

Re-shaping and Re-founding Citizen Bodies: The Case of Athens, Cyrene and Camarina

Lucia Cecchet

Introduction

In *Politics*, Aristotle observed that without the subdivisions of the citizen body, no state would be possible.¹ With the constitutions of the Greek cities in mind, he was certainly right: subdivisions of citizens into tribes, phratries and other units are attested in several parts the Greek world since the archaic period. That the Greeks gave great importance to civic subdivisions is confirmed by many facts, not least the practice of inscribing new citizens into civic sub-units and organising many aspects of public life according to membership of tribes and phratries.

While the origins of civic subdivisions are generally obscure,² much effort has been put into understanding their nature and function in the organisation of the public and private life of the polis in reference to political, military and religious functions.³ As well as evidence for the existence of such subdivisions, sources bear witness also to reforms and changes in their structure in the late archaic and early classical periods. Some of these cases of reforms are recorded by sources in relation to moments of crisis and change in the polis. In this paper, I will offer an overview of three reforms of the civic subunits in Athens, Cyrene and Camarina during the archaic and early classical periods. In these three cases, the re-founding of civic units seems to have happened in relation to tensions and conflicts internal to the citizen body. The aim of this paper is that of understanding the reasons and the mode in which the citizen-body was re-organised and how the re-organisation could serve as a tool to solve internal conflicts.

1 Aristot. *Pol.* 1264a6 ff.

2 For theories on the origin of civic subdivisions in the Greek poleis, see Roussel (1976) 173–191.

3 For early studies on civic subdivisions, see Szanto (1901) about the *phylê*; and Guarducci (1937) about the phratry. For a thorough collection of evidence about civic units in the Greek world, see Jones (1987). On *phylai*, see now Grote (2016).

1 Mixing Up the People: Cleisthenes' Reform at Athens

In 508/7 BC, the division of the citizen body and the mode of access to political life in Athens were drastically changed. A reform was carried out after the end of a troubled period for the city, signalled by a series of dramatic events that rapidly followed one another. In a very short time period, the tyranny of Hippias was overthrown with a joint cooperation by the Alcmeonids, Cleisthenes and the Spartans; the Spartan king, Cleomenes, entered Athens as an ally of Isagoras against Cleisthenes; Cleisthenes and 700 Athenian wealthy families were forced into exile. Isagoras, however, failed in his attempt to gain the leadership and after being besieged on the Acropolis, he left the city. The exiled Athenians came back to Athens and Cleisthenes enacted the reform that would shape the political organisation of Athens for the centuries to come.⁴

Cleisthenes did not invent civic subunits. Athenians were already divided into civic units, but the nature of the archaic divisions and their functions are to a good extent an enigma. According to Aristotle, Solon left intact a civic structure consisting of four phylai, divided into three trittyes and twelve *naukrariai* each.⁵ We know very little about the old phylai and all we can say is that, allegedly, they were the original four tribes into which the Ionians were divided and that each tribe provided 100 men for the Council of the Four Hundred.⁶ The scant evidence that we have for them consists mainly of their survival in the Athenian religion.⁷ No less enigmatic is the pre-Cleisthenic partition into trittyes and *naukrariai*.⁸ What seems to be certain, however, is that

4 Hdt. 5.63–73. [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 19.4–20.4.

5 [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 8.3. Rhodes (1981) 150–153.

6 [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 8.4. See Rhodes (1981) 153–154. For arguments in support and against the historicity of a Council of the Four Hundred, see De Ste Croix (2004) 83–89. Against scepticism over the existence of the Council of the Four Hundred, see Rhodes, *ibid.*

7 Parker (1996) 112–113.

8 Information about the *naukrariai* is perhaps the most controversial; cf. Rhodes (1981) 151–152; Van Wees (2013) 44–53 and 305 n. 8. Faraguna (2015) 652. The connection with the function of ship-supply is suggested not only by the name itself, but also by a lexicographical reference in Pollux, attesting that each *naukraria* supplied two horsemen and one ship; see Pollux 8.108; Lex. Seg. 283.20–21. Herodotus seems to attribute fundamental powers to these administrative units when speaking of Cylon's attempted putsch. He says that at that time the *prytaneis* of the *naukrariai* ruled at Athens (Hdt. 5.71.2). On the basis of what Aristotle says about the board of *naukrariai* being in charge of exacting monies and of making disbursements from the Naukratic fund ([Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 8.3), Jordan (1970) 153–175 suggested that the *naukrariai* were taxation districts and that the passage of Herodotus should be interpreted accordingly

Cleisthenes intervened on existing structures. Whitehead has convincingly shown that not even the demes were an innovation introduced in 508 BC, a fact that is suggested by them amounting to the odd number of 139 in the classical period (between the beginning of the fourth century and the last quarter of the third century) and that they were of different sizes.⁹ However, before the reform they seem to have had no political function.¹⁰

While many aspects of the political organisation of Athens before 508 BC remain obscure, the internal divisions of the Athenian citizen body after the reform of Cleisthenes are essentially clear. Thus, we read in the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians*:

He (Cleisthenes) first divided the whole body into ten tribes instead of the existing four, wishing to mix them up, in order that more might take part in the government; [...] Next he made the Council to consist of five hundred members instead of four hundred, fifty from each Tribe, whereas under the old system there had been a hundred. This was the reason why he did not arrange them in twelve tribes, in order that he might not have to use the existing division of the Thirds (for the four Tribes contained twelve Thirds), with the result that the multitude would not have been mixed up. He also portioned out the land among the demes into thirty

as a reference to the *prytaneis* who collected the revenues at Athens; for *naukrariai* and taxation in archaic Athens, see Van Wees (2013) 44 ff. On the division of the old tribes in *naukrariai* in the pre-Cleisthenic organisation, see Jones (1987) 28–31; Van Wees (2004) 203–206. For some hypotheses on the functions of the pre-Cleisthenic trittyes see Hignett (1952) 47–48, 71–72; Lambert (1993) 256–257, n. 56. On the meaning of trittyes, see Eliot (1967) 79–84.

9 On the number of demes, there has been much debate: see Whitehead (1986) 17–20. The only piece of literary evidence is Strabo 9.1.16 who suggests the two figures of 170 and 174. For scepticism on Strabo's figures, see Traill (1975) 97 with n. 86. An investigation of Traill (1975) 73–103 points to the number of 139 demes based on two prerequisites for their identification; i.e., 1) a minimal body of citizens shown by the *démotikon*; 2) representation in the Boule as attested in the bouletic and prytanic lists; see Traill (1975) 75–81.

10 Whitehead (1986) 15. In fact, it has been suggested that they were simply districts of habitation in early times. Thompson (1971) 72 argued that the demes should not be understood as portions of land having defined boundaries. However, *horoi* marking deme boundaries (ruepestrian *horoi*) have been found: see Lohmann (1993) I, 57–59; for epigraphic and literary evidence suggesting territorial boundaries for the demes, and specifically on the boundary between the demes of Melite and Kollytos on the Athenian Agora, see Lalonde (2006) 83–119.

parts, ten belonging to the suburbs, ten to the coast, and ten to the inland district; and he gave these parts the name of Thirds, and assigned them among the Tribes by lot, three to each, in order that each Tribe might have a share in all the districts. And he made all the inhabitants in each of the demes fellow-demesmen of one another, in order that they might not call attention to the newly enfranchised citizens by addressing people by their fathers' names, but designate people officially by their demes; owing to which Athenians in private life also use the names of their demes as surnames.¹¹

Tr. H. RACKHAM

Ten tribes replaced the previous four in regulating access to the Boule—thereby providing 50 councillors each. A group of three trittyes was assigned to each tribe: one from the coast, one from the inland and one from the city of Athens. What is striking in this account is the fact that [Aristotle] insists on repeating that Cleisthenes' purpose was that of 'mixing the people up': he notes this twice—first, while introducing the reform and, second, while explaining why Cleisthenes refused to use the old trittyes-system.¹² If this account is correct, it is clear that Cleisthenes aimed to tackle a very specific problem, i.e. the fact that the Athenians were not 'mixed' enough. The expression is, however, cryptic, as it is not clear how a 'blend of people' would have enlarged political participation. In order to find some clues about this, we have to look at other sources; i.e., two passages from Herodotus and one from Aristotle's *Politics*, as we shall see in a moment.

It is generally agreed that the reform was the most decisive step for the development of Athenian democracy; this is a *communis opinio* among modern scholars, less so among ancient authors.¹³ Herodotus depicts Cleisthenes as the founder of democracy and [Aristotle] says the Athenian constitution after his reform became more democratic than that of Solon,¹⁴ but fourth-

11 [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 21.2–4. See Rhodes (1981) 249–256. For the division into ten tribes cf. Hdt. 5.66 and 69; see How-Wells (1957) 11, 32–37; Aristot. *Pol.* 1319b19–27.

12 On the question of the pre-Cleisthenic trittyes, see Lambert (1993) 256–257, n. 56; see n. 8 above.

13 For a re-assessment of the figure of Cleisthenes, which takes into account both the aspects of continuity and those of innovations in his reforms, see Ismard (2011) 165–174. The idea that founder of democracy was Solon, rather than Cleisthenes, dominated early scholarship, but it was not fully abandoned in more recent times: for an overview, see Hansen (1994) 25–37.

14 Hdt. 6.131.1; [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 22.1.

century sources generally tend to attribute the honour of inventing democracy to Solon.¹⁵ Both Herodotus and the author of the *Ath. Pol.* relate Cleisthenes' reform to the attempt to draw the people over to his side in order to gain political victory over his rival Isagoras.¹⁶ This portrait of a power-hungry politician was in all probability disseminated in early times by his political opponents¹⁷ and it is likely to have had a revival in the fourth century, after the re-writing of the Solonian law-code had contributed in increasing the popularity of the archaic law-giver over other 'competitors'. In fact, there are no signs of Cleisthenes' intention of constructing a personal power by means of his reform. As De Ste Croix noted, his constitution reserved no special place for him¹⁸ and the new system made it difficult for the formation of a compact support-group that could promote one person,¹⁹ because the Athenians usually did not vote by tribe, like the Romans, but individually.²⁰ Rather than securing personal power, the reform aimed to change an obsolete structure by intervening in the channels of access to public participation.²¹

There were essentially three main aspects of innovation. [Aristotle] seems to have them all in mind when referring to the fact that Cleisthenes 'mixed the

-
- 15 See Wade-Gery (1958): "Cleisthenes did not dominate popular imagination. The founder of democracy in popular thought was not Cleisthenes but Solon, and the destroyer of tyranny not Cleisthenes but Harmodius." Cf. De Ste Croix (2004) 130; Hansen (1994) 25 ff.
- 16 Hdt. 5.66. How-Wells (1957) II, 33 attempted an interpretation of the factions at the time of Cleisthenes and Isagoras as a continuation of the old regional opposition at the time of Peisistratus, but Herodotus provides no clue in this direction. Cf. [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 20.1. De Ste Croix (2004) 130 maintains that here Herodotus is the source of *Ath. Pol.*
- 17 De Ste Croix (2004) 133.
- 18 De Ste Croix, *ibid.*
- 19 De Ste Croix (2004) 150; *contra* Walker, *CAH* (1923–1924) 143, who defines the trittyes-system as "a cunning attempt to secure that in each of the ten tribes there should be a compact body of voters who were his own special adherents".
- 20 De Ste Croix, *ibid.* There are some attested cases of voting organised by tribe in the Assembly, generally when voting took place with cards (such as in *ostrakismos*) or with pebbles, such as in trials: for example, *κατὰ φυλάς* in the Arginusae trial (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.9); however, voting by show of hands seems to have been the norm in the fourth century, see Hansen (1977) 123–137.
- 21 Salmon (2003) 234 assumes that Cleisthenes was not aware of all that his reform might achieve. However, modifying a civic organisation that had remained unchanged for centuries is too much of an extraordinary act to suppose that it could be done without any awareness of its political meaning.

people up', but he does not explain them separately; nor does he make it clear which aspects did in fact entail an extension of political participation. I will argue below that with his reform, Cleisthenes enacted a threefold blend of the people.

The first and greatest innovation the reform brought in concerns the internal composition of the tribes. The ten new tribes included Athenians coming from different parts of Attica, thereby eliminating any possibility of political alliances and conflicts on a regional/geographical basis. Sources suggest that such conflicts troubled Athens in earlier times: according to Herodotus, when Peisistratus was first raised to power in the mid sixth-century, there was civil strife (*stasis*) among three factions: the Athenians from the coast, those from the plains, and the third faction, led by Peisistratus, from the mountains.²² [Aristotle] attests the same tripartite division and he provides a political explanation for it: the men from the plain aimed at the *mesê politeia* (i.e., a moderate form of constitution), those from the plains wanted to establish an oligarchy, and those from the mountains, under the leadership of Peisistratus, grouped together all those disappointed by Solon's cancellation of the debts and those who were not Athenian citizens by descent.²³ Plutarch, based in all probability on the *Ath. Pol.*, gives the same political interpretation of the tripartite division and he dates it back to the period prior to Solon's archonship.²⁴ However, it has been noted that such a political explanation and, in particular the idea of a faction aiming at the *mesê politeia*, is a typical Aristotelian ideal and it is unlikely to reflect sixth-century politics, though it is plausible that local rivalries had been fuelled by the Solonian legislation.²⁵ The information on the people of non-Athenian origin gathered in the third faction is put in context by the author of the *Ath. Pol.*, with the revision of the lists of the citizens carried out after the

22 Hdt. 1.59.3. How-Wells (1957) 1, 81 ascribes the rise of these factions to the weakening of the rule of the Eupatrids after Solon's reforms. For a sceptical view of this 'schematic division' in three factions, see Asheri in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 119–121. Cf. Schmidt-Hofner (2014) 624–668. On regionalism in Attica, see Sealey (1960) 155–180.

23 [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 13.4; cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 1305a 23–24. See Rhodes (1981) 179, 185–187. Aristotle calls the members of the third faction *diakrioi*, instead of *hyperakrioi* as in Hdt. 1.59, but the three factions are the same.

24 Plut. *Sol.* 13 and 29. On the dependency of his account from the *Ath. Pol.*, see Rhodes (1981) 179 ff.

25 See Rhodes (1981) 186. While he refuses the idea that the first faction aimed at a moderate legislation, he is less sceptical on the possibility that the third faction grouped together "various kinds of unprivileged Athenians" and that local rivalries had been fuelled by Solon's legislation (*ibid.*).

deposition of the tyrants and it is equally enigmatic, as Herodotus makes no mention of non-Athenians in any of the three factions.²⁶

In truth, we do not know the reason for the regional strife, nor how long it lasted in the sixth century before Cleisthenes' reforms,²⁷ but we have no reason to doubt our sources about a regional opposition in Attica in the sixth century. Cleisthenes' reform swept it away or at least he made it irrelevant in political terms. By prescribing that each tribe be made up of one trittys from the coast, one from the inland region and one from the plain, he promoted the mixed association of all three groups: each new tribe stood as a cross section of the entire citizen population.²⁸

However, a problem arises when we read the first lines of *Ath. Pol.* 21, in which [Aristotle] seems to relate this 'mixing up' with Cleisthenes' purpose of involving a larger number of citizens in political life. One can hardly see a connection between regional blend and enlarging political participation. Most probably, by relating the two things, the author of the *Ath. Pol.* is confounding two different aspects of the reform. The geographical blend of the people had certainly the purpose of eliminating regional-based conflicts and in this respect it succeeded, as we hear nothing about regional conflicts in Athens in the classical period. However, the extension of political participation was achieved through two other kinds of 'mixing up'.

The second kind of 'blending of people' concerns the effect of Cleisthenes' reform on the traditional power structures of the old elites. This aspect is not as clear as the geographical blend in our sources: while we read nothing about it in the *Ath. Pol.*, some clues are provided yet again by Herodotus. The historian says that Cleisthenes took inspiration from his uncle, Cleisthenes, the tyrant of Sikyon, who changed the names of the Dorian tribes of Sikyon under the

26 [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 13.5. On the scrutiny of the list of the citizens in 510/9 BC, see Manville (1994) 173–185. On the *diapsêphismos* after the deposition of the tyrants, see also Welwei (1967) 423–437; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 111b Supp. 1, 156–160, believed that both the *diapsêphismos* of 510/9 BC and the enfranchisement of citizens done by Cleisthenes were invented by fourth-century propaganda; against this view, see Welwei (1967) 424–425. Loddo (2012) 55–93 argues that the *diapsêphismos* was proposed in 508 BC by Isagoras and that it was an (unsuccessful) attempt to oppose Cleisthenes.

27 The possibility that the strife was socio-economic in kind, with the inhabitants of the plain owning the most fertile lands and those of the coast controlling access to maritime resources, has been rejected by most scholars, who tend rather to interpret it as a conflict internal to aristocratic clans; see Hopper (1961) 189–219; Kluwe, (1972) 101–124; Asheri in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 121; recently, Schmidt-Hofner (2014) 624–668.

28 On this, see now Grote (2016) 210–212.

pretext that they would no longer match with the names of the Argives tribes.²⁹ In fact, in so doing, it has been noted that the tyrant ridiculed the Sikyonian-Dorian elites.³⁰ Indeed, Jones was right in saying that we do not have sufficient grounds for making either a positive or a negative judgement on the historicity of these facts.³¹ However, what interests us is the fact that Herodotus saw similarities between tribal reform at Sikyon and at Athens. Most commentators have highlighted the enigmatic aspect of such similarity, as the modern reader will note much more the contrast, rather than the parallels between the two reforms.³² However, if we follow the argumentation of Herodotus, it appears clear that the similarity that he envisaged concerned the opposition to the old elites both at Sikyon and at Athens. In fact, he observes that Cleisthenes of Athens imitated his predecessor for he despised the Ionians, and he desired that the tribes should not be common to his own people and the Ionians.³³ This makes sense only if we understand it as a reference to the Ionian elites, whose wealthy life-style, especially in the cities of the Ionian coast, was renowned.

When saying that Cleisthenes acted against the Ionians, thus, Herodotus refers to the Eupatrid families who controlled access to public life within the four tribes, including the selection of the 100 men for the Boule.³⁴ As well as eliminating factions on a regional basis, the reform must have also weakened factions on a social (i.e., aristocratic) basis.³⁵ This happened because

29 Hdt. 5.67–68; How-Wells (1957) 11, 34–35. In changing the names of the Sikyonian tribes, Cleisthenes ridiculed the Sikyonians themselves, because he gave to their tribes names derived from the words ‘donkey’ and ‘pig’; furthermore, this policy could also be considered an internal anti-Dorian action, although, the reasons for these actions are unclear; cf. Jones (1987) 105; cf. Grote (2016) 47–61.

30 On the anti-Dorian motivation of the reform in Sikyon, see Andrewes (1956) 57 ff.; Berve (1967) 533; Jones, (1987) 105. On the anti-Dorian action of Cleisthenes of Sikyon in relation to his non-Dorian origins, see Bockisch (1976) 527–534. Against this interpretation, see Grote (2016) esp. 51–61, who argues the main purpose of the change of name was opposition to Argos and the strengthening of the Sikyonian civic identity.

31 Jones (1987) 104.

32 Hdt. 5.69. How-Wells (1957) 11, 36; cf. *ibid.*, 34: “The resemblance between the two policies, on which Herodotus against insists, is less clear than the contrast”.

33 Hdt. *ibid.*

34 De Ste Croix (2004) 80 ff. speaks of the “Eupatrid monopoly of the ‘state machine’” at the time of Solon; on the political role of the *genos*, see also Parker (1996) 63–64.

35 Many scholars—in particular Lewis (1963) 22–40, Forrest (1966) 197–200 and Andrewes (1977) 241–248—highlighted this aspect of the reform. See also Rhodes (1981) 253–254 (in general, about the new tribal system) and 256 (specifically, on the role of the demes in strengthening the citizens’ involvement in politics at a domestic level with a possible challenge to the supremacy of the aristocrats); cf. De Ste Croix (2004) 140 ff.

1) the families of the 'Ionian aristocracy' were now scattered across 10 tribes whose composition was internally diversified and 2) the 50 councillors were drawn by lot from a board of citizens selected by vote in deme-assemblies. The second kind of 'mixing up' refers, therefore, to the 'socio-economic' blending of the people. Both this and the geographical blending are complementary aspects of the Cleisthenic reform.

Nonetheless, the reform did not affect the role of the kinship-associations; i.e., the phratries.³⁶ It weakened the existing aristocratic power-structures insofar as they no longer played a role in granting access to public and political life; however, it would be a mistake to identify these power structures with the phratries, which were in fact not divisions exclusive to the aristocracy.³⁷ After 508 BC, phratry membership continued to be a fundamental aspect of the life of a citizen.³⁸ [Aristotle] rightly notes that Cleisthenes left these associations entirely untouched³⁹ and, in fact, after the reform they continued to maintain the control of some local cults.⁴⁰ By looking at the honorary decrees of the fifth century, in particular those granting citizenship to foreigners, we note that "the general pattern was for the new citizen to be made a member of both a deme and a phratry".⁴¹

36 On the phratries before Cleisthenes' reform, see Lambert (1993) 245–275; cf. Parker (1996) 105–108.

37 Lambert (1993) 249–250 argues that in the 7th century, phratry procedures would have reflected the dominance of the *aristoi*, whereas their internal organisation in the 4th century would have mirrored the democratic norms of the period. However, he also notes that every Athenian was registered in a phratry and, obviously, in archaic Athens not all Athenians were *aristoi*; see Lambert (1993) 31–32, 248–249. On p. 33 he notes that phratry and deme in the fifth century were a dual link and "a common feature of the contemporary concept of Athenian citizenship".

38 Rhodes (1981) 253–254, 258; De Ste Croix (2004) 141 ff.

39 [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 21, 6; Rhodes (1981) 258–260. Against this view, see Murray-Price (1990) 14–15.

40 Lambert (1993) 205 ff.; Parker (1996) 114; De Ste Croix (2004) 141.

41 Lambert (1993) 32; see also *ibid.* n. 31. One may say that membership in a phratry survived as a remnant of the previous organisation without any longer having effective implications. But Athenians were registered in their phratries well before the age of 18, when they officially became members of a deme. Thus, we have to presume that in the event that a child was declared unfit for phratry registration, he would never have come to be deme-registered at the age of 18. Further, even though the 10 Cleisthenic tribes were indeed territorial-based divisions, we should note that, in the generation following the reform, Athenians were registered in the same deme as their father, regardless of whether or not they were living in the same areas where their ancestors had lived. After the first gener-

Let us now turn to the third kind of ‘mixing up’ enacted by the reform. In the last lines of *Ath. Pol.*, 21.4, [Aristotle] notes that Cleisthenes “made all the inhabitants in each of the demes fellow-demesmen of one another, in order that they might not call attention to the newly enfranchised citizens”.⁴² After 508 BC, the most important element of identification for a citizen was the demotic, which, unlike the name and the patronymic, could not betray foreign origin. The third kind of blend of people enacted by the reform concerns, in fact, the new admissions to the citizen body of Athens. We do not read anything about this in Herodotus and our main source is Aristotle’s *Politics*, where he says that after the expulsion of the tyrants “he [Cleisthenes] enrolled in his tribes many foreigners, and metics who were former slaves”.⁴³ As noted above, in *Ath. Pol.* 13.5 [Aristotle] mentions the scrutiny of the lists of citizens (*diapsêphismos*) after the deposition of the tyrants and he seems to imply that with it many people were excluded from the citizen body after the end of Hippias’ rule.⁴⁴ By contrast, *Ath. Pol.* 21.4 and, more clearly, *Politics* 1275b34–39 refer to the enfranchisement of new citizens carried out by Cleisthenes. It seems plausible that this also included the re-admission in the citizen body of those who had been excluded by the recent *diapsêphismos*.⁴⁵

The main problem obviously arises from the fact that it is not clear whom Cleisthenes admitted to the citizen body: in *Politics* (ibid.), Aristotle mentions two groups; i.e., foreigners and metics who were former slaves.⁴⁶ Scholars

ation, in fact, it could well be the case that the demesmen of a coastal trittys had moved to the *asty* of Athens, a phenomenon that had surely increased with the mass migration to the city in the first years of the Peloponnesian War. But these Athenians still took up membership in their father’s deme. Kinship ties were far from being neglected. On this, see Whitehead (1986) 67–70.

42 [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 21.4.

43 Aristot. *Pol.* 1275b34–39. See Rhodes (1981) 255–256. On the expression “foreigners and metics who were former slaves”, see n. 46 below.

44 Rhodes (1981) 188 suggests that these non-Athenians might have been the mercenaries employed in the tyrants’ army. For the view that they were craftsmen and mercenaries, see Manville (1994) 178–179. Welwei (1967) 429 excludes that a revision of the civic lists was carried out immediately after the deposition of Hippias and he suggests that the real revision was conducted in the context of the re-organisations of the demes following Cleisthenes’ reforms. For a date to 508 BC for the revision of the lists of the citizen and a different interpretation of it, see Loddo (2012) 55–93 (also n.26 above). On the importance of civic subunits for the enfranchisement of citizens, see Ismard (2010).

45 This is the opinion of Rhodes (1981) 256. See *ibid.* for discussion and overview of scholarly debate.

46 On the use of *xenoi metoikoi* to indicate foreigners, see Rhodes (1981) 255. Cf. Welwei

suggested several possible candidates for the Cleisthenic enfranchisement, such as the immigrant craftsmen that Solon brought to Attica with the promise of granting them citizenship⁴⁷ and the tyrants' mercenaries.⁴⁸ Among these there might well have been individuals of different, including non-Ionian, origins. However, the evidence does not allow us a clear identification of these groups. What matters here, is that the importance given to the demotic in the new tribal system enabled the enfranchised citizens to be perfectly 'mixed up' and integrated into the political machine, at least with regard to access to civic institutions and selection for offices.⁴⁹

As is obvious, this last aspect also mattered to the extension of political participation, as it was related to the enlargement of the citizen body itself. With regard to the figures of this enlargement, the sources give us no clue. We can only say that the increase of the number of the citizens was obtained not only through the naturalisation of foreigners as attested by Aristotle, but also through the return of those exiled Athenians who had fled the city with the Alcmeonids during the alliance of Isagoras and the Spartans. In light of this, it is clear that the re-organisation of civic subunits in Athens and the 'blend of the people' in 508 BC went hand in hand with the enlargement of the civic community.

Scholars have pointed out other plausible aims and effects that Cleisthenes' reform may well have had. Notably, van Effenterre and Siewert argued that the main purpose was a reform of the Athenian army.⁵⁰ On the basis of a detailed study of the ancient roads throughout Attica to Athens, and of the assignment of the demes to their respective trittyes in relation to these roads, Siewert argued that Cleisthenes created a system in which the army could be easily gathered together.⁵¹ The demes, in fact, were assigned to the trittyes on the basis of what he defined as the *Zentralwegprinzip*: those of the same

(1967) 435, for the view that the *xenoi metoikoi* are simply metics—i.e., free-born foreigners resident in the city—while *douloi metoikoi*, are freedmen and descendants of freedmen resident in the city.

47 Rhodes (1981) 256 and Welwei (1967) 427 drawing from the later account of Plutarch, *Sol.* 24.

48 Bicknell (1969) 34–37; cf. Welwei (1967) 428; Rhodes (1981) 256 assumes that those who received citizenship within Cleisthenes' reforms were the same as those who had been deprived of it with the revision of the civic lists attested in [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 13.5.

49 However, see Lape (2010) 61–94 and 186–239 on the rhetoric of racial citizenship and scrutiny of the lists of citizens in classical Athens.

50 Van Effenterre (1976) 1–17; Siewert (1982) esp. 137–160.

51 Siewert (1982) 84 ff.; 157–158.

trittys were generally located on a central road, with just a few exceptions.⁵² In the new tribal system, the *lochos* of 300 men that each trittys provided could quickly line up and reach the Agora at Athens, where all the roads of Attica converged, by marching along the fastest route. Thereby, Cleisthenes created an effective citizen army, able to gather quickly together, which certainly did not exist at the time of the tyrants. However, reasonable doubts have been cast by Rhodes against Siewert's theory: the number of exceptions to the principle of combining neighbouring demes suggests that ease of mobilisation was not Cleisthenes' highest concern.⁵³ Furthermore, he observes that if the suggestion of trittys-based *lochoi* is true, it is surprising that we hear so little of the trittyes in later sources.⁵⁴ It seems more plausible that the purpose of fighting off regionalism and the power of the old elites in controlling access to politics were the main motivations beyond Cleisthenes' reform. This had indeed an impact on many aspects of the new organisation of the polis: along with the widening of political participation, the reform contributed to the definition of a new civic identity. To this also belonged the strengthening of the internal cohesion of the army; a citizen army that aims at internal cohesion necessarily needs to overcome the issue of territorial opposition and regional-based conflicts.

2 Dividing up the People? Tribal Reform at Cyrene

Some scholars have suggested that the forerunner of the Cleisthenic reform at Athens was the reform undertaken by Demonax of Mantinea at Cyrene around the mid-seventh century BC.⁵⁵ Information on tribal reform at Cyrene is provided by Herodotus,⁵⁶ who attests that the reform tackled the problems which arose when new colonists arrived to Cyrene after the first settlers.

We need to take a step back and look at what we know about the foundation of Cyrene. Herodotus reports what he calls the Theran and the Cyrenean traditions on the foundation of the city⁵⁷ and further evidence is provided by a famous fourth-century decree containing the oath of the found-

52 See Siewert (1982) 84.

53 Rhodes (1983) 203.

54 Rhodes (1983) 204.

55 Notably, Jeffery (1961) 139, 147. On Cleisthenes' inspiration from Corinth, see Salmon (2003) 219–234; cf. Stanton (1986) 139–153.

56 Hdt. 4.161.1–2. See Corcella in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 689–691.

57 Hdt. 4.153 ff. See Corcella in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 680 ff.

ers.⁵⁸ There are obvious parallels between the historian's account and the oath, though it has been argued that Herodotus is not the source of it and that the text might well be the fourth-century edition of an original archaic document.⁵⁹ Herodotus says that at some point in the seventh century, the Therans, following a prophecy of the Delphic oracle, resolved to send one male adult from each family to Libya; the colonists would be chosen by casting lots and they would come from all the seven districts of the city.⁶⁰ In agreement with him, the decree mentions the king, Battos, as a leader of the expedition and the selection of one Theran from each household.⁶¹ Herodotus also provides a rough figure of the first colonists, with the mention of two penteconter ships for a total number of ca. 150–160 colonists.⁶²

In lines 27–28 of the decree, we read that the colonists sailed “*epi tai isai kai tai homoioiai*” [“on fair and equal terms”], a formula that Graham defines as a standard expression for colonial foundations from the middle of the fifth century with reference to the granting of equal political rights in the new city.⁶³ Although the language of the decree suggests a fourth-century redaction, the inscription, as noted above, seems to derive from an original document and

-
- 58 ML 5. On the oath of the founders, see Graham (1960) 94–111; (1964) 52 ff., 224 ff.; Jeffery (1961) 139–147; Seibert (1963) 9–71; Giangiulio (1981) 1–24 and (2001) 116–137; Malkin (1994) 1–9 and (2003) 153–170.
- 59 Notably Graham (1960); for dependence of both the inscription and Herodotus on Theran sources, see Jeffery (1961) 139–147, Seibert (1963) 9–71. Cf. Giangiulio (2001) 116–137.
- 60 Hdt. 4.153.1. On the seven *chôroi* of Thera, see Jones (1987) 215–216.
- 61 Several restorations have been proposed for the letter gap at lines 29–30: on the basis of Hdt. 4.153, Jeffery proposed the following: “one son is to be conscripted; from the perioeci (or townsmen?) adults the number of 100 are to sail, and from the other Therans, 100 free men.” (1961, 140–141). At p. 141 she argues: “The restoration assumes that what Herodotus called ‘all the districts, seven in number’ consisted of Thera town and a perioecis of six districts. There is no ancient evidence that the districts of the island were called the perioecis, but the assumption is reasonable; Sparta, Thera’s traditional mother-city, provides the obvious geographical parallel.” However, the figure of 100 perioeci and 100 Theran colonists is a pure guess. Graham, by contrast, followed the widely-accepted restoration of Wilhelm and he translated as follows: “that one son be conscripted from each family; that those who sail be in the prime of life; and that, of the rest of the Therans, any free man who wishes, may sail” (Graham 1964, 225). For discussion about the text, see Graham (1960) 98.
- 62 Hdt. 4.153. See Corcella in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 680.
- 63 Graham (1960) 108 points out that the first occurrences are in the Athenian decree about Hestiaea IG I³ 41 (but the formula in the inscription is only a hypothesis of restoration) and in Thuc. 1.27.1, who says that when the Corinthians proclaimed a colony to Epidamnus, political equality was guaranteed to all who choose to go. Cf. Graham (1964) 59.

it may well provide genuine information on the first colonising expedition to Cyrene. The reference to equal rights for the colonists most probably suggests equal shares in land upon their arrival in the new city.⁶⁴ Further provisions about land in the colony are contained in the lines 33 ff.: “if the colonists establish the settlement, any of their fellow citizens who later sails to Libya shall have a share in citizenship and honours and shall be allotted a portion of the unoccupied land.”⁶⁵ The colony took measures concerning future arrivals from Thera: the later colonists would partake in citizens’ rights—as they would be granted *politeia*—including land ownership. Part of the land was intentionally left undivided, a provision in Greek colonies that is elsewhere attested.⁶⁶

The situation at Cyrene, however, started becoming complicated in the course of the sixth century. According to Herodotus’ account, based on the Delphic promise of ‘land for all’, new colonists from Crete, Peloponnese and the islands arrived at Cyrene. The new colonists appropriated the lands of the neighbouring Libyans, who asked for help from the Egyptians, and this led to the Cyrenean-Egyptian war.⁶⁷ The situation was, later on, aggravated by a series of internal conflicts within the royal house of the Battiads, which brought the Cyreneans to a war against those Libyans who had supported part of the Battiad family.⁶⁸ After suffering a defeat by the Libyans and further strife among the Battiads, the Cyreneans sent a delegation to Delphi to ask for help and a man from Arcadia, Demonax of Mantinea, was called in as an external arbitrator to settle the crisis.⁶⁹ According to Herodotus, he solved the problem by means of a tribal reform:

when this man (Demonax) came to Cyrene and learned everything, he divided the people into three parts (τριφύλους ἐποίησέ σφεας); of which the

64 Malkin (2003) 162 notes that the idea that land distribution at Cyrene took place “much later” is to be ascribed to the ‘purified tradition’ that followed the pattern of *ktisis*-motif of difficult beginnings. It is obviously more likely that the first division of land took place among the first settlers and that a secondary division was undertaken later. For secondary land distribution after the original one, see Asheri (1966) 27 ff.; cf. Cecchet (2009) 191–197.

65 Tr. Graham (1964) 225.

66 See Graham (1964) 64–65 on the case of the settlement on Black Corcyra and the foundation of the Locrian community. See also n. 80, 81, 82 below.

67 Hdt. 4.159. Chamoux (1953) 135–138; Corcella in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 686–687; Grote (2016) 27.

68 Hdt. 4.160. On dissent within the Battiad family, see Chamoux (1953); Corcella in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 687–689; Grote (2016) 27.

69 Hdt. 4.161.1–2. On the Demonax of Mantinea, see Corcella in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 689–690. Cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 1319b1–27. See Chamoux (1953) 115–127.

Theraeans and the perioikoi were one (*μίαν μοῖραν*), the Peloponnesians and the Cretans the second, and all the islanders the third.⁷⁰

Tr. A.D. GODLEY

As Herodotus explains, the Battiad monarchy was deprived of part of its prerogatives and, apart from some domains and priesthoods, “the rest was given to the demos, in common”.⁷¹ The historian does not provide many details on the tribal reform itself; he simply says that the citizens were now made *triphylloi*—that is “divided into three tribes”—and the reader is left wondering how this would have solved the crisis.

One major difficulty in the text is represented by the ambiguity concerning the composition of each tribe. Herodotus mentions three parts (*moirai*), which were respectively: 1) Therans (both Theran citizens and Theran *perioikoi*);⁷² 2) Peloponnesians and Cretans; 3) islanders (including non-Dorians).⁷³ However, there is no consensus as to how each tribe was internally composed. The majority of scholars believe that each tribe was made up of one single *moira*.⁷⁴ An alternative reading, suggested by Jeffery and followed by Hölkeskamp, rejects the correspondence between *phylai* and *moirai*, implying that each tribe contained all the three *moirai*.⁷⁵ In this view, the Cyrenean tribes would be a cross-

70 Hdt. 4.161. See Roussel (1976) 300–301.

71 Hdt, *ibid.* On Demonax’s intervention as a sign of the weakness of the Battiad monarchy, see Chamoux (1953) 139; Mitchell (2000) 88–90; cf. Laronde (2010) 99–104.

72 There has been much discussion about the word *perioikoi*. Busolt (1895) I, 490, n. 2 suggested they were the neighbouring Libyans; similarly, Schaefer (1963) 248–252. Mitchell (2000) 88–89 seems keener to believe the *perioikoi* were from Thera. It has been noted that it is unlikely that the local natives (Libyans) were mixed up with the descendants of the first settlers; see Chamoux (1953) 221 ff. How and Wells (1957) I, 355 suggested they were the Therans’ serfs, but this view has found little favour. Chamoux (*ibid.*) argued that they were the Therans who arrived after the original settlers and were allocated land only outside the walls of Cyrene, living in the villages as clients of the original settlers. Along the same lines, Jeffery (1961), noting that Thera had a *perioikis* as her mother-city Sparta, proposed that the *perioikoi* had the same origin as the Therans. The possibility that they came from Thera has been the most widely accepted: see the convincing arguments of Jones (1987) 218 in support of Jeffery (1961), Hölkeskamp (1993) esp. 412, and the recent discussion by Grote (2016) 31–34; cf. Corcella in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 690, who also maintains they were from Thera.

73 On the composition of the *moira* of the islanders, see Jeffery (1961) 142, n. 9 on Lindians and 142–143.

74 See Jones (1987) 216; similarly, also Corcella in Asheri-Lloyd-Corcella (2007) 690, who suggests parallels in other colonies, such as Thurii.

75 Jeffery (1961) 141–144; see Hansen-Nielsen (2004) 1244. Against Jeffery’s view, see Jones

section of the entire population, similar to the Cleisthenic tribes in Athens, and yet with a fundamental difference: whilst Cleisthenes mixed the people up on the basis of geographical provenance within Attica, at Cyrene the three sections were differentiated according to the local provenance of the settlers.

Jeffery supported her view of a mixed composition of the Cyrenean tribes mainly based on a passage of Aristotle's *Politics*, in which Athens and Cyrene are both mentioned together:

... for democracy are useful also the kind of arrangements to which Cleisthenes at Athens resorted when he wanted to strengthen the democracy, and in the case of Cyrene those who established the demos. For different and most numerous phylai and phratries must be created ...⁷⁶

TR. H. RACKHAM

However, it has been noted that Aristotle is more likely to refer here not to Demonax's reform, but to a latter change which occurred in the middle of the fifth century BC, when the Battiad monarchy came to an end.⁷⁷ Even provided that these passages draw a parallel between Cleisthenes and Demonax, this may simply signify that both reformers improved the political crisis by reforming the tribal system, but it certainly does not say that the Cyrenean tribes resembled those of Cleisthenes in their composition. Hölkeskamp argued that the Cyrenean tribes contained all the three *moirai*, mainly based on an *argumentum ex silentio*, namely, on the fact that, in contrast to many other naturalisation decrees, in the Cyrenean oath of the founders the new colonists from Thera are not assigned to any specific tribe. After being granted *isopoliteia*—i.e., equal rights with the citizens of Cyrene—it is stated that they shall be assigned to one tribe, one *patra* and one of the nine *hetaireiai*, but no precise instructions are given as to these subdivisions.⁷⁸ According to Hölkeskamp, this suggests that each of the three tribes contained the *moira* of the Therans. But, as is apparent, this formulation of the text may well also prove true the oppo-

(1987) 217. In support of Jeffery (with the addition of further arguments), see Hölkeskamp (1993) 404–421.

76 Aristot. *Pol.* 1319b19–27. On the possibility of the creation of citizen registers at Cyrene in the context of Demonax's reform, as in Cleisthenes' reform in Athens, see Faraguna (2015) 655–656.

77 See Jones (1987) 218. On the end of the Bacchiad monarchy, see Chamoux (1953) 202–210; Mitchell (2000) 93–97.

78 ML 5 l. 12 (*isopoliteia*); ll. 15–16 (registration in the tribe, *patra* and *hetaireia*). See Hölkeskamp (1993) 412. For further objections to Hölkeskamp, see Grote (2016) 34–37.

site case: the absence of specification of the tribe might show that there was only one tribe in which they could be registered; i.e., that containing the *moira* of the Therans.

Is it plausible that Demonax enacted a mixing up of the people similar to that enacted by Cleisthenes in Athens? I believe that this would hardly have offered a solution to the conflict in Cyrene. The *moirai* that Demonax created were, *per se*, already a 'blend of people', because one tribe put together old and new Theran colonists and Theran *perioikoi*; another united Peloponnesians and Cretans, who shared in common Dorian origins, but came from different *poleis*; and another one combined all the islanders, including perhaps also non-Dorians. It seems that the criteria Demonax adopted in his grouping were based on the local provenance of the colonists, but also on the different waves of colonisation. This makes sense if we think of the context in which the conflict in Cyrene arose. Herodotus (4.159–160) speaks of internal tensions in relation to the question of land. Problems began with the immigration of new colonists and their claims on land. Each group had obviously different claims: the first settlers claimed their right to maintain their lots; later colonists from Thera asserted their right to the lots allocated from public land, as stated in the foundation decree; while Peloponnesians, Cretans and the islanders, who had been left struggling, ended up taking away land from the Libyans. As is apparent, Demonax, as well as transferring powers from the royal house of the Battiads to the demos, also needed to define the rights of earlier and later settlers with regard to the question of the land. This explains why he identified each *moira* according to the waves of immigration. It is unlikely that he blended the three *moirai* within each tribe, distributing rights on land equally among all, as this would have probably led more quickly to civic strife (*stasis*) than to a resolution. Far from being a way to further increase opposition, the separation of the three groups of colonists was a way to regulate land ownership and prevent the risk of re-distribution.⁷⁹

79 Here I do not agree with Grote (2016) 38–39, who follows Walter (1993) 148, arguing that one of the roots of the problem was the fact that the last colonists, who lived far from the Agora of Cyrene, could not regularly partake in the Assembly meetings and that the reform granted equal political rights to all tribes (cf. also *ibid.* 42). In fact, we have no evidence to believe that the conflict in archaic Cyrene was caused by limitations in access to civic institutions; Herodotus 4.159 clearly refers to problems of land distribution in the specific colonial context created by the several waves of immigration and, in addition, to conflicts internal to the Battiad family (4.160). The expression τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τὰ πρότερον εἶχον οἱ βασιλέες ἐς μέσον τῷ δήμῳ ἔθηγε (Hdt. 4.161) certainly shows that Demonax gave to the demos a larger share in the political life of the polis, but we have no evidence of equal polit-

Interestingly, we have some attested cases in the epigraphic record from which we derive a clue of how colonies acted to prevent the risks of internal strife deriving from the arrival of new settlers and land distribution. An example is provided by a famous inscription of a Locrian community settling a new territory in Aetolia or near Naupactus, dated to the late sixth century BC.⁸⁰ The inscription on a bronze tablet contains, on the obverse, the text of a regulation concerning the land in the new colony. The text illustrates three fundamental points: the rules concerning land ownership among the first settlers;⁸¹ the ban of redistributing the land after the first allotment; and the possibility of admitting 200 new settlers for military reasons and their right to own land.⁸² The lines 11–14 set out the punishment for those who attempt to redistribute land in violation of these regulations: their property shall be confiscated and their house demolished. The presence of such a detailed regulation suggests that problems deriving from the arrival of later settlers and concerning land distribution were well known when new settlements were founded. The regulation aimed to protect the rights of the first settlers, while at the same time allowing the possibility of new admissions in the citizen body and subsequent allocation of public land.

At Cyrene, it seems the later waves of immigration from the Peloponnese and from the islands found the Cyreneans rather unprepared. Demonax had to put order on a chaotic situation and he did this through mediation: by means of dividing the people into three tribes, he recognised, on the one hand, the right of all the three groups of settlers to be part of the polis; in fact he also included the later colonists—namely the Peloponnesians, the Cretans and the other islanders—within the citizen body.⁸³ On the other, he differentiated the rights

ical rights for the members of the three *moirai*. We should refrain from applying too readily the Athenian democratic model to archaic Cyrene. For an interpretation of the reform as a way to strengthen the landed aristocracy of the Therans, see Mitchell (2000) 88.

80 ML 13. For problems concerning the attribution of the text to a polis, see *ibid.* 24–25.

81 In particular, land rules about pasturage and cultivation are stated on the obverse at lines 3–7.

82 A ban of redistribution, with the exception of the 200 new colonists, and consequent curse and penalty on the obverse are stated in the lines 7–14. According to the restoration accepted by Meiggs-Lewis the text at ll. 15–17 reads: “the land shall belong, half to the previous settlers, half to the additional settlers”. In ll. 1–3 regulations also include public land (l. 3: *damosion*).

83 Jones (1987) 216–219 maintained that before Demonax’s reform there were just the three Dorian tribes, in which the Theran colonists were registered. Now three new tribes were created to include in the citizen body also more recent non-Theran colonists. Cf. Hölkeskamp (1993) 409 against the idea that Demonax created three new tribes.

on land ownership among each *moira*; i.e., among original settlers and later arrivals from Thera from the one side, and *nouveaux venus* from other parts of Greece, on the other. The first settlers from Thera indeed maintained the rights on the lots allocated within the ‘primary division’ of land, while later Theran colonists maintained their right on the lots within the ‘secondary division’, as was prescribed in the founding decree of the city.⁸⁴ This seems to have been the norm in Greek foundations and the most obvious way to avoid civic strife deriving from land re-distribution.

We are not informed about land provisions for Peloponnesians, Cretans and other islanders and we do not know if their occupation of the lands of the Libyans became permanent, although this is suggested by the Cyrenean victory in the Egyptian war. Further, we do not know how political rights, such as appointment of offices, were distributed among the three tribes and we have no evidence to believe that all three *moirai* enjoyed equal status within the political community.⁸⁵ We cannot exclude that offices or access to a specific institutional organ might have remained a prerogative of the first settlers; i.e., of the first *moira*, that of the Therans. On this note, we should remember that Aristotle, in *Politics*, says that in other colonies, such as Thera and Apollonia on the Adriatic Sea, only the first settlers could hold offices.⁸⁶ As we noted, it is highly likely that rights concerning land did differ among the three *moirai*, as a way to protect the land of the first settlers. Parallels with Cleisthenes’ reform at Athens should therefore be limited to the action of re-organisation

84 The expressions ‘primary division’ and ‘secondary division’ are those of Asheri (1966).

85 Cf. Mitchell (2000) 89: “By the tribal reform, the new settlers will have gained constitutional uniformity with the original Theran colonists but the latter will have been left united, with their land tenure and social organisation untouched and with the *perioikoi* added to their local tribe, that of their masters, which would have discouraged their democratisation. The Therans would therefore have been strengthened rather than weakened as a landed aristocracy and enabled to oppose the monarchy”. Further (ibid.): “The Therans, who formed the first tribe along with their *perioikoi*, will have been of higher status, derived from their longer occupation of richer land closer to the city and with control over their *perioikoi*. They therefore had local power, analogous to the influence of Athenian families with estates in the Attic plain before Cleisthenes’ tribal reform split them up between the ten new Attic tribes.”

86 Aristot. *Pol.* 1290b12–15. See Jeffery (1961) 143. Another clear example is the appointment of *timai* according to property class: at Athens, for example, in Solons’ constitution only the first two property classes could access archonship before it was open to the Zeugitai in 457 BC. Thetes seem to be excluded from most magistracies, though [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4 suggests this rule may not have been observed in the fourth century. On the unequal distribution of *timai* among citizens in Greek poleis, see Blok (2013) 171–173.

of the civic body by means of a tribal reform that tackled internal crisis, but we have no reasons to assume an analogy between the composition of the Cleisthenic tribes and that of the Cyrenean tribes, nor to assume a similar political organisation in archaic Cyrene and in the Cleisthenic democracy. This perspective would downplay the specific nature of the agrarian crisis in the colonial context of Cyrene.

Tribal reform at Cyrene was indeed a tool for legitimising the position of different groups based on their local provenance and, in relation to it, based also on the wave of colonisation in which they took part. In this way, the reform was a decisive measure for integrating the newcomers into the civic community, while at the same time defining their position and protecting the rights of the first colonists.

3 Re-founding the Citizen Body: New Civic Units at Camarina

In the case of the Sicilian polis Camarina, we have extraordinary material evidence for a general re-distribution of the civic body into new civic subunits—the phratries—in the first half of the fifth century BC. Such a reorganisation was revealed by the finding in 1987 and publication by Cordano of 154 lead tablets,⁸⁷ all of which were found in the temple of Athena, apart from one found in the southern side of the *temenos*.⁸⁸ The tablets were possibly contained in a wooden box, due to the way in which they were preserved (banded and rolled) which suggests that they were not meant to be used after their display in the temple. They show on one side a personal name in the nominative with its patronymic in the genitive case and on the other one an ordinal number (the biggest being “fourteenth”), associated in some cases with the word *phratra* or *phatra*, either in the nominative or in the genitive case.⁸⁹ Some of them, such as tablets n. 2 and n. 69, also have an indication of another subunit, the *triakas*, possibly in order to avoid ambiguity in case the same name occurred several times. Cordano suggests that the tablets were used for the allotment of offices, their shape being suitable for insertion in a ballot box similar to that used for the selection of jurors at Athens.⁹⁰ In order to advance further hypotheses on

87 Cordano (1992) 29–73.

88 On the topography of Camarina, see Uggeri (2015).

89 Cordano (1992) 81.

90 See Cordano (1992) 88. On the plaques as tools of Camarinian democracy, see Robinson (2002) 61–77. Cordano (1992) 94 and (2004) 287–288 is more cautious and speaks of a “republic”.

their possible use, however, we must first examine some crucial points about the history of Camarina.

The city was founded by Syracuse in the beginning of the sixth century and was then subdued by her around fifty years later.⁹¹ Thereafter, it remained under the rule of Syracuse until Syracuse was besieged by Hippocrates of Gela in 492 BC.⁹² The tyrant re-founded Camarina for the first time around 492 BC, probably by transferring people from Gela to the 'new' polis.⁹³ With the succession of Gelo to Hippocrates, nonetheless, its inhabitants were deported to Syracuse. An honorary decree from Olympia⁹⁴ dating to this period shows that the Camarinians received Syracusan citizenship, but did not lose their original identity as Camarinians. Prassiteles, the recipient of the honorary decree, is defined both as Syracusan and as Camarinian.

In 461 BC, after the end of tyranny at Syracuse, Camarina was re-founded a second time by the Gelans: this entailed the return of the Camarinians from Syracuse to their city.⁹⁵ It is likely, thus, that the situation was quite confused. The Camarinians who had been transferred to Syracuse could now officially be citizens in their polis. But as well as her former inhabitants, new settlers from Gela also joined the new citizen body.⁹⁶ In this chaotic context, a new citizen body had to be founded, made of up of former and new Camarinians. Cordano highlights that sources use two terms to indicate the re-foundation: *katoikizein* (used by Thucydides and Diodorus Siculus),⁹⁷ which designates the settling of new inhabitants, and *synoikizein* (used by Timaeus and Philistus),⁹⁸ that implies the participation of various unspecified groups in the re-organisation.⁹⁹ Diodorus Siculus attests that, together with the re-foundation, the Gelans re-distributed the land by lot.¹⁰⁰

It is therefore against this tormented background that we must contextualise the finding of our tablets. The form of the letters suggests a dating from the

91 Thuc. 6.5.3. See Cordano (1992) 3–15; Di Luna (2009) 75–86.

92 Hdt. 7.154.

93 Thuc. *ibid.*

94 *IO* 266; see Cordano (1992) 6.

95 Thuc. *ibid.*

96 Information about a *synoikismos* of Gelans and Camarinians is provided by Tim. *FGrHist* 566 F 19 and Phil. *FGrHist* 556 F 15. See Cordano (2004) 283–284. About land distribution between Gelans and Camarinians, see Diod. 9.76.5. See Cordano (2004) 286.

97 Thuc. 6.5.3; Diod Sic. 11.76.4–5. See Cordano (1992) 7; see Casevitz (1985) 168.

98 Tim. F 19 and Phil. F 15; see n. 96 above. See Cordano, *ibid.*

99 Cordano (1992) 7.

100 See n. 97 above.

first half of the fifth century.¹⁰¹ Their re-use and deposition in the temple is likely to date to the second foundation, around 461 BC. The allotment of the public offices implies the participation of the citizens in the administration of the state, a practice unacceptable to a tyrant.¹⁰²

As we have seen, there are three elements that identify citizens in the tablets: name, patronymic, and, most interestingly, the phratry. Phratries in Camarina seem to have the very important function that elsewhere in the Greek world was assigned to the tribes. But, different from typical cases, phratries on the Camarinian plaques do not appear with names: they are merely indicated by numbers.¹⁰³ The lack of names is the main clue that the tablets attest a completely new system, for which the polis did not have any pre-existing structures. The units were not ancient subdivisions of the citizen body, but rather new creations introduced *ad hoc* with the re-foundation of 461 BC.

Interestingly, the tablets were used several times before deposition. Cordano pointed to a number of them in which earlier names were erased and new names were inscribed.¹⁰⁴ We do not know exactly what other functions they might have previously had, but their shape suggests they are ballot cards, so they might have been previously used for the distribution of land or the allotment of some other public offices before they were used in the last allotment and deposited in the temple. Cordano also proposed that they might have been used for registering the right to public pay, based on the indication *dekalitron* on two of them.¹⁰⁵ Nonetheless, after their location in the temple, the plaques were not meant to be re-used; this is confirmed by the fact that some of the citizens are indicated as being deceased, as the presence of the verb *tethnake* on some of them shows.¹⁰⁶ In all probability, their deposition in the temple served as the proof of a foundation act after all previous steps (recruitment of citizens, distribution of land, allotment of offices) had been done.

Camarina was brought to life again. A new citizen community was built with former and new members and the political apparatus was fully re-organised. The new order needed to be legitimised by a formal act, probably within a religious ceremony. This also explains why the objects of dedication are ballot plaques and not, as we might expect, a list of names inscribed on stone. The

101 So Cordano (1992) 77–79.

102 Cordano (1992) 94. Cf. Cordano (2004) 284.

103 Cordano (1994) 418–419 suggests that the number shows the quartier of the city. On the phratries of Camarina, see also Del Monaco (2004) 597–613.

104 Cordano (1992) 30.

105 Cordano (1992) 84.

106 Precisely, tablets n. 81; 93; 56; 112b; 135; 136; see Cordano (1992) 84.

plaques probably preserved the memory of the last in the row of the allotments of magistracies. The fact that the same tablets had been already used for other allotments before being dedicated in the temple might well show the rush of the Camarinians to provide their city with a new civic order.¹⁰⁷

Commenting on the absence of names for the phratries, Murray notes that numbers are a good expression of what he defines as “the rationality of the Greek city”, noting that “the rationality of these new institutions is shown by their numerical basis, and the absence of any attempt in them to recall a more complex or more embedded relationship to the past.”¹⁰⁸ The absence of phratry names might indeed be indicative of a rejection of re-using existing names—all the more so if these matched with those of the Syracusan phratries, which would explain the reason for the cancellation of anything reminiscent of the ‘Syracusan captivity’. But this choice could also be ascribed to the refusal of appealing to a ‘pure Camarinian tradition’, in respect to the new mixed composition of the citizen body, in which not only Camarinians, but also Gelans and probably settlers from other *poleis*, belonged.¹⁰⁹ The use of numbers is explained also by the rush in which the city founded new units and needed to put them into use.

We do not know by what criteria the new phratries and the other shown divisions (the *triakades*), were identified. Cordano suggested that the numbers corresponded to the districts in the city.¹¹⁰ It has been argued that Camarina took inspiration for her new civic subdivisions from the Athenian model, because contacts between the two *poleis* in the fifth century are largely attested by the presence of Attic pottery in Camarina and, furthermore, by her alliance with Athens later on in 427 BC.¹¹¹ Murray noted that it might well be that the recent changes under Ephialtes would have made the Athenian example more prominent.¹¹² Robinson argued for a Camarinian democracy in the fifth century, based on the practice of allotment for which the plates provide evidence.¹¹³ Nonetheless, we do not have much ground to claim that the new Camarinian

107 I agree with Faraguna (2015) 659 that the function of the tablets was not mainly symbolic, as their several re-uses show they were practically deployed for selection and allotment. I believe, however, that their final preservation in the temple had a symbolic value, as the proof of the last act of the process of refoundation of the city.

108 Murray (1997) 497.

109 Convincingly, Cordano (1994) 419.

110 See n. 103 above.

111 See Cordano (1992) 9–10; Murray (1997) 497.

112 Murray, *ibid.*

113 Robinson (2002) 61–77.

system imitated the Cleisthenic one, as we know nothing about the composition of the Camarinian phratries.¹¹⁴ In contrast with the Athenian model, the phratries in Camarina are mentioned in official ballot lots, while in the Athenian allotment and voting practice they usually do not appear: the *ostraka* used for the *ostrakismos*-vote show that citizens were designed mostly by name, patronymic and demotic.¹¹⁵

Most probably, Camarina developed her new civic structure autonomously and in a very short period of time, as the fact that no names but rather numbers were chosen to indicate the phratries. This was an emergency act after a long story of deportations. The recent past of the city may have played a role far more important than any contact with Athens in fuelling the need of a radical re-organisation.

4 Conclusions

In the late archaic and early classical periods, Athens, Cyrene and Camarina changed the divisions of their citizen bodies. These reforms were carried out after the end of a troubled period; i.e., civil and political strife at Athens, immigration of new settlers and conflicts between colonists and locals at Cyrene, and the re-foundation of the city after deportations of citizens at Camarina.

The main features of the reforms seem to have been to some extent similar, as far as they all entailed the registration of citizens into new civic units and they all aimed to solve political crises. But there are some important differences in the mode of creation and composition of new units. Cleisthenes' reform enacted a threefold blend of the people; i.e., geographical (from different parts of Attica), socio-economic (against the power of the elites), and ethnic (enfranchisement and integration of new citizens). By contrast, in Cyrene it is unlikely that each tribe mixed up citizens from all groups of settlers, as the nature of the conflict in Cyrene was not regional, as it was in Athens at the time of Peisistratus, but centred on the question of land in a colonial context. It is more likely that the reform aimed at integrating new colonists while at the same time protecting the rights of the first settlers. Camarina's case differs from the previous two because it had to deal with an act of re-foundation of the entire

114 Murray argues that "the essential similarity of the thought process behind the two reforms lies in the importance of validating the new institutions by appeal to religious authority" (Murray [1997] 501).

115 For citizens' names on the *ostraka*, see Brenne (2001) 49–86. On the identification of citizens on Athenian *ostraka* and dikastic *pinakia*, see recently Faraguna (2014) 168–169.

citizen body after deportation. Re-foundation seems to have followed the steps similar to those probably undertaken in the foundation of new settlements: registration of the citizens in newly founded civic units, allotments of offices, and distribution of land.

In all the above cases, the re-organisation of the citizen body had the effect of making the polis more stable, thereby opening a new season of political life. In Athens, the reform was a fundamental step in the widening of political participation. In the case of Cyrene, all we can say is that the new system, while recognising the different claims on land of the settlers, apparently solved the conflict by enabling all three groups to be part of the polis. In Camarina, the allotment of offices for which the plates were used is indeed reminiscent of democratic practices. The later alliance with Athens suggests that the polis might have had a democratic government, though we do not know if the deposition of the plates in the temple of Athena was the formal act of celebrating the introduction of democracy.

What is interesting is the fact that these three cases, all coming from different parts of the Greek world, show that civic order in the Greek *poleis* was thought of as achievable only through establishing subunits. Any reform of the old civic order and any foundation of a new one entailed a reform of the existing subdivisions or the introduction of new divisions in the citizen body. Before being a member of the polis *in pleno*, a citizen experienced membership in the smaller divisions that comprised the polis.

Bibliography

- Andrewes, A., 1956. *The Greek Tyrants*. London.
- Andrewes, A., 1977. Kleisthenes' reform bill. *CQ* 27: 3–9.
- Asheri, D. 1966. *Distribuzioni di terre nell'antica Grecia*. Torino.
- Asheri, D., A. Lloyd, A. Corcella. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. Books I–IV. Oxford.
- Berve, H. 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*. 2 vols. München.
- Bicknell, P.J. 1969. Whom did Kleisthenes enfranchise? *PDP* 24: 34–37.
- Blok, J. 2013. Citizenship, the citizen body and its assemblies. In *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, ed. H. Beck, 161–175. Oxford.
- Bockisch, G. 1976. Zur sozialen und ethnischen Herkunft der Tyrannen von Sikyon. *Klio* 58: 527–534.
- Brenne, S. *Ostrakismos und Prominenz in Athen. Attische Bürger des 5. Jhs. v. Chr. auf den Ostraka. Tyche* 3. Wien.
- Busolt, G., 1895. *Griechische Geschichte*. Vol. I. Gotha.
- CAH 1923–1924 = *Cambridge Ancient History*. 1st ed. Cambridge.
- Casevitz, M. 1985. *La Vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien*. Paris.

- Cecchet, L. 2009. Γῆς ἀναδασμός: A real issue in the Archaic and Classical *poleis*? *Biblioteca di Athenaeum* 55: 185–198.
- Chamoux, F. 1953. *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades*. Paris.
- Cordano, F. 1992. *Le tessere pubbliche dal tempio di Athena a Camarina*. Roma.
- Cordano, F. 1994. La città di Camarina e le corde della lira. *PdP* 49: 418–426.
- Cordano, F. 2004. Camarina città democratica? *PdP* 59: 283–292.
- Cordano, F. 2011. *Camarina. Politica e istituzioni di una città greca. Themata* 8. Roma.
- De Ste. Croix, G.E.M. 2004. *Athenian Democratic Origins*. Oxford.
- Del Monaco, L. 2004. Le fratrie di Camarina e gli strateghi di Siracusa. *Mediterraneo antico* 7: 597–613.
- Di Luna, M.E. 2009. Camarina sub-colonia di Siracusa: dalla fondazione al conflitto. In *Colonie di colonie. Le fondazioni sub-coloniali greche tra colonizzazione e colonialismo. Atti del convegno internazionale, Lecce, 22–24 giugno 2006*, eds. M. Lombardo, F. Frisone, 75–86. Galatina.
- Eliot, C.W.J. 1967. Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 44.1 and the meaning of Tryttis. *Phoenix* 21: 79–84.
- Faraguna, M. 2014. Citizens, non-citizens and slaves. Identification methods in Classical Greece. In *Identifiers and Identification Methods in the Ancient World*, ed. M. Depauw, S. Coussement, 165–183. Leuven, Paris, Walpole.
- Faraguna, M. 2015. Citizen registers in Archaic Greece: The evidence reconsidered. In *AXON. Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*, eds. A.P. Matthaiou and N. Papazarkadas, 649–667. Athens.
- Forrest, G. 1966. *The Emergence of Greek Democracy: the Character of Greek Politics 800–400 BC*. York.
- Giangiulio, M. 1981. Deformità eroiche e tradizioni di fondazione: Batto, Miscello e Ioracolo delfico. *ASNP* 11: 1–24.
- Giangiulio, M. 2001. Constructing the past: colonial traditions and the writing of history. In *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. N. Luraghi, 116–137. Oxford.
- Graham, A.J. 1960. The authenticity of the Opkion τῶν οἰκιστῆρων of Cyrene. *JHS* 80: 94–111.
- Graham, A.J. 1964. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*. Manchester.
- Grote, O. 2016. *Die griechischen Phylen. Funktion, Entstehung, Leistungen*. Stuttgart.
- Guarducci, M. 1937. *L'istituzione della fratria nella Grecia antica e nelle colonie greche di Italia*. Roma.
- Hansen, M.H. 1977. How did the Athenian Ecclesia vote? *GRBS* 18: 123–137.
- Hansen, M.H. 1994. The 2500th anniversary of Cleisthenes' reforms and the tradition of Athenian democracy. In *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, eds. R. Osborne, S. Hornblower, 25–38. Oxford.
- Hansen, M.H. and Th.H. Nielsen, eds. 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford.
- Hignett, Ch. 1952. *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.

- Hopper, R.J. 1961. Plain, shore, and hill in early Athens. *ABSA* 56: 189–219.
- How, W.W., Wells, J. 1957. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. 2. Vols. Oxford.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 1993. Demonax und die Neuordnung der Bürgerschaft von Kyrene. *Hermes* 121: 404–421.
- Ismard, P. 2010. *La cité des réseaux. Athènes et ses associations, VI^e–I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.* Paris.
- Ismard, P. 2011. Les associations et la réforme clisthénienne: le politique «par le bas». In *Clisthène et Lycurque d'Athènes: autour du politique dans la cité classique*, eds. Azoulay V. and P. Ismard, 165–174. Paris.
- Jeffery, L.H. 1961. The pact of the first settlers at Cyrene. *Historia* 10: 139–147.
- Jones, N.F. 1987. *Public Organisation in Ancient Greece. A Documentary Study*. Philadelphia.
- Jordan, B. 1970. Herodotos 5,71.2 and the Naukraroi of Athens. *CSCA* 3: 153–175.
- Kluwe, E. 1972. Bemerkungen zu den Diskussionen über die drei «Parteien» in Attika zur Zeit der Machtergreifung des Peisistratos. *Klio* 54: 101–124.
- Lalonde, G.V. 2006. IG I³ 1055 B and the boundary of Melite and Kollytos. *Hesperia* 75: 83–119.
- Lambert, S.D. 1993. *The Phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor.
- Lape, L. 2010. *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.
- Laronde, A. 2010. «Cyène sous la monarchie des Battiades» revisité. In *Journée d'hommage à François Chamoux*, eds. J. Leclant, A. Laronde, 99–104. Paris.
- Lewis, D.M. 1963. Cleisthenes and Attica *Historia* 12: 22–40.
- Loddo, L. 2012. Il *diapsephismos* post-tirannico: cittadinanza e lotta politica. *RSA* 42: 55–93.
- Lohmann, H. 1993. *Atene: Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika*. Vol. 1. Köln.
- Malkin, I. 1994. Inside and outside: colonization and the formation of the mother city. In *Apoikia. Studi in onore di G. Buchner = Annali dell'Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli* (sezione di archeologia e storia antica) 16: 1–9.
- Malkin, I. 2003. Tradition in Herodotus: the foundation of Cyrene. In *Herodotus and his World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, ed. P. Derrow, R. Parker, 153–170. Oxford.
- Manville, P.B. 1990. *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*. Princeton.
- Mitchell, B. 2000. Cyrene: Typical or atypical? In *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, eds. R. Brock and S. Hodkinson, 82–102. Oxford.
- Murray, O. 1997. Rationality and the Greek city: the evidence from Kamarina. In *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*, ed. M.H. Hansen, 493–504. Copenhagen.
- Murray, O. and S. Price, eds. 1990. *The Greek city from Homer to Alexander*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford.

- Rhodes, P.J. 1981. *A Commentary to the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1983. Reviewed work: Die Trittyen Attikas und die Herresreform des Kleisthenes by P. Siewert. *JHS* 103: 203–204.
- Robinson, E.W. 2002. Lead plates and the case for democracy in fifth-century BC Camarina. In *Oikistes. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies and Military Power in the Ancient World Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham*, eds. V.B. Gorman, E.W. Robinson, 61–77. Leiden.
- Roussel, D. 1976. *Tribu et cité*. Paris.
- Salmon, J. 2003. Cleisthenes of Athens and Corinth. In *Herodotus and His World*, eds. P. Derow and R. Parker, 219–234. Oxford.
- Schaefer, H. 1963. *Probleme der alten Geschichte. Gesammelte Abhandlungen und Vorträge*. Göttingen.
- Schmidt-Hofner, S. 2014. Politik räumlich denken. Herodots drei Parteien in Attika und das politische *Imaginaire* der Griechen. *HZ* 299: 624–668.
- Sealey, R. 1960. Regionalism in Archaic Athens. *Historia* 9: 155–180.
- Seibert, J. 1963. *Metropolis und Apoikie. Historische Beiträge zur Geschichte ihrer gegenseitigen Beziehungen*. Würzburg.
- Siewert, P. 1982. *Die Trittyen Attikas und die Herresreform des Kleisthenes*. Munich.
- Stanton, G.R. 1986. The territorial tribes of Corinth and Phleious. *ClAnt.* 5: 139–153.
- Szanto, E. 1901. *Die griechischen Phylen*. Wien.
- Thompson, W.E. 1971. The Deme in Kleisthenes Reforms. *SO* 46: 72–79.
- Trail, J.S. 1975. *The Political organisation of Attica. A Study of the Demes, Trittyes, and Phylai and their Representation in the Athenian Council*. Hesperia Supplement 14. Princeton.
- Uggeri, G. 2015. *Camarina: storia e topografia di una colonia greca di Sicilia e del suo territorio*. Galatina.
- Van Effenterre, H. 1976. Clisthène et les mesures de mobilisation. *REG* 89: 1–17.
- Van Wees, H. 2004. *Greek Warfare. Myths and Realities*. London.
- Van Wees, H. 2013. *Ships and Silver, Taxes and Tribute. A Fiscal History of Archaic Athens*. London.
- Vernant, J.P. 1996. Cleisthenes's models. In *Cleisthenes the Athenian: an Essay on the Representation of Space and Time in Greek Political Thought From the End of the Sixth Century to the Death of Plato*, eds. Pierre Lévêque and Pierre Vidal-Naquet, 44–51. New Jersey.
- Wade-Gery, H.T. 1958. *Essays in Greek History*. Oxford.
- Walter, U. 1993. *An der Polis teilhaben. Bürgerstaat und Zugehörigkeit im archaischen Griechenland*. Historia Einzelschriften 82. Stuttgart.
- Welwei, K.-W. 1967. Der *diapsephismos* nach dem Sturz der Peisistratiden. *Gymnasium* 74: 423–437.
- Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca.250 BC: A Political and Social Study*. Princeton.