TRIBAL PARTICIPATION AND SOLIDARITY IN FIFTH CENTURY ATHENS: A SUMMARY

David Pritchard

A diverse body of evidence from classical Athens suggests that every citizen – regardless of social class and military role – had a strong sense of solidarity and connection with his phyle (tribe) and symphyletai (fellow tribesmen).\(^1\) Demosthenes supposes, for example, that all members of his tribe are keenly interested in the performance of their choral teams in the dithyrambic competitions (e.g. 21.19, 126, 132), and, along with Aristophanes and Lysias, maintains that bonds of solidarity between fellow tribesmen are normal, entirely commonplace and comparable to the personal ties amongst relatives and friends.\(^2\) The belief of these public speakers and the playwright that every Athenian had a strong connection with one of the ten Kleisthenic tribes also crops up in a decree of 410 BC which assumes that all citizens attend tribal assemblies (Andokides 1.96-98). Nevertheless the clearest expression of this universal tribal solidarity is the public funeral for the city’s war dead where the bond between tribe and deceased is solemnly and repeatedly articulated.\(^3\) The first stage of the funerary rites for dead citizen soldiers was the laying out of their remains in the agora for three days – possibly in front of the statues of the eponymous heroes of the ten tribes (Aristophanes Peace 1173, 1179-1186) – in order that their relatives could leave the mortuary offerings customary to deposit at the burials of loved ones (Thoukydides 2.34.2). On the day of the entombment itself the ashes of the war dead were transported by chariots in a grand procession to the public cemetery in the Kerameikos that was considered ‘the most beautiful suburb of the city’ (2.34.4-5; cf. Aristophanes Birds 395-399). For this cortège the remains of each dead citizen soldier were placed in a cypress coffin reserved for the tribe he had belonged to in life, while an empty bier commemorated those Athenians whose bodies could not be retrieved (Thoukydides 2.34.3-4). At the public cemetery the ten tribal caskets were placed in an impressive collective tomb that sportedleonine and battle scene representations evoking martial excellence as well as catalogues of the names

---

\(^1\) This is a substantially revised version of a paper presented at a conference of the Australian Society for Classical Studies held at the University of Sydney in 1997. On all things tribal I have benefited over the years from the expertise and generosity of Associate Professor Greg Stanton whom I would also like to thank – along with this journal’s anonymous referee – for useful comments on the original version of the paper. All translations of the Greek are my own.

\(^2\) Demosthenes 29.13; Aristophanes Akhaimiv 567-570; Birds 366-368, with Sommerstein (1987) 220-221; Lysias 21.6-7; cf. Andokides 150; Thoukydides 7.69.

\(^3\) For the details of this funeral see Pritchard (1996) 137; (2000) 224-234 with references.
of all Athenians, including citizen sailors, who had fallen in battle during the previous year \(\text{IG I}^2 1142-1193\). These lists were organized by tribes. The names of the war dead of each phyle were allocated – depending on the total number of Athenians killed in the year – either a clearly defined space on a solitary stone slab (e.g. 1162, 1168, 1175, 1183, 1184, 1190), an individual column on a stele shared with the fallen of another tribe (e.g. 1164, 1186, 1191), or their own stone (e.g. 1147) The bond of solidarity between dead phyletes and phyle was reinforced further on these lists by having the name of the tribe in the genitive case and that of the deceased in the nominative so declaring that each man had literally ‘belonged to’ his tribe.\(^5\) The speech traditionally delivered at the graveside might also make something of tribal belonging as Demosthenes most certainly did in his funeral oration of 338 BC when he suggested that those who had fought and died valiantly at Khaironeia had been emulating the patriotic mythical deeds of the eponymous demi-gods of their respective tribes (60.27-31).\(^6\)

Although public speakers, playwrights and the politicians responsible for systematizing the content of public inscriptions and ceremonies were members of the Athenian upper class, they faced adjudication by vocal massed audiences and so were obliged to negotiate and express the values, perceptions and prejudices of their predominantly lower class spectators and judges.\(^7\) As a result of this performance dynamic, we can infer from the diverse evidence cited above that the constant assumption that every citizen had a profound bond of solidarity with his tribe and fellow tribesmen was a stock element of what has variously been called ‘popular thinking’, ‘Athenian identity and civic ideology’ or ‘the Athenian imaginary’.\(^8\) In reality, however, the particular kind of connection each Athenian had with his tribe and fellow tribesmen did not flow automatically from formal tribal membership but was, as most scholars appreciate, a function of active involvement in the collective endeavours of his tribe and those activities of the city’s government that were organized along tribal lines (Demosthenes

\(^4\) Strauss (2000) and Pritchard (2000) 234-240 mount detailed arguments against the lingering scholarly skepticism about the inclusion of the names of thetic casualties on these lists (e.g. Bradeen (1969) 153 n 1; Hanson (1996) 306; Loraux (1986) 34; Raaflaub (1996) 156.

\(^5\) Bradeen (1969) 147

\(^6\) This passage is well considered by Kearns (1985) 197-198; (1989) 86.

\(^7\) For this performance dynamic and its effects on speeches and plays see Pritchard (1998a) 38-44; (2000) 2-74.

\(^8\) The first phrase is mine, the second comes from Boegehold and Scafuro (1994) and the third was invented by the great Nicole Loraux (1986)
39. 23, 28). Therefore, if every citizen, as Athenian popular thinking suggests, did enjoy a strong sense of belonging with his tribe, then all Athenians would have participated to a comparable level in tribal or tribally organized activities. However my study of the tribes of fifth century Athens has shown, firstly, that the extent of participation in activities structured by tribes has been drastically overestimated by scholars, and secondly, that a range of specific city centred activities were not, contrary to frequently made claims, organized in any way by tribes.

This article by and large is a summary of my research on tribal participation and solidarity in fifth century Athens. Nonetheless it does consider dithyrambic competitions in some detail to provide a case study of a tribal activity with no, or next to no, non-elite participation, and the manning of the fifth century navy as a detailed example of a civic activity which has been erroneously linked with the Kleisthenic tribes.

Dithyrambic Choruses

From the late sixth century BC each of the ten newly created tribes entered a team of fifty boys and another of fifty adult tribesmen into the competition to sing and dance a dithyramb at the annual festival of the Great Dionysia. And certainly by 420/19 at the latest tribes formed into pairs each year to submit similarly sized choruses of boys and men in the dithyrambic contest at Apollo's festival of the Thargelia (Antiphon 6 11). The choruses of these tribally arranged dithyrambic contests are reported to have trained very hard. The main responsibility for the training of a dithyrambic chorus as


11 I am not convinced by the arguments of Neils (1994) that the euandria (manly beauty) and boat race competitions go back to the fifth century. These tribal competitions along with the banquet for the tribe are attested only for the fourth century (Davies [1967] with references) and are outside the scope of this study. Tribes played no part in the organization of the jury courts of fifth century Athens (Hansen [1991] 181).

12 For the date of the introduction of this tribal team event, Davies (1967) 33; Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 72, with primary references. For useful discussions of the details of the tribally arranged dithyrambic contests, Golden (1990) 65-67; Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 75-79; and especially Wilson (2000) 50-98.

13 For this date, Davies (1967) 34.

14 Xenophon On the Cavalry Commander 1 26; Hiero 9 11; Demosthenes 21 17.
well as for recruiting its singers and paying its production expenses fell to a rich citizen who had been invited or, if necessary, conscripted by his fellow tribesmen to be a *khoregos* (chorus leader/sponsor)\textsuperscript{15} The extent to which non-elite as well as elite citizens were *khoreutai* (chorus members) can be determined by considering the various demands and costs of being a member of a cyclic chorus, the class position of those capable of meeting these, and the types of Athenians a chorus sponsor would have preferred to have in his team. The first clues about the time demands of being a dithyrambic singer and dancer come from the timetable for appointing chorus sponsors. One of the first duties of the eponymous archon when he entered office in the month of Hekatombaion (June/July) was to accept the names of the *khoregoi* that the tribes had selected for their cyclic choruses at both the Great Dionysia and Thargelia (*AP* 56.3). Since these festivals took place in Elaphebolion (February/March) and Thargelion (April/May) respectively, training for dithyrambic choruses would appear then to have extended over several months.\textsuperscript{16} Such team training sessions, like the other corporate activities of the tribes, took place no doubt in the *astu* (urban centre).\textsuperscript{17} Chorus sponsors did not give their choristers a wage but instead provided for their daily needs by organizing for the necessary purchases and paying for them out of their own pocket (*Antiphon* 6.13; cf. Xenophon *Ways and Means* 4.51-52).\textsuperscript{18}

One good way to try to clarify the regularity and length of choral training sessions as well as the ability of different classes of Athenians to attend them is to think about the regular schooling of an Athenian boy and how being a dithyrambic chorister would have dovetailed with it. Throughout the classical period the so-called 'Old Education' of male children consisted of the three disciplines of *grammata* (letters and poetry memorisation), *mousike* (music and sung poetry) and *gymnastike* or athletics (Plato *Protagoras* 312b).\textsuperscript{19} As classes in each of these were taken concurrently, groups of students traveled between *didaskaleia* (school rooms) throughout the day (e.g. Aristophanes

\textsuperscript{15} Many references bear out the responsibility of each tribe to select these chorus sponsors and their ability to conscript them if necessary: *AP* 56.3; *Antiphon* 6.11; *Demosthenes* 21.13; 39.7; *IG II²* 1140.12-15; 1147.9-11; 1157.2-3; 1158.2-3.

\textsuperscript{16} For the calendar of major classical Athenian festivals, Bruit Zaidman and Schmitt Pantel (1992) 103-104.

\textsuperscript{17} The prioritising of the city centre for tribal assemblies, proclamations, religious rituals and the setting up of honorific decrees has been put beyond doubt by Jones (1995) 505-518.

\textsuperscript{18} In view of his general partisanship and frequent inaccuracies I do not think Pseudo-Xenophon (1.13) can be trusted on this point.

\textsuperscript{19} These three disciplines are so described in Aristophanes *Clouds* where they are contrasted with the ‘New Education’ of the sophists. In spite of the complaints of the personified ‘Old Education’ in this comedy (921-1023), a close reading of this character’s *agon* speech suggests that boys are still going to the lessons of the athletics coach and kithara teacher and spending time in the city’s public gymnasiu.
Clouds 963-964), presumably spending no more than a few hours at the establishment of each teacher. Such a pattern of school attendance happens to be encapsulated in the verb *phoitoa*, which the classical Athenians used to describe a student going to school (e.g. Aristophanes Knights 1235; Clouds 916, 938; Demosthenes 18.257, 265); its basic meaning is to go back and forth with great regularity. Therefore, in order for an Athenian boy to attend his normal classes with his *grammatistes* (letter teacher), *kharistis* (kithara teacher) and *paidotribes* (athletics coach) during the many months when he was training to be a dithyrambic chorister, each practice session with his fellow tribesmen would have had to have lasted no more than a few hours. That training for the boys' dithyramb was indeed scheduled in this way is strongly suggested by its assimilation with the regular school curriculum in the minds of classical Athenians: young dithyrambic choristers were said to rehearse in a *didaskaleion* (school room) set up in the house of the chorus sponsor (Antiphon 6.11); and, tellingly, the verb used to describe their attendance there was *phoitoa* (e.g. Demosthenes 39.23-24; Aiskhines 1.10). Classical Athenians understood very well that the actual number of education disciplines pursued by a young male and the length of his schooling depended entirely on the financial resources of his family. Socio-economic circumstances determined not only whether a family could pay the not always insignificant fees of the letter teacher, lyre teacher and athletics coach (e.g. Athenaios 584c) but also whether they could give their sons the requisite leisure to pursue disciplines that were taught concurrently. Contemporary writers and speakers make clear that many non-elite Athenians relied on the labour of their womenfolk and especially sons for maintaining family farming and business concerns (Aristotle Politics 1323a5-7; Herodotos 6.137; Demosthenes 57.41-44), and that this reliance on child labour did limit the educational opportunities of male children. As a result, poor Athenian families passed over *mousike* and *gymnastike* and sent their sons only to the lessons in *grammata* which they judged the most useful of the three

---

20 Independent cases for the concurrent scheduling of classes are made by Beck (1964) 81-83; Golden (1990) 62-63; Marrou (1956) 148 all with primary references. Didaskaleion was a generic word for premises used for education (e.g. Aiskhines 1.9; Demosthenes 18.258; Pausanias 6.9.6; Theophrastos Characters 30.14; Thukydides 7.29.5; Xenophon Kyropaidia 1.2.15)

21 LSJ s.v. *phoitoa*

22 e.g. Aristophanes Clouds 101, 797-798; Plato Apology 23c; Protagoras 326c; Pseudo-Xenophon 1.15; Xenophon On Hunting 2.1

23 Demosthenes 18.256-267; Isokrates 7.43-45; Lysias 2011-12; Xenophon Kyropaidia 1.2.15; 8.3.37-30
traditional disciplines for business and political participation and the most important for instructing their sons in military and personal morality.\textsuperscript{24}

In view of such choices by poor Athenian parents about the formal education of their sons the participation of non-elite youngsters in the dithyrambic training sessions of their tribes seems far from certain. If a poor family could not afford to send their sons to music and sports classes, it does not seem likely that they would send them off to the singing and dancing lessons of the tribe. Nor is it probable that they would have their boys give up the practical and moral lessons of the letter teacher in favour of choral training. We might also wonder whether indigent Athenian families could really afford to do without the labour of their sons so that they could regularly go off for months on end to the townhouse of a chorus sponsor. Still more certain is that if a poor Athenian father was not able to let his sons go to choral training, he would not himself have had the leisure and wherewithal to be part of a men's dithyramb for his tribe.

Athenian khoregoi also had very good reasons to avoid recruiting lower class choristers. They spent the thousands of drachmas needed to train, provision and costume a dithyrambic chorus (e.g. Demosthenes 21.63, 156; Lysias 21.1-5; Xenophon On the Cavalry Commander 1.26) not out of any disinterested philanthropy but because of their philonikia and philotimia (Xenophon Memorabilia 3.4.3; Demosthenes 21.66, 69) – a fondness for victory and honour easy to understand in light of the rewards and advantages of winning. From his fellow tribesmen a victorious khoregos might receive not just an honorary decree and a public crowning (e.g. IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1138.1-9; 1139) but also a gold wreath worth five hundred drachmas (e.g. 1157.7-9; 1158.5-7) and an exemption from having to be a choral liturgist again for a few years (1147.9-11).\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, the prestige of the victorious chorus sponsor was not confined to his tribe but spread across the city where it could be transformed into political influence and support amongst the citizen masses (e.g. Plutarch Nikias 3.1-3).\textsuperscript{26} Liberal expenditure as a khoregos, especially if resulting in victory, also served as a kind of legal insurance. In court upper class speakers habitually tried to improve their chances by cataloguing past choral sponsorships and other liturgies like the trierarchy, in an attempt to instil a sense of kharis (gratitude) towards themselves in the

\textsuperscript{24} The whole issue of and evidence for participation in traditional classical Athenian education is considered in Pritchard (forthcoming a)

\textsuperscript{25} For an exhaustive discussion of tribal honours and honorands see Jones (1995) 531-537.

\textsuperscript{26} See Wilson (2000) 109-197
minds of the jurors (e.g. Lysias 3.46; 12.38; 21.1-6; 30.1; cf. 18.23; 20.31; 25.12-13).  

With so much riding on success chorus sponsors competed with each other to select the most accomplished dithyrambic poet (Aristophanes Peace 1403-1404; Xenophon Memorabilia 3.4.4) and flute player (Demosthenes 21.13-14). We also know that they were very careful to recruit ‘the best’ singers and dancers (Antiphon 6.11; Xenophon Memorabilia 3.4.4), and, faced with parents who might be reluctant for their sons to be choristers, they even had the means to compel them to hand over their sons for dithyrambic training (Antiphon 6.11). Clearly, those best qualified to be boy or adult khoreutai were members of the Athenian elite. They had the months of free time to attend all of the choral training sessions. Further, as lessons in mousike were another preserve of wealthy citizens, they alone had 'the necessary musical background' to attempt dithyrambs which were no barnyard sing-a-longs but poems of highly complex language and phraseology (Aristophanes Peace 828-831; Birds 1372-1409; Clouds 333-338). Therefore, the khoregoi of fifth and fourth century Athens had good reasons to stick with fellow members of the elite when selecting chorus members. And, for the fifth century in particular, demographic modelling shows that chorus sponsors would have been able to draw every one of their boy and adult choristers from the city's upper class, and what ancient evidence there is, especially Aristophanes Frogs 727-733, confirms that they did in fact do so.

Tribes also entered teams of youthful lampadephoroi (torch racers), most probably from the early fifth century, into contests at the annual festivals of the Panathenaia, Hephaistia and Promethia. These young torch racers also had to train hard (Aristophanes Frogs 1087-1088) and did so in regular classes (IG II² 1250.8) under the direction of a tribally appointed gymnasiarchos (Xenophon Poroi 4.51). In view of what we know about participation in the tribally organized choral competitions, it seems necessary to infer that only upper class Athenians would have had the leisure and cultural capital – in this case, experience of gymnastike (athletics) – to train and compete as torch racers for their respective tribes. Critically, this inference appears to be confirmed for the late fifth century by the famous

---

27 For liturgies and the gratitude of jurors see Dover (1974) 176-177; Ober (1989) 231-233; Roberts (1986) all with references.
28 Quotation from Beck (1962) 128.
29 I consider in detail the demography of and evidence for dithyrambic participation in fifth and fourth century Athens as well as the motivations of Kleisthenes and the political community for the original introduction of this particular tribal competition in Pritchard (2001) and forthcoming b.
30 For the dates and organization of these contests see Davies (1967) 35-37 with references.
scene in Aristophanes’ *Wasps* where a rich son tries to ready his indigent father for an elite drinking party (1121-1264).³¹ Dressed and walking vaguely like a rich man, Philokleon is asked by his son whether he knows any ‘august stories’ suitable to relate to upper class drinkers (1174-1175). Bdelykleon, of course, discovers very quickly that his father knows no tales ‘befitting of a great man’ (*megaloprepeis*) and so encourages him to speak perhaps of an embassy in which he might have participated (1183-1188). Yet as only wealthy citizens with their established foreign contacts were able to be ambassadors (*Akharnians* 607-611; *Birds* 1570-1571), the best Philokleon can do is point to service as a rower on an expedition to Paros (*Wasps* 1188-1189). Undeterred, Bdelykleon encourages his father instead to converse intelligently about boxing (1190-1194; cf. 1212-1213) or ‘how once you chased a wild boar or a hare, or you ran a torch race, after you have worked out your most dashing youthful exploit’ (1202-1205; cf. 1196-1199). Again the lower class Philokleon displays ignorance of such things. In its entirety, then, this passage puts membership of a tribal torch racing team on a par with other pursuits, like hunting (e.g. Xenophon *On Hunting* 2.1, 12.1-13.18; Isokrates 7.45), which we know certainly were exclusively upper class activities.³²

While the other two tribal or tribally organized activities of the fifth century did involve large numbers of non-elite Athenians, participation in them did not extend much, if at all, into the class of citizens, known as *thetes*, who could not afford to arm themselves as hoplites. Although thetic citizens were not formally barred from service in the council of Five Hundred, its benches could be filled without them, and the active political demands of being a *bouleutes* (councillor) and the huge monetary penalties for not conducting council business correctly most probably dissuaded these humblest of Athenians from joining it.³³ Finally, the tribes themselves did hold assemblies several times a year at the sanctuary of their respective eponymous heroes, and the decrees issuing from such meetings show that tribesmen deliberated almost entirely on the performances of their *khoregoi* (dithyrambic chorus sponsors), *gymnasiarchkoi* (torch race sponsors), *boulentai* (councillors) and *taxiarchkoi* (commanders of the hoplite unit of the tribe – e.g. *IG II²* 1139-1171).³⁴ Since such matters were of no direct interest to *thetes* for whom there was a ‘surfeit of competition from other organizational entities’, it is

³¹ For a detailed analysis of this scene see Pritchard (2000) 53-55 with references.
³² I outline the egregious errors of fact and interpretation behind the extraordinary thesis of Sekunda (1990) that all eighteen and nineteen year old citizens of fifth and fourth century Athens took part in the tribal torch races as part of universal ephelic training in Pritchard forthcoming *a*
³³ See Sinclair (1988) 106-114
³⁴ For an exhaustive analysis of these assemblies see Jones (1995) 511-515 with references.
highly unlikely that any number of these sub-hoplite citizens would have bothered to turn up to the assembly of a tribe.\textsuperscript{35}

The Navy

Scholars of classical Athens commonly assert that the organization of the city’s armed forces mirrored the tribal arrangement of the citizen body at peace.\textsuperscript{36} There is no doubt that the Athenian hoplite army, created at the end of the sixth century by Kleisthenes, did muster and fight in tribal units (e.g. Herodotos 6.111; Thoukydides 6.43.1).\textsuperscript{37} The one thousand upper class horsemen of the 1,200 strong cavalry corps of late fifth century Athens (Thoukydides 2.13.8) also were divided into phylai (tribes) and commanded by tribal commanders.\textsuperscript{38} Happily, a number of ancient historians, including Greg Stanton and the late Peter Bicknell, do more than simply assert that the navy of fifth century Athens was likewise arranged along tribal lines.\textsuperscript{39} They argue that five fifth century horoi (boundary markers) from the naval harbour at Zea, whose inscriptions indicate that a trittys (third) of a tribe ends and another trittys of the same tribe or the first trittys of the next tribe begins there (IG I\textsuperscript{3} 1127-1131), prove conclusively that the organization, or at least the mustering, of the navy of the imperial city was by tribes. Yet their interpretation of this inscriptive evidence overlooks a number of important issues and pieces of evidence. They do not acknowledge that a trireme crew consisted of three distinct groups and so do not explore how the tribal boundary markers of Zea might fit in with what is otherwise known about the mobilization of these three groups. They do not consider either how the different legal statuses of the sailors of the imperial fleet might have restricted the utilization of these markers. Finally, they do not test their interpretation of the Zea horoi against the only surviving crew records of the classical Athenian navy – the four fragmentary lists of IG I\textsuperscript{3} 1032, which were most probably part of the monument in honour of the sailors of the eight triremes which escaped with Konon after the destruction of the Athenian fleet at Aegospotami.\textsuperscript{40} When all of these matters are taken into consideration, it

\textsuperscript{35} Quotation from Jones (1995) 538.
\textsuperscript{36} For a summary of my research on the organization and personnel of the armed forces of fifth century Athens see Pritchard (1995) with ancient sources and bibliography.
\textsuperscript{37} For the formal hoplite army as the invention of Kleisthenes see Pritchard (2000) 131-134.
\textsuperscript{38} While references to cavalry phylai only begin to appear in the early fourth century (e.g Xenophon On the Cavalry Commander 2.2), the existence of cavalry phylarchs in the late fifth century (e.g Aristophanes Lysistrata 561-565; Birds 799) presupposes tribes of horsemen to command.
\textsuperscript{39} e.g Jones (1987) 57; Jordan (1975) 226-230; Pritchett (1985) 179 n.251; Stanton and Bicknell (1987) 56.
\textsuperscript{40} This is the now widely accepted identification of this inscription by Laing (1965).
emerges that the use of the tribal naval markers of Zea was so limited that the
navy of the imperial city cannot justifiably be said to have been organized by
tribes.

There were one hundred and seventy nautai (rowers) on the standard ‘fast’
trireme of the Athenian navy.41 In fifth century Athens, when a fleet was
about to be launched, rowers normally just turned up to the docks and
volunteered their services to the triarchs whom they found to be offering
the best pay and conditions (e.g. Aristophanes Akharnians 545-554;
Thoukydides 6.31.1; cf. Demosthenes 50.7). It is hard to see any place for
tribal subdivisions in such a freewheeling form of recruitment. Moreover, a
substantial but ever changing proportion of rowers in the imperial war fleet
was made up not of Athenian citizens but of metics (e.g. Thoukydides
1.143.1; 7.63.3-4), allies (e.g. 1.121.3; 7.13.2; Xenophon Hellenika 1.5.4) or
even slaves (e.g. Thoukydides 7.13.2).42 Since membership of a tribe and
deme were closely guarded prerogatives of Athenian citizenship, these
essential non-citizen rowers could not have mustered behind the tribal horoi
of Zea.43 Critically, the crew lists of Aegospotami confirm that this mixed
legal standing of rowers and the decidedly open method of their recruitment
even stopped the use of tribal boundary markers for Athenian rowers. If
citizen nautai were mustered behind trittys markers and then led in an orderly
fashion to the ships, all Athenian rowers on a trireme should come from one
or possibly two tribes next to each other in the city’s official order of tribes.44
Tellingly, the nautai astoi (citizen rowers) with preserved abbreviated
demotics on each ship of IG I3 1032 are scattered right across the ten
triremes. In the first trireme (3-13) there are three sailors each from Aigeis
and Oineis, and one each from Erekhtheis, Leontis, Akamantis, Kekropis,
Hippothontis and Antiokhis. In the second ship (50-68) there are four rowers
from Aigeis, two each from Leontis and Aiantis, and one each from
Akamantis, Kekropis, Hippothontis and Antiokhis. In the third trireme (170,
172-210) there are five from Erekhtheis, four from Hippothontis, three from
Oineis, two each from Leontis, Kekropis and Antiokhis, and one each from
Pandionis, Akamantis and Aiantis. Finally, in the fourth ship (305-319) there
are eight from Erekhtheis, three from Aigeis and one each from Akamantis,
Oineis and Antiokhis. The large number of members of the Erekhtheis tribe
on the last trireme is most probably due to the fact that seven of the sailors of
this tribe are from the same deme as one of the ship’s two triarchs (277,

42 The regular employment of slave rowers in the Athenian and other Greek navies of the fifth
century has been confirmed recently by Hunt (1998) 83-101.
43 The exclusion of metics from deme and tribal membership is studied by Whitehead (1977).
44 For the official order of the tribes see Hansen (1991) 46-49
306-312). Thus, in the only surviving crew lists of fifth century Athens 'there is no regular system of enlistment apparent from ship to ship'.

Each 'fast' trireme of the imperial city also had a group of twenty petty officers, archers and deckhands-cum-rowers known collectively as the *hyperesiai* (naval specialists). The central government had a register of these indispensable specialists (e.g. *IG II²* 212.60-65) and used it to conscript them *en masse* for each naval expedition (e.g. Thoukydides 7.1.2; 6 31.2; cf. Demosthenes 51.6). Although the city itself was responsible for calling up and paying the basic wages of its *hyperesiai*, their assignment to individual ships was determined by market forces as trierarchs competed with each other to secure the best of these professionals with promises of generous pay supplements and bounties (e.g. Thoukydides 6.31.3-4; Lysias 21.10). Again there would appear to be no place for tribal boundary markers, and this is confirmed once again by the extant crew lists from Aegospotami where the petty officers and archers of each ship, apart from including metics and allies, have citizens drawn from a number of non-contiguous tribes (*IG I²* 1032.35-49, 156-171, 290-304).

The final members of the crew of the standard classical Athenian warship were the ten *epibatai* (marines) who were normally recruited from the ranks of the citizen hoplites. Their involvement in a sea expedition was announced in advance by a publication of their names on tribal lists (e.g. *IG I²* 60.9-18; *ML* 23.18; Thoukydides 8.24.1-2). These perhaps are the section of the crew of a 'fast' trireme linked with the stones of Zea. Such tribal markers would certainly have facilitated a roll call of these soldiers, and perhaps even embarkation itself. Yet the crew lists from Aegospotami clearly invalidate this second hypothesis as the *epibatai* on each ship come from at least two non-contiguous through to six different tribes (*IG I²* 1032.24-34, 144-154, 279-289, 410-412). Therefore, five per cent of a trireme’s crew *may* have been mustered by tribal divisions. This small tentative figure in no way justifies the suggestion that the fifth century navy was organized by tribes.

Elsewhere I establish that the other branches of the fifth century Athenian armed forces, namely the *toxotai* (archers), *hippotoxotai* (mounted archers) and *psiloi* (motley lightly armed troops), were manned by sub-hoplite Athenians and metics and were not organized at all by tribes.

---

45 Quotation from Laing (1965) 62
47 Jordan (1975) 196-198 with primary sources puts the hoplite status of *epibatai* beyond doubt.
48 For a summary see Pritchard (1995) 71-72
Finally, two further areas of Athenian civic life have been linked unjustifiably with the Kleisthenic tribes. Firstly, an article by the late John Winkler seems to have succeeded in reviving Pickard-Cambridge’s old suggestion that the classical theatre of Dionysos – where tens of thousands of non-elite Athenians sat to watch the tragic, comic and dithyrambic competitions – had discreet wedges of seats for each Kleisthenic tribe. However, under close analysis the evidence for this turns out to be no more than three tribal dedications to the emperor Hadrian (IG II² 3287A-C) and two possible tribal theatre tickets which can be dated anywhere between the fourth century BC and the High Empire. This, unfortunately, is no foundation for any argument about the organization of the fifth century theatre. Secondly, Stanton and Bicknell, in a characteristically thorough and scholarly article, have re-presented the thesis that the ekklesia (assembly) was structured along tribal lines. Nevertheless Hansen and Traill, have responded most persuasively that the system proposed by Stanton and Bicknell rests on thin and highly contestable evidence, and that such an arrangement lacks any actual administrative function.

Conclusion

Three distinct levels of participation in tribal and tribally organized activities – each with corresponding bonds of solidarity between citizens, phylai and phyletai – existed in fifth century Athens. Upper class Athenians participated in a wide and the widest range of tribally arranged activities, and had, as a result, rock solid, substantive connections with their respective tribe and fellow tribesmen. Nevertheless, non-elite hoplites did fraternise with symphyletai in the hoplite army, the Council of Five Hundred and probably even in tribal assemblies, and so possessed a bond of solidarity with their tribe and its members, that, while less profound than their elitist peers, was of a meaningful and long term nature. The tribes of fifth century Athens hardly figured in the lives of thecitic citizens. This majority part of the citizen body took no part in tribal or tribally organized activities. Deprived of opportunities for interacting with fellow tribesmen, thetic citizens possessed no more than an empty, perfunctory association with their tribes. Therefore,

49 Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 269-272; Winkler (1990) 37-42 Goldhill for one is convinced by this revived suggestion (e.g. (1997) 59-60; (2000) 62-63)).
50 For Athenian lead tokens see Lang and Crosby (1964) and Svoronos (1900). The interpretative section of the former work scuttles Pickard-Cambridge’s view of these ‘tickets’. The appearance of tribal wedges in the theatre of Dionysos at the time of Hadrian is probably related to the revival of tribally organized dithyrambic competitions in this period (Wilson [2000] 276-278)
51 Stanton and Bicknell (1987).
the oft-articulated assumption of our ancient sources that every Athenian enjoyed a profound bond of solidarity with his tribe is nothing but an ideological mirage based on the experiences of a minority of Athenians. The popular thinking of imperial Athens, of course, was known to employ other minority experiences, like fighting for the city as a hoplite, as the norms of civic life.\(^{53}\) Consequently, universal tribal solidarity needs to be understood as another example of the potential gap between the imaginary and the real in fifth century Athens.

---
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\(^{53}\) For the central and normative role of the citizen hoplite in the popular thinking of fifth century Athens see Pritchard (1998a) 44-53; (1998b); (2000) 76-161.


