



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

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

G. R. Stanton The Trittyes of Kleisthenes

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **24 • 1994**

Seite / Page **161–208**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1066/5433> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1994-24-p161-208-v5433.3

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

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

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

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

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

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

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

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

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

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

G. R. STANTON

The Trittyes of Kleisthenes

Early research into the location of the Attic demes relied heavily on literary sources. W. M. LEAKE, for example, traversed the countryside with (it would seem) a veritable cartload of Greek texts.¹ About one hundred years ago scholars began to make more extensive use of the lists of members of the Council of Five Hundred in Athens. These lists come in two forms, inscriptions which list all the councillors in a particular year (‘bouleutic’ lists) and inscriptions which list the *prytaneis*, that is, the fifty councillors from a single tribe who form the executive for a month of the conciliar year. Thus R. LÖPER paid attention to prytany lists, such as Agora XV 44 (334/3 B. C.), which appeared to list the rosters of the various demes according to the *trittytes* into which they were organised by Kleisthenes at the end of the sixth century.² A. MILCHHÖFER, who ranks with E. VANDERPOOL as one of the two greatest topographers of Attike, combined superb knowledge of the Attic countryside

¹ The Topography of Athens and the Demi², London 1841, especially vol. 2. I am grateful to P. J. RHODES, R. S. STROUD and D. WHITEHEAD for prompt comments on an earlier version of this paper and would like to express particular thanks to P. SIEWERT and J. S. TRAILL for detailed responses to a draft which directly opposed their published views. I thank also Mrs D. PEPPAS-DELMOUZOU for permission to study EM 8037 (the deme catalogue, IG II² 2362), 8698 (Agora XV 20) and 10651 (Agora XV 17) in the National Epigraphical Museum and Dr P. G. KALLIGAS, Director of the First Ephoreia, and Mrs J. JORDAN for permission to study I 2553 (Agora XV 68) and I 5564 (Hesperia 9, 1940, 54 no. 2) in the Agora Museum. The following special abbreviations are used: Agora XV = The Athenian Agora XV: Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors, edited by B. D. MERITT and J. S. TRAILL, Princeton 1974; Demos = J. S. TRAILL, Demos and Trittytes: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica, Toronto 1986; POA = J. S. TRAILL, The Political Organization of Attica: A Study of the Demes, Trittytes, and Phylai, and their Representation in the Athenian Council, Hesperia Suppl. 14, Princeton 1975; SIEWERT = P. SIEWERT, Die Trittyten Attikas und die Heeresreform des Kleisthenes, München 1982; THOMPSON 1966 = W. E. THOMPSON, Τριττύς τῶν πρυτάνεων, Historia 15, 1966, 1–10; THOMPSON 1969 = W. E. THOMPSON, Kleisthenes and Aegeis, Mnemosyne 22, 1969, 137–152; TRAILL 1978 = J. S. TRAILL, Diakris, the Inland Trittytes of Leontis, Hesperia 47, 1978, 89–109; TRAILL 1982 = J. S. TRAILL, An Interpretation of Six Rock-Cut Inscriptions in the Attic Demes of Lamprai, Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography, Hesperia Suppl. 19, Princeton 1982, 162–171.

² On the reorganisation of the tribes by Kleisthenes see Chiron 14, 1984, 1–41. For LÖPER’s attention to Agora XV 44 (then IG II 869) see MDAl(A) 17, 1892, 426–427; cf. ABSA 79, 1984, 289–291.

with strong command of the literary and epigraphical evidence.³ Discussion of the disposition of rosters on prytany and bouleutic inscriptions continued along much the same lines into the middle of this century.⁴

The study of *trittyes* took a new and – I shall argue – misguided turn after the publication in 1961 of an almost complete list of *bouleutai* from the first five tribes in the official order from (probably) 336/5 B. C., now Agora XV 42.⁵ Comparing this new list with known inscriptions W. E. THOMPSON discerned groupings of demes in three tribes, Aigeis (tribe II), Pandionis (III) and Leontis (IV) – groupings which largely followed topographical placement but which consistently had one or more demes out of topographical order. He suggested that the relevant inscriptions listed the demes according to *«trittyes of prytaneis»*, a term derived from Athenaion Politeia 44,1, where reference is made to the task of the *epistates* of the *prytaneis* selecting *«a trittys of the prytaneis»* to spend the night on duty with him.⁶ On this view *«a trittys of the prytaneis»* was not simply a third of the *prytaneis* but a formally constituted group of 15–18 councillors from the same tribe who belonged to a set of demes which mainly came from the same geographical area (or *trittys*) but which could include demes from another region. With access to only one of THOMPSON'S subsequent publications on demes and *trittyes* and without the consolidated corpus of prytany and bouleutic inscriptions in Agora XV published by B. D. MERITT and J. S. TRAILL in 1974, P. J. RHODES tried to assess THOMPSON'S theory by examining all available lists down to the age of Augustus. He concluded that there was a phenomenon to be explained at any rate in two tribes, Aigeis and Pandionis.⁷

TRAILL retained the traditional, geographically arranged *trittyes* in his fundamental study of the political organisation of Attica (POA) prepared along with Agora XV, but by 1978, when he published a textual join of Agora XV 13a (an inscription which could not be found) and Έφην. 1973, 180–185 no. 3 (370/69 B. C.), he was attracted to the idea of modified geographical *trittyes*; in an addendum to that article he even contemplated the idea that there had never been strictly topographical *trittyes*, but that the *«equal trittyes»* (to use a term suggested by P. J. RHO-

³ See his *Untersuchungen über die Demenordnung des Kleisthenes*, Abh. Berlin, Berlin 1892, and the *Erläuternder Text (and maps) to E. CURTIUS and J. A. KAUPERT (edd.), Karten von Attika, Berlin 1881–1900*. For a similar linkage of MILCHHÖFER and VANDERPOOL (1906–1989) see J. OBER, CPh 83, 1988, 70.

⁴ See, for example, A. W. GOMME, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.*, Glasgow Univ. Publ. 28, Oxford 1933, 51–52 n. 2, 57 n. 1, etc.; C. W. J. ELIOT, *Coastal Demes of Attika: A Study of the Policy of Kleisthenes*, Toronto 1962, 126–127.

⁵ S. I. CHARITONIDES, *Hesperia* 30, 1961, 31–33 = SEG 19, 149.

⁶ *Historia* 15, 1966, 1–10; cf. *Mnemosyne* 22, 1969, 140. THOMPSON used the inscriptions now known as Agora XV 10, 12, 13, 32, 38 and 42. For his avoidance of the plural *«trittyes of prytaneis»* see n. 151 below.

⁷ *Historia* 20, 1971, 385–404, referring to THOMPSON 1969 but not *Hesperia* 39, 1970, 64–67 or SO 46, 1971, 72–79.

DES) he now saw in Aigeis, Pandionis and Leontis were the original *trittyes* of Kleisthenes.⁸ P. SIEWERT adopted this idea in his wide-ranging study published in 1982. He also emphasised the blocks of territory on the east coast of Attike in which the coastal and inland *trittyes* of Aigeis and Pandionis were located and he sought to align *trittyes* along 'Zentralwege' to Athens.⁹ At the same time TRAILL produced a revised version of administrative *trittyes* for Erekhtheis (I) and proceeded in an appendix to attempt to divide the *prytaneis* of recalcitrant tribes into *trittyes* of 16, 17 and 17 representatives, notably the stumbling block of Oineis (VI) which has one deme with 22 representatives. He thus departed from SIEWERT, who agreed with his 1978 division of Erekhtheis.¹⁰ In a review of SIEWERT's book, D. M. LEWIS pointed out that Aigeis (for example) broke all the rules when divided into 'Prytanen-Trittyen' by SIEWERT: the coastal *trittyes* contained a city deme, the inland *trittyes* a coastal deme and the city *trittyes* two inland demes. But he was prepared to accept that demes were listed contrary to strict topographical order in three tribes, Aigeis, Pandionis and Leontis.¹¹ TRAILL has maintained most of his assignments of demes to *trittyes* in his recent book (*Demos*), which supersedes POA in some respects (notably the conspectus of deme locations and bouleutic quotas). Whether stung by LEWIS' criticisms of the 'Prytanen-Trittyen' devised by SIEWERT or not, he has reduced the number of tribes that have demes assigned to *trittyes* for administrative reasons, contrary to topographical reality. In particular, he has made Leontis a tribe arranged strictly according to topographical *trittyes* (by assigning Kholleidae to the city region geographically) – an ironic turnaround, since his 1978 article finding 'trittyes of *prytaneis*' in Leontis provoked so much speculation along those lines. Only seven tribes – Erekhtheis (I), Aigeis (II), Pandionis (III), Oineis (VI) Hippothontis (VIII), Aiantis (IX) and Antiokhis (X) – now have administrative as opposed to topographical *trittyes*. He believes that all the *trittyes* go back to Kleisthenes, but that the other tribes fell naturally into *trittyes* which provided 16, 17 and 17 *bouleutai* (councillors).¹²

⁸ *Hesperia* 47, 1978, 109; the term 'modified geographical *trittyes*' is suggested in the postscript found after n. 79 on that page. The join was first announced by TRAILL in *Phoenix* 29, 1975, 386–387 and n. 3. P. J. RHODES used the term 'equal *trittyes*' at *JHS* 103, 1983, 204. For RHODES' current position ('I think it is a serious possibility that Cleisthenes' *trittyes* were equal *trittyes*') see the Select Addenda in: *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiion Politeia*, Oxford 1993, 773.

⁹ SIEWERT 14, 25–26, 67–86, 91–95.

¹⁰ TRAILL 1982. Compare SIEWERT 104–105 and G. R. STANTON, *Chiron* 14, 1984, 29–31. For TRAILL's treatment of other tribes (II–V and VII–X) see TRAILL 1978, 97–106.

¹¹ *Gnomon* 55, 1983, 432–434. For a review of research into deme topography prior to the publication of *Demos*, see D. WHITEHEAD, *The Demes of Attica 508/7 – ca. 250 B. C.: A Political and Social Study*, Princeton 1986, XVIII–XXII.

¹² See especially the conspectus in chapter VI of *Demos*; cf. my review in *Gnomon* 63, 1991, 25–30. For defence of the assumption that fourth-century lists of councillors reflect the bouleutic quotas of Kleisthenes see G. R. STANTON, *Chiron* 14, 1984, 2 n. 2.

I have already expressed doubts about the existence of modified geographical *trittyes*, concentrating particularly on the various arrangements suggested for Erékhtheis and on the poor job done by Kleisthenes if he wanted to arrange demes into <equal> *trittyes* along major routes to Athens.¹³ In this paper I raise further doubts about the military sense of the <*trittyes* of *prytaneis*> discerned by TRAILL and SIEWERT (section I) and seek an explanation as to why such <*trittyes*> have been discerned in some tribes and not others (in the long section II). TRAILL's meticulous study of the deme-catalogue inscription (IG II² 2362) makes possible further work on the assignment of demes to *trittyes* in the first five tribes (section III). One list of arbitrators, comprehensively studied by E. RUSCHENBUSCH and discussed briefly by TRAILL,¹⁴ provides assistance with the last four tribes (section IV). The *trittyes* thus delineated turn out to be the topographical *trittyes* of Kleisthenes.¹⁵

I. The alleged military purpose of <*trittyes* of *prytaneis*>

It is, of course, possible to accept the existence of <*trittyes* of *prytaneis*> for non-military purposes. There may have been administrative tasks which were more effectively handled by three groups of *prytaneis* which were roughly equal in number.¹⁶ It is even conceivable that there was resistance to spending a night on duty in the *tholos* with the *epistates* of the *prytaneis* and a third were chosen by compulsion – though I incline to S. DOW's suggestion that the *epistates* simply chose about a third of the *prytaneis*, a group of men he found congenial, to spend the night on duty with him.¹⁷ There has, however, been a strong belief that the *trittyes* of Kleisthenes had a military purpose.¹⁸ It is now emphasised by TRAILL, who omitted it

¹³ Chiron 14, 1984, 3–7, 29–32; see also ABSA 79, 1984, 303–304.

¹⁴ E. RUSCHENBUSCH, ZPE 49, 1982, 267–281; Demos 115–116.

¹⁵ Although fundamentally opposed to the speculations of SIEWERT and TRAILL, I have learned much from their careful epigraphical and topographical work. Indeed, I was stimulated to pursue this study by TRAILL's new study of the famous deme-catalogue of 200 B. C. discussed in section III (though he has long held – see POA 99 – that the demes of several tribes in this catalogue are grouped by τριτίτες τῶν πρυτανείων) and by his re-study of prytany lists of Pandionis in chapter II of Demos.

¹⁶ P. J. RHODES, JHS 103, 1983, 204 (in a review of SIEWERT); see also his comment on Athenaiou Politeia 44,1 in: Aristotle: The Athenian Constitution, Harmondsworth 1984, 148; cf. op. cit. 1993 (n. 8) 533. Most recently (in: M. PIÉRART [ed.], Aristote et Athènes, Paris 1993, 57–58) RHODES has suggested that the author of the Athenaiou Politeia implies at 21,4 that *trittyes* were of varying size and each was located wholly in one of the three regions because he had access to a decree setting up the Kleisthenic organisation; if there were *trittyes* of equal size, but not each located wholly in one of the three regions, this may be because the organisation was not in the end done exactly as the decree stipulated.

¹⁷ S. DOW, in: L. BONFANTE – H. VON HEINTZE (edd.), In Memoriam Otto J. Brendel: Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities, Mainz 1976, 69–84, esp. 72–80. For a cautious reaction to this view see D. WHITEHEAD, op. cit. (n. 11) 302.

¹⁸ M. A. LEVI, Commento storico alla respublica Atheniensium di Aristotele, Milano-Vare-

in POA.¹⁹ But the most forceful and extended exposition of a military purpose for the <trittyes of prytaneis> is found in SIEWERT's book.

In the case of Aigeis (II) and Pandionis (III) SIEWERT envisages blocks of territory in the east of Attike which might allow contingents of soldiers to muster reasonably efficiently along routes to the centre.²⁰ The treatment of Aigeis to obtain <trittyes of prytaneis> is a methodological nightmare. THOMPSON at least found repetition in Agora XV 38 of the pattern he discerned in the roster of Aigeis on Agora XV 42. However, the <trittyes of prytaneis> thus determined require double transfers of demes. As if it were not peculiar to overload the city <trittyes of prytaneis> by adding to it the five *bouleutai* of Ikarion from the inland region, Plotheia with one *bouleutes* was also transferred by THOMPSON to the <city> committee. Then three demes with one *bouleutes* each have to be transferred out of the city region to make up for the three *bouleutai* of Philaidai who were removed from the <coastal> region to the <inland> committee.²¹ SIEWERT reduced the proportion of violations of geographical order – nine demes out of twenty-one in Aigeis – by maintaining the two Ankyle demes in his <Asty-Trittyes> and by arguing (not unreasonably) that Philaidai was an inland, not a coastal, deme. But in so doing he eliminated the main support for the identification of <trittyes of prytaneis>, namely the repetition of associations of demes on prytany and councillor lists.²² SIEWERT drew two lines across the roster of Aigeis on Agora XV 42 and constructed <Prytanen-Trittyen> which do not recur on Agora XV 36, 38 or 43, nor on two lists from the Makedonian era (XV 85 and 89). But, even granted this precarious means of devising more nearly equal *trittyes*, what are the consequences for mustering of the three contingents of Aigeis in the Agora? The members of Kollytos can reach the Agora in a few minutes, while those from Ankyle will take longer – but certainly not half an hour. Some of the soldiers with whom they are to associate, however, will not arrive for another five hours, walking from two demes (Plotheia and Ikarion) situated on the far side of Mount Pendeli. Again, the members of Diomeia, situated between Kollytos and Ankyle, will have to cool their heels in the Agora for several hours while fellow members of the <Küstentrittyes> come from as far afield as Phegiaia at Ierotsakouli, only about three kilometres south of Nea Makri.²³

se 1968, 223–224; P. J. BICKNELL, *Studies in Athenian Politics and Genealogy*, Wiesbaden 1972, 19–21; H. VAN EFFENTERRE, REG 89, 1976, 1–17; J. H. OLIVER, *Hesperia* 49, 1980, 35–38.

¹⁹ Demos 14, 16, 87, 112–113, etc.; cf. D. M. LEWIS, *AJA* 80, 1976, 311–312 and *Gnomon* 55, 1983, 431; TRAILL 1978, 99, 109.

²⁰ SIEWERT 67–78, especially (for Aigeis and Pandionis) 69–75.

²¹ THOMPSON 1966, 2; THOMPSON 1969, 143–144. See further section II. A and n. 44 below. Philaidai, on my view (cf. sections II. A and V), should be regarded as a coastal deme because Strabon lists Brauron as a <deme> along the coast (9,1,22) and because the likely sites of Philaidai are so close to the coast.

²² SIEWERT 20, 88–89. Explicit rejection of Agora XV 38: SIEWERT 88–89 n. 8, following TRAILL 1978, 103–104.

²³ E. VANDERPOOL, in: *Mélanges helléniques offerts à Georges Daux*, Paris 1974, 339–343.

One can point out similar difficulties in other tribes. In Erekhtheis (I), Themakos is removed from the city demes (the two Agryle demes and Euonymon) between which it is probably situated and assigned to the <Küstentrityts>. Anagyrus is situated in a regionally coherent coastal trityts, but is assigned to the <Binnen-trityts>, which is as far north of the city as it, at Vari, is south. In Pandionis (III) TRAILL now seeks to place Kydathenaion further north of the Akropolis than it has traditionally been placed.²⁴ This may just render Probalinthos (on the Marathonian plain) physically closer to Kydathenaion than to the remainder of the coastal *trityts* based on Myrrhinous.²⁵ But the fact remains that the soldiers from Kydathenaion could reach the Agora several hours before the other members of the <Asty-Trityts> who lived at Probalinthos. Alternatively, if the members of this alleged <Asty-Trityts> were detailed to defend the north-eastern border of Attike, the soldiers from Probalinthos would arrive hours before those from Kydathenaion. On SIEWERT's disposition of Oineis (VI) the soldiers from Phyle – admittedly a remote centre of population on the north-western frontier of Attike – have to collaborate with a *trityts* based on Lakiadai, which is as far south as the Sacred Way and lies east of the Kephisos stream.²⁶ On TRAILL's disposition of Hippothontis (VIII) the members of Oinoe and Azenia, placed north-west and north of Eleusis, are asked to collaborate with Dekeleia, on the eastern foothills of Parnis, and other demes as far east as Mighdhaleza.²⁷ As both TRAILL and SIEWERT arrange Aiantis (IX),²⁸ soldiers from Phaleron can saunter up to the Agora while those from Rhamnous – perhaps the most distant deme of all – pass right through the coastal *trityts* of Aiantis on the <Zentralweg> to Athens. According to SIEWERT the members of the <Asty-Trityts> of Antiokhis (X) come from the south to the

²⁴ Demos 119 with 117; compare, however, his retention at 129 of the description of the location as <generally placed north of Akropolis> from POA 42.

²⁵ For the political disadvantages created by this distance between Probalinthos and Myrrhinous or Prasia for the family or families using the cult centre at Probalinthos, see D.M. LEWIS, *Historia* 12, 1963, 28, 30–31 and (briefly) G.R. STANTON, *Chiron* 14, 1984, 9–10.

²⁶ Lakiadai: Pausanias 1,37,2–3; cf. A. MILCHHÖFER, *op.cit.* 1881–1900 (n.3) 2,16; TRAILL: POA 49. For TRAILL's doubts about the transfer of Phyle to the city *trityts* (SIEWERT 97–98) see Demos 134 n.30.

²⁷ There is no reason, apart from the dubious one of aligning quantity of remains at a site with bouletic representation (Demos 138 n.40), for associating Azenia, rather than (say) Auridai or Hamaxanteia, with the remains near the chapel at Kokkini (on which see A. MILCHHÖFER, *op.cit.* 1881–1900 [n.3] 7–8, 18; E. VANDERPOOL, *CSCA* 11, 1978, 237, 245 n.26). The belief that Azenia was a coastal deme is based on the faulty text of Strabon 9,1,21 (where Ἀζηνεῖς should be corrected to Ἀτηνεῖς, not to Ἀζηνεῖς); see C. W. J. ELIOT, *op.cit.* (n.4) 125–126, Demos 144 n.50; G.R. STANTON, *Athenian Politics c.800–500 B.C.*, London 1990, 163–164. For the erased deme decree found at Mighdhaleza see E. ΤΣΟΦΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ-ΓΙΝΙ, *Ἐφημ.* 1980, 94–95 and plates 20α, 23β. TRAILL suggests (Demos 137) a possible identification as Anakaia on the basis of the association of Ἀνάκεια at IG I³ 258,6 with Plotheia and Epakreis. Cf. STANTON, *Chiron* 14, 1984, 39 n.136.

²⁸ TRAILL 1978, 102 (cf. 100); Demos 138; SIEWERT 101–102, 112.

city, along the Rhamnous-Athens route from the north and along the Brauron-Athens route (as well as from two unknown locations). The soldiers from Pallene who, to judge from numbers of *bouleutai*, might have been outnumbered by soldiers from coastal demes in the 'Binnentrittyes' to which they gave their name, arrive in Athens from the north-east and have to wait for other members of their *lokchos* to arrive independently from Aigilia (a 'Quasi-Enklave') and Thorai (an 'außerregionale Enklave') in the south-east.²⁹

D. M. LEWIS observed that it hardly matters whether the components of a military unit, one of which has walked several miles and the other only one or two to the Agora, are together for the last mile, the last hundred yards or not at all.³⁰ There is no point in arranging co-ordination for such a short distance. While we can have no doubt that tribes provided contingents in the army – indeed, this practice provides a major reason for believing that the original tribes of Kleisthenes were roughly equal in population – the results produced by a scheme as complicated as that devised by SIEWERT call into question the very existence of the alleged 'trittyes of *prytaneis*'. Yet equal units would virtually be essential if the army was organised in terms of 'Prytanen-Trittyen'.

This may be the place to mention the position adopted by K. H. KINZL. He saw the chaos that results on the ground from arithmetically determined *trittyes*, with (especially in SIEWERT's case) many enclaves of various sorts. Instead of rejecting these creations KINZL takes the principle of 'equalised' *trittyes* as proven and proceeds to dismiss the evidence of Athenaion Politeia 21,3 and 21,4.³¹ He believes that, given what we know of deme locations, the topographical *trittyes* that generations of scholars have attributed to Kleisthenes (or a commission set up under his bill) are illogical – that the traditional, geographical *trittyes* is out. But what is illogical about a family with a long history of self-interested and ruthless political activity³² seeking to allocate communities to *trittyes* in such a way as to promote their own position? The concern that KINZL evinces for administrative tidiness is characteristic of some modern Western countries; it should not be taken for grant-

²⁹ SIEWERT 102–104 and Karte 4. TRAILL's disposition is similar (TRAILL 1978, 104; Demos 139–140 and coloured map), except that the members of Kolonai, instead of joining the Brauron-Athens route near Pallene, live in the far north-east of Attike and come to Athens along the route from the Amphiaraion near Oropos.

³⁰ In his review of SIEWERT's book, *Gnomon* 55, 1983, 433, TRAILL pointed out that three of four ephebic rosters studied were definitely not arranged according to *trittyes* – a surprising result if the *trittyes* had an important military role (Demos 14–16).

³¹ AHB 1, 1987, 25–33; *Chiron* 19, 1989, 347–365; see also his reviews of TRAILL's Demos in CR 103, 1989, 67–69 and *Gymnasium* 96, 1989, 560–561 (the latter apparently written first). For his stress on the military aspect of the reform see *Chiron* 19, 1989, 357–359. He jumps to the conclusion that if the tribes provided roughly equal military units so did the *trittyes* 'by extension' (AHB 1, 1987, 28).

³² *Chiron* 14, 1984, 7–8 with n. 24.

ed in ancient Greece.³³ Moreover, the Table³⁴ which is intended to show that chaos reigns supreme is quite arbitrary in places. Take the first entry, for Erekhtheis (I). (1) The first *trittys* is intended to be the <coastal> one, comprising not only Anagyrous and Coastal Lamprai – with fifteen representatives – but also Pambotadai and Sybridai with two (in fact they seem to have shared a single seat). TRAILL places neither of the latter demes on his coloured map; how then can KINZL claim this as a <unitary> *trittys* of demes which form a single territorial entity? (2) The city *trittys*, probably called Euonymon, is said to have a common boundary with Upper Lamprai. Across Mount Imito? I am assured by one who has walked the pass over the southern part of Imito³⁵ that because of the necessary zigzagging there is no saving of time. The Karten von Attika show that the route debouches well to the south-west. Members of demes as far south as Thorai may have walked around the southern tip of Imito, but surely people from the coastal and inland *trittyes* of Pandionis and Akamantis, from Sounion and perhaps Anaphlystos-Phrearrhioi travelled to Athens around the northern tip of Imito (just as modern traffic did before the coast road to Sounion was built). Or take Hippothontis (VIII). (1) The <inland> *trittys* is said to form a single territorial entity though on TRAILL's map two demes at the north-western extremity of Attike are joined for administrative purposes with three demes stretching from the south-eastern flank of Parnis virtually to Hekale (placed at Koukounarti). (2) The <city> *trittys* is broken into three components. Should not the suggested locations of Eroiadai and Keiriadai make this five?³⁶ KINZL is able to draw a picture of chaos by assuming that <equal> *trittyes* have supplanted the traditional, topographical *trittyes* and then

³³ Note KINZL's earlier words, in: Greece and the Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory: Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermayr on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday, Berlin 1977, 222: In Athens of the late sixth and early fifth centuries <we are dealing with a disorderly, chaotic world. We have no right to restore it to its <true>, <original> state of neat order and simplicity by imposing on it patterns which are alien to it.>

³⁴ Table 1 in Chiron 19, 1989, 349. KINZL would have done well to retain his earlier emphasis on demes as people, not blocks of territory on a map: op. cit. (n. 33) 204 n. 29.

³⁵ The idea of such a pass goes back to I. N. TRAVLOS, Πολεοδομική εξέλιξις τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἀπὸ τῶν προϊστορικῶν χρόνων μέχρι τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ 19^{ου} αἰῶνος, Athens 1960, 17. He made clear the hypothetical character of this reconstruction (ibid. 18), and M. PETROPOULAKOU and E. PENTAZOS did not put it on their map of communication routes from the Archaic to the Roman period: Ἀττικὴ: οἰκιστικὰ στοιχεῖα, Ancient Greek Cities, 21, Athens 1973, fig. 9. Although aware of these doubts (33 n. 164) SIEWERT reproduced TRAVLOS' map as Karte 3 and made the route over Imito one of his <Zentralwege> to Athens (68 and Karte 4; cf. 81 on Pandionis and my earlier criticism at Chiron 14, 1984, 4 n. 9).

³⁶ Of course, Table 2 on Chiron 19, 1989, 350 is also affected by these comments. KINZL's map on 351, in order to draw a coherent *trittys* north of Phyle (belonging to another tribe, Oineis), restricts the <inland> *trittys* of Hippothontis to land above 600 metres for some distance. KINZL's figure of c. 200 enclaves (350) must mean that of the 139 demes he counts demes represented by c. 200 of the 500 councillors as enclaves. TRAILL has enclaves represented by c. 55 councillors (Demos 126–129, 133–135, 137–140).

applying these 'equal' *trittyes* to the regions of Athenaion Politeia 21,4. No wonder he finds many enclaves; they are created by the search for arithmetical equality. He accuses scholars like me of ignoring 'the complete absence of any evidence for the background and context of the reforms',³⁷ yet he has declared worthless the crucial evidence for the nature of the tribal reform contained in Athenaion Politeia 21,3–4, with its emphasis on geography (in, for example, τὴν χώραν and τῶν περὶ τὸ ἄστυ). He ignores the past record of the Alkmeonid family, documented largely by Herodotos, and simply assumes that there was a team of reformers ('one and the same body of people') working in the same direction over a decade.³⁸ Unattested stages in the reform are postulated. As an example of the invention of details one might note KINZL's treatment of Herodotos' report (5,72,1) that Kleomenes tried to set up a Council of three hundred of Isagoras' partisans (the word στασιῶται is acknowledged); scholars will be interested to learn that this Council makes sense only if it comprised one hundred from each of the Solonian divisions Pentakosiomedimnoi, Hippeis and Zeugitai.³⁹ Rather than speculate on the basis of arithmetically determined *trittyes*, we should reject on logistic grounds the idea that equal *trittyes*, composed of demes from disparate regions, were devised by the Athenians for convenience of mustering.

II. The so-called 'trittyes of prytaneis'

The schemes worked out by SIEWERT and TRAILL attempt to find 'Prytanen-Trittyen' in all ten Kleisthenic tribes. Consequently, for example, TRAILL divides the known quota of twenty-two *bouleutai* for Akharnai between two *trittyes*. However, 'trittyes of *prytaneis*' have been accepted more widely by scholars with respect to three tribes, Aigeis (II), Pandionis (III) and Leontis (IV). D. M. LEWIS was willing to concede, in reviewing SIEWERT's book, that groupings which transcend geographical limits were attested in three (but only three) tribes.⁴⁰ I deal with these three tribes, in which a repeated pattern of demes (a pattern which shows minor deviations from geographical order) has been discerned, in section A below; the other tribes are examined in section B.

In testing W. E. THOMPSON's theory, P. J. RHODES examined all lists of *bouleutai* (whether of *prytaneis* or of the whole Council) datable to before the Christian era, but found no trace of regular division in lists later than the creation of Ptolemais in 224/3 B.C. In fact, there seems little point in examining inscriptions dated after 307/6 B.C., when the two Makedonian tribes Antigonis and Demetrias were created. For at that time some tribes lost all or nearly all the demes from one *trittys*: Ke-

³⁷ Chiron 19, 1989, 354.

³⁸ Ibid. 355, based on his essay in op. cit. (n. 33) 199–223, especially 202–210.

³⁹ Chiron 19, 1989, 362 n. 56.

⁴⁰ Gnomon 55, 1983, 432; cf. 434.

kropolis, for example, lost three city demes (Melite, Xypete and Daidalidai), represented by fifteen *bouleutai*, to Demetrias; if, as I believe, Pandionis had only one deme (Kydathenaion) in its city *trittys*, the whole *trittys* was transferred to Antigonis.⁴¹ I have nevertheless examined all inscriptions down to the creation of Ptolemais. This task is made much easier than it was for RHODES twenty years ago by the collection and re-study of all councillor inscriptions by MERITT and TRAILL in Agora XV.

A. Tribes for which repeated patterns have been discerned

II. Aigeis

THOMPSON in 1966⁴² listed violations of geographical order affecting nine demes in the pattern he saw repeated in Agora XV 38 and XV 42; this would have risen to ten had he accepted TRAILL's assignment of Myrrhinoutta to the inland *trittys* later published in POA.⁴³ As many as nine violations in a total of twenty-one demes invites the conclusion that the perceived pattern is illusory, and THOMPSON subsequently reduced the number by suggesting that Philaidai belonged geographically to the inland *trittys*, and that Teithras may have been coastal according to Kleisthenic *trittys*.⁴⁴ TRAILL in 1978 had only five violations of geographical order: he classified Ikarion and Plotheia as inland demes transferred to the city *trittys* administratively and Diomeia as a city deme transferred to the coastal *trittys*. Teithras and Philaidai were thought to have <exchanged places from what would seem their proper, i. e. topographical, *trittyes*>.⁴⁵ Otryne was now allowed to be in the city *trittys*,⁴⁶ as were both Ankyle demes and Erikeia, and Myrrhinoutta was allowed to be a coastal deme. Already, in order to avoid <*trittyes of prytaneis*> with 15, 18 or 19 councillors, TRAILL was beginning to doubt the *trittys* assignments made by THOMPSON on the basis of repeated patterns on the inscriptions, although he was aware that <in

⁴¹ Cf. POA 11; Demos 89–90. This, incidentally, is a reason for doubting TRAILL's interpretation of the series of *boroi* near Thiti as marking a boundary between coastal and inland *trittyes* (TRAILL 1982, 162–171; Demos 118). For if the various series of rupestral *boroi* in rural Attike belong to the creation of the Makedonian tribes in 307/6 B.C., as TRAILL argues (TRAILL 1982, 168; Demos 118), the distinction between city, inland and coastal *trittyes* scarcely exists and the repeated ΟΡΣΙΜ inscriptions cannot usefully distinguish between coastal and inland *trittyes*. See further ABSA 79, 1984, 298–301.

⁴² THOMPSON 1966, 3.

⁴³ POA 41.

⁴⁴ THOMPSON 1969, 145–149. There were eight violations in RHODES' analysis (Historia 20, 1971, 389) of Agora XV 38 (=IG II² 1749).

⁴⁵ TRAILL 1978, 103.

⁴⁶ Confirmed by Demos 127 n. 14, where D.M.SCHAPS' demonstration (CPh 77, 1982, 327–328) that the quotation from Antiphanes' Timon (fr. 204 KASSEL – AUSTIN) in Athenaios 309 d–e that had previously been taken to indicate a coastal location has only negative value is gladly accepted.

Agora XV, no. 38 the two sections of Ankyle, along with Diomeia, were inscribed at the bottom of the «coastal» column» (the pattern of XV 38 is shown below).⁴⁷ In 1982 SIEWERT had only three violations of geographical order: he classified Ikarion and Plotheia as «außerregionale Enklaven» and Diomeia as a «Quasi-Enklave».⁴⁸ By 1986 TRAILL had reduced the violations to these same three. All the other demes are now in their proper geographical *trittys*: Teithras is considered a coastal deme and Philaidai an inland deme (despite the fact that it is much closer to the coast than Teithras is).⁴⁹

One should note carefully what TRAILL (or SIEWERT) has done here: he has abandoned the very basis of THOMPSON's theory. He no longer sees a pattern of administrative *trittyses* repeated on Agora XV 38 and 42. Instead, the two Ankyle demes (listed either side of Diomeia at the foot of column III) on XV 38 break the pattern discerned by THOMPSON, whereby they were listed with coastal demes. We are presented with a set of «equal» *trittyses* which have been calculated arithmetically and in defiance of the disposition of demes on the stone. In the case of XV 38, why is Diomeia placed between the two Ankyle demes? Should it not belong to the same *trittys*? On TRAILL's most recent view, column III lists five coastal demes, followed by a city, then a «coastal», then a city deme. It is surely preferable to conclude that Diomeia is listed at the foot of the column between two city demes because it also was a city deme. One might also ask the purpose of transferring a city deme with one representative (Diomeia) to the «coastal» *trittys* and then replacing it with an inland deme (Plotheia) with one representative. If Kleisthenes had wanted a minimum of sixteen councillors in every *trittys*, it would have been simpler to transfer Plotheia directly to the «coastal» *trittys* of Aigeis.

It would, in fact, have been possible to assign one column to each of the postulated administrative *trittyses* in Aigeis without a variation in column length greater than that which actually survives on XV 38. On the next page are TRAILL's latest assignments for Aigeis, with the number of lines needed for councillors indicated after the plus sign («Kollytos + 3», for example, means that four lines are needed on the stone; I have adopted TRAILL's first figure where the bouleutic quota varied; asterisks indicate demes transferred from their geographical location). However, this pattern is found on neither of the prytany lists (though both are arranged in three columns) for Aigeis from the period of the original ten tribes.

THOMPSON's theory drew attention to the fact that the two inscriptions he studied do not suggest administrative *trittyses* of 16, 17 and 17 *prytaneis*: in Agora XV 38 and 42, on THOMPSON's analysis, there are only 15 councillors in the «city» *trittys* and as many as 18 in the «coastal». In attempting to avoid this disparity,⁵⁰

⁴⁷ TRAILL 1978, 103.

⁴⁸ SIEWERT 88–89 and Karte 4.

⁴⁹ Demos 127–128 and coloured map.

⁵⁰ Cf. TRAILL 1978, 103: «Such an assignment, however, vitiates a basic assumption of the

<i>city</i> tritlys	<i>inland</i> tritlys	<i>coastal</i> tritlys
Kollytos +3	Gargettos +4	Halai Araphenides +5
Kolonos +2	Erkhia +6	Teithras +4
Bate +2	Philaidai +3	Phegaia +3
Upper Ankyle +1	Ionidai +2	Araphen +2
Lower Ankyle +1	Kydantidai +2	Myrrhinoutta +1
Erikeia +1		Diomeia* +1
Hestiaia +1		
Otryne +1		
Ikarion* +4		
Plotheia* +1		
17 <i>bouleutai</i> +	17 <i>bouleutai</i> +	16 <i>bouleutai</i> +
10 (or 9) demotics	5 demotics	6 demotics
=27 (or 26) lines	=22 lines	=22 lines

however, TRAILL has abandoned the repeated pattern with minor deviations from geographical order discerned by THOMPSON. And in fact TRAILL does not satisfactorily avoid an administrative *trittys* of 18 councillors. Ikarion's quota is attested as five councillors, never four. An alleged variant quota of four is based on a reconstruction of Agora XV 36 which assumes that Ikarion was paired with Bate to produce a combined total of six councillors. This is a sheer guess, based on the further and unlikely assumption (see below) that XV 36 has nine lines missing at the top of each column.⁵¹ It is just as likely that Bate supplied two councillors when one single-councillor deme (such as Myrrhinoutta or Diomeia) failed to supply its councillor. Bate has two councillors on Agora XV 36; Ikarion should be assumed to have its consistently attested five; TRAILL's *city* *trittys* thus has 18 councillors in that year.

The two prytany lists from this period do show associations of demes from the same *trittys*, but do not follow such divisions rigidly. On Agora XV 38 we have (ci = city; co = coastal; in = inland):

theory of *trittyes of prytaneis*, namely, that the three groups of demes should have nearly equal total representation.>

⁵¹ POA 15–16. But note TRAILL's comment: 'It is not necessary, however, to assume that the pairs were so drawn up as to consist always in one larger and one smaller deme' (ibid. 16). GOMME, op. cit. (n. 4) 57 n. 1, apparently assumed that each column had nine lines missing and that all demes were represented when he noticed that the lines occupied by 19 *bouleutai* and 8 demotics are exactly divisible by three. He did not comment on the markedly shorter column III that results from his assumptions, and later scholars have followed him in this.

I	II	III
in Erkhia + 6	in Ikarion + 5	co Halai + 5
in Ga[rg]ettos + 4	ci Hestiaia + 1	co/in Teithras + 4
co/in Philaidai + 3	ci Bate + 1	co Phegaia + 3
in [K]ydantidai + 2	ci Kolonos + 2	co Araphen + 2
in Ionidai + 1	ci Kollytos + 3	co Myrrhinoutta + 1
	in Plotheia + 1	ci Ankyle + 1
	ci? Otryne + 1	ci Diomeia + 1
	ci? Erikeia + 1	ci Ankyle + 1
21 lines (22 if Ionidai had two representatives)	23 lines	26 lines

This inscription provides the best indication available from prytany and councillor lists of *trittys* assignment in Aigeis. The person who drew up the list for the stone-cutter filled column I largely (or wholly) with inland demes and continued at the top of column II with Ikarion. Then comes a run of four city demes before the inland deme Plotheia. These two lines (Plotheia and councillor) might have fitted at the foot of column I, but that column was probably left unfinished while a search was made for a possible second councillor for Ionidai. Five (or four) coastal demes appear in the upper three-quarters of column III, but the column is filled with three city demes and their councillors, thus producing a column three lines longer than column II and five lines longer than column I. Although the actual cutting was carelessly executed,⁵² the register, which has played so large a part in the discernment of <administrative> *trittyses*, was drawn up sufficiently carefully to count strongly against such an idea. Certainly column I has the <correct> number of councillors – sixteen, or seventeen if Ionidai had two representatives. But even if Ikarion and Plotheia in column II are assigned administratively to the city *trittys*, the column totals only fifteen names. Moreover, column III has eighteen councillors, too many to form a *trittys* of <correct, i. e. 1/3, size>.⁵³

On Agora XV 36 it is, as MERITT and TRAILL suggested, possible that nine lines were missing at the top of each column (the missing 19 *prytaneis* + 8 demotics = 27 lines) when M. FOURMONT transcribed this now lost inscription. But since column III then has only 20 lines, compared with 27 and 25 lines in columns I and II, more is likely to be missing in column III, probably at the top but possibly both top and bottom. Reconstructions which retain equal lacunae in columns I and II and place Erkhia in column III with Gargettos (also inland) tend to make the third col-

⁵² Cf. U. KÖHLER ad IG II 872: <titulus satis neglegenter incisus>.

⁵³ Demos 87.

umn uncomfortably long. It is preferable to assume that the transcript by FOURMONT allows uneven lacunae at the tops of columns I and II. A possible reconstruction (Myrrhinoutta could replace Diomeia) is:

I	II	III
[in Ikarion + 5]	[co/in Teithras + 4]	[ci? Otryne + 1]
co/in [Phi]laid[ai] + 3	[ci Hestiaia + 1]	[ci? Erikeia + 1]
in [Io]ni[d]ai + 2	ci [An]kyle + 2	[ci Diomeia + 1]
co [Ha]lai + 5	in Kydantidai + 1	[in Erkhia + 6]
co [Phe]gaia + 4	ci Kolonos + 2	in [Garg]ettos + 4
	ci Bate + 2	ci Kollytos + 3
	co Araphen + 2	in Plotheia + 1
	secretary (2 lines)	
24 lines	23 lines	24 lines

Overall, it is better to conclude with MERITT and TRAILL that the register is not arranged according to *trittyes*.⁵⁴ There are demes that are certainly inland (Ionidai, Kydantidai, Gargettos) in all three columns, and Araphen is separated from Halai Araphenides.

A situation similar to that we have seen on the prytany lists applies to the two rosters of Aigeis on bouleutic inscriptions of this period. Agora XV 42 has runs of demes from the same *trittys*. A string of five demes in the second column (Plotheia to Kydantidai) are plausibly held to be all inland. The deme listed above Plotheia, Otryne, could be either city (since the column begins with city demes) or inland. The other bouleutic list, XV 43, strengthens the impression that it is a city deme by placing Otryne below Hestiaia and above Erikeia and Bate. But there are interruptions to the sequences of demes from the same *trittys*. On XV 42 the first column begins coastal-city-coastal (Halai, Diomeia, Araphen) and later has the inland deme Ikarion between a single entry for the two city demes called Ankyle and the city deme Kollytos. On XV 43 the string of city demes is followed by two inland demes (Kydantidai and Plotheia) and the city deme Diomeia.⁵⁵

THOMPSON saw a pattern repeated on one prytany and one bouleutic inscription. Unfortunately for him, the groups thus discerned had total representation of 15, 17 and 18 councillors. If we look at all the surviving lists from the period of the original ten tribes, we might well conclude (as SIEWERT and TRAILL must do) that the per-

⁵⁴ Agora XV, p. 47.

⁵⁵ This list is even more irregular for TRAILL, for although he turns Plotheia into a city deme administratively, the roster will not end for him in two city demes, since he transfers Diomeia to the coastal *trittys* administratively.

ceived repetition was coincidence. All we have are short sequences of demes from the same *trittys* (topographical *trittys*, that is), but no rigorous disposition by *trittys*. This applies to all four rosters from the first period. No surviving inscription preserves the groupings now upheld by SIEWERT and TRAILL, although, as we have seen, a column could be devoted to each group on a three-column inscription without the lengths of columns being decidedly uneven.

III. Pandionis

THOMPSON originally⁵⁶ saw a repeated pattern for Pandionis on two prytany inscriptions, Agora XV 12 and 32, and the bouleutic list XV 42. Only one deme certainly violated geographical grouping, Probalinthos (an acknowledged enclave far from the rest of the coastal *trittys* centred on Myrrhinous to the south).⁵⁷ When he took SEG 23,87 (Agora XV 10) into account, THOMPSON could claim⁵⁸ that on four inscriptions Probalinthos was listed after the city deme Kydathenaion. In two out of four cases, however, the blocks of demes cut across the normal practice of reading all the way down one column and then starting at the top of the next column. In XV 12 the coastal demes filled column I and also ran under Kydathenaion and Probalinthos in column II (thus raising the question whether Probalinthos and Kytherros did not make a pair of coastal demes). In XV 42 one had to imagine a block of inland demes occupying thirteen lines of column I and seven lines of column II.

TRAILL devoted a chapter (II) in *Demos* to the *trittyes* of Pandionis. He began by pointing to the existence of a *trittys* heading in column I of Agora XV 26: Παιωνίων τριτύς. On this basis headings have been supplied at the top of columns II and III: Κ[υδαθηναίων τριτύς] and [Μυρρηνουσίωv τριτύς].⁵⁹ The names of the *trittyes* are identical with the names of demes with substantial representation in the Council. TRAILL adopted the term <trittytic> to denote such deme-*trittys* homonyms. Now, Pandionis is the most amply attested tribe for the original period of ten tribes, with no fewer than six prytany inscriptions (XV 10, 12, 15, 26, 32, 47). There are also one nearly complete and one fragmentary register for this tribe on bouleutic inscriptions (XV 42, 43). TRAILL's re-study of the inscriptions led to the conclusion that five of the prytany registers (all except XV 15) and XV 42 were arranged by *trittys* and that they all employed <trittytics> to begin the register of a *trittys*. This latter point, I suggest, provides the explanation for the

⁵⁶ THOMPSON 1966, 4–5.

⁵⁷ See D. M. LEWIS, *Historia* 12, 1963, 31; THOMPSON 1966, 7; G. R. STANTON, *Chiron* 14, 1984, 9–10.

⁵⁸ THOMPSON 1969, 139.

⁵⁹ Cf. B. D. MERITT and J. S. TRAILL on this inscription (Agora XV, p. 42): <This inscription is unique in that it is the only preserved register in which the *trittyes* are actually mentioned, although there are a number of texts where the demes appear to be listed to a great extent according to *trittys*> (they refer to XV 47 from Pandionis and two other inscriptions).

persistent arrangement of prytany registers for this tribe first discovered by THOMPSON.

TRAILL, of course, sees the <trittytics> as the names of administrative or <equal> *trittyes* and rejects the notion that Kleisthenes created topographical *trittyes* as described in Athenaion Politeia 21,4. But let us assume for the moment that (as I believe) Kleisthenes set up topographically-based *trittyes*. For Pandionis these would be (with numbers of councillors indicated after the plus sign):

<i>city</i>	<i>inland</i>	<i>coastal</i>
Kydathenaion + 11/12	Lower Paiania + 11 Upper Paiania + 1 Oai + 4 Konthylidai + 1	Myrrhinous + 6 Probalinthos + 5 Prasia + 3 Steiria + 3 Angele + 3/2 Kytherros + 2
11/12 <i>bouleutai</i> + 1 demotic = 12/13 lines	17 <i>bouleutai</i> + 3/4 demotics = 20/21 lines	22/21 <i>bouleutai</i> + 6 demotics = 28/27 lines

From the totals of lines needed, it can be seen that there are only two ways for a secretary drawing up a three-column inscription to even up the columns with a single transfer: either the Myrrhinous register (7 lines) or the Probalinthos register (6 lines) must be moved to the city column. These transfers produce columns ranging from 19 to 21 or from 18 to 22 lines in length. But if Myrrhinous is to be retained to head the column of coastal demes as the deme that gave its name to the *trittys*, there is only one choice left. The roster of Probalinthos is the obvious choice to fill the column left incomplete by the city roster (the single deme Kydathenaion). TRAILL's insight concerning the desirability of heading each column with a <trittytic> explains the repeated pattern on prytany rosters of Pandionis.

Now, one must express some reservations about the means by which TRAILL has reached his conclusions, in particular about his treatment of the transcripts of lost inscriptions. In the case of Agora XV 12 TRAILL makes good use of S. A. KOUMANOUEDES' indications of demotics protruding into the margin. But he supplements six out of eight demotics contrary to KOUMANOUEDES' transcript of 1862. Despite his claim to have changed only three letters,⁶⁰ one or more letters are altered from the transcript to obtain Myrrhinous in line 4, Kytherros in 11, Prasia in 14, Angele in

⁶⁰ Demos 38. In the table on this page the words <Upper> and <Lower> (referring to the two Paiania demes) should be reversed.

18, Probalinthos in 37 and Konthylidai in 58.⁶¹ Only Upper Paiania and Oai are supplemented in accordance with the traces recorded by ΚΟΥΜΑΝΟΥΔΕΣ, while Kydathenaion and (Lower) Paiania are preserved complete at the tops of columns II and III. (Steiria is supplied in column I line 20.)

In the case of the other lost prytany inscription for Pandionis, XV 47, TRAILL makes the startling suggestion that the six lines of the transcript by G. WHEELER below the only representative from Oai and the third representative from Steiria should be moved to the right, so that the last few lines of column I become the end of column II and the last six lines of column II become a record of a missing third column. There is no indication of such a break in WHEELER's transcript. Nor is the break postulated on the bottom of the stone regular; it must have turned back to the left to preserve as much as has been preserved of the last line (printed as line 2 in XV 47 and most earlier versions), if TRAILL is correct. The sequence of mistakes by WHEELER imagined at (4) on Demos 46 is not convincing. TRAILL's rearrangement of the text would be more convincing if what J. SPON and WHEELER report as a final line were clearly the end of a line. But it can be restored as the beginning of a line with only five letters missing, as indeed MERITT and TRAILL restored it in Agora XV 47. TRAILL makes much of these missing letters and of the missing letters at the beginning of the representative from Oai (line 17 in his new version of the inscription).⁶² But there are parallels for [στεφα]γωθέντες at the beginning of a line in XV 26, 30, 38, 44 and 51,⁶³ and for isolated damage to a councillor's name in XV 38 (lines 15, 30), 42 (line 321), 44 (lines 9, 12, 40), 49 (line 8), etc.

There are other problems in TRAILL's revised disposition of this inscription.⁶⁴ He swaps lines 13 and 14⁶⁵ so that lower Paiania has its normal complement of eleven,

⁶¹ Line numbering as in Demos 33. The original publication by S. A. ΚΟΥΜΑΝΟΥΔΕΣ was in Φιλίστωρ 3, 1862, 455–456.

⁶² Demos 44, 46.

⁶³ If the inscription were three-column, the final line may have read [στεφα]γωθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου [δικαιοσύνης ἔνεκα]; cf. XV 19 (lines 4–7), 38 (lines 2–3).

⁶⁴ One might add that, along with the movement of everything from ΠΡΑΣΙΕΙΣ down on the WHEELER transcript one column to the right, the alignment between columns is completely altered: the five lines now in column III are two lines above the corresponding lines in column II. To obtain more even columns (21, 19 and 21 lines) TRAILL should have supplied Kytherros and its two representatives at the foot of column III instead of column II. But that would have put Probalinthos with another coastal deme (just as in Agora XV 12; but there TRAILL now [Demos 33] moves Kytherros to line 11 in column I, where ΚΟΥΜΑΝΟΥΔΕΣ' transcript reads ...ΩΙΟ.). For a strong reaction to TRAILL's reorganisation of the two copies of XV 47 by SPON and WHEELER, see the comments of R. S. STROUD, JHS 109, 1989, 253: 'Both clearly show a list of names arranged in two columns. Since this disposition creates eight problems for his reconstruction of at least two deme-quotas, T. simply shifts the bottom three lines of col. I into col. II and transplants the bottom five lines of col. II into a hypothetical and hitherto unattested col. III. Is this scholarship or merely a game without rules?'

⁶⁵ Line numbering as in Demos 45.

not ten, representatives (he argues that Khaireas, though attested in seventeen demes, better fits Paiania than Konthylidai). But depriving Konthylidai of its sole representative involves positing yet another unreported line (15). Again, the movement of the bottom six lines to the right produces a column III that is short (Kydathe-naion must have its lower quota of eleven representatives now that Lower Paiania is given eleven and Angele has three) and a vacat of four lines is proposed between line 62 (61 on Demos 45) and the record of honour by the Council and Assembly. Unless we imagine that the line placed at the bottom of the transcript, which has been printed as part of the heading by previous editors (including MERITT and TRAILL), was placed there for some extraneous reason (e.g. it was difficult to read and was written down later), it is preferable to have the two columns come down close to it (as in my table below) rather than to have such a break between the end of a column and a final line.

While the inscription may indeed have had three columns, as was normal in the period of the original ten tribes,⁶⁶ the two transcripts report two columns only; there is no information about a third column in which the rosters of Kydathe-naion, Kytherros and perhaps Upper Paiania appeared. Nor is there any indication of a break six lines from the bottom of the transcript. What the SPON-and-WHEELER publication does give is «a line of dots both above and beneath the prytanis of Oai».⁶⁷ SPON and WHEELER could scarcely be expected to know that Oai regularly had three or more representatives; they must be indicating what they saw on the stone. If we allow Oai to have its full complement of four councillors,⁶⁸ column I would be complete with 22 lines and column II with 21:

I	II
Paiania + 10	Angele + 3
Konthylidai + 1	Myrrhinous + 6
Oai + [3] + 1	Steiria + 3
Prasia + 3	[Probalinthos] + 5

Column III (if it existed) would be nearly the same length with the names of Kydathe-naion, Kytherros and Upper Paiania and their 14 or 15 councillors. If, on the other hand, we were to assume an additional unreported line to give Lower Paiania

⁶⁶ So Demos 43–44, 142.

⁶⁷ Demos 43. This is one indication that the transcript by WHEELER and the published version (J. SPON and G. WHEELER, *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce, et du Levant: Fait aux années 1675 & 1676*, Lyon 1678, 3,2,70–72) are independent. The second *bouleutes* from [Probalinthos] is omitted by WHEELER and the fifth by the SPON-and-WHEELER publication. The best policy is to assume that a line exists if it is reported by either.

⁶⁸ MERITT and TRAILL at Agora XV 47, following S.N. KOUMANOUDES (*Πολέμων* 8, 1965–66, 45–46), posited a lacuna of three lines.

its regular quota of 11 councillors and assume as well that both Upper and Lower Paiania were recorded under one heading and so add two unreported lines, we would be driven to believe that SPON and WHEELER did not in their reports pay attention to the columns of the original, for column I reaches a length of 24 lines and column III could have only 15 lines. Such an inscription would be rather unbalanced for one in three columns. The fact that both the published version and WHEELER's transcript have two columns beginning with Paiania and Angele suggests that the inscription was constructed as in the table above.

With our present knowledge of bouletic quotas, it is easy to postulate a demotic in line 38 (37 in Agora XV 47), after a full complement of three councillors from Steiria, and to predict that it is Probalinthos since five councillors follow. That the five came from that deme was suggested by J. KIRCHNER, ad IG II² 1753. TRAILL, of course, would prefer the roster of Probalinthos to be in a third column, separate from the coastal demes in column II. But on the evidence of the two transcripts by SPON and WHEELER, there is a run of inland demes in column I (Paiania, Konthylidai, Oai) followed by a run of coastal demes beginning at the foot of that column (Prasia, Angele, Myrrhinous, Steiria, Probalinthos). The coastal *trittyis* is not headed, as in XV 12 and 32, by the <trittytic> Myrrhinous. But Probalinthos appears in its proper topographical context.

Despite my reservations about TRAILL's treatment of these two inscriptions known only from transcriptions of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, there remain two three-column inscriptions in which the eponymous demes head the three columns (XV 12 and 32). The same may have been the case in XV 26, to judge from the word τριτύς at the top of column I. If similar headings occurred at the top of two further columns, it is likely that Probalinthos was listed under Kydathenaion in column II. The roster of Probalinthos may have been separated from that of Kydathenaion by a vacant line, as was done in similar circumstances for Antiokhis on XV 44 (and possibly XV 43: see discussion under X. Antiokhis below). Certainly the drafter was prepared to use up space, as is shown by the fact that headings for Paiania take up three lines in column I (the minimum, seen on XV 32, is one line). This reconstruction in three columns produces a symmetrical inscription with columns of 22, 20/21 and 23/22 lines. (But other reconstructions are possible.) In XV 10 there is run-on from column I to column II; presumably the roster of Myrrhinous was started at the foot of column I because the secretary wanted an exactly comparable third column of 22 lines and intended to cite his own name and office (taking up three lines) there. (In the engraving, however, the spacing was very irregular.)

Finally, Agora XV 42. There is ample evidence from councillor lists alone (leaving aside other types of lists) that the reader was expected to go right down one column and then start at the top of the next column. There is run-on from the bottom of one column to the top of the next not only in XV 10 (mentioned above), but also in XV 14 and 17, possibly in XV 15, and (in the late fourth century) XV 58. So

THOMPSON'S idea that the roster of Pandionis on the bouleutic inscription XV 42 has a block of inland demes at the top of both columns (with the block occupying only half as much space in column II as in column I) is not convincing. Rather, we have an alternation of inland, city and coastal demes in column I, and the remaining two inland demes followed by the remaining five coastal demes in column II. There is a run of demes from the same area – sufficient to suggest that Kytherros was a coastal deme⁶⁹ – but no consistent arrangement by *trittys*. Consequently there is no particular significance in the listing of Probalinthos after Kydathenaion (possibly the habit of prytany lists carried over into this bouleutic list). Nor should we attach any weight to THOMPSON'S point that Probalinthos could have been fitted in the right hand column; it would of course fit there, since other tribes had more demotics to fit in – but only at the expense of greater unevenness in the two columns devoted to a tribe than is seen on this inscription: column I would then have had only 26 lines, while column II had 34. The largest imbalance seen on the inscription is four lines (Pandionis and Leontis).

TRAILL'S observation that drafters of prytany inscriptions for Pandionis liked to have deme-*trittys* homonyms at the tops of the three columns – attested on XV 12 and 32 and likely on XV 26 – explains the repeated pattern whereby Probalinthos was placed after Kydathenaion: it was the only deme available whose register would fill Kydathenaion's column so as to produce three roughly even columns. The practice was observed also by the drafter of XV 10, who achieved precisely even columns I and III by means of run-on from column I to column II. When the inscriptions are not three-column, as in the two surviving bouleutic registers for this tribe, there are no more than sequences of demes from one *trittys* (the coastal) and no arrangement by *trittys* (on XV 43 the small part of the register preserved ends with Upper Paiania, clearly separated from Lower Paiania and the rest of the inland *trittys*).

IV. *Leontis*

There is a repeated pattern on the prytany lists for Leontis. This was suggested by THOMPSON, and originally doubted by RHODES; but after the publication of Hesperia 47, 1978, 89–109 RHODES included Leontis with Aigeis and Pandionis as tribes in which THOMPSON'S groups could be discerned. My view is that the stone-cutters were indeed interested in grouping the demes largely, though not wholly, by *trittyes*. The sequences of demes belonging to the same *trittys* can be seen in Agora XV 13, a neatly laid-out inscription with indentation of councillors' names under demotics and further indentation of patronymics under councillors' names. Spaces were left at eight places in column II where patronymics were presumably not known at the time of inscription (columns I and III are complete). The inscription fits what appears to have been a valued disposition, in which the two outside col-

⁶⁹ A point considered uncertain by THOMPSON: *Historia* 15, 1966, 5 (cf. 7–8).

umns of a three-column inscription were identical in length or almost so, and the middle column was a fraction shorter.

I	II	III
ci [K]ettos + 3	co Phrearrhioi + 9	in Pelekes + 2
ci [Hali]mous + 3	co Sounion + 4	in? Hybadai + 2
ci Upper Potamos + 2	co Deiradiotai + 2	in? Oion + 1
ci Lower [P]otamos + 1	co Potamos + 2	in Hekale + 1
ci [S]kambonidai + 3		in Kropidai + 1
ci? Leukonoion + 3		in Paionidai + 3
in? [Kho]lleidai + 2		in Eupyridai + 2
		in? Aithalidai + 2
		in Kolonai + 2

This inscription is a good guide because it is completely preserved and the bottoms of the columns are securely known. In fact, any unevenness in the lengths of columns would have been exaggerated on this inscription because names and patronymics of councillors are inscribed on separate lines. The column lengths are 41 lines (17 councillors), 38 lines, including 8 spaces for missing patronymics (17 councillors), and 41 lines (16 councillors) respectively.

The same groupings can be suggested for Agora XV 13 a⁷⁰ + Ἐφημ. 1973, 180–185 no. 3, joined by TRAILL in *Hesperia* 47, 1978, 89–109:

front of stone

I	II	III
[co Phrearrhioi] + 9	ci Ska[mbonidai] + 3	3 names (4 possible)
co [S]oun[i]on + 4	ci? Leukonoion + 3	
co [D]eiradiot[ai] + 2	ci Kettos + 3	
co Potamos + 2	ci Uppe[r] Potamos + 2	[award?]
	ci Lowe[r] Potamos + 1	
	in? [Kh]olleidai + 2	
	[ci Halimous]	arkhonship

⁷⁰ A line, preserving only two letters, has been omitted (following the original publication in *Δελτ.* 25, 1970, A' 84–85 no. 1) after the demotic Deiradiotai in line 16. Restoring the second representative of Deiradiotai removes the anomaly for this deme in Table of Representation IV in POA.

IV	V
[<i>lacuna</i>]	[missing; TRAILL lists demotics for Hekale, Kropidai, Paionidai, Eupyridai and Aithalidai, in the order seen on Agora XV 13 (above), that is, 5 demotics and 9 names]
arkhonship	
Diakris	
in Pelekes + 2	
in? Hybadai + 2	
in? Oion + 1	
in Kolonai + 2	

This is a peculiar inscription, by any standards. The arkhonship is repeated at the top of column IV, having just been given at the bottom of column III on the adjacent side. Columns I and II are both 21 lines in length, though the precisely identical length is achieved by supplying the demotic Halimous at the foot of column II—whereas Kholleidai ends a column on Agora XV 13. Even with an additional line supplied at the top of column IV this column is only 14 lines long, and column V, as supplied by TRAILL, is also 14 lines long. This is far short of the attested length of columns I and II. Finally, there is a word on TRAILL's squeeze immediately after the second occurrence of the date and above the demotic Pelekes in column IV. Despite the arrow on the photograph and reassurance that the photograph was printed back-to-front, I have found it extremely difficult to discern the word <Diakris>, which TRAILL takes to be a *trittys* heading.⁷¹ As the photograph is printed, the delta is to be sought above the pi, the kappa above and slightly right of centre of the second eta of Pelekes (but compare the traces there with the kappa following that eta), the rho above and slightly left of centre of the kappa in Pelekes, the iota above the vertical of the epsilon, the sigma above the sigma of Pelekes. Even allowing for uneven spacing, I cannot make out the word.⁷²

In publishing this textual join, TRAILL considered whether the groupings on the combined register represented Kleisthenic topographical *trittyes* or later, modified <*trittyes* of *prytaneis*>.⁷³ He pointed to recent scholarly consensus placing Upper and Lower Potamos in the city *trittys*, and was prepared to see Oion [Kerameikon] as an inland deme. But he preferred to follow the evidence of Aristophanes (Akharnians 406) and consider Kholleidai an inland deme, although he observed that the evidence was not overwhelming.⁷⁴ Kholleidai was thus regarded as an inland deme

⁷¹ TRAILL 1978, 94, 97 with Plate 32. See my comment in *Gnomon* 63, 1991, 28.

⁷² The inscription has been moved from the apothiki at the Library of Hadrian and its present whereabouts are unknown.

⁷³ TRAILL 1978, 98–99.

⁷⁴ TRAILL 1978, 99 n.26: <Dikaiopolis, except for this reference, would be assigned to Acharnai ... and one scholiast suggests that Χολλήδης in line 406 was chosen for the sake of a pun on χωλός.> But χωλούς in verse 411 rather looks forward and introduces the parade of Euripidean plays (seven in verses 418–434) with ragged heroes, the one that Dikaiopolis has in

listed with the city demes in the newly joined register and in Agora XV 13. TRAILL concluded that Phrearrhioi, Skambonidai and Diakris represented headings not for Kleisthenic *trittyes*, but rather for modified *trittyes* of *prytaneis*.⁷⁵

SIEWERT noted that the lists of councillors produced a coastal *trittys* with an arithmetically satisfying third of a tribe, 17 councillors. But since Phrearrhioi and Sounion were on one route to the city and Deiradiotai and Potamos Deiradiotai on another, he designated all four coastal demes as enclaves that could not be satisfactorily assigned to a *trittys*.⁷⁶ He classified the city demes Skambonidai, Halimous, Upper and Lower Potamos and Leukonoion and the inland deme Hekale similarly. Kholleidai, however, he regarded as an inland deme in the vicinity of other demes of that *trittys* but assigned artificially to the city *trittys* (a ‘Quasi-Enklave’).⁷⁷

Although he noted in 1978 that ‘existing evidence shows no other city *trittys* [than that of Leontis] contiguous with its inland or coastal counterpart’,⁷⁸ by 1986 TRAILL had come to the conclusion that Kholleidai was a city deme well to the north of the city, and closer to Paionidai, Kropidai and other inland demes than to the city demes Skambonidai or Leukonoion. The consequences are enormous for his own view of modified geographical *trittyes*. On TRAILL’s latest view, none of the demes in the groups discerned in the two prytany inscriptions is assigned to a *trittys* to which it did not belong topographically.⁷⁹ There is, then, no pattern of deme arrangement in the registers contrary to topographical reality; one of the three necessary ingredients for THOMPSON’s groups – minor deviations from geographical order – is absent. Moreover, ‘Diakris’, if it is to be read on ΈΦημ. 1973 no. 3, is the heading of a *trittys* which is completely topographical. One should conclude from TRAILL’s *trittys* assignments in Leontis not that there were administratively convenient *trittyes* in Leontis but that we have the actual topographical *trittyes* of that tribe.

I am inclined to think, however, that we do have one deme, Kholleidai, out of topographical order in these two inscriptions. I am, of course, prepared to see consistency thrown to the winds by Aristophanes in order to promote humour: in ‘Clouds’ Sokrates insists that Strepsiades must learn the correct masculine names for four-footed animals, but Strepsiades’ list ends with a bird. Strepsiades is finally rejected as a student because he cannot remember that κάρδοπος should, according

mind being also lame. More plausible than the scholiast’s suggestion is that of W. RENNIE in his commentary (London 1909) that Χολλήθης may have been chosen in order to create a jingle with οὐ σχολή in the following verse and verse 409.

⁷⁵ TRAILL 1978, 98–100.

⁷⁶ Perhaps SIEWERT was unnecessarily cautious on this detail. If he wanted a ‘Zentralweg’ from this coastal *trittys*, he might have suggested that members of all four demes travelled to the city via Kephale.

⁷⁷ SIEWERT 91–94 and Karte 4. He needed Kholleidai, with two *bouleutai*, to make a full Prytanen-Trittys of 17 *bouleutai* (ibid. 93).

⁷⁸ TRAILL 1978, 99.

⁷⁹ Demos 67, 130–132.

to Sokrates, be καρδότη, but he later uses this piece of subtlety to dismiss the first creditor.⁸⁰ It is possible, as TRAILL says, that a location for Kholleidai north of the city could be close enough to Akharnai to fit the context in Aristophanes' <Akharnians> – Dikaiopolis has easy access to Akharnai, from which he has abducted a basket of coals from Mount Parnes (333–336, 348) – and still belong to the city *trittys*. However, in the deme-catalogue (section III below) Kholleidai appears to be in the inland *trittys* and this would suit Aristophanes' reference better. With Kholleidai in the inland *trittys*, the *trittyes* do not make a neat three-column inscription:

<i>city</i>	<i>inland</i>	<i>coastal</i>
6 demes (5 or 6 names)	10 demes	4 demes
15 councillors	18 councillors	17 councillors
21 (or 20) lines	28 lines	21 lines

In order to obtain even columns one deme and its representatives have to be moved from the inland column, preferably to the city column where Upper and Lower Potamos could be listed together (compare the bouletic inscription Agora XV 42). For some reason (perhaps it was the most isolated from the other inland demes, if it was on the city side of Akharnai) Kholleidai was the deme listed – at the foot of the column – with the city demes.⁸¹ This small transfer in drawing up the list produced columns of 24 (or 23) lines for the column consisting mainly of city demes, 25 for the remaining inland demes and 21 for the coastal column. For a symmetrical arrangement one would expect the columns to appear in the order city-coastal-inland, as in fact they do on Agora XV 13.

Finally, *trittys* names. TRAILL suggested that Phrearrhioi and Skambonidai, heading columns I and II on Hesperia 47, 1978, 90–91, may serve as <trittytics>. He also pointed out in 1978 that <the four coastal demes and the first three inland demes were inscribed in precisely the same order> in the newly joined register and Agora XV 13.⁸² If the *trittyes* were all named after demes in their *trittys*, Pelekes, listed first in both registers, is a suitable candidate for the name of the inland *trittys*. Its name is about the right length for the missing *trittys* name on Hesperia 9, 1940, 54 no. 2.⁸³ It does not, however, head the list of inland demes on the deme-catalogue.

⁸⁰ For these and other examples see G. R. STANTON, *Hermes* 104, 1976, 493–494.

⁸¹ Before he wanted to place Kholleidai in the city TRAILL made this very point: in Agora XV 13 Kholleidai <appears at the bottom of the first column which contains the city demes ... , but it may have been deliberately placed there by the mason in order to provide a more symmetrical arrangement of the register> (POA 46 n. 18 bis).

⁸² TRAILL 1978, 98.

⁸³ The name of the inland *trittys* of Leontis is about six letters in length (in the genitive case). It has sometimes been thought to begin with delta (B. D. MERITT, *Hesperia* 9, 1940, 54; TRAILL 1978, 94–95 and n. 4 bis; Demos 100), but the epigrapher who originally published the

We have, then, in the prytany inscriptions of Leontis useful sequences of demes, indicating that (for example) Hybadai and Oion Kerameikon are likely to be inland demes. One might add that there may well be a run of inland demes on Agora XV 52, since the missing demes with two representatives (apart from Upper Potamos, which should be with the city demes and may have been in a missing third column) were all inland; the preserved column (II) shows the four coastal demes of this tribe listed together as on the two prytany inscriptions discussed above. When we turn to bouletic inscriptions, we can note that Agora XV 42 cannot (as THOMPSON held) be used to delineate groups finally because the representatives of the city demes Upper and Lower Potamos are listed with those from Potamos Deiradiotai in a single list among coastal demes in column I. Kholleidai on this list comes between city and inland demes. Agora XV 43 is even less helpful: in the register for Leontis, as in the placing of Upper Paiania after a pair of coastal demes in the adjoining column (Pandionis), the city deme Lower Potamos comes in a run of inland demes. Again the lists of councillors provide informative sequences of demes, but there is no absolute and clear-cut division into *trittyes*.

B. Tribes in which prytany lists display no repeated pattern

I. Erekhtheis

The evidence is very limited. Of four prytany inscriptions (the heading Ἐρεχθῆ-
ῖ[δος] on Agora XV 21 probably indicates that this fragment of six words is a bou-
letic list), XV 6 has been restored in five (or six) columns and XV 29 preserves
only four lines. The remaining two are in three columns, but XV 1 is clearly an in-
complete list, allowing only thirty-seven councillors to be listed if all fourteen de-
motics appeared on the inscription.⁸⁴ The remaining list (XV 14) makes no attempt
to achieve even columns by grouping the demes. Instead there is run-on from the
bottom of column I to the top of column II and also from the bottom of column
II to the top of column III; the engraver was prepared to end column II with a de-
motic in order to achieve three columns of 21 lines.

There seems to be no arrangement by *trittyes* in the two three-column inscrip-
tions. Anagyrous (coastal) comes between Upper Agryle and Euonymon (both
city) on XV 1; column I on XV 14 starts Kephisia (inland) after [Euonymon] (city)
and Anagyrous (coastal). There is a run of inland demes in column III of XV 1. The

inscription later denied that any letter could be read in this place: B. D. MERITT, *Hesperia* 30, 1961, 265. The delta resurrected by TRAILL and accepted by G. V. LALONDE on the basis of Diakris as the name of the inland *trittyes* (Agora XIX, Princeton 1991, 30 no. H41) is an illusion on the photograph, as MERITT pointed out. A full centimetre of stone has been lost by the point where the apex of the delta should be.

⁸⁴ For earlier discussion of this inscription see A. E. RAUBITSCHER, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B. C.*, Cambridge Mass. 1949, 188–191, with references.

only repeated pattern is the placement together of Anagyrous and Euonymon, not always in the same order, on XV 1, 6 and 14. I have argued⁸⁵ that there is no arrangement by *trittys*, whether topographical or alleged administrative *trittys*, in the register of Erekhtheis on the bouletic list XV 42. Nor is the brief portion of preserved roster on XV 43 instructive.

Erekhtheis was open to several arrangements, if one wanted to obtain three even columns. This is paralleled in the various attempts of modern scholars to make even *trittyes* in Erekhtheis:

deme	<i>bouleutai</i>	THOMPSON (in 1970) ⁸⁶	POA	TRAILL 1978 = SIEWERT = JONES (1987) ⁸⁷	Demos
Upper Agryle	2	ci	ci	ci	ci
Lower Agryle	3	ci	ci	ci	ci
Anagyrous	6	co	co	in	co
Euonymon	10	ci	ci	ci	ci
Kedoi	2	ci	co?	ci	ci?
Kephisia	6	in	in	in	in
Upper Lamptrai	5	co	co	co	<i>in</i> *
Coastal Lamptrai	9	co	co	co	co
Pambotadai	1/0	ci	co?	in	co?
Upper Pergase	2	in	in	in	in
Lower Pergase	2	in	in	in	in
Phegous	1	in	in?	co	in?
Sybridai	0/1	—	in?	—	co? ⁸⁸
Themakos	1	in	ci	co	in?

Noting that Pambotadai moved from the city to the coastal to the inland *trittys* within a decade of modern scholarship, S. G. MILLER now suggests⁸⁹ that Pambotadai be located in the Pikermi area, where he wishes to associate a fourth-century

⁸⁵ Chiron 14, 1984, 29–32.

⁸⁶ Hesperia 39, 1970, 66.

⁸⁷ N. F. JONES, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*, *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* 176, Philadelphia 1987, 33. In Demos (next column) TRAILL uses an asterisk and italics to indicate a deme assigned to a *trittys* to which it does not belong geographically.

⁸⁸ TRAILL has tentatively suggested the *trittys* affiliation of Sybridai, which apparently alternated with Pambotadai in being represented on the Council, as inland when he believed in topographical *trittyes* (POA 38) and as coastal when he became more confident about *trittyes* of *prytaneis* and assigned Pambotadai to the ‘coastal’ *trittys* of Erekhtheis (Demos 126 and n. 12). SIEWERT (179; cf. abbreviations at 132 n. 201) and JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 87) 33, however, follow TRAILL 1978, 105 in treating the *trittys* affiliation of Sybridai as unknown.

⁸⁹ Pambotadai found?, BCH 117, 1993, 225–231. I am very grateful to Professor MILLER for sending me a copy of his typescript in advance of publication.

gravestone belonging to a member of Pambotadai, dug up by a bulldozer, with the settlement at Drafi of the fifth (or fourth) century B.C. excavated by I. PAPADIMITRIOU and A. KALOYEROPOULOU in 1955–1957 and not fully published.⁹⁰ I have earlier inveighed against the practice of examining the find-places of known gravestones of members of a particular deme, isolating a single gravestone which has been found away from Athens and locating the deme there. In fact, Pambotadai was once placed at Hasani on just this basis.⁹¹ At Drafi one gravestone has been found for a member of Pambotadai; another was reported as found here in 1955 for Polykles of Phegaia,⁹² but this is now disputed. Probably neither Pambotadai nor Phegaia⁹³ is to be placed here. I developed an argument for interpreting the six rock-cut inscriptions near Thiti as telling members of Π(α)μ(β)ωτάδαι not to intrude on the territory of Lamptrai.⁹⁴ Remains on the eastern side of the Lombarda valley running down to Aghia Marina were recorded on the Karten von Attika (Blatt XIII) and reported also by ELIOT.⁹⁵ ELIOT thought they were probably remains of a villa from the late Roman period, but H. LAUTER put the first habitation in the Classical period.⁹⁶ LAUTER thought they belonged to an isolated farmhouse because the closest remains of settlement he knew were about 500 m. away on the route over Aghios Dhimitrios to the small valley to the south, also called Aghios Dhimitrios. Here, however, LAU-

⁹⁰ See BCH 80, 1956, 246–247; 81, 1957, 516–517, with a plan of House A on 515; 82, 1958, 681, 684 fig. 26; J. E. JONES, in: H. F. MUSSCHE, Thorikos and the Laurion in Archaic and Classical Times, Ghent 1975, 102–104. For the cemetery see BCH 80, 1956, 247–248; 81, 1957, 517–519; 82, 1958, 681–684 with a plan on 680. On both settlement and cemetery: I. N. TRAVLOS, Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Attika, Tübingen 1988, 335, 337–338, 387 (map).

⁹¹ P. J. BICKNELL, Mnemosyne 28, 1975, 58 n. 15. For criticism of this methodology see C. W. J. ELIOT, op. cit. (n. 4) 58–59 n. 31, SIEWERT 104 n. 102 and G. R. STANTON, Chiron 14, 1984, 17–18, 25 n. 86, 32, 35. In a paper ‘Gravestones and the Topography of Attic Demes’, M. K. LANGDON suggests that demes can be located solely on the evidence of gravestones only when (a) they occur in numbers in the same locality, (b) that locality cannot be shown by other kinds of evidence to belong to another deme, and (c) the *trittys* grouping (topographical *trittys*, of course) is not damaged by such a placement. He accepts the location of Euonymon at Trahones, Hagnous at Markopoulo and Kephale at Keratea on these criteria. But single gravestones, even when there is an associated deme site, are inadequate for location. In some other cases ‘the gravestones serve as welcome corroboration rather than final determinant of location’. I am very grateful to Professor LANGDON for showing me a copy of his typescript in advance of publication.

⁹² BCH 80, 1956, 247 with 248 fig. 10; E. VANDERPOOL, BCH 89, 1965, 26 n. 1; TRAILL, POA 40 n. 12.

⁹³ E. VANDERPOOL, in: Mélanges helléniques offerts à Georges Daux, Paris 1974, 339–343, placing Phegaia at Ierotsakouli.

⁹⁴ ABSA 79, 1984, 299–301.

⁹⁵ C. W. J. ELIOT, op. cit. (n. 4) 59 with E on fig. 4, facing 52.

⁹⁶ Ibid. 58–59; H. LAUTER, in: F. KRINZINGER et al. (edd.), Forschungen und Funde. Festschrift Bernhard Neutsch, Innsbruck 1980, 279–286, especially 284: ‘Die Gründung des Gebäudes ist jedenfalls mit aller Wahrscheinlichkeit in klassische Zeit zu setzen.’

TER is prepared to conclude from the spread of remains that there existed a hamlet in the Classical period. Perhaps Pambotadai, if it was situated where I have suggested, controlled the small valley of Aghios Dhimitrios as well as the larger one running down to Porto Lombardo and Aghia Marina. TRAILL, while rejecting my suggestion in its embryonic form, offered a parallel for the combination of abridgement and curtailment involved in my interpretation of the inscription.⁹⁷ He himself should be able, under his theory of administrative *trittyes*, to tolerate placement of Pambotadai in any of the *trittyes* of Erekhtheis. But what makes placement of Pambotadai near Pikermi intolerable is the complete isolation of the deme there from all three *trittyes* of Erekhtheis. It is as awkward as identifying the Eitea at Grammatiko as a deme of Akamantis rather than of Antiokhis.⁹⁸ The only parallel would be the separation of Probalinthos from the rest of its *trittys*, but we know the political reasons for breaking up the control of the families or family living around the cult centre of Probalinthos.⁹⁹

V. Akamantis

W.E. THOMPSON¹⁰⁰ found groups of 17, 16 and 17 members on the only available list, Agora XV 42. He suspected there were two violations of geographical *trittys*, Kephale (which may, however, be thought to belong to either the inland or the coastal *trittys*) and Poros (for which there was no solid evidence). TRAILL¹⁰¹ inclined to follow this: he assigned Poros to the coastal *trittys* and accumulated 17 councillors (with the danger that there were 18 on XV 39 unless Kephale had one councillor fewer than usual there) and assigned Eitea to the city administrative *trittys* (rather than the inland region, as previously)¹⁰² and reached 16 councillors. But, as TRAILL pointed out earlier,¹⁰³ Poros could be the last of the coastal or the first of the city demes on XV 42; Eitea could be the last of the city or the first of the inland demes on both that inscription and the deme catalogue of 200 B. C. (but see the discussion of *trittys*-deme homonyms in section III below). Nevertheless, in Demos TRAILL assumes that Poros was in fact situated in the coastal region and Eitea in the city region.¹⁰⁴ He has thus eliminated any violation of geographical order in the administrative *trittyes* of Akamantis. Now Akamantis as well as Leontis fails to exhibit one of THOMPSON'S three criteria for what later came to be called *trittyes of prytaneis*, namely minor deviations from geographical order.

⁹⁷ Demos 118. For TRAILL'S movement of Pambotadai from the coastal *trittys* to the inland and now back to the coastal administrative *trittys* see TRAILL 1982, 167 n. 17.

⁹⁸ See Chiron 14, 1984, 24–25; cf. Demos 140–142.

⁹⁹ See n. 25 above.

¹⁰⁰ THOMPSON 1966, 5–6.

¹⁰¹ TRAILL 1978, 101.

¹⁰² POA 48.

¹⁰³ Ibid. 48 n. 21.

¹⁰⁴ Demos 68, 132–133, cf. 142.

VI. Oineis

This tribe has always seemed an insuperable obstacle to the theory of nearly equal *trittyes* of *prytaneis* because the 22 councillors of Akharnai would have to be split between two such *trittyes*.¹⁰⁵ TRAILL actually did this in 1982 and reiterated the argument in *Demos*: 7 (or 6) councillors are assigned administratively to the city *trittys*, while the remaining 15 (or 16) are retained in the inland *trittys* where Akharnai is geographically located.¹⁰⁶ Unfortunately, the lists of councillors do not offer any support to this hypothesis.

There is a three-column inscription on which one might have expected *trittyes* of *prytaneis* to have appeared if they existed. For the cutter of Agora XV 17 produced very even columns of 21, 21 and 20 lines respectively. The last column has twenty councillors from Akharnai (the other two are at the foot of column II) and there is no indication on the stone of a break after four or five names in column III, nor six or seven lines from the end of the list; instead, a vacant line corresponds with the 21st line in the other two columns. Within the columns there are sequences of demes from the same, topographical *trittys*.¹⁰⁷

Other inscriptions are not very informative. The names in column I of Agora XV 20 must belong to Akharnai, Oe or Thria (4 councillors are too many for any other deme in Oineis); the names in column I of XV 48 must represent Akharnai or Thria (the roster of Oe is preserved in column II), unless a demotic is read in line 5 or line 6 (KIRCHNER's [Θοο]ίμοι here makes the list bouletic, as he perhaps realised, though he did not include the stone [IG II² 2438] with what he regarded as bouletic lists at II² 1697–1700).

TRAILL seeks support for his division of Akharnai into an inland and a 'city' deme administratively in a re-study of Agora XV 68, which he now assigns to the period of the original ten tribes,¹⁰⁸ where, however, the practice of curtailment of patronymics is very difficult to parallel. He would place 15 councillors from Akharnai in column I (where 10 names are preserved) and 7 in a posited third column.¹⁰⁹ If [T](y)r(m)eidai (despite the strong statement in favour of [P]errheidai, presumably written by MERITT, in the commentary on XV 68) is indeed the deme whose name is preserved at the bottom of column I, there can be no more than one councillor

¹⁰⁵ Even the proponents of 'equal *trittyes*' have found it difficult: THOMPSON 1966, 7; TRAILL 1978, 101 ('a very obvious obstacle'), 105; TRAILL 1982, 169 ('Acharnai was five or six *bouleutai* too large'); SIEWERT 97–98; P. J. RHODES, JHS 103, 1983, 204.

¹⁰⁶ TRAILL 1982, 169; *Demos* 133–134, 142–144.

¹⁰⁷ So MERITT and TRAILL (Agora XV, p. 38): 'This register lists the demes of Oineis in columns according to *trittyes*, with the exception of Phyle, which appears with the city demes in Col. I, and the beginning of the long roster of Acharnai, which appears at the bottom of Col. II below the coastal demes.'

¹⁰⁸ *Demos* 142–144.

¹⁰⁹ Contrast the comment by MERITT and TRAILL (Agora XV, p. 80): 'There can have been only two columns of names.'

listed between it and the bottom of the column. Or, to make the calculation in another way, there would be a maximum of 64 lines (50 councillors and 14 demotics) on an inscription which listed councillors from Akharnai under two headings and had every other deme represented; if column II had 21 lines and column III 25 lines, as TRAILL suggests, column I could have no more than 18 lines. Column I thus has 18 lines on TRAILL's hypothesis, contrasting with 25 lines in column III. Not a balanced or symmetrical inscription. Moreover, his whole reconstruction is dependent on the assumption (rejected in the commentary on Agora XV 68) that the inscription had three columns.

More probably, Agora XV 68 was a two-column inscription. It may even have been part of a bouletic list, like Agora XV 42. If it is assigned to the period before 307/6 B. C. Lakiadai should have two, not three, *bouleutai*, and Akharnai twenty-two, not twenty-three or more. Several arrangements in two columns are possible, but one which follows the grouping of XV 17 (i. e. topographical *trittyes*) closely is:

[Akharnai]	[5 demotics and 8 <i>bouleutai</i> , e. g. Hippotomadai + 1
[12 missing <i>bouleutai</i>]	Boutadai + 1 Lousia + 1 Perithoidai + 3 Kothokidai + 2]
10 <i>bouleutai</i>	[Oe]
[T]{y}r{m}eidai	6 <i>bouleutai</i>
1 <i>bouleutes</i>	Thr[ia]
[Epikhephisia	2 <i>bouleutai</i>
1 <i>bouleutes</i>	[5 missing <i>bouleutai</i> from Thria, then Phyle + 2]
Ptelea	
1 <i>bouleutes</i>	
Lakiadai + 2]	
<hr/>	
27 <i>bouleutai</i>	23 <i>bouleutai</i>
+ 5 demotics	+ 8 demotics
= 32 lines	= 31 lines

There is thus no evidence of a division of Akharnai into two demes. As TRAILL pointed out in 1982, 'the indirect evidence of Agora XV, nos. 43 and 492 does not encourage a divided deme'. At the same time¹¹⁰ TRAILL hinted at another difficulty in positing two separate demes called Akharnai. In every other case of divided demes, one of the two demes was transferred to Antigonis in 307/6 B. C. (from Leontis, Potamos Deiradiotes went to Antigonis and Lower Potamos to Demetrias,

¹¹⁰ TRAILL 1982, 169–170 n. 24.

while Upper Potamos remained in Leontis). By contrast, Akharnai remained wholly in Oineis and apparently increased its representation in 307/6 B. C.¹¹¹ There were probably at least two centres of population in Akharnai – the two mentioned by TRAILL as south-west of Menidhi and at Menidhi (now officially <Aharne>) itself. But there was only one deme of Akharnai.¹¹²

Agora XV 42, the inscription that set THOMPSON to work on <trittyes of prytaneis>, is preserved only for the first five tribes. For Oineis, there is only one complete inscription, XV 17. It does, indeed, pay attention to geographical order; in fact, there is only one certain violation of it: Phyle, an isolated coastal deme in the midst of city demes in column I.¹¹³ Agora XV 20, 43, 46, 48 and 54 are all too poorly preserved to show any repetition of a violation of geographical order in Oineis (only XV 54 includes Phyle). But Agora XV 17 clearly has all the representatives of Akharnai listed together.

VII. Kekropis, VIII. Hippothontis, IX. Aiantis

Prytany and bouleutic rosters of Kekropis are all too poorly preserved to indicate that they are arranged by *trittys*, let alone reveal violations of geographical order. The prytany material for Hippothontis in the period of the original ten tribes is <extremely sparse> and <of little help in determining the *trittys* affiliation of the demes.>¹¹⁴ For Aiantis there are no surviving prytany lists from the original period, and the bouleutic lists Agora XV 43 and 46 are uninformative (however, the general location of all six demes is fairly certain).

X. Antiokhis

TRAILL bases his <trittyes of prytaneis> for this tribe on Agora XV 44, which I have discussed on previous occasions.¹¹⁵ The first column has four coastal demes with 17 representatives. The second has two more coastal demes, which TRAILL assigns to the inland *trittys* administratively, followed by the inland deme Pallene – a total of 17 councillors. The third column is headed by Alopeke, the only city deme (topographically speaking) in this tribe. After a vacant line there follow no less than five demes, all of which TRAILL regards as demes assigned to the city *trittys* from the inland segment;¹¹⁶ this interpretation gives 16 representatives to the city administra-

¹¹¹ POA 20 and 59, based on Hesperia 37, 1968, 9 with 12.

¹¹² In a generally favourable review of Demos (Phoenix 41, 1987, 441–443) D. WHITEHEAD points out that, as far as the second Akharnai is concerned, TRAILL has failed to meet his first requisite for identifying a constitutional deme, a distinct body of members (cf. POA 75: <every deme which was in reality a constitutional deme ought to have a body of known *demotai*>).

¹¹³ But TRAILL does not assign Phyle to the city *trittys* administratively (Demos 134 and n. 30).

¹¹⁴ Demos 109; cf. TRAILL 1978, 106.

¹¹⁵ See ABSA 79, 1984, 289–291 for a technical discussion and Athenian Politics c. 800–500 B. C., London 1990, 160–162 for a translation with general comment.

¹¹⁶ Demos 139.

tive *trittys*. TRAILL does not explain why the two demes transferred from the coastal segment are listed ahead of the inland deme that gave its name to the *trittys* in column II. (The obvious explanation is that one reads coastal demes, headed by the <trittytic> Anaphlystos, down column I and the first half of column II until one comes to the inland <trittytic>, Pallene.) TRAILL is, however, aware of another problem.¹¹⁷ Pallene and Eitea – both established as inland demes – share a councillor. This is tolerable if the *trittyes* (as I believe) are not limited to 16 or 17 councillors each. But for TRAILL the fluctuations in deme quotas entail that in 335/4 B.C. (Agora XV 43) TRAILL'S city administrative *trittys* had 17 councillors and the inland 16, whereas in the next year (XV 44) the figures were reversed.

Since other inscriptions listing councillors from Antiokhis (XV 22, 46, and 55) never have more than three demes from the same *trittys* (whether topographical or the supposed administrative *trittyes*), we are forced to draw conclusions from Agora XV 43 and 44. The latter certainly suggests that the coastal demes are listed sequentially in columns I–II. They are followed in the lower half of column II by the deme that gave its name to the inland *trittys*. The top of column III was allocated to the deme Alopeke, which gave its name to the city *trittys*. Below it a vacant line was left, as if to mark off from the city *trittys* (the single deme Alopeke) the remainder of the inland demes. It is possible, as I have suggested, that vacant lines were similarly used in Agora XV 43 to separate the three *trittyes* in the Antiokhis roster.¹¹⁸ The *trittyes* of Antiokhis are thus strictly topographical:

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>	<i>coastal trittys</i>
Alopeke 10	Pallene 6/7	Anaphlystos 10
	Eitea 2/1	Aigilia 6
	Eroiadai 1	Amphitrope 2
	Kolonai 2	Atene 3
	Krioia 1	Besa 2
	Semakhidai 1	Thorai 4
totals: 10	13	27

This is, in fact, precisely the composition of Antiokhis determined by TRAILL in 1975.¹¹⁹ By 1978,¹²⁰ however, he had been misled by the neat layout of Agora XV 44, with the roster in three columns of 21, 20 and 22 lines (the secretary is listed at the end of the shortest column and the two wreaths are offset to left and right)¹²¹ into

¹¹⁷ TRAILL 1978, 104.

¹¹⁸ ABSA 79, 1984, 290–291.

¹¹⁹ POA Table of Representation X.

¹²⁰ TRAILL 1978, 104.

¹²¹ See G. R. STANTON, *op. cit.* 1990 (n. 115) 160.

making the three columns constitute three administrative *trittyes*. By the time the new division has firmed up¹²² TRAILL has five out of six inland demes transferred to the city administrative *trittys*, to be partially replaced in the inland (administrative) *trittys* by two of the six coastal demes. Or, to look at it from the other side, the city administrative *trittys* derives five of its six demes from another segment, and the inland administrative *trittys* derives two out of three demes from another segment. This is hard to credit, especially when an acceptable interpretation of Agora XV 44 in regional terms is available.

III. *The catalogue of Attic demes, IG II² 2362*

In chapter III of *Demos* TRAILL argues that the famous deme-catalogue belongs to the reorganisation that introduced the tribe Attalis; indeed, since he further holds that there was no brief period of eleven tribes in 201/0 B. C., it belongs to a single but somewhat complex reorganisation which removed the two Makedonian tribes, Antigonis and Demetrias, and established Attalis.¹²³

This view gains some support from consideration of the literary evidence along with the actual construction of the new tribe. Polybios (16, 25–26) cites the honours to Attalos I (including the creation of the tribe named after him) and the declaration of war on Philip V of Makedon in that order. This is not a question of shuffling the fragments of Polybios, as so often in books 6–39 – the evidence comes from a single fragment preserved by Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos.¹²⁴ Yet the creation of Attalis, with a neat arrangement (parallel to that seen in the establishment of Ptolemais in 224/3 B. C. and of Hadrianis in A. D. 126/7) whereby one deme was taken from each of the existing tribes and a new deme added, shows that there were eleven tribes under consideration – as TRAILL emphasises¹²⁵ – not the thirteen tribes that existed from 224/3 to 201/0 B. C. In the mind of the creators the two Makedonian tribes have been disbanded and their demes returned to their original tribes. The logic of the creation of Attalis demands the prior disbandment of the two Makedonian tribes, whereas Polybios mentions the honours to Attalos before the open

¹²² *Demos* 139–140 and map.

¹²³ See especially *Demos* 72–74.

¹²⁴ See, for example, the discussion by F. W. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary on Polybios*, Oxford 1957–1979, 2, 1–28; 3, 1–62 (2, 25 and 2, 533–536 on this fragment from the *excerpta de legationibus*). On Attalos and Athens in 200 B. C. see CH. HABICHT, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen 1982, 142–150 and H.-J. SCHALLES, *Untersuchungen zur Kulturpolitik der pergamenischen Herrscher im dritten Jahrhundert vor Christus*, Tübingen 1985, 138–143.

¹²⁵ *Demos* 24, 72. With TRAILL's demonstration of the likelihood that there was a single reorganisation in 200 B. C., Table of Representation I in POA should be emended so that «ATTALIS» indicates that it is Upper, not Lower, Agryle that was transferred to that tribe in 200 B. C. The choice as to which of these split demes were transferred to Antigonis (and Attalis) had previously been arbitrary (POA 6; cf. 29, 125 and *Demos* 56).

break with Makedon. The removal of Antigonis and Demetrias and the introduction of Attalis were surely part of the same reorganisation.

On the other hand, this reorganisation may have taken some time – though surely not as long as the original introduction of ten tribes by Kleisthenes at the end of the sixth century B. C.¹²⁶ Some demes had been moved from their Kleisthenic tribe to a Makedonian tribe over a hundred years previously. It may have been obvious that Upper Lamptraï had originally belonged to Erekhtheis along with Coastal Lamptraï.¹²⁷ But at least on paper it had to be noted that, for example, Ikarion had been taken from Aigeis and placed in Antigonis, and that Hagnous had been taken from Akamantis and Atene from Antiokhis and placed in Demetrias. Oral consultation of experts or retrieval of documents from the archives would have been necessary. There is some evidence in the language of the catalogue that archival documents were consulted. The spelling of some demotics in $-\eta\varsigma$ suggests that the list obtained from the archives came from the fifth or fourth century.¹²⁸ There is also an indication in the mixed nomenclature that a combination of earlier records and later lists (e.g. ones including places which were not constitutional demes) was used.¹²⁹

Attalos was honoured by refurbishing a monument, perhaps of the fifth century B. C. or perhaps Lykourgan, which stood in a conspicuous position on the Akropolis. TRAILL's attention to the architecture of the monument shows that IG II² 2362 was on the side of the monument.¹³⁰ What was on the front? At a minimum, a decree setting up the new tribe Attalis. It is reasonable to expect such a decree to include a list of the demes assigned to the new tribe, one from each of the continuing eleven tribes and the new deme Apolloniëis. However, this would not be sufficient information for Athenian institutions, and particularly the Council, to operate. It would have been unwise to assume that other citizens could work out which tribe was theirs. The citizens most likely to be puzzled were those whose demes had been assigned to the two Makedonian tribes since 307/6 B. C.: members of Gargettos, Diomeia, Kydathenaion and so on. The contents of the catalogue and the architectural aspects of the stone point to the inscription of a complete list of the demes of the other eleven tribes on a marble block already in place on the side of the monument. The demes were listed as originally assigned by Kleisthenes or his commission and as returned after the dissolution of Antigonis and Demetrias.

TRAILL's other major contribution in chapter III of *Demos* to the study of IG II² 2362 is epigraphical. He has reached a new set of readings which enables us to see why previous attempts to make sense of the catalogue in terms of *trittyes* were un-

¹²⁶ Cf. STANTON, *op. cit.* 1990 (n. 115) 168–169 n. 3.

¹²⁷ A comparison of Agora XV 14 (367/6 B. C.) with, say, XV 86 (256/5 B. C.) establishes that it was Coastal Lamptraï that remained in Erekhtheis.

¹²⁸ Cf. L. THREATTE in *Demos* 60.

¹²⁹ *Demos* 77–78.

¹³⁰ *Demos* 52–54, 74.

successful. In his text reprinted below, in addition to the usual epigraphical conventions, underlining is used to indicate letters which were read by K. S. ΠΙΤΤΑΚΙΣ¹³¹ but not by later editors.

[----- Heading? -----]			
[----- ? -----]			
[----- ? -----]			
Col. I	Col. II	Col. III	Col. IV
[Ἐρεχθεΐδος]	[-----] 30	<u>Θυ</u> [ργωνίδα] 56	<i>lacuna</i> ,
[Κηφισιά] 5	[Πρα]σία	[Κ]λω[πίδα]	perhaps
[Ἀγρυλή ὑπέ]νερο	Στειρία	[.]α. [-----]	<i>vacat</i>
[Ἀναγυρ]οῦς]	Φηγαεῖς .[- -?]	Πε[ταλίδα?]	
[Λαμπ]τραὶ καθύπερ	Γραῆς	[Πε]ρρ[ί]δ[αι] 60	
[Λαμπ]τραὶ ὑπένερο	ἽΟαῆς 35	ἽΥπώρει[α]	
[Κηδ]οί 10	Λεωντίδος	Εὐνοστίδα	
[Πα]μβωτάδα	Σκαμβωνίδα[ι]	[Κο]ω[νεῖς?]	
[Ε]ὐώνυμον	Λευκονοε[ῖς]	[-----]	
[Π]εργασὴ καθύπερ	Ποταμός	[-----] 65	
Περγασὴ ὑπένερο	Ποταμός 40	[Ἀκαμαν]τίδος	
Συβρίδα 15	Κηττός	[Κ]εραμεῖς	
Φηγοῦ[ς]	Ἄλμ[ο]ῦ[ς]	Ἰ[φι]στίαδα	.[-----] 76
Ἀϊγείδο[ς]	Δι[-----]	Εἰρεσίδα	Κ[-----]
[Κ]ολλυ[τός]	.[-----]	Ἔρμος 70	Ε[-----]
Ἄγρυλή [καθύπερ]	[-----] 45	[[Χολαρ]γ]εῖς	
Ἄγρυλή[ῆ ὑπένερο] 20	Παιονίδα	Εἰτέα	
Διόμ[εα]	ἽΥβάδα[ι]	Σφηττ[ός]	
Κολ[ωνός]	Πήληγες	Κ[ίκυ]ννα	
Ἐσ[τ]ίαα	Κρωπίδα	<u>Κ</u> [εφαλῆ?] 75	
Βατή	Εὐπυρίδα 50	<i>lacuna</i>	
Ἐρίκεια 25	Κολωνεῖς		
ἽΟτρύνη	<u>Οἶ</u> [ον]		
Γαργητός	[-----]		
[-----]	<i>lacuna</i>		
<i>lacuna</i>	[Πτολεμαῖδος]		
[Πανδιονίδος]	<i>lacuna</i>		
<i>lacuna</i>	[Ἄφιδνα] 55		

There are clearly some infelicities in the list. In particular, the placement of Euonymon and Kephisia (restored in line 5) needs to be reversed, since Euonymon is the leading deme of the city *trittys* and Kephisia of the inland *trittys* of Erekhtheis. The

¹³¹ Ἐφημ. 1840, 339–340 no. 410; transcript conveniently reproduced at Demos 76 fig. 4.

order of listing in Aigeis and Akamantis is city-inland-coast,¹³² but in Erekhtheis, Leontis (see discussion below) and (perhaps) Hippothontis it is city-coast-inland.

TRAILL offers¹³³ two reconstructions of the whole catalogue, one on the assumption that it belongs to a period of eleven tribes and the other on the assumption that it belongs to the second period of twelve tribes (as he believes). But he declines to take into consideration the contents of column IV or a possible column V. Two indications of run-on from the foot of one column to the top of the next – in the rosters of Pandionis (columns I–II) and of Ptolemais (columns II–III)¹³⁴ – suggest that the number of lines in all columns except the last should be the same. There is no expectation of uneven columns as in the prytny inscriptions discussed in section II above. The minimum number of lines required for a four-column inscription can be readily calculated:

names of existing eleven tribes	11
original demes (including the twelve transferred to Ptolemais)	139
new deme in Ptolemais	1
names of places that are not demes	(at least) <u>9</u>
	160
<i>less</i> : demes transferred to Attalis	<u>11</u>
	149

The minimum length of column needed to achieve this is 38 lines (three columns of 38 lines and one of 35). Column IV would have space for three more names, so up to three more places which were not constitutional demes could have been listed on the missing or illegible parts of the inscription. TRAILL opts for this minimum length of 38 lines in his preferred disposition. However, since two names of places which were not constitutional demes are preserved on the stone at the top of column II in the roster of Pandionis, one more line is needed for the constitutional demes at the foot of column I. A slight increase in length also allows for further extra-constitutional demes in other columns: given that such names are preserved in the rosters of Pandionis and Ptolemais,¹³⁵ some small allowance should be made for them in other rosters. Will the names preserved on the inscription actually fit a column length of 39 lines? I suggest the following arrangement, extending the disposition laid out by TRAILL on Demos 69 and using the abbreviations <ci> for city demes, <co> for coastal demes, <in> for inland demes (always referring to topographical location, unlike TRAILL, who uses these abbreviations here for the administrative *trittys* to which he assigns a deme) and <ex> for an extra place-name that is not a constitutional deme. But in the case of Ptolemais I follow the suggestion of TRAILL¹³⁶ that the demes were or-

¹³² Cf. Demos 66–68.

¹³³ Demos 70.

¹³⁴ So Demos 54.

¹³⁵ So Demos 70.

¹³⁶ Demos 69; cf. POA 99–100.

nineteen demes of Aigeis and nine of Pandionis must fit before the heading for Leontis preserved in column II. Similarly, the demes of Akamantis, Oineis and Kekropis must fit before the sequence of kappa and epsilon in column IV which, as KIRCHNER recognised, corresponds to a pair of deme-names in Hippothontis, but not in Kekropis (or Aiantis). The only freedom for movement, in fact, is in column IV, where two further place-names which are not demes could be included.¹³⁷ In short, this catalogue seems to belong to the actual reorganisation of 200 B.C. Demes have been listed in the order of their original tribes, including some areas of settlement which were associated with a deme (such as Aphidna). But the eleven demes that were transferred from the existing tribes to Attalis have been subtracted for listing elsewhere, presumably on the front of the monument.

If this reconstruction is correct, then conclusions can be drawn about the assignments of demes to *trittyes* and about *trittys*-deme homonyms. First, *trittys* affiliation. There are fair runs of demes from the same *trittys* in Aigeis (nine city demes, then the inland roster begins), Leontis (six city demes together and seven inland demes together) and Akamantis (six or five city demes, followed by two or three inland demes). If in the Erekhtheis roster [Kephisia] and Euonymon are swapped, there are two city demes followed by five coastal demes and five inland demes: an entire tribal complement arranged by topographical *trittys*. The following affiliations can be read off the inscription:

- I. Anagyrous is coastal, not (with SIEWERT) inland.
 Upper Lamprai is coastal, not (with TRAILL) inland.
 Kedoi is coastal, not (with SIEWERT and TRAILL) city?
 Sybridai is inland, not (with TRAILL) coastal?
 Phegous is inland, not (with SIEWERT) coastal.
- II. Diomeia is city, not (with SIEWERT and TRAILL) coastal.
 Plotheia is inland, not (with SIEWERT and TRAILL) city.
- IV. Kholleidai is inland, not (with SIEWERT and TRAILL) city.
 Oion Kerameikon is inland, not city.¹³⁸

Secondly, *trittys*-deme homonyms. One has to be cautious about identifying a deme name as also a *trittys* name, for there are known to be three non-deme names used for *trittyes*: Pedieis for the inland *trittys* of Oineis, Ze- or Te- for the inland *trittys* of Hippothontis and Tetrapoleis for the coastal *trittys* of Aiantis (on Epakreis see n. 156 below). But it seems that the demes that gave their name to the *trittys* of

¹³⁷ The order of demes in Ptolemais is speculative. The non-constitutional demes Melainai (associated with Oinoe, from Hippothontis) and Titakidai (associated with Aphidna, like the six extra place-names in column III) might have been placed immediately before the heading Akamantis in column III rather than low in column II. In Aiantis, on the other hand, the city deme Phaleron was probably listed first (city demes come first in all preserved rosters).

¹³⁸ As was suggested by TRAILL at POA 44 and n. 17, but rejected at POA 134.

which they were a member were placed at the head of the *trittys* roster in some ten cases on the preserved portion of the inscription:

	<i>city</i>	<i>inland</i>	<i>coastal</i>
I.	[Euonymon] (these two names have been swapped)	[Kephisia]	Anagyrous?
II.	Kollytos	Gargettos	
IV.	Skambonidai		[Phrearrhioi]
V.	Kerameis	Sphettos	Kephale?

If this practice was indeed followed on this inscription, then the following *trittys* affiliations and other conclusions can be inferred:

- I. Pambotadai is coastal, not (with SEWERT and MILLER) inland.
- II. Otryne is city, not coastal.¹³⁹
- III. The name at the top of column II is likely to be either Angele or Kytherros.
- V. Eitea is city, not inland.¹⁴⁰
Kephale as well as Thorikos (SEG 10, 371) is attested as a *trittys* name; this would provide a second instance of alternation in this tribe.¹⁴¹

My reconstruction, based on advances made by TRAILL in studying epigraphical and architectural aspects of the monument, is subject to severe limitations, given that the positions on the stone of three tribal headings and forty-five deme names are attested. Yet the demes of the eleven other tribes at the creation of Attalis actually fit the four columns known to have been inscribed on the stone. The sequences of demes from the same *trittys* and the placement of demes which gave their name to a *trittys* at the head of a sequence enable the *trittys* affiliation of many demes to be identified or confirmed (see the summary in section V below).

IV. The list of *diaitetai*, IG IP 1927

Several lists of *diaitetai*, men in their sixtieth year and thus in the forty-second age cohort of those liable for military service¹⁴² who acted as public arbitrators, have been preserved. One, dated to c. 330 B. C. by most scholars and to c. 360 B. C. by E. RUSCHENBUSCH,¹⁴³ evidently has the demes arranged strictly in accordance with topographical order. TRAILL devoted a few paragraphs to this inscription at the end

¹³⁹ Cf. POA 40 n. 11 and the comments in n. 46 above.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. POA 48 n. 21 and Demos 140–142.

¹⁴¹ Kerameis (IG I² 883 = I³ 1118) and Kholargos (I² 900 = I³ 1131) are both attested as names of the city *trittys*. On Kephale as an alternative name for the coastal *trittys* see Demos 108.

¹⁴² D. M. LEWIS, ABSA 50, 1955, 29.

¹⁴³ See his thorough study in ZPE 49, 1982, 267–281.

of his chapter on the Attic *trittys* markers and *trittys* names,¹⁴⁴ and one wishes he had said more. Unlike the catalogue of demes, this inscription does not pay strict attention to deme-*trittys* homonyms. For example, Oinoe is listed first of the coastal demes of Aiantis and Thorai first of the coastal demes of Antiokhis; both are unlikely to be demes which gave their name to a *trittys*. While not as helpful as the deme-catalogue, this inscription allows some progress on the assignment of demes to *trittyes* in four tribes whose lists are very poorly preserved on the catalogue, Kekropis (VII) to Antiokhis (X). The arrangement of IG II² 1927 is as follows:

Kekropis	Hippothontis	Aiantis	Antiokhis
ci Melite	ci <i>Peiraiens</i>	ci Phaleron	ci <i>Alopeke</i>
ci Xypete	ci? <i>Eroiadai</i>	in Aphidna	co Thorai
in/ci [P]ithos	ci Korydallos	co Oinoe	co A[i]gilia
in [Ph]ya	co <i>Eleusis</i>	co Marathon	co Atene
[in Athmo]non	co Kopros	co Trikorynthos	co Anaphlystos
[in ?]	co Oinoe	co Rhamnous	co Besa
co A[ixone]	co? <i>Elaious</i>		in <i>Pallene</i>
co Ha[la]i	in <i>Dekeleia</i>		in Kolonai
(Aixonides)	in Oion		in <i>Eroiadai</i>
	(<i>Dekeleikon</i>)		in Eitea

Given the ravages of war and disease, and the possibility that *thetes* were exempted from the post,¹⁴⁵ not all demes will have had 59-year-old *diaitetai* in a particular year; and the bottom of the stone was lost before it was transcribed by CHANDLER. The following demes are missing:

ci Daidalidai	ci? <i>Hamaxanteia</i>	—	co <i>Amphitrope</i>
? <i>Epieikidai</i>	ci <i>Keiriadai</i>		in <i>Krioa</i>
in <i>Sypalettos</i>	ci <i>Koile</i>		in <i>Semakhidai</i>
in <i>Trinemeia</i>	ci <i>Thymaitadai</i>		
(one of these last	in/co? <i>Akherdous</i>		
two could fit	in? <i>Anakaia</i>		
before <i>Aixone</i>)	co? <i>Azenia</i>		
	? <i>Auridai</i>		

All but two of these missing demes had a bouleutic quota of one or two representatives and probably they had no *diaitetai* in the year of II² 1927.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁴ Demos 115–116. For an earlier emphatic statement of the attention to *trittys* order in this inscription see P.J. BICKNELL, *Historia* 27, 1978, 371 n. 14.

¹⁴⁵ P.J. RHODES, *op. cit.* 1993 (n. 8) 591, 778.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. E. RUSCHENBUSCH, *ZPE* 49, 1982, 271. The two exceptions are *Koile* and *Anakaia*, with three *bouleutai* each.

There are two problems in the Kekropis roster. K[ikyn]na, which has been restored in line 37, belongs to Akamantis, not Kekropis.¹⁴⁷ R. LÖPER suggested that Athmonon or Trinemeia was to be read here and TRAILL and RUSCHENBUSCH opt for Athmonon.¹⁴⁸ But there is also a problem in line 42 or 44. Every other *diaitetes* has a patronymic inscribed. If the same practice applied in these poorly preserved lines, there must be another deme name in line 42 or line 44. If <᾿Α>[θμο]νεῖς is read in line 37, [Συπαλήττιοι] or [Τρινεμεεῖς] can be supplied in one of these two lines. The few preserved letters of line 43 will belong to a name in the first case or to a patronymic in the second.

Clearly the list is an obstacle for those who think that the postulated <equal trittyes> were the *trittytes* of Kleisthenes. In Aiantis, Rhamnous is listed with other coastal demes, not with the city deme Phaleron. In Antiokhis, Thorai and Aigilia are listed between Alopeke (the sole city deme) and the other coastal demes, and are separated from the inland demes with which SEWERT and TRAILL would associate them.¹⁴⁹ The inland demes Kolonai, Eroiadaí and Eitea are all listed after the deme which gave its name to the inland *trittytes*, not with the city deme Alopeke. Thus all six demes preserved on the stone that are believed by TRAILL to have been transferred to other *trittytes* are in the wrong place for the theory of <equal trittytes>.¹⁵⁰

V. Conclusion

The idea of equal *trittytes* in Athens has won some surprising acceptances from scholars. They should have been careful not to slide from an allusion to <a *trittytes* of *prytaneis*> in Athenaion Politeia 44, 1 to <*trittytes* of *prytaneis*>.¹⁵¹ The now discredited <*strategos ex hapanton*>, misleadingly derived from a statement in Athenaion Politeia 61, 1 that <generals (στρατηγοί) were formerly chosen tribe by tribe, one from

¹⁴⁷ See J. KIRCHNER, ad loc.

¹⁴⁸ R. LÖPER, MDAI(A) 17, 1892, 409 n. 2, 414 n. 1; POA 83, 115 no. 18; Demos 115; E. RUSCHENBUSCH, ZPE 49, 1982, 268.

¹⁴⁹ SEWERT 103–104; TRAILL 1982, 170–171; Demos 139–140, 144–146.

¹⁵⁰ Since the *trittytes* assignment of Elaious is not certain, one cannot use this list to exclude firmly the transfer of Oinoe to the <inland> *trittytes* of Hippothontis that has been tentatively suggested by TRAILL (Demos 137 and n. 39). However, TRAILL's view that this inscription supports the assignment of Elaious to the coastal *trittytes* (Demos 138) entails support for the view that Oinoe, listed below Eleusis and Kopros and above Elaious, was a member of the coastal *trittytes*. Oinoe would thus be a seventh deme in the wrong place for the theory of <equal trittytes>.

¹⁵¹ The titles of THOMPSON 1966 and of RHODES' 1971 article (Historia 20, 1971, 385–404) meticulously preserved the singular τριτύς, but in time scholars were talking of <*trittytes* of *prytaneis*> or τριτύες τῶν πρυτάνεων (POA 40 n. 11; 42 n. 14; TRAILL 1978, 98–107, 109; P. J. RHODES, op. cit. 1993 [n. 8] 533; cf. THOMPSON 1969, 140). K. H. KINZL speaks freely of <the τριτύες τῶν πρυτάνεων of AP 44.1> in AHB 1, 1987, 28 nn. 15–16 (the text at this point makes THOMPSON's groups a neat 17, 17 and 16 each; but see section II.A above on THOMPSON 1966); similarly in Gymnasium 93, 1986, 556.

each tribe, but now from all citizens (ἐξ ἁπάντων) should have provided a warning.¹⁵² A book by N.F. JONES which will surely be used as a standard reference has opted for SIEWERT's and TRAILL's assignments of demes to *trittys*. The trouble with this approach is that the distribution of demes is constantly changing among proponents of 'equal *trittys*'.¹⁵³ I believe that a great deal more caution is required.¹⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the following distribution of demes to *trittys* seems to emerge for the first five tribes of Kleisthenes from the deme-catalogue combined with the prytany and bouleutic inscriptions studied in section II. For the last four tribes the list of *diaitetai* studied in section IV provides some guidance, and I have discussed elsewhere¹⁵⁵ tribe X (Antiochis). That leaves tribe VI (Oineis) which has, however, been discussed at some length in section II.B.

In the following tables demes which gave their name to the *trittys* are underlined. So that others can gauge the strengths and weaknesses of the conclusions reached in sections III–IV above I use an asterisk to indicate demes whose *trittys* affiliation has been derived solely from the discussion there and/or from their associations in prytany and bouleutic lists, and not from other evidence (such as the finding place of deme inscriptions, literary sources, and the survival of the name to the early twentieth century [before archaising renaming became established]). A question mark before a *trittys*-name indicates uncertainty about that name, not uncertainty about the deme's *trittys* affiliation.

I. Erekhtheis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>	<i>coastal trittys</i>
<u>Euonymon</u>	<u>Kephisia</u>	(?) <u>Anagyrous</u>
Upper Agryle	Upper Pergase	Kedoi*
Lower Agryle	Lower Pergase	Upper Lamprai
Themakos	Phegous*	Coastal Lamprai
	Sybridai*	Pambotadai

¹⁵² See E. S. STAVELEY, in: E. BADIAN (ed.), *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday*, Oxford 1966, 287 n. 14.

¹⁵³ See my table at the beginning of section II.B above for Erekhtheis. By the time N. F. JONES's book *Public Organization in Ancient Greece* (n. 87) was published, TRAILL had changed the *trittys* affiliation of seven demes (Anagyrous, Pambotadai, Upper Lamprai, Phegous and Themakos in I; Akharnai [part] in VI; Oinoe [provisionally] in VIII). JONES (*ibid.* 34) understandably included Rhamnous as a coastal deme in Aiantis (IX), but SIEWERT (102) in fact regarded it as a 'Quasi-Enklave' attached to the city *trittys*. Note also M. H. CHAMBERS, *Aristoteles: Staat der Athener* (Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung, 10.1), Berlin 1990, 227–229, 353–354. D. WHITEHEAD, in Appendix 2 (369–373) of his fundamental study *The Demes of Attica 508/7 – ca. 250 B. C.* (n. 11), showed the tribal affiliation and bouleutic representation of the demes, but did not attempt to give their *trittys* affiliation.

¹⁵⁴ See *Chiron* 14, 1984, 17–19, 20–21, 23–27, 32; *op. cit.* 1990 (n. 115) 164–165.

¹⁵⁵ *ABSA* 79, 1984, 289–291, 303–304.

II. Aigeis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>	<i>coastal trittys</i>
<u>Kollytos</u>	(?) <u>Gargettos</u> ¹⁵⁶	(?) <u>Halai Araphenides</u> ¹⁵⁷
Upper Ankyle	Erkhia	Araphen
Lower Ankyle	Ikarion	Myrrhinoutta
Bate*	Ionidai ¹⁵⁸	Phegaia
Diomeia	Kydantidai*	Philaidai
Erikeia*	Plotheia	Teithras
Hestiaia		
Kolonos		
Otryne*		

III. Pandionis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>	<i>coastal trittys</i>
<u>Kydathenaion</u>	Upper <u>Paiania</u>	<u>Myrrhinous</u>
	Lower <u>Paiania</u>	Angele
	Konthylidai	Kytherros*
	Oai	Prasia
		Probalinthos
		Steiria

IV. Leontis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i> ¹⁵⁹	<i>coastal trittys</i>
<u>Skambonidai</u>	Aithalidai*	<u>Phrearrhoi</u> ¹⁶⁰
Halimous	Eupyridai	Deiradiotai
Kettos*	Hekale	Potamos Deiradiotes
Leukonoion*	Hybadai*	Sounion

¹⁵⁶ Epakreis, attested as a *trittys* name (IG I² 899, II² 2490, 8; cf. I³ 258, 30), has often been thought of as the inland *trittys* of Aigeis, but it may be the name of a pre-Kleisthenic *trittys*, like Leukotainioi (J. H. OLIVER, *Hesperia* 4, 1935, 21 no. 2 line 36); SEWERT 14, 15 n. 67. For a different view (Epakreis as the members of a cult) see THOMPSON 1969, 150–152.

¹⁵⁷ TRAILL suggests Halai, for lack of contrary evidence, as the most probable name for the coastal *trittys* (Demos 108).

¹⁵⁸ The reference at Demos 127 to H. F. MUSSCHE (ed.), op. cit. (n. 90) is to J. E. JONES' article, at 102–104.

¹⁵⁹ On the name of the inland *trittys* of Leontis see B. D. MERITT, *Hesperia* 30, 1961, 265 and n. 83 above.

¹⁶⁰ Restored in the deme-catalogue, but attested in B. D. MERITT, *Hesperia* 9, 1940, 54 no. 2 as a *trittys* name.

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>
Upper Potamos	Kholleidai
Lower Potamos	Kolonai
	Kropidai
	Oion Kerameikon*
	Paionidai
	Pelekes

V. Akamantis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>	<i>coastal trittys</i>
<u>Kerameis</u>	<u>Sphettos</u>	(?) <u>Kephale</u>
Eiresidai	Hagnous	Poros*
Eitea*	Kikynna	<u>Thorikos</u>
Hermos	Prospalta	
Iphistiadai		
<u>Kholargos</u>		

VI. Oineis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i> (<u>Pedieis</u>)	<i>coastal trittys</i>
<u>Lakiadai</u>	Akharnai	<u>Thria</u>
Boutadai		Kothokidai*
Epikephisia		Oe
Hippotomadai*		Phyle
Lousia		
Perithoidai		
Ptelea		

unknown *trittys*: Tyrmeidai

VII. Kekropis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>	<i>coastal trittys</i>
(?) <u>Melite</u>	Athmonon	Aixone
Daidalidai	Phlya	Halai Aixonides
Xypete	Sypalettos	
	Trinemeia	

unknown *trittys*: Epieikidai, Pithos

VIII. Hippothontis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i> (Ze- or Te-)	<i>coastal trittys</i>
Peiraieus	Dekeleia	Eleusis
Eroiadai	Oion Dekeleikon	Elaious*
Keiriadai		Kopros
Koile		Oinoe
Korydallos		
Thymaitadai		
	unknown trittys: Akherdous, ¹⁶¹ Anakaia, Auridai, Azenia, Hamaxanteia	

IX. Aiantis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>	<i>coastal trittys</i> (Tetrapoleis)
Phaleron	Aphidna	Marathon
		Oinoe
		Rhamnous
		Trikorynthos

X. Antiokhis

<i>city trittys</i>	<i>inland trittys</i>	<i>coastal trittys</i>
Alopeke	Pallene	(?)Anaphlystos ¹⁶²
	Eitea	Aigilia
	Eroiadai*	Amphitrope
	Kolonai	Atene
	Krioia*	Besa
	Semakhidai	Thorai

This distribution of demes to *trittyes* conflicts with that in JONES' list in some twenty places.¹⁶³ In Pandionis (III) and Leontis (IV) there is a single disagreement: I do not

¹⁶¹ There is some very uncertain evidence for placing Akherdous in the inland *trittys*. The extremely fragmentary Fr. 19e of Euphorion (POxy 2219–20), discussed by SIEWERT (92–93 n. 32), mentions Akherdous (v. 21) after Aphidna (v. 15) and a scholiast on v. 23 reported by B. A. VAN GRONINGEN, *Euphorion*, Amsterdam 1977, 53 wrote κολωνην, possibly an allusion to Kolonai (cf. A. S. HOLLIS, *Callimachus: Hecale*, Oxford 1990, 204). Both Kolonai demes and Aphidna are in inland *trittyes*.

¹⁶² Whereas Agora XV 44 is dubious evidence for TRAILL (Demos 109–110), since his inland *trittys* is headed by a deme transferred from the coastal *trittys*, for me Anaphlystos heads the list of coastal demes and both Pallene and Alopeke can be seen as headings. Anaphlystos has been plausibly restored on *Hesperia* 9, 1940, 55–56 no. 4: B. D. MERITT, *Hesperia* 30, 1961, 264; D. M. LEWIS, *Historia* 12, 1963, 30.

¹⁶³ See N. F. JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 87) 33–35. The amount of disagreement with TRAILL'S Demos (125–140) is similar.

regard Probalinthos and Kholleidai as city demes. There would also be a single disagreement in Aiantis (IX), if JONES had noticed that SIEWERT (like TRAILL) assigned Rhamnous to the city Prytanen-Trittys. There is no disagreement between JONES' list and mine for Akamantis (V), Oineis (VI) and Hippothontis (VIII). But my list differs extensively in Erekhtheis (I) and Antiokhis (X) from those of both JONES and TRAILL, as one would expect from the discussion in section II.B above.¹⁶⁴ By contrast, there are no disagreements about *trittys* affiliation between my list and the *conspetus* in TRAILL's older work (POA) for Erekhtheis, Aiantis and Antiokhis.

Finally, I offer a couple of checks on this distribution of demes. Strabon's list of demes along the coast of Attike will not provide a complete list of coastal demes from Phaleron to Rhamnous, since we know of some coastal *trittyes* which extend into the interior (those containing Oinoe and Phyle, for example).¹⁶⁵ But all demes listed by Strabon should be regarded as coastal demes, and the demes he mentions in 9,1,21–22 are indeed all in the columns of coastal demes above. (Of course, SIEWERT and TRAILL have demes such as Thorai, Aigilia, Probalinthos and Rhamnous assigned to non-coastal *trittyes* – despite their appearance in Strabon's list.) Secondly, do the inscriptions of the first period of twelve tribes (307/6 – 224/3 B. C.) support this assignment of demes rather than those by SIEWERT or TRAILL? For the reason given in the introduction to section II (the wholesale removal of some *trittyes* to the new tribes), the inscriptions after 307/6 have limited value. Nevertheless, they do seem to pay attention to *trittys* affiliation in some cases. There are, for example, runs of city, inland and coastal demes from Aigeis on the prytany inscription Agora XV 89; of inland demes from Leontis on the bouleutic inscriptions XV 61 and 72 and the prytany inscription XV 88; and of city demes from Oineis on XV 72. There is a tendency to list demes which earlier had given their names to *trittyes* either at the head of the *trittys* or early in the whole register: thus the prytany inscription XV 58 (Akamantis), which can be restored entirely in accordance with topographical *trittyes*, has Sphettos and Kephale at the head of their respective *trittyes*, while the bouleutic inscription XV 72 lists Kholargos, Sphettos and Kephale first;¹⁶⁶ similarly XV 62 and 72 list first the three deme-*trittys* homonyms of Antiokhis.¹⁶⁷ The most difficult obstacle for those who

¹⁶⁴ In Erekhtheis, JONES lists Kedoi as city, Anagyrous and Pambotadai as inland, Phegous and Themakos as coastal and Sybridai as unknown. In Antiokhis, both JONES and TRAILL have transferred five inland demes (Eitea, Eroiadai, Kolonai, Krioia and Semakhidai) to the city *trittys* and two coastal demes (Aigilia and Thorai) to the inland *trittys*. I differ with them on the *trittys* affiliation of seven out of thirteen demes in Antiokhis (though I have no disagreement with TRAILL's earlier assignments in POA 53–54, where three affiliations are marked as tentative).

¹⁶⁵ See Chiron 14, 1984, 28–29.

¹⁶⁶ Note that here and elsewhere (for example, the Erekhtheid contribution to Antigonis on Agora XV 60 and 61) there is a tendency to list demes in the order city-inland-coastal.

¹⁶⁷ Not so clear-cut are XV 86 (Lamptraï before Euonymon, Kephisia and Anagyrous in Erekhtheis) and XV 89 (Halai and Kollytos first; Gargettos has been removed from Aigeis).

believe in administrative *trittyes* is the treatment of Rhamnous, which must be listed with the coastal demes, not the city deme Phaleron, on the prytany list XV 59 and the bouleutic list XV 61. Rhamnous was evidently treated as a coastal deme, not as one transferred to a postulated <city> *trittys*.

*

The purpose of this investigation has been both to cast doubt on the <*trittyes* of *prytaneis*> that have been suggested (and received a degree of acceptance) in recent scholarship and to construct a plausible assignment of demes to *trittyes*. Certainly it is difficult to perceive a sensible military intention in the formation of <*trittyes* of *prytaneis*>. In section II it has been suggested that three more nearly equal <*trittyes* of *prytaneis*> have been perceived because rosters of *prytaneis* were so frequently inscribed in three roughly equal columns.¹⁶⁸ Cutters often seem to have been motivated by the aesthetic desirability of having columns of equal length; either the secretary took this into account when drafting a list of names and demotics on papyrus or a wax tablet, or discussion took place between secretary and cutter. Even the repetition of certain adjustments (such as the placement of Probalinthos in a column headed by Kydathenaion) can be explained in this way. However, TRAILL's re-examination of the catalogue of demes has opened the way for further determination of *trittys* affiliation – but the *trittyes* thus discerned are not (as TRAILL might have hoped) the alleged <*trittyes* of *prytaneis*>, but the topographical *trittyes* of Kleisthenes.

Although the Athenians had roughly equal tribes for administrative and military purposes, at least down to the Peloponnesian War, the *trittyes* that constituted these artificial tribes must have been uneven in size. Kleisthenes or a commission set up under his bill evidently gave more weight to the location of the communities that became demes under his reform than to administrative convenience. The advantages of compact *trittyes* for the family of Kleisthenes and the epigraphical and literary indications that citizens were encouraged (not compelled) to gather in *trittys* groups on the Assembly place of the fifth century B.C.¹⁶⁹ combine to point to a self-interested motive on the part of Kleisthenes.

Department of Classics and Ancient History
University of New England
Armidale N. S. W. 2351
Australia

¹⁶⁸ Note THOMPSON's caution at the beginning of this debate: <When we had only three column stelai, the numbers of members in each group could be attributed to the chance division of the total tribal membership over three roughly equal columns> (THOMPSON 1966, 6).

¹⁶⁹ See on these two aspects Chiron 14, 1984, 1–41 and GRBS 28, 1987, 51–92.

