



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Edmund F. Bloedow **Hipponicus and Euthydemus (Euthynus)**

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **11 • 1981**

Seite / Page **65–72**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1311/5660> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1981-11-p65-72-v5660.8

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

EDMUND F. BLOEDOW

Hipponicus and Euthydemus (Euthynus)*

At the end of the summer of the fifth year of the Peloponnesian War, i. e., in 427 BC, the Athenians sent out the First Sicilian Expedition under the command of Laches and Charoeades (Thuc. 3, 86, 1). For the term τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ θέρους τελευτῶντος, GOMME favoured c. the end of August, although conceded that there was some latitude from then towards the end of October.¹ BUSOLT, on the other hand, argued for towards the end of September.² Either way, it will have been shortly after the new generals had taken office. In accordance therewith, Laches and Charoeades appear under the year 427/6 in the modern *strategoï* lists.³

After referring to this development Thucydides maintains, at least on the surface, a careful sequence of events. «So the summer ended. In the following winter the plague broke out among the Athenians for the second time» (86, 5–87, 1). «Next summer the Peloponnesians and their allies ... set out to invade Attica» (89, 1). In that «same summer» Laches was still in command of the Sicilian fleet, whereas Charoeades had been killed in battle with the Syracusans,⁴ leaving Laches «in sole command of the fleet» (90, 2).⁵

*List of Abbreviations

BELOCH, AP = J. BELOCH, *Die attische Politik seit Perikles*, Leipzig 1884

BELOCH, GG = J. BELOCH, *Griechische Geschichte II*², Straßburg-Berlin 1927

BUSOLT, GG = *Griechische Geschichte III*², Gotha 1904

DOVER = K. J. DOVER, ΔΕΚΑΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΣ, *JHS* 80, 1960, 61–77

FORNARA = C. W. FORNARA, *The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404*, Wiesbaden 1971

GOMME, HCT = A. W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides II*, Oxford 1956

KIRCHNER, PA = J. E. KIRCHNER, *Prosopographia Attica I*, Berlin 1901

LEWIS = M. LEWIS, *Double Representation in the Strategia*, *JHS* 81, 1961, 119

SEALEY = R. SEALEY, *Athens in the Archidamian War*, *PACA* 1, 1958, 61–87 = *Essays in Greek Politics*, New York 1967

¹ GOMME, HCT, 386.

² BUSOLT, GG III², 1056.

³ BELOCH, AP 291; vgl. idem, GG II² 2, 263; F. E. ADCOCK, *CAH* V, 1927, opp. p. 252; SEALEY, 108; LEWIS, 119; FORNARA, 56.

⁴ About which Thucydides does not give any details, but cf. GOMME, HCT II, 389f.

⁵ Indeed he is still active in Sicily in the following winter (3, 103, 3), which raises interesting questions about his re-election. Did it take place in absentia, or did he return early in the spring for the new elections?

In the same summer Demosthenes and Procles were in command of a fleet of thirty ships sent around the Peloponnesus (Thuc. 3,91,1).⁶ At the same time, at least that is the impression Thucydides gives, another fleet, composed of sixty ships and 2000 hoplites, set out for Melos, under the command of Nicias (3, 91, 1).⁷ The object of Nicias' mission was to compel Melos to join the Attic alliance, and to this end he began to lay waste the Melian country. When this failed to produce any results, however, he abandoned the enterprise and sailed back to the mainland, to Oropus. From there his hoplites immediately marched to Tanagra in Boeotia, where «in answer to pre-arranged signals they were met by the Athenian army from Athens itself». This force was under the command of Hipponicus and Eurymedon (3, 91, 3–4).

On the basis of this passage in Thucydides (91, 4), FORNARA placed both Hipponicus and Eurymedon under the archon year 426/5,⁸ whereas BELOCH had placed them under the year 427/6.⁹ In this attribution, FORNARA was presumably following SEALEY, DOVER and LEWIS.¹⁰ This new attribution, namely of Hipponicus in particular, apparently first pointed out by LEWIS,¹¹ rests on Athenaeus (5, 218 b), who places the battle of Tanagra and Hipponicus in the archonship of Euthydemus alias Euthynus.¹²

Not only does this attribution have an important bearing on Thucydides' account, but significant theories have also been built on it. According to SEALEY, for instance, «when Demosthenes set sail in the summer of 426, he was strategos for 427/6, not for 426/5».¹³ He does not, however, think that Demosthenes was *strategos* in 426/5.¹⁴ Since Nicias was allegedly *strategos* for both 427/6 and 426/5, he may have set out for Melos in either archon year, although the probability is that he, like Demosthenes, set out in the archon year 427/6 – and this seems to be the implication of Thuc. 3, 91, 1. This is also the position taken by FORNARA, who cites Thuc. 3, 91, 1 for Nicias' *strategia* for 427/6. But by the time Nicias arrives at Melos he seems already to be operating under the archon year 426/5, at least that is the conclusion which seems to be suggested by FORNARA's list, since he cites Thuc. 3, 91, 3–6 as the authority for Nicias' *strategia* for 426/5.¹⁵ A very similar position had been taken by SEALEY, who suggested that «the

⁶ They are also included under the year 427/6 in the modern *stratego*i lists: BELOCH, AP, 291; cf. GG II, 263 f.; ADCKOCK, CAH V, opp.p. 252; SEALEY, 108; LEWIS, 119; FORNARA, 56.

⁷ BELOCH, AP, 291; GG II² 2, 263 f.; ADCKOCK, CAH V, opp. p. 252; cf. SEALEY, 108; LEWIS, 119; FORNARA, 56.

⁸ FORNARA, 58.

⁹ BELOCH, AP, 291; GG II² 2, 263 f.; ADCKOCK, CAH V, opp. p. 252.

¹⁰ SEALEY, 108; DOVER, 66; LEWIS, 119.

¹¹ Cf. SEALEY, 104.

¹² «But in the archonship of Euthydemus, Hipponicus is in the battle line as a *strategos* together with Nicias against the Tanagraeans and other Boeotians who came to their aid». Cf. LEWIS, 119; DOVER, 66.

¹³ SEALEY, 104.

¹⁴ loc. cit., cf. 108. He is apparently followed by FORNARA, 57 f., who rejects LEWIS' inclusion of him (LEWIS, 119) (cf. FORNARA, 58 n.).

¹⁵ FORNARA, 57. His authority for Demosthenes' *strategia* for 427/6 is Thuc. 3, 91, 1. In 91, 1 we have the statement about the expedition to Melos, in 91, 2 about its purpose, and in 91, 3 the action

chapter in Thuc. (3, 91) covers the turn of the Attic year»,¹⁶ and by LEWIS, who wanted much more time for Nicias' activities on Melos.¹⁷ But all this becomes necessary because of the archonship of Euthydemus/Euthynus, and «there seems to be no reason to doubt this date».¹⁸

But just how secure is the archonship of Euthydemus/Euthynus for 426/5, or, alternatively, the attribution of Hipponicus to his archonship? The evidence is not unequivocal. To begin with, there is confusion over the name. Athenaeus (5, 218 b), Diodorus (12, 58, 1)¹⁹ and Argum. Aristoph. Acharn. read Euthydemus, whereas Philochorus frg. 106 = Schol. ad Lucian Tim. 30 (cf. JACOBY, FGrHist., Philochorus fr. 128), Anonym. Vita Thuc. 8 p. 202 WESTERM. and the Miletus Decree (IG I² 22 ls. 63, 88) read Euthynus. The only one of these sources which provides a specific date, namely as deduced from Thucydides' account, is Athenaeus. Thus it would appear that either Euthydemus or Euthynus was archon in 426/5.

To complicate the issue, however, Athenaeus refers to another archon by the name of Euthydemus, to wit for 431/30 (5, 217 b), as does Diodorus (12, 38, 1). In addition, Diodorus has a third Euthydemus, for the year 450/49 (12, 3, 1). Numerous attempts have been made to sort out these names. At the moment it is widely accepted that Euthydemus was archon in 450/49, another Euthydemus was archon in 431/30, and Euthynus archon in 426/5.²⁰ Even if, despite the confusion in the sources, we accept that Euthynus was archon in 426, does it follow that Hipponicus is securely dated in his archonship?

The reference by Athenaeus to the other, i.e., first, Euthydemus appears in a somewhat convoluted passage (216 d – 217 a). What we are told there is as follows: in the archonship of Aristion, Xenophon's symposium was supposed to have been held;²¹ this

on Melos begins. There would be nothing inherently implausible about a change of official year in the course of such developments, were a general elected two years in succession.

¹⁶ SEALEY, 104.

¹⁷ LEWIS, 119.

¹⁸ loc. cit.

¹⁹ «When Euthydemus was archon in Athens ... in this year the Athenians, who had enjoyed a period of relief from the plague, became involved again in the same misfortunes».

²⁰ On the other hand, KIRCHHOFF emended Diod. 12, 3, 1 from Euthydemus to Euthynus (i.e. 450/49), who has been followed by, e.g., KIRCHNER, PA no. 5563; idem, RE 6,1 (1907) 1517 s.v. no. 1; M.N. TOD, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions I², Oxford 1946, 235; G.F. HILL, Sources for Greek History Between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, Oxford 1951, 398; R. MEIGGS and D.M. LEWIS, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century, Oxford 1969, 291 (all three have another Euthynus for archon in 426/5), but this has been challenged by MATTINGLY, who prefers either Euthydemus or Eudemus for 450/49 alias for 431/30 (cf. H.B. MATTINGLY, Athens and Eleusis: Some New Ideas, in: D.W. BRADEEN & M.F. MCGREGOR [eds.], ΦΟΡΟΣ. Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt, Locust Valley, N.Y., 1974, 99f.), accepted by J.D. SMART, Phoenix 31, 1977, 250. On Euthydemus, cf. also KIRCHNER, PA n. 5515, and idem, RE 6,1 (1907) 1503; on Euthynus, idem, PA n. 5563 and 5564, idem, RE 6,1 (1907) 1517 s.v. nos. 1 and 2.

²¹ Aristion archon in 421/20, cf. VON SCHAEFFER, RE 2,1 (1895) 890; KIRCHNER, PA I, no. 1732.

was four years before Euphemus, in whose archonship Plato placed Agathon's victory;²² when Agathon won his victory Plato was only fourteen years old;²³ but Plato was born in the archonship of Apollodorus,²⁴ who succeeded Euthydemus.

We are thus confronted by a contradiction, with two dates emerging for Plato's birth, differing by one year (431/30 and 430/29). Should his birth therefore perhaps be moved up by one year, and consequently also the date of Euthydemus? That would provide a tidy solution. Unfortunately, the question is not so simple, for «Platons Geburtstag ist nach Jacoby Apollodors Chronik 304ff. Praechter Hermes XXXIX (1904) 474ff. Überweg-Praechter¹² 181 zwischen März und Mitte Juli des Jahres 427 v. Chr. anzusetzen».²⁵ JACOBY's reconstruction of the statement by Diogenes Laertius (3, 2, 1), together with the other relevant sources, puts Plato's date of birth beyond question, which compels us to conclude that Athenaeus, or his source, simply got it wrong. If Athenaeus (or his source) could get so eminent a figure as Plato in the wrong archonship, there is an even greater possibility that he should likewise err in connection with Hipponicus.²⁶ If it cannot be proven that Hipponicus was not *strategos* in the archonship of Euthydemus/Euthynus, it cannot, on the other hand, be accepted as completely secure that he was, as has hitherto been the case.

If one prefers BELOCH's attribution of Hipponicus to 427/6 (and there are reasonable grounds for doing so), and consequently also accepts that Nicias was not *strategos* in 426/5, what of the question of the time involved in Nicias' mission? According to LEWIS, a major advantage of having Nicias' *strategia* also in 426/5 is that it »gives far more time for Nicias' operations against Melos«. ²⁷ Just how much time did he in fact require, and how much would he have had, were he to have been *strategos* only for 427/6? If it is necessary to find enough time for Nicias on Melos, the same must also apply to Demosthenes for his expedition round the Peloponnesus, especially if one assumes that he was not re-elected for 426/5. And SEALEY seems to think that on the basis of 3, 94, 1 Nicias probably »spent a considerable time on Melos«, in other words, by the time Nicias had virtually completed his operations on Melos, Demosthenes was just beginning his action at Ellomenus and Leucas.²⁸ Following this line of argument,

²² Thus 417/16, cf. KIRCHNER, PA I, no. 6034.

²³ Which would put Plato's birth in 431/30.

²⁴ Archon in 430/29, cf. KIRCHNER, PA I, no. 1375.

²⁵ H. LEISEGANG, RE 20, 2 (1950) 2347, a date also accepted by W. K. C. GUTHRIE, A History of Greek Philosophy IV, London – New York – Melbourne 1975, 10.

²⁶ This is in no way affected by the fact that Diodorus places the resurgence of the plague in the archonship of Euthydemus/Euthynus. It is perhaps worth bearing in mind Thucydides' contention that «it is better to calculate on the time basis which I have used rather than to trust to any reckoning based on the names of magistrates» (5, 20, 2–3).

²⁷ LEWIS, 119; cf. SEALEY, 104. LEWIS (119) takes the attribution of Hipponicus and consequently the date of the events at Tanagra as established beyond question.

²⁸ About the time that the Athenians were in Melos the other Athenians, after ambushing and defeating the garrison at Ellomenus, attacked Leucas. The remainder of Demosthenes' operations took up by far the bulk of his time.

one would be compelled to conclude that Demosthenes conducted the whole Aetolian campaign (3, 94,3–98,5) *after* his term of office had expired.

Now Thucydides does not give any indication precisely when either fleet left Athens. In connection with the Spartan invasion of that year he does not even include the term «when the corn was ripe», but simply says τοῦ δ'ἐπιγιγνομένου θέρους (89,1) – although this is not surprising since in this summer the invasion did not come to anything because of the earthquakes. On the other hand, in the seventh prytany of this year (mid-March to mid-April) the *hellenotamiai* made a payment to Demosthenes for equipping his expedition.²⁹ According to SWOBODA, his fleet was ready to sail by the end of April.³⁰ But, on the basis of Thuc. 89, 1 and 91, 1, BUSOLT did not think that it left before the Spartans had withdrawn from the Isthmus, either mid-May,³¹ or the beginning of June³² – although this is not absolutely necessary, since on a previous occasion the Athenians sent out such an expedition before the Peloponnesians had withdrawn. And on this occasion, since there was presumably little left to devastate (perhaps not the least reason why the earthquakes proved to be a convenient deterrent against proceeding beyond the Isthmus), the Athenians will scarcely have wasted time waiting around for the Spartans. In addition, since they were embarking on a two-pronged offensive this summer, it is more likely that they would have decided on an earlier than a later beginning.

But even if they did not depart before the middle of May, this would still have given them considerable time for campaigning. Crucial here is the length of the archon year of 427/6. BUSOLT, for instance, argued that it did not end until 17 August.³³ On the basis of MERITT's reconstruction, however, the year ended on 10 July.³⁴ But MERITT's entire hypothesis, especially his notion of the application in Athens of the Metonic cycle in the fifth century, has been fundamentally contested.³⁵ Moreover, LOTZE has proposed the intercalation of a month after Gamelion in 427/6.³⁶ The point, however, is that in view of our limited knowledge of the Athenian calendar in the fifth century, we simply are not yet in a position to fix with certainty the end of the year 427/6.³⁷ For the time being, however, if BUSOLT's solution has proven unacceptable, and MERITT's hypothesis untenable, whereas LOTZE's suggestion is at least entirely feasible, it is reasonable to conclude that the time available for Nicias' activities before his term came to an end in the summer of 426 was over two months, possibly even three. That, it seems to me,

²⁹ CIA IV p. 162.

³⁰ H. SWOBODA, *Hermes* 28, 1893, 592.

³¹ Cf. GOMME, *HCT* II, 390.

³² BUSOLT, *GG* III² 2, 1062.

³³ BUSOLT, *GG* III² 2, 1057, n. 5.

³⁴ B. D. MERITT, *The Athenian Year*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1961, 218.

³⁵ Cf. W. K. PRITCHETT, *The Choiseul Marble*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1970, esp. 52 ff., 90 ff. See also E. J. BICKERMAN, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, London 1968, 34 ff.

³⁶ D. LOTZE, *Philologus* 111, 1967, 38 f. and esp. 41.

³⁷ Cf. PRITCHETT, *Choiseul Marble* (n. 35), 96.

would be ample for his operations on Melos, as well as at Tanagra and on the Locrian coast. I do not see, for instance, any need to allow more than a month for the devastation of Melian territory,³⁸ especially if we consider the Spartan invasions of Attica (which usually did not last more than a month), and also the Athenian devastation of Epidaurian territory in 430, laying siege to the city itself, followed by devastating the territory of Troezen, Haliae and Hermione (2, 56, 4–5) – all this within the space of about a month.³⁹ Here it is also worth comparing the later expedition against Melos by Cleomedes and Tisias (5, 84, 1, cf. 84, 3). They had time to set up camp (84, 3), carry on extended negotiations (85–113), to build a wall completely around the city of Melos (114, 1), and establish a garrison (114, 2) – all within the space of the same summer!

More important still, however, if we are to take Thucydides' statement as reasonably accurate, that «about the time that the Athenians were in Melos» the other Athenian fleet, upon having ambushed and destroyed some garrison troops at the Leucadian town of Ellomenus, proceeded to attack Leucas itself (3, 94, 1), Nicias must have been on Melos fairly early, since Demosthenes still had the attack of Leucas and the whole Aetolian campaign ahead of him – a considerable amount to achieve, especially if he was not re-elected for the following year.⁴⁰

Furthermore, how much time are we to allow for the battle of Tanagra and the ravaging of the Locrian coast?⁴¹ For one thing, from the departure from Melos to the end of the battle of Tanagra we should calculate no more than three days. To begin with, the voyage from Melos to Oropus should not require more than one day. According to Thucydides, upon arrival, Nicias spent the night on board ship at Oropus, but next morning «the hoplites *immediately* landed and marched overland to Tanagra» (91, 3). They pitched camp there, and then spent the remainder of the same day on which they arrived (ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν) in laying waste the countryside around Tanagra (91, 4). The battle itself was fought τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ (91, 5). After capturing some arms and setting up a trophy, they withdrew, Hipponicus and Eurymedon to Athens, while Nicias and his sixty ships «sailed along the coast» (91, 5) (presumably setting out still on the same day, or on the morning of the fourth day). As for the activity along the Locrian coast, this operation too cannot have taken very long, for Nicias only «laid waste the parts of Locris that were on the sea» [ἐπιθάλασσια] (91, 6), and thereafter returned to Athens. For this operation in Locrian territory, a week to ten days should suffice.⁴² If, therefore, we allow about two weeks for Tanagra and the Locrian coast

³⁸ LEWIS' desire for «far more time for Nikias» operations against Melos is, I think, an overstatement.

³⁹ They left while the Spartans were in Attica, and arrived back after the latter had withdrawn (after having been in Attica for about forty days).

⁴⁰ Thus BELOCH (GG II² 2, 264) and SEALEY, 104.

⁴¹ LEWIS speaks of «all Nikias' extensive operations of the summer» – namely «against Melos, in support of Tanagra, and up the Locrian coast» (119). This too, it seems to me, is an overstatement.

⁴² Indeed, the overall impression we get is that, if anything the various operations were carried out more quickly than slowly.

(which ought to be sufficient), we would then be left with in fact up to a month and a half or even more for activity on Melos. In other words, in whichever way one wishes to allot the time, there is no difficulty in fitting in Nicias' operations before the year ended alias before his term or office expired. Consequently, there is no compelling reason, on historical grounds, for placing Hipponicus in 426/5 instead of 427/6. At the same time it makes for a more natural reading of Thucydides, who otherwise appears guilty of some negligence, and this after having just maintained a careful sequence of events.

Further consequences follow from the attribution of Hipponicus to the archonship of Euthynus alias to 426/5. In his influential study attempting to demonstrate the strict collegiality of the Athenian board of generals, DOVER made this attribution an essential element in one of his arguments, namely on the relation between «chairmanship» and election ἐξ ἁπάντων.⁴³ Another general of the same year, Aristoteles, the son of Timocles,⁴⁴ was «almost certainly» of the same tribe (Antiochis) as Hipponicus. From this we are compelled to conclude that one of them must have been elected ἐξ ἁπάντων.⁴⁵ But, according to SEG X, 227, 3 ff., a payment is made on Prytany ii 4 of the year 426/5 στρα[τεγοῖς] ἡλποκράτει Χολαργεῖ καὶ χου[νάρχοισιν]. «It follows that we cannot say *both* that the eponym is chairman throughout the year *and* that the general elected ἐξ ἁπάντων is chairman throughout the year; in other words, if the argument from formulae is pressed as evidence for Pericles' powers, the argument from election ἐξ ἁπάντων cannot be pressed, and vice versa».⁴⁶ That is to say, no general was either chairman or had authority superior to any other.

If Hipponicus and Aristoteles, however, each belong in a different year, the argument becomes invalid.⁴⁷ In other words, until the attribution of Hipponicus can be securely established, DOVER's case remains unproven. Apart from the above, there are serious problems connected with Aristoteles' demotic; moreover, he and Hierophon may have been *nauarchoi* in 426/5, and not *strategoï*.⁴⁸

As DOVER indicated, at issue in particular is the question of Pericles' powers. This question, in so far as it relates to Pericles in 431, I shall discuss in a separate study,⁴⁹ here I wish only to draw attention to several aspects of the problem deriving from insecure assumptions. For the moment, however, it is possible to say that the case for strict collegiality in the *strategia* at Athens is no longer as secure as has hitherto been maintained. Nor is it any longer possible to maintain that «we can now scrap the con-

⁴³ DOVER, 66.

⁴⁴ Thuc. 3, 105,3; cf. BELOCH, AP 291; GG II² 2, 264; LEWIS, 119; FORNARA, 58.

⁴⁵ Cf. BELOCH, AP, 291; cf. GG II² 2, 264; FORNARA, 57.

⁴⁶ DOVER, 66.

⁴⁷ To illustrate the confusion which can result from the current situation, it may be noted en passant that KAGAN, although apparently following BELOCH's attribution of Hipponicus to 427/6 (D. KAGAN, *The Archidamian War*, Ithaca & London 1974, 169), accepts, without qualification, DOVER's thesis of collegiality (ibid., 56 n. 45) (not, of course, that DOVER's thesis stands or falls entirely on this argument).

⁴⁸ Cf. B. JORDAN, TAPhA 101, 1974, 238.

⁴⁹ See E. F. BLOEDOW, *Pericles' Powers in the Counter Strategy of 431* (in press).

siderable quantity of work which has been put into developing the consequences of his [Nicias'] exclusion [from 426/5].»⁵⁰ At the same time, too, it once more raises the possibility that there were in 426/5 in fact only 10 *strategoi*, and not 13, as LEWIS argued. As he acknowledged, there was at least one «really doubtful» case, namely that of Lamachus. Now, moreover, with the possibility that Hipponicus, Nicias and Aristoteles were not *strategoi* in this year, the question of the number of generals in 426/5 must remain open. It also follows naturally that the case for double representation remains (as signalled above) unproven.

⁵⁰ LEWIS, 120.