιν παρασχέιν* (33.3). This passage is abnormal in one respect. Thucydides seldom attributes undisclosed motives or feelings to individuals apart from a few major figures about whom he was evidently able to obtain an abundance of confidential information from reliable sources: these are Demosthenes in north-western Greece and at Pylos, Brasidas in the Thraceward area, Nicias in Sicily, Alcibiades in Asia. In the first three books of the *History*,¹⁶ amounting to more than one-third of the entire work, attributions of motives and feelings are very rare indeed: the treatment of Aristeus, the Corinthian leader at Potidaea, constitutes a remarkable exception.¹⁷

It is undeniable that Thucydides might have obtained reliable information about the feelings of Paches on this occasion by some lucky accident

¹⁶Excluding the closing chapters of the third book (91–116), where Demosthenes emerges as an important character.

¹⁷It is examined in my *Essays on the Greek Historians and Greek History* (Manchester 1969) 74–83. The presentation of Cleon has no parallel throughout the *History*: discreditable motives and feelings are attributed to him which must be inferred from an unfavourable assessment of his character rather than based upon unimpeachable evidence, cf. my *Individuals* (above, n. 3) 69–85. Occasionally Thucydides confesses some uncertainty in attributing motives and feelings (cf. 5.65.3, Agis; 8.94.2, Agesandridas), so that, where he does not express any doubts, he presumably has some confidence in the trustworthiness of his evidence.

which did not apply to other occasions. It is also conceivable that he might have inferred the feelings here attributed to Paches solely from knowledge of his actions and his character. Neither explanation, however, would be consistent with the evidence emerging from a study of other similar passages. The source from which Thucydides derived his information must be sought in another direction.

The tone of the views ascribed to Paches is markedly apologetic. He seems to be trying to justify, ostensibly for his own satisfaction, a rather questionable decision by resorting to rather questionable arguments. It is true that in parts of Lesbos Athenian authority had not yet been restored (35.1) and that much remained to be done before a final settlement was reached (50.2-3); but the revolt had already collapsed, and the flight of the Peloponnesians removed any danger that it might be revived. The visit of Paches to Notium, where his treacherous suppression of opposition must have kept him occupied for some time, hardly suggests that at the moment when he broke off his pursuit of the Peloponnesians he considered his immediate return to Mytilene to be imperative. It is not surprising that the Athenians were incensed by the escape of the enemy fleet.¹⁸ Many doubtless expressed feelings which were precisely the opposite of those attributed to Paches, namely that absolute priority should have been given to its capture or destruction and that, if it could have been forced to take refuge somewhere, the diversion of Athenian resources to conduct even a lengthy blockade would have been more than offset by the resultant advantages.¹⁹ The image of Athenian thalassocracy had been tarnished, and it would be consistent with the practice of this period if Paches was attacked by leaders of the extreme democracy, nominally for some financial misdemeanour but actually because, in spite of his success at Mytilene, he had failed to achieve the hardly less desirable objective of destroying the Peloponnesian fleet. The sentiments attributed to Paches on abandoning the pursuit are, as has been noted, self-justificatory, and the reason why Thucydides deserts his normal practice by reporting them without reservation may very well be that Paches actually expressed them in court to rebut accusations of culpable negligence.

Support for this explanation of the complaints directed against Paches may be found in the case of Phormio, who despite his two naval victories was apparently attacked at his *εἵδωνα* and condemned to pay a fine. The circumstances are obscure because the evidence is unsatisfactory, but

¹⁸Cf. W. S. Churchill, *The Second World War* 4 (London 1951) 98-102, on the episode, which caused much "wrath and distress among the public" (*ibid.* 71) when the *Scharnhorst* and *Gneisenau* "escaped from Brest and successfully made the passage of the English Channel to regain the shelter of their home ports."

¹⁹Later in the same summer this fleet, when reassembled and reinforced, seriously threatened Athenian interests during the civil strife at Corcyra despite the timid leadership of Alcidas (69-81).

from the reports of Thucydides on the campaigns of Phormio, though they convey a favourable impression of his leadership, it is easy to understand why criticism was directed against him after his return to Athens.²⁰ Thucydides mentions only that in the following year the Acarnanians requested that a son or relation of Phormio should be sent to the west to assume command there (7.1); evidently Phormio himself was not available. It is characteristic of Thucydides that he does not explain why Phormio could not be sent, and equally characteristic that he does not refer to the attacks to which Paches was subjected.²¹ It is true that the tendency of the Athenian democracy to treat its generals harshly is a phenomenon upon which he lays much emphasis,²² doubtless influenced by his own experience after his command at Amphipolis (5.26.5). On the other hand, in his account of the Lesbian revolt he characteristically directs the attention of the reader almost exclusively to a few significant features of the episode. The most important of these is the Athenian debate on the punishment of the rebels: he ends his report rather abruptly after recording the revocation of the order for the execution of the adult male population, which is the climax of the whole episode, and he adds only some bleak and unsatisfactory notes (50.1–3),²³ which have given rise to much discussion. Another salient feature of his account is the stress which the revolt imposed upon the Athenians, weakened as they were by the plague, and a third feature is the dilatory and irresolute handling of the Peloponnesian fleet by Alcidas. Because the generalship of Paches is not a major issue, his subsequent eclipse is the more easily ignored.

II

The authenticity of the story that Paches committed suicide in court does not seem to have been questioned by modern scholars, and it may appear to be confirmed by his abrupt disappearance after a largely successful command. Nevertheless, while the story cannot be conclusively proved to be apocryphal, there are factors which give rise to grave suspicion.

Suicide by Greeks in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. was undoubtedly rare: historians record very few instances, mainly by undistinguished

²⁰F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 3b, Suppl. 1 (1954) 125–137, cf. my *Individuals* (above, n. 3) 53–59.

²¹Cf. the absence of any comment on the temporary eclipse of Demosthenes after the failure of the operations against Boeotia culminating in the Athenian defeat at Delium.

²²2.70 (the generals at Potidaea, see above p. 110); 4.65.3–4 (Pythodorus, Sophocles, and Eurymedon after the first expedition to Sicily), cf. 7.48.4 (the fears of impeachment expressed by Nicias).

²³H. P. Stahl, *Thukydides, die Stellung des Menschen in geschichtlichen Prozess* (Munich 1966) 110, makes this point convincingly.

persons who would hardly have been mentioned by name if they had not attracted attention by committing suicide, prompted by some disgrace which they found intolerable.²⁴ The attitude of Greek thought towards suicide is a subject so complex that any brief statement on it must inevitably involve oversimplification. Very broadly, however, the Pythagoreans, followed by Plato and Aristotle, disapproved of suicide on principle, though with some reservations,²⁵ whereas the Cynics and the Stoics approved of it, though also with reservations. Under Stoic influence the Roman world, especially in the period of the Empire, regarded suicide as almost a duty for public figures who had fallen into disgrace or found themselves faced with irretrievable disaster.²⁶

The public suicide of a prominent general would thus appear much more remarkable to Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries than to Plutarch himself or to any predecessor writing within the preceding two hundred years or more. To Thucydides the incident might seem to be a personal matter and so to lie outside the scope of his *History*,²⁷ but for a variety of reasons it would appeal to many writers of the fourth century and early Hellenistic age—not only historians but also philosophers, gossip writers, and orators. Nothing could have been better suited “to point a moral or adorn a tale.” Although only a fraction of the literature produced by this period has survived, it was combed by later authors who lived before Plutarch, and many of them were attracted by sensational material. If, for example, the story had been recorded by Ephorus, it would in all probability have been taken over by Diodorus (12.55.10), who had a taste for anything sensational. In this instance the argument *ex silentio* is stronger than such arguments usually are.²⁸

Plutarch does not name the source from which he derives his story about the suicide of Paches. As has been noted above (page 114), in both passages in which the story appears (*Nic.* 6.1; *Arist.* 26.5) it is associated with a list of eminent fifth-century Athenians harshly treated by the

²⁴Hdt. 1.82.8 and 7.232 (both obscure Spartans); Thuc. 2.92.3 (one of the Spartan “advisers” in the second naval battle against Phormio), cf. 1.138.4 (a reference to a tradition, apparently not accepted by Thucydides, that Themistocles poisoned himself); Xen. *Hell.* 6.2.36 (the commander of a Syracusan naval squadron) and 7.4.19 (an Elean cavalry general). Philistus, *FGH Hist* 556 F 53 refers to the attempted suicide of Demosthenes in Sicily, cf. Plut. *Nic.* 27.2. According to the very late account of Justin (4.5.10), which is undoubtedly false, Demosthenes did actually commit suicide.

²⁵Plato *Phaedo* 61b–62d and *Laws* 9.873c–d; Aristotle *Eth. Nic.* 5.1138a9, cf. 3.1116a13.

²⁶The subject is fully discussed by J. M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge 1969) 233–255.

²⁷Cf. Gomme, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 10).

²⁸W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens* (Princeton 1971) 139–140, considers that the suicide of Paches bears witness to the “vehemence and impetuosity” of political life in the period in which it belongs. It is, however, highly questionable whether political life at Athens was then more vehement or impetuous than, for example, in the time of Demosthenes and Aeschines.

democracy. Plutarch did not compile these lists himself. The complaint against the democracy had evidently become a rhetorical commonplace before his day: for he refers in the *Aristeides* to "all" the authors who had written about the treatment of the Athenian leaders, and the names contained in his two lists are by no means identical.²⁹ He must have discovered several versions of the rhetorical commonplace in the course of his wide reading, which covered many branches of literature. Hence there is no basis for even a conjectural identification of the author responsible for the prototype of the complaint against the democracy from which the various versions of the commonplace were presumably developed; nor is there any means of determining to what genre his work belonged. Moreover, even if this author could be identified with confidence, it could not necessarily be assumed that he mentioned the public suicide of Paches. In neither passage of Plutarch are the consequences of harsh treatment by the democracy recorded in any detail in the case of any Athenian leader other than Paches: the fate of each of the others is defined in a single word, and the reader is evidently expected to be familiar with the circumstances. Only in the case of Paches is any explanation provided—which suggests that Plutarch himself may well have modified and enlarged a bare reference to Paches in his source by adding explanatory information about the public suicide derived from a different source. It must therefore be acknowledged that no light can be thrown upon the origin of the suicide story by seeking to trace the source, or sources, from which Plutarch derived the rhetorical commonplaces in the *Nicias* and the *Aristeides*.

If, as is likely, the more sensational details about Paches are false, the error could well be the result of a misunderstanding by Plutarch or some predecessor. Such a misunderstanding could have arisen for all manner of reasons, and speculation about it may be thought to be unprofitable. There is, however, one source of information about fifth-century Athens which tended, more than other sources, to be misinterpreted by later generations, namely the political scenes and references of Old Comedy. The use of Old Comedy as evidence on fifth-century politics by authors who did not fully appreciate its transient peculiarities certainly led to some serious misconceptions. A well-known example is the palpable error of writers from Ephorus onwards in mistaking for sober fact the fantastic explanations in the *Acharnians* and the *Peace* on the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war.³⁰ More relevant to the present investigation is the brilliant trial scene in the *Wasps* in which the dog Labes, representing the

²⁹From the evidence assembled by C. P. Jones, *JRS* 56 (1966) 68, the chronological relationship between the *Nicias* and the *Aristeides* does not seem to be determinable. Whereas the former is among the later of the *Lives*, the latter may also be late but could also be considerably earlier than the *Nicias*.

³⁰G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London 1972), 236–237 and 244–246; cf. on other misunderstandings, *ibid.* 235–236.

Athenian general Laches, is prosecuted on a charge of stealing Sicilian cheese (891–1008, cf. 240–244, 835–843). Although many scholars have inferred from this scene that Cleon must have prosecuted Laches in 423, this interpretation is fraught with difficulties. It is much more probable that Cleon publicly attacked Laches, whose policy was abhorrent to him, and threatened him with prosecution but did not bring a formal charge against him.³¹ If this conclusion is correct, it must be acknowledged that the scene creates a misleading impression. One expedient commonly adopted by Athenian politicians in seeking to promote their own interests was to challenge their opponents in the law courts, and this practice gave plenty of scope for comic exploitation, as is abundantly illustrated in the *Knights*.³² Some comedy may well have contained a reference to the *εθνοβα* of Paches, suggesting with comic exaggeration that the battering received by him at the hands of his accusers was such as to drive him to suicide, or a whole scene may have been devoted to this theme. Many years later, when the conventions of Old Comedy were partly forgotten, a reference, or a scene, of this kind could have given rise to the belief that Paches had actually committed suicide in court, and this belief might seem to be confirmed by his abrupt disappearance after holding a military command of the highest importance.

Paches bore a name which seems to have been very uncommon, at least among more prominent Athenians, since apparently no evidence has survived of any other Athenian called Paches. The name of his father Epicurus (18.3) is also unusual in the fifth and early fourth centuries: only two other Athenians named Epicurus are known before the philosopher,³³ who was born in 341. The rarity of the two names suggests, though it does not prove, that Paches did not belong to one of the few families from which even under the extreme democracy the Athenians recruited most of their military leaders. He may thus have been a *novus homo* who obtained his command through the influence of the new politicians, such as Cleon, but subsequently incurred their displeasure to such an extent by his failure to capture or destroy the Peloponnesian fleet that they brought charges against him. Even if he was acquitted, he can no longer have enjoyed their support, and if he lacked political backing from any other source because of relatively humble birth, it is easy to understand how his eclipse proved to be permanent.

WRESTLINGWORTH, BEDFORDSHIRE

³¹F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 3b, Suppl. 1 (1954) 500–501, D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes, Wasps* (Oxford 1971) 163–165.

³²For example, 278–281, 300–302, 442–449, 475–479, 710, 774–776, cf. *Ach.* 676–718.

³³The first was Hellenotamias in 409/8 (*IG*, 1².301.11–12, 39, and 42); the second is mentioned in vaguely opprobrious terms by Aristophanes, *Eccles.* 644 (produced in 392). These two references may well be to the same person.