



# **Sprachen – Schriftkulturen – Identitäten der Antike**

## **Beiträge des XV. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik**

Wien, 28. August bis 1. September 2017

### **Einzelvorträge**

Wiener Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte online (WBAGon) 1  
([wbagon.univie.ac.at](http://wbagon.univie.ac.at))

Herausgegeben von TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich

vertreten durch

Franziska Beutler und Theresia Pantzer

Wien 2019

This article should be cited as:

Taisuke Okada, *Some Notes on IG P<sup>3</sup> 1032 and the Crews of Athenian Triremes in the Fifth Century BCE*, in: F. Beutler, Th. Pantzer (ed.), *Sprachen – Schriftkulturen – Identitäten der Antike. Beiträge des XV. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik*, Wien 28. August bis 1. September 2017: Einzelvorträge, *Wiener Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte online (WBAGon) 1*, Wien 2019 (DOI: 10.25365/wbagon-2019-1-17)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).  
© authors 2019

## INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Emiliano A r e n a

*Una nuova evidenza di sigle “demotiche” e di synkletos dalla Sicilia tardoellenistica: SEG LIX.1102 e la storia di Kale Akte*

François B é r a r d

*Les carrières des sous-officiers de l’armée romaine : derrière la diversité des parcours l’affirmation d’une forte identité militaire*

Francesco C a m i a

*At the Crossroads of Different Traditions. Social and Cultural Dynamics in Roman Thrace Through the Epigraphic Practice*

Massimo C a s a g r a n d e, Gianfranca S a l i s

*I miliari di Capoterra (Cagliari – Sardegna). Notizia preliminare*

Patrizia d e B e r n a r d o S t e m p e l

*Celtic Religion between Epichoric and Roman Epigraphy*

Françoise d e s B o s c s

*Épigraphie des amphores de la Bétique et épigraphie lapidaire. L’apport d’une approche croisée à l’histoire socio-économique des élites : Le dossier des Stertini*

Paul E r n s t

*L’usage du latin dans les pratiques épigraphiques des Italiens installés dans la Grèce égéenne aux II<sup>e</sup> et I<sup>er</sup> siècles avant notre ère*

Concepción F e r n á n d e z - M a r t í n e z

*CLE de las Galias: Estado de la cuestión y avances para la edición de CIL XVIII/3*

Rossella G i g l i o, Rossana D e S i m o n e

*Epigraphica Lilybetana. Tra Punici, Greci e Romani. Un decennio di ricerche (2006–2016). Note bibliografiche*

Hernán G o n z á l e z B o r d a s, Jérôme F r a n c e

*A Mention of conciliabula in the Imperial Regulation from Lella Drebbia (AE, 2001, 2083), Dougga, Tunisia*

Takashi H a s e g a w a

*Identités et statuts sociaux des commerçants connus dans les sanctuaires de Nehalennia*

Christine H o ë t - v a n C a u w e n b e r g h e

*Fanum Martis (Gaule Belgique) : L’écrit du quotidien dans un vicus Nervien*

Sara K a c z k o

*Greek Myths, Local Pottery and Vase-Inscriptions: Hellenic Culture and Indigenous Identity in 4<sup>th</sup> Century Magna Graecia*

Urpo K a n t o l a

*Römische Namen in griechischen Inschriften: Ein Überblick auf die Filiationen und andere Genitivbestimmungen im Späthellenismus und in der frühen Kaiserzeit*

Tuomo N u o r l u o t o

*Names and Social Distinction: How were Roman Female patronae Recorded in the Nomenclature of Their Slaves?*

Julien M. O g e r e a u, Ulrich H u t t n e r

*The Inscriptiones Christianae Graecae Database. Towards a Digital Corpus of Early Christian Inscriptions from Greece and Asia Minor*

Taisuke O k a d a

*Some Notes on IG P<sup>3</sup> 1032 and the Crews of Athenian Triremes in the Fifth Century BCE*

Werner P e t e r m a n d l, Astrid S c h m ö l z e r, Wolfgang S p i c k e r m a n n

*Zum Start des FWF-Projekts ‚Die keltischen Götternamen in den Inschriften der römischen Provinz Germania Inferior‘. Mercurius Gebrinios: Ein Fallbeispiel*

Catherine S a l i o u

*Espace urbain et mémoire des empereurs en Orient dans l'Antiquité tardive*

Felix H. S c h u l t e

*Städtische Politik im kaiserzeitlichen Italien. Epigraphisch überlieferte Beschlüsse der städtischen Dekurionenräte und ihre Aussagen bezüglich der munizipalen Selbstverwaltung*

Erkki S i r o n e n

*Abteilung der Verse in den spätantiken Epigrammen von Griechenland*

Marco T e n t o r i M o n t a l t o

*Die Weihgaben des Kroisos für Amphiaraios: Herodot und BÉ 2015, n. 306*

Ekkehard W e b e r

*Lateinische Epigraphik in Wien*

Serena Z o i a

*Donne in Transpadana ai tempi della romanizzazione tra conservatorismo e innovazione*

SOME NOTES ON *IG I<sup>3</sup> 1032* AND THE CREWS OF ATHENIAN  
TRIREMES IN THE FIFTH CENTURY BCE

*Introduction*

*IG I<sup>3</sup> 1032*, which I refer to hereafter as the Catalogue, is an inscription that consists of eleven fragments of Pentelic marble found in and around the Akropolis. The fragments were assembled by Laing (1966), who reconstructed the large inscription, which appears to contain a complete roster of eight complements of Athenian triremes. Laing's reconstruction was followed by Lewis' (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 1032*) and then was confirmed by Graham (1998).

The crews in the roster are arranged according to rank, function and legal status. The two trierarchs are at the top, followed by ten marines (*epibatai*), the petty officers (*hypēresia*) and, finally, the crew in three categories: citizens (*nautai astoi*), foreigners (*xenoi*) and slaves (*therapontes*)<sup>1</sup>. One of the most striking features of the complements of the triremes is their high proportion of non-citizen crews, including slaves, who may have represented 20–60% of the complements. Since the publication of the Catalogue, there has been a heated debate over whether the roster reflects common Athenian practices. Many scholars have regarded it as exceptional, especially because of the large number of slaves.

In this paper, I argue that the complements of the crews in the Catalogue are fairly typical complements of Athenian triremes in the late fifth century. For this purpose, I discuss five aspects of the Catalogue: (1) its link to the battle of Arginusai/Aigospotamoi, (2) slave crews, (3) *epibatai*, (4) the way of manning the ships and (5) the nature of the document.

*Link to Arginusai/Aigospotamoi*

Although many scholars have linked the Catalogue to Arginusai or Aigospotamoi in attempts to interpret the high proportion of slave crews in the complements as exceptional, their arguments have been refuted. Early scholars assumed that the Catalogue was a casualty list for Arginusai, but the objections to this assumption are, as Graham (1992.264–265) rightly noted, too strong to overcome<sup>2</sup>. First, if it represents the entirety of the complements of the triremes, it cannot be a casualty list, because even if the fleet was defeated, all the complements would hardly have been lost. Moreover, both of the two trierarchs would not have perished, because only one trierarch commanded the ship in a syntrierarchy. Second, all the fragments have been found in or near the Akropolis, not in Kerameikos, where the casualty lists were typically erected. Third, the roster is arranged by ships, whereas the casualty lists were usually arranged by tribes. Fourth, one of the trierarchs of Trireme 4, Morychos of Thria (l.409; *LGPN* II 3), has been identified as the son of Lachemoiros of the same deme, who dedicated an inscription (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4882*) on the Akropolis in the early fourth century<sup>3</sup>.

Köhler (1883.179–180) argued that it was to honour the slaves who fought at Arginusai, which was rightly objected to by Sundwall (1915.135–136). Laing (1966.107–117) and Welwei (1975.84–86) supposed that it honoured the crews of the eight triremes that escaped from Aigospotamoi with Konon (*Xen.Hell.2.1.28*). Laing dated the honouring to after the battle of Knidos in 394, and Welwei assumed that the crews were honoured just after the battle. Yet, we could raise several objections to these arguments. First, as Graham (1992.265) pointed out, it is hardly conceivable that the crews who fled from the lost battle were honoured, especially in the volatile atmosphere just after the Arginusai trial. Second, Lewis

<sup>1</sup> Under the heading of *xenoi*, the metics are distinguished by their demes of residence and the other foreigners by their ethnika.

<sup>2</sup> Also see Bakewell 2008.154–155. Funke (1983.169 et n.83) regarded the Catalogue as a casualty list without associating it with Arginusai, though his argument was not strong enough to overcome the objections.

<sup>3</sup> Meritt 1927.469–470; Laing 1966.82.

(1979.186 n.7) has suggested that dating it after the battle of Knidos is most likely late because of the strong resemblance of the hand of the Catalogue to that of the Erechtheion account of 408/7 and to the third hand in *IG I<sup>3</sup> 101* (410/9). Third, the composition of the crews could hardly remain the same for ten years<sup>4</sup>. Fourth, there were most likely more than eight ships that escaped from the debacle<sup>5</sup>.

Other pieces of evidence for dating the inscription are unfortunately scarce<sup>6</sup>. Its Ionic letters would place it anywhere between the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth centuries<sup>7</sup>. The two trierarchs heading each complement of the crews indicate the syntrierarchy that would have existed by 409–405. Yet, as Graham (1992.265 et n.34) noted, this is a *terminus ante quem* for the origin of the system, rather than a *terminus post quem* for the Catalogue<sup>8</sup>.

There is internal evidence, however, that could be valid for dating the Catalogue: the foreign crews from ten allied states — Aphytos, Peparethos, Kynthos, Hestiaia, Naxos, Chios, Samothrake, Keos, Rhodos and Kimolos — most of whom were aboard Trireme 1 (ll.72–99). Some scholars have maintained that their presence does not reflect any political ties between their homelands and Athens, because foreign crews were not always recruited from formal allies<sup>9</sup>. Jordan (1975.71–72), however, plausibly stated that their presence does reflect political ties with Athens. We should notice not only Perikles' claim that foreign crews would be exiled if they served the enemy of their states (Thuc.1.143.2) but also that as soon as the Athenians learned of the revolt of Chios, they arrested all the Chians in their camp (Thuc.8.15.2)<sup>10</sup>. Moreover, the Chians, together with the Rhodiens and other allies, supplied fifty ships to the Peloponnesian navy in 406 (*Xen.Hell.*1.6.3). Jordan (1975.71–72 et 71 n.45) also pointed out that all the home countries of the foreign crews, with the exception of Kimolos, were founding members of the Delian League, which indicates that the League remained intact at that time.

Funke (1983.168 et n.80) objected to Jordan's argument and placed the Catalogue after 408 — but no later than the end of the fifth century — on the grounds that two Rhodian crews were designated as *RODI* (ll.93–94), which would have been unlikely before the *synoikismos* of Rhodos. However, as Gabrielsen (2000.180–185) indicated, the ethnic *Rhodioi/Rhodos* was widely used even before the beginning of the *synoikismos*, not only in literary texts such as Thukydides, but also at least in two inscriptions apart from the Catalogue<sup>11</sup>. Gabrielsen (2000.200 n.18) definitely remarked that the appearance of these two *Rhodioi* can no longer be used for dating the Catalogue to after 408.

Thus, it is reasonable to suppose that the Catalogue dates from some time before the revolts of Chios and Rhodos in 413 and 412/411, respectively.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Funke 1983.166–167.

<sup>5</sup> Eight (*Plut.Alc.*37.4, *Lys.*11.8; *Justin.*5.6.10); nine (*Xen.Hell.*2.1.28); ten (*Diod.Sic.*13.106.6; *Paus.*3.11.5); twelve (*Lys.*21.11). For the other references, see Krentz 1989.177.

<sup>6</sup> Based on the prosopographical prominence of the tribe Erechtheis in the roster and the presence of a slave named Strombichides, Graham (1998.103–108) argued (inspired by Harold Mattingly) that the Catalogue commemorated the crews of eight ships that sailed from blockading Peiraion to Samos under the command of Strombichides in 412 (*Thuc.*8.15.1–16.1). Graham's argument could not be ruled out but seems rather weak. In the first place, the fleet of Strombichides, which not only failed to catch up with the fleet of Chalchideus but also fled from a larger enemy fleet, would not have been regarded as worthy of being commemorated with that extravagant inscription.

<sup>7</sup> Laing 1966.94 et n.1.

<sup>8</sup> An erroneous notion that the syntrierarchy was not known before 411 led Pope (1935.22) to regard the disastrous expedition to Eretria as the occasion commemorated.

<sup>9</sup> Sundwall 1915.137; Laing 1966.69–70; Graham 1992.265.

<sup>10</sup> The most likely scenario is that even mercenary sailors generally preferred to fight on the side of their native states. Hunt 1998.95.

<sup>11</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup> 1454*, l.30 (c.445–430); *lvO 151* (Elis 464).

### *Slaves*

For scholars, the most striking feature of the Catalogue is the high proportion of slaves. Each slave name in the nominative is followed by a name in the genitive, which has been regarded as the name of the slave's master. Although most of the masters' names recur among the officers — trierarchs, *epibatai* and other petty officers — seven names are assumed to be those of rowers (three are citizens; four are foreigners and metics). All of the officers and their slaves seem to have served on the same ship. Of the seven rowers, however, only two are found on board with their putative slaves<sup>12</sup>.

Some scholars have explained the presence of slaves on board by arguing that even though they would at times have taken the oars, they were not regular rowers but were, rather, personal attendants of the ship's officers or of the *epibatai*<sup>13</sup>. This argument was refuted by Graham, who proposed an excellent interpretation of Thuc.7.13.2, in which Nikias reveals that the desertion of slaves crippled the Athenian fleet besieging Syrakusai. Graham (1992.258–259) rightly maintained that the deserting slaves must have been part of the regular rowers of the Athenian triremes. That these slave rowers were apparently distinct from the slaves from Hykkara, whom some crews substituted for themselves, also supports Graham's argument. Moreover, Graham (1992.260–263) demonstrated that at least some of the slave rowers accompanied free rowers by interpreting the cryptic phrase '*ep'automolias prophasei*' as referring to free rowers who deserted by claiming that they were pursuing their own runaway slaves.

We now have a solid foundation for showing that a larger part of the slaves on board, especially the slaves of free rowers, regularly rowed<sup>14</sup>. In fact, the Old Oligarch said that the slaves used to row with their masters ([Xen.] *Athe.pol.*1.19). Although there must have been some slaves who attended their masters on board, the number of slaves on some triremes in the Catalogue is apparently far more than the officers needed<sup>15</sup>. Thus, the slaves who did not serve their masters on board must have rowed, because the triremes had no room for unoccupied personnel to sit around.

That leads to another important issue. Scholars have pointed out that on some triremes, the slaves seem to have been too numerous to be accompanied by their masters<sup>16</sup>. Hunt (2006.27), following Laing (1966.138–139), suggested that slaves whose masters' names were not found among the free crew members on the ship would have been assigned by their masters' relatives or friends who were not on board<sup>17</sup>.

A comparison with a series of accounts of the construction of the Erechtheion (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 474–479) sheds light on this issue. This almost contemporaneous document shares very marked features with the Catalogue, and these similarities have attracted scholars' attention<sup>18</sup>. Here, we find that the craftsmen, both slave and free (metics and citizens), not only worked side by side on apparently similar tasks but also received equal pay for equal work<sup>19</sup>. What deserves explicit emphasis is that some of the slaves may

<sup>12</sup> For the free rowers and their possible slaves, see Graham 1992.266 n.40, 1998.98–99. Graham (1998.109) suggested that at least the latter two rowers (metic and foreigner) really rowed together with their slaves on board. Herzogenrath-Amelung (2017.56) stated without discussion that no citizen rower brought slaves with him.

<sup>13</sup> Sargent 1927.273–274, 276; Casson 1966.36–37; Garland 1988.164, 166.

<sup>14</sup> Welwei 1974.88–89; Jordan 1975.223; Graham 1992.258–259 et 258 n.4, 1998.109–110; Hunt 1998.98.

<sup>15</sup> Morrison et al. (2000.113) supposed that one of two gangs of five slaves attended the helmsman (*kybernētēs*), and the other, the bow officer (*prōiratēs*). Cf. Xen.*Anab.*5.8.20; Graham 1998.101–102. Moreover, the trierarch and some other petty officers, such as the pentekontarch, would have needed assistants. It is thus assumed that the slaves who attended a trireme's officers and *epibatai* probably made up about 10% of the complement. Laing 1966.93; Hunt 1998.97.

<sup>16</sup> Laing 1966.136–137. Graham (1998.101–102) seemed to leave the question open.

<sup>17</sup> Pope (1935.22 n.32) earlier indicated in that direction. Laing (1966.138–139) referred to Philonichos (I.169), an archer attended by Herakleides, slave of Philonichides (I.270) whom Laing regarded as a relative of the archer because of the rarity of their names.

<sup>18</sup> The three categories—citizens, metics and slaves—were all represented among the craftsmen at the Erechtheion. The citizens bore the demotics, the metics were noted by the deme where they were registered, and the slaves were denoted by the genitive of the names of their masters. Randall 1953.200; Jordan 1975.261; Graham 1998.107–108; Hunt 1998.99, 2006.27–28.

<sup>19</sup> Loomis 1998.108 et n.12. Feyel (2006.323) maintained that there was a distinction between tasks performed by freemen and those by slaves, and that the slaves were allocated to 'travail servile', since all of the slaves were either carpenters or masons. However, it may be simply because, as Randall (1953.204) pointed out, only the masons and the carpenters for whom there

not have worked with their masters<sup>20</sup>. Some of them worked with a free craftsman who was not their owner<sup>21</sup>. It is probable that these slave craftsmen without masters were sometimes entrusted or leased to free craftsmen, who may have been relatives or business partners of their masters — and the slave craftsmen may have sometimes worked independently<sup>22</sup>.

In fact, it has been noted that it was common practice for slave owners to let their slaves work independently, levying a part of their earnings from them as rent (*apophora*) and allowing them to keep the rest. Such slaves were generally called *douloi misthophorountes* (rented slaves)<sup>23</sup>. It is also notable that sailors of merchant ships — sometimes even the captains — were often *douloi misthophorountes* and owned by the proprietors of the vessels<sup>24</sup>. The Old Oligarch ([Xen.] *Athen.pol.*1.20) said that helmsmen, after having trained in the merchant ship or passenger boat, embarked on the trireme. Moreover, Dem.4.36–37 attested that slaves ‘living apart [*chōris oikountes*]’, who were most likely identical to *douloi misthophorountes*, were able to be drafted to man the warships<sup>25</sup>. The vague account of the Old Oligarch ([Xen.] *Athen.pol.*1.11) may have indicated this<sup>26</sup>. On these grounds, we can reasonably maintain that some of the slaves who appear on board without their masters in the Catalogue were *douloi misthophorountes*.

What incentives encouraged the slave owners and the slaves themselves to engage in this practice? Given that the slave craftsmen at the Erechtheion were paid the same rate as their masters, the same was most likely true of the slave crews<sup>27</sup>. In fact, Thukydides (3.17.4) in reporting that the Athenian hoplites, along with their attendants, were paid two drachmas each during the blockade of Poteidaia in 428, suggests that the same was true for naval personnel<sup>28</sup>. The incentives for the slave owners and their slaves must have been as follows: First, the owners were able to, as the Old Oligarch ([Xen.] *Athen.pol.*1.11) implied, keep a portion of their slaves’ earnings as *apophora*. Second, seasonal naval services allowed the owners, who may have been farmers as well as craftsmen, to keep their slaves more fully employed. This must have been of great benefit to the owners, since the slaves were not able to be laid off. Third, we can deduce from a lease contract of slave miners (Xen. *Vect.*4.14) that it was the lessee who fed the slave crews and replaced casualties resulting from all kinds of hazards: injury, death and desertion<sup>29</sup>.

---

was greatest demand had the capital to acquire and train slaves. In fact, there seems to be no difference between freemen and slaves in terms of tasks and pay.

<sup>20</sup> Kroisos (*IG*.I<sup>3</sup> 475, ll.67, 233, 255–256) and Gerys (ll.254, 290): slaves of Philokles; a slave of Herakleides (l.234); a slave of Dromon (l.187); Kerdon (*IG*.I<sup>3</sup> 476, ll.22, 88–89, 201, 237–238, 319) and Sokles (ll.90, 202–203, 239, 320): slaves of Axiopieithes; Onesimos: slave of Nikostratos (ll.206–207, 243–244, 443); Antidotus: slave of Glaukos (ll.210–211, 247). Cf. Randall 1953.202–203; Feyel 2006.33–35, 39, 41, 45, 49.

<sup>21</sup> Kerdon and Sokles, whose master was Axiopieithes of Melite, always worked with Simias of Alopeke and his five slaves.

<sup>22</sup> Randall (1953.204) speculated that some craftsmen trained cheap, unskilled slaves in order to profitably hire them out. As a matter of fact, Demosthenes (27.20) referred to slave craftsmen being leased.

<sup>23</sup> Although most of the evidence dates from the fourth century, it is likely that these types of slaves also existed in the fifth century. Aesch.1.97; Isae.8.35; Theophr. *Char.*30.15. One piece of evidence for the fifth century is [Xen.] *Athen.pol.*1.17. Kalinka 1913.131–132, 162; Randall 1953.206; Westermann 1955.12; Jones 1956.188.

<sup>24</sup> Dem.33.8–9; 34.10. Amit 1965.54.

<sup>25</sup> Kolbe 1901.45 et n.249; Westermann 1955.12; Jones 1965.188; Welwei 1974.102 n.144. Some scholars have suggested that the *chōris oikountes* were not slaves but freedmen, adducing mainly two sources: Dem.47.72 and Harp. (Suda.; Phot.). s.v. *tous chōris oikountes*. Sargent (1927.267 n.6) summarized the arguments made in this direction. The argument, however, is unsound, because all these sources attest only to the fact that the freedmen lived apart from their masters.

<sup>26</sup> The text, while much discussed, is difficult to interpret because of corruption. Even if the slaves were involved in non-military sectors, as some scholars have maintained (Kalinka 1913.129–130; Sargent 1927.272 n.3; Gelzer 1937.117; Amit 1965.32; Welwei 1974.91), it does not exclude the possibility that some slaves embarked on the warship. Jordan 1975.261–262; Graham 1992.262–263.

<sup>27</sup> Morrison et al. 2000.108; Bakewell 2008.153 et n.70.

<sup>28</sup> Pritchett (1971.16) seems to take for granted that it was only free crews who received pay.

<sup>29</sup> Jones 1956.189; Gauthier 1976.138–139. It has often been argued that slave owners would not have exposed their property to the hazards of war or desertion, far from home and supervision. Sargent 1927.273; Amit 1965.37. Welwei (1974.103) and Gabrielsen (1994.108) assumed the contribution of slave crews came from privates. Euxenides, a metic, was honoured for having offered twelve *nautai*, probably his slaves, in 306/5 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 554).



The slave crews were allowed to keep a part of their gross salary and were then able to afford to buy their freedom after several years<sup>30</sup>.

Hunt (1998.87–95; 2006.30–31) pointed out that the recruitment of the slaves itself was not exceptional; rather, what was unusual and scandalous was that the slaves who fought at Arginusai were emancipated and even enrolled as citizens. Welwei (1974.95–96) and Graham (1992.267) argued in the same direction. Therefore, the presence of slave crews alone would not link the Catalogue to Arginusai. Moreover, Hunt (1998.98–99) maintained that it must have been possible and practical for Athens to use slave crews because four of the five largest Greek navies in the time of Peloponnesian War — the Korinthian, the Korkyrean, the Syrakusan and the Chian — also used slave crews.

### *Epibatai*

In the Catalogue, the *epibatai* are always listed right after the trierarchs, which indicates that they had the second-highest status on the ships. Moreover, each of the *epibatēs* was most likely accompanied by at least one personal attendant, and some of their names imply that they were of high-borne<sup>31</sup>.

This image of the ‘elite *epibatai*’ appears to contradict two accounts of Thukydides, which have often been adduced to argue that the Athenian *epibatai* normally consisted of *thētes*. Thukydides (6.43.1) reported that the Athenian hoplites who embarked on ships for the Sicilian expedition in 415 consisted of 1,500 men from the register (*ek katalogou*) and 700 *thētes*, who served as *epibatai*<sup>32</sup>. In another account, Thukydides (8.24.2) stated that Athenian generals heading for Lesbos in 412 had hoplites *ek katalogou* serving as *epibatai* out of compulsion under their command. On the basis of these accounts, scholars have assumed that because the *epibatai* apparently stood in contrast to the hoplites enrolled *ek katalogou*, the *epibatai* were normally recruited from the volunteer *thētes*, whereas the hoplites conscripted *ek katalogou* were obliged to serve on board in exceptional circumstances<sup>33</sup>.

However, the argument that the *epibatai* consisted exclusively of *thētes* is incompatible with the ample evidence attesting to the fact that people of higher social standing served on board<sup>34</sup>. In fact, on the eve of the battle of Salamis, Themistokles called up and addressed the *epibatai* (Hdt.8.83). During the expedition to Aitolia in 426, 120 of 300 *epibatai* under Demosthenes’ command died in battle. Thukydides (3.98.4; Cf. 95.2) described the dead soldiers as ‘the very finest men [*beltistoi*]’<sup>35</sup>. Moreover, the *epibatai* poured out libations with the archons at the ceremonial departure of the Sicilian expedition (Thuc.6.32.1)<sup>36</sup>. Andokides, an elite citizen, was accused in 399 of shying away from serving either as a horseman, hoplite, trierarch or *epibatēs* (Lys. 6.46). Andrewes (*HCT* V.56) rightly suggested that there was a conception that Andokides could have served as either a hoplite or an *epibatēs*. Jordan (1975.198) and Herzogenrath-Amelung (2017.54) also indicated the same idea. The image of an ‘elite *epibatai*’ is also supported by pictorial evidence. The gravestone of Demokleides, son of Demetrios, who died

<sup>30</sup> Given that a rower’s wage at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War was six obols a day, three of which represented the slave’s living expenses, Hunt (2006.38 n.67) assumed the following: the owner took two of the three remaining obols per day, and the slave took one; a sailing season of one hundred days yielded the slave one hundred obols per year. If the average price of a slave was 750 obols, the slave could buy his freedom after seven and half years of work.

<sup>31</sup> Laing 1966.137–138; Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017.55–57. Hippodamas (l.284) was one of the *epibatai* and was thought to be the grandson of a person with the same name who was a general in 459. Laing 1966.76–79; Osborne-Byrne 1994.237.

<sup>32</sup> This is the only mention of *thētes* in Thukydides. Rosivach (2002.41 n.21) regarded the referent not as a property class but, rather, as poor working folk. I prefer de Ste. Croix’s perspective (2004.20–21) that *thētes* refers to a property class.

<sup>33</sup> Busolt 1926.575 et n.1, 1206; Körte 1932.1030; Laing 1966.137 n.23; Dover (*HCT* IV) 310; Andrewes (*HCT* V) 56; de Ste. Croix 2004.21; van Wees 2001.59, 2004.210, 308 n.40, 2006.371; Hornblower 2008.815–816.

<sup>34</sup> Jordan 1975.195–203; Pritchard 2010.24 n.139; Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017.49–57.

<sup>35</sup> Gabrielsen 2002b, 211; Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017.54–55. Gomme (*HCT* II) 407–408 adhered to the accepted theory, whereas Andrewes (*HCT* V.56) expressed reservations about it. Hornblower (1991.514) was puzzled, and Morrison et al. (2000.110) suggested that they were a physically fit and elite force. Platon (*Leg.*706d) also referred to the *epibatai* as ‘the best part of the citizens [*to tōn politōn beltiston meros*]’. Cf. Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017.53.

<sup>36</sup> Morrison et al. 2000.110. Dover (*HCT* IV.296) took them as ‘representatives of the troop on board’ because it is improbable that the *thētes* poured libations.

around 400, pictures a man sitting at the prow end of a ship deck. A shield and a Korinthian helmet behind him indicate that he was an *epibatēs*. The quality of the stele testifies to the wealth of his family<sup>37</sup>.

It is also evident that the *epibatai* of other states had a higher social standing. The Chian *epibatai* — who fought bravely in the battle of Lade in 494 — were referred to as ‘selected men [*andres logades*]’ (Hdt.6.15). Thukydides (1.55.1) reported that most of the Korkyraean citizens captured in the battle of Sybota in 433 were ‘the first men [*prōtoi*]’, who could not have been rowers and most probably were *epibatai*. Hermokrates, a Syrakusan general, consulted with his *epibatai* as well as his trierarchs and helmsmen before making decisions in 410/9 (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.28)<sup>38</sup>. Finally, Aristotle stated that ‘the naval mob [*nautikos ochlos*] does not have to belong to the polis because it is *epibatikon* — free men who belong to the army — who are in command on board the ship’ (Arist. *Pol.* 1327b6–10)<sup>39</sup>.

In light of the overwhelming evidence that the *epibatai* were in fact higher-status soldiers, I will return to Thuc.6.43.1 and 8.24.2. The argument that the *epibatai* were exclusively recruited from the *thētes* is untenable. It is likely that not only the *thētes*, but also citizens from the other property classes, served as *epibatai*<sup>40</sup>. Therefore, exclusive recruitment of the 700 *thētes* as *epibatai* in 415 must have been exceptional, which would explain Thukydides’ specific mention of them. Here, Thukydides must have been contrasting conscripts *ek katalogou* and volunteers from the *thētes*. In other words, Thukydides was drawing a distinction between different modes of recruitment rather than between the *thētes* and the other property classes<sup>41</sup>. That the Athenians recruited the *epibatai* on a voluntary basis is also supported by the inscription *IG I<sup>3</sup> 60* (c.430), which records the dispatch of an Athenian fleet<sup>42</sup>. Here, each trireme was manned with five volunteer (*ethelontes*) *epibatai* (ll.10, 15–16). There is no mention of the property classes<sup>43</sup>. As for Thuc.8.24.2, what is exceptional is that the *epibatai*, who were usually volunteers, were conscripted in 412.

#### *Way of manning the ships*

In the past, scholars have generally shared the view that although the triremes were manned by conscripts during the Pentekontaetia, the conventional way of manning the ships was recruitment of volunteers by the trierarchs, which occurred from the late fifth century until 357, when the responsibility for providing the crews was transferred from the trierarchs to the state by the Periandros reform<sup>44</sup>. Recently, this schematic model has been reconsidered. Hansen (1985.22–24) supposed that the conscription of citizens for naval service dating back to the fifth century was the typical way of manning warships in the fourth century; however, conscription was not used in all cases, and conscripts did not always constitute the entirety of the complement. Evidence for conscription can be found in Dem.14.22–23; 50.6; *IG I<sup>3</sup> 1127–1131*; and *SEG 22.274*. Miyaji (1987.7–11) maintained that already in the fifth century, there was conscription based on the deme registers and organized by tribes and *trittyes*, and thus recruitment of volunteers by the trierarchs was not the typical mode of manning the warships but rather a voluntary contribution. Miyaji (1987.4) also pointed out that the silence of the sources does not indicate the absence of conscription, while the Athenians seemingly resorted to conscription only in

<sup>37</sup> Jordan 1975.198; Strauss 2000.262–264 et 263 fig.1; Okada 2015.20; Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017.46–47.

<sup>38</sup> Krentz 1989.103.

<sup>39</sup> Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017.53–54.

<sup>40</sup> I do not deny that the wealthy *thētes* could serve as *epibatai*. As van Wees (2001) maintained, some of the *thētes* may have begun serving over time as hoplites and ended up comprising no small part of the hoplites in the Classical period. Cf. Okada 2017. I am grateful to my colleague, Professor Asako Kurihara, for her remark.

<sup>41</sup> Pritchard 2010.24–25. Jordan (1975.196–197) suggested that the thetic *epibatai* for the Sicilian expedition were exceptional. Also see Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017.50–51.

<sup>42</sup> It has been widely held that the decree cannot be associated with the Athenian expedition against Melos in 416/5 and that the fleet was supposed to levy tributes from allies. Meritt 1953.300–303; Eberhardt 1959.284–314; Seaman 1997.403–404. Mattingly (1990.111–112) suggested that the establishment of the tribute-collecting fleet should be dated to soon after the reassessment of 425, while Meritt (1953.301–302) put it in the 430s.

<sup>43</sup> Jordan 1975.201–203; Gabrielsen 2002a.92; Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017.51.

<sup>44</sup> Armstrong 1949.34–95; Busolt 1926.574; Jameson 1963.398–399; Amit 1965.48. Discussions are summarized by Miyaji (1987.2–3).

emergencies in the late fifth century. Gabrielsen (1994.107–108), however, argued that conscription was not the rule but the exception for most of the fifth and the entirety of the fourth centuries, stating also that it was ineffective and that recruitment by trierarchs was always the rule.

We have strong grounds for believing that in the late fifth century, the supposed date of the Catalogue, manning done by trierarchs was the rule, while the Athenians may have resorted to conscription occasionally. Critical evidence is provided by Thuc.6.31.3, in which Thukydides mentioned a division of roles for getting ships and crews ready: the state paid crews the basic wage and provided the ‘empty ships [*naus kenas*]’ and the *hypēresia* to man them, whereas the trierarchs were supposed to recruit volunteer crews<sup>45</sup>. The argument for understanding *naus kenas* as ships without equipment is invalid, because it was always the state that furnished gear<sup>46</sup>. The alternative proposed by Armstrong (1949.64–67) and Miyaji (1987.10) — that is, adopting *kainas* (new) found in a minor MS — is not sufficiently plausible. The mention of *naus kenas* in Dem.3.5; 4.43 also suggests empty ships without crews<sup>47</sup>. Sources from the late fifth century (Isoc.18.60; Lys.21.10) confirm this division of roles between the state and trierarchs, because what the litigants, trierarchs stressed here was not that they manned the warships, but that they themselves provided rowers with a wage and recruited the *hypēresia*, which were typically furnished by the state.

At this point, we can understand how the Athenians manned the triremes in the Catalogue. A conspicuous feature, and one that has attracted the attention of scholars, is the prominence of the tribe Erechtheis, especially on Trireme 3, on which as many as 60% of the citizen crew members came from the Erechtheid demes<sup>48</sup>. It is hardly possible, however, to assume that these Erechtheids were drafted from the deme registers, because the case of Trireme 3 is isolated, and the discernible citizen crew members on Trireme 1 and Trireme 2 were from demes of eight or nine different tribes. Thus, it would be reasonable to suppose that the Erechtheids on Trireme 3 were volunteers recruited by the Erechtheid trierarch Protomachos through a tribal network. That nine of the ten *epibatai* on this ship were Erechtheids points to the same conclusion, because the *epibatai* were typically volunteers, as we have seen<sup>49</sup>.

That argument could be supported by a newly published inscription dated to the late fifth or early fourth century<sup>50</sup>. It is supposedly part of a larger roster of the crews of more than one Athenian trireme, which is both formally and chronologically a close parallel of the Catalogue, but is not likely a part of it<sup>51</sup>. The heading ‘*Erechtheidos*’ is followed by a trierarch, perhaps ten *epibatai* and three officers (*kybernētēs*, *keleustēs* or *prōiratēs*, pentekontarch). The tribal heading, that trierarch and all of the *epibatai* being from the Erechtheid demes led Bardani (2004.153–154) to suggest that the crews of the trireme of this roster were organized on the tribal basis. Although that could be possible, we still wonder if these Erechtheid *epibatai* were recruited by a tribal network of the trierarch in the same way as their counterparts on Trireme 3 of the Catalogue, especially because *kybernētēs* and *keleustēs/prōiratēs* are not citizens but foreigners (Abderian and Phaselite). As for the tribal heading, it could be the name of the ship, as Bardani (2004.153 n.29) himself noted<sup>52</sup>.

To return to the Catalogues, variations of the composition of the crews on individual triremes also indicate recruitment of volunteers by the trierarchs. There seems to have been a higher proportion of free crew members and a lower proportion of slaves on Trireme 2 than on the other triremes; all the discernible *xenoi* on Trireme 1 were citizens from allied states, whereas those on Trireme 4 were mostly

<sup>45</sup> Kolbe 1901.34, 38; Busolt 1926.574 et n.1; Dover (*HCT IV*) 293–294.

<sup>46</sup> Boeckh 1857.708–709.

<sup>47</sup> Pritchett (1974.87 n.151) seemed to take the *naus kenas* as ‘ships comprising mercenary crews’ but did not provide evidence to support his argument. The *naus kenas* could have been empty ships to be manned later with mercenary crews.

<sup>48</sup> Pope 1953.1048; Laing 1966.98; Graham 1998.107–108.

<sup>49</sup> Gomme (1933.49 n.2) and Armstrong (1949.45–46) found it doubtful that the crews of the Catalogue were enrolled by tribes. Bakewell (2008.152) assumed that only *epibatai* and citizen rowers in Trireme 3 were conscripts, which I doubt.

<sup>50</sup> Bardani 2004.

<sup>51</sup> Bardani 2004.151.

<sup>52</sup> Jordan (1975.164–166) inferred the presence of ten sacred ships bearing the names of the ten Kleisthenic tribes in the fifth and fourth centuries.

metics. It is likely that this variety resulted from recruitment by each pair of trierarchs through either social or personal networks, rather than from uniform and systematic mobilization by the state.

### *Nature of the Catalogue*

The important question still remains: for what purpose and in what historical context was this inscription created, especially if the complements of the crews in the Catalogue were normal ones of the Athenian fleet in the late fifth century. Since this is a large issue, it must be handled rather summarily here.

First of all, it should be noted that the Catalogue is not necessarily a *sui generis* monument<sup>53</sup>. Other than the newly published inscription mentioned above (Bardani 2004), we have at least two other fragmentary inscriptions assumed to belong to similar crew rosters that are not part of the Catalogue<sup>54</sup>. That would back up our argument that the Catalogue was not a unique document derived from a certain specific historical context.

As for the nature of the Catalogue, we must draw attention to Bakewell's studies (2007, 2008) for the military record keeping in fifth-century Athens. After the Persian Wars, detailed military records began to be kept because of changes in the nature of warfare, the establishment and growth of the empire and democratic development in Athens. Individual commanders — generals as well as trierarchs — found it necessary and useful to create and maintain records of those serving under them, not only for self-defence against antagonistic *dēmos*, but also for effectively maintaining the personnel. The commanders tended to keep records in non-standard, idiosyncratic ways. The variations that we mentioned above in the crew listings of the surviving four triremes in the Catalogue indicate that it was not derived from standardized administrative documents but from records about the personnel kept by individual trierarchs.

Bakewell (2008.154) suggested that the primary purpose of the Catalogue was not administrative but honorific on the grounds that the Catalogue was supposed to have been erected in Akropolis, not in Agora or Peiraeus, and that it may not have been designed for easy consulting. We prefer to regard it basically as a dedicatory monument that was originally kept on impermanent media and later edited and inscribed on stone, most likely as the Erechtheion accounts that share very marked features with the Catalogue. Once dedicated as such, the military records compiled by the trierarchs became sacred, by which a kind of accountability of the trierarchs would also have been ensured. Whether or not the monument was actually consulted would not have really mattered.

### *Conclusion*

This paper investigated five aspects of the Catalogue, *IG I<sup>3</sup> 1032*: (1) its link to the battle of Arginusai/Aigospotamoi, (2) slave crews, (3) *epibatai*, (4) the mode of manning the ships and (5) the nature of the document. As far as these aspects are concerned, nothing seems to indicate that this inscription reflects an extraordinary situation. Thus, the roster on the inscription, which would originally have been compiled by individual trierarchs then inscribed onto the stone and dedicated on the Akropolis, reflects the typical complement of crews of the Athenian triremes, at least in the late fifth century.

### *Bibliography*

- Amit, M. (1965). *Athens and the Sea: A Study in Athenian Sea-power*. Bruxelles.  
 Armstrong, J. I. (1949). *The Trierarchy and the Tribal Organization of the Athenian Navy*. (Ph.D), Princeton.  
 Bakewell, G.W. (2007). Written lists of military personnel in Classical Athens. In C. Cooper (Ed.), *The Politics of Orality: Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World VII* (pp. 89–102). Leiden: Brill.

<sup>53</sup> Bakewell (2008.157) erroneously stated that 'to date not a single fragment from another monument listing crews has come to light'.

<sup>54</sup> EM12894, found on the north slope of Akropolis in 1937, is different from the Catalogue both in the geological character and in some lettering. Laing 1966.94 n.1; Graham 1998.90. Stroud (1972.428) dated it to the early fourth century. Agora I 4784, found in the foundation of a late Roman house southeast of the Tholos in 1937, is similar to the Catalogue in the geological character, but the colour of the marble is blueish. Meritt 1960.54–55; Lewis' note in *IG I<sup>3</sup>*.

- Bakewell, G. W. (2008). Trierarchs' records and the Athenian naval catalogue (IG I<sup>3</sup> 1032). In E. A. Mackay (Ed.), *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World* (pp. 144–162). Leiden: Brill.
- Bardani, V. N. (2004). Θραύσμα ναυτικού καταλόγου. In A. P. Matthaiou & G. E. Malouchou (Eds.), *Αττικά Επιγραφαί. Πρακτικά Συμποσίου εις Μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm* (pp. 141–154). Athens: Greek Epigraphical Society.
- Boeckh, A. (1857). *The Public Economy of the Athenians* (A. Lamb, Trans.). Boston: Little, Brown and company.
- Bronner, O. (1933). Excavations on the north slope of the Acropolis in Athens 1931-1932. *Hesperia*, 2(3), 329–417.
- Busolt, G. (1926). *Griechische Staatskunde*. München: Beck.
- Casson, L. (1966). Galley slaves. *TAPhA*, 97, 35–44.
- De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. (2004). The Solonian census classes and the qualifications for cavalry and hoplite service. In D. Harvey, R. C. T. Parker, & P. J. Thonemann (Eds.), *Athenian Democratic Origins: And Other Essays* (pp. 1–72). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Pr.
- Eberhardt, W. (1959). Der Melierdialog und Die inschriften ATL A 9 (IG II2 63 +) und IG I2 97 +. *Historia*, 8(3), 284–314.
- Feyel, C. (2006). *Les artisans dans les sanctuaires grecs aux époques classique et hellénistique à travers la documentation financière en Grèce*. Athens: de Boccard.
- Funke, P. (1983). Konons Rückkehr nach Athen im Spiegel epigraphischer Zeugnisse. *ZPE*, 53, 149–189.
- Gabrielsen, V. (1994). *Financing the Athenian fleet: Public Taxation and Social Relations*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Pr.
- Gabrielsen, V. (2000). The synoikized « polis » of Rhodes. In P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, & L. Rubinstein (Eds.), *Polis & Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History: Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on His Sixtieth Birthday* (pp. 177–205). Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Pr.
- Gabrielsen, V. (2002). The impact of armed forces on governments and politics in Archaic and Classical Greek poleis: A response to Hans van Wees. In A. Chaniotis & P. Ducrey (Eds.), *Army and Power in the Ancient World* (pp. 83–98). Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Gabrielsen, V. (2002). Socio-economic classes and ancient Greek warfare. In K. Ascanti (Ed.), *Ancient History Matters: Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydsgaard on His Seventieth Birthday* (pp. 203–220). Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Garlan, Y. (1988). *Slavery in Ancient Greece* (J. Lloyd, Trans.). Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr.
- Gauthier, P. (1976). *Un commentaire historique des Πόποι de Xénophon*. Genève: Droz.
- Gelzer, K. I. (1937). *Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener*. Hildesheim: Weidmann.
- Gomme, A. W. (1933). *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Oxford & Malden (Mass.): Blackwell.
- Gomme, A. W. (1959). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, I*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr. (HCT I)
- Gomme, A. W. (1956). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, II: Books II–III*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr. (HCT II)
- Gomme, A. W. (1956). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, III: Books IV–V 24*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr. (HCT III)
- Gomme, A. W., Andrewes, A., & Dover, K. J. (1970). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, IV: Book V 25–VII*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr. (HCT IV)
- Gomme, A. W., Andrewes, A., & Dover, K. J. (1981). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, V: Book VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr. (HCT V)
- Graham, A. J. (1992). Thucydides 7.13.2 and the crews of Athenian triremes. *TAPhA*, 122, 257–270.
- Graham, A. J. (1998). Thucydides 7.13.2 and the crews of the Athenian triremes: An addendum. *TAPhA*, 128, 89–114.
- Hansen, M. H. (1985). *Demography and Democracy: The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.* Herning (Denmark): Forl. Systeme.
- Herzogenrath-Amelung, T. (2017). Naval hoplites: Social status and combat reality of Classical Greek *epibatai*. *Historia*, 66(1), 45–64.
- Hornblower, S. (1991). *A Commentary on Thucydides, I: Books I–III*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr.
- Hornblower, S. (2008). *A Commentary on Thucydides, III: Books 5.25–8.109*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Pr.
- Hunt, P. (1998). *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Pr.

- Hunt, P. (2006). Arming slaves and helots in Classical Greece. In C. L. Brown & P. D. Morgan (Eds.), *Arming Slaves: From Classical Times to the Modern Age* (pp. 14–39). New Haven (Conn.): Yale University Pr.
- Jameson, M. H. (1960). A decree of Themistokles from Troizen. *Hesperia*, 29(2), 198–223.
- Jameson, M. H. (1963). The provisions for mobilization in the decree of Themistokles. *Historia*, 12(4), 385–404.
- Jones, A. H. M. (1956). Slavery in the Ancient World. *The Economic History Review N.S.*, 9(2), 185–199.
- Jordan, B. (1975). *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period: A Study of Athenian Naval Administration and Military Organization in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Berkeley: University of California Pr.
- Kalinka, E. (1913). *Die pseudoxenophontische "Athēnaiōn politeia" : Einleitung, Übersetzung, Erklärung Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare.* Leipzig & Berlin: B.G.Teubner.
- Köhler, U. (1883). Aus den attischen Marineinschriften. *MDAI(A)*, 8, 165–180.
- Kolbe, G. (1901). *De Atheniensium re navali quaestiones selectae.* (Dissertation), Berlinensi.
- Körte, A. (1932). Eine Verlustliste aus der Schlacht bei den Arginusen? *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 52, cols.1027–1032.
- Krentz, P. (1989). *Hellenika, I–II.3.10.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Laing, D.R.Jr. (1966). *A new interpretation of the Athenian naval catalogue, IG II2, 1951.* (Ph.D), Cincinnati.
- Lewis, D. M., & Stroud, R. S. (1979). Athens Honors King Evagoras of Salamis. *Hesperia*, 48(2), 180–193.
- Loomis, W. T. (1998). *Wages, Welfare Costs, and Inflation in Classical Athens.* Ann Arbor (Mich.): University of Michigan Pr.
- Mattingly, H. B. (1990). Some fifth-century Attic epigraphic hands. *ZPE*, 83, 110–122.
- Meritt, B. D. (1927). An Athenian naval catalogue. *AJA*, 31(4), 462–470.
- Meritt, B. D. (1953). An Athenian decree. In G. E. Mylonas & D. Raymond (Eds.), *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday II* (pp. 298–303). Saint Louis Missouri: Washington University.
- Meritt, B. D. (1960). Greek Inscriptions. *Hesperia*, 29(1), 1–77.
- Miyaji, K. (1987). The recruiting system for the Athenian navy in the fifth and fourth century B.C. *Review of Western History*, 13, 1–19. (Japanese)
- Morrison, J. S., Coates, J. F., & Rankov, N. B. (2000). *The Athenian Trireme: The History and Reconstruction of an Ancient Greek Warship* (2 ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Pr.
- Okada, T. (2017). Crew composition in the 5th century BCE Athenian fleet: An analysis of the Athenian Naval Catalogue in-scription. *Shigaku-Zasshi*, 124(12), 1–36. (Japanese)
- Okada, T. (2017). Zeugitai and hoplites: A military dimension of the Solon's property classes revisited. *Japan Studies in Classical Antiquity*, 3, 17–37.
- Osborne, M. J., & Byrne, S. G. (Eds.). (1994). *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names II, Attica.* Oxford: Clarendon Pr.
- Pope, H. M. (1935). *Non-Athenians in Attic Inscriptions.* New York: Cosmos.
- Pope, H. M. (1953). Erechtheus and the Erechtheids *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday II* (pp. 1044–1051). Saint Louis Missouri: Washington University.
- Pritchard, D. M. (2010). The symbiosis between democracy and war: The case of ancient Athens. In D. M. Pritchard (Ed.), *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens* (pp. 1–62). Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Pr.
- Pritchett, W. K. (1971). *The Greek State at War, I.* Berkeley: University of California Pr.
- Pritchett, W. K. (1974). *The Greek State at War, II.* Berkeley: University of California Pr.
- Randall, H. R. J. (1953). The Erechtheum workmen. *AJA*, 57(3), 199–210.
- Rosivach, V. J. (1985). Manning the Athenian fleet: 433–426 B.C. *AJAH*, 10, 41–66.
- Rosivach, V. J. (2002). The Requirements for the Solonic Classes in Aristotle, AP 7.4. *Hermes*, 130, 36–47.
- Sargent, R. L. (1927). The use of slaves by the Athenians in warfare. *CPh*, 22(3), 201–212, 264–279.
- Seaman, M. G. (1997). The Athenian expedition to Melos in 416 B.C. *Historia*, 46(4), 385–418.
- Strauss, B. S. (2000). Perspectives on the death of fifth-century Athenian seamen. In H. v. Wees (Ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece* (pp. 261–283). Swansea: Classical Pr. of Wales.
- Stroud, R. S. (1972). Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis, II. *Hesperia*, 41(4), 422–450.
- Sundwall, J. (1915). Liste athenischer Marinebesatzungen. *AA*, 30, cols.124–137.
- Wees, H. v. (2001). The myth of the middle-class army: Military and social status in ancient Athens. In T. Bekker-Nielsen & L. Hannestad (Eds.), *War as A Cultural and Social Force: Essays on Warfare in Antiquity* (pp. 45–71). Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag.

- Wees, H. v. (2004). *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London: Duckworth.
- Wees, H. v. (2006). Mass and elite in Solon's Athens: the property classes revisited. In J. H. Blok & A. P. M. H. Lardinois (Eds.), *Solon of Athens* (pp. 351–389). Leiden: Brill.
- Welwei, K. W. (1974). *Unfreie im antiken Kriegsdienst, I: Athen und Sparta*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Westermann, W. L. (1955). *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

Taisuke OKADA  
Takachiho University  
Faculty of Humanities  
2-19-1 Ōhmiya Suginami Tokyo 168-8508 Japan  
okadat@takachiho.ac.jp