

## A NOTE ON THE ATHENIAN STRATEGIA

BORIMIR JORDAN

*University of California, Santa Barbara*

In 1964 D. W. Bradeen published an Athenian casualty list in which the curious title of *archôn tou nautikou* was attested for the first time in fifth century Athens. In his commentary on the new term Bradeen collected a number of similar naval titles scattered through the ancient literary sources, and concluded from the examination of the testimonia that *archôn tou nautikou* is not equivalent to *stratêgos* or to *nauarchos*, which is applied almost incidentally to some Athenian naval officers by Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.6.29 and 1.7.30). Secondly, Bradeen assumed that *nauarchos* was the official title of subordinate officers, and raised the possibility that *archôn tou nautikou* could have been the term applied to yet another grade of subordinate officer. On the whole, however, he thought it much more likely that in the last decade of the fifth century the term was applied "to those elected by the fleet in Samos to command them."<sup>1</sup>

Although Bradeen conceded that the generals elected by the fleet are invariably called *stratêgoi* in our sources (Thuc. 8.76.2; Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.22), he was apparently inclined to believe that the "official" title of the generals was *archontes tou nautikou*, while unofficially they called themselves by the traditional Athenian term for a commander-in-chief, *stratêgos*, and were so called by the historians also.<sup>2</sup> Were the date 409 B.C., which Bradeen assigns to the entire monument, securely established, as it is not, the mention in *IG* 1<sup>2</sup> 304 A (Tod 1 83) of a *stratêgos* named Pasiphon Phrearrios of the tribe Leontis would constitute compelling evidence for the identity of the two titles, since one

<sup>1</sup> D. W. Bradeen, "Athenian Casualty Lists," *Hesperia* 33 (1964) 43-55 (= *SEG* XXI 131).

<sup>2</sup> Bradeen (above, note 1) 49.

*archôn tou nautikou* in the *Hesperia* inscription is also called Pasiphon and belongs to Leontis.<sup>3</sup>

There is, however, as I hope to show in what follows, nearly conclusive evidence that there in fact existed in Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries a military grade of *archôn* which was held by officers subordinate to the *stratêgoi*. The existence of such a rank, if it can be proved, would have the most serious consequences for some of the thorniest problems of the Athenian *stratêgia*.

Before proceeding with the presentation and discussion of the evidence we must address ourselves to the problem of nomenclature. What difference, if any, is there between a *nauarchos* and an *archôn tou nautikou*? Bradeen suggested that, on the assumption that both titles refer to subordinate officers, some difference in rank must be postulated, although he did not indicate wherein such a difference might lie.

It is almost certain, however, that *nauarchos* and *archôn tou nautikou* are only slightly different versions of one and the same title. The application of such varied nomenclature to officials and bodies of officials which are identical in every other respect is a well known characteristic of Athenian institutions, and numerous examples for this practice can be adduced, including some in which the titles used are even more disparate than those of *nauarchos* and *archôn tou nautikou*.<sup>4</sup> As far as naval commanders are concerned, W. S. Ferguson long ago showed that in the second and first centuries B.C. the titles of *stratêgos epi to nautikon* and *nauarchos* were applied to the same officer and that the only difference between the two was strictly one of nomenclature and not of fact.<sup>5</sup> The significant element in such compound titles is *archôn*, for it is present in some form in all of the titles under discussion. Consequently, our investigation must be concerned with isolating and defining all terms exhibiting this element.

<sup>3</sup> Bradeen (above, note 1) 48.

<sup>4</sup> The *epimeletai tôn neôriôn*, for example, were also called *hoi archontes en tois neoriois*, *archê*, *epimeloumenoi*, and *neôroi*. Cf. my *The Administration and Military Organization of the Athenian Navy in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Diss. Univ. California, Berkeley [unpublished] 1968) 33-55. Other examples of this practice: IG II<sup>2</sup> 2336, lines 70 and 229 compared with *Inscr. Délos* no. 1878, lines 32, 205 and 219. Cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1028, lines 99 and 105.

<sup>5</sup> W. S. Ferguson, "Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents III," *Klio* 9 (1909) 315.

The thesis which I propose to defend is not new. In 1936 Ulrich Kahrstedt recognized that the subordinate rank of *archôn* was attested as early as the fifth century,<sup>6</sup> and in 1964 Bradeen assigned a similar position to the nauarchs, apparently without being aware of Kahrstedt's findings.

That the rank *archôn-nauarchos* was in wide use at Athens during the fourth century can be inferred from Diodoros. Diodoros, who admittedly cannot, on the whole, be said to have a firm grasp of Athenian institutional and constitutional matters, applies the terms *nauarchos* and *stratêgos epi to nautikon* to Athenian *stratêgoi* who were active in the 'seventies of the fourth century.<sup>7</sup> Although Diodoros clearly confounds these *archontes* with the genuine *stratêgoi*, as I hope my arguments will show, his evidence is valuable at least in so far as it testifies to the existence of these terms at Athens. It is also possible that the historian or rather his source, Ephoros, was further confused in the matter of terminology by the practice, incipient in the very late fifth or in the early fourth century, of assigning special competencies and of apportioning specific commands on land and sea to the individual *stratêgoi*.<sup>8</sup>

Be that as it may, for the late fifth and for the fourth centuries we have unimpeachable evidence documenting the existence of *archontes* with special commissions who ranked below the generals. In listing the evidence I begin with the most obvious examples.

Xenophon reports that three Athenian *nauarchoi* participated in the battle of Arginousai. The position of their ships within the order of battle was at the center of the second line of ships and immediately behind the ships of the taxiarchs. After the battle the generals ordered the ships of the nauarchs, the taxiarchs, the Samians, and some vessels from their own squadrons to sail to the rescue of the shipwrecked.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> U. Kahrstedt, *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur von Athen* 2 (Stuttgart 1936) 275.

<sup>7</sup> Diod. Sic. 15.34.3; 15.36.5; 15.43.6; 15.45.2; 18.15.8-9. Cf. Polyaeus, *Strat.* 5.22.3; Harp. s.v. *Διότιμος*. Themistokles too is called nauarch by Plut. *Them.* 18. The title is discussed by Bradeen (above, note 1) and E. Kiessling, "Nauarchos," *RE* 16 (1935) 1890, but both give a very incomplete list of the testimonia available for Athens. G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* (Munich 1926), do not recognize *nauarchos* as an Athenian title.

<sup>8</sup> C. W. Fornara, *The Strategia of Athens 501/0-405/4* (UCLA Dissertation 1961) 112. Ferguson (above, note 5) 314 ff. places the establishment of the general *epi to nautikon* in 321 B.C.

<sup>9</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.29; 1.7.30.

The three nauarchs of this account clearly cannot have been *stratêgoi*. All ten generals are accounted for by the narrative of Xenophon. Eight of them participated in the battle while two, Konon and Leon, were blockaded at Mytilene.<sup>10</sup> As the nauarchs are not identical with the generals and as they take their orders from them, we must draw the certain conclusion that they held some subordinate rank.

Xenophon makes a similar, clear distinction between *nauarchos* and *stratêgos* at *Hellenica* 5.1.5-9, where he reports that the Athenians appointed Eunomos *nauarchos* and commanded him to defend the Attic coast from the depredations of Gorgopas and the pirates. During the period of Eunomos' activities in the Saronic Gulf, the Athenian *stratêgoi* were in the northern Aegean.<sup>11</sup> Eunomos had thirteen ships under his command, but although he is mentioned three times he is nowhere called a *stratêgos*.

Yet another commander in the narrative of Xenophon who was most probably a nauarch or *archôn tou nautikou* is the Phanosthenes whom the Athenians sent at the head of four ships to replace Konon on Andros in 406-405 B.C.<sup>12</sup> As the ten regularly elected *stratêgoi* for the year have just been listed by Xenophon, the case for Phanosthenes' being an *archon* becomes extremely strong.<sup>13</sup>

The last example of an Athenian *nauarchos* occurs in a spurious decree from the *De Corona*. We may infer from the fact that the *stratêgoi* report to the *ekklêsia* on the forceful detention in Macedonia of the *nauarchos* Leodamas, that Leodamas is not a general, but a subordinate officer serving as commander of some twenty grain ships.<sup>14</sup>

The evidence attesting the alternate terminology used of *archontes* is even more plentiful. It will be seen that the title consists of the participial noun *archôn* or its finite equivalent coupled with a prepositional phrase or a word in the genitive, which define the officer's command. I list the testimonia in chronological order.

<sup>10</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.16. Erasinides was with Konon in Mytilene whence he made his way to the main fleet on board the trireme commanded by the pleader of Lys. 21 who had previously carried Archestratos. Archestratos died and was replaced by Lysias (Lys. 21.8).

<sup>11</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.5; 5.1.7.

<sup>12</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 1.5.18.

<sup>13</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 1.5.16.

<sup>14</sup> Dem. 18.73.

## 414/413 B.C.

Thuc. 7.31.4: ἀφικνείται δὲ Κόνων παρ' αὐτοὺς, ὃς ἦρχε Ναυπάκτου.

The Konon here mentioned is almost certainly the great admiral. His peculiar position at Naupaktos has been noticed by some scholars, but none have explained it adequately. Fornara, for example, sees in Konon's *arché* the antecedent of the various specialized commands of the *stratégoi*. Classen-Steup evidently consider Konon to be a regular *stratégos* and remark with some surprise on the odd way in which Thucydides describes his position. But we need not be surprised. Kondon is simply not a *stratégos*, and Thucydides does not call him that.<sup>15</sup>

## 414/413 B.C.

Thuc. 7.43.3: οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι ἐκ τῆς Ναυπάκτου τριάκοντα ναυσὶ καὶ τρίσιν (ἦρχε δὲ αὐτῶν Δίφιλος) ἐπέπλευσαν αὐτοῖς.

Like Konon, Diphilos is nowhere called a *stratégos*. He is an *archôn tôn neôn* and most probably was Konon's replacement when the latter joined Demosthenes in Arkarnania (Thuc. 7.31.2-3).

## 414 B.C.

Thuc. 7.20.1: . . . ἔστειλαν καὶ Χαρικλέα τὸν Ἀπολλοδώρου ἄρχοντα.

Charikles Apollodorou led a force of thirty ships around the Peloponnesos in the summer of 414. He is styled *archôn* in an emphatic way and is nowhere called a *stratégos*.

<sup>15</sup> Fornara (above, note 8) 113. J. Classen and J. Steup, *Thukydides* (Berlin 1900-22) *ad loc.* Konon's command at Naupaktos forms a link which has not been noticed so far between the *archontes* whom the Athenians appointed as governors in some of the subject states and in other strategic points (e.g. Naupaktos and Pylos) and the *archontes* who commanded squadrons of ships. The "governor"—*archontes* are abundantly attested in fifth and fourth century inscriptions: SIG<sup>3</sup> 54 (after 450 B.C.) lines 5-7; SIG<sup>3</sup> 107 (410/9) line 45; SIG<sup>3</sup> 114 (408/7) lines 15-20; SIG<sup>3</sup> 136 (387/6) lines 15 ff. SIG<sup>3</sup> 192 (357/6) lines 15-20, where, however, it is expressly required that the *archon* be one of the duly elected generals; SIG<sup>3</sup> 199 (355/4) lines 24-25 SIG<sup>3</sup> 207 (346/5) line 20. Despite this evidence the *archontes* (on whom see Busolt-Swoboda 1356, 1376) are not even mentioned in the numerous and elaborate articles devoted to the problems of the *stratégia*. Yet the cases of Konon and Diphilos prove beyond any doubt that the *archontes* of most, if not all, Athenian overseas stations commanded squadrons with which they operated just like the generals.

## 411 B.C.

Thuc. 8.64.1-2: . . . καὶ Διειτρέφη ὄντα περὶ Χίον, ἡρημένον δὲ εἰς τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης ἄρχειν, ἀπέστελλον ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν.

This Dieitrephes, an appointee of the Oligarchy, is certainly the same one who was ordered to escort the Thracian mercenaries home (Thuc. 7.29). As Thucydides does not call him a *stratēgos*, we must assume that his official title was *archōn epi Thrakēs*.

## After 409 B.C.

Bradeen, *Hesperia* 33 (1964) 43 (SEG XXI 131): ἄρχων τοῦ ναυτικοῦ.

Bradeen's date of 409 B.C. rests on combinations and is not binding. The document may well be later than 409 B.C. Two men, Theoros and Pasiphon, are called *archontes tou nautikou*. If, as is most likely, this Pasiphon is the general of 409 B.C. (IG I<sup>2</sup> 304 A), we can assume that he was *archōn* after he had served as *stratēgos*. No difficulty arises from such an assumption; if Pasiphon failed to win re-election as *stratēgos* after 409, he obviously continued to serve the state in the lesser capacity of *archōn*. It follows that 409 B.C. is the *terminus post quem* for the entire casualty list.

## 410/409 B.C.

IG I<sup>2</sup> 304 A, lines 9-10: ἕτερον τοῖς αὐτοῖς Ἑλληνοταμίαις Ἑρμῶνι ἐδόθη ἄρχοντι εἰς Πύλον.

The records of the treasurers of Athena for this year show that six talents were disbursed to the commandant at Pylos whose official title as recorded on the stone is *archōn es Pylon*.<sup>16</sup> There is no possibility whatever that a general may be meant by the term, for the generals are referred to as *stratēgoi* in line 35. Kahrstedt cited this inscription as evidence for the existence of the rank of *archōn*, and pointed to the fact that *archontes* were given their own military treasury (*Finanzhoheit*).

<sup>16</sup> This *archōn* Hermon may well be the Hermon said to be the *archōn* of the *peripoloi* at Mounichia (Thuc. 8.92.5). If he is, he would be an example of one *archōn* who did not have whatever it took to become a general, and Thucydides' way of referring to him suggests that this was so.

## 362 B.C.

(Dem.) 50.53: . . . ἐμβιβάσας μοι Λυκῖνον τὸν Παλληνέα ἄρχοντα εἰς τὴν ναῦν.

According to this speech the Athenians launched a sizeable naval expedition in the archonship of Molon. Towards the end of the campaign, the general in command of the expedition ordered some of the ships in the squadron to return to Athens. As commander (*archôn*) of the force bound for home he appointed a certain Lykinos of Pallene who was under orders to pay the *siterêsion* to the sailors.

## 360 B.C.

Dem. 23.161: . . . ὁ ἄρχων Κριθώτης.

The *archôn* at Krithote is mentioned by Demosthenes in connection with the activities of Charidemus in Thrace. There clearly is an official ring to the title *archôn* in this passage, precluding the possibility that the officer stationed at Krithote was a general.

The cumulative weight of the evidence assembled above must confer the status of indisputable fact on the theory that the distinct rank of *archôn* existed at Athens. This theory can be considered as proven beyond doubt even if the identification of *nauarchos* with the formulae containing the term *archôn* is not accepted.<sup>17</sup> If, however, this identity is accepted, we are confronted with an impressive body of evidence which has an important bearing on several problems connected with the *stratêgia* of Athens, namely the tangled problems of supremacy of one general over his colleagues and double representation on the strategic board.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Kahrstedt (above, note 6) 275.

<sup>18</sup> Even if one prefers to adhere to the view that *nauarchos* and *archôn tou nautikou* are two different grades, one would merely be postulating the existence of two subordinate ranks instead of one, which does not affect the present argument.

<sup>19</sup> The bibliography on the problems of the *stratêgia* is collected in C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1962) 348 ff. and E. S. Staveland, "Voting Procedure at the Election of *Strategoï*," *Ancient Society and Institutions* (Studies presented to V. Ehrenberg Oxford 1966) 285-86. Although it is not much more than a competent review of the work of others, Fornara (above, note 8) should be added to the bibliography.

My contention, to put it briefly, is twofold. First, some of the Athenian commanders mentioned by Thucydides who have hitherto been regarded as *stratēgoi* are in fact *archontes*. Secondly, only those commanders can be drawn into a discussion of the problems of election, command, and tribal representation who are expressly called *stratēgoi* by Thucydides. In the cases of all others we must suspend judgement until they have been proven to be *stratēgoi*.

The *archai* of Konon, Diphilos, Charikles, and Dieitrephes have already been adduced as evidence that the technical terminology of *archontes* is in some measure recognized and used by Thucydides. It may properly be objected that their cases do not constitute positive proof since the fact that Thucydides does not call them *stratēgoi* does not necessarily mean that they were not generals. However, the weakness of the *e silentio* argument is counteracted by the epigraphical evidence which proves that the title did actually exist. There is, moreover, a piece of evidence in Thucydides of more positive character than the cases of the commanders referred to above.

This evidence is supplied by the careers of two commanders, Diomedon and Leon. We first meet Diomedon approaching the coast of Asia Minor with sixteen ships. Soon after we find him at Teos, and later on in this same summer his squadron is reinforced by the ten ships under the command of Leon. The entire force now sails to Lesbos whence Leon and Diomedon carry on the war against Chios.

So far neither Diomedon nor Leon are said to be *stratēgoi*; Thucydides describes their position by saying simply that they "command the ships." During the winter of 412/411 the *ekklēsia*, acting on false accusations brought forward by Peisander, cashiered the *stratēgoi* Phrynichos and Skironides, and "sent Diomedon and Leon to the fleet as *stratēgoi* in their place." Leon and Diomedon arrived at their new posts in the same winter, and when we hear of them again early in the summer of 411, they are called *stratēgoi*. In order to illustrate the change in nomenclature which Thucydides applies to the two men, I list the passages dealing with Diomedon and Leon.

Thuc. 8.19.2: καὶ καθορῶσιν ἑκκαίδεκα ναῦς ἃς ὕστερον . . . Διομέδων ἔχων προσέπλει.

Thuc. 8.20.2: καὶ Διομέδων ἀφικόμενος.



Thuc. 8.23.1: αἱ Ἀττικάι νῆες ἔπλεον ἐς Λέσβον ὧν ἦρχε Λέων καὶ Διομέδων.

Thuc. 8.24.2: καὶ Λέων καὶ Διομέδων ἔχοντες τὰς . . . ναῦς.

Thuc 8.54.3: ἄμα τε διαβαλόντος καὶ Φρύνιχον τοῦ Πεισάνδρου παρέλυσεν ὁ δῆμος τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ τὸν ξυνάρχοντα Σκιρωνίδην, ἀντέπεμψαν δὲ στρατηγοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς Διομέδοντα καὶ Λέοντα.

Thuc. 8.55.1: ὁ δὲ Λέων καὶ ὁ Διομέδων . . . ἀφιγμένοι . . . ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ναῦς.

Thuc. 8.73.4: οἱ δὲ αἰσθόμενοι τῶν τε στρατηγῶν Λέοντι καὶ Διομέδοντι . . . τὸ μέλλον σημαίνουσι.

Thuc. 8.73.5: ὁ τε Λέων καὶ ὁ Διομέδων. ναῦς . . . κατέλειπον.

The crucial word in these passages is *stratēgous* at 8.54.3. Why did Thucydides choose to call Diomedon and Leon *stratēgoi* at this point in their careers? It is true that he uses *archō* and *archē* inconsistently, and it can be shown that *archō* is used particularly of *stratēgoi*. But it would be asking too much of the laws of probability to argue that his own inconsistency in the use of terminology has caused him to drop the term *archō* and to substitute *stratēgos* precisely at the point when Leon and Diomedon were commissioned to replace the two deposed generals. The only credible answer can be that after the deposition of Phrynichos and Skironides, Leon and Diomedon, who up to that time had served as *archontes*, were elevated to the *stratēgia* by popular mandate.

The extraordinary appointment in 414 of Menandros and Euthydemos, who were certainly not elected in the seventh prytany, proves that the constitutional process could be disregarded and that commanders could be brought into office whenever pressing needs required it.<sup>20</sup> The rank which Menandros and Euthydemos held before they were commissioned is not known. Fornara suggests that they had been taxiarchs. This is possible, but there are no certain examples for a direct "promotion" of a taxiarch to a general.<sup>21</sup> In the light of the results obtained so far, the assumption that Menandros and Euthydemos were *archontes* is much more likely.<sup>22</sup>

We may now make a further application of these results to certain

<sup>20</sup> Thuc. 7.16.1. Cf. D. M. Lewis, "Double Representation in the *Strategia*," *JHS* 81 (1961) 122.

<sup>21</sup> Fornara (above, note 8) 104. A possible but not very probable case may be that of Lamachos; Lewis (above, note 20) 120.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Thuc. 6.32.1.

passages in Thucydides with a view to determining whether some of the commanders mentioned by the historian were in fact *archontes* rather than *stratēgoi*.

The notorious difficulty at 1.57.6 can be cleared up if we assume, in accordance with the evidence for a subordinate grade of *archôn*, that the *alloi deka* dispatched to Poteidaia with Archestratos Lykomedous are not generals but *archontes*. As only one of the eleven commanders is a *stratēgos*, Thucydides very properly refers to the entire contingent not as *stratēgoi*, but as *archontes tôn neôn*. The text can be allowed to stand as it is, and the considerable efforts to provide a suitable emendation can now be scrapped.<sup>23</sup>

It has been assumed that of two commanders for the year 426/425, Aristoteles Timokratous and Hierophon Antimnestou, the former may be identical with a general of the year 431/430, the last four letters of whose name are preserved in IG 1<sup>2</sup> 299, and also with a *hellenotamias* and a member of the Thirty bearing the name of Aristoteles. Although neither the restoration *Aristotelei* in IG 1<sup>2</sup> 299 nor the date of the inscription are certain, some elaborate arguments have been constructed on this flimsy evidence in recent years concerning the motive for double representation on the strategic board and the principle of election *ex hapantôn*.<sup>24</sup> However, Aristoteles and Hierophon, who is otherwise unknown, can no longer be regarded as *stratēgoi*. In describing their commands, Thucydides uses exactly the same terminology as in the case of Leon and Diomedon (ὧν ἡρχε, ἡρχε τῶν νεῶν).

The nature of the command held by Strombichides Diotimou is less clear. He is evidently an *archôn* at the beginning of his career while in charge of eight ships at Speiraios in the spring of 412. During this period we find him operating in the vicinity of Samos.<sup>25</sup> Not until the winter of 412/411 is he called a *stratēgos*, when he is assigned to the fleet at Samos along with the two other generals, Charminos and

<sup>23</sup> See A. W. Gomme *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1944) 1 209 for a discussion of the various proposed emendations of the text in this passage. A minor difficulty which may be resolved by the *archôn* hypothesis is the curious nomenclature *ho labôn* and *ho komizôn* (Thuc. 2.85.5-6; Gomme (above, note 23) 2 221). The commander referred to was probably an *archôn* whose name Thucydides could not or did not bother to ascertain.

<sup>24</sup> Thuc. 3.105.3. See Gomme (above, note 23) 2 417-18. The argument made by Lewis (above, note 20) 119-21 and its result are accepted by Staveland (above, note 19) 286.

<sup>25</sup> Thuc. 8.15.1; 8.16.1-2.

Euktemon,<sup>26</sup> and is in office as a *stratēgos* in the following year.<sup>27</sup> His case appears to be analogous to that of Leon and Diomedon, for he probably was elected *stratēgos* (as a *suffectus*?) sometime between the spring of 412 and the following winter.

There now remains to consider what conclusions must be drawn from these findings concerning the enigmatic *autos* formulae used by Thucydides. Let it be said that in only two of these does Thucydides make it absolutely clear that all the commanders involved are *stratēgoi*.<sup>28</sup> In all other cases we cannot discount the possibility that the commanders implicitly included in the numeral are not generals but *archontes*. For example, Kallias was sent to Poteidaia along with four others whom Thucydides calls his *xynarchontes*. Kallias himself, however, is called *ho tôn Athēnaion stratēgos*.<sup>29</sup> The terminology can be best explained if we assume that the other four were not *stratēgoi*, but *archontes*. We can take the phrase *pempton auton stratēgon* to mean "they sent Kallias, the fifth (of a group of five commanders), as *stratēgos*" rather than "as the fifth general" if we construe *stratēgon* as a predicate in the most narrow sense and not in loose apposition.

This hypothesis can be applied without any difficulty and with even better results (cf. especially Thuc. 3.19.1) to all of the remaining passages where the *autos* formula occurs. It follows from this that in the two instances where the title *stratēgos* is applied to all of the generals, the one mentioned by name was in overall command. This view has been combated by Dover,<sup>30</sup> and Lewis has observed that although Phrynichos is called *ho tôn Athēnaion stratēgos*, he persuades rather than overrules his colleagues.<sup>31</sup> But the men who served in the military forces of Athens, and particularly those in the positions of command, were first and foremost civilians with equal political rights and members of the government. They were military men secondarily and only incidentally, and at least before the fourth century, never professional military men. A commander-in-chief could not, therefore, expect the same unquestioning obedience from his technical subordinates as the Roman *imperatores* and their modern counterparts.

<sup>26</sup> Thuc. 8.30.2.

<sup>27</sup> Thuc. 8.62.2; 8.63.1; 8.79.3-5.

<sup>28</sup> Thuc. 2.79; 3.3 and 3.4.

<sup>29</sup> Thuc. 1.61.1; and 1.62.4.

<sup>30</sup> K. J. Dover, "Dekatos Autos," *JHS* 80 (1960) 69-71.

<sup>31</sup> Lewis (above, note 20) 121.