

HYPERESIA IN NAVAL CONTEXTS IN THE FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURIES BC

L. J. D. Richardson's article *ΥΠΗΡΕΤΗΣ*, CQ xxxvii (1943) 55–61, asserted the manifest truth that the word *hyperetes*, for which 'an unattested original meaning "under-rower" has been universally assumed, had ceased to be used literally by the time our records, literary and epigraphic, begin'. 'When *ὑπηρέτης* and its derivative *ὑπηρετέω* first appear (in Herodotus *saepe*), both the particular transferred sense "servant" and the generally transferred sense "subordinate" were already well established to the exclusion of the original meaning (whatever it was), and, what is more, the metaphor from the seafaring usage seems to be already "dead". The essential note, however, in the group of words (*ὑπηρέτης*, *ὑπηρετέω*, *ὑπηρεσία*, *ὑπηρετικός*) is not hard to assess: it is *implicit, unquestioning service in response to another's authoritative bidding*.' The truth of this assessment for the fourth as well as the fifth century is plain from an examination of the very frequent use of the word in, e.g., Plato. Richardson proceeded to point out 'a source of confusion in the dictionaries' (which still prevails), *viz.*, that of the four chief members of the group of words mentioned, *hyperesia* alone, having become 'figurative (as service) in all areas, was then reapplied in the naval domain', as a name for part of the ship's company of the fifth- and fourth-century trireme. This pattern (of reapplication in a naval context) is in fact also true of *hyperesion* and *hyperetikos*. The former is the name given by Thucydides and Isocrates to the oarsman's cushion, called *proskephalaion* by Hermippus and Theophrastus,¹ while the latter is used of a naval dispatch boat.²

Richardson's guess at the pre-literary, unattested, original meaning of *hyperetes*—'a member of an organised team of oarsmen'—is hardly satisfactory. Another guess is perhaps worth making, that the meaning is shown by the position of an oarsman in an oared ship below the captain and steersman who are seated in the high stern. As Aegisthus says to the chorus in *Agamemnon*: 'you say this seated at the oar below, while those on the *zugon* are in command of the ship'.³

An important conclusion of Richardson's article is that the meaning given first by LSJ for *hyperesia*—'body of rowers', 'ship's crew'—does not arise from the texts there quoted in support. Recently this meaning has been adopted by B. Jordan, who argues that *hyperesia* is the name for a body of slave oarsmen in the Athenian fleet (as opposed to *nautai* who are the citizen oarsmen). N. G. L. Hammond, still more recently, in 'The Narrative of Herodotus and the Decree of Themistocles at Troezen', *JHS* cii (1982) 75–93 interprets *hyperesiai* in the decree as 'oarsmen collectively' and 'oarsmen groups'.⁴ He regards them as distinct from the other oarsmen, not as slaves (like Jordan) but as coming from 'a pool of trained oarsmen' and thus as differing from the untrained oarsmen who were, he says, drafted into the fleet in 481. Accepting, as we should, Richardson's premise that the original connexion with rowing had disappeared from the meaning of the word *hyperesia* in the fifth and fourth centuries, and that it had been reapplied in the sense of 'a body of assistants' in naval contexts, the problem is to establish in what sense this assistance was given, and by whom and to whom, if the word in these contexts is to be properly understood. It is of course perfectly possible that the mode of assistance in the word's naval reapplication could have been associated with pulling an oar (as in the case of *hyperesion*),

¹ Thuc. ii 93.2; Isoc. viii 48; Hermippus *fr.* 34; Thphr. *Char.* ii 11.

² X. *HG* i 6.36 *ὑπηρετικός κέλης*, Ps.-Dem. li 46 *ὑπηρετικόν*, D.S. xviii 95.3–4 *ὑπηρετικοί*: this is the dispatch boat of the *hyperetes*, the general's ADC.

³ A. *Ag.* 1617–18; *cf.* the stern platform, the *selma*, where the gods sit *ibid.* 182–3. See J.S. Morrison and

R.T. Williams, *Greek Oared Ships* (Cambridge 1968) 48, 196–7 (henceforward GOS).

⁴ B. Jordan in his valuable book *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period*, U. Calif. Class. Stud. xiii (1975); N.G.L. Hammond, 'The Narrative of Herodotus and the Decree of Themistocles of Troezen', *JHS* cii (1982) 75–93 (see n. 54 for his reasons).

but this association must be demonstrated from the naval contexts in which the word is found. It derives no support in Greek literature and inscriptions from the original derivation of the word.

The question which I propose to examine, in view of the interpretations of Jordan and Hammond, is then this: do the naval contexts of *hyperesia* in fifth- and fourth-century literature and inscriptions suggest the meaning ‘slave oarsmen’, ‘oarsmen groups’ or ‘oarsmen collectively’, and if not what do they suggest? The decree of Themistocles will be considered last, out of chronological order, as the context most difficult and controversial in interpretation. The suggestions of the much later scholiasts and lexicographers can safely be ignored, but some later literary contexts of the word will be noted in Appendix 2.

I

(i) Thuc. i 143.1: Pericles’ speech to the Assembly about Athenian resources in the event of the outbreak of war with Sparta (432 BC).

εἴ τε καὶ κινήσαντες τῶν Ὀλυμπίασιν ἢ Δελφοῖς χρημάτων μισθῶ μείζονι πειρῶντο ἡμῶν ὑπολαβεῖν τοὺς ξένους τῶν ναυτῶν, μὴ ὄντων μὲν ἡμῶν ἀντιπάλων ἐσβάντων αὐτῶν τε καὶ τῶν μετοίκων δεινὸν ἂν ἦν· νῦν δὲ τόδε τε ὑπάρχει, καί, ὅπερ κράτιστον, κυβερνήτας ἔχομεν πολίτας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ὑπηρεσίαν πλείους καὶ ἀμείνους ἢ ἅπανα ἢ ἄλλη Ἑλλάς.

Again if they go so far as to remove money at Olympia or Delphi and try to lure away the foreigners among our *nautai* with greater offers of pay, while we Athenians and metics should not be able to make up the losses by going aboard our ships, it would be a serious matter. But we both have that capability in fact and, what adds most to our strength, we possess citizen helmsmen and the rest of the *hyperesia* [or ‘the *hyperesia* as well’], more in number and better in quality than all the rest of Greece.

In this passage *nautai* are distinguished from ‘helmsmen and the rest of the *hyperesia*’ (or ‘the *hyperesia* as well’); and both the latter are said to be the strongest asset they have. It is to be noted that when war broke out Samian exiles at Anaea sent helmsmen to Sparta, and that in the fourth century Athens supplied *hyperesiai* to Conon’s Persian squadron, and later to Syracuse and the Bosporan kingdom.⁵ It fits Pericles’ argument that both ‘citizen’ and ‘more in number and better in quality etc.’ should be taken as applying both to ‘helmsmen’ and to ‘*hyperesia*’. He says that the Peloponnesians cannot diminish Athenian naval power by the use of ill-gotten money. The Athenians and metics can fill the places of defecting foreign *nautai*. The helmsmen and *hyperesia* are Athenian citizens (and so will not defect) and we have plenty of good ones (and so we need not recruit in the open market where the enemy might outbid us). It seems unlikely that the phrases τὴν ἄλλην ὑπηρεσίαν and ἢ ἄλλη Ἑλλάς should use ἄλλος in different senses so closely together. Since then the latter means ‘the rest of Greece’, it is likely that the former means ‘the rest of the *hyperesia*’, and that the helmsmen are included in the *hyperesia*. It is notable that the *epibatai* are not mentioned.⁶

The only firm conclusion to be drawn from (i) is that in a trireme the helmsman and the *hyperesia* are associated and are distinct from the *nautai*. The helmsman probably belongs to the *hyperesia*.

(ii) Thuc. vi 31.3: the dispatch of the Sicilian expedition from Piraeus in 415 BC. Cf. IG i³ 93, 22 and 33; ML 78 c 13 and a 9.

τὸ μὲν ναυτικὸν μεγάλας δαπάναις τῶν τε τριηράρχων καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἐκπονηθέν, τοῦ μὲν δημοσίου δραχμὴν τῆς ἡμέρας τῷ ναύτῃ ἐκάστῳ διδόντος καὶ ναῦς παρασχόντος κενὰς ἐξήκοντα μὲν ταχείας, τεσσαράκοντα δὲ ὀπλιταγωγούς καὶ ὑπηρεσίας ταύταις

⁵ Thuc. iv 75.1; *HellOxy* 2 1; Isoc. iv 142; IG ii² 212.

⁶ Neither are the *toxotai*: see (ii) and (vi).

τὰς κρατίστας, τῶν <δὲ> τριηράρχων ἐπιφοράς τε πρὸς τῷ ἐκ δημοσίου μισθῷ διδόντων τοῖς θρανίταις τῶν ναυτῶν καὶ ταῖς ὑπηρεσίαις καὶ τὰλλα σημεῖοις καὶ κατασκευαῖς πολυτελεσί χρησαμένων, καὶ ἐς τὰ μακρότατα προθυμηθέντος ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ὅπως αὐτῷ τινὶ εὐπρεπεία τε ἢ ναῦς μάλιστα προέξει καὶ τῷ ταχυναυτεῖν.

The fleet was elaborately fitted out at great expense to the trierarchs and to the city. The public treasury gave a drachma a day to each *nautes* and provided empty hulls,⁷ sixty fast ships and forty troop-transports,⁸ and the strongest *hyperesiai* for these. The trierarchs gave bonuses in addition to the public pay to the *thranitai*⁹ among the *nautai* and to the *hyperesiai*, and in other ways fitted emblems¹⁰ and expensive equipment. Each trierarch did his utmost to ensure that his ship should excel both in appearance and in speed.

Since Thucydides says that the treasury provided pay for all the *nautai* and that the trierarchs gave bonuses to ‘the *thranitai* among the *nautai*’ (and not therefore to the other two classes which together with the *thranitai* made up the total of the oarsmen) and to the *hyperesiai*, it is a necessary implication that the *hyperesiai* are not oarsmen. It also seems likely that he is using the general word *nautes* to mean oarsman as distinct from *hyperesia*. It is to be noticed that there is no mention of the *kybernetes*, from which it must be inferred—as (i) suggested—that he is to be included in the *hyperesia*, since he is not a *nautes* (Pl. *Repub.* 341c) and there is no other category for him. There is again no mention of the regular *toxotai* and *epibatai*, who may, again, be included in the *hyperesia*.

Together with the *thranitai* the *hyperesiai* are given bonuses. Aristophanes¹¹ singles out the *thranitai* as ‘the saviours of the city’, and in (i) above Pericles is reported as saying that the possession of citizen *kybernetai* and *hyperesiai* ‘adds most to our strength’. It seems most unlikely that the *thranitai* should be singled out from the oarsmen as specially important, and then another group, the *hyperesiai*, be treated as equally to be rewarded if they too were oarsmen. As against Jordan, it seems very unlikely that the *hyperesiai* should receive pay from the treasury, and, what is more, bonuses from the trierarchs if they were, as he claims,¹² public slaves. Ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.* i 11 has been claimed as showing that slaves worked for pay in the fleet (their pay going to their masters), although that meaning is by no means certain. But these would be private not public slaves, and if the bonuses were an incentive this end would hardly be achieved if the bonuses went to their masters.

The conclusions to be drawn from this passage seem to be the following:

(1) that the *hyperesia* on a trireme was not a group of oarsmen (so *HCT*, Gomme on i 143.1 and Dover on vi 31.3);

(2) that it was a group which included the helmsman, possibly also the *toxotai* and *epibatai* in this passage;

(3) that the members of this group were not slaves.

(iii) Thuc. viii 1.2: the Athenian dismay in 412 BC at the news of the total loss of the Sicilian expedition.

ἄμα δὲ ναῦς οὐχ ὀρώντες ἐν τοῖς νεωσοίκοις ἱκανὰς οὐδὲ χρήματα ἐν τῷ κοινῷ οὐδ’ ὑπηρεσίας ταῖς ναυσὶν ἀνέλπιστοι ἦσαν ἐν τῷ παρόντι σωθήσεσθαι. . . .

Seeing at the same time insufficient ships in the ship-sheds, money in the treasury or *hyperesiai* for the ships, they were for the moment without hope of salvation.

If what Pericles says in (i) above is true, that the most important thing for seapower is to possess citizen helmsmen and ‘the rest of the *hyperesia*’, the lack of the latter (including, in this passage, not only helmsmen but *toxotai* and *epibatai* probably as well) following the defeat of the

⁷ ‘Empty’ because the provision of gear was the responsibility of the trierarch.

⁸ See GOS 246–8.

⁹ See GOS 269–71.

¹⁰ See GOS 133–4, 197.

¹¹ *Acharnians* 162–3.

¹² Jordan (n. 4). 240–64.

Sicilian expedition would indeed, together with the lack of ships and money, have dismayed the Athenians.

(iv) Lysias xxi 10: the speaker relates that at Aegospotami he brought away his own ship and rescued another (403–402 BC).

καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἀπὸ τύχης ἐγίγνετο ἀλλ' ἀπὸ παρασκευῆς τῆς ἐμῆς· εἶχον γὰρ χρήμασι πείσας κυβερνήτην Φαντίαν ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον ὃς ἐδόκει τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄριστος εἶναι. παρεσκευασάμην δὲ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα πρὸς ἐκείνον καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ὑπηρεσίαν ἀκόλουθον.

And this happened not by chance but by my own deliberate provision, since by financial inducement I employed Phantias for the whole period. Phantias had the reputation of being the best helmsman in Greece. And I also provided a *pleroma* up to his standard and the rest of the *hyperesia* to match.

The first point to be noticed is that here after mention of the helmsman the phrase τὴν ἄλλην ὑπηρεσίαν is used, as in (i), as opposed to simple *hyperesia* when the helmsman is not mentioned, as in (ii) and (iii). The inference again is that the helmsman is included in the *hyperesia*. In the second place, *pleroma* is distinguished from the helmsman and the rest of the *hyperesia*, and appears, like *nautai* in (i) and (ii), to mean the oarsmen.

(v) The same usage appears in a sentence of the letter which Nicias sends from the Athenian camp before Syracuse in Thuc. vii 14.1:

ἐπισταμένοις δ' ὑμῖν γράφω ὅτι βραχεῖα ἀκμὴ πληρώματος καὶ ὀλίγοι τῶν ναυτῶν οἱ ἐξορμῶντές τε ναῦν καὶ ξυνέχοντες τὴν εἵρεσίαν.

You to whom I write know that the peak of an (oar-)crew's efficiency is brief [or 'that the cream of an (oar-)crew is small': cf. Thuc. viii 46 where there is the same ambiguity], and that few are the *nautai* who get a ship off the mark and keep up the rate of striking.

Whichever of the two alternative interpretations is preferred (i.e. whether Nicias is making two separate points or the same one, first in general terms and then more particularly) *pleroma* seems to mean the oarsmen, as in (iv).

(vi) In Dem. *On the Trierarchic Crown* (361–357 BC) the verb *plerousthai* is used in a similarly restricted sense to refer to the recruitment of oarsmen for a trireme: li 5–6

καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἂν ἐκείνῳ γ' ἔχοιεν εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἀνεπειρῶντ' ἐμοῦ πρότεροι· πρὶν γὰρ ἦφθαι μόνον τῆς τριήρους τούτους ἐπεπλήρωτό μοι, καὶ πάντες ἐωρᾶθ' ὑμεῖς ἀναπειρωμένην τὴν ναῦν. ἔτι τοίνυν ὑπηρεσίαν τὴν κρατίστην ἔλαβον, πολλῶ πλείστον ἀργύριον δούς.

Nor would they be able to make this allegation, that they gave their ship its trials before I gave mine; for before they had so much as laid hands on their ship I had manned mine, and you all saw it undergoing trials. Furthermore¹³ I engaged the strongest *hyperesia*, offering more money than anyone else.

In this passage 'manning' refers to oarsmen as distinct from the *hyperesia*. Since here too there is no mention of *epibatai* they may be included in *hyperesia*.

(vii) Ps.-Dem. 1 *Against Polycles* 7 (Apollodorus is speaking):

ἐγὼ δ' ἐπειδὴ μοι οὐκ ἦλθον οἱ ναῦται οἱ καταλεγέντες ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν, ἀλλ' ἢ ὀλίγοι καὶ οὗτοι ἀδύνατοι, τούτους μὲν ἀφήκα, ὑποθεῖς δὲ τὴν οὐσίαν τὴν ἐμαντοῦ καὶ δανεισάμενος ἀργύριον πρῶτος ἐπληρωσάμην τὴν ναῦν, μισθωσάμενος ναύτας ὡς οἶόν τ' ἦν ἀρίστους, δωρεὰς καὶ προδόσεις δούς ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν μεγάλας. ἔτι δὲ σκεύεσιν ἰδίοις τὴν ναῦν ἅσασι κατεσκεύασα, καὶ τῶν δημοσίων ἔλαβον οὐδέν, καὶ κόσμῳ ὡς οἶόν

¹³ See Denniston, *Greek Particles* 574–6 II (1) and (2) or introducing 'a further item in a series' for τοίνυν marking 'a fresh step in the thought or action'

τ' ἦν κάλλιστα καὶ διαπρεπέστατα τῶν τριηράρχων. ὑπηρεσίαν τοίνυν ἦν ἐδυνάμην κρατίστην ἐμισθωσάμην.

When the only *nautai* forthcoming on the demesmen's lists were few and these incompetent, I dismissed them and, by mortgaging my own property and borrowing money, I first manned the ship hiring the best *nautai* I could get, giving big bonuses and advance-payments. Next I equipped the ship throughout with my own gear. Furthermore, I hired the strongest *hyperesia* I could get.

In this passage again there is no mention of the *epibatai*, but *ibid.* 10, where he speaks of the monthly payments to the ship's company, he specifies the *hyperesia*, the *epibatai* and the *nautai*. So it looks as if earlier the *epibatai* had been included in the *hyperesia*. 15–16 shows that these *nautai* were oarsmen (for whose recruitment the word *plerousthai* is used):

ὄσω γὰρ φιλοτιμούμενος ἄμεινον ἐπληρωσάμην τὴν ναῦν ἐρετῶν ἀγαθῶν, τοσοῦτῳ μοι πλείστη ἀπόλειψις ἐγένετο τῶν ἄλλων τριηράρχων. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοις, εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο, οἷ γε ἐκ καταλόγου ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν ναῦν παρέμενον τηροῦντες τὴν οἶκαδε σωτηρίαν, ὅποτε αὐτοὺς ἀφήσει ὁ στρατηγός· οἱ δ' ἐμοὶ ναῦται πιστεύοντες αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῷ δύνασθαι ἐλαύνειν, ὅπου ἔμελλον ἀργύριον πάλιν πλείστον λήψεσθαι, ἐνταῦθ' ἀπῆσαν.

For the more successful I was, because of my ambition to excel, in manning the ship with good oarsmen, the greater was the number of desertions I had, exceeding the other trierarchs. . . . My *nautai*, confident in themselves because of their skill in pulling an oar, deserted in the place where they expected to be re-engaged at the highest pay.

The replacements which were hired at Lampsacus and elsewhere to take the places of the deserting oarsmen are called *nautai* (18, 19, 23). They were probably non-Athenian. The position is summed up at 25:

καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῷ διεξιὼν τοὺς τε μισθοὺς τοὺς τῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ καὶ τοῖς ἐπιβάταις κατὰ μῆνα διδομένους, τοῖς τε ναύταις οὓς αὐτὸς ἐκ τῆς Λαμψάκου ἐμισθώσατο, καὶ τοῖς ὕστερον ἐπεμβάσιν ἀντὶ τῶν ἀπολιπόντων, ἔτι δὲ ὁ τῶν ἀρχαίων ναυτῶν ἐκάστῳ προσέθηκα δεηθέντι. . . .

Going over with him [Polycles] in detail the pay which was given to the *hyperesia* and the *epibatai* monthly, and [or 'both'] to the *nautai* which he [the *pentekontarchos* Euctemon] himself hired from Lampsacus and to those who joined the ship later as replacements for the deserters, and in addition what I added to the pay of each of the original *nautai* at his request. . . .

At 29 Apollodorus speaks of his meeting with Polycles (his successor in the trierarchy) in Thasos in the fourth month after his trierarchy had expired:

παραλαβὼν ἐγὼ μάρτυρας τῶν τε πολιτῶν ὡς ἐδυνάμην πλείστους καὶ τοὺς ἐπιβάτας καὶ τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν προσέρχομαι αὐτῷ ἐν Θάσῳ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. . . . λογίσασθαι δ' ἤθελον αὐτῷ καθ' ἕκαστον, ἕως μοι μάρτυρες παρήσαν τῶν ἀνηλωμένων οἷ τε ναῦται καὶ οἱ ἐπιβάται καὶ ἡ ὑπηρεσία.

Taking with me as many witnesses as I could who were Athenian citizens and the *epibatai* and the *hyperesia* I approached him in Thasos in the market-place. . . . I wished to reckon with him in detail, while I had witnesses present of the expenditures, the *nautai* and the *epibatai* and the *hyperesia*.

In this passage the third class of those who are Athenian citizens, beside the *epibatai* and *hyperesia*, is first described as 'those who are Athenian citizens' and then as *nautai*, i.e. some of the *nautai* were Athenian citizens and some, as we should expect, were not, whereas all the *epibatai* (naturally) and the *hyperesia*—*cf.* (i)—were.

In the remainder of the speech *Against Polycles* there are five occasions when the three components of the ship's company are mentioned:

32: the *nautai* and the *epibatai* and the *hyperesia*

35: *pleroma* . . . *epibatai* . . . *hyperesia*

36: *nautai* . . . *epibatai* . . . *hyperesia* (twice)

44: 'and he (Polycles) knew that when he took over the ship he was going to have a bad trierarchy since neither the *trierarchema* nor the *epibatai* and *hyperesia* would be at his disposal since no one would stay in his service'.

The two variations, in 35 *pleroma* = *nautai* = oarsmen and in 44 *trierarchema* for *nautai*, are to be noticed. The latter is unique.

At 53 Apollodorus says: 'When he [the general Timomachus] had no longer need of triremes . . . he told me to sail home. Then when we were on the homeward voyage at Tenedos, and Lucinus whom Timomachus had ordered to do so was not giving the *nautai* ration money . . . and the *stratiotai* had no money to buy rations, but without rations they would have been unable to pull an oar, . . . again I took witnesses of the Athenian and approaching the defendant Polycles in Tenedos. . . .'

The variation of *stratiotai* for *nautai* (= oarsmen) is certain here and probably occurs earlier at 23. It is to be found in Thucydides (ii 88.1–3, vii 61 *nautai* and hoplites, viii 95.4) and Isocrates (iv 142).

Conclusions from the usage of naval terms in the speeches *On the Trierarchic Crown* and *Against Polycles* are as follows:

(1) The noun *pleroma* and the verb *pleroun*, *plerousthai*, which like the adjective *pleres* is used generally for the manning of ships (see LSJ), in these speeches are used more restrictively to refer to the ship's complement of oarsmen. These oarsmen are more usually called *nautai*, on one, possibly two, occasions *stratiotai*, both terms which again have a more general meaning.

(2) Distinguished from the oarsmen are two further components, the *epibatai* and the *hyperesia*, although in both speeches there is an occasion when it seems possible that the *epibatai* are included in the *hyperesia*.

(3) Since the *kybernetes* is never separately mentioned in the references to the ship's company, he must be included in the *hyperesia* since he is not an *epibates* nor is he a *nautes*: see (ii). The absence of mention of the *kybernetes* in these speeches is matched by the absence of the phrase ἡ ἄλλη ὑπηρεσία: see above (i) and (iv).¹⁴

(viii) *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* 2 1:

ἀπέπεμπον μὲν γὰρ ὄπλα τε καὶ ὑπηρεσίας ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς μετὰ τοῦ Κ[όνωνος]. . . .

For they (the many and the democrats) were sending out arms and *hyperesiai* for the ships with Conon.

These were the ships which Conon had succeeded in bringing away from Aegospotami and which were at this time in the SE Aegean in the service of the Persian king. The sending of *hyperesiai* to him is also mentioned by Isocrates (iv 142: *χρώμενος ταῖς ὑπηρεσίαις ταῖς παρ' ἡμῶν*). *Hopla* here may stand for *hoplitai*, i.e. *epibatai* (see LSJ s.v. 4).

Ibid. 15 1: The passage describes an incident when Conon was seeking financial support for his ships from the Persians. Tithraustes sends Persian officers to the ships at Caunus with 220 talents of his own money to pay the *stratiotai*, a term which as has been seen is likely at any rate to include the oarsmen. Some Cyprians under Conon's command are told by agitators that the Persian officers 'were not going to give the pay that was owing, but were paying off the *hyperesiai* and *epibatai* only', i.e. presumably the skilled men and hoplites sent out from Athens to ships manned by Cyprian oarsmen. The Cyprians mutiny.

There is here a clear distinction, as in the speech *Against Polycles*, between *hyperesiai* and *epibatai* on the one hand and a third category which is likely to consist of oarsmen.

(ix) Plato *Seventh Letter* 350 a: Plato is describing his experiences, late in 361 BC, on his third visit to Sicily.

¹⁴ For later contexts see Appendix 2.

ῶκουν δὴ τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ἔξω τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἐν τοῖς μισθοφόροις· προσιόντες δέ μοι ἄλλοι τε καὶ οἱ τῶν ὑπηρεσιῶν ὄντες Ἀθήνηθεν, ἐμοὶ πολῖται, ἀπήγγελλον ὅτι διαβεβλημένος εἶην ἐν τοῖς πελτασταῖς. . . .

After this I was living outside the acropolis among the mercenaries. Amongst others, some of the *hyperesiai* who were from Athens, my fellow-citizens, reported that the peltasts were speaking ill of me.

This passage is evidence that (1) in the mid-fourth century, as one might have expected, there were members of naval *hyperesiai* from Athens serving abroad as mercenaries; and (2) that they were Athenian citizens: cf. (i) and conclusion (2) of (iv).

(x) IG ii² 212 of 346 BC = Tod ii no. 167.60–5. This inscription attests that Spartocus II and Paerisades I, joint rulers of the Bosporan kingdom, applied to Athens in 346 BC for permission to recruit mercenary *hyperesiai* in Athens. The Council decrees among other things:

Δοῦναι δ[ὲ τὰ]ς ὑπη[ρεσί]-
α]ς, ἃς αἰτοῦσι Σπάρτοκος καὶ Παιρισ[άδης τ]-
οῦ]ς δὲ πρ[έ]σβεις ἀπογράψαι τὰ ὄνόμα[τα τῶν]
ὑπ]ηρεσιῶν ὧν ἂν λάβωσιν τῶι γραμμα[τεῖ τῆ]-
ς β]ουλῆς· οὓς δ' ἂν ἀπογράψωσιν εἶνα[ι ἐν τῶι]
τ[ε]ταγμένωι ποιοῦντας ἀγαθὸν ὅ τι [ἂν δύνω]-
νται τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς Λεύκωνος.

To grant the *hyperesiai* which Spartocus and Pairisades request, and that the ambassadors [of the kings] should make a list of the names of the *hyperesiai* which they take for the Secretary of the Council; and that whoever they shall list shall be under obligation to serve the sons of Leucon [the two kings] to the best of their ability.

In view of the interpretation of (i), (vii) and (ix) above it is perhaps not necessary to argue further against the contention that the *hyperesiai* were public slaves. In connexion with this inscription Jordan argues¹⁵ that the state could not 'give' the *hyperesiai* unless they were public property nor could the ambassadors 'take' them. The last sentence shows that what is being transferred to the kings is the duty (presumably legal) for the *hyperesiai* to serve in the Athenian fleet if required. Further, if they were public property assigned as chattels to the kings rather than recruited as mercenaries by the ambassadors, it is difficult to believe that the state would not have had a list of those assigned. There would be no reason for the ambassadors to return a list unless the recruitment was a matter of negotiation between free individuals and the representatives of the kings. In the latter case the state would want to know who had gone in case they had to be recalled in an emergency.

The list of passages (i)–(x) above is, I believe, apart from the 'Decree of Themistocles', exhaustive for the usage of the word in fifth- and fourth-century literature and inscriptions. Conclusions may be drawn as follows:

(1) In a ship's company the *hyperesia* is a component distinct from the *nautai* and in some of the later passages from the *epibatai*. *Nautai*, a general term for seamen, seems to have a restricted sense of oarsmen, when these are distinguished from the other two components. The general word *stratiotai* is also used in a restricted sense for oarsmen, once for oarsmen and *epibatai*.¹⁶

¹⁵ Jordan (n. 4) 257–8.

¹⁶ A passage in the description of Ptolemy Philopator's *tessarakonteres* quoted by Athenaeus from Callixenus (late 3rd century BC) may be noticed here. (v 37, 204b) When the ship underwent its trials it took on board: ἐρέτας πλείους τῶν τετρακισχιλίων, εἰς δὲ τὰς ὑπηρεσίας τετρακοσίους, εἰς δὲ τὸ κατάστρωμα ἐπιβάτας τρισχιλίους ἀποδέοντας ἑκατὸν καὶ

πεντήκοντα. Cf. Plut. *Demetr.* 43 where in the description of the same ship, probably also derived from Callixenus, instead of *hyperesia* Plutarch uses the phrase ναῦταις . . . χωρὶς ἐρετῶν τετρακοσίοις and these *nautai* and *eretai* are distinguished from *hoplitai* carried on deck, i.e. *epibatai*. It may be noticed also that in Plb. i 63.3 *pleroma* is used for the oarsmen of a warship as distinct from the *epibatai*.

(2) *Hyperesiai* in Athenian ships seem to have been made up of Athenian citizens, and Athenian citizens took service as mercenaries in the *hyperesiai* of foreign fleets in the fourth century. The service of Athenian hoplites (as *epibatai*) in Conon's squadron is perhaps hardly to be regarded as foreign.

(3) The name *hyperesia*, meaning a body of assistants, is suitable for the group of 'specialists' listed in Ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.* i 2, viz *kybernetai*, *keleustai*, *pentekontarchai*, *proratai*, *naupēgoi*. Together with 'the *demos* who pull oars in the ships' they are those who give the city its power. There is a similar list in *IG* ii² 1951. 94–105 which adds the *auletes*.¹⁷ But the inference that can be drawn from the passages about its composition relates only to the *kybernetes*. On the other hand, if the *kybernetes* belonged to it there is a strong likelihood that the others did too. It has been seen that in some passages the *epibatai* seem to be included in it. There is a negative conclusion that in none of the passages cited is there a suggestion of any connexion with pulling an oar, nor in any of the uses of *hyperesia*, *hyperetes* or *hyperetein* in any other contexts in the literature or inscriptions of the period. The only word of this derivation showing a connexion with rowing, the cushion spoken of by Thucydides and Isocrates, can hardly be regarded as sufficient grounds for asserting that *hyperesia* means an 'oarsman group'.

(4) There is no suggestion in any of the contexts that the *hyperesia* in Athenian ships of the period was composed of slaves, public or private, and some evidence to the contrary.

II

The ship's company of a trireme of this period is likely to have been two hundred men, excluding the trierarch, although no doubt this is a round figure. In Herodotus (iii 13.1–2) the Mytilenaeon ship with a company of two hundred in the invasion of Egypt in 525 can hardly be other than a trireme, since no other type in service at the time would have had so large a crew. Elsewhere in Herodotus (vii 184.1) the number of men given for the 1207 Persian ships in the invasion of 480 is 241,400, i.e. 1207×200 , excluding the extra *epibatai* on each ship. And Cleinias (vii 17) joins the Greek fleet at Eurymedon (466 BC) with his own ship and a crew of two hundred men. Later in the fifth century (Thuc. vi 8.1, viii 29.1) ship's pay seems to be calculated on the basis of a crew of two hundred. And in Demosthenes (iv 28: 351 BC) the pay of the crews of fast triremes (20 minas a month at 2 obols a day) is similarly calculated.¹⁸

In the Athenian naval lists the number of oars in the different categories, thranite, zygian and thalamian, is regularly given as 62, 54, 54 with thirty spares.¹⁹ These numbers certainly represent the number of oarsmen regularly in each class, making a total of 170 oarsmen in all. The remaining thirty men must have been the *hyperesia* and (or including) the *epibatai*. The latter are hoplite citizens regularly ten in number (see Appendix 1: Thuc. ii 23.2 [431 BC: 1000 hoplites and 400 archers on 100 ships]; iii 95.2 [428 BC: 300 marines from 30 ships, cf. 91.1], cf. ii 66.1–2; Xen. *HG* iv 8.28 [390 BC]; *IG* ii² 1951. 79–82) carried as a normal part of the ship's company. When the ship was a troop-carrier (*hoplitagōgos*, *stratiotis*) it did of course carry many more fighting men, but 'fast' triremes appear to have carried *epibatai* only, and ships carrying troops put them (but not the *epibatai*) ashore before a battle (D.S. xiii 49 Cyzicus, and 77–9 Mytilene; the text in the latter passage has been wrongly emended, *ἐμβιβάσας* for *ἐκβιβάσας*). There remain twenty²⁰ places to be accounted for.

If the list in *IG* ii² 1951 is followed there were in addition to the oarsmen and *epibatai* also archers (two or three) and the six specialists including the helmsman. The Decree of Themistocles and Plutarch's account of the fleet at Salamis put the number of archers at four, and this may be taken as the normal upper limit (cf. Thuc. iii 95.2). Skilled men would have been needed to work the ship under sail. A reference to these seems to be provided in Xenophon

¹⁷ See GOS 266–8.

¹⁸ $2 \times 30 \times 200 = 12,000$ obols = 20 minai.

¹⁹ See GOS 272 n. 16.

²⁰ In GOS 256 line 24 'ten' is a mistake for 'twenty'.

Anabasis (v 8.20) where the author describes how ‘in a storm with the seas running high for a mere nod the bow officer gets irritated with “those in the bows” and the helmsman gets irritated with “those in the stern”’. It looks as if these are the assistants to the two officers named. The existence of such bow and stern gangs is confirmed in a later source,²¹ probably relating to a *tetreres* of the Rhodian navy. The number of men recorded in each gang is there recorded as five.

The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence cited above is as follows: *hyperesia* in naval contexts is a collective term for the thirty assistants to the trierarch over and above the oar-crew. These consisted of (i) six specialist ‘petty officers’ (see p. 55 (3) above: the helmsman, *keleustes*, *pentekontarchos*, bow officer, ship’s carpenter, pipeman); (ii) two gangs of five seamen each at the disposal of the helmsman and bow officer; (iii) ten *epibatai* on the deck; (iv) four archers in the stern (n. 23).

III

Hammond argues that the occasion for the Decree is that described in Hdt. vii 143.3, when in the debate following the response of the Delphic oracle in September 481 the Athenians decided on evacuation of Attica and ‘to receive with their full forces on their warships the impending invasion of Greece by the barbarians in obedience to the god, together with any Greeks who were willing’. His argument is convincing. The fleet would then have been manned and in commission almost a year before the Persians actually arrived at Artemisium.²²

If the conclusions of I and II above are adopted, the description of the manning of the fleet in the Decree of Themistocles can be explained as follows (I use the text provided by Hammond):

The trierarchs. 18–23: the generals are to appoint as from the following day two hundred suitably qualified trierarchs, one for each ship, and to assign the ships to them by lot.

Epibatai and toxotai. 23–6: They (the generals) are to mobilise (*καταλέξαι*) the *epibatai* for each ship . . . and four archers.

Hyperesiai. 26–27: They (the generals) are to assign by lot also (i.e. as well as the trierarchs) the *hyperesiai* to the ships at such time as they allocate the trierarchs by lot.

[*Nautai*]. 27–31: The generals are to write up on the white boards also (i.e. as well as writing up the trierarchs and *hyperesiai*) the [*nautai*] by ship, the Athenians from the deme-registers and the foreigners from the lists of the polemarchs.

It is unfortunate that the word for the fourth component is not preserved. But there can be little doubt that the word must be *nautai* in conformity with the usual classification. There is one difference between the classification here and the naval contexts considered in I. Here the *toxotai* are mentioned whereas there they were not, although they certainly must have been present. It seems then that the *toxotai* always, as the *epibatai* occasionally, were regarded as part of the

²¹ See Mario Segre, ‘Dedica votiva dell’ equipaggio di una nave rodia’, *Clara Rhodos* viii (1936) 225–44. The inscription dates from the Mithridatic war. The mess-mates of Alexidamas, a *proreus*, are listed as a *kybernetes*, a *nauegos*, a *pedaliouchos* (tiller-man), five men working (*ἐργαζόμενοι*) in the bow and five in the stern, two *katapultaphetai* (catapulters), six *toxotai*, an *elaiochrēistes* (oiler), a *kopodetes* (oar-binder) and twenty *epibatai*, making a total, with the *proreus*, of 45. Since Alexidamas’ last ship was a *tetreres*, it is reasonable to infer that this is a list of the *hyperesia* of a *tetreres*. Its ship’s company would be about 300, $4 \times 64 + 45 = 301$, and the proportion of the *hyperesia* to the ship’s company would then be the same as for a trireme ($30/200 = 45/300$). It is to be noted that one of Alexidamas’ earlier posts was ‘foreman of the *erga*’, i.e. of the *ergazomenoi*. In Maiuri, *Nuova Sylloge* 5 there is a further list: the trierarch’s

clerk, *kybernetes*, *proreus*, *keleustes*, *pentekontarchos*, *nauegos* and *ergazomenoi*. Plutarch (*Praec. reip. ger.* 15–16, 812 b–c) speaks of helmsmen ‘doing some things with their own hands, but sitting apart and turning and twisting other things by other persons and other tools. And they employ *nautai* and *proreis* and *keleustai* and often summoning some of them to the stern they commit the tiller to their charge’ (cf. *pedaliouchos* above). Cf. *ibid.* 807 b where he is speaking of a merchantman.

²² This backdating of the mobilisation of the fleet strengthens the case for the view that the Greek fleet was slower at Artemisium and Salamis because it had been at sea without ‘drying-out’ much longer than the Persian fleet, which had had the opportunity of drying out at Doriscus in the following spring.

hyperesiai as attendants (*paredroi*) of the helmsman.²³ If in the decree the *hyperesiai* include the *epibatai* and *toxotai*, the lack of reference to the allocation of both to the ships at 23–6 is explained, since it is covered by the following sentence.

The posting of the taxeis. 31–38: They (the generals) are to make the posting, distributing (the men) in *taxeis* to the number of two hundred in (two) divisions of a hundred in number and to write at the head of each [*taxis*] the name of the trireme and of the *trierarch* and of (each member of) the *hyperesia*, so that they (i.e. the men whose names are posted) may know onto which trireme each *taxis* is to embark. Line 36 suggests that the oar-crews also were allocated to the triremes by lot.

It is to be noted that the *epibatai* and *toxotai* are not here mentioned, and are therefore, again, to be regarded as included in the *hyperesia*.

Since there are two hundred *taxeis* (and 200 ships, line 14, and 200 trierarchs, 18–23) it seems certain that the *taxis* is at least the body of *nautai* and at most the whole ship's company. Since in lines 31–8 the posting of the whole ship's company is described, *taxeis* there would seem to have this latter meaning.²⁴

The most natural interpretation of the phrase 'in (two) divisions of a hundred' is to take it as referring to the division of the fleet into two squadrons of a hundred ships each, one for service in home waters, and the other for dispatch to Euboean Artemisium (lines 41–4), a hundred *taxeis* being assigned to the ships of each squadron. There is a possible, but not I think probable, alternative interpretation. If it is accepted that the word *hyperesia* here covers not only *toxotai*, as is usual, but *epibatai* as well, and *taxis* means the ship's company, the *taxis* or the ship's company of two hundred all told could be posted in two lists of a hundred men each, divided according to their provenance either from the deme-registers of Athenian citizens or from the Polemarch's list of foreigners. The purpose of such a method of posting might have been to mix up citizens and metics in at least some ships.

In line 34 there seems no reason not to supply the obvious [τάξε]ι in the gap of four letters.

The application of the conclusions of I and II to the Decree of Themistocles leads to the following explanation of the detailed orders given by the Council to the generals concerning the manning of 'the 200 ships that had been prepared':

The orders relate to (i) suitably qualified trierarchs; (ii) suitably qualified *epibatai*, and *toxotai*, both included in *hyperesiai*; and (iii) oarsmen. They concern two operations in each case, (a) mobilisation and (b) allocation to ships. (Nothing is said about the mobilisation of those members of the *hyperesiai* who were not *epibatai* or *toxotai*. Their mobilisation must have been otherwise provided for.) The trierarchs and the *hyperesiai* are to be allocated simultaneously to their ships by lot. The generals are to post lists of 200 oar-crews, assigning them by lot in ship's companies to the 200 ships in two fleets of 100 ships each (or possibly but not probably with each ship's company of 200 made up of a hundred Athenians and a hundred foreigners). The full ship's company of each trireme is to be posted on the notice boards for guidance in embarkation.

The orders seem very plain and logical. Such points as are obscure for us were probably not obscure to the contemporary reader.

APPENDIX I: THE NUMBER OF MARINES CARRIED NORMALLY ON ATHENIAN TRIREMES IN THE FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURIES

Jordan (*op. cit.* 187) makes the surprising statement: 'that Athenian triremes carried large numbers of

²³ IG i² 930.157. See GOS 260.

²⁴ Cf. A. Pers. 380 τάξις δὲ τάξιν παρεκάλει νεὼς μακρᾶς. The embarkation of the Persian fleet on the evening before Salamis is being described. In GOS 153 I said: 'Aeschylus's phrase suggests different *taxeis* within each ship. He may then be thinking of the different

categories of oarsmen.' I now think I was wrong to put so much weight on Aeschylus's use of the singular νεὼς μακρᾶς. Similar shouted encouragement from ship to ship seems to be described in Arrian's account of a naval engagement at the siege of Tyre (ii 21.9).

marines, particularly in the early part of the fifth century, is flatly affirmed by Thucydides who reports that the two opposing fleets of the Corinthians and Kerkuraians at the battle of the Sybota Islands, in which Athenian triremes also participated, fought in the old way with many hoplites, archers and javelin men engaging the enemy from the decks. In spite of the clear evidence of Thucydides some scholars have argued that even at Salamis the number of marines on board each ship was only ten.²⁵

Jordan appears to be making two separate points. The first is that the old-fashioned way of fighting a sea battle was that which the Athenians practised in the early part of the fifth century, e.g. at Artemisium and Salamis. The method is described in Thucydides' account of the battle of Sybota as follows: 'It was more like a land battle than a sea battle. For when the ships crashed into each other they did not easily get away because of the number and crush of ships and because they trusted for victory more to the hoplites on their decks . . . And there was no opportunity for the *diekplous*.'

The *diekplous*, developed among the Ionian Greeks before the battle of Lade, and the defensive tactic against it practised by the Greek fleet in the skirmish before Artemisium, are the marks of the modern method of sea-fighting with which Thucydides contrasts the old way used by the Corinthians and Corcyraeans at Sybota. Essentially, the new way treated the warship as an offensive weapon in itself, rather than as a platform for fighting hoplites. There is good reason to believe²⁶ that the Greeks at Salamis successfully achieved a *diekplous*. This modern way can be seen to have been practised by Athenian fleets under Phormio in the Peloponnesian war, and it was only when the Athenians in the Great Harbour at Syracuse were forced to fight in the old way,²⁷ putting all their hoplites, javelin men and archers on deck and making a land battle of it, that they gave up the modern way. It seems plain that the Athenians normally in the fifth century did what all the evidence attests²⁸ and put on board their fast triremes only the normal ten *epibatai*. With troop-carriers of course it was another matter. Jordan fails to distinguish between the normal complement of *epibatai* and the troops embarked in *stratiotides* by Tolmides (455 BC: D.S. xi 84), Pericles (D.S. xi 85), and Hagnon (Thuc. ii 56, 58).

The second point which Jordan appears to be making is that since the Athenians 'also participated' in the battle of Sybota what Thucydides says of the old way also applies to them. But it is clear that the passage quoted only applies to the engagement of the Corinthian and Corcyraean fleets. He says: 'the Corinthians and Corcyraeans fought having many hoplites on their decks . . . for they were still equipped rather unscientifically in the ancient fashion. The Attic ships if they saw the Corcyraeans pressed at any point came up and kept the enemy in awe, *but the generals did not begin fighting fearing to disobey the instructions of the Athenians*.' It is clear that Thucydides' description of the old way does not apply to them.

Jordan also cites five other battles to support his contention: Cynossema, Cyzicus, Mytilene, Arginusae and Abydos. In only one of these is any marine fighting described in our accounts and in this (Abydos) there is no indication of unusual numbers. In two (Cyzicus and Mytilene) Diodorus says that the troops carried on the ships were put ashore before the engagement.²⁹

There seems to be no good reason to suppose that the complement of *epibatai* on Athenian triremes in the fifth and fourth centuries exceeded the normal ten.

APPENDIX 2: NAVAL CONTEXTS OF *HYPERESIA* LATER THAN THE FOURTH CENTURY

LSJ cite certain later occurrences of the word *hyperesia* to support the meaning 'body of rowers', 'ship's crew'.

(i) Plb. v 109.1: *χρεία πλοίων ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς κατὰ θάλατταν ὑπηρεσίας*. Philip, in winter quarters, calculated that 'he needed ships for his campaigns and a naval arm' (or 'capability').

(ii) Plb. i 25.3: (*ναῦς*) *εὐ ταῖς ὑπηρεσίαις ἐξηρτυμένη*. The Carthaginians surrounded and destroyed the other Roman ships and they all but captured the general's ship with its crew. But in spite of all it luckily escaped the danger 'equipped as it was with *hyperesiai* and being a fast ship'. There were two reasons for its escape, the *hyperesiai* and its speed. The *hyperesiai* must therefore be not the oarsmen, but defensive equipment, e.g. catapults. *καταπελταφέται* are among the ancillary personnel on Rhodian

²⁵ For the texts on which this conclusion is based see above p. 55.

²⁶ GOS 135-9, 313-19.

²⁷ Thuc. vii 62.1-4.

²⁸ See above n. 25.

²⁹ D.S. xiii 50-1; xiii 77.3. See p. 55 above.

ships in the first century BC.³⁰ A second possibility is that *hyperesiai* = *hyperetika ploia*, i.e. the dispatch boats which usually attended a flagship.

(iii) *Geop.* xviii 9.3 ἡ θριξ (τῶν αἰγῶν) ἀναγκαία εἰς ναυτικὰς ὑπηρεσίας. This very late text can hardly weigh in the argument. Hair screens are mentioned in the naval lists,³¹ but catapults are probably again the naval auxiliary services referred to.

A naval context which LSJ do not cite is the description of the ship's company of Ptolemy Philopator's *tessarakonteres*: see n. 16. There the *hyperesia* is a component of the crew distinguished from the oarsmen (*eretai*). There are also two passages in Arrian not cited by LSJ and concerned with naval matters. The first is the account of Alexander's disbandment of his navy in 334 BC (i 20.1), his idea being 'that since he controlled Asia with his land forces he would have no need any longer of naval power and that by seizing the coastal cities he would break up the Persian navy since they would have nowhere from where to make up their *hyperesiai* and no port in Asia where they could put in'. The second describes Alexander's naval preparations at Babylon in 324 (Arrian cites Aristobulus as his source): he brought up one fleet from the Persian Gulf, had a second transported from Phoenicia, and built a third on the spot, *πληρώματα δὲ εἰς τὰς ναῦς καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὑπηρεσίας πορφυρέων τε πλήθος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσοι ἐργάται τῆς θαλάσσης ἀφίχθαι αὐτῷ ἐκ Φοινικῆς τε καὶ τῆς ἄλλης παραλίας*. 'And as crews for his ships and for the rest of the naval services' (or 'the naval services as well') 'a crowd of purple-fishermen and of other types of seamen had come to him from Phoenicia and the rest of the coastal region.'

In the second of these passages the phrase *τὰς ἄλλας ὑπηρεσίας* presents the usual ambiguity. If it means the rest of the naval services, then *hyperesiai*, unusually, includes *pleromata*, i.e. oarsmen, but it could mean *hyperesiai* as well. There is however a similar phrase in the next sentence 'from both Phoenicia καὶ τῆς ἄλλης παραλίας' and it is difficult to believe that the ambiguity could be resolved in different ways in phrases so close together, so that, since in the latter phrase the meaning must be Phoenicia and the rest of the coastal region, the meaning must be the same in the former. *Hyperesiai* here then must include oarsmen, and it is probable that the case is the same in the earlier passage of Arrian. This is then a late use, quite understandable, since rowing is a naval *service*, but not attested before Arrian (or Aristobulus if the rather improbable view is held that Arrian cites him word for word).

In all these later contexts the word *hyperesia* or *hyperesiai* means naval service, or services, of various kinds. In one case, the latest, this service may include pulling an oar.

J. S. MORRISON

Great Shelford, Cambridge

³⁰ See n. 21. It is interesting in this connexion to observe that Demosthenes twice uses *hyperesia* in the sense of 'machination against' a person: xxxi 8 εἰς τὴν καθ' ἡμῶν ὑπηρεσίαν and Proem. lii τοσαῦται τέχναι

καὶ γοητεῖαι καὶ ὄλως ὑπηρεσίαι τινές εἰσιν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς κατεσκευασμένοι. Such usage facilitates the meaning 'artillery'.

³¹ GOS 302.