

XVI.—The Athenian *Strategoi* of the Years 441/40 and 433/32

FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ

YALE UNIVERSITY

In the following pages I invite attention to a reconsideration of the essential text bearing on the problem named in my title. It is a document in part corrupt which is generally believed to have received its definitive form from the hand of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff more than sixty years ago. The results of this renewed examination are surprising and permit us to solve one of the most discussed problems of the Periclean era. I refer to the list of the Athenian *στρατηγοί* of the year 441/40. It is familiar to every scholar interested in the history of the fifth century, and apart from its historical significance it possesses a certain human interest as placing in juxtaposition in a matter of state two such names as Pericles and Sophocles.

The source of this list of the *στρατηγοί* is a single scholion on Aelius Aristides's second Platonic discourse *Ἐπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων*.<sup>1</sup> When Wilhelm Dindorf published the third volume of his edition of Aristides in 1829 he based the text of the scholia upon material which J. J. Reiske had collected, and printed it without criticism. This material was a *rudis indigestaque moles* quite unfit for publication, and in the case of our scholion it was derived from incomplete manuscripts, in which the scholion reads as follows: τῶν δέκα στρατηγῶν τῶν ἐν Σάμῳ τὰ ὀνόματα<sup>2</sup> κατὰ Ἀνδροτίωνα. There follow then eight names. Since Reiske's manuscripts offered only eight names instead of ten (given according to the official order of the ten Athenian phylai) it is evident that the last two names are lost.

When, about 1875, Wilamowitz inspected the Venice manuscript of Aristides (Marcianus Graecus 423) he discovered a more complete text and republished this scholion in a program of the University of Greifswald,<sup>3</sup> adding the two missing names Γλαυκέρης<sup>4</sup> . . . and Κλειτοφῶν Θοραιεὺς. Through Wilamowitz's publication

<sup>1</sup> 3.485, 28 D.<sup>2</sup> v. l. τῶν σάμω τὰ ὀνόματα and τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἐν σάμω.<sup>3</sup> *De Rhesi scholiis* (1877) 13. This program is now accessible in Wilamowitz's *Kleine Schriften* 1.1ff.<sup>4</sup> κλαυκέρης Marcianus.

the list has received its accepted form and is supposed by modern scholars to be correct. But one point, which I shall discuss below, should have provoked doubt. It will be useful to give first the names of the ten commanders and to add the numbers and names of the phylai following Wilamowitz and Beloch, who also in his *Griechische Geschichte* 2.2.261 discussed the list of the ten commanders.

Σωκράτης Ἀναγυράσιος	I <sup>5</sup>	Erechtheis
Σοφοκλῆς ἐκ Κολωνοῦ ὁ ποιητής <sup>6</sup>	II	Aegeis
Ἀνδοκίδης Κυδαθηναίεύς	III	Pandionis
Κρέων <sup>7</sup> Σκαμβωνίδης	IV	Leontis
Περικλῆς Χολαργεύς	V	Akamantis
Γλαύκων ἐκ Κεραμέων	V	Akamantis
Καλλίστρατος Ἀχαρνεύς	VI	Oeneis
Ξενοφῶν Μελιτεὺς	VII	Kekropis
Γλαυκίτης † Ἀθηναῖος	?	
Κλειτοφῶν Θοραίεύς	X	Antiochis

Wilamowitz pointed out that the ninth phyle, the Aeantis, is missing. So long as it was impossible to explain this circumstance satisfactorily doubts of the correctness of the list should have been entertained. Obviously the name of the deme to which the ninth commander belongs, Ἀθηναῖος, is corrupt. Wilamowitz corrected to Ἀζηνιεύς, and claimed the man for the eighth phyle, the Hippothontis. This correction was approved by all the scholars who have since dealt with the list. The Italian scholar Silvio Accame who, in 1935, published a study of "Le archeresie degli strateghi Ateniesi nel quinto secolo" <sup>8</sup> uses Wilamowitz's correction as if it were found in the manuscript, nor does he even mention the corruption Ἀθηναῖος.

Wilamowitz however overlooked one very important fact. The Marcianus has not ten names but eleven.<sup>9</sup> After Wilamowitz the

<sup>5</sup> The numbers refer to the official order of the ten phylai.

<sup>6</sup> The words ὁ ποιητής can scarcely have been in the original list in the archives of Athens. It seems a plausible hypothesis that they were added by Androtion.

<sup>7</sup> Χρέων Marcianus.

<sup>8</sup> *RFIC* 63 (1935) 341ff.

<sup>9</sup> It is not important that the author of the scholion begins his note with the words τῶν δέκα στρατηγῶν. When he began to write his scholion he remembered the well known fact that the number of the στρατηγοί was commonly ten, and did not become conscious of the different number of names in Androtion's list, because he contented himself with copying the original without revision. I don't believe that we must write <α> instead of ι'.

whole Venice manuscript<sup>10</sup> was collated twice, by Bruno Keil and by myself. I was able to correct some smaller inexactness in Keil's collation of the scholion, but on this passage we were in complete agreement. Before the two last names, which were added by Wilamowitz's reading, the manuscript names another commander, *Λαμπίδης Πειραιεύς* (overlooked surprisingly by Wilamowitz), who is no better known than *Γλαυκέτης* and *Κλειτοφῶν*. He belongs to the eighth phyle, the Hippothontis. If Wilamowitz's correction *Ἀξηνιεύς* were right we should now have, not only two commanders who belong to the fifth phyle, Pericles and Glaucon, but also two others who belong to the eighth, Lampides and Glauces, while the ninth is still missing.

When I discussed these difficulties with Professor Rostovtzeff, he entertained doubt of the correctness of Wilamowitz's suggestion. As no objection can be made to the name of Lampides, who belongs to the eighth phyle, Professor Rostovtzeff suggested to replace if possible the corrupt word *ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ* by the name of a deme belonging to the missing ninth phyle, such as might explain the corruption. Among the names of the demes of the ninth phyle there is one and only one that enables us to explain the corruption easily, that is *ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ*. Replacing *Ἀθηναῖος* by *Ἀφιδναῖος* we solve the whole problem. The repetition of the eighth phyle is eliminated, the Aeantis is no longer missing, and the official order of the phylai is preserved. We restore the list as corrected therefore as follows:

<i>Σωκράτης Ἀναγυράσιος</i>	I	Erechtheis
<i>Σοφοκλῆς ἐκ Κολωνοῦ ὁ ποιητής</i>	II	Aegeis
<i>Ἀνδοκίδης Κυδαθηναίεύς</i>	III	Pandionis
<i>Κρέων Σκαμβωνίδης</i>	IV	Leontis
<i>Περικλῆς Χολαργεύς</i>	V	Akamantis
<i>Γλαύκων ἐκ Κεραμῶν</i>	V	Akamantis
<i>Καλλίστρατος Ἀχαρνεύς</i>	VI	Oeneis
<i>Ξενοφῶν Μελιτεῖς</i>	VII	Kekropis
<i>Λαμπίδης Πειραιεύς</i>	VIII	Hippothontis
<i>Γλαυκέτης Ἀφιδναῖος</i>	IX	Aeantis
<i>Κλειτοφῶν Θοραίεύς</i>	X	Antiochis

<sup>10</sup> Details about the Marcianus Graecus 423 are given by F. W. Lenz, *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien* (Berlin, 1934) 29ff.

It is now quite a different question why two commanders were taken from the fifth phyle. We know also other cases in which another commander, belonging to the fifth phyle, was elected together with Pericles,<sup>11</sup> and we shall have to assume that Pericles had Glaucon elected as his proxy, because in the interest of the state he did not wish to be absent from Athens too often nor too long at a time.

Thus we must recognize not ten *στρατηγοί* but eleven in 441/40.<sup>12</sup> This may seem strange, but it is not without example. We have an extremely valuable confirmation at our disposal, in which the name of Pericles is again concerned. It is however necessary to free this confirmation from prejudice and false conjectures due to erroneous interpretations of an unequivocal remark of Thucydides 1.57.6: *ἔτυχον γὰρ τριάκοντα ναὺς ἀποστέλλοντες καὶ χιλίους ὀπλίτας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ Ἀρχεστράτου τοῦ Λυκομήδους μετ' ἄλλων δέκα στρατηγοῦντος*. This passage of Thucydides was not understood because it seemed to conflict with all that we knew about the *στρατηγοί* in Athens during the fifth century B.C. Now however it proves to be the best possible parallel to our text, and enables us the better to understand Androtion's list, which apparently reproduces the original document in the archives of Athens very carefully. The list of several of the *στρατηγοί* who were elected for 433/32 when the Athenians decided to intervene in the conflict between Corinth and Corcyra and to send the first expedition against Potidaea and Macedonia (Ol. 86,4) is contained in an inscription.<sup>13</sup> This list cannot contain the names of all the *στρατηγοί* of this year, because the record of expenses, in which the list is given, includes only the names of those six commanders who were in charge of the expedition against Corcyra. Two names out of these six are not quite certain. This inscription was discussed and explained first by Boeckh and afterward by Droysen.<sup>14</sup> Although Droysen was able to modify and complete the results reached by Boeckh he made an error in the interpretation of the decisive passage of Thucydides cited above. From this passage

<sup>11</sup> Accame has discussed them in his paper mentioned above (note 8).

<sup>12</sup> This conclusion does not conflict with the observations made by W. Kendrick Pritchett in his important paper on "The term of office of Attic Strategoi," *AJPh* 61 (1940) 469f.

<sup>13</sup> See *IG* I<sup>2</sup>.295 = *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 72 where further references are given, and especially the recent discussion of the inscription by Benjamin Dean Meritt, *Athenian financial documents of the fifth century* (Ann Arbor, 1932) 69ff.

<sup>14</sup> *H* 9 (1875) 1ff. = *Kleine Schriften* 2.182ff.

we learn that the seventh general of that year and the commander in chief of the expedition was Archestratus, son of Lycomedes. From general considerations, which are doubtless right, Droysen added as eighth *στρατηγός* Pericles, since according to Plutarch (*Per.* 16.3) Pericles was *στρατηγός* during fifteen successive years. As there is not the slightest reason to suspect Plutarch's report we must believe that Pericles belongs to the list of *στρατηγοί* in 433/32. The fact that both in this list and in the list for 441/40 Pericles and Glaucon, both of whom belong to the fifth phyle, appear together, did not escape Droysen's attention. It seems a plausible hypothesis that Pericles had Glaucon elected as his proxy more than once. Droysen misinterpreted however the decisive words of Thucydides referred to above. The number *δέκα—μετ' ἄλλων δέκα*—has been rejected by most of the editors and interpreters of Thucydides as untrustworthy, because it increased the number of generals to eleven, and it has been regarded therefore as an obvious corruption. It was either printed with the dagger (Jones in the edition of the Bibliotheca Oxoniensis) or replaced by *δύο* (G. Hermann) or by *τεσσάρων* (G. Krueger) or bracketed altogether (Ed. Schwartz<sup>15</sup> and W. Kolbe).<sup>16</sup> One conjecture is however no less arbitrary than another. Droysen characterized the number *δέκα* as "certainly false" (p. 3) and adds: "For the first expedition against Potidaea in the spring of 432, with only 1000 hoplites and 30 ships, there was certainly no need of all the ten *στρατηγοί* and of still an eleventh in addition" (p. 5). Droysen's statement that it was not necessary to send all the *στρατηγοί* against Potidaea is a mere surmise without support in Thucydides. As Thucydides mentions only Archestratus by name, we must infer that it was Archestratus who commanded the expedition, which consisted of 30 ships and 1000 heavy infantry. Thucydides does not think it important to give the names of the other *στρατηγοί*. The name of the commander in chief, who was in charge of the enterprise and was responsible, was enough. Among the modern interpreters of Thucydides J. Steup, the second editor of the exegetical Weidmann edition, was the only one who was not convinced that the number *δέκα* is to be considered wrong (see the appendix to 1.57.6), and he defended the manuscript tradition. Steup's general reflections carry much less weight than his reference to 1.116.1 where we read that an Athenian fleet of

<sup>15</sup> *Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* 254.

<sup>16</sup> *Thukydides im Lichte der Urkunden* (Stuttgart, 1930) 8 and 33.

44 ships fought a battle near the island of Tragia, Περικλέους δεκάτου αὐτοῦ στρατηγοῦντος, that is, with nine colleagues. Immediately afterward Thucydides informs us that reinforcements were sent from Athens to Samian waters.<sup>17</sup> From this statement Steup draws the conclusion that several other στρατηγοί arrived and the entire number was more than ten. Furthermore, Steup pointed out that the expression μετ' ἄλλων δύο or τεσσάρων (as corrected by editors) does not agree with Thucydides's usage, since he says in similar cases τρίτου or πέμπτου αὐτοῦ. Steup was criticized by Schwartz, who refused to accept the number ten and disapproved of Steup's general considerations, but approved of the stylistic observation made by him. From this observation of Thucydidean usage Schwartz concluded that the number δέκα is to be bracketed as the addition of some scribe who wrote it unthinkingly, recalling the fact that as a rule there were ten Athenian στρατηγοί. In 1.57.6 cited above Thucydides says that the Athenian fleet which sailed against Macedonia was commanded by Archestratus with ten others. As pointed out by Droysen we must assume that one of these ten was Pericles. I do not see any reason why Pericles should not have participated in this expedition. On the other hand, it is not likely that during that very critical time he wished to remain away from Athens during the whole expedition, and so it is easy to understand that he did not wish to be commander in chief, particularly as his special proxy Glaucón was one of the στρατηγοί. It is not within the scope of my discussion to deal fully with the very difficult interpretation of this whole section of the first book of Thucydides, about which there has been much discussion between Eduard Schwartz,<sup>18</sup> F. Jacoby,<sup>19</sup> and W. Kolbe.<sup>20</sup> For my purpose it is enough to say that the situation in both years 441/40 and 433/32 proves to be quite identical. We have not ten but eleven στρατηγοί, one of whom was Pericles. Besides Pericles in both years the same Glaucón, belonging to the same phyle as Pericles, is στρατηγός. Thus in two different cases Thucydides and Androtion agree in the decisive point, that in two years of the Periclean era there were besides Pericles ten other στρατηγοί. The very important fact that

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Pritchett *loc. cit.* 469f.

<sup>18</sup> *Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* 98ff.

<sup>19</sup> *NGG* 1929, 1ff.

<sup>20</sup> *Thukydides im Lichte der Urkunden* 5ff., where further references are given; see especially H. M. Hubbell, *CPh* 24 (1929) 220.

Androtion does not limit himself to giving a specific number, but offers eleven names, eliminates definitely the hypothesis that in the text of Thucydides two numbers were confused. The number ten in the text of Thucydides proves to be much more trustworthy in this case than modern scholars have been inclined to recognize.

Last of all: the agreement between Thucydides and Androtion throws new light upon Pericles's position in Athens, and the controversy<sup>21</sup> whether or not one of the *στρατηγοί* had a higher rank and was to be considered commander in chief, as contended by K. J. Beloch<sup>22</sup> and Eduard Meyer.<sup>23</sup> Their point of view however is to be modified, inasmuch as the number did not always have to be nine besides the commander in chief, but sometimes was ten. It also becomes evident that all the other nine phylai were represented by a *στρατηγός*, when Pericles and his special proxy who was taken from the fifth phyle belonged to the *στρατηγοί*. If in 441/40 and 433/32 eleven *στρατηγοί* were elected, this does not exclude the possibility that in other years their number was only ten, either of equal rank or nine under a commander in chief. In any case, the two passages of Thucydides and Androtion show that the Athenians followed their own rule much less rigorously than we had hitherto supposed.

It should be added that the procedure followed by the Athenians in the Periclean era is not without analogy. We know that before the battle of Marathon the ten generals were unable or unwilling to decide whether or not to fight, and that they added to their council the polemarch Callimachus. Thus Callimachus whose vote became decisive had the rôle of an eleventh *στρατηγός* in a very crucial case. The political situation during the last decade of the *πεντηκονταετία* and after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, besides the pre-eminent personality of Pericles, caused the Athenians to find another solution of the problem. Now we must recognize that Pericles because of his position as first *στρατηγός* together with ten others was more than *princeps inter pares*, and we are better able to understand what Thucydides means when he speaks of *ἀρχὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρός*.

<sup>21</sup> See Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* 2. Hälfte (München, 1926) 891.3.

<sup>22</sup> *Altische Politik* 274ff.

<sup>23</sup> *Geschichte des Altertums* 3.348.