

## VI. Seniority in the *Stratêgia*

MICHAEL H. JAMESON

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Until shortly before the time of Aristotle each of the ten members of the Athenian board of generals was elected from a different tribe (*Ath. Pol.* 61.1). Several exceptions to this rule had been noticed and had received their most thorough discussion by Beloch even before the discovery of the *Athênaiôn Politeia*.<sup>1</sup> His view was that one member of the board was regularly elected without regard to tribe from all the people (ἐξ ἀπάντων) and served as president of the board throughout the year. Though constitutionally no more than *primus inter pares* the manner of his election and the likelihood of his personal ascendancy, as with Pericles, would give him decisive influence in the college. Beloch saw him as an annual commander-in-chief and argued that his presence could be detected not only in the doubling of a tribe's representation (one of the two being *ex hapantôn*) but also in historical references to a chief military command, though he was careful to distinguish this from the designation of a general, or other official, as *autokratôr*. It is here that later writers have been most critical: it cannot be shown that a military command was granted with election to the *stratêgia* or that there

<sup>1</sup> Julius Beloch, *Die attische Politik seit Perikles* (Leipzig 1884 [referred to hereafter as Beloch, *AP*]) 274–88. Earlier suggestions for a chairman of the *stratêgoi*: J. G. Droysen, *Hermes* 9 (1875) 13 f.; G. Loeschke, *De titulis aliquot Atticis quaestiones historicae* (Diss. Bonn 1876) [referred to hereafter by the author's name alone] 24–27. Other bibliographical references are to be interpreted as follows: Hauvette-Besnault = Am. Hauvette-Besnault, *Les Stratèges athéniens* (Paris 1885); Beloch, *GG*<sup>2</sup> 2 = K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*<sup>2</sup> 2 (Strassburg 1914–16); Busolt-Swoboda = G. Busolt & H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* 2 (Munich 1926); Ferguson, *T. of A.* = W. S. Ferguson, *The Treasurers of Athena* (Cambridge, Mass. 1932); *AFD* = Benjamin Dean Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*, "Univ. Mich. Stud.," Hum. Ser. 27 (Ann Arbor 1932) [numbers refer to pages]; Kahrstedt = Ulrich Kahrstedt, *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen* [*Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens* 2] (Stuttgart 1936); *ATL* = B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (Cambridge, Mass. 1939–53) [the texts of the "Lists" were printed in volume 1 and reprinted in 2]; Gomme = A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford 1945); Tod = M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1946) [numbers refer to inscriptions]; Hignett = C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1952).

was a commander-in-chief every year, and it is known that commands were granted by decree of the *dêmos* (e.g., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 123.13 f.); the *archairesiai* and the *psêphisma* assigning a command were complementary but separate steps.<sup>2</sup> The current view most in accord with the evidence we have (that of Wade-Gery, Gomme, and Hignett, among others) regards the *stratêgos ex hapantôn* as an exceptional arrangement which, without carrying any special powers of command or supremacy over other members of the board, permitted the election from one tribe only of two (but no more than two) generals; this arrangement is associated with the period of Pericles' dominance and his continuous tenure of the *stratêgia*.<sup>3</sup> Wade-Gery has, with the help of Plato, *Leg.* 759D, proposed a method whereby the nine places remaining after the election of the *stratêgos ex hapantôn* were filled and the eleventh man dropped, and this has

<sup>2</sup> See especially Kahrstedt 238 ff.

<sup>3</sup> H. T. Wade-Gery, *CQ* 24 (1930) 38; *ibid.* 25 (1931) 89; *JHS* 52 (1932) 219. Gomme 178 f., 386 f. Hignett 247–49, 348–54. The articles of S. Accame (*RFIC* n.s. 13 [1935] 341 ff.) and V. Ehrenberg (*AJP* 66 [1945] 113 ff., cf. his *Sophocles and Pericles* [Oxford 1954] 77 ff.) are not included here as both depend on the unproved view that Phormion belonged to Pandionis; cf. J. Kirchner, *Hermes* 31 (1896) 258 f.; Beloch, *GG*<sup>2</sup> 2.2.261; Hignett 350 f. It should be noted that there is an epigraphic difficulty with Wade-Gery's restoration of *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 50 (in *CP* 26 [1931] 312 = *AFD* 49, *ATL* 2, p. 73, *SEG* 10.39) which, while providing a further example of both Pericles and Glaucôn as generals from Acamantis, offers Phormion as general from Pandionis in 439/38 B.C.; he must restore Oeneis with an initial *h*, or, as suggested by A. M. Woodward, double sigmas in *Καλλιστρατος*. Attribution of Phormion to Pandionis would result in two tribes with double representation in 431/30 B.C., since Hagnon is more safely of Pandionis and is general that year; cf. Hignett 351 f. On other cases where such a situation has been suggested but not proved, Hignett 349–52.

A more decided rejection of Beloch's view sees no significance in the doubling of tribal representation: Busolt-Swoboda 891, with note 3, would explain such instances by the failure of a tribe to supply even a single candidate, through sickness, death, apathy, rejection at the *dokimasia*, etc. (cf. W. Schwahn, *RE* Suppl. 6 s.v. "Strategos" 1074; M. Scheele, *ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ ΑΤΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ* [Diss. Leipzig 1932] 7). One may ask why there is never more than one vacancy through default and why such dominant figures as Pericles and Alcibiades are found as one of the two members from their tribe. Even if more evidence could remove these objections, we may wonder that fifth-century Athenians would let the generalship go by default. A more "realistic" explanation, allowing for the appearance of well-known political figures, is claimed by Kahrstedt 28: political manipulations insured that there would be no candidate from one or another tribe in the interest of a particular candidate. Does this mean that Pericles wanted Glaucôn and, later, Carcinus, as Diodorus says Alcibiades wanted Adeimantus and Thrasybulus in 407/6 B.C. (13.69.3)? The difficulties in the current view, as outlined in the text below, apply in part to this explanation too, and we should add Gomme's warnings against exaggerating the political significance of the office (386 f.); his remarks apply with still greater force to Ehrenberg's article, *AJP* 66 (1945) 113 ff.

been approved by Jacoby who suggests that both schemes, Plato's and that for the *stratêgia*, were modelled on a Solonian method for electing *exêgêtai pythochrêstai*. Wade-Gery, further, restores and interprets *IG I<sup>2</sup> 114.43–45*, in such a way as to give the *dêmos* each year the choice of whether or not it will elect a general *ex hapantôn*.<sup>4</sup>

This paper will examine the implications of the current view and will reconsider Beloch's theory in the light of some further evidence. The primary datum is the doubling of tribal representation and it will be agreed at the outset that this cannot be related to an annual supreme command but that it does require by way of explanation some electoral arrangement such as a *stratêgos ex hapantôn*. The designation of this arrangement remains in doubt. Although we do not know that the phrase *ex hapantôn* was applied to generals in Athens (*Ath. Pol.* gives no evidence for either the phenomenon or its designation), there does appear to have been, on occasion at least, a *stratêgos ek pantôn* in Rhodes side by side with generals representing the old cities within the synoecized state (*ex omni populo non ex tribu aliqua selectus*). But the references come from the second century B.C.<sup>5</sup>

The following appear to be the safest examples of doubling in fifth century Athens:

- 441/40 B.C. Pericles and Glaucôn of Acamantis (Androtion, fr. 38, *FGrHist* 3B, p. 69).<sup>6</sup>
- 439/38 B.C. Pericles (Plut. *Per.* 16.3 on his period of continuous office) and Glaucôn (Wade-Gery, *CP* 26 [1931] 312 on *IG I<sup>2</sup> 50* = *AFD* 49, *ATL* 2, p. 73, *SEG* 10.39).
- 435/34 B.C. Pericles (Plut. *Per.* 16.3) and Glaucôn (restored in *IG I<sup>2</sup> 365.13* in *ATL* 3, p. 330).
- 433/32 B.C. Pericles (Plut. *Per.* 16.3) and Glaucôn (Thuc. 1.51 and *IG I<sup>2</sup> 295.19–20* = Tod 55).
- 432/31 B.C. Pericles (Thuc. 2.13.1) and Carcinus of Acamantis (Thuc. 2.23.2; his demotic from *IG I<sup>2</sup> 296.36–38*).

<sup>4</sup> Dropping of one man: Wade-Gery, *CQ* 25 (1931) 89 (cf. J. W. Headlam, *Election by Lot at Athens*, rev. by D. C. MacGregor [Cambridge 1933] 195 f.); F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 3B, Suppl. vol. 2, p. 135. Decision on method of election: Wade-Gery, *CQ* 24 (1930) 38, 117.

<sup>5</sup> *IG XII.1.700*, 701, 1036 (= *SIG<sup>3</sup> 586*); 3.103 (= *SIG<sup>3</sup> 673*). The explanation quoted above is that of Dittenberger and Hiller von Gaertringen (*SIG<sup>3</sup>, loc. cit.*; *RE* Suppl. 5 [1931] 768). Schwahn's view (*RE* Suppl. 6 [1935] 1104) is that *pantôn* includes foreigners as well as native citizens and that the *stratêgos ek pantôn* was not a native citizen.

<sup>6</sup> On the view of F. W. Lenz (*TAPA* 72 [1941] 226–32) that there were on occasion eleven generals, see Jacoby, *FGrHist* 3B, Suppl. vol. 1, pp. 148–50.

- 431/30 B.C. Pericles (Thuc. 2.31.1) and Carcinus probably again (cf. Beloch, *GG*<sup>2</sup> 2.2.262; Accame, *RFIC* n.s. 13 [1935] 347, note 1).
- 407/6 B.C. Alcibiades and Adeimantus of Leontis (Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.10, 21; Diod. 13.69.3; for the latter's demotic, cf. *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 325–28).

There are also four examples from the first half of the fourth century which strengthen Beloch's argument for the regularity of the position, but since there is the possibility, though no evidence, that a change in election methods had occurred, they are not usually considered in discussing the *stratêgia* in the fifth century and will therefore be left out of account.<sup>7</sup>

The current explanation of these examples which sees them as exceptional cases, limited to Pericles' time and Pericles' tribe, has the effect of confining a practically powerless position to only the most powerful political figure of the century. The situation in 407/6 B.C. is presumably regarded as a reversion to the conditions of the period of Pericles' dominance.<sup>8</sup> Such an arrangement is justified by the argument that it is not so much Pericles in whose favor an exception is made as it is his fellow tribesman who would otherwise be deprived of office, or of whose services Athens would otherwise be deprived owing to Pericles' monopoly of his tribe's *stratêgia*.<sup>9</sup> Can these considerations be paralleled in the constitutional history of Greece? The first motive is eminently fair, but surely anachronistic; as for the second, are we to believe that a sys-

<sup>7</sup> Beloch, *AP* 276 f., 283; Kahrstedt 27, 29, accepts at least the first two cases (Agyrrhius and Thrasybulus in 388/87 B.C., Iphicrates and Callistratus, 373/72 B.C.) as coming before the change mentioned in *Ath. Pol.*

There is a possibility that Nicias and Pythodorus both represented Aegeis in 415/14 B.C. (depending on the date of the invasion of Laconia, Thuc. 6.105.2), if this is the Pythodorus, son of Epizelus, choregus in 415/14 B.C. for Aegeis, *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 770A. But since we cannot judge the effect of Nicias' absence from Athens from 415 on, and since identification is not certain, it is safer not to argue from this case at this point. In 427/26 B.C. Nicias' colleague Hipponicus now appears to have represented Antiochis, cf. Meritt, *Hesperia* 5 (1936) 410. For 459/58 B.C. the presence of two generals from Erechtheis in a casualty list (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 929.5–6, 62–63 = Tod 26) is susceptible of various explanations, cf. Tod p. 43; Kahrstedt p. 27, note 8. On attempts to find other examples of doubling see Hignett 349–52. For lists of generals, see Beloch, *AP* 289–98; A. Krause, *Attische Strategenliste bis 146 v. Chr.* (Diss. Weimar 1914); Beloch, *GG*<sup>2</sup> 2.2.260–69; Pomello & Zancan, *RFIC* n.s. 5 (1927) 361 ff.; S. Accame, *ibid.* 13 (1935) 342 ff. For shorter periods, cf. also Wade-Gery, *CQ* 24 (1930) 35; G. F. Hill, *Sources for Greek History*,<sup>3</sup> rev. R. Meiggs & A. Andrewes (Oxford 1951) 401 ff.

<sup>8</sup> It does not appear that the full consequences of this explanation have been faced. I must apologize if, unwittingly, I misrepresent the positions of these scholars by presenting, so to speak, a composite view.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. MacGregor (above, note 4) 195, note 1.

tem clearly more concerned with dividing membership on the board evenly among the tribes than with choosing the best men regardless of tribe allows an exception in the case of Glaucon, Carcinus, and Adeimantus, none of whom we have reason to think was essential to Athens' well-being? Let us visualize the situation as Wade-Gery conceives it: each year the *dêmos* decides before the elections in what way it desires to hold the elections, i.e. whether to permit this exception. If it so decides the implication is that it knows in advance that a certain candidate, let us call him P., will be elected and continue his series of years in office (which Gomme insists occurred only rarely),<sup>10</sup> and will thus deprive another candidate, G., also of P.'s tribe, of his chance; G.'s candidacy is already known and also the prospects of his being the most popular man from his own tribe after P. and of his not coming in eleventh, i.e. of his not being the least popular of the ten tribal candidates after the election of P. *ex hapantôn*. And, of course, it must be apparent to the *dêmos* that P., and not some other candidate from some other tribe, will be successfully chosen *ex hapantôn*. No doubt this exaggerates (even though we avoid further difficulties by assuming that the restriction P. = Pericles is *de facto* and not *de iure*), but a number of these assumptions are unavoidable in the current view so long as we say that the exception was made for the *lesser* of the two men in the same tribe. It is a far simpler explanation of the facts as we know them to say that the choice (if any) before the *dêmos* was whether to have a *stratêgos ex hapantôn* elected without regard to tribe, i.e. candidate P. or a comparable rival, and to suppose that the sole consideration would be the qualities of the most popular candidates. But simpler still is to do away with this preliminary decision; neither Wade-Gery's restoration nor his interpretation of *IG I<sup>2</sup> 114* is inevitable. If the position had little or no actual power why the need for an annual decision on its existence? It is no evidence against a regular, annual *stratêgos ex hapantôn* that in some, perhaps most, years there were ten generals from ten tribes (e.g., Plut. *Cim.* 8, where the ten generals from ten tribes are pressed into service as judges at the Great Dionysia, an example that has often been cited as showing the absence of a general *ex hapantôn*). There was always a chance that the candidate from a tribe which had already supplied the general

<sup>10</sup> Gomme 386–87, disagreeing with Wade-Gery (e.g., "Iteration was so much the rule in the *stratêgia* . . .": *CQ* 24 [1930] 35, note 1, followed by Ehrenberg, *AJP* 66 [1945] 131).

*ex hapantôn* would prove the weakest of the ten. Furthermore, since he is the second candidate from his tribe it is reasonable to suppose that, everything else being equal, he would command less support than the *top* man of any other tribe. There may also have been a tendency on the part of the electorate to preserve the tribal distribution of generals; even after the change in the electoral system when generals could be chosen without regard to tribe there seems to have been a tendency to keep the tribal distribution.<sup>11</sup> Thus it would require a more popular man than the average to avoid being dropped if he were only the second most popular man in his tribe.

While rejecting Beloch's combination of supreme command and presidency of the board, later writers have implicitly retained the imputation of authority for the general chosen *ex hapantôn* and have, therefore, denied his regular, annual character; it will be maintained here, on the contrary, that the post was quite normal and, in itself, devoid of all special authority. To be sure, the whole problem can be dismissed if we regard every example as exceptional and as not requiring a constitutional explanation. But here we have a remarkably strict adherence to a scheme aimed at the even division of generals among the tribes, and yet for one period about which we are particularly well informed we can detect at least six cases of doubling within eleven years, and if this is due solely to Pericles then it is a unique example of his modification of the democracy "in name" as well as "in fact."<sup>12</sup> The recurrence of doubling in 407/6 B.C., as we shall see below, cannot be connected with Alcibiades' powers as *autokratôr*, and, indeed, the election and return of Alcibiades that year marks a normalization of the generalship. Only if the phenomenon cannot be explained in terms of regular, constitutional arrangements are we justified in explaining it as an exception, and a meaningless one if only in favor of Pericles and Alcibiades, the basis of whose power, it is generally agreed, lies elsewhere. In brief, the presence of ten generals from ten tribes is not inconsistent with the regular, annual election of one general without regard to tribe, while the occasional presence of two generals from the same tribe (but only two and from only one tribe) does require some such electoral arrangement. The actual situation was not so different from that described in *Ath. Pol.* that we need wonder at Aristotle's silence on this point.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Kahrstedt 29.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Thuc. 2.65.9; this point was well made by G. Gilbert, *Beiträge zur innern Geschichte Athens* (Leipzig 1877) 40 f.

So far we have confined ourselves to familiar and generally accepted examples. But to make more precise our ideas on this position further evidence is needed. What was the function of the *stratêgos ex hapantôn* if he was not, *ipso facto*, commander-in-chief for the whole year? If he was not supreme commander the post need not have been restricted to a Pericles and this has been argued by Ehrenberg, not, however, on the basis of clearly acceptable evidence.<sup>13</sup> Was this job in fact, if not in theory, confined to Pericles? One would welcome information on some one other than Pericles in answer to both questions, for with Pericles it is hard to distinguish the functions of this role from the other roles, formal and informal, that he played in the life of Athens. He was, in effect, commander-in-chief and director of Athenian policy in or out of office for most of the time after Cimon's death down to 429 B.C. Our greater knowledge of Pericles' career can be misleading: of the six cases of double representation between 441 and 431 B.C. our awareness of the first four depends on the Androtion fragment (which we probably owe to later interest in the *annus mirabilis* when Sophocles and Pericles served together)<sup>14</sup> and Plutarch's report of Pericles' extraordinary fifteen-year tenure of the *stratêgia* (*Per.* 16.3).<sup>15</sup> For 432/31 B.C. (and hence 431/30 when Carcinus' generalship is inferred from his mission at the end of 432/31) we have detailed knowledge from Thucydides on the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (2.13.1, 23.2, 31.1) and the fortunate accident that *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 296.36–38 confirms Carcinus' demotic. We need to know not only that a man was general but also his tribe and that of his colleagues for that year. Thanks to the fame of Pericles and his unusual continuous fifteen years in office we have this evidence and the doubling of representation is disclosed. But it does not follow that a lesser man with a less spectacular run of offices, about whom and about whose colleagues we know less, could not have been elected *ex hapantôn* if the resulting position did not require a man of Pericles' stature. The nature of our evidence may have led to an unwarranted conclusion.

<sup>13</sup> *AJP* 66 (1945) 113–32; see above, note 3.

<sup>14</sup> Besides the scholium on Aristides (3.485 Dindorf) which preserves the Androtion fragment (fr. 38, *FGrHist* 3B, p. 69), cf. Ion *ap.* Athen. 13.603E–604D (*FHG* 2.46 f.); Strabo 14.1.18, p. 638; Plut. *Per.* 8.8; Justinus 3.6.12–13 (Pericles and Sophocles, but the events are confused).

<sup>15</sup> The restorations of *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 50 for 439/38 B.C. and I<sup>2</sup> 365 for 435/34 are made possible by our knowledge of 441/40 and 433/32. In the latter year, though Glaucon's *stratêgia* is attested by both Thuc. 1.51 and *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 295, Pericles' position is inferred from Plutarch's report (*Per.* 16.3) of his fifteen years in office.

And yet so long as the fifth-century evidence has been confined to Pericles (and Alcibiades has been strangely slighted) it is not surprising that the present apparently cautious, but implicitly radical, view has held the field.

There is a passage in Plutarch's *Nicias* (15.2) that throws light on the problem in more ways than one: once, in the *stratêgeion*, Nicias asked Sophocles, the poet, first for his opinion on some matter *ὡς πρεσβύτατος ὢν τῶν συστρατήγων*. Sophocles answered: 'Εγώ . . . παλαιότατός εἰμι, σὺ δὲ πρεσβύτατος. The anecdote depends on the double sense of *presbytatos* like our use of "senior," meaning both "oldest" and "highest ranking." It has been noticed that the incident clearly illustrates the operation of the chairman of the board in the *stratêgeion* at Athens who presides over its deliberations and asks the members for their opinion; but Hauvette-Besnault, for one, felt there was nothing to show that Nicias' chairmanship lasted throughout the year.<sup>16</sup> It has not been observed, I believe, that Nicias and Sophocles were both of the tribe Aegeis.<sup>17</sup> Thus if they are present on the same board, one would be *ex hapantôn* and Sophocles' words leave no doubt that it was Nicias. Nicias' use of the word *presbys* (no doubt he referred to Sophocles as *presbytatos* in asking him to open the discussion) shows that it was not the technical term in Athens that it was, for instance, in Sparta for the chairman of various boards (e.g., *IG* V 1.51, Ephors and *Nomophylakes*; 556.6–7, *Bideis*; 504.16, *Synarchia*; 564.3–5, *Phyle*; 675, *Sphaireis*; 128.13, *Pheideition*), while Sophocles' reply shows that it could easily be understood in this sense. It can hardly be a coincidence that the chairman is the man we expect to be *ex hapantôn*. Plutarch's unconsciousness of the tribal affiliations is some warrant that the incident is genuine. There is no point in saying with Hauvette-Besnault that Sophocles was never general with Nicias "à ce qu'il semble"; of contrary evidence there is none. The poet was general in 441/40 B.C. with Pericles (Androtion, fr. 38, *FGrHist*; perhaps his only foreign venture — our anecdote is set in Athens), hellenotamias in 443/42 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 202.36) and *proboulos* in 412/11 (Aristot. *Rhet.* 3.18, 1419A.25 ff.), all elected posts, and there are some indications of recent political activity in Aristophanes' *Pax*

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Loeschke 24; Hauvette-Besnault 55.

<sup>17</sup> The deme Colonus would not, by itself, be sufficient evidence for Aegeis, cf. *AFD* 102, but the fact is proved by the Androtion fragment (above, note 14) where Sophocles' name appears second in the official tribal order. For Nicias, cf. *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 302.20–21, 44 = Tod 75, *AFD* 161 f. [where line 44 becomes 50].

695 ff. of 421 B.C.<sup>18</sup> Nor are we justified in denying that this Sophocles is the poet: he was the subject of several anecdotes (Plato, *Rep.* 1.329B–C; Plut. *Per.* 8.5 and Cicero, *De off.* 1.40, 144; Aristot. *Rhet.* 1.14, 1374B.35 ff., 3.15, 1416A.14–17, 3.18, 1419A.25 ff.) in one of which (Ion *ap.* Athen. 13.603E–604D) he plays, as here, on the two meanings of a work (*στρατηγείν*). It is doubtful that this very mild witticism, but typical of the charming manners that so delighted Ion, would ever have been recorded coming from a less famous man.

As to the date of the incident, we can only point to some time between 428 and 417 B.C., later rather than earlier, and excluding 426/25 when Nicias was probably not general (and perhaps 420/19 and 419/18 as well) and 425/24 for which ten generals, besides Cleon, are known. By 427/26 B.C. Sophocles was probably seventy (accepting 497/96 as the year of his birth) and easily, therefore, *palaiotatos* on any ordinary board.<sup>19</sup>

A number of conclusions may be drawn from this incident. (1) The post of *stratêgos ex hapantôn*, whatever its actual title, could be filled by some other than Pericles, whereas Wade-Gery has written: "I do not think any of the strategoi in the twenties, after Perikles' death, was of this eminence—not even Nikias."<sup>20</sup> (2) There is nothing to show that he was in any way more than chairman of the board's discussions and had any authority superior to that of his colleagues; there is no reason to doubt that majority decisions prevailed. (3) The addition of Nicias' name to that of Pericles and Alcibiades (and possibly Iphicrates in the fourth century) suggests that previous experience in the office of *stratêgos* was a prime qualification for the chairmanship. The possibility (and we have argued that it was in any year only a possibility) of an exception to the strict sharing of the generalship among the tribes is allowed not to

<sup>18</sup> Cf. T. B. L. Webster, *An Introduction to Sophocles* (Oxford 1936) 12 f. (who is surely right in differing from Drew, *CR* 42 [1928] 56 f.) and J. Van Leeuwen in his ed. of Aristophanes' *Pax* (Leiden 1906) on lines 697–99. The scholiast *ad loc.* sees a reference to Sophocles' profiteering during his generalship on "Samos."

<sup>19</sup> Cf. lists of generals cited above, note 7, and G. Reincke, *RE* s.v. "Nikias" 323–33. Dates given for Sophocles' birth vary between 500/499 and 488–85 B.C. with 497/96 usually accepted (*Marm. Par.* 56, 64 [*FGrHist* 2, pp. 1000 f.]; cf. Jacoby, *RE* Suppl. 2.233). Conceivably this generalship could have been in 428/27, but the passage in the Sophoclean *Vita* (9) on which attempts have been made to base this date is hopelessly corrupt, and there is no reason to think Thucydides, the son of Milesias, was general that year. Sophocles' *stratêgia* with him is highly questionable. See G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* 3.1 (Gotha 1897) 576, note 3; Webster (above, note 18) 12 f.; Blumenthal, *RE* s.v. "Sophokles" 1044; Ehrenberg, *Sophocles and Pericles* 117, note 1.

<sup>20</sup> *CQ* 24 (1930) 38.

give any one tribe's representative greater power but to ensure presidency each year of a man thoroughly familiar with the business of the board. His seniority is in no way inconsistent with the collegiate principle. Certainly such an experienced man was often also given a major military command, but such a command was not conferred simply by election and need not last the year; and there were years when it was neither necessary nor desirable for the senior general to be away on campaign. In the hands of a man of little personal force the post would be of slight importance; in the hands of a Pericles it could be most influential.

It will be useful to consider the office of "chairman" ("Obmann," "Vorsitzenden," "président") in Athens. Scholars have been understandably hesitant to elaborate on the subject; our knowledge comes almost entirely from epigraphic formulae with no certain explanation available from literary sources. Loeschke and Beloch regarded references to a board by the name of one member of the board as a relevant parallel to the chairman of the board of generals. At the other extreme, Kahrstedt has denied that the so-called chairmen were any more than eponymous representatives of their boards, but, aside from the special problems of *IG I*<sup>2</sup> 304A for the hellenotamiae, Kahrstedt has failed to show, against a great number of inscriptions to the contrary, that the same individual did not normally represent the board throughout the year; nor does his view explain the presence, as we shall see, of distinguished names as chairmen of the hellenotamiae in important years, nor why another eponymous official was needed in addition to the secretary.<sup>21</sup>

The best parallel for the existence of an annual chairman comes from the next most important elected board in Athens, the hellenotamiae. There is no special title for the office; this is not unusual

<sup>21</sup> Loeschke 24; Beloch, *AP* 280 f.; Kahrstedt 160–62. The problems of *IG I*<sup>2</sup> 304A are discussed in the text below. Otherwise Kahrstedt's case rests on the fact that one Pythodorus of Halae, with his fellow Treasurers of the Goddess, was recorded as handing on their charge to their successors in 418/17 B.C. (*IG I*<sup>2</sup> 244, 268), but when this same board was recorded as receiving its charge from the previous board of 419/18 (*IG I*<sup>2</sup> 283, and probably 267) it was headed by Charinus of Pelekes. Why should we not assume that this single instance of a changed chairman is due to death or retirement? Kahrstedt (161, note 3) speaks of all three inscriptions as referring to the acceptance of their charges, but 244 and 268 come from the end of their year of office and speak of acceptance from the previous board only as a preliminary to recording the handing of their charge to their successors. In any case, a shift in chairman makes better sense than a change in a purely eponymous official within the year. In answer to Ferguson's suggestion that for a period of years the representative from Erechtheis was always chairman of this same board (*T. of A.* 9, note 2), see Kahrstedt 162, note 1.

for the chairmen of Greek boards and may explain the absence of a title in our information on the generals.<sup>22</sup> For the first eleven years of the publication of the Athenian "Tribute Lists" (454/53–444/43 B.C.) only the name of the secretary of the board of *hellenotamiae* occurs in the inscriptions (*ATL* 1, p. 567). In 443/42 and 442/41 the secretary, the assistant secretary, and the chairman were named, this last being identified simply by *ἡλληνотаμίᾱς ἐν* (*ATL* 1, Lists 12 and 13). From 441/40 to probably 431/30 B.C. we find only the secretary and the chairman, who is identified in this same way. But from 430/29 to at least 416/15 the names of all members of the board, listed in the official order of their tribes, appear to have been given along with the name of the secretary.<sup>23</sup> There is, however, reason to think that there continued to be a chairman. In the records of the *logistai* for 426/25–423/22 B.C. (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 324 = *AFD* 136–43, Tod 64) the *hellenotamiae* receive loans from the sacred treasures each year and are referred to by the name and demotic of one of their members followed by the words *καὶ χσυνάρχουσιν*. Again in the records of the Treasurers of the Goddess for 418/17 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 302 = *AFD* 160–63) the board is referred to by the name of one member (presumably the chairman) *καὶ συνάρχουσι* (plus at least once the chairman of the *paredroi* *καὶ συνάρχουσι*; the chairman is mentioned at least twice, probably three times, and once [line 11–12] another member's name follows his). This same method of reference recurs in this inscription for 415/14 B.C. (five times, lines 66–76) and probably on similar inscriptions of the Treasurers of the Goddess for 414/13 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 297.4, 8 = *AFD* 88–90) and under the Four Hundred in 411 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 298.11 ff. = *AFD* 93). Besides such references to the whole board by the name of the chairman there is mention of individual members who receive loans (two in 417/16, two in 415/14 B.C., *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 302.31–32, 63, 77–78). Although it is not clear why at times the whole board, headed by the chairman, is

<sup>22</sup> Cf. G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* 1 (Munich 1920) 481 f. On *hellenotamiae*. Swoboda, *RE* s.v. "Hellenotamias" 177–81, and Busolt-Swoboda 1131 ff. are to be revised for detail in the light of continued study of the inscriptions; see especially the roster of *hellenotamiae* in *ATL* 1, pp. 567–70, with 2, p. 125, and 4, p. xii. On their election, Kahrstedt 43–45.

<sup>23</sup> 430/29 B.C. marks the end of the selection in reverse of the official tribal order of the secretaries of the Treasurers of the Goddess and of the *hellenotamiae* (in the case of the former it was resumed at a later date). The onset of the Peloponnesian War seems to have been the occasion for a number of administrative changes; see Ferguson, "The Athenian Secretaries," *Corn. Stud. Class. Phil.* 7 (1898) 70 ff.; *T. of A.* 10, note 1; Meritt, *AFD* 3–5.

said to receive a loan, while at other times an individual member, with or without his *paredros*, is the recipient, it does appear that the board continued to have a chairman whose name followed by *kai synarchontes* designated an annual board, as with the Treasurers of the Goddess and other boards.<sup>24</sup>

In the middle of 410/9 B.C. there is a change in the description of loans by the Treasurers of the Goddess. In the first part of the year the first loan in each prytany is made to the younger Pericles *kai synarchosin*, subsequent loans in the same prytany being made simply *τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἡλληνισταμίαις* (*IG I<sup>2</sup> 304A = AFD 94-96*, Tod 83); this surely is the designation of the whole board by its chairman. Professor A. Andrewes has recently noted that in the first half of the year the purpose of the loan is specified but no day is given within the prytany, whereas in the second half of the year, and thereafter, the date is specified but not, for the most part, the purpose, and that various individuals, followed by *kai synarchosin*, receive the loans. Since he detects no pattern in the names or dates, Andrewes suggests that "particular groups of hellenotamiai habitually dealt with particular types of business" and thus the purposes of the loans did not need to be recorded.<sup>25</sup> If this is correct there is here a clear contrast between the earlier usage where the chairman's name followed by *kai synarchosin* represents the whole board and the later where one or more individual members represent the board for a special purpose. An omission of *kai synarchosin* in the second half of this year may not be significant, as Andrewes contends, but it is noteworthy that all earlier examples of *kai synarchosin* can be understood as following the name of a chairman; the contrast within this one year between Pericles and his colleagues confirms that up to this year we should understand the name before *kai synarchosin* as that of the chairman. This is important since the multiplicity of names in the second half of this year has often been cited (against the evidence of earlier inscriptions) as showing that the hellenotamiae had no single, annual chairman.<sup>26</sup> The change may be connected with other changes in financial arrangements that year, such as (1) the lending of current income rather than reserves, (2) the payment

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *IG I<sup>2</sup> 304A.2-3*, Treasurers of the Goddess; 5-6, *athlothêtai*; 6-7, *hieropoioi*. *IG I<sup>2</sup> 304B.74 ff.*, *logistai*. *IG I<sup>2</sup> 313*, *epistatai* of Eleusis. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1541*, *epistatai* of Eleusis and Treasurers of the Other Gods. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1524. 49 f.*, *epistatai* of Brauron.

<sup>25</sup> *JHS* 73 (1953) 5 f.

<sup>26</sup> e.g., by Hauvette-Besnault 53, note 1; Kahrstedt 162 f.

to the hellenotamiae rather than to the generals, (3) the doubling of the number of the hellenotamiae and the disappearance of the *kôlakretai*, and (4) the specifying of the lender of each sum (Athena Polias, Athena Nike, or Hermes).<sup>27</sup> In the records of loans by the Treasurers of the Goddess in 409/8 and 407/6 B.C. (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 301, 304B.41 ff. = *AFD* 119–22) various members continue to represent the board in receiving loans but the name of one member, Lysitheus, occurs some twelve times compared to four for the most frequently mentioned of the others and he is listed in the roster of *ATL* 1, p. 570, as “chairman (?)”. However, in the records of 405/4, in view of the change in 410/9, the single occurrence of the name Chariades (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 255.328) does not justify our calling him chairman, as does Ferguson.<sup>28</sup>

Study of the hellenotamiae does not suggest that chairmen of elected boards have any greater power than their fellow members or perform different duties with respect to the special function of the board (as opposed to the board’s internal machinery). They are an organizational convenience, perhaps a necessity. At times they represent the whole board in certain records, but in the same year in another type of record the whole board will be listed by name, the chairman being distinguished in no way and the place of his name being determined by the official order of the tribes (cf. 432/31 B.C., *ATL*, List 23 and *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 296.8, 33–34 = *AFD* 80–83). In a single class of records, the “Tribute Lists” published by the hellenotamiae themselves, we have seen that the chairman is not distinguished after 432/31 B.C. In a single inscription (410/9 B.C., *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 304A = *AFD* 94–96) the chairman is seen to represent the whole board in the first three prytanies of their term of office but thereafter shares with other members in taking responsibility for particular business.<sup>29</sup> In 407/6 B.C. it may be that the chairman represents the board more frequently than his fellows in receiving loans from the Treasurers of the Goddess, if he is, in fact, chairman (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 304B.47 ff. = *AFD* 119–22).

<sup>27</sup> (1) Cf. Ferguson, *T. of A.* 21 f., 32 ff.; *AFD* 63. (2) Ferguson, *T. of A.* 18 f. (3) *ibid.* 3 f.; *AFD* 99 ff., cf. *Ath. Pol.* 30.2, but on the *kôlakretai* cf. *ATL* 3, p. 364. (4) Ferguson, *T. of A.* 18. Some of these changes were probably introduced before the restoration of the democracy.

<sup>28</sup> *T. of A.* 13, and Index s.v. “Chariades”; cf. *ATL* 1, p. 570.

<sup>29</sup> Pericles’ absence from the records thereafter may be connected with his election to the *stratêgia* for the following year (Ferguson, *T. of A.* 43, note 1, on *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 301.22) and, possibly, his departure for Ionia with Thrasyllus.

We cannot be sure how the chairman was chosen. He does not seem to have been chosen according to any tribal cycle even in those years when the secretary was (439/38–430/29 B.C.) and this suggests a different method of appointment. Nor does sortition with provision for even distribution among the tribes over a period of years seem likely in view of chairmen from Cecropis in both 443/42 and 442/41 B.C. (*ATL*, Lists 12 and 13) and three chairmen from Aca-mantis in the years between 414/13 and 410/9 B.C. (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 297.4 = *AFD* 88; *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 298.12–13 = *AFD* 93, under the Four Hundred; *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 304A.8 etc. = *AFD* 95).<sup>30</sup> Add to this that in the years 443/42 and 410/9 when significant financial changes took place Sophocles and the younger Pericles were chairmen, the only two hellenotamiae who, as far as we know, also served as generals (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 202.36 = *ATL*, List 12, and *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 304A.8 etc. = *AFD* 95).<sup>31</sup> The most reasonable conclusion is that not only were the members of the board elected but that one of their members was elected chairman and, at least in certain years, by the people rather than the board itself in view of the positions held by Sophocles and the younger Pericles.<sup>32</sup>

Was election as chairman of the hellenotamiae *ex hapantôn*? There is no complete list of members for any one year. There are two members from the same tribe in 407/6 B.C. (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 304B.41–42, etc., and 75 = *AFD* 119 ff.) but Meritt has explained this by the increase of members to twenty in 410 B.C. (*AFD* 126). By itself, however, this deviation from the rule of one member per tribe, paralleled that same year in the *stragêgia*, would not have to be accounted for by an increase in membership, and it is interesting that of the two men from Hippothontis, Lysitheus is mentioned twelve times and is possibly chairman; the other, whose demotic alone is preserved, is mentioned only twice (lines 75, 85–86). Meritt's case rests rather on *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 304A (*AFD* 94–96, cf. 98–103) from 410/9 B.C. where in one year there are two tribes with two representatives each. Thus, if the reform to twenty members con-

<sup>30</sup> On this method, cf. Ferguson, *T. of A.* 142 f.

<sup>31</sup> On 443/42 B.C., cf. *ATL* 3, p. 306; Ehrenberg, *Sophocles and Pericles* (above, note 3) 127 ff. (who thinks, 135, that the board itself chose the chairman, but admits that in this year their choice must have had Pericles' approval). On 410/9 B.C., cf. Ferguson, *T. of A.* 163 ff.; *ATL* 3, pp. 359 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Pericles as *athlohetês* (Plut. *Per.*13) and Cleophon as *poristês* (probably, cf. Beloch, *RhM* 34 [1884] 257, accepted by Busolt-Swoboda 904, note 3, with reference to *Ath. Pol.* 28.3) were likely to have been chairmen, and elected as such by the people.

tinued through 407/6 B.C. there is no positive evidence for a chairman *ex hapantôn*, nor, in the present state of our knowledge, is there evidence against one. However, the tasks of the hellenotamiae in most years were surely much more routine than those likely to fall to the generals, and the need for a chairman may not have been allowed to unbalance the tribal distribution of places.

The existence of an annual chairman for the hellenotamiae confirms, by analogy, his presence on the board of generals. But when we advance from the argument from analogy and look for similar epigraphic formulae, we are faced with differences in the character of the epigraphic references. We have no records of the board of generals, nor reason to expect any. They do not dedicate an *aparchê* to the Goddess, as do the hellenotamiae, whose chairman was, as a result, named in certain years. In a treaty ratified by the *dêmos* the generals are listed in tribal order, which, we have seen, is also used for other boards that continue nonetheless to have chairmen (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 50 = *AFD* 49; cf. *CP* 26 [1931] 309 ff.). It is not certain that, as a board, they received payments from the state, for most of the financial references to them in the form *στρατηγούς τῷ δέλνι καὶ συνάρχουσιν* (e.g., *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 324.3, 20–21, cf. 56–57 = *AFD* 136–43, Tod 64 [426/25–423/22 B.C.]) or *στρατηγούς τοῖς δείνοις* (e.g., *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 302.16, 20–21 = *AFD* 160 ff., Tod 75) or *στρατηγούς τοὺς μετὰ τοῦ δέλντος* (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 105.5–6 = *AFD* 114, Tod 91)<sup>33</sup> may be understood as referring to a smaller number of generals assigned to a particular task, as is clearly the case when the purpose of a payment is specified by reference to a field of operations between the words *στρατηγούς* and *τῷ δέλνι* (e.g., *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 324.18 ff. = *AFD* 138, Tod 64; cf. *AFD* 89, lines 12–13) or between *στρατηγούς* and *τοῖς δείνοις* (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 295.7–9, 18–21 = *AFD* 69, Tod 55; *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 302.9, 29–33, 43–44, 50–51 [= *AFD* 160–62, Tod 75], cf. 71–73 where only *στρατηγῶ* followed immediately by the locality with no general's name is given). The first two examples (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 324.3 and 20–21) are closest verbally to phrases we have taken as referring to entire boards and have been so interpreted, briefly, by Loeschke and Beloch;<sup>34</sup> the same formula is used in the Hellenistic age for the annual eponymous chairman of the

<sup>33</sup> Lysias 21.7 *τοὺς δὲ μετὰ Θρασύλλου δέκα* (cf. Plato, *Apol.* *τοὺς δέκα στρατηγούς*, of the eight generals indicted) may indicate chairmanship of the whole board. In the late inscriptions of Olbia the formula *οἱ περὶ τὸν δείνα στρατηγοί* refers to the whole board identified by its chairman, the other five names following, *Inscr. Pont. Eux.* I<sup>2</sup> 82 ff.; the same formula for archons: 128, 130, etc., and *agoranomoi*, 128, 129.

<sup>34</sup> Loeschke 25 f.; Beloch, *AP* 280 f.

three generals of Epirus.<sup>35</sup> The better case can be made out for Nicias in 424 B.C. (lines 20–21), for Meritt (*AFD* 134) has pointed out that grants of a hundred talents were regularly made at the beginning of the campaigning year in 425, 424, and 423 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 324.11–12, 32, 43–44) and believes that this was “a blanket appropriation to the generals, for their use in maintaining the fleet and armies overseas” and that it “reflects a general administrative policy.” Under these conditions one would expect the chairman to represent the board in receiving the grant and it would be no surprise to find Nicias as chairman in 425/24 B.C.

But why is one general's name used to designate a smaller group of generals? Perhaps because he had been voted the command of the expedition, or perhaps as chairman of the sub-committee of the board, so to speak; the latter would be consistent with the use of the formulae elsewhere. Of course the chairman is not likely to have been a different man from the commander, but one may raise the question whether, when more than one general was despatched on a mission, there is any clear evidence of the subordination of the rest to one man as commander. Is it not possible that the commander's position was simply that of chairman, still subject to majority vote? Literary references to only one man where inscriptions show that more than one general was involved (e.g., Thuc. 5.83.4, cf. *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 302.20–21 = *AFD* 161, Tod 75) may indicate that the historian describes the *de facto* situation while the inscriptions show that, *de iure*, the collegiate principle continues in force. We may compare the familiar use of ὁ δέῖνα τρίτος (vel τέταρτος vel πέμπτος) αὐτός (e.g., Thuc. 1.46.2; 8.35) where the individual named is clearly the senior officer.<sup>36</sup> But, in Athens, as commander or chairman? It has been observed that the named general still consults his colleagues and thus may well have been subject to majority decision (Thuc. 1.61 [cf. 62.4], 57.6, 59.2). When Pericles is described as *dekatos autos* (Thuc. 1.116.1; 2.13.1) it is generally agreed that he was not acting as commander with all nine

<sup>35</sup> *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, ed. O. Kern (Berlin 1900) 32, 37 f.: Κρίσωνα τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ τοὺς συνάρχοντας, cf. Livy 29.12.11 (3 generals); but in 32.10.2 only the eponymous chairman, as in *SGDI* 1338, 1339, 1349, 1350; on the explanation, Kaerst, *RE* s.v. “Epeiros” 2729, Schwahn, *RE* Suppl. 6.1141. The description of one of a board as *prōtos* or *στρατηγῶν τὸν πρῶτον τόπον* is also found in later times, Schwahn, *ibid.* 1121 f.

<sup>36</sup> Gomme 178 f.; Hignett 353. The named general (*penthos autos* in Thuc. 1.61.1) and his colleagues are ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς καὶ οἱ ξυνάρχοντες (1.62.4).

subordinate generals present, and, therefore, *dekatos* must refer to his position on the board rather than in the field. Thus it has been admitted that at special crises one member was given supreme authority over all his fellows. Herodotus' reference to Miltiades as *dekatos* of the generals (6.103.1) makes it likely that the historians used the ordinal numbers to indicate leadership *de facto*. But since in both 441/40 and 431/30 B.C. Pericles was general *ex hapantôn*, and so, according to the hypothesis, chairman of the full board, his position *de iure* needs to have been no more than that. On each occasion he probably had with him a majority of the board and thus continued to operate as chairman of the incomplete board; it is significant that we never hear of a general being "sixth, seventh, eighth, or ninth himself." That Pericles was in effect commander-in-chief at Samos in 440 B.C. and of the Attic defences in 431 B.C. was the result of the chairman being Pericles, and not so much because Pericles was chairman.<sup>37</sup>

It has sometimes been argued that the presidency of the board of generals may have rotated daily among its members.<sup>38</sup> The evidence adduced concerns the command of Miltiades at Marathon and two passages in Diodorus on Arginusae and Aegospotami. For Miltiades, Herodotus' account (6.110) is the major source and one may doubt that other references have independent value (Plut. *Arist.* 5; *Mor.* 628E). Quite apart from the probability that the story is anachronistic and that, in fact, the polemarch was commander-in-chief,<sup>39</sup> it should be noted that both here and in Diodorus it is command, not presidency, that is said to have been rotated; otherwise, the Miltiades story loses its point — that the counsel of Miltiades prevailed though held by a minority of the generals. Now there is no evidence for, and considerable evidence against, supposing that a minority view could ever prevail on the board in the fifth century.<sup>40</sup> Thus, if we reject this idea for Marathon, there

<sup>37</sup> In inscriptions where more than one general was named without apparent distinction it is possible that the first-named was chairman, e.g., *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 302.20 f., cf. Thuc. 5.83.4 where only Nicias is mentioned as general (cf. Alcibiades in line 16). However, for the Sicilian expedition the same inscription lists Alcibiades, Lamachus, and Nicias, in that order (lines 43 f., 50–52), whereas we shall see below that there is a possibility that Nicias was chairman even before the removal of Alcibiades and the death of Lamachus.

<sup>38</sup> e.g., by Gilbert (above, note 12) 38; Hauvette-Besnault 55; Kahrstedt 163 f.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* 2 (Oxford 1912) 357 f.; Hignett 170 f.

<sup>40</sup> Kahrstedt 152.

is much less to be said for it at Arginusae and Aegospotami, in a period for which we are relatively better informed. But so long as the polemarch is an effective commander we must concede some uncertainty as to the relation of the board to him and of its members to each other; such uncertainty later in the fifth century no doubt permitted the inconsistencies in Herodotus' account.

For Arginusae, Thrasyllus is singled out so that a dream portending the trial of the generals may be attached to him (Diod. 13.97.6); he is introduced as *ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν*, and said to have commanded the right wing. Xenophon's account of the battle is considerably more detailed and there is no suggestion that Thrasyllus had any superior command (*Hell.* 1.6.29). It is Protomachus who held the right wing and Thrasyllus was beside him with an equal number of ships. Surely the account in Diodorus stems from a desire to fasten the ominous dream on some individual, and since there was no indication of a supreme commander for the campaign, a temporary commander for the day is introduced. The choice of Thrasyllus is understandable; he was the leading figure among the generals elected after Alcibiades' withdrawal (cf. Lys. 21.7, *τοὺς δὲ μετὰ Θρασύλλου δέκα*; Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.18, *τοὺς ἀμφὶ Θράσυλλον καὶ Ἑρασινίδην*) and it is not impossible that he was elected *ex harpantiōn* that year (his tribe is unknown), though even in Diodorus' account he was not commander of the whole expedition. (Diodorus' source may have thought of Conon as succeeding to Alcibiades' supreme command, cf. *προκρίνας Κόνωνα*, 13.74.1, whereas Xenophon has him taking command only of the detachment at Samos, *Hell.* 1.5.18.) The familiar story of Miltiades at Marathon was at hand to serve as a model, and so add to the dramatic appropriateness of the dream.

At Aegospotami, according to Diodorus (13.106.1) Philocles was in command the day of the disaster (*ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ἀφηγούμενος*) and was caught with thirty ships ahead of the main body of the fleet which, though ordered to follow after, was overwhelmed by Lysander before putting out to sea. Once again Xenophon's account (*Hell.* 2.1.27 ff.) is quite different: Lysander takes advantage of Athenian carelessness following a repeated offer of battle. Though his account is more detailed (Tydeus and Menander are the ones who particularly rebuff Alcibiades, Philocles and Adeimantus among the generals Lysander had on board his ship after the battle, 2.1.26, 30) the importance of Philocles is his recent brutality towards prisoners

of war, for which Lysander singles him out in a bitter rebuke before executing all the prisoners except Adeimantus, who had opposed Philocles' brutality (31–32, cf. Plut. *Lys.* 9.7, 13.1–2, citing Theophrastus). In Diodorus we read Φιλοκλέα ζωγρήσας τὸν στρατηγὸν ἀπαγαγὼν εἰς Λάμψακον ἀπέσφαξε (13.106.7). Thus both accounts single out Philocles (and Diodorus' source, Ephorus, seems to have named Philocles as rebuking Alcibiades, Nepos, *Alc.* 8),<sup>41</sup> but Diodorus, without the reason for Philocles' distinction, must attribute to him some temporary command. It can be seen that in neither of the Diodorus passages have we reliable evidence for the Athenian *stratêgia*. All these cases, including that in Herodotus, can be understood as aiming at solving the problem of a conspicuous individual who, the tradition clearly showed, was not commander of the entire mission.

We have already stressed that these passages speak of rotating command, not presidency. Is there any justification for believing that the authors misunderstood what was actually a rotating presidency? There does not, in fact, appear to be other evidence for Athens of daily rotation among the tribes of a chairmanship, nor can Herodotus' use of the word *πρυτανίη* (echoed in Plut. *Mor.* 628E but not found in the Diodorus passages) be pressed as a technical term of Athenian government.<sup>42</sup> We really have only the *boulê* as a parallel for either the term or the fact. Of four applications of cognate terms in Athens, there is evidence of rotation for only one, i.e. the obvious instance of the prytanizing tribe in the *boulê*, where in the fifth century, however, the individual chairman (changing daily *within* the prytany) is the *epistatês*. It should also be observed that in a large body (such as the *boulê* and the *diaitêtai*) whose members are chosen by lot, whenever one or more are required to perform a specific function, we might expect this task to be assigned mechanically and held temporarily. This is not true of the task of presiding over an elected board with wider powers, in a position administratively powerless and yet less limited in scope and more susceptible to the skill of the competent individual.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Cf. A. Momigliano, *RFIC* n.s. 13 (1935) 185–88.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Gomme, *OCD* s.v. "Prytanis" on the use of the term in Asia Minor. Herodotus alone speaks of *prytanies* of the much-vexed *naukraroi* (5.71.2); the significance of both the fact and the term are disputed.

<sup>43</sup> (1) *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 4.22–25 (cf. 3.20–21) may be restored so as to speak of a *prytanis* who is to exact fines from the Treasurers of the Goddess should they fail in certain duties. Whether the *prytanis* is a daily officer, and whether he is even one of the treasurers him-

In sum, the argument for a daily rotation of presidency must rest primarily on Herodotus (with the possible parallel of the *boulê*, more significant for its effect on Herodotus than its bearing on the *stratêgia*), and he speaks of command, not presidency, and of a time when the position of the generals was significantly different from what it later came to be. It is submitted that such evidence does not outweigh the arguments for an annual chairman of elected boards.

Four instances bearing on our problem remain to be considered.

### Cimon, 468 B.C.

Plutarch (*Cim.* 8) tells how Cimon and his fellow generals were pressed into service at the Great Dionysia when Sophocles, competing against Aeschylus, was victorious for the first time (dated in 468 B.C., *Marm. Par.* 56; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325). The incident took place when the archon refused to let the generals depart *ὡς δὲ Κίμων μετὰ τῶν συστρατῆγων προελθὼν εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἐποιήσατο τῷ θεῷ τὰς νενομισμένας σπονδὰς* (i.e. Cimon made the libations for the whole board). Even if the ritual represents thanksgiving for a successful mission, as has been suggested, the action of the archon shows this is not an individual's triumph but a case of the whole board representing the state.<sup>44</sup> Here, indeed, we may see some indication of the chairman, for obviously not all ten generals, operating together as a board, can be expected to perform, *pari passu*, every act of official ritual. If we could be sure that Plutarch was not writing loosely, nor simply making his hero the principal actor in all he describes, we would have here another clue to the workings of the board when all were together in Athens.<sup>45</sup>

self, remains, despite Kahrstedt 163, an open question. (2) On the ten *pôlêtai*, chosen by lot, one from each tribe (*Ath. Pol.* 47.2), we have Pollux 8.99, *πρυτανεῖς δ' ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰς, ὅς τὰ παλούμενα βεβαίωσι*; we know nothing more about their *prytanis*. (3) Demosthenes speaks of *ὁ πρυτανεύων* of the *diailêtai* (21.86 f.), and it is likely enough that in a large body this position was held by rotation; Kahrstedt 164, note 2, argues reasonably that (as with the *pôlêtai*) the *prytaneuôn* had a particular job and was not simply chairman. The prytany of the *boulê*, though presiding over meetings of the *boulê* and *ekklêsia*, operated as a board itself, with certain judicial powers.

<sup>44</sup> Thanksgiving ritual, Kahrstedt 249, note 3. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford 1953) 96 f. and 97, note 1: "... there seems to be no sufficient reason to discredit the story."

<sup>45</sup> This passage stands in contrast to other literary evidence (e.g., Plut. *Them.* 13.2; *Nic.* 24.1) which refers to the ritual of a commander in the field on behalf of his troops, and to epigraphic evidence which speaks of the *stratêgoi* as a group (e.g., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1496.83-85, 94-97, etc.) or comes from a time when the functions of the individual generals had

**Nicias, 415 B.C.**

The same considerations must affect our acceptance of Plutarch's account of the preparations for the Sicilian expedition. Plutarch writes that Nicias continued his opposition *καὶ μετὰ τὸ . . . Ἀθηναίους . . . στρατηγὸν ἐλέσθαι πρῶτον ἐκείνουν μετ' Ἀλκιβιάδου καὶ Λαμάχου* (*Nic.* 12.3). Can Plutarch's *prôton* be taken as referring to Nicias' election *ex hapantôn* for the year 415/14 B.C.? It is almost inevitable that a general *ex hapantôn* would be the first man chosen, and there is the possibility that Nicias' tribe had two representatives on the board either in 415/14 or 414/13.<sup>46</sup> Plutarch's words may permit the interpretation that the election of generals for the coming year took place between the first and second assemblies that discussed the Sicilian venture, and, according to him, it was only at the second assembly that the three were granted *autokratoria*. But Thucydides' remarks on the first assembly ("they voted to send sixty ships to Sicily and Alcibiades . . . Nicias . . . and Lamachus . . . as *stratêgoi autokratores*," 6.8.2) imply that they were among the generals already elected for the coming year, and he speaks of the granting of *autokratoria* at both assemblies, referring the first grant to freedom of action in Sicily, the second to the size and composition of the expedition (6.26, but the distinction is not altogether clear). If, however, the generals had already been elected before the first assembly, and if the question whether Nicias was *ex hapantôn* is left aside, there is still the possibility that he was chosen chairman of this detachment of the board of generals. Though it is quite evident from both Thucydides and Plutarch that Nicias was in no sense commander-in-chief of the Sicilian expedition (he could be overruled by the majority, Thuc. 6.50.1; Plut. *Nic.* 21.4), Plutarch's *prôton* may be taken with some other points to indicate that he enjoyed a certain seniority. Thus, at the second assembly as reported in Thucydides, when Nicias is pressed for an estimate of military needs he hesitates and says he would rather deliberate with his fellow generals before answering; to be sure, this is characteristic of Nicias, but it is also in character for the chairman of a group to speak for the group and to hesitate to do so without having their opinion. Later, at Syracuse, we may detect Nicias'

been specialized (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 649.23 ff.). Conon's hecatomb after his victory at Cnidos in 394 B.C. appears to have been a personal undertaking, though enjoyed by "all the Athenians" (*Athen.* 1.3D).

<sup>46</sup> See above, note 7.

influence as the senior general, for though Demosthenes and Eury-medon wish to leave, Nicias' desires prevail (Thuc. 7.49.4, cf. 8.27.1, 5, perhaps a similar case of a senior general's influence). Plutarch seems to be trying to reconcile Nicias' lack of supreme command and his evident weaknesses as a leader with his position of seniority among the generals. Nicias' experience is valued (*Nic.* 12.4, *Comp. Nic. Crass.* 3.5), but Lamachus was *stragégikôteros* (*Nic.* 15.3). When Alcibiades withdraws, Nicias is described as *λόγῳ μὲν ἀποδεχθεὶς δεύτερος ἡγεμῶν, δυνάμει δὲ μόνος ὢν* (*Nic.* 14.4). Plutarch explains in terms of character and especially social status Lamachus' failure to match Nicias' influence and it is at this point that he introduces the anecdote of Nicias and Sophocles which contains, we have argued, unknown to Plutarch, the explanation of Nicias' position in probably more than one of these years. Such considerations may lead us to agree with Beloch, who suggested that Nicias was *tritos autos* for the Sicilian expedition, if we confine this strictly to chairmanship and not command.<sup>47</sup> Against these arguments, however, must be placed the references to the three generals in *IG I<sup>2</sup>* 302.43–44 and 50–52, where Nicias' name comes third; or if we are to understand this order of names as meaning he was *tritos autos* then we must abandon the suggestion that Nicias was chairman or commander on the mission referred to in lines 20–21, where his is the first name.<sup>48</sup> But these are perhaps not serious objections, as there is no guarantee of significance in the mere order of names one way or the other. There remains the considerable danger of distortion by Plutarch in casting history as biography; the *prôton* of *Nic.* 12.3 may be dramatic, not historical.

### Alcibiades, 407 B.C.

The grant to Alcibiades of extraordinary powers in 407 B.C. is often felt to be sufficient explanation of the double representation of Pandionis by Alcibiades and Adeimantus that year. So, e.g., Andrewes writes that as *ἀπάντων ἡγεμῶν αὐτοκράτωρ* (Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.20) "it was quite in order for him to have a colleague from his own tribe."<sup>49</sup> But there are difficulties here. With respect to tribal representation, the situation is no different from that of

<sup>47</sup> Beloch, *AP* 286. Since Beloch's clear distinction of the two there has been no reason to confuse the voting of *autokratoria* with election *ex hapantôn* and chairmanship of the board.

<sup>48</sup> See above, note 37.

<sup>49</sup> *JHS* 73 (1953) 3.

Pericles and Glaucon or Carcinus, and yet it is improbable that Pericles was *autokratôr* on every occasion in which he had a colleague from Acamantis. In fact, we have distinguished the assigning of a particular command or special powers *after* election from the election arrangements that resulted in the doubling of a tribe's representation. In the case of Alcibiades we can see that the two steps are separate. He was elected general sometime before returning to Athens: *στρατηγούς εἶλοντο Ἀλκιβιάδην φεύγοντα καὶ Θρασύβουλον ἀπόντα Κόνωνα δὲ τρίτον ἐκ τῶν οἰκόθεν* (Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.10); it was at this time, Beloch believes, that he was elected president of the board of generals.<sup>50</sup> Xenophon speaks of the election of three men only, though surely, if these were normal *archairesiai* (and regular election by the city is what Alcibiades required for his return, cf. Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.8), all ten generals would be chosen at the same time. Underhill explains that of the ten generals elected Xenophon mentions only the three leaders of the fleet.<sup>51</sup> That is, these three are among those elected in Athens and the two men abroad are then confirmed by the *ekklêsia* to their command, along with Conon who was already in good standing. Only when Alcibiades returns to Athens later that summer is he made *hapantôn hêgemôn autokratôr*, i.e. supreme commander with special competence vis-à-vis the *ekklêsia*. Diodorus says that after his return the Athenians *αὐτὸν στρατηγὸν καταστήσαντες αὐτοκράτορα, καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν, ἀπάσας τὰς δυνάμεις ἐνεχείρισαν αὐτῷ* (13.69.3), which may not be so different from Xenophon's designation of Alcibiades as *hapantôn hêgemôn*, in contrast to Aristocrates and Adeimantus who were *ἡρημένοι κατὰ γῆν στρατηγοί* (*Hell.* 1.4.21). Plutarch writes *ἡρέθη δ' ἅμα καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν αὐτοκράτωρ στρατηγός* (*Alc.* 33.2, cf. Nepos, *Alc.* 7). The descriptions of the later writers (all perhaps influenced by Ephorus), if taken literally, would mean that he was not made general before his return; this error probably arose from failing to see that Alcibiades was not a regularly elected general during his Hellespontine operations and from taking *stratêgos autokratôr* as an office.<sup>52</sup>

Now Diodorus adds that the Athenians *εἶλοντο δὲ καὶ στρατηγούς ἑτέρους οὓς ἐκείνος ᾔθελεν, Ἀδείμαντον καὶ Θρασύβουλον*. From Xenophon it is clear that Thrasybulus' election was prior to and independent of Alcibiades' *autokratoria*. What of Adeimantus? There is

<sup>50</sup> *AP* 286 f.

<sup>51</sup> G. E. Underhill, in his commentary on the *Hellenica* (Oxford 1906) *ad loc.*

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Hignett 248 on this as a modern error.

possibly some suggestion in Xenophon that he may have been elected at the time of the voting of Alcibiades' new command, for he, with Aristocrates, accompanied Alcibiades to Andros *ἡρημένοι κατὰ γῆν στρατηγοί* (*Hell.* 1.4.21), in contrast, presumably, with Alcibiades as *hapantôn hêgemôn*. Yet the expression may be condensed and the election normal, with only the assignment coming later. However, Adeimantus like Alcibiades was one of the exiles for his part in the mystery scandal and we do not know that he found it safe to return any sooner than Alcibiades, although the election *in absentia* of two of the figures in the scandals would be remarkable. The linking of his name with Thrasybulus in Diodorus may indicate an awareness on the part of his source that he too was out of Athens.<sup>53</sup> Thus it is just possible that Adeimantus, at least, was not elected before Alcibiades' return though the latter's intervention may have been limited to securing the same pardon he himself had received; this would require the assumption of a vacancy on the board. If for some reason this were the case, the basic situation is not abnormal — Alcibiades is *ex hapantôn*, Adeimantus is elected to fill a vacancy on his return. Otherwise we are faced with the quite abnormal procedure of first electing only three generals and then electing a slate presented by Alcibiades on his return. Only in this way could the appointment of Adeimantus be brought into connection with Alcibiades' special powers. Of the two possibilities the more regular is certainly preferable, i.e. Adeimantus was elected normally either to fill a vacancy in the summer, or in the spring, having with Alcibiades regained favor in Athens (in which case Diodorus' statement concerns only his assignment to serve with Alcibiades on Andros).

### Cleophon

The recent discovery of an ostrakon in the Athenian agora bearing the name of Cleophon has provided him not only with a father (Cleippides of Acharnae) but, as a consequence, with a tribe (Oeneis).<sup>54</sup> Since this shows that, with great probability, he came from a family that had held the *stratêgia* (Thuc. 3.3.2), the statement that he himself was general (Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 679) requires a more open-minded consideration than it has yet received. Beloch

<sup>53</sup> Aristocrates may have been the moderate of 411 B.C. (Thuc. 8.89.2, 92.2; *Ath. Pol.* 33; [Dem.] 58.67; cf. Tod, p. 206) but if he joined Theramenes at Alcibiades' side in discreet avoidance of the restored democracy he did so after his "city" generalship in 411/10 B.C., when he was at Samos (cf. *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 304A.35).

<sup>54</sup> E. Vanderpool, *Hesperia* 21 (1952) 114 f. Cf. *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 911 = Tod 45.

accepted his *stratêgia* and supported it with some arguments that were not, in themselves, compelling.<sup>55</sup> He believed that Cleophon was elected after the trial of the generals, for 405/4 and possibly the remainder of 406/5 B.C. There is no room for him earlier in 406/5 and his hostility to Alcibiades makes 407/6 unlikely. Earlier he seems to have busied himself with the *diôbelia*, perhaps as *poristês*.<sup>56</sup> 405/4 B.C. is the most reasonable time, when Athens had deprived herself of better men. But in that year Oeneis was represented by Tydeus, son of Lamachus, one of the unsuccessful generals at Aegospotami (Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.16).<sup>57</sup> To the disquieting thought that Cleophon was general must be added the possibility that he was *ex hapantôn*. There is, however, the alternative that Tydeus was so elected; in Plutarch he is the spokesman for the generals when they rebuff Alcibiades (*Lys.* 10.6; *Alc.* 37.1), while in Xenophon Tydeus is coupled with Menander (*Hell.* 2.1.26, cf. Plut. *Alc.* 36.5 οἱ περὶ Τυδέα καὶ Μένανδρον καὶ Ἀδείμαντον στρατηγοί; Diodorus, 13.105.3–4, names no individuals, Nepos, *Alc.* 8, following Ephorus, names Philocles). In either case, we would have traced the chairmanship of the board of generals to its nadir at the end of the fifth century.

In summary, it has been argued that Beloch's hypothesis of a regular, annual chairman of the *stratêgoi*, elected from all the people, remains the most satisfactory explanation of the evidence we have, if the office is strictly limited to the functions of a chairman.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>55</sup> *AP* 89, 313; *RhM* 34 (1884) 255 f.; *GG*<sup>2</sup> 2.1.427, note 2, and 2.2.269. He argued that an ordinary citizen could not have come to the assembly under arms (Aeschin. 2.76; Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 1532), nor would an ordinary citizen have been executed *leipostratiou* (*Lys.* 13.12). Swoboda regarded his generalship as altogether improbable (*RE* s.v. "Kleophon" 793). Two further considerations may be added to Beloch's arguments: in 406/5 B.C. the demagogue Archdemus was handling the *diôbelia* (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.2) and not Cleophon, as previously; nor does he seem to have taken any part that same year in the trial of the generals after Arginusae, and yet he continued to be powerful. Was he on military service, then, in 406/5 B.C., and elected general after the fall of the more moderate Thrasyllus and his colleagues? Cleophon's own downfall came when he abused the *boulê* (τὴν βουλὴν ἐλοιδόρει) and the *boulê* was persuaded to indict him (*Lys.* 30.10). Does the ἐλοιδόρει imply that he abused the *boulê* to its face while in session? If so, his presence there can easily be accounted for. If he were general he would be there as an *ex officio* member, whereas the private citizen did not normally have free access to its sessions, cf. Hignett 242 ff.

<sup>56</sup> See above, note 31, *ad fin.*

<sup>57</sup> On his identity see J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Berlin 1901–3) s.v. "Tydeus" (No. 13884) and "Lamachos" (No. 8981).

<sup>58</sup> The writer is grateful to Professor Edward L. Cannan of the University of Texas for rewarding discussions of these problems, and to the Bryn Mawr College Library for its hospitality.