
Notes on Certain Athenian Generals of the Year 424-3 B. C.

Author(s): Allen B. West

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, 1924, Vol. 45, No. 2 (1924), pp. 141-160

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/289025>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*

JSTOR

II.—NOTES ON CERTAIN ATHENIAN GENERALS OF THE YEAR 424-3 B. C.

The lists of Athenian generals for the first half of the Peloponnesian War, to which we must go for a large part of our knowledge of the political vicissitudes in Athens during this period, are in need of correction. In certain cases, apparently slight modifications make possible the re-assembling of our material in such a way as to throw considerable light on the tribal affiliations and political views of certain generals.¹ In this paper I shall use as a basis for discussion the revised lists of Beloch, indicating, wherever necessary, the changes that must be made.² In addition to revising the list of generals for the year 424-3, a list that offers us several points of unusual interest, and one that can be reconstructed with greater precision than most, I shall try to make clear the political situation of that year by showing how the change in public opinion that swept over Athens after the defeat at Delion and the victories of Brasidas in the north found expression in four or five important bye elections and resulted in the return of Nicias' supporters to office.

DEMODOCUS.

No one, I think, after reading Thucydides' account of the campaigns of 424,³ would have assigned Demodocus to the year

¹ As this paper was written preliminary to my article, *Pericles' Political Heirs*, Class. Phil., April, 1924, pp. 124 ff., the two papers supplement each other; and statements made there depend for proof upon the material collected here. For the political views and party platforms of the rival leaders, Cleon and Nicias, see that paper, where I have shown that Nicias was neither an oligarch nor a pacifist, but a Periclean democrat, conservative only when contrasted with Cleon. In the present paper I shall use the word "conservative" in that sense.

² Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*,² II, 2, pp. 260-269. I have chosen Beloch in preference to Arthur Krause, *Attische Strategenlisten bis 146*, Weimar, 1914, because his lists are more readily accessible, more recent, and on the whole more accurate, even though not quite so detailed. In a few cases Krause is probably to be preferred, but in the main, so far as concerns this paper, the errors of the one are the errors of the other.

³ Thuc., iv. 66-75.

425-4, if Beloch had not come to the conclusion that the chronology of Thucydides was inexact or that Demodocus and his colleagues Aristides and Lamachus held commands after their year of office had expired.⁴ The operations of these generals in the Hellespont and the Black Sea followed, or were contemporary with, the expedition into the Megarid, led by Hippocrates and Demosthenes. As neither Hippocrates nor Demosthenes held office in 425-4, their campaign came shortly after they entered the strategion, midsummer 424, and by the same token Demodocus should be considered a general of their year.

Beloch for two reasons, neither of which is adequate, sets aside the evidence of Thucydides as of no importance, whereupon other writers, accepting his assumption as a fact, are led into unwarrantable deductions.⁵ Beloch's first assumption is that no general would hold the lucrative and responsible post of revenue-collector for two years in succession, and since Aristides served in that capacity during the preceding winter,⁶ he and both his colleagues, Lamachus and Demodocus, could not have commanded the tribute-collecting ships in 424-3. It hardly seems worth while to answer such an argument. In the first place, although we may agree with Beloch that no Athenian general, not even an Aristides, could be trusted with the collection of unpaid tribute for more than a year at a time, we need not suppose that generals in this position invariably failed of re-election or were recalled to Athens immediately upon the expiration of a year in office. Furthermore, it was a very simple matter to replace generals serving in the Aegean when it was time for their successors to take over their commands. The Salaminia and Paralos were constantly cruising about on errands of this kind; but probably for a voyage to the Hellespont it would be unnecessary to make use of these vessels. There were enough merchant ships sailing on that route to provide accommodations for an occasional general. A few days would suffice to bring every general to his new station, and as several months intervened between the elections and the time when the generals took up their duties, it seems unreasonable to suppose

⁴ *Attische Politik seit Pericles*, pp. 303 f.

⁵ Cf. Busolt's account of the elections of 425-4, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1084.

⁶ *Thuc.*, iv. 50.

that in ordinary circumstances, at least in the Aegean, there would be any delay in relieving generals whose terms had expired.

Beloch's further assumption that Athens never had more than ten generals in a given year seems at first sight a more reasonable argument for assigning Demodocus and his colleagues to the previous year, for otherwise, Beloch points out, we should be confronted with an impossible number of eleven generals. But as a matter of fact, it is probable that Athens had twelve generals or more in 424-3 rather than ten, for Hippocrates lost his life at Delion and Thucydides lost his office at Amphipolis. To fill these positions special elections were undoubtedly held, and one of the eleven generals of course owed his position to one of these bye elections.

This solution of the difficulty has two advantages over Beloch's. It preserves Thucydides' reputation for accuracy,—Beloch, I believe, does not consider him worthy of a pedestal⁷—and it also enables us to understand why there were so many conservative generals in a year when the regular spring elections brought victory to the radical city democracy led by Cleon and his aristocratic cat's-paw Hippocrates. The latter apparently acted as commander-in-chief. After the unlucky campaign in Boeotia and the loss of Amphipolis a conservative reaction set in that resulted in the armistice of the following spring. Can we doubt that the special election held after the death of Hippocrates brought into office a man from the opposing party?

The question remains, what were the political affiliations of Demodocus? It is difficult to say with any certainty, but judged by the task to which he was assigned, and perhaps by the company with which he was associated, he was probably one of Cleon's henchmen. Aside from the opportunities for graft in the revenue-collector's post, which made it a plum for demagogues and their associates⁸ to wheedle out of the gullible demos, conditions made it imperative that reliable and ruthless democrats should be on guard in the Aegean to forestall revolts caused by the heavily increased tribute and to enforce payment

⁷ For one of Beloch's gibes against the author, see *Gr. Gesch.*², II, 1, p. 333, note 2.

⁸ Aristophanes, *Knights*, 1067 ff.; *Wasps*, 668-679.

from unwilling and delinquent subjects. Unscrupulous democrats were also needed to bring unfounded charges against the wealthy citizens of the allied states, by which they might be brought to trial and their property confiscated for the benefit of the hungry populace or the unpaid sailors.⁹ It is hard to imagine Cleon at the time of his greatest popularity allowing any one but his most loyal supporters to undertake such a task.¹⁰ Aristophanes by his reference to the greedy fox-dogs of tribute-collecting ships in the *Knights*, 424, and by his more detailed accusations given in the *Wasps* two years later, shows clearly that about this very time Cleon had secured the appointment of his friends to this profitable position. Though these strictures may be grossly exaggerated, they serve to cast suspicion upon every man who acted as revenue-collector at the time of Cleon's ascendancy, and, more important for our purpose, to brand him as a radical democrat. He may have been as honest as the day, or again he may have been one of those aristocrats who were attacked by the Old Oligarch¹¹ because they espoused the democratic cause for the benefit of their personal finances. It is impossible to say, nor does it greatly matter. At least it is hard to agree with Busolt that Demodocus probably belonged to the party of Nicias.¹² Busolt might have come to a different conclusion if he had seen that Demodocus was elected as a colleague of Cleon in 424, and not, as he thought, as a colleague of Nicias in 425 when the conservative democrats were comparatively successful at the polls. Demodocus may have held office the previous year as well, but there is absolutely no evidence that he did.

ARISTIDES.

Aristides, the colleague of Demodocus in the summer of 424, should be added to the list of generals for 424-3,¹³ but since Thucydides mentions him as a revenue-collector in the preceding winter,¹⁴ his name should not be taken from Beloch's list for 425-4.

⁹ Ar., *Knights*, 1067 ff.; *Wasps*, 286 ff.; *Peace*, 639 ff.

¹⁰ Cf. Ps.-Xenophon, *Constitution of Athens*, i. 14.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, ii. 20.

¹³ Thuc., iv. 75.

¹² *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1084.

¹⁴ Thuc., iv. 50.

His politics were probably the same as Cleon's, for what we have said of Demodocus applies with equal or greater force to Aristides. It has been suggested that Panourgipparchides, whom Aristophanes criticizes for having a highly paid sinecure on the Thracian coast, is Aristides the son of Archippos who was serving there in a lucrative post a few months later.¹⁵ That is quite possible, and, if true, it would make of Aristides a radical.¹⁶

Now that we know that Aristides held office for two years, it is possible to assign him to a tribe with a considerable degree of certainty. Beloch's lists of generals, with the additions and corrections indicated by this paper,¹⁷ show that in one or the other of these two years every tribe except Cecropis is represented by a general.¹⁸ Aristides, therefore, can have belonged to no other tribe. He was Laches' successor.¹⁹

LAMACHUS.

Lamachus, like Demodocus, served in 424-3²⁰ but not in 425-4; but unlike Demodocus and Aristides he was something more than a politician, or perhaps it would be more accurate to call him less of a party man.²¹ He was the forerunner of the

¹⁵ Velsen, *Philol. Anz.*, VII, 1876, 386; cf. Herbst, *Philol.*, XLIX, 161; Busolt, *op. cit.*, 621; Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 603.

¹⁶ I can not agree with Busolt, *op. cit.*, 1084, when he makes Aristides a partisan of Nicias.

¹⁷ For proof that Pythodorus does not belong to Cecropis see page 155 *infra*. Since he is not a member of Cecropis, he should be assigned to Hippothontis.

¹⁸ During the Peloponnesian War I feel sure that the generals were elected each one by his own tribe. Therefore all tribes would be represented except when the tribe of the commander-in-chief had two generals.

¹⁹ It is tempting to consider Aristides as the father or close relative of Aristomachus, an oligarch who was active in the Revolution of 411, Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 32, 1, for an Aristides, son of Aristomachus, of the tribe Cecropis, is known to us in the next century. Kirchner, *Prosop. Att.*, 1689. We need not be surprised to find the son of a democrat taking part in the oligarchic revolution, for some of the most radical democratic politicians became oligarchs when the tide turned that way. See Busolt, *op. cit.*, 1350.

²⁰ Thuc., iv. 75.

²¹ Cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, 1084.

professional soldiers of the fourth century, a man who apparently had no large source of income aside from the perquisites of office, who padded his expense accounts so as to get a pair of shoes or an overcoat, and whose reputation for strategic ability in the army, although high, was insufficient to counteract the disdain felt by the well-to-do hoplite farmers for their impecunious leader.²² He had all the qualifications for generalship, except wealth and social position, and although he had enviable renown for bravery and military ability, he was never forgiven for not having been born a gentleman, at least not until after his heroic death in Sicily.

As a semi-professional soldier Lamachus was a convenient person to have in the strategion. On him could be foisted the disagreeable duties that promised much danger and little glory. It was Lamachus who was sent into the Black Sea when his colleagues chose the easy and more showy task of reducing Antandrus, and it was Lamachus who is pictured by Aristophanes in the *Acharnians* as being sent on a dangerous expedition by the numerous and incompetent generals.²³ He appears there as a well-disciplined subordinate ready to answer his country's call at a moment's notice, and it was precisely for this rôle that he was chosen to go with Nicias and Alcibiades on the ill-fated Sicilian expedition.

A man of that type is not likely to be much of a politician, and whenever he does enter politics as a candidate for office, he does it as a soldier relying upon the fame of his military exploits. For some reasons this should have been a simpler task in fifth-century Athens than it is today, for there party lines were not strictly drawn and party government was unknown. There, too, the chief elective office called for strategic ability, or at least military experience accompanied by the habit of command. Thus in theory it should have been easy for men who had distinguished themselves in the field to enter the strategion; but in fact it was quite the contrary, for the custom of choosing generals from the *καλοὶ κάγαθοί* was very firmly entrenched. A new man like Lamachus would find it difficult to ride into office on a flood of hero worship, and once in office he would meet

²² Plutarch, *Nicias*, 15; *Alcibiades*, 18, 21.

²³ *Acharnians*, 1071 ff.

with a certain amount of insubordination among the troops, as both Lamachus and Cleon discovered, the one in Sicily, the other before Amphipolis. Only as subordinates could self-made generals perform the most effective service. They were most useful when they were under the protecting wing of some friend or patron.

Their tenure of office was in like measure dependent upon finding some one to vouch for them and to throw the weight of his influence in their favor. The career of Lamachus illustrates what I mean. He first appears as a general in the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes, but elected, as it would seem, under peculiar circumstances. The scenes in which he appears have been a source for much discussion, because, while he enters as a general in one passage,²⁴ in another he is apparently not one of them but merely their tool,²⁵ in other words, a subordinate officer whom they can order about. One explanation for this change of rôles is that he had been elected in a bye election to take the place of Procles who had fallen in Demosthenes' Aetolian expedition.²⁶ And this may well be true, for Dicaeopolis is careful to tell us that at the election only a handful of cuckoos voted.²⁷ At a special election during the busy season in summer the peasant vote would probably be very small. The three cuckoos represent the worthless citizens of the city demes, *voces et praeterea nihil*.²⁸

Of course Dicaeopolis, the typical Attic peasant, would bear it ill that a man of Lamachus' stamp should get into office by such a fluke, although he might hold Lamachus in high esteem for his bravery and devotion to duty, virtues which he could appreciate much better than his fellow-tribesmen from the city. That Lamachus had shown himself possessed of these qualities in Aetolia, where Procles lost his life, is Müller-Strübing's happy suggestion.²⁹ The name of Lamachus, hero of the

²⁴ *Acharnians*, 566-625.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1071-1226.

²⁶ Gilbert, *Beitr. z. inn. Gesch. Athens*, 175. Beloch, *Att. Pol.*, 302. is wrong, I think, in his conclusion that Lamachus was not a general in 426-5.

²⁷ *Acharnians*, 598.

²⁸ Rogers, note on *Acharnians*, 598.

²⁹ Müller-Strübing, *Acharnians*, 575.

“crests and cohorts,”³⁰ was probably in every one’s mouth at the time of the special election. Perhaps the pun of Aristophanes, so reminiscent of the peculiar characteristics of the Aetolian terrain,³¹ was coined soon after the news of Lamachus’ heroism reached Athens and as a slogan carried his cause to victory. A minority election and military fame had combined to bring about the election of a *novus homo*.

It would be interesting to know just what Aristophanes thought of Lamachus, and whether the Lamachus of his plays is the real man or merely a punning personification of the war spirit to which was attached the martial name of a well-known soldier.³² If we can determine the underlying purpose of the scenes in which Lamachus appears, it may help us to answer these questions. At first we see him as an ally of the warlike Acharnian semi-chorus, but at the end he is represented as a symbol of the inefficiency of the generals in office. After fighting for his country at their command, he returned wounded in the midst of the festivities being celebrated by Dicaeopolis.³³ In his eagerness to get at the enemy, he had suffered humiliating and ludicrous accidents, running into a stake, falling into a ditch, spraining his ankle and bumping his head; then recovering quickly he had brought to a stop the rout of his disorganized command and driven the Boeotians away in flight. There is nothing of the cowardly Miles Gloriosus in this,—Busolt is wrong in calling him a Bramarbas,³⁴ nor can we detect any personal malice against him in the mind of the author of

³⁰ Rogers, translation of τῶν λόφων καὶ τῶν λόχων, *Acharnians*, 575.

³¹ Müller-Strübing, *loc. cit.*

³² Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens*, 54 f., thinks that Aristophanes did not try to individualize Lamachus. To Croiset the Lamachus of the play is nothing but a caricature of the class of professional soldiers to which he belonged, a class that was much hated by the peasants. It was this class that Aristophanes was attacking, not Lamachus the representative of the war party and the tool and associate of the demagogues. There is much to be said for the view that Aristophanes was holding up to ridicule the professional officer with his exaggerated military air and his blustering ways, but it seems to me that he had a great deal more in mind when he wrote the scenes where Lamachus appears.

³³ *Acharnians*, 1174 ff.

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, 1084.

the play. On the contrary, Lamachus is the unfortunate victim of war in this scene where the evils of war are so humorously contrasted with the blessings of peace. It is Lamachus in whose mouth is placed the most biting criticism of the generals; and it is he who suffers most, through their fault, in being prevented from attending the Dionysiac revels. It is not difficult to sympathize with him, and one can imagine that Aristophanes was actually sorry for him, as he was sorry for all those who had suffered in the war.

The persons against whom Aristophanes was really directing his shafts were the incompetent leaders of the war party, not a more or less competent subordinate. Aristophanes undoubtedly did take occasion to ridicule Lamachus' poverty, his eagerness to serve in well paid positions, and perhaps his unpaid debts, but Lamachus was hardly one of the young men of "noble birth and little worth,"³⁵ such as Dicaeopolis complains of, no Braggart or Impostor from Diomeia, perhaps the successor to Nicias, no Geretothedorus, who was perhaps Procles the son of Theodoros, a general who had been recently killed in battle and replaced by Lamachus himself.³⁶ The contrast is evident. Not Lamachus, but his colleagues are being attacked.³⁷

On the whole, it is difficult to find any more malice in the characterization of Lamachus in the *Acharnians* than in that of Nicias and Demosthenes in the *Knights* of the following year; and likewise, the historical Lamachus of Thucydides and Plutarch is easily discernible in the broad humor of the play. I think we may go even deeper into the mind of Aristophanes and say that he felt an admiration for certain of Lamachus' traits of character, his bravery, loyalty, and devotion to duty. After his death in Sicily, Aristophanes speaks of him only with respect.³⁸

³⁵ Rogers, note on *Acharnians*, 603.

³⁶ *Acharnians*, 598-625.

³⁷ Croiset, *op. cit.*, 54 f., I think, has overrated the part played by the professional officers in the politics and campaigns of this period. See also *op. cit.*, 57. This has resulted in his stressing the martial peculiarities of the rough soldier which he admits are merely the external trappings of the type to which Lamachus belonged. Thus his attention is diverted by details of little significance from the real purpose of the author.

³⁸ *Frogs*, 1039; *Thesmophor.*, 841.

In the *Eirene*, presented after the Peace of Nicias was assured, there are passing references to Lamachus. The day of Peace is Misolamachus.³⁹ In another place Lamachus is represented as shirking and standing in the way of the peasants who were busily engaged in unearthing Peace.⁴⁰ But the implied charges against him are only such as have been made against professional soldiers on many occasions since then. At the end of the play the son of Lamachus displays an inability to think or sing about anything except the glories of war.⁴¹ It would seem as though he had made himself objectionable by boasting of his father's exploits. In these references to Lamachus we can see what was more apparent in the *Acharnians*, his dependence upon the perquisites of office for a livelihood, and his military reputation.

Lamachus was a soldier, not a politician, a follower and not a leader; and as a soldier he would find himself in agreement with the party that stood for aggressive measures and a war fought to a finish. No compromise peace would satisfy a soldier who felt that an ultimate victorious peace was possible, and I imagine Lamachus was no exception. As a follower, he could only succeed in politics under the wing of some leading politician, and he had to choose between Nicias and Cleon. It was an easy choice for a soldier whose personal bravery was not tempered with prudence; and Lamachus, the protégé of Cleon, found himself in office when his patron was in the ascendancy, first in 426-5 as the result of a special election, next in 424-3 as a colleague of Cleon, and probably again in 422-1, when Cleon held the generalship a second time. If not general in that year, he at least held some official position that made him *ex officio* one of the Athenian Peace Commission to ratify the treaties with Sparta.⁴² But it is hard to think of Lamachus holding any position not connected with the army.

The next time we hear of Lamachus in the strategion, Alcibiades was at the height of his power, and the aggressive plans of Cleon had been revived. He was then chosen as the third in command of the Sicilian expedition and served on that expedition until his death.

³⁹ *Peace*, 304.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 473 f.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1270-1294.

⁴² *Thuc.*, v. 19, 24.

EURYMEDON

Another general whose career offers interesting problems is Eurymedon, serving continuously from 427 to 424, when he lost his position because of the failure of his Sicilian command, and coming out of political retirement in 414 to hold office until his death in 413-2.

Busolt has shown that his demotic was either Ἐκαλήθην or Κεφαλήθην and his tribe either Acamantis or Leontis.⁴³ As Hippocrates was a member of Acamantis and was general also in 426-5, it is almost certain that Eurymedon should be assigned to Leontis. In none of the years when Eurymedon held office did Leontis have a general, so far as our records permit us to judge. Furthermore we know that when he was not in office, some one else represented that tribe, Thucydides being the first.

Before considering the details of Thucydides' election, a few words about the previous career of Eurymedon will be necessary. His election in 427 coincides with Cleon's advent to leadership of the city demos, and his actions at Corcyra, where he showed sympathy with the ruthless democracy of the city, have linked his name with the radical Athenian democrats. In 425 he was chosen with Pythodorus and Sophocles to carry out Cleon's imperialistic plans in Sicily. When the elections of 424 took place he was still in Sicily, and knowing that Cleon's party were victorious at the polls that spring, we may accept Busolt's conjecture that Eurymedon was elected.⁴⁴ There was at that time no good reason for recalling him.

But about the time when the new generals took office, the Sicilian cities made a peace that rendered further operations in the island futile, and the Athenian fleet sailed for home.⁴⁵ Upon its arrival, the Athenians vented their disappointment upon the generals, exiling two and fining Eurymedon. His past connections were insufficient to save him from punishment, al-

⁴³ *Hermes*, XXV, 571-579.

⁴⁴ *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1125, note 1. Busolt saw that there were no good reasons for thinking that the Sicilian generals failed of re-election; but he did not reason the problem through to its logical conclusion and so thought that one of them, probably Pythodorus, was defeated.

⁴⁵ *Thuc.*, iv. 65.

though they probably did save him from the exile by which his colleagues paid the penalty of failure. This trial made three vacancies in the college of generals.

When the special elections to fill these vacancies were held we do not know; but if we consider Thucydides as the successor of Eurymedon, we can best account for his election by assuming that the elections were held soon after Athens began to feel uneasy over the fate of her possessions in Chalcidice, perhaps as late as the loss of Acanthus to Brasidas. Some explanation for Thucydides' entrance into office in 424 is necessary. He had taken no great part in politics, and his conservative views were not such as would have won him support in the spring of 424 when the influence of Cleon was at its height. The disgrace of Eurymedon offered him an opportunity to enter the strategion; the failure of Cleon's policy in Sicily and the threat to the Empire in the north brought a reaction in public opinion that promised success to an opponent of Cleon; and finally Thucydides' interests on the coasts of Thrace made him the logical choice of his tribe.

After Thucydides had brought his military career to a speedy and inglorious end, there are a few years when the names of only one or two of the Athenian generals are known. Then in 420 Alcibiades, who was also a member of the tribe Leontis, began his meteoric career in the strategia, an office that he held, with the exception of one year, until his disgrace in 415. Leontis had lost two generals through exile in ten years. The fates were playing into the hands of Eurymedon, who could now offer himself as a candidate for election from Leontis with good prospects of success. Peisander had taken the place of leading demagogue once held by Cleon; and Eurymedon's experience in Sicily would make him a valuable member of the strategic board. Thus the very first year the tribe Leontis found it necessary to find a successor to Alcibiades, Eurymedon was elected to the generalship and was sent with reinforcements to Sicily,⁴⁶ where he was slain toward the end of the summer of 413.⁴⁷ In 412 another general, Phrynichus, was the choice of Leontis.

While it seems clear that Eurymedon was of the deme Hecale

⁴⁶ Thuc., vii. 16.

⁴⁷ Thuc., vii. 52.

and of the tribe Leontis, there is still to be considered the possibility that he was a member of the tribe Acamantis to which the deme Kephale and the general Hippocrates belonged. Since Hippocrates was apparently commander-in-chief in 426-5, he could have been Eurymedon's fellow-tribesman, and Acamantis might have had two representatives on the strategic board. But as we shall see when we come to consider the tribal affiliations of Nicostratus, assigning Eurymedon to Acamantis would make it necessary to assign Nicostratus to Leontis and would create difficulties without solving a single one. For example, it would be necessary to explain why Hippocrates, the nephew of Pericles and an ambitious politician of the more radical group, should not have been chosen in 427 instead of the less important Eurymedon, who was likewise radical in his views. But the inability of Hippocrates to defeat Nicostratus, the friend of Nicias, needs no explanation in a year when there was no great amount of dissatisfaction with the latter's leadership. We shall have occasion to consider a very similar difficulty, involving Thucydides, when we come to study the career of Nicostratus.

PYTHODORUS

Pythodorus, like Eurymedon, was probably chosen for the year 424-3. Busolt⁴⁸ thinks that only two of the Sicilian generals were re-elected, because, as he says, we already know the names of eight generals for that year, and with the three from Sicily there would then be eleven. But as the premise on which he bases his conclusion is incorrect, we shall have to re-examine the evidence. We know of eleven generals who served in 424-3, not merely eight; but no one can possibly tell from the evidence at hand whether more than six of those whose names we know were elected at the regular spring elections. What Busolt and all others have forgotten is that this particular year was filled with special elections and that every special election requires us to add one to the number of generals chosen for that year. Since we have gone above ten, it is as possible to have fourteen as thirteen, on the natural assumption that vacancies caused by conviction or death would be filled.

Busolt also ventures the supposition that Pythodorus was

⁴⁸ *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1125, note 1.

the one of the three Sicilian generals to be defeated at the polls. But let us consider his record. He was in command of the Sicilian expedition, having taken the place of Laches, and in the spring of 424 he had done nothing to merit the displeasure of Cleon. He may not have seen with him eye to eye on all matters of public policy, but at the time of the elections he was closely identified with one of Cleon's pet schemes, the conquest of Sicily, and would therefore be re-elected in the ordinary course of events. He had been chosen for the first time in 426 when Cleon's party had been victorious at the polls and had then been entrusted with the important task of winning Sicily. Busolt himself saw that similar arguments for the re-election of the subordinate generals Eurymedon and Sophocles were valid. They ought then to apply with greater force to Pythodorus.

But after the return of Pythodorus to Athens with empty hands, he was brought to trial, convicted and exiled. The same fate came to his colleague Sophocles, although Eurymedon, who was perhaps second in command, was let off with a fine, apparently through the influence of Cleon. Eurymedon was radical enough to deserve some consideration from the demagogue. The reason for the severity with which Pythodorus and Sophocles were treated is to be sought not in a greater degree of guilt,—for this was a political trial in which guilt and innocence were probably not the decisive factors—but in their politics.

How then did their views differ from those of Cleon? In 426 they had been with him, but since 426 party lines had changed. Men who had been able to support Cleon in a policy of active military measures were now aligning themselves with the conservatives against Cleon,⁴⁹ and it is quite likely that Pythodorus and Sophocles had in some measure suffered a change of heart since 426 and had recently come out in opposition to Cleon. Perhaps their inactivity in Sicily was due to

⁴⁹ Party lines were not so stable in Athens as modern authors have supposed; and the studies of Athenian politics of this period made by men like Beloch are almost worthless because they antedate by several years the issues that were dominant between 425 and 421. For that reason they give an incorrect idea of the political situation before 425. I have discussed this more fully in *Class. Phil.*, April, 1924, pp. 124 ff.

this change of heart which became manifest after their return to Athens when they had an opportunity to see for themselves the state of public opinion.

The tribe to which Pythodorus belonged was certainly not Cecropis, even though Busolt⁵⁰ and Beloch apparently agree in identifying the general with a man of that name from the deme Phlye. Beloch's error is in not admitting that the tribe Cecropis had a general in 426-5 when Pythodorus was first elected. Laches was a member of this tribe and remained in command of the Sicilian expedition until December or January, when Pythodorus took his place. Beloch believes that Laches failed of re-election but was allowed to conduct the operations in Sicily for about nine months after his defeat at the polls, and six months after his year of office had expired, this too at a time when dissatisfaction with the conservative generals was rife. Since he could have been recalled easily, even without the necessity of finding an excuse, if his term had expired, the mere fact that he continued to act as general for half of the official year 426-5 makes it clear that he was a legally elected member of the strategic board and not merely one with a sort of pro-consular authority.

This makes it necessary for us to find another vacancy for Pythodorus. The only vacancy is Hippothontis, a tribe whose company of knights was commanded by a Pythodorus about this time.⁵¹

SOPHOCLES

Sophocles, the third of the Sicilian generals to be tried and punished, although probably the junior in command, received a punishment as severe as that of Pythodorus, and we may assume that the two men held the same political views. There can be no question about his re-election.⁵² As to his tribe and successor's name, we can only conjecture. Like Eurymedon, he was probably followed by a conservative. That leaves us only two men to consider, Autocles and Nicias. Autocles is really out of the question, because he was a colleague of Sophocles in

⁵⁰ *Philol.*, L, 1891, p. 91.

⁵¹ Kirchner, *Prosop. Att.*, 12405.

⁵² Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1125, note 1, was the first to suggest that Sophocles was re-elected in the spring of 424.

425-4, and since he was not commander-in-chief, his tribe would not be entitled to two generals. It is true that Nicias was likewise general in 425-4, but being apparently the senior officer he could have had a colleague from the same tribe. Furthermore, in 426, when Sophocles was first elected, Nicias and the other old generals were generally defeated at the polls. Nicias might very well have been defeated also in the spring of 424, for the more one studies the situation at that time, the more convinced one must become that the victory of Cleon's party was overwhelming. Nicias took no part in the summer campaigns of 424, and in our records he does not appear as active in the strategion until after the loss of Amphipolis made possible negotiations for a truce.⁵³

Demodocus might be considered as a successor to Sophocles despite his politics, except that he held a command at the very beginning of the official year, that is before there had been time for the auditing of Sophocles' accounts, his trial, and the election of a successor. Furthermore, all tribes except that of Nicias are out of the question for similar reasons, or because generals from those tribes served as colleagues of Sophocles in one or another of his official terms. Beloch has pronounced against the identification of Sophocles the general with the member of the Thirty by that name, of the tribe Oeneis, and rightly too in my opinion, for Sophocles would then have been a colleague of Lamachus in 426 and again a colleague-elect in 424.

⁵³ The tribe of Nicias was also the tribe of the more renowned Sophocles the poet. In this connection it should be noted that the incident related by Plutarch in his *Life of Nicias*, chap. 15, in which Sophocles the poet appears as a junior colleague of Nicias proves that once at least when Nicias was the senior general he had a fellow-tribesman named Sophocles on the strategic board with him. But since this episode is not at all appropriate where it stands in the midst of the story of the Sicilian expedition, it would seem as though it had been taken from some Sicilian source and perhaps had been told originally of the other Sophocles who had tried to conquer the island nearly ten years before the fatal expedition. It would have been a simple matter for Plutarch to ascribe it to the poet. As this is the only intimation that the poet ever held the generalship during the Peloponnesian War, the authenticity of the story has been questioned. But applied to Sophocles the general, the story might very well be true.

HIPPOCRATES

Hippocrates serves as a sort of barometer of political fortunes in Athens at this time. He was a general on two occasions, first in 426 and then again in 424. Both times the radical democracy won a decisive victory. It seems strange to find the nephew of Pericles working hand in glove with Cleon, but undoubtedly for an ambitious youth co-operation with the demagogue would prove the path of least resistance to political office. There was a dearth of military ability among the supporters of Cleon, and all recruits from the aristocracy would be welcome, especially one who could bring the prestige of the Periclean name to the radical cause. The more conservative elements of the state had recognised leaders who were loyally supported, even though not entirely worthy of the position in which they found themselves. It would be difficult for Hippocrates to displace them in public confidence except as an opponent relying upon the support of the city democracy and upon the growing dissatisfaction at the lack of success of their policies.

As Hippocrates' election was followed by a radical change of military policy on both occasions, it seems probable that he stood on a platform of more aggressive operations and that he hoped through military successes to win an assured place in Athenian politics. But his inglorious Boeotian campaign in 424 resulted in his death at Delion and a reaction that brought his opponents back into power.

The tribe to which Hippocrates belonged, Acamantis, is of particular interest because it was also the tribe of Pericles. To whom did it give its confidence when Hippocrates was not in office and whom did it choose to take his place after his death? We may assume that the political rival of Hippocrates was a man of some prominence in the state. Otherwise, Hippocrates with his advantages would have had a secure position on the strategic board. Against a weak candidate the assistance of the radicals would have been unnecessary, and furthermore a weak candidate would have been unable to defeat him in 425 when the spirit of imperialism was still strong in Athens. If we can find a man who took office as a general shortly after the death of Pericles, was elected in 425 when Hippocrates was defeated, and finally was again general in the spring of 423, we need not

hesitate to consider him as a rival of Hippocrates and a member of Acamantis, provided, of course, he does not belong to some other tribe.

NICOSTRATUS

The career of Nicostratus fulfils these conditions precisely, for he too was a barometer of public opinion. He was elected first in 428 or 427,⁵⁴ holding office until the radical victory of 426. Then in 425 he returned to office. In 424 the tables were turned again, but after the disasters of the summer a conservative reaction set in which restored the influence of Nicias, Nicostratus, and Autocles. None of these took part in the operations of the second half of the summer of 424, but all of them signed the truce with Sparta,⁵⁵ and the first two were given command of the important expedition sent out for the recovery of Scione and Mende.⁵⁶ Since the tribes of Nicias and Autocles are known, they can not be considered the successors of Hippocrates, and since all of the other known generals of this year served before his death or at least in the early winter immediately after it, there is only one possible conclusion, *viz.*, that Nicostratus is the eleventh general chosen to take the place of his unfortunate rival.

Furthermore, careful study of the years in which he was general shows that he can not have belonged to any tribe except Acamantis, for at one time or another he had colleagues from each of the other tribes, with the possible exception of Leontis to which we have assigned Eurymedon. We must still consider the possibility, mentioned above, that Eurymedon belongs to Acamantis, in which case Nicostratus must go to Leontis. But if that were true, it would be necessary to explain why the unknown Thucydides should have been preferred to the honored Nicostratus, both being conservative in their views. Nicostratus had the further advantage of being in office when the election took place. We know that he was trusted, for he was elected to fill a vacancy later in the year and held an important command. If he and Thucydides were fellow-tribesmen, he must have been

⁵⁴ Beloch prefers 428, which would make him an immediate successor to Pericles.

⁵⁵ Thuc., iv. 119.

⁵⁶ Thuc., iv. 129 f.

chosen to take the place left vacant by the historian when he went into exile. But there is not a single reason for accepting this hypothesis, not even Thucydides' Thracian connections, for the elections came several months before Brasidas threatened to destroy the empire in Chalcidice.⁵⁷

The defeat of Nicostratus by Thucydides would be very difficult to explain, but the election of Thucydides to fill out the term of Eurymedon and the victory of Hippocrates over Nicostratus offer no problems. Nor is the election of Nicostratus after the death of Hippocrates at all surprising. When public opinion began to turn away from Cleon to Nicias, and when Cleon was powerless to prevent the truce with Sparta, the thoughts of all would incline toward the trusted friend and former colleague of Nicias.

According to Beloch,⁵⁸ Hippocrates held the presidency of the board of generals in 424-3. It is possible that Nicostratus was his successor in this position. Thucydides has given us a transcript of the truce with Sparta and a list of the plenipotentiaries who ratified it.⁵⁹ It is evident that we possess a copy of the original document. Those who ratified the truce on behalf of Athens were Nicostratus, Nicias, and Autocles, Nicostratus taking precedence over Nicias in the list. Unless he held a position superior to that of Nicias, his name would normally be placed second. Under ordinary circumstances, Nicias was the more important of the two men and his name would occur first to the mind of the historian. That the order is reversed on this occasion is further reason for accepting Thucydides' copy of the truce as accurate.

The more normal order is found in Thucydides' account of the expedition sent out to recapture Mende and Scione.⁶⁰ The

⁵⁷ Commentators on Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 81, have thought that Nicostratus was from the deme Scambonidae, but this hypothesis has not found general acceptance. If we are wrong in assigning Pythodorus to Hippothontis, there is a possibility that Nicostratus belonged to that tribe, but there is no reason for preferring this assumption to the one offered above. On the contrary, it would be more difficult to reconstruct the list on that basis.

⁵⁸ *Att. Pol.*, p. 282.

⁵⁹ *Thuc.*, iv. 119.

⁶⁰ *Thuc.*, iv. 129.

author had no need to consult official documents here, and as we should expect, he gives the place of honor to the more famous man. Even on this expedition, it is possible that Nicias actually held a subordinate position, for on two occasions Nicostratus was in charge of the main operations. Once Nicias led what was apparently a feint attack, while Nicostratus with the bulk of the troops advanced against the defenders of Mende from another direction.⁶¹ A second time Nicostratus conducted the siege, while Nicias led a raiding party into the surrounding country.⁶² Thucydides may have unconsciously inverted the order of names because of the greater renown of the junior general.

Nicostratus was again general in 418, when he and Laches lost their lives at Mantinea. His tribe now found it necessary to choose a new man. He had monopolised the office for so many years, except for the two short intervals when Hippocrates was general, that no man of experience was available. As we should expect, in 417-6 Acamantis was represented by a man whose name has not appeared in our records before, Teisias of Kephale.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the spring elections of 424 really resulted in a decisive victory for Cleon's candidates, almost all of whom were successful; but after the return of the generals from Sicily a reaction set in from which the conservative candidates, Thucydides, Nicostratus, and perhaps Nicias, profited at the special elections. This reaction grew in force until Laches and Nicias were able to persuade their countrymen to accept a truce with Sparta, greatly to the discomfiture of Cleon and the imperialists.

ALLEN B. WEST.

WHEATON COLLEGE,
NORTON, MASS.

⁶¹ Thuc., iv. 129.

⁶² Thuc., iv. 130.