

THE ATHENIAN PHYLAI AS ASSOCIATIONS

DISPOSITION, FUNCTION, AND PURPOSE

RECENT DECADES have witnessed a veritable explosion of publications devoted to various aspects of the democratic constitution of Athens after Kleisthenes. Not a few of these publications concern the framework of that constitution, the network of phylai, trittyes, and demes through which the various responsibilities and privileges of government were theoretically equally apportioned over the citizen population. The functioning of these segments of the state was by no means limited, however, to the distribution or administrative management of the business of the democracy, for all three sets of units were simultaneously internally organized as more or less self-contained and autonomous *associations* devoted to the pursuit of activities possessing little or no connection (or so it has seemed) with the operation of the organs of the central government. It is in regard to this second, arguably no less vital, aspect of the constitutional framework that my statement about the “explosion” of publications requires some qualification. Not until 1986 was Haussoullier’s venerable study of the Attic demes¹ finally superseded by Whitehead’s penetrating and exhaustively detailed book *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca. 250 B.C.*, and even it appeared under the subtitle *A Political and Social Study*.² The trittyes, although they have played an important role in attempts to understand the political motivations behind, and the originally intended or actual later functioning of, Kleisthenes’ new organization, have not left sufficient traces of their internal arrangements to support even the most rudimentary attempt at description.³ That leaves the phylai, about which, as will be seen, considerable documentation survives. Except, however, for a brief summary description in my own *Public Organization in Ancient Greece*, that documentation has gone largely unexamined.⁴ It is the purpose of the present study to make good this deficiency.

The plan of my discussion, which is of necessity constrained and shaped by the availability of only certain kinds of evidence, requires a few words by way of introduction. It begins (I) with a review of the indications for the location of the “seats” of the phyle organization, with a view to establishing the point that their concentration in the town (a fact that has never been contested) was not an accident but the result of deliberate and continually reaffirmed choice. At or near that seat, furthermore, were held the *agorai* or meetings of the phylai (II), which I shall argue were devoted in significant part to managing the finances of the organization with a view to acquiring the funds necessary to support the most frequently documented phyletic activity, the conferring of honors upon the benefactors of the organization. Against

¹ Haussoullier 1883.

² Whitehead 1986.

³ For what little documentation there is, see Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.33 (pp. 60–61).

⁴ Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.32 (pp. 58–60). Earlier accounts, brief as they are, may be mentioned: DarSag IV, pp. 450–454, esp. 452–453, *s.v.* Phylè (C. Lécivain); Gilbert 1895, pp. 200–203; H. Swoboda in Busolt and Swoboda 1920–1926, II, pp. 974–975; *RE* XX, 1941, cols. 994–1011, esp. 1008–1009, *s.v.* Phyle (K. Latte). To these accounts, little or nothing is added by the comprehensive treatises of Szanto 1901 and Roussel 1976.

this positive finding must be set, by contrast, the negative observation (III) that there is little evidence of solidarity among *phyletai* and that, therefore, the primary purpose of the phyle organization was apparently not to promote community among its members. A lengthy discussion (IV) of the personnel of the phylai (officeholders, movers of decrees, and honorands) helps us understand just what that purpose might have been. While officeholders of a phyle seem often to have been citizens of substance, yet at the same time men without ambitions beyond the phyle organization itself, the movers of the honorary decrees of that same phyle, may have seen this role as a means of promoting their present or future careers in the political life of the city. But it is the record of the people honored by a phyle that yields the most telling clues, for not only their current positions in the central government but also, even more revealingly, the reasons given by the phyle for so honoring them suggest strongly that the purpose of these decrees, and indeed of the organization as a whole, was to promote the advancement of the phyle's interests in the context of the public life of the city of Athens. Thus, I conclude (V), we may understand the urban situation of the seat and the preoccupation with the bestowing of often costly honors, especially upon phyletai with official appointments of one kind or another in the city: the associations of the phyletai had evolved, to sum up the situation in a single word, into organs of *representation*.

By far the most abundant and informative indications are provided by inscriptions⁵ comprising decrees of individual phylai (the overwhelming majority) plus an assorted miscellany of other texts. All ten Kleisthenic phylai except Oineis are represented by at least one decree; of the five post-Kleisthenic units we *may* have a single decree of Ptolemais, and not a few texts, although not assignable to a specific unit, are recognizably authorized by a phyle. Chronologically, the vast majority of the inscriptions fall within the 4th century; only a very few texts, *viz.* the herm of Aigeis (before 415) and a dedication of Pandionis (*fin. s. V*), are likely to antedate the year 400,⁶ and only a scattering of others demonstrably postdate the dismantling of the democracy under the Macedonians. Similarly, what literary references we have to phyletai in their capacity as members of a phyle association range from an Aristophanic use of phyletes in the *Birds* (414) down through the orators Andokides, Lysias, and Demosthenes (see pp. 518–521) in the later 4th century. But such literary sources are surprisingly few, a fact to which I shall attach a significance vital to my position.

Archaeological evidence is another matter. As will be seen, the destroyed or so far undiscovered (but epigraphically attested) shrines of the eponyms severally served as the focal points of the *individual* phyle organizations. But much of the rest of the physical record would seem to require a quite different interpretation. The depiction of the eponyms on the east pediment of the Parthenon,⁷ the monument of the Eponymous Heroes in the Agora,⁸ and the epigraphic record of ten kylikes “of the eponyms” dedicated by the Boule in the name

⁵ For the reader's convenience, and to simplify referencing throughout my discussion, I append (pp. 540–541 below) a corrected and amplified version of the list of the inscriptions of the phylai published in Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.4, Appendix, pp. 65–67.

⁶ For a probable 5th-century attestation of Aiantis' board of *epimeletai* (this term does not actually occur in the text), see *IG I³ 377* (= *I² 304 B; 407/6*), lines 21–22 (with Traill 1986, pp. 79–80, no. 1).

⁷ For the interpretation of the pedimental figures as the eponyms, see Kron 1976, pp. 202–214 and Harrison 1979, pp. 71–85.

⁸ On the monument, see *Agora III*, nos. 229–245, pp. 85–90; *Agora XIV*, pp. 38–41; Shear 1970, pp. 145–222 (the definitive publication); and Kron 1976, pp. 228–236.

of “the Hero”⁹ all bespeak the *collective* representation of the eponyms by the state. Some scholars have favored in this connection the notion of a common cult of the eponyms.¹⁰ Yet, not only is such a notion not otherwise supported, but also, on the hypothesis argued here, it is no longer necessary. If I am right, the purpose imposed upon the phyle organization by its active members was to promote the interests of that organization beyond the phyle in the wider context of the city of Athens. The pediment, the monument, and the kylikes may, on such a reconstruction, all be regarded as the state’s response to this trend: while an individual phyle might promote itself at the expense of the remaining nine-tenths of the state, the state itself by these collective representations of the heroes asserted both the unity of the state and its own suzerainty over the individual parts of the state. None of these physical remains should be confused with the acts or arrangements of the phylai themselves, whether individually or collectively.

I. THE DISPOSITION OF THE PHYLE ORGANIZATION

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

At the heart of Kleisthenes’ new partition of Attica was a geographical division into three regions, *viz.* the City, Coast, and Inland. Over these regions were scattered the units of the organization, probably exactly 139 in number and, once institutionalized by Kleisthenes, known technically as “demes”; some of these were formed on already-existing rural villages, others the reformer carved out of the more or less continuous sprawl of the urban center. The demes, in turn, Kleisthenes grouped in the clusters called trittytes, ten clusters to each region, numbering thirty in all. Each of the ten phylai was constructed of three trittytes of demes, one trittytes from each of the three regions. Thus the organization comprised three tiers of units, *viz.* phyle, trittytes, and deme, each of which was theoretically capable of providing the territorial basis for an independent “association” of the type found in numerous Greek city-states.¹¹

In two of the three cases, the creation and maintenance of such an organization will have been a relatively straightforward, uncomplicated affair. For many of the demes, especially the rural ones, a nucleated settlement already existed, and even in the densely packed urban center more or less natural “neighborhoods” may have been defined by streets or other manmade or topographic features. Not surprisingly, therefore, the record of associational life in the deme is relatively copious, for (to select an easily calculated index) of the 139 units we have epigraphic documents of one kind or another (but usually decrees) in the names of about fifty.¹² The case of the trittytes was somewhat more complicated. Not all trittytes, despite my use of the term “cluster” above, were compact, contiguous aggregates of constituent demes;

⁹ Rotroff 1978, pp. 196–209.

¹⁰ So, most recently, Rotroff in her publication of the inscription mentioning the “ten kylikes of the Eponymoi” (Rotroff 1978, pp. 207–208). In the end, on the basis of this text, she comes down in favor of “a common cult of the ten Eponymoi in Athens in the 4th century B.C.” (p. 208). Earlier, Kron, to whom the inscription was not known, had concluded that the existence of such a cult remained merely a possibility (Kron 1976, p. 228).

¹¹ For the recorded examples, see Jones 1987, Index III, pp. 396–403.

¹² See the list of deme documents in Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.4, Appendix, pp. 67–72; a similar, annotated list may be found in Whitehead 1986, Appendix 3, pp. 374–393.

in a number of instances an individual member deme might lie at a considerable distance from the main body of the trittys. Obviously, the physical separation of some of the members of the trittys from each other could only impede the internal functioning and associational life of the organization, were such an organization to be formed. Among other problems, one will have been in which member deme or demes to situate any institutional structures, *viz.* a town hall or communal shrine, or, if such structures were to share a common location, the “seat” of the trittys. But we shall never know how this or any other related problem was solved since, although just enough evidence survives to indicate that the trittys did develop internally, that evidence is too slight to permit meaningful generalization.

With the phyle, of course, the problems of the physical separation of the membership and of situating the “seat” acquire far greater urgency. It is one thing when one or two demes of a trittys lie at some remove from the main cluster. It is quite another when the unit, the phyle, falls into three more-or-less equal (in population, if not in territory or numbers of demes) and usually non-contiguous segments situated in three topographically and demographically distinct regions.¹³ Nor is it simply a matter of the political question of how to decide the problem of which trittys will enjoy the privilege of possessing the seat, important as that question is. For the location of the seat would (and, in the event, undoubtedly did) go far towards determining the composition and so the character of the organization since, given the realities of ancient transportation and communications, only phyletai living in close proximity to the seat would have acceptably convenient access to the phyle’s meetings, cultic celebrations, and other functions. In which of the three regions, then, would the seat be located? Or would there be more than one seat, perhaps one in each region? Evidently because virtually all the available evidence has pointed to the urban center, as will be seen, no one (so it seems to me) has bothered to come to grips with this question. To mention only the most obvious item of that evidence, virtually all the relevant inscriptions (the very few exceptions are discussed below) were, where a provenience is known, found either on the Akropolis or in or near the Agora. Not unnaturally, therefore, the situation of the seat in the town might be taken as a given of the phyle organization.¹⁴ Yet, I shall argue, this outcome was the product of a choice or series of choices, and the perception of the basis for that choice or those choices will provide an important ingredient in our ultimate characterization of the function and purpose of the internally organized phylai.

THE SHRINE OF THE EPONYMOUS HERO

Some commentators believe that it was at the shrine of the eponymous hero that the phyletai focused their associational activities.¹⁵ This belief is not without merit. The Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* states (21.6) that Kleisthenes appointed ten eponymous

¹³ For cartographic representations of the affiliations of demes, trittyes, and phylai, see Traill 1975, Maps 1–3, and for an improved version, Traill 1986, map at end.

¹⁴ For the reasoned position of Swoboda, however, see p. 510 below, with note 23.

¹⁵ Such is the assumption underlying my own statement in Jones 1987 that “several, if not indeed all, of the phylai were headquartered on or near the Akropolis” (p. 58). This statement was based, although not explicitly so, on my further observation that “each eponymous is known (or can be assumed) to have possessed a sanctuary, with a concentration on the Akropolis, where three, possibly four, of the shrines are believed to have been situated” (p. 60).

heroes for the phylai, chosen by the Pythian priestess from a pre-selected list of one hundred founders (*archegetai*). That the tradition of instituting a hero continued after Kleisthenes with the later additions (totaling five) to the original ten phylai is demonstrated by the phases of construction of the monument of the Eponymous Heroes in the Agora: as a new phyle was added to or an old phyle subtracted from the organization, statues of the corresponding eponyms were tacked onto or removed from the monument. Shrines are another matter; the recognition of a hero need not necessarily imply the existence of a shrine. So, the first order of business, prior to asking whether a shrine, if it existed, functioned as the “seat” of its phyle, is to determine the existence, then the location, of that shrine. Of course, much attention has been given already to these questions, most fully by Ursula Kron in her 1976 monograph cited earlier,¹⁶ so there is no need to go over once again this already much-worked ground. For our purposes, however, since we are opening up a question about the phylai previously believed to be answered (or not worth asking), it is important to observe a distinction regarding the evidence on the basis of which the determination of the location of the shrine (given its existence) is made. Some of this evidence, e.g. a notice in Pausanias, is independent of the documents under review here. But to what extent is the evidence of the inscriptions, including above all the record of their proveniences, admissible in this connection? If, on the one hand, as in the case of Pandion, some of the decrees of the phyle Pandionis (as restored) call explicitly for the stele to be erected “on the Akropolis in the shrine of Pandion,” and if (as is the case) a number of such stelai are found in that very location, *viz.* the Akropolis, the conclusions that, first, the (thus far undiscovered) shrine of Pandion was located in this general vicinity and that, second, this shrine was of some importance for the administration of the phyle Pandionis are both unobjectionable. But we cannot assume, on the other hand, that the provenience of a phyle inscription containing no such injunction to erect the stele in the shrine of the eponym (or any other mention of the hero or his cult) necessarily indicates, should the existence of that shrine be established, the location of that shrine, for that would be to beg the question under consideration here regarding the location of the phyle’s seat. The seat, in other words, may have been situated elsewhere than in or near the shrine. In the end, happily, only the case of Erechtheis is affected by this consideration, and that is the one phyle for which not only the existence but also the location of a shrine of the eponym is beyond all doubt. Nonetheless, it will repay the effort to rehearse briefly (with the help of Kron, McLeod, and Rotroff)¹⁷ the key indications, and above all the epigraphic testimony, bearing on our question.

I Erechtheus. The building on the Akropolis visited by Pausanias (1.26.5) and incontrovertibly identified as the Erechtheion can only have been the shrine of the eponymous hero of the phyle. The decrees of the phyle, although in three instances found on the Akropolis (*viz.* *IG II*² 1146, 1150, 1165), do not preserve an injunction to set up the stele in the shrine.

II Aigeus. A heroon of Aigeus is recorded by Pausanias (1.22.5) but without indication of its precise location. H. G. Lolling (1886, pp. 322–323) placed the shrine at the western base of the Akropolis. Consistent with this placement, *Agora XV*, no. 69, identified as a decree of the phyle, was discovered *in arce* (see *IG II*² 656). Perhaps pertinently, too, an inscription identified by its editor as a joint decree with Aiantis (*Hesperia* 56, 1987, pp. 47–58) was discovered near the western entrance to the Agora

¹⁶ See note 7 above.

¹⁷ Kron 1976, *passim*; McLeod 1959, pp. 125–126; and Rotroff 1978, pp. 205–206, note 46.

Excavations (p. 47). While the editor regards the stone as Aiantis' copy (p. 51), I think it equally likely, in view of the difficulties involved in locating the latter phyle's shrine (see below), that we have the copy of Aigeis.

III Pandion. Pausanias (1.5.4) saw a statue of the hero on the Akropolis, and several inscriptions of the phyle (as restored) enjoy that the stele be placed "on the Akropolis in the shrine of Pandion" (*IG* II² 1144, 1148, 1152; *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 41, no. 42) or simply "in (the shrine) of Pandion" (*IG* II² 1138, 1140, 1157). All these inscriptions were found "in arce" (the *IG* texts) or "near the Eleusinion" (*Hesperia*). For discussion of the shrine's possible precise location, see H. R. Immerwahr's publication (*Hesperia* 11, 1942, pp. 341–343, no. 1) of a dedication by Pandionis (evidently the phyle), likewise found on the Akropolis; and for the probable original erection of the stelai at the shrine, see Lewis 1955, pp. 17–24, no. 25.

IV Leos. The honorary ephebic decree of Leontis, *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8, dedicated [τῶι ῥ]ρωτι (line 1) and to be placed "in the shrine of the hero" (col. I, lines 31–33) or simply "in the shrine" (col. II, line 5), was discovered in the northeast part of the Agora. As Rotroff notes (1978, pp. 206–207), the *lex sacra* of Skambonidai (a deme of Leontis), *IG* I³ 244 (= I² 188), is recorded to have been discovered "Athenis ad Theseum", i.e., near the Hephaisteion northwest of the Agora. She concludes that Leos' shrine, if such existed, may have stood near the north side of the Agora. Alternatively, she adds, Leos may have shared the shrine of his daughters, the Leokoreion, again situated on the north side of the Agora. On the Leokoreion, see *Agora* III, nos. 317–338 (pp. 108–113); *Agora* XIV, pp. 121–123; Wycherley 1978, pp. 63–64 (northwest corner of the Agora). Further afield, McLeod (1959, p. 126) conjectured the existence of a shrine of the hero near the present Daphni ("perhaps in the inland trittys of Leontis"), the provenience of a dedication by the *epimeletai* of Leontis τῶι Λεῶι. . . , *IG* II² 2818 (357/6). But Traill, while passing no judgment on the shrine (although it had already been rejected by Kron [1976, p. 200]), has argued that Daphni belonged to the deme Kettos in the city trittys of the phyle,¹⁸ so on constitutional grounds McLeod's proposal remains a possibility. The original situation of a similar dedication to the hero, however, in this case in the name of the prytaneis of the phyle (*IG* II² 1742) is not recorded.

V Akamas. *IG* II² 4983, an altar of the 3rd century dedicated to Zeus Herkeios, Hermes, and Akamas, was found "in ore Dipyli" and, according to the editor, *in situ*: (Koehler 1879, p. 288). He also noted that the deme in which the Dipylon Gate was situated, Kerameis, belonged to the phyle Akamantis. With this rather good evidence the remaining indications are in conflict. Two decrees, the second explicitly of Akamantis (ΑρχΕφ 1965, pp. 131–136), as restored, call for the stele to stand "in the shrine of Akamas" (I, lines 10–11; II, lines 22–24). The findspot is recorded as the neighborhood of Kallithea, understood by the editor to fall within the deme Xypete of the phyle Kekropis (*op. cit.*, p. 136); Traill places this deme in the city trittys of the phyle.¹⁹ Obviously, if there was a shrine of Akamas in this location, it could not have been the headquarters of Akamantis. Similarly, the ephebic dedication of the phyle published by McLeod (1959, pp. 121–126) was discovered in the fortress at Rhamnous, but this deme belonged to coastal Aiantis; so even if the editor's restoration of "the hero" in line 1 is correct, it would be difficult to posit the existence of a shrine belonging to Akamantis in that location.

VI Oineus. No evidence for existence of a shrine. The marker of the tomb (ἄρος σήμ[ατος]) of one Oineus found in the Agora and published by W. K. Pritchett (1942, pp. 240–241, no. 45 [s. IV]) is unlikely, as he says, to have had anything to do with the phyle's eponym.

VII Kekrops. The decrees *IG* II² 1156 and 1158, both found on the Akropolis, order (as restored) that the stele be placed "in the shrine of Kekrops." *SEG* II 8, "at Athens . . . formerly *in arce* . . . of uncertain origin," contains (on the original editor's restoration and interpretation of the fragmentary text) two separate decrees. The one, an honorary decree (of the Boule and Demos?), is to be set

¹⁸ Traill 1986, p. 81, note 7.

¹⁹ Traill 1975, p. 50; Traill 1986, p. 134.

up “on the Akropolis” (line 2); the other (a decree of the phyle Kekropis) sets aside a *topos* for the honorary statue “in the shrine of Kekrops” (lines 10–11). It is a tempting, but of course by no means compelling, inference that the shrine stood *in arce*. *IG II²* 1141, of unknown original provenience, records a vote “on the Akropolis” (line 7).

VIII Hippothoos. Pausanias (1.38.4) testifies that the hero’s shrine stood in or near Eleusis: under the Kleisthenic organization, a deme of the coastal trittys of Hippothontis. Two decrees of the phyle, *IG II²* 1149 and 1153, were found in Eleusis. The former (as restored) calls for an announcement of the honors “in the Hippothontion.” *IG II²* 1163 enjoins the erection of *two* stelai bearing the identical text, one in the Asklepion (on the southern slope of the Akropolis), the other in the Hippothontion. The decree’s findspot “between the theaters of Dionysos and Herodes” (*IG, ad loc.*) indicates that it is the former of the two copies. As McLeod noted (1959, p. 125, note 12 [p. 126]), a priest of Hippothoos is mentioned in the accounts from Eleusis, *IG II²* 1672, lines 290–291.

IX Aias. The decree *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15, found in the Agora, calls for erection of the stele “in the Eurysakeion.” Eurysakes, of course, was the son of Aias. Harpokration (*s.v.*) places the Eurysakeion in the deme Melite [of the phyle Kekropis and located a short distance west of the Agora²⁰]; Pollux (7.132–133) states that the Kolonos Agoraios was “beside the Eurysakeion” (similarly, the second hypothesis to Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus*). Post-Classical inscriptions from the Agora (not, however, connected with the phyle Aiantis) call for their placement “in the Aianteion” (*IG II²* 1008 [118/17], line 87; *Hesperia* 24, 1955, pp. 220–239 [128/7], lines 140–141). Since other decrees inscribed on these same stones instruct that the stele be set up in the Agora (*IG II²* 1008, line 42; *Hesperia, loc. cit.*, lines [43], 99, [113], 127), Wycherley concluded that the Aianteion was situated in the Agora and suggested, furthermore, that it was not necessarily distinct from the Eurysakeion “on the Kolonos Agoraios.”²¹ Rotroff (1978, p. 206), however, argues from the findspots of the latter two inscriptions (“at the southeast corner of the Agora, near the south end of the Stoa of Attalos”) for “a separate shrine [of Aias] somewhere in this area.”

X Antiochos. The only evidence for the existence or location of a shrine is provided by one of three decrees of the phyle (or of components thereof) found on the bank of the Ilissos near the shrine of Herakles at Kynosarges (*SEG III* 115–117); the decree of “the phyle of the *hippeis*” (no. 115) calls for erection of the stele “in the shrine of Antiochos” (lines 22–23).

Mention must also be made of the five post-Kleisthenic phylai, since in one instance an honorary decree, if correctly assigned to its phyle, preserves an injunction vital to my line of argument. The heroes of these phylai were not studied by Kron.

Antigonos. No evidence for existence of a shrine.

Demetrios. No evidence for existence of a shrine.

Ptolemy. An honorary decree of a phyle from the Agora, *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 14–15, no. 13 (*init. s. II*), enjoins erection of the stele “in the Eurysakeion.” The name of the phyle was wholly restored by Meritt (*ibid.*) as Ptolemais in line 9 on the ground that the deme of the honorand, Aphidna, belonged to that phyle at the time of the inscription. On the Eurysakeion, see above under IX Aias. Meritt (p. 15) speculated that the phyle inherited from Aiantis “a close association with the sanctuary and its attendant privileges.”

Attalos. No evidence for existence of a shrine.

Hadrian. No evidence for existence of a shrine.

Thus, of the fifteen phylai, ten, including all but one (Oineus) of the ten Kleisthenic phylai, are known to have possessed or to have had access to a shrine of an eponymous

²⁰ Traill 1975, p. 50; Traill 1986, p. 134.

²¹ *Agora III*, p. 91, col. I; cf. Wycherley 1978, p. 97.

hero. Of these ten, three (possibly four) are assigned to the Akropolis (Erechtheus, Pandion, Kekrops, and possibly Aigeus), three to the Agora (Leos, Aias, Ptolemy), two to the city but outside the Agora (Akamas, Antiochos), and one to Eleusis (Hippochoos). The five others remain entirely unattested and so may or may not have existed (Oineus, Antigonos, Demetrios, Attalos, Hadrian). Again, the concentration in the urban center is striking and must, in view of the tripartite regional disposition of the phyle, be given an explanation. Some of the shrines of the ten Kleisthenic eponyms were probably already in existence at the time of Kleisthenes' reforms. A degree of recognition in any case is implied by the fact the heroes had already achieved status as "founders" when the names of the one hundred archegetai were submitted to the Pythia at Delphi. So the location of the shrine will probably already have been predetermined in at least some cases. And even if a shrine of an eponymous hero were to have been founded later than the reforms, the chances that it would have been located outside the urban center are remote. The eponyms had been selected (with the known exceptions of Aias, a hero of Salamis, and of Hippothon, closely linked with Eleusis) from among the archegetai of the city of Athens, not of the formerly independent communities of the countryside of Attica. Proceeding, then, to the next step, must the shrine also have become the headquarters or "seat" of its phyle?²² Swoboda came close to such a conclusion. He reasoned that since the phylai, divided into three distinct regions, possessed no "Bezirksvororte", the shrine of the eponym became by default the "Versammlungsplatz".²³ Shortly (pp. 511–512), I shall examine the evidence for the place of assembly of the phylai. But concerning the location of the headquarters, or "seat", the testimony under review here is unambiguous. In the cases of seven of the nine known shrines of the ten Kleisthenic eponyms, at least one decree calls for the stele to be erected "in the shrine of the eponymous" *vel sim.*, and this despite the fact that in each instance the content of the decree in question is not related to the hero, to the functioning of the shrine, or to any discernible religious matter. That is, there is no apparent reason for the stelai to be set up in these locations, unless the shrines were in some sense the administrative centers of the associations.

Yet, there are two discernible, and I think telltale, variations from this otherwise neat and tidy picture. First, all three of the heroes assigned to the Agora (Leos, Aias, Ptolemy) are certainly or possibly linked by the phyle documents with a shrine other (strictly taken) than that of the hero himself (respectively, the Leokoreion, Eurysakeion, and Eurysakeion again), despite the fact that in one instance (Aias) a shrine of the eponymous (*viz.* the Aianteion) is independently attested. In principle, therefore, the seat of a phyle was not unalterably wedded to the ancestral shrine of the eponymous. That is to say, those headquarters that were so located were placed there as a result of a conscious decision. Second, another sign that we are dealing with deliberate choice is afforded by the inscriptions of Hippothontis. That phyle's shrine and administrative center, as shown by the findspots of two of its decrees, were situated in Eleusis, a coastal deme; yet, as noted above, a third decree calls for a second stele to be erected in the Asklepieion in town. The conjunction of the unparalleled

²² The one other monumental structure that might be considered a candidate is the tomb of the eponymous hero. Pritchett, in the course of dismissing the possibility that the horos of the grave of Oineus pertains to the eponymous hero, cited evidence for such tombs of Erechtheus and Kekrops: Pritchett 1942, p. 241, note 40.

²³ H. Swoboda, in Busolt and Swoboda 1920–1926, II, p. 974.

extramural situation of the phyle's shrine and of the unusual provision for a second decree to be erected in a different location cannot be accidental. Again, it appears that although the connection between shrine and headquarters was admittedly a strong one, it was not preordained to the extent that it could not be contravened. The location prescribed for the second stele shows that the inclination to focus the phyle in the urban center could override, or at least successfully compete with, whatever propensity existed to house the seat of the association at or near the ancestral shrine of the eponymous hero.

II. THE AGORAI: LOCATION, SCHEDULE, AGENDA, AND PURPOSE

If a decree of a phyle was regularly placed in the shrine of its eponymous, it is natural to begin here (in or around the shrine) the search for the place of the meetings of the phyletai, *viz.* the agorai, to which our inscriptions make several references and at which most or all of the formal business of the phylai was demonstrably or presumably conducted.

Let us first review the exasperatingly few scraps of direct evidence. The term *agora* itself might be thought to provide a clue about location or a type of location, but the word's derivation from ἀγείρειν suggests that it denoted simply a gathering of people, without any necessary allusion to the *place* of assembly, much less to any particular place of assembly (such as was originally, presumably, the Agora of Athens).²⁴ As it happens, there is only one direct indication of the location of these meetings, but it is a good one: an inscription of Kekrops (*IG II²* 1141) records the taking of a vote ἐν Ἀκροπόλει (line 7), where, as noted above (pp. 508–509), the shrine of Kekrops is to be located with high probability. Thus the agora of at least this phyle will almost certainly have been convened in or near the Kekropeion “on the Akropolis”.

What remaining epigraphic clues there are relate largely to other aspects of the agora, yet they are not entirely without implications for its venue. The meetings were convened by the chief officers, the epimeletai, for they are the only possible subjects of the clause ὅταν ἀγορὰν ποιῶσιν embedded in the decree of Erechtheis *IG II²* 1165 (*ca.* 300–250), line 34. (In *SEG III* 115, however, the subject of the parallel clause ὅταν ἀγοράζῃ [line 18] is manifestly “the Antiochid phyle” mentioned in the immediately preceding phrase.) In lines 7–9 of the Erechtheid decree Wilhelm restored “(sc. and he saw to it) ὅπως . . . [. . . κα]ἰ ἀγοραὶ γίνωνται ὑπὸ τῶν φυλετῶν κατὰ μῆνα κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα κτλ.,” but the bracketed words are unfortunately not entirely supported by the other phyle documents. Besides the problem about the identity of the convener(s), monthly meetings, while not in themselves unthinkable, are unlikely since a somewhat earlier decree of Pandionis, *IG II²* 1140 (386/5), is prefaced by the words “in the agora after Pandia” (lines 4–5). If the meetings of a phyle were monthly, why do we not find a reference to a specific month? At all events, since, to build upon this last phrase, the Pandia was shown by Mikalson to have occurred on Elaphebolion 17, following directly upon the City Dionysia on the 10th through 16th of the same month,²⁵ it is tempting to speculate (with Mommsen) that the meeting was timed

²⁴ Whitehead notes, however, in connection with the deme assemblies, for which the term *agora* was also used, that “sometimes its sense is almost purely locative” (Whitehead 1986, p. 87 with note 6).

²⁵ Mikalson 1975, p. 137.

in order to take advantage of the probably large numbers of phyletai in town for the two festivals; conceivably, the meeting was held late in the day of the 17th prior to the departure of the phyletai to their homes that same evening.²⁶ Thus the date might be taken as an (admittedly weak) argument for an urban setting for the meeting.

Whatever be thought of this argument, the agora “after Pandia” need not have been the only meeting of Pandionis during the year. The slightly later decree of Kekropis already cited, *IG II² 1141* (376/5), mentions a secret vote of the phyletai on the Akropolis τῆι κυρίαι ἀγοραῖι (line 6).²⁷ The implication is that, parallel with the practice at the state level, there were other meetings that were not thus *kyriai*.²⁸ If so, the distinction between “ordinary” and “extraordinary” might refer to the time (or even the place) of assembly, or to the agenda, or to both. An example of meetings of both extraordinary timing and subject matter is provided by a motion made in the Assembly by Demosthenes in the year 337 that agorai of the phylai be called for the second and third days of Skirophorion in order to select superintendents and treasurers for work on the walls (Aischines 3.27: 330 B.C.). More vaguely, the previously cited phrases “whenever (the epimeletai) convene an agora” and “whenever (the Antiochid phyle) convenes an agora” might be taken to suggest extemporaneous meetings devoted to some irregular or unforeseen item of business.

A possible distinction between different kinds of meetings may also be detected in one of the Eleusinian decrees of Hippothontis, *IG II² 1149* (*ante med. s. IV*). It calls for the epimeletai to “announce” a crowning “in the Hippothontion” (lines 5–6, as restored).²⁹ The term ἀνειπεῖν is technical in this sense in the deme documents and in the documents of public units of other states³⁰ but, I think significantly, has only one other use in the phyle decrees despite the very frequent mention of crownings. (That one other use is in the somewhat later *IG II² 1161* [*fn. s. IV*], on which see p. 513 below.) Given its rarity, in other words, there must be a point in the addition of the announcement to the act of crowning itself. I suggest that, again, the explanation is to be found in the unusual, i.e., extramural, location of the shrine of Hippothontis. Possibly the crowning and its announcement were to be carried out in two different locations. Since the text enjoins that the announcement take place (in Eleusis) at the shrine, it is at least worth suggesting that the agora at which the crowning

²⁶ Thus the speaker of Demosthenes 57 (delivered in 345?), in his account of a meeting in the city of the demesmen of Halimous, relates how, before the proceedings had actually been brought to a close, the older *demotai* had already returned to their farms, “for in the case of our deme, men of the jury, being thirty-five stades from the asty, and since the greatest number lives there, the majority had gone back” (§10). For Mommsen’s speculation (based on a slightly different set of dates), see Gilbert 1895, p. 202, note 4.

²⁷ Part of this verse, as indicated by the editor’s subscript lines, depends entirely upon the testimony of Fourmont. But except for the first letter of the definite article, the phrase “the *kyria agora*” was clear on the stone when republished by Pritchett (1941, pp. 263–265, no. 67).

²⁸ Similarly, a *kyria agora* is attested for the deme Aixone: *IG II² 1202*, lines 1–2. Yet, it is surprising that if the phrase indicates regular procedure among all or even a large number of the demes, it is found in no other deme decree, the single possible additional example being the restored phrase in a lease from Rhamnous, *IG II² 2493*, lines 14–15. See, further, Whitehead 1986, pp. 90–91. For practice in the city ekklesia, see Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 43.4.

²⁹ [... ἀ]νειπεῖν ἐν τ[ῶ]ι Ἱπποθωντ[ί]ωι, . . .

³⁰ For examples, see Jones 1987, Index III, F.2.b (“announcement of honors”), p. 399. Occasionally, the synonymous nominal term *anagoreusis* and others are used outside Athens.

was actually performed had taken place in the city, where it might be witnessed by a larger number, or at least different set, of phyletai. This interpretation is consistent with the likely import of the decree of an unknown phyle just mentioned containing the other attestation of an “announcement”, *IG II²* 1161. Although the stone was found on the Akropolis, the text reads in lines 3–5 [. . . ἀν]ειπεῖν Λαμπ[τρᾶσι]----- Δι]ονυσίοις τὸ[ν στέφα-
νον. . . . In this case, on the reasonable assumptions that we have the only copy of the decree, that it was erected in the general vicinity of the place of its passage, and that the crowning was part of the agenda of that meeting, the crowning will have taken place on or near the citadel, with the announcement assigned, apparently on the occasion of the celebration of the Rural Dionysia,³¹ to a place called Lamp(trai?). Both demes named Lamptrai, Upper and Coastal, belonged to the phyle Erechtheis,³² and both to the coastal trittys. Thus in both texts the effects of the regional diversity of the Kleisthenic phyle would be in evidence: the crowning will take place in the urban trittys, its announcement in the coastal trittys.

Nor is this the only significance to be found in these texts. Presumably, it was the act of crowning itself, the *stephanosis*, that was regarded as the more important event of the two. Presumably, as I have suggested, it was at the *kyria agora* that the crowning took place, since, to judge from the frequency of mention of crowns in the decrees, this was an item of regular business. If, then, in these two examples, the actual crowning transpired in the city, while the less important subsequent announcement was relegated to the coastal trittys, we are entitled to speak of a prioritizing of the urban phyletai. This was the more important audience. Some confirmation is provided by a passage in a roughly contemporary forensic text: Aischines mentions a decree of the state prohibiting both phylai and demes from *announcing* their award of crowns “at the tragedies” (*sc.* in town) (3.41–45: 330 B.C.). Obviously, since we are here dealing with an announcement not before a meeting of phyletai but before a general audience, the matter goes beyond normal phyletic procedures. Nonetheless, the underlying idea may be the same. The state’s decree aimed to curb the efforts of the associations to publicize their acts, specifically their crownings of their benefactors, by staging announcements in front of a captive urban audience at the well-attended tragic productions on the slopes of the Akropolis. Aischines is explicit on the point that the phylai and demes were engaging in unfair competition with the state; the people crowned by them, he says, were receiving greater *timai* than those crowned by the People (§43). Just as (on my argument) Hippothontis and Erechtheis seem to have favored the city trittys by holding their crownings in the “ordinary” meeting in town, so those phylai checked by the decree mentioned by Aischines had pursued that same tendency still further. Not satisfied with a *stephanosis* conducted in town before their own phyletai, they sought to publicize their acts further by gaining access to the urban members of *all* the phylai. The prioritizing of the town had been carried to its ultimate extreme.

With these findings in mind, we may now consider the evidence for the business of the assemblies. Some of this evidence concerns alleged central governmental functions, of which

³¹ I find, however, in Whitehead’s detailed discussion of the Rural Dionysia (Whitehead 1986, pp. 212–222) no mention of either Lamptrai.

³² If the deme(?) in question is Upper, not Coastal, Lamptrai, the phyle may after all be Antigonis, since the stone is dated “fin. s. IV” (*IG*) and since that deme belonged to Antigonis under the XII phylai (307/6–224/3) and XIII phylai (223/2–201/0): see Traill 1975, p. 111, no. 83.

one in particular, if accepted, would go far towards providing the *raison d'être* of the phyle's agora. Whitehead has suggested that the selection of *bouleutai* (and of the five hundred *phrouroi*) was conducted not at the deme level, as always thought, but in the "tribal" assemblies.³³ The question turns on the interpretation of a vexed passage in the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians*. At §62.1 it is stated that at one time, some of the sortitive magistracies, including the nine archons, used to be allotted "from the whole phyle," while the others, allotted in the Theseion, were distributed among the demes. But, the text continues, when the demes began to sell the magistracies, they allotted the latter group as well "from the whole phyle," with the exception of the *bouleutai* and *phrouroi*, "which they [still] turn over to the demes." Now, the mention of "whole" phylai certainly opens up the possibility that at the agora of each phyle the assembled membership conducted the selection of its apportioned quota of state officers. Whitehead's point, however, concerns the demes. He proposes, with reference to the allotment by the demes in the Theseion of the councillors (and guards), that the meetings in question were in fact the ten "tribal assemblies". His principal arguments, in the absence of any reference to such assemblies in the text, are ones of economy. He finds it difficult to believe that all 139 demes met separately and individually for this purpose in the Theseion; and there are logistical problems involving fractions of *bouleutai* (or their alternates) that could be handled more elegantly at the level of the phyle.³⁴ But Whitehead's proposal, whatever its merits, entails a difficulty: the fact that Aristotle places the earlier allotments by the demes (and presumably, but not necessarily, the later as well) in the Theseion. Indeed, Aristotle may have been mistaken in limiting that venue to the sortitions of the demes, since Aischines (3.13), writing in 330 and so with reference to the later procedure,³⁵ appears to place both classes of sortition (i.e., by "whole" phylai as well as by the demes) in the Theseion, on which point he is followed (*contra* Aristotle) by Rhodes, who supposes that "A.P. has been careless in his phrasing."³⁶ So it is quite likely that all the sortitions, both early and late, took place in this single location. That is the problem. It would help, of course, if we knew more about the Theseion, but the design of the building and its location, except for the fact that it was situated somewhere in the general vicinity (probably to the east) of the Agora, remain an enigma.³⁷ Even so, whatever the disposition or location of the structure, the sortitions were manifestly conducted by *all* the phylai in a *single* place; that they were also conducted at a single time must, however, remain a mere unverified possibility, at least on Aristotle's (and Aischines') evidence. It follows, in any case, that the sortitions could not possibly have coincided with the several agorai of the individual phylai. Even the scanty evidence reviewed

³³ Whitehead 1986, p. 269. His statement of the position at pages 269–270 is somewhat more guarded: "My suggestion is, then, that the actual process of sortition which resulted, after necessary adjustments, in the final tribal complements of fifty councillors and an appropriate number of deputies was conducted at tribal level by special meetings (or at least special deliberations) of the tribal assemblies."

³⁴ Whitehead 1986, pp. 266–270.

³⁵ For the suggestion that the later procedure indicated by Aristotle was instituted with or prior to the introduction of the division of the phyle into ten sections, A–K, early in the 4th century, see Rhodes 1981, on §62.1, pp. 690–691. By *ca.* 370 the use of *kleroteria* had been extended to magisterial appointments; and the associated bronze *pinakia* (magisterial as well as *dikastic*) show each phyle divided into the ten sections.

³⁶ Rhodes 1981, on §62.1, pp. 689–690.

³⁷ See *Agora* III, nos. 339–362, pp. 113–119; *Agora* XIV, pp. 124–126 (with p. 125 for the location to the east); Rhodes 1981, on §15.4, pp. 210–211.

above shows that the latter were convened at different locations (*viz.* including in at least some instances the several shrines of the heroes) on separate schedules and at the behest of “the phyle” or its officers, acting individually (so far as we are informed), not to mention the fact that none of the phyle documents so much as alludes to either sortitions or the Theseion. We must, I think, rule out the possibility that the sortitions at any period, whether by “whole” phylai or demes, coincided with, or were elements of, the agorai of the phylai formally attested in the inscriptions.

Even so, it must be admitted that the agora was not entirely without central governmental roles. As previous scholars have suggested, it is reasonable to assume that the selection of the holders of liturgies (*gymnasiarchia*, *trierarchia*, *choregia*, and others) and of the members of the extraordinary statewide boards of *taphropoiōi*, *teichopoioi*, and *trieropoioi*, all apportioned *kata phylas*, was conducted by each phyle in its agora.³⁸ Elsewhere, I have suggested that it was at these meetings that the fathers of each year’s ephebic recruits assembled *kata phylas*, took oaths, and selected from those over forty years of age three men “the best and most suitable” to take charge of the ephebes. (From these candidates the Demos elected by show of hands a *sophonistes* for each phyle and, from the other Athenians, a single *kosmetes* to preside over the whole class³⁹). Along the same lines, it has been suggested that the agora might be put to *ad hoc* uses by the state, but the putative cases of such uses known to me are neither numerous nor compelling. A passage in the *Athenaion Politeia* (48.4) containing a reference to ταῖς ἀ[γορ]αῖς was once thought to allude to the assemblies; if so, the text would be saying that the (state officers), the *euthynoi* and their *paredroi*, were compelled, at or during the agorai, to sit at the statue of the eponymous hero of each phyle (to hear charges brought by citizens against the magistrates). But a more attractive rendering “in the market hours” was championed by Wilamowitz, followed by Rhodes.⁴⁰ Andokides, in a speech of 399 (1.97), records a decree of the Assembly ordering all Athenians to take an oath “by phylai and by demes.” Whitehead interprets this to mean not that the oath was taken twice over by each citizen both in his deme and phyle but “that the demesmen took it, by demes, at the tribal assemblies,”⁴¹ a reasonable, but unverifiable, suggestion. The state, in sum, seems to have made only very limited use of the administrative apparatus of the internally organized phylai.⁴²

What, then, was the function of these assemblies? To judge from the inscriptions, virtually all the business transacted by the phyletai was concerned with the internal affairs of the association. These will have included, of course, the selection of the phyle’s officers (on which, see section IV, pp. 521–528 below), although such elections lack explicit attestation. What the inscriptions do attest is that on a seemingly regular basis, and without visible

³⁸ For details concerning the liturgies, including the evidence for their representation of the phylai, see Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.27 (pp. 48–51); for the extraordinary boards, see §1.26 (p. 47: *taphropoiōi* and *teichopoioi*) and §1.29 (p. 57: *trieropoioi*).

³⁹ Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.29 (p. 54), and §1.32 (p. 59), citing Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 42.2.

⁴⁰ Rhodes 1981, on §48.4, pp. 561–562. As Rhodes says (p. 561), “Some indication of time is needed, since the place is specified in what follows.”

⁴¹ Whitehead 1986, p. 109.

⁴² We must, therefore, reject or severely qualify the statement of Swoboda (in Busolt and Swoboda 1920–1926, p. 975) that “die Phylenversammlungen hatten sich aber auch mit staatlichen Angelegenheiten zu beschäftigen.”

prompting from the central government, the phyletai assembled to vote, bestow, and perhaps announce various honors on a wide range of benefactors. Among these, by far the best known are the boards of *prytaneis* or other councillors upon whom the phyletai sometimes conferred formal honors.⁴³ But irrespective of the identity of the honorand(s), if the sheer bulk of documentation provides even the most approximate index of frequency, the conferring of honors represents the principal business of the agorai. Even if the (few) bouleutic texts are set aside, of the 51 remaining decrees, 48, or 94 percent, are recognizably honorary in character. Nor is it merely a matter of frequency. Granted the possibility that the engraving on stone of certain types of documents and not others has skewed the record (and honorary texts will have enjoyed a strong claim to both public and permanent display), it is plain that the bestowal of *timia* drew heavily upon the financial resources of these organizations. One need only consider the value in drachmas attested for some of the crowns.⁴⁴ How, then, was the association able to finance such a costly activity?

The residue of isolated particular items of business from the inscriptions provides the answer. Several allude in different ways to measures taken to bring funds into the organization. A simple example is provided by the decree of Akamantis threatening to fine any person (i.e., member) who contravenes its terms.⁴⁵ But for the point, vital to my argument, that it was the agorai, that is, the memberships as a whole, that managed the financial affairs of the association, there are three straightforward articles of evidence. A brief attributed to Demosthenes charges that a member of Leontis, Theokrines, had been found at his *euthynai* to owe 700 drachmas to the Eponymous (i.e., to the phyle). To demonstrate that Theokrines had acknowledged the debt and that he had made arrangements with the

⁴³ Of the 56 inscriptions of the period of the original ten phylai published in *Agora XV*, all but twelve are certainly or probably dedications or decrees set up by individual phylai acting in their own names. But of these 44, fifteen cite the praise and/or crown by the Boule, the Demos, or the Boule and Demos, so they, and undoubtedly many others, were presumably prompted by prior action at the state level. Nonetheless, evidence of independent action by the phylai can be found. In no. 5 (= *IG II²* 1142; *init.* s. IV), a board of prytaneis is honored in a decree of an organization of unknown identity; Meritt and Traill (*loc. cit.*) express the opinion that the text belongs to the dedication of a phyle. From a later period, no. 69 (= *IG II²* 656+; Dow 1937, no. 2) is printed by Meritt and Traill as a decree of Aigeis, but the key reference to the phyle in line 10 is wholly restored (note, however, the possible mention of the epimeletai in lines 15–16). No. 33 (= *IG II²* 3202; 344/3), a dedication of an unknown phyle, preserves several wreaths, of which two read “the phyletai” (lines 6 and 9). From the Macedonian era, similar wreaths or citations of “the phyletai” are found in *Agora XV*, no. 58 (= Dow 1937, no. 1; 305/4; Akamantis), lines 86, [92], [98]; no. 67 (*init.* s. III; unknown phyle), line 3; no. 76 (279/8; Pandionis), lines 47 and 53; no. 84 (256/5; Antigonis), lines 81, 89, 92, 95, 100; and no. 95 (s. III; unknown phyle), Face A. In one instance, *Agora XV*, no. 38 (= *IG II²* 1749), of Aigeis (341/0), the inscription, while acknowledging the crowning of the prytaneis by the Boule and Demos (lines 1–3), appends three decrees, of which the first (lines 74–77) and second (lines 78–81), honoring the *tamias* of the phyle and “them” (i.e., the prytanies themselves), were passed by “the phyletai.”

⁴⁴ Thirty-six crownings are attested by the decrees (or consequent dedications by the honorands). In six cases, the text is sufficiently preserved to show that the type of crown was not specified; in one other, it is too damaged to allow one to determine whether the type was specified or, if it was specified, what the type was. Of the twenty-nine others, ten are stated to be of olive and nineteen of gold. Of the nineteen gold crowns, while five are not given a specific value and in three other cases the number or numeral is not preserved, eight are recorded (or the text is so restored) to have been of 500 drachmas and three (or so the text is restored) of 1,000. For the references to the gold crowns of stated value, see note 117 below.

⁴⁵ *ΑρχΕφ* 1965, pp. 131–136: i, lines 6–8.

phyletai for its payment, the speaker adduces the decree that one Skironides had moved “among the phyletai” (58.14–15; 17–18). The reference here can only be to the phyle’s agora. Similarly, the two other examples, both epigraphic records of decrees, must be the products of formal meetings of the phyletai. A decree proposed by Antisthenes of Erechtheis (to be discussed in detail in section IV, pp. 523–524 below) called for the biannual inspection of properties under lease from the phyle.⁴⁶ No less concerned with financial matters is the decree of an unknown phyle setting out the terms of the lease of certain of its properties, *IG II² 1168* (s. III?).⁴⁷ That the terms of a lease in particular should have been promulgated in the form of a decree is proof that the memberships, while concerned frequently with the bestowal of honors, were simultaneously engaged in the raising of the substantial funds required for such often costly honors.

In support of this general conclusion regarding procedure may be marshaled a miscellany of particular examples, in some instances culled from decrees of the phylai (but often incidental to the decree’s principal content), of the financial dealings of the phyle: *viz.* the above-mentioned imposition of a fine and pursuit of funds owed to the Eponymous; the recovery by Aiantis at a state auction of 666 2/3 drachmas owed by a former epimeletes who had failed to turn over “the sacred money of Aias” which he had collected;⁴⁸ the lending of funds by Kekropis on the security of a plot of land;⁴⁹ the leasing (again) by Erechtheis of its lands and by an unknown phyle of properties of uncertain identification;⁵⁰ the evident ownership of other lands abroad, at Oropos and on Lemnos, by Antiochis and at Oropos by all the phylai jointly holding the properties in pairs;⁵¹ and the attestation of accounting procedure in a decree of Hippothontis.⁵² More or less formal references to “revenues” or “money” appear in the inscriptions of several different phylai.⁵³

⁴⁶ *IG II² 1165* (ca. 300–250), lines 17–22.

⁴⁷ That the text belongs to a phyle is shown by the reference to “the epimeletai of the phyle” in lines 9–10; that it is a decree (and so the product of an agora), by the words τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα in line 20.

⁴⁸ *Hesperia* 5, 1936, pp. 393–413, no. 10 (346/5), lines 153–185.

⁴⁹ *IG II² 2670*, line 5 (Kekropidai). Cf. the decree of Erechtheis, *IG II² 1165*, lines 21–22, where mention is made of mortgage stones (*horoi*) placed on the properties of the phyle.

⁵⁰ *IG II² 1165* (ca. 300–250), lines 17–22, credits the honorand with moving a decree calling upon the epimeletai to make regular inspections of the properties (*ktemata*) to ascertain whether the lands (*choria*) were being farmed in accordance with the leases (*synthekai*). The lease of the unknown phyle is *IG II² 1168*.

⁵¹ *SEG III 117* (Antiochis), lines 6–17. The acquisition by Athens in 338 of lands at Oropos and their division among pairs of phylai were mentioned by the orator Hyperides in his speech (IV) in defence of Euxenippos (§16). A badly damaged inscription dated ca. 330, Agora inv. no. I 6793, is believed by its editor to be “very probably” (p. 51) a joint decree of Aigeis and Aiantis concerning their portion of the lands: see Langdon 1987, pp. 47–58. Langdon identifies the stone as the one (of two copies) belonging to Aiantis. Since publication of Langdon’s *editio princeps*, lines 2–16 have been improved by Walbank (1990, pp. 95–99). *Inter alia*, Walbank establishes two points broached by Langdon but not confirmed by his readings, *viz.* that the text is a decree of the two phylai and that there were originally two stelai (lines 4–5).

⁵² *IG II² 1163*, lines 26–28.

⁵³ Erechtheis: *IG II² 1165*, lines 4–5, 11; cf. 1146, line 9; Kekropis?: *IG II² 1158*, lines 8–9; Antiochis: *SEG III 117*, line 20. The new decree of Aigeis and Aiantis published by Langdon and improved by Walbank (note 51 above) seems in lines 9–10, according to Walbank’s readings, to direct that the costs of publication be met out of the “common monies” of the phylai (Walbank 1990, p. 97).

Plainly, funding was a topic of considerable concern to the memberships. To be sure, the probability that matters effecting the financial well-being of the organization enjoyed a particularly strong claim to be permanently recorded on stone may distort our perception of the volume and frequency of such transactions. Nonetheless, even if such dealings were infrequent, the sums involved were in some cases demonstrably substantial. Nor are the uses to which such moneys would be put difficult to imagine. By such means the phylai would have been able to support any otherwise non-funded cultic and other associational activities of their organizations (see section III below), but most important, as I have suggested, they would have been able to sustain thereby the considerable expense involved in their frequent and sometimes lavish bestowal of honors upon their benefactors.

III. THE SOLIDARITY OF THE PHYLE AS ASSOCIATION

Since the phylai give every appearance of functioning as internally organized, self-sufficient associations, it would be natural to expect to find traces of some degree of solidarity among the members of a phyle when measured against their actions towards or feelings about other Athenians who were not members. First, were occasions available for meaningful interaction among phyletai? To begin with, a suitable venue, large and centrally located, would be needed. The shrines of the eponyms (and just possibly their tombs⁵⁴) are likely candidates. Naturally, it is most plausibly at the shrine that the *thysia* (sometimes stated to have been offered in the name of the eponymous hero) attested for Erechtheis, Pandionis, and Akamantis should be situated.⁵⁵ These sacrifices might have been of a frequency and dimension that, if we had more information, would impress us. As it is, our only clues are, with regard to magnitude, the attestation (twice) of 50 drachmas as the sum awarded to a benefactor to allow him to carry out such a *thysia*,⁵⁶ hardly enough to fête even a small fraction of only the city residents of a phyle. With regard to frequency, the restoration ἐν τῇ ἐπιθέτω[ι θυσίαι. . .] at *IG II*² 1146, line 11 suggests a regular calendar to which an addition might on occasion be made.⁵⁷ Somewhat differently, since (as with all liturgies) the state was involved, one could add the *hestiasis*, or banqueting of the phyle, an annual liturgy borne by individuals nominated by their phylai and attested for both the Dionysia and the Panathenaia.⁵⁸ But, except for these cultic events, there is very little trace of

⁵⁴ See note 22 above.

⁵⁵ Erechtheis: *IG II*² 1146, line 7 (restored); 1150, lines 4–5; 1165, lines 5–6. Pandionis: *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 41, no. 42, line 5; *IG II*² 1152, line 8. Akamantis: *IG II*² 1166, lines 4–5 (sacrifices performed by honorand in his capacity as [state] *hieropoios*). In the inscription of Aigeis and Aiantis concerning their holdings at Oropos discussed above (with note 51), Walbank conjectured in line 4 a reference to a sacrifice ordered by the joint decree (Walbank 1990, p. 97).

⁵⁶ Both texts belong to Pandionis: *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 41, no. 42, lines 4–7, and *IG II*² 1152, lines 7–9 (in both cases the number, though partly restored, appears to be the only likely candidate).

⁵⁷ At line 7 of the decree of Erechtheis, *IG II*² 1165, the editor offered a restoration likewise suggesting a calendar of sacrifices: . . . ὅπως ἂν θύωνται ἐν τοῖς [καθήκουσι χρόνοις. . .].

⁵⁸ Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.27 (p. 49). It is perhaps to these banquets that we should refer τὰ φυλετικὰ δεῖπνα said by Athenaios (*Deipnosophistai*, 5.185d) to have been “ordained” by “the lawgivers” (*sc.* of earlier times).

significant interaction among phyletai *qua* phyletai. The qualification is vital for my position. Two members of the same phyle might associate with one another on the basis of blood relationship, marriage ties, proximity of residence, occupation, deme or phratry affiliation, or other factor. Only if that relationship can be shown to be a function of membership in the same phyle to the exclusion of all other factors will it count towards establishing a case for “tribal” solidarity.

As it happens, the epigraphic testimony offers a single instance: Erechtheis, in addition to the usual praise and crown, honors its member Antisthenes by calling upon the epimeletai to care for the needs of his daughter whenever she, upon her father’s death, should become legally defined as *epikleros* (*IG II²* 1165, lines 30–38). Apparently, we have here a suggestion of the sort of camaraderie one might expect to find in a tightly knit organization, with the membership going so far as to play a role otherwise normally confined to closely related blood or affinal relatives. But by no means can this episode be regarded as anything but atypical. This extraordinary measure had been prompted by the equally extraordinary benefactions of Antisthenes, themselves unparalleled in our corpus of phyle inscriptions (on which, see section IV, pp. 523–524 below).⁵⁹ It is an isolated datum without significance for the day-to-day functioning of these organizations.

Literary sources might be expected to add more, but their positive evidence, when measured against the quantity of potentially relevant texts in which such indications might be expected to appear, is meager. Osborne asserted that Athenians felt “closer links with tribesmen than with the mass of the citizen body”;⁶⁰ and Whitehead, responding to Osborne, cited a number of passages from the orators and Aristophanes, observing that “there is ample evidence for bonds between men of the same tribe.”⁶¹ Examination of these passages, however, fails to support the hypothesis of intraphyle solidarity.⁶²

Demosthenes, for example, in his brief against Meidias, asserts that his adversary, in attacking him, the *choregos* of his phyle Pandionis, at the Dionysia, “thought fit to act insolently not only against me and mine but also against the phyletai through me” (Demosthenes 21 *Against Meidias* §81); and, again, that not only was he, Demosthenes, injured, but also, because Meidias’ misdeeds were directed against the chorus, the phyle, the tenth part of the citizen body, as well. . . (§126). The point here is that since the choregos, and hence the chorus, of the phyle had been publicly humiliated, such humiliation could only extend to the phyletai represented by that choregos and chorus. But such reactions or feelings do not by themselves amount to the “links” or “bonds” that characterize a cohesive, interconnected community. Andokides’ exhortation (1 *On the Mysteries* §150), closely paralleled by the sentiment expressed

⁵⁹ For the case of a phyle undertaking to regulate the marriage of its “heiresses” (*epikleroi*) at Gortyn, see *Inscriptiones Creticae* IV, Gortyn no. 72 (*med. s. V?*), with Jones 1987, chap. 5, §29 (pp. 224–225).

⁶⁰ Osborne 1985, p. 90.

⁶¹ Whitehead 1986, p. 248, with note 119.

⁶² I confine myself to the passages adduced by Whitehead (note 61 above). Limitations of space do not permit an exhaustive examination of the literary record at this time. (The final item in Whitehead’s note, i.e., Demosthenes 29.33, incidentally, is a misprint for 29.23, treated below.) Significantly, however, regarding the prospects of discovering previously undetected evidence of such solidarity, Lécivain (*DarSag* IV, 1877–1919, s.v. “Phyle”, p. 453 with note 11) adduced in support of his alleged “des liens de solidarité entre les membres des tribus” two of the same passages appearing in Whitehead’s list (*viz.* Andokides 1.150 and Demosthenes 23.206) plus the Erechtheid decree concerning Antisthenes’ daughter.

by Demosthenes in 23 *Against Aristokrates* §206, that the *syndikoi* chosen from his phyle express a favorable opinion of him before the court, is ambiguous in that it leaves open the possibility that such fellow tribesmen are in fact kinsmen, affines, personal friends, etc.; it is, in any case, an exhortation, not a statement of fact. Besides, both texts are explicit on the point that the *syndikoi* had been *chosen* to represent their fellow tribesmen; accordingly, it cannot be inferred that *any* member under *any* circumstances would automatically be expected to come to the aid of his *symphyletes*. Polystratos is said by the speaker of [Lysias] 20 *For Polystratos* to have been chosen by his phyletai as one of the Four Hundred by reason of the soundness of his views “concerning his fellow demesmen and concerning the citizen body.” Yet, he continues, his enemies accuse him of disloyalty to this very citizen body, even though he had been chosen by his phyletai, “who can best judge the character of this or that person among them” (§2). These last words in isolation might be taken to indicate solidarity, but plainly, the reference here to phyletai is prompted, indeed required, by the previous reference to his selection as one of the Four Hundred “by his phyletai”; and, still more decisively, this previous reference goes on to attribute to Polystratos sound views concerning not his *symphyletai* (as we would expect, if there were such a thing as intraphyle solidarity) but, in addition to the citizenry as a whole, his fellow demesmen: a small, tightly knit “natural” community about whose members an individual might indeed possess some real familiarity. The speaker of Lysias’ speech *On a Charge of Taking Bribes* mentions that the officer staff of his ship had included Alkibiades, who he would have much preferred had not sailed with him, since Alkibiades was “neither friend nor kinsman nor phyletes” (21§6). Here, the absence of an expected reference to fellow demesmen in place of the use of the term *phyletes* suggests that the latter term appears for a reason not necessarily having anything to do with solidarity, namely, that Alkibiades’ presence on board with the speaker would normally be the result of their common membership in the same phyle, as was true of the Athenian military organization generally,⁶³ but in this case, exceptionally, was not. Special significance also appears to be attached to common membership in the same phyle at Demosthenes 29 *Against Aphobos* III §23, where the speaker exploits the fact that Phanos is “a friend and phyletes” of the accused, from which he concludes that it was not enmity that had motivated Phanos to give testimony injurious to Demosthenes’ adversary. Closer attention to the affiliations of these two individuals, however, reveals Demosthenes’ probable motive in singling out just the phyle, and not some other association, for mention. Phanos’ deme was Kerameis,⁶⁴ of the City trittys of Akamantis; Aphobos’ deme was, following Davies, almost certainly Sphettos,⁶⁵ of the Inland trittys of that phyle. Demosthenes would undoubtedly have liked to say, but could not, that the two men were of the same deme, or even of the same trittys. So in desperation he pins his argument on the common phyle affiliation. We come, finally, to the conjunction of “kinsman” and “phyletes” in Aristophanes, *Birds* 368, where the context seems to suggest that both terms bespeak solidarity. But Aristophanes’ own text proves, as Sommerstein realized, that the poet could not have intended the latter word to be taken

⁶³ For the dominating role by the phylai (*vs.* trittyes and demes) in the military organization of Athens, see Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.29, with pp. 56–57 for the naval arrangements.

⁶⁴ *APF* 14079 = 14080.

⁶⁵ *APF* 3597, VI, p. 120.

literally.⁶⁶ Accordingly, if phyletes means in this context something other than “member of a phyle”, the passage necessarily loses all value for the present discussion.

Possibly, to add a single item to the texts cited by Whitehead, one could strengthen the argument by adducing from Aristotle the *sysitia* by phylai of the ephebes (*Ath. Pol.* 42.3). But is this not merely an instance of the enforced association of Athenians within military units based on the phylai in their primary role as administrative entities, whereas it is with the *voluntary* interaction between phyletai that we are concerned in this context?

Given, again, the large volume of contemporary written sources, if phyletai *qua* phyletai enjoyed close relationships, we should expect to learn more of them. The decree of Erechtheis shortly to be discussed, *IG II²* 1165, which twice implies the ignorance on the part of the phyletai of their own affairs (lines 9–10, the calendar; 17–18, properties), may be more representative of the actual situation. It seems that we are being drawn to the conclusion that the phylai did not in fact maintain a particularly intimate associational life.

IV. OFFICERS, PROPOSERS, AND HONORANDS

THE OFFICERS OF THE INTERNALLY ORGANIZED PHYLE

If phyletai did not regularly fraternize or feel or express strong bonds of attachment with each other *qua* phyletai, it does not follow that the organization was entirely without vitality or purpose. In fact, the phylai will emerge as vigorous, purposeful organizations thanks in large part to the ambitions and energies of a relatively few individuals, probably but not demonstrably in every instance their officers. What do we know about these phyletai?

The board of epimeletai, it is no exaggeration to say, for the most part monopolized the formal administrative leadership of the phylai throughout the period of our evidence.⁶⁷ Since the epimeletai are attested for most of the phylai, and in the absence of any competing title, their presence in all may be assumed with surety. The officers served for one year⁶⁸ and were normally three in number (never demonstrably more or fewer), invariably in our records one from each of the three trittyes of the phyle, as shown by Traill.⁶⁹ As a collegium, the epimeletai will have possessed the manpower and, presumably, variety of experience

⁶⁶ The words are addressed to the birds by Tereus, who inquires why they are about to tear apart the two men Peisetairos and Euelpides, since they are “kinsmen and phyleta [dual number] of my wife.” The point of the joke is that Tereus’ wife, Prokne, is the daughter of Pandion and so is naturally a member of Pandionis! But when Euelpides gets around to mentioning his deme, it turns out to be Krioa (line 645), a deme not of Pandionis but of Antiochis. Perhaps, as the scholiast suggested, Aristophanes had in mind for Tererus’ meaning something like “compatriots”. See Sommerstein 1987, on line 368, pp. 220–221.

⁶⁷ Besides the very brief accounts mentioned in note 4 above, the epimeletai of the phylai have been studied by Oehler (*RE* VI, 1907 [cols. 162–171], cols. 168–169, *s.v.* epimeletai), Swoboda (in Busolt and Swoboda 1920–1926, II, pp. 974–975), and, most recently, Traill (1986, pp. 79–92). Among other contributions, Traill seeks to identify the epimeletai with the trittyarchs appearing in inscriptions dated between 301/0 and 295/4 (pp. 89–90).

⁶⁸ *IG II²* 1165 (Erechtheis), lines 18–19: οἱ ἐπιμελεται | οἱ αἰει καθιστάμενοι κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν. . . (and, again, in lines 31–32). A similar reference to a board serving κατ’ ἔτος was wholly restored by Kirchner at *IG II²* 1164 (*init. s.* III; unknown phyle), lines 6–8.

⁶⁹ Traill 1986, pp. 79–92.

and competence to cover effectively a wide range of duties. A multiplicity of duties might in any case be expected in view of the nondescript generality of the title epimeletes, or “caretaker”. Not surprisingly, therefore, the documented tasks of the officers reflect a variety of competencies. Legally, they could represent the phyle’s interests before the state, as shown by Demosthenes’ account (21.13) of a meeting of the Athenian Assembly when the epimeletai of Pandionis engaged the archon in a dispute regarding the phyle’s failure to appoint a choregos. In the cultic domain, they were charged with the holding of sacrifices for the association, according to a decree of Erechtheis.⁷⁰ Several examples, too, are found of a financial capacity. From a decree of an unknown phyle concerning the lease of certain of its properties, *IG II*² 1168, we learn that the board (with the *tamias*, or treasurer) was charged with the receipt of rents (lines 9–10) and was (again with the *tamias*) to take possession of the securities in the event that the lessees failed to pay in accordance with the contracts (lines 11–13). Similarly, we find a single(?) epimeletes of Aiantis entrusted with the collection of “the sacred money”; and when this officer failed to turn the money over to the phyle, the same inscription records that the (three) current epimeletai laid a claim against him in a state court.⁷¹ Antisthenes of Erechtheis, as will be seen momentarily, also assumed, probably *qua* epimelete, a variety of (mainly financial) functions.

But the great bulk of attested acts of the epimeletai have as their setting the phyle’s assembly. A clause in an inscription mentioned above (p. 511) indicates that it was they who convened the agora;⁷² from this it is a likely inference that they also presided over all such meetings. Accordingly, their attested business, reflecting the content of our decrees, has to do almost entirely with the passage and implementation of honorific grants: the announcement of the honors;⁷³ the engraving of the stele (meaning, of course, the commissioning of a mason);⁷⁴ its erection in a suitable place (such as the shrine of the eponymous);⁷⁵ the necessary payment to the party(ies) contracted to execute the stele;⁷⁶ the disbursal to the honorand of a sum of cash (the attested amount is fifty drachmas) for a (one-time?) sacrifice;⁷⁷ and the responsibility for the appropriate accounting of the expenses.⁷⁸ Since no other officer is assigned such tasks, it is evident that when a phyle acted to bestow honors, it was upon

⁷⁰ *IG II*² 1150, lines 4–5.

⁷¹ *Hesperia* 5, 1936, pp. 393–410 (346/5), lines 161–163 and 176–179 (the collection), 156–171 (the claim).

⁷² *IG II*² 1165, line 34.

⁷³ *IG II*² 1149 (Hippothontis).

⁷⁴ *IG II*² 1147 (Erechtheis; restored); 1138, 1139, 1140, 1157 (all Pandionis); *ΑρχΕφ* 1965, pp. 131–136: i (Akamantis; restored); *IG II*² 1163 (Hippothontis); *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15 (Aiantis); *Hesperia* 4, 1935, pp. 41–42, no. 9 (unknown phyle; restored).

⁷⁵ The instruction to erect the stele is often conjoined with the order to inscribe. See *IG II*² 1144 and 1157 (Pandionis); *ΑρχΕφ* 1965, pp. 131–136: i (Akamantis; restored); *IG II*² 1163 (Hippothontis); *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15 (Aiantis); *Hesperia* 4, 1935, pp. 41–42, no. 9 (unknown phyle; restored). At *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 14–15, no. 13 (Ptolemais?), lines 10–12, as restored by Meritt, the location for the erection of the crown and statue is to be approved by the epimeletai.

⁷⁶ *IG II*² 1148 (Pandionis); *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i, col. II, lines 5–7 (Leontis; restored); *IG II*² 1161 (unknown phyle; restored).

⁷⁷ *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 41, no. 42 and *IG II*² 1152 (both Pandionis). At *Agora* XV, no. 69 (Aigeis; 284/3), Meritt and Traill print a restored text calling for the epimeletai to advance a sum to the bouleutai of Aigeis for a sacrifice, but the number of drachmas is not preserved (lines 14–17).

⁷⁸ *IG II*² 1163 (Hippothontis).

the epimeletai that the primary responsibility regularly devolved. Whether still other duties beyond these just mentioned fell to the board, however, must remain an open question. Since stone stelai are our sole source of information on these matters and since the surviving stelai are overwhelmingly honorific in character, it is quite possible that these indications do not actually represent the full range of their activity. Not all official acts of course had necessarily to be recorded and those that were, not necessarily on stone. In the case of an honorary text, the object of a lapidary inscription may not have been so much documentary as designed to enhance an honorand's sense that the accolade had been appropriately, i.e., publicly and permanently, promulgated. A stone stele, in other words, can hardly be regarded as a necessary condition of an official act by a phyle, or by any of its officers. We may, therefore, be ignorant of much of these officers' duties and functions.

As it happens, we are lucky to have a possible indication of a far more substantial role for the epimelete in a decree of Erechtheis of the first half of the 3rd century, *IG II²* 1165, honoring its member Antisthenes, son of Nikandros, of (Upper? Coastal?) Lamprai (*PA* 1198). Unfortunately, the case is of uncertain significance for this discussion because we cannot be sure of Antisthenes' status at the time of his meritorious services. Nor must an office necessarily be assumed, since three decrees certainly or probably of Kekropis honor individuals who are not identified by any title whatsoever.⁷⁹ The repeated use of the verb *epimeleisthai* (lines 1, 3), on the other hand, suggests the office; so does the fact that one of Antisthenes' acts is the authorship of a decree calling for future boards of epimeletai to carry out certain inspections of phyle properties (lines 17–22). If he was an epimelete, however, since this post comprised more than a single officer, as the text proves (lines 18, 31–32), the fact that he alone is honored by this decree opens up the possibility, indeed, it borders on a probability, that Antisthenes' accomplishments fell outside the normal run of magisterial duties. If not, why is there no trace of his two colleagues?

Whatever the roles of the epimeletai, if any, a large part of Antisthenes' services to the phyle was financial, not surprisingly, in view of the probable fact that Antisthenes' father, Nikandros, served as *tamias* of the goddess in 343/2.⁸⁰ The fragmentary opening lines refer to his receipt of funds (the use here of the technical term for such receipts, *παραλαμβάνειν*, which normally indicates a succession of officers or boards, is an additional hint that he is not merely a *privatus*) and to the balance (at the end of his year of office?) of more than 3,000 drachmas (lines 4–5); at an interval follow (again, fragmentary) references to disbursals(?) "from the common revenues" (line 11) and to "four drachmas" (restored, lines 11–12). Although the intervening lines mention in broken context his evident efforts to regularize the schedules of (?) "the sacrifices to Erechtheus" (lines 6–7) and "the agorai" (line 8), it is not at all clear what Antisthenes did to promote these activities, in particular whether personal expenditures or other extraordinary effort on his part were involved. But the object of his effort was that something "be preserved" (line 16, plural) "for all time" (line 15) and in a manner "advantageous to the phyle" (lines 16–17, restored). So far, however, except for the fact that he has acted without a colleague (a fact of significance, of course, only if he is an epimelete), Antisthenes' stewardship, though not paralleled in the body of evidence under

⁷⁹ *IG II²* 1141 (= *Hesperia* 10, 1941, pp. 263–265, no. 67), 1143, 1145.

⁸⁰ *PA* 10688, citing *IG II²* 1443, line 6.

review, is hardly extraordinary when measured against the larger background of internally organized Greek public units.

What follows is otherwise. Antisthenes authored a decree to ensure that all the Erechtheidai be informed about their properties (*ktemata*), to which end (the Greek construction, however, is paratactic) the epimeletai in office each year would “walk” the properties twice during the year to ascertain whether the fields were being worked in accordance with the contracts (i.e., with the phyle) and whether “they” (*viz.* the lessees) had planted the mortgage stones similarly in compliance with those contracts (lines 17–22). Again, finances are to the fore, and Antisthenes has acted alone. Much, too, is made of the fact that Antisthenes carried out his benefactions “neither for his own benefit nor placing any one’s interests before those of the phyle nor receiving a bribe from anyone; rather, he has continued speaking and acting in the manner best for the phyle, presenting himself blameless *to all the phyletai* (my emphasis)” (lines 22–26). These last words echo two previous references to *all* the members: in line 9, in uncertain context but with explicit reference to Antisthenes’ efforts to make something known (καὶ εἰδότες πάν[τες]), and in line 18, with reference to the membership’s hoped-for knowledge about the phyle’s properties (εἰδῶ[σιν ἅπ]αντες).

Taking these details together, and particularly with the final point in mind, I suggest the following reconstruction: Antisthenes had found the organization in disarray and, most important, while returning its finances to a condition of solvency, took measures to ensure in the future predictable and orderly conduct of its meetings and sacrifices and in each area saw to it that the organization’s arrangements came under the scrutiny of all its members. Thanks to his efforts, the phyle could now function in a more financially secure, open, and democratic fashion conducive to the interests of the entire association.

If an epimelete (or, less likely, it now appears, a *privatus*) could play so far-reaching a role, it stands to reason that there would have been little need for an extensive corps of subordinate officers. And, indeed, we learn only of a secretary, treasurer, and herald, each bearing a common Greek generic descriptive title (γραμματεὺς,⁸¹ ταμίαις,⁸² κῆρυξ⁸³) and, where recorded, performing predictable and appropriate tasks. Probably such duties were too bothersome or time-consuming to impose upon a person qualified and willing to assume the onerous responsibilities of “caretaker”, or they required specialized knowledge or skills. Exceptionally, a small residue of responsibility is assigned in three instances to ad hoc boards⁸⁴ rather than to an additional officer or officers bearing a distinctive, specialized title, possibly differing (as with the demes) from phyle to phyle. Again, as I observed in connection

⁸¹ *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i (Leontis), col. II, line 4; *ArchEph* 1965, pp. 131–136: ii (Akamantis), line 23 (restored); *IG II²* 1158, lines 11–12 (restored); and *SEG II* 8, line 4 (both Kekropis; restored). For very late attestations (*viz.* after 166) of a [γραμματεὺς ἱπάρχους φυ[λετῶν] and of a [γραμματεὺς φυλεῖ, both allotted, see *Hesperia* 3, 1934, pp. 42–43, no. 31, lines 14–17, but these secretaries may not belong to the association *per se*. Likewise, I assume that the secretaries occasionally mentioned in bouleutic inscriptions pertain to the Council and to the boards of prytaneis in particular.

⁸² *IG II²* 2824 (Aigeis); 1158 (Kekropis?; restored); 1168, lines 9 and 12–13 (unknown phyle). Again, as with the secretaries, I omit the officers associated with the personnel of the Council.

⁸³ *IG II²* 1145, lines 7–8: [. . . τ][δὸν κῆ]ρυξ (Kekropis?). The relation of these words to the larger context is uncertain.

⁸⁴ *SEG II* 8, line 5? (Kekropis); *SEG III* 115, lines 15–23 (Antiochis); *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 14–15, no. 13, lines 12–14 (Ptolemais?).

with the epimeletai, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Erechtheis, Pandionis, and the others were equipped with similarly titled staffs of just these few officers and, furthermore, that given the relative abundance of our records, we now possess the full complement of these titles.⁸⁵ Such uniformity undoubtedly reflects a shared concentration of headquarters and of active personnel and members in the urban center, in contrast with the often remote and isolated situation of the demes.

THE REWARDS OF HOLDING OFFICE IN THE PHYLE

The holding of such offices, despite the sometimes onerous work and significant responsibility involved, was not without its rewards. For some individuals, certainly, simply to bear an official title was sufficient reward in itself, since a title allowed a citizen to stand out amidst the uniformity imposed by the prevailing egalitarian ethos. Beyond that minimal return, such formal (or informal) powers as these officers possessed afforded opportunities for the pedaling of influence in connection with the various departments of phyletic business; that is, the powers of the office could be used in such a way as to assure future payoffs from the beneficiaries of such use. And with the expiry of one's term of office, even a modest achievement on the phyle's behalf could easily, and sometimes did, result in a highly public conferral by vote of the phyletai in the agora of honors of various type and value (see pp. 532–533 below). The question to be asked (and answered) now is, was this all? In particular, one would like to know whether tenure in an office of a phyle was a prelude to some higher level of attainment. Still more particularly, was such an office in fact, or at least perceived as, a stepping-stone in some sense to office or other prominence in the central government?

This question is by no means a new one. A century ago, Haussoullier, to be followed until recent times by a number of others, maintained that the typical Athenian political career was launched at the local level, where apprentice politicians learned the ropes, so to speak, of democratic politics and built the power base which was to undergird their attempts to achieve appointment to the higher elective city offices. By "local level" (my term) the author of *La vie municipale en Attique* had in mind of course the demes. But this model, however plausible its original or later formulations, was decisively exploded by Whitehead in his 1986 study. True, Whitehead concedes, an individual might through participation in deme politics acquire a degree of practical know-how applicable to city politics and, within the safe confines of his home community, harmlessly undergo the trials and errors of political activity as a preliminary to the more hazardous risk taking in the urban arena. But the building of a clientele, the forging of links of patronage, the acquisition of a political reputation, to the extent that these were intended to be transferable to politics in the big city, were another matter altogether. In any case, to put the matter in empirical terms, had successful careers in the central government indeed been launched in the demes, we should now, with more than one hundred deme decrees in addition to literary evidence at our disposal, be able to find traces of such a progression from home community to urban center. Yet Whitehead's prosopographical investigation revealed that the "overlap" between

⁸⁵ Momentarily, however, I shall consider the possibility that the existence of another, previously unattested board of three is implied by the text of *IG II² 2824*.

citizens active at the deme level and those active at the city level is “strikingly small.”⁸⁶ These were, he concluded, two different groups of people. What, then, of the phylai? Were their offices or, more generally, political activity of any kind within the phyle in any sense a prelude to similar activity in the city of Athens?

Since little trace survives of the workings of the political life of the internally organized phylai (such as we have, for example, in the case of the demes), we are entirely dependent upon the prosopographical record of phyletai serving as officers in their phyle organizations. That record consists of about thirty names preserved in whole or part in epigraphic sources. To answer the question, two aspects of each officer’s biography must be considered: wealth (as indicated principally, following Davies’ work, by membership in the liturgical class) and the holding of governmental office, or political activity, in the city of Athens. As it happens, in all but nine instances no information about membership in the liturgical class or governmental or political activity of any kind has come down to us in regard to the officer himself, his father, or any determinable near ancestor or other family connection. The remaining harvest of positive instances may be quickly reviewed. A decree of Pandionis honors three of its members, on the basis of which number they were identified by the editor as the epimeletai. Meritt restored the third name as Meidokrates, son of Meidokrates, of Probalinthos; if the restoration is correct, he may be the councillor of that name *ca.* 336/5 or his father, the former alternative being preferred by Traill on chronological grounds.⁸⁷ The second name was restored by Traill as Antisthenes, son of Antisthenes, of Kytherros, a man of documented wealth and service in public liturgies.⁸⁸ Three other candidates are provided by the three honorands crowned by Pandionis at the end of the 4th century and, again in view of their number, presumably epimeletai. The first was restored by Kirchner, followed by Davies, as Pheidippos (II), son of Pheidon (II?), of Paiania; if the restoration is correct, he may be identified as a member of the liturgical family of Chairephilos, the salt-fish seller.⁸⁹ Traill restored the second as Aristodamas, son of Kallisthenes, of Myrrhinous; while this Aristodamas is otherwise unknown, the father he identified with the Kallisthenes who was councillor for Myrrhinous in 336/5.⁹⁰ The third, Nikomachos, son of Θρα[σ. . . .], [Κυ][δ[α]θην, may be a descendant (a grandson?) of the Kalliades, son of Nikomachos, of that deme named in a *diadikasia* about 380.⁹¹ Next, Chairimenes, son of Lysanias, of Deiradiotai, one of the three epimeletai of Leontis who dedicate *IG II*² 2818 (357/6), might

⁸⁶ Whitehead 1986, pp. 313–326, especially 317 (for the quotation) and 319. For the original formulation of the theory, see Haussoullier 1883, pp. i–ii.

⁸⁷ *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 41, no. 42 (*ante med. s. IV*), lines 2–4. For the councillor, see *Agora XV*, no. 42, line 165, and, on the chronology, Traill 1986, p. 87.

⁸⁸ Traill 1986, p. 86. For his wealth and public service, see *APF* 1194 = 1196 = 1197.

⁸⁹ *IG II*² 1152, lines 5–6. For Davies’ reconstruction of the family, see *APF* 14162, with the cross reference to 15187, especially p. 567.

⁹⁰ Lines 6–8. Traill 1986, p. 88. For the councillor, see *Agora XV*, no. 42, line 179. While I follow Traill’s argument in favor of his restoration of the nomen, I fail to see the basis for his statement that Aristodamas “. . . should be a son of either the prytanis or the property lessee in the poletai record,” since these people belong not (so far as we know) to the epimelete’s family but to another family of Myrrhinous to which he appeals for his onomastic parallels.

⁹¹ Lines 8–9. Thus *APF* 10951 with the cross reference to 7794; for the *diadikasia*, see *IG II*² 1932, line 19 (with Davies’ date).

be a descendant of Chairimenes of Leontis, the foreman of the prytaneis in a decree of 410/09, *IG I² 108* (= *IG I³ 101*), line 5;⁹² and another, Philoneos, son of Gnathios (III), of Leukonoion, was assigned by Davies to the liturgical family of Apollodoros (II), son of Thrasyllus (II).⁹³

Two further names may be added from a dedication, *IG II² 2824* (313/12), erected in the names of the tamias (preserved fully in lines 1 and 3) and, as once thought by some following the restoration by Koehler in lines 1 and 4, the epimeletai, a restoration favored by the certainty that in line 4 the word is followed by just three names. Traill's reexamination of the stone, however, has shown the restoration to be impossible on grounds of spacing.⁹⁴ Even so, it is clear that the three names comprise a board of officers of the phyle Aigeis, for the following reasons: (a) their presence alongside the assured officer, the tamias; (b) the fact that the two preserved demotics (*viz.* Ἀλαιεύς, lines 4, 5, *sc.* Halai Araphenides) as well as that of the tamias (*viz.* Ἰξα|[ριευύς. . .], lines 3–4) belong to the same phyle; and (c) the fact that the remains in line 1, [–^{ca. 5-6}–]αι, must, since they immediately precede καὶ ταμίας, denote such a college. Pittakys had proposed λογισταί, which, as Traill observes, is correct for the spacing, although it is without parallel in our dossier of documents. Another suitably short word, not mentioned by commentators, δρισται, is found in a decree of the deme of Peiraieus, but its pertinence to the dedication is entirely a matter of conjecture.⁹⁵ Nonetheless, officers they must be. Of the three, Philagros (patronymic and demotic not preserved) may, following Davies, be identified with the syntrierarch of that name from Halai in 322.⁹⁶ Secondly, the son of Nikokrates of Halai, again following Davies, may be associated with a branch of the family of the Nikostratos of that deme who was syntrierarch in the 370's and again before 356.⁹⁷

This roster cannot be extended by enlisting the preserved names of the other phyle officers: secretary, treasurer, or herald. Only a single name is sufficiently preserved to allow even a tentative identification.⁹⁸ If officers of the Ephebic College were included perhaps a few others might be added, but since these officers (*viz.* sophronistai, ephebic *taxiarchoi*, *lochagoi*) functioned, *qua* officers, outside the phyletic organization, they are not really relevant to our present concern.⁹⁹

⁹² *PA* 15232. For other possible family connections, see Traill 1986, p. 82.

⁹³ *APF* 1395 = 1429 (see p. 43; stemma on p. 46). For probable ancestors of this epimelete, see Traill 1986, p. 82.

⁹⁴ Traill 1986, pp. 90–92.

⁹⁵ *IG II² 1177* (*med. s. IV*), line 22. If, as remains possible, all three officers (other than the tamias) were of the same deme, namely Halai Araphenides (on which point, however, see Traill 1986, pp. 90–92), it is conceivable that the board had been involved in a dispute regarding the deme's boundaries and that they, along with the treasurer, were honored by the phyle for their meritorious service.

⁹⁶ *APF* 14208 *bis*, at p. 535, citing *IG II² 1632*, line 192.

⁹⁷ *APF* 11019, at p. 411; for the syntrierarchies, see *IG II² 1605*, lines 38–39 and 1622, line 266. *Ca.* 370, one Nikokrates, son of Nikodemos, of the deme was councillor: *Agora XV*, no. 492, line 64; since on the basis of script and orthography Traill favors the later date, i.e., 313/12 (rather than 340/39), for no. 2824, identification is plainly impossible.

⁹⁸ Namely, the tamias in *IG II² 2824*, lines 3–4, Gorgiades, son of Mnesikleides, of Ikarion (*PA* 3062). Mnesikleides Γο[ργιάδο] of the same deme, councillor *ca.* 370 (*Agora XV*, no. 492, line 72), is probably an ancestor.

⁹⁹ For the known members of the liturgical class, however, see note 157 below.

Thus, to revert to the first of our two criteria, we are left with a total of six certain or possible members of wealthy families (*viz.* Antisthenes, Pheidippos, Nikomachos, Philoneos, Philagros, and the son of Nikokrates). The number, though small, represents about a fifth of the total and, accordingly, is significant given the fact that, on Davies' estimate, the liturgical class comprised no more than two or three percent of the citizen population in the 5th and 4th centuries.¹⁰⁰ Wealth, inferentially, characterized the class of phyle officeholders. None, however (to address the second criterion and the question raised by Haussoullier and Whitehead), except for a single (non-elective) councillor, Meidokrates, is expressly recorded to have himself engaged in the political life of the city. Obviously, it would be difficult on this basis to argue that an office in one's phyle served to pave the way to prominence or high elective position in the democratic central government.

More likely, these phyletic offices were in fact, and were regarded as, political dead ends. Secretaries, treasurers, and heralds were charged with doubtless petty specialized tasks that neither necessitated nor allowed significant contact with people of power or wealth and so afforded no opportunity for political ladder climbing. Somewhat differently, the duties of the epimelete, as I suggested above, probably extended far beyond the perfunctory responsibilities necessitated by the execution and implementation of honorary decrees and so known to us from stone inscriptions. After all, no other major office is known, and the minor officers were certainly confined to the functions indicated by their titles. It was probably upon the epimeletai that most tasks not assigned to their more specialized colleagues devolved, and, indeed, it was doubtless upon them that ultimate responsibility for the health, if not the survival, of the organization rested. If this were true (and the case of Antisthenes, whose father almost certainly was the Nikandros who was *tamias* of the goddess in 343/2 and so a member of the Solonian class of *pentakosiomedimnoi*,¹⁰¹ suggests that it is), we could then appreciate the relative preponderance of officers with liturgical connections. Their wealth was needed in order to sustain the organization. At the same time, however, it is obvious that a burden of such magnitude will have held little attraction for a man not only of wealth but of talent and ambition as well and intent upon a career in city government. The epimeletai, by contrast, were, while often prosperous, more likely men of modest aspiration, fully conscious of any limitations of capacity, happy to be a big fish in the little pond of their phyle's organization, and, by no means a negligible factor, perhaps at the same time a trifle intimidated by the well-known dangers of Athenian political life.¹⁰²

THE PROPOSERS OF THE DECREES

To identify the officers as the chief sustainers of the organization leaves unanswered, of course, the question of whose interests were actually served by that organization beyond satisfying the limited ambitions of those content to venture no further than the boundaries of

¹⁰⁰ Davies (1981, pp. 27–28) estimates the size of the two classes of men who performed the liturgies, i.e., the trierarchy and the agonistic or festival liturgies. Each numbered, he calculates, about 300 men. Together, they will have comprised about 2 percent of a population of 30,000 in the 5th century and about 2.8 percent of the 21,000 citizens counted by Demetrios of Phaleron late in the 4th.

¹⁰¹ For Nikandros, see p. 523 above, with note 80. For the census class of the *tamiai*, see Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 8.1 and 47.1 with the comment of Rhodes (1981, pp. 147–148).

¹⁰² On these dangers, see Sinclair 1988, pp. 136–162.

their own phyle. For the beginnings of an answer we turn to a second category of phyletai identifiable by name, *viz.* the movers of the decrees.

Of the twenty-three wholly or partially preserved names, for nine (moving ten decrees) there is an indication of wealth or service, or both, on the part of the proposer himself or some member of his family, in the central government. One Moschos, of Anaphlystos, mover of a decree of Antiochis, is the son of Antiphanes (I), syntrierarch in 356, and Moschos' own son, in turn, is recorded to have been a councillor in 304/3.¹⁰³ Demokrates, son of Demokles, of Aphidna, the mover of a decree of Aiantis of 327/6, was remembered *inter alia* for his pro-Macedonian political activity; he is assigned by Davies to a cadet branch of the family of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, the Gephyraioi, which, according to Davies' discussion, sustained its prominence in public affairs from the mid-5th to the late 3rd century.¹⁰⁴ Onetor (VIII), son of Kephisodoros (I), of Melite, mover of a decree of Kekropis of 376/5, belongs to a wealthy and powerful family of his deme.¹⁰⁵ Pandaites (II), son of Pasikles, of Potamos, mover of a decree of Leontis of 333/2, is the son of a niece of the syntrierarch (and councillor) Alkisthenes, son of Alkibiades, of Cholleidai.¹⁰⁶ Kirchner found the father of Polynikos, mover of a decree of Hippothontis, in Phokiades of Oion, a treasurer of Athena in 425/4.¹⁰⁷ Just possibly to be associated with Kallikrates, son of Kallikrates, of Paiania, proposer of two decrees of Pandionis, is another Kallikrates (I) of that deme, who, according to the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* (28.3), brought about the abolition of the *diobelía*.¹⁰⁸ Kallikrates, son of Glaukon, of Aixone, the mover of a decree of Kekropis of 334/3,¹⁰⁹ is honored by a decree of his deme of 313/12;¹¹⁰ perhaps, as Whitehead suggests, the deme is commemorating his *choregia*, for four years earlier his father (or son[?], so Whitehead), Glaukon, son of Kallikrates, had been honored by the same deme, in this case explicitly for his service as choregos.¹¹¹ Proxenos (II), son of Pylagoros (II), of Acherdous, mover of a decree of Hippothontis, was identified by Kirchner as the grandson of *PA* 12271, a *grammateus kata prytaneian* in 335/4.¹¹² A very strong candidate for Philton, proposer of a decree of Erechtheis of the mid-4th century, is the homonym (no patronymic is preserved, but the name is very rare) of the Erechtheid deme of (Upper? Coastal?) Lamprai who was *tamias* in 346/5.¹¹³ Despite points of uncertainty, the cumulative effect of these associations is, again, significant. Wealth, indicated in four instances (*viz.* Moschos, Onetor, Pandaites, and Kallikrates of Aixone), is, to be sure, only slightly less frequently encountered than in the case of the officers. But, if family members may be counted as well as the proposers

¹⁰³ *SEG* III 115, lines 3–4. See *APF* 1227. For the syntrierarch, see *IG* II² 1612, line 106; for the councillor, *Agora* XV, no. 61, line 312.

¹⁰⁴ *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15, lines 2–3. See *APF* 12267, especially pp. 472 and 475.

¹⁰⁵ *IG* II² 1141, line 8. See *APF* 11473 and, for Onetor [VIII], son of Kephisodoros [I], p. 425.

¹⁰⁶ *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8, col. III, lines 10–11. See *APF* 11572, with cross reference to no. 643 and stemma on p. 24. For the councillor, see *Agora* XV, no. 13 (370/69), lines 40–41.

¹⁰⁷ *IG* II² 1153, lines 2–3. See *PA* 15066, citing, for Phokiades, *IG* I² 241, line 101.

¹⁰⁸ *IG* II² 1159 (303/2) and 1160 (*ca.* 300). For Aristotle's Kallikrates, see *PA* 7975.

¹⁰⁹ *IG* II² 1156, lines 26–35.

¹¹⁰ *IG* II² 1202.

¹¹¹ *IG* II² 1200 (317/16), lines 2–7. See Whitehead 1986, p. 419, no. 86.

¹¹² *IG* II² 1163 (*ca.* 288/7), lines 2–3. See Kirchner, *PA* 12271, citing *Agora* XV, no. 43, line 227.

¹¹³ *IG* II² 1146 (*ante med. s.* IV), line 2. For the *tamias*, see *PA* 14790, citing Michel no. 832 (from Samos).

themselves, in seven cases, or nearly one third of the total (*viz.* Moschos, Demokrates, Pandaites, Polynikos, Kallikrates of Paiania[?], Proxenos, and Philton), there are possible indications of participation in city government or city politics, or both, and in three instances the mover himself is indicated to have been so active.¹¹⁴ Above, I speculated about the rewards, chiefly psychic, of service as an officer of a phyle. What, may now be asked, was so alluring to a man of governmental or political aspirations about moving a decree in the agora of that same phyle?

Some general considerations may be mentioned at the outset. First, all the decrees (except Philton's, *IG II*² 1146) moved by these men are honorary, that is, by proposing their decrees, they are publicly pronouncing judgment on the merits of the individual(s) so honored. What is the likely status of a man who would presume publicly, first before his assembled fellow phyletai and, later, with the erection of a stone stele, before all his fellow Athenians in perpetuity, to pronounce such judgment? Plainly, a person of high station, at the very least at or near the same rank as the person receiving the accolade. Men of wealth or ambition, accordingly, will be found among their number. Furthermore, whatever the formal or understood requirements, the job of mover was probably also viewed as possessing certain attractions. No particular effort was involved: only a brief and accurate speech (*epainos*) need be composed. There was presumably little risk, provided that the honorand was not controversial and the mover ventured no inflammatory opinions in his speech. Positively, the role was highly visible, played out before potentially one tenth of the citizen population, not to mention the fact that the mover's name was to occupy a prominent position on the eventual stone stele. Nor can the possibility of a future reciprocation on the part of the honored party be ruled out. (This possibility may be illustrated by the case of Kallikrates, son of Glaukon, of Aixone, mentioned above. He, presumably as a younger man, moves the decree of Kekropis of 334/3, *IG II*² 1156, lines 26–35, honoring its class of ephebes and, two decades later, is himself honored in turn by a decree of his deme, *IG II*² 1202 [313/12]. Was the mover of the latter decree one of the ephebes honored by Kallikrates's phyle decree in 334/3?) Now, was this all, or can we imagine still other rewards in moving a decree, rewards peculiar to the nature of the phyle organization?

I believe that there were such rewards, rewards connected with the phyle's urban focus (whether at the shrine of the eponym or other location of its agora). To frame my point, let us consider by way of contrast the often remote rural situation of the demes. The probable difference between the meetings of the two organizations is instructive. The chances are that the mover of a deme decree, even when the meeting of a non-urban deme took place in the city (as we know happened at least once, in the case of Halimous: Demosthenes 57), spoke before a group of farmers or fishermen who only seldom visited the town. But the mover of a phyle decree addressed an audience consisting of preponderantly city phyletai, since, as was seen above, all evidence for the agora places it in or near the urban center. (Nothing precluded the attendance of coastal or inland phyletai, but why should they have made a greater effort to attend than their urban counterparts?) These same city phyletai,

¹¹⁴ Compare the results of Whitehead's parallel study of the movers of the decrees of the demes (Whitehead 1986, p. 318): of the 59 known proposers, only eight, or 14 percent, could be identified as participants in central government or city politics, or both.

by virtue of such residence, could be expected to vote in statewide elections in greater relative numbers than their rural symphyletai, since the elections of course took place in the town. Accordingly, a speech (*viz.* the motion plus the laudatory *epainos*) before the phyle's agora afforded the mover an opportunity to display his political wares to a large group of potential voters and possible supporters of his own candidacy in some future election. Herein, I think, lay the attraction for the politically ambitious of the job of mover of a phyle decree.

THE HONORANDS OF THE DECREES

The one other identifiable class of people preserved in our records is the honorands named in the laudatory decrees. Such texts, again, comprise 45, or 94 percent, of the total of 48 decrees preserved. Typically, the decree identifies the honorand, specifies in what capacity the meritorious conduct was accomplished (although in a small minority of cases, no office or official position of any kind is mentioned),¹¹⁵ characterizes that performance by laudatory language (usually adverbs or a prepositional phrase), mentions the party (self, phyle, or state) benefited (or not) by the honorand's actions, and finally indicates the honors to which he or they are entitled. These honors, while admitting some variation, always (with one possible exception) include praise¹¹⁶ and a crown of olive or gold, in the latter case of a value, when stated, of either 500 or 1,000 drachmas;¹¹⁷ in two instances, discussed above, the crowning is to be officially announced.¹¹⁸ Anomalous honors are the exemption from liturgies for two¹¹⁹ or three¹²⁰ years or for life;¹²¹ the award on two occasions of 50 drachmas for a sacrifice;¹²² a statue¹²³ or, following upon the voting of a statue by the Boule and Demos or the phyle itself, possibly a place (*topos*) in which to erect it;¹²⁴ and, finally, the privilege

¹¹⁵ The three certain cases, all from Kekropis, are given in note 79 above. The doubtful case of Antisthenes of Erechtheis was discussed above (pp. 523–524) at length, without certain result.

¹¹⁶ Twenty-nine instances are preserved. The possible exception is *IG II*² 1149 (*s.* IV; Hippothontis), which, though only fragmentarily preserved, with certainty opened with the injunction to crown. Elsewhere, mention of the praise precedes that of the crown.

¹¹⁷ As with praise, the crown is never demonstrably absent. *IG II*² 1142 (*init.* *s.* IV; unknown phyle) hardly counts as an exception, since here the phyle(?) is evidently honoring (with praise alone?) an entire board of prytaneis. For the total number of crownings and the recorded types (olive or gold), see note 44 above. For the 500 drachma crowns, see *IG II*² 1152 (partly restored) and 1157 (both Pandionis); *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i (Leontis), col. I, lines 28–30; *IG II*² 1141; 1156, lines 26–35 (*bis*; once restored); and 1158 (all Kekropis); and *Hesperia* 4, 1935, pp. 41–42, no. 9 (unknown phyle; restored). For the 1,000 drachma crowns, see *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i (Leontis), col. I, lines 16–17; ii (Leontis), col. III, lines 15–16 (restored); and *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15 (Aiantis).

¹¹⁸ *IG II*² 1149, lines 5–6 (Hippothontis); 1161, lines 3–4 (unknown phyle).

¹¹⁹ *IG II*² 1147 (Erechtheis, number restored).

¹²⁰ *ΑρχΕφ* 1965, pp. 131–136: i (Akamantis), lines 1–2 (number restored).

¹²¹ *IG II*² 1140, lines 13–15 (Pandionis; partly restored).

¹²² *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 41, no. 42 (number and numeral restored); *IG II*² 1152 (both Pandionis). At *Agora XV*, no. 69 (= *IG II*² 656+; 284/3), Meritt and Traill print a restored text calling for the epimeletai to grant to the honorands, the bouleutai, a sum for a sacrifice (lines 14–17). The number of drachmas is not preserved.

¹²³ *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 14–15, no. 13, lines 11–14 (Ptolemais?; both references to the [bronze] *eikon* are wholly restored).

¹²⁴ *SEG II* 8 (Kekropis): first decree (“the setting up of the *eikon*”; partly restored), second decree (“to provide a place in the shrine of Kekrops”; reference to the *topos* wholly restored). As the *SEG* editor observes, both decrees, in the estimation of Hiller and Kirchner, were passed by the phyletai.

of setting up a dedication in the shrine of the hero.¹²⁵ Plainly, some of these honors were of considerable value and must have taxed, in the absence of any other information about fiscal resources, the income from fines, rents, and so on reviewed above. It is legitimate to ask, accordingly, what motivated the phyletai to commit their resources so frequently and, on occasion, in such a lavish manner. Together, the honorary decrees preserve the names of quite a few honorands. Perhaps the answer to our question is to be found in the prosopographical record of these men.

Not surprisingly, first of all, the phyle honors its own members with only a single exception. The exception is an ephobic decree of Leontis of 333/2 (*Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8), which honors, besides the phyle's own ephebes and their officers, two "*didaskaloi* of the phyle" (as restored), one an Athenian citizen of the deme Pallene (phyle Antiochis), the other a foreigner from Methone (i, col. I, lines 33–38). Presumably, these were skilled professionals unobtainable from within the phyle's own membership. That they should be mentioned in a document otherwise concerned only with the phyle's own members is best explained as a requirement of the subject matter of the text, that is, if any ephobic officials are named, they must all be named.¹²⁶ The exception accounted for, we may proceed with the classification of the great bulk of the honorands. Predictably, the phyle sometimes honors its own internal officers. Perhaps not so predictable is the relative infrequency of such cases. The subordinate officers (secretary, treasurer, herald), despite the fact that their duties were undoubtedly both tiresome and vital to the smooth functioning of the organization, are never so honored in our surviving texts.¹²⁷ No less surprising, in only a maximum of eight instances can a case be made that the honorands are in fact the board of (three) epimeletai. *IG II²* 2818 (357/6), a dedication by the three epimeletai of Leontis, records the phyle's crown (cf. no. 2842 [321/0 or 318/17]; phyle unknown); and, in the next century, *IG II²* 2861 preserves two (of an original total of six?) crowns enclosing the names of epimeletai of Antigonis and Demetrias.¹²⁸ The three honorands of the decree of Aiantis of the mid-4th century, *IG II²* 1151, were understood by Koehler to be the board of epimeletai, and he offered a similar interpretation for the somewhat later laudatory decree of Pandionis, *IG II²* 1152 (*fin. s. IV*). Similarly, the identification of the three honorands in another decree of Pandionis (*Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 41, no. 42), depends solely upon their number. (The rubric "*curatores Erechtheidis honorantur*", however, is open to question in the case of *IG II²* 1150, since in the absence of any precise indication of the number of honorands, it rests entirely upon the plural words in lines 5 and 6.) We have already examined Erechtheis' accolade of Antisthenes, *IG II²* 1165, in which the identification of the honorand as epimelete is not quite certain. Given the survival of nearly fifty honorary decrees (plus a number of dedications), nearly all of which preserve some indication of the identity of the honorand(s), this is a rather

¹²⁵ *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i (Leontis), col. I, lines 31–33 (largely restored).

¹²⁶ For additional examples of *didaskaloi* of a phyle, some known not to be members of the phyle, see Rhodes 1981 on §42.3, pp. 506–507.

¹²⁷ Again, as stated above with notes 81 and 82, I do not include in the present discussion the treasurers and secretaries honored by phylai (or by the state) in bouletic inscriptions on the grounds that in all probability they are specific to the Council and not officers of the association *per se*.

¹²⁸ For the phyle affiliations, see Appendix, pp. 540–541 below, under these phylai.

small harvest.¹²⁹ Plainly, these phylai were not introverted groups content to reward their own for merely carrying out the day-to-day administrative responsibilities required to keep the organization afloat. Who, then, were these honorands, and why were they so honored?

Perhaps unexpectedly, all remaining honorands, although their services in various capacities are recorded to have benefited the honoring phyle in one way or another, performed their benefactions not while holding an office in the organization itself but rather while in a position or capacity that, though dependent upon appointment by the phyle itself or by the state *kata phylas*, involved the honorand in the statewide activities of the city of Athens. The attested cases fall into four more or less well-defined clusters, with a small residue of isolated or problematic items. Four of the men honored by decrees with certainty, and possibly as many as six, are identifiable as choregoi; and nine others can be added from the list of subsequent awardees of Pandionis in *IG II² 1138*.¹³⁰ The Ephebic College is represented on eight occasions in the persons of the officers: the kosmetes(?),¹³¹ the sophronistes,¹³² the ephebic taxiarchos,¹³³ lochagoi,¹³⁴ and (exceptionally, on one occasion) the ephebes themselves.¹³⁵ As a third group we may instance those few so-called prytany inscriptions in which the party initiating the accolade is recognizably not the Boule or Demos but the phyle itself.¹³⁶ The fourth cluster comprises five certain attestations (and one probable) of a *thesmothete* allotted from the honoring phyle.¹³⁷ Isolated are the (phyle's)

¹²⁹ I assume that the *dedications* by the epimeletai acknowledging the conferring of honors upon them by their phylai just mentioned imply the existence of *decrees* no longer extant and so must accordingly be included in this enumeration. For a decree authorizing the erection of such a dedication by the honorand, see *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i (Leontis), col. I, lines 31–33 (as restored).

¹³⁰ *IG II² 1147* (Erechtheis); 1138 = 1139 (+ *Hesperia* 22, 1953, p. 177, no. 1); *IG II² 1157* (both Pandionis); 1158 (Kekropis); *Hesperia* 4, 1935, pp. 41–42, no. 9 (unknown phyle; status as choregos uncertain). Besides the immediately foregoing inscription, another problematic item is *IG II² 1144* of Pandionis, which, as restored in lines 9–11, calls for the engraving of the name of the archon and of the “victors” by patronymic and deme, with evident reference to a catalogue of successful choregoi (cf. no. 1138, also of Pandionis).

¹³¹ *ΑρχΕφ* 1965, pp. 131–136: ii (Akamantis), line 15. The word is wholly restored; for the editor's justification, see p. 133. The decree of Leontis, *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i, dedicated “to the hero” by the sophronistes and the taxiarch upon their crowning by the Boule and Demos and the phyle (lines 1–2, partially restored), appends the name of the *kosmetes* (col. II, lines 12–13), but he does not figure among the phyle's ephebic honorands.

¹³² Besides the decree of Leontis just cited (note 131 above), line 1; i, col. I, lines 4–5, 14–15; col. II, 13–14; and ii, col. III, 11–12, the sophronistes of Kekropis is honored at *IG II² 1156*, lines 31–32.

¹³³ Again, besides the honorand of the decree of Leontis (note 131 above), line 1 and i, col. I, lines 20–22 and col. II, line 15, Kekropis honors its taxiarch at *IG II² 1155*, lines a2 and b7–12.

¹³⁴ Yet again, the honorands of the decree of Leontis (note 131 above) include the lochagoi at col. I, lines 22–28 and col. II, lines 16–22.

¹³⁵ Finally, the decree of Leontis (note 131 above) cites the ephebes beginning at col. II, line 22.

¹³⁶ For the references, see note 43 above.

¹³⁷ *IG II² 1148* (Pandionis); *Hesperia* 15, 1946, p. 189, no. 35 (Leontis or Aiantis); and *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15 (Aiantis). At *IG II² 1163* (Hippothontis; ca. 288/7), lines 8–10, the reference to the honorand's tendance of “the sortition of the courts” suggested to Koehler that the man, who is otherwise identified only as priest of Asklepios (lines 3–4), had simultaneously served as thesmothete. Two additional instances are preserved in dedications. The phyle (Kekropis) joined the Boule, Demos, the honorand's fellow demesmen and colleagues in the archonship in honoring one Kleonymos, son of Kleemporos, of Epieikidai, according to his dedication, *IG II² 2837* (329/8); similarly, an unknown phyle, Boule, and Demos in no. 2843 (319/18).

priest of the eponymous hero of Pandionis;¹³⁸ the (state's) priest of Asklepios;¹³⁹ the (state's) priest of Asklepios and Hygieia (restored);¹⁴⁰ a (liturgical) gymnasiarch charged with the training of a team of *lampadephoroi*;¹⁴¹ a phyletes who had served as judge at the Thargelia;¹⁴² a phylarch of the cavalry;¹⁴³ another person, undoubtedly a phylarch too, who had led his phyletai to victory in the *anthippasia*;¹⁴⁴ and a *syndikos* (acting) "on behalf of the temenos on Lemnos. . . ."¹⁴⁵ In the problematic category are a *hieropoios* (a member of one of the state boards designated by this name?) conjecturally restored in a decree of Akamantis,¹⁴⁶ and an honorand of unknown identification who will render his *euthynai* and who therefore must be an officer of the state.¹⁴⁷

The decrees themselves leave no doubt why these various phyletai are being so honored. In the carrying out of their duties, they had, we learn, benefited the phyle in some way. By my count, in no fewer than 36 instances (of a total of 45 honorary decrees, some of which are fragmentary) attention is drawn, explicitly or implicitly, to this fundamental fact. In no intact (or nearly intact) decree, moreover, is such acknowledgment absent. What is perhaps somewhat surprising is that, despite the fact that in each instance the honorand had been concerned with duties or responsibilities at the state level, on only seven or eight occasions does the decree appear to acknowledge comparable benefits to the city of Athens, and in each instance this point supplements, but normally does not replace, the still present mention of the phyle's interests.¹⁴⁸ Thus the impression left by the decrees as a group is that the phyle is honoring a member or members who, in the exercise of a city office or (as with the liturgies) a post operating at the city level, had nonetheless in some way benefited his (or their) own phyle, to the exclusion, necessarily, of the remaining nine tenths of the state.

We could learn more if the decrees were more specific about the nature of such benefits, but characteristically their language is vague or merely laudatory. External evidence must be brought to bear. To consider only the four principal categories, a choregic victory of course

¹³⁸ *IG II*² 1140 (Pandionis).

¹³⁹ *IG II*² 1163 (Hippothontis).

¹⁴⁰ *IG II*² 1171 (unknown phyle). The injunction in line 14 to stand (the stele?) "beside the eponymous" strongly favors the ascription of the decree to a phyle.

¹⁴¹ *IG II*² 1250 (Aiantis).

¹⁴² *IG II*² 1153 (Hippothontis).

¹⁴³ *SEG III* 115 (Antiochis).

¹⁴⁴ *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 111–112, no. 21 (unknown phyle).

¹⁴⁵ *SEG III* 117 (Antiochis), lines 7–8. No title is associated with his services, described in lines 12–19, in connection with certain properties at Oropos.

¹⁴⁶ *IG II*² 1166 (Akamantis), line 2. Whatever the title, a statewide religious post of some kind is indicated by the context.

¹⁴⁷ *IG II*² 1164 (unknown phyle), line 6.

¹⁴⁸ A generous list, giving the benefit of the doubt in fragmentary passages, would include *IG II*² 1150 (Erechtheis), lines 3–4; 1148 (Pandionis), lines 9–10; 1167 (Pandionis), lines 4 and 9; 1163 (Hippothontis), lines 7–8 and 19–20; 1151 (Aiantis), line 8(?); 1142 (= *Agora XV*, no. 5; unknown phyle), line 8 (with reference to a board of prytaneis; not necessarily a decree of a phyle); *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 111–112, no. 21 (unknown phyle), lines 6–8. At *IG II*² 1141 (Kekropis), lines 8–9, the text "since Pyrros has proved good concerning the phyle and *ta koina*" was improved by Pritchett (*Hesperia* 10, 1941, pp. 263–265, no. 67) to read ". . . concerning the phyle and *ta koina* of the phyle." Mention is not made of any benefit to the phyle in either *IG II*² 1142 or 1167, but both these texts are too fragmentary for any significance to be attached to this fact.

meant good publicity for the liturgist's phyle, first in the theater itself, later in the form of sometimes impressive monuments inscribed in the name of the phyle.¹⁴⁹ (A similar argument applies to the phylarch's victory in the anthippasia and to the gymnasiarch's coaching of the torch-runners.) The well-being of the ephebes, young men about 18 or 19 years of age, will have been a topic of some concern, since these teenagers, probably often away from home for the first time, were being entrusted to the care of older adult males, a relationship to which Greeks were notoriously sensitive. This must be at least part of what Aristotle is getting at when he writes that, after the scrutiny of the cadets, their *fathers* (my emphasis)¹⁵⁰ meet *kata phylas* and select on oath three men over forty years old whom they regard as "the best and most suitable" to take charge of the cadets. (From these the Demos was later to elect one man from each phyle as sophronistes and from all the Athenians one kosmetes over all [*Ath. Pol.* 42.2].) It is presumably in part the ephebic officer's success in living up to the standard of "the best and most suitable" that has motivated the accolade of the home phyle, no doubt largely at the prompting of the fathers of the cadets. As for the prytaneis, no obvious explanation is at hand, but there is a strongly suggestive parallel in a decree of the demesmen of Teithras, who honor their bouleutai (note, not their prytaneis) "since they well and energetically took care of the sacrifices and everything else that the demotai bid."¹⁵¹ Here, explicit acknowledgment is made of the serving by members of the Council of the interests not of the state but of their home community. The case of the thesmothetai, finally, is quite unclear. A decree of Aiantis mentions the honorand's attention to the allotment of offices, to the staffing of the courts, and to "everything else that concerns the Aiantid phyle." In the "manifesto" that follows, the hope is expressed that future thesmothetai will be similarly zealous on behalf of the phyle; but the connection between the state office and the benefiting of the phyle is not made explicit,¹⁵² nor is it easy to imagine. Certainly public acknowledgment of favoritism towards one's phyletai in connection with either the magistracies or the courts would be hard to accept as an explanation. It is to be suspected, accordingly, that the honorand's benefactions, though no less the result of his use of the office, are in fact masked by the vague reference to "everything else that concerns the Aiantid phyle" (lines 10–12). A similar opacity marks the honors by Leontis or Aiantis of its thesmothete for his attention to [--- τῶν πε] | ρι τήν φυλήν | ν κατὰ τοὺς | [νό] μους in a decree of about the same date.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁹ For the details, with references to the epigraphic texts, see Jones 1987, chap. 1, §1.27, pp. 48–51.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *IG II²* 1159 (Pandionis), lines 11–14, where "the fathers of the ephebes" are recorded to have testified to the sophronistes' praiseworthy performance.

¹⁵¹ *Agora XV*, no. 45 (= *Hesperia* 31, 1962, pp. 401–403, no. 3; 331/0 or 330/29), lines 7–12: ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀλῶς καὶ φιλοστρίμως | ἐπεμελήθησαν τῶν θ[υσιῶν καὶ τῶν] ἄλλων | [ῥσα ἐκέλευσαν οἱ δη]μοῖται. . . . Note that nothing is said or implied here regarding the *location*, whether the town, the deme itself, or elsewhere, at which either the sacrifices or the other services were carried out. Whitehead, however, assumes without argument that the duties in question were undertaken "within the deme" (1986, p. 266, note 40), with a view to supporting his contention that the bouleutai of Teithras did *not* function as representatives of their deme. As a matter of fact, nothing precludes or even lessens the probability of my view that these councillors had acted, on order from their demotai, to advance the interests of the deme in the arena of the city of Athens.

¹⁵² *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15, lines 5–12, 21–27.

¹⁵³ *Hesperia* 15, 1946, p. 189, no. 35, lines 5–7.

The practice of the phylai, then, will have fallen midway between two extremes. At the extreme of self-promotion, an office holder might use his powers for personal benefit, hence the decrees on occasion praise the honorand for carrying out his duties “well and justly and *without taking bribes*.”¹⁵⁴ At the other extreme, in this case a praiseworthy attitude but one (as we saw) hardly recognized, the honorand is stated to have served the interests of the entire city of Athens. But the great bulk of our material specifies neither self nor state but rather the phyle of the honorand as the proper recipient of his benefactions. Such actions are customarily characterized with laudatory language (e.g., “well”, “well and energetically”) and often, too, by a prepositional phrase ascribing to the honorand “excellence”, “justice”, “moderation”, or the like, but such verbiage is beside the point when measured against his benefaction to the phyle. Sometimes, too, to drive the point home still further, the decree ends with a formulaic element (of varying construction) expressing the hope that others, incited by the present honorand’s award, may similarly benefit the phyle in the future.¹⁵⁵

That the reason for the bestowal of honors resided in the honorand’s official position and in his use of that position to the advantage of the phyle is, I think, the most likely but not the only possible interpretation of the record. Alternatively, it might be argued that the office itself is incidental to the award of honors, that it merely provided an occasion or excuse for a decree, and that the real, underlying reason was the honorand’s use of his wealth or influence to the benefit of the phyle above and beyond the narrowly circumscribed range of his duties in office or liturgy. To be sure, such a view garners some plausibility from the presence among the honorands of the liturgical choregoi,¹⁵⁶ as well as from several indications of wealth or significant political service at the state level in the persons or families of some of the others.¹⁵⁷ But against this line of reasoning are the several explicit statements

¹⁵⁴ The word is ἀδωροδοκῆτως: *IG II²* 1148 (Pandionis), lines 4–5 (partly restored); 1153 (Hippothontis), lines 4–5. So also, more fully, Antisthenes’ accolade by his phyle Erechtheis, *IG II²* 1165, lines 22–24.

¹⁵⁵ *IG II²* 1159 (Pandionis); *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15 (Aiantis); *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 14–15, no. 13 (Ptolemais?); *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 111–112, no. 21 (unknown phyle); *IG II²* 1171 (unknown phyle).

¹⁵⁶ The honored choregoi are Saurias, son of Pythogenes, of Lamprai (Erechtheis), *IG II²* 1147 (*APF* 12612); Nikias, son of Epigenes (I), of Kydathenaion (Pandionis), *IG II²* 1138 and 1139 (*APF* 10807); [-----¹⁰-----]δωρου of Kydathenaion (Pandionis), *IG II²* 1157 (*APF* A85); lost name (Kekropis?), *IG II²* 1158; lost name (unknown phyle), *Hesperia* 4, 1935, pp. 41–42, no. 9; lost name of possible choregos (Pandionis), *IG II²* 1144. The final three examples are not listed in *APF*’s “lost names”, D1–22, pp. 592–595. From the catalogue of victors of Pandionis come the nine additional names: *IG II²* 1138, lines 17–32: Andokides (IV), son of Leogoros (II), of Kydathenaion (*APF* 828, especially p. 31); Euripides, son of Adeimantos (I), of Myrrhinous (also at no. 2812, lines 1–3; *APF* 5949 = 5955 = 5956, especially p. 204); Demon (III), son of Demoteles, of Paiania (*APF* 3737); Charmantides (II), son of Chairestratos (I), of Paiania (*APF* 15502); Philomelos (II), son of Philippides (I), of Paiania (also at no. 2812, lines 4–7; *APF* 14670); Apemon, son of Pheidippos, of Myrrhinous (*APF* 1350); Xenopeithes (I), son of Nausimachos (I), of Paiania (*APF* 11263); Kleomedon (I), son of Kleon (I), of Kydathenaion (*APF* 8586); and Antisthenes (I), son of Antiphates, of Kytheros (*APF* 1194 = 1196 = 1197). For the name of the gymnasiarch honored by Aiantis in *IG II²* 1250, see *SEG* XL 124.

¹⁵⁷ For the certain or possible members of liturgical families among the phyletic officers (most of them, where a determination is possible, as it turned out, epimeletai) honored by the decrees, see pp. 526–528 above. To these may be added five others: Nikandros of Lamprai (*PA* 10688), tamias of the goddess in 343/2, is the father of Antisthenes, honored by Erechtheis, *IG II²* 1165; Demon (I), son of Demomeles (I), of Paiania, priest of Pandion, honored by Pandionis, *IG II²* 1140, belongs to a liturgical family (*APF* 3735); Epikrates, son of Peisianax, of Sounion, ephebic lochagos, honored by Leontis, *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i, col. I,

that the honorand, by fulfilling the duties of his post, did so to the enhancement of his phyle's interests,¹⁵⁸ plus the fact, already noted, that at least one phyle, Kekropis, on two or three occasions honors a phyletes for whom no post of any kind was indicated.¹⁵⁹ This latter practice implies that no need was felt to name an office simply to satisfy some perceived prerequisite to the bestowal of praise or crown. We can be sure, then, that the benefactions had been delivered through the medium of the honorand's office or liturgy.

V. CONCLUSION: THE PHYLE ASSOCIATION AS INSTRUMENT OF REPRESENTATION

What Kleisthenes originally (or, in later times, other reformers) intended, if anything, for the associational role of the phylai we shall never know. But a few recorded or highly probable features of the nascent phylai would seem to have encouraged, or at least to have opened the door for, such a development. The new phylai were given eponyms selected from among the "first founders" of the Athenian state, who might, by virtue of their high antiquity, be cast in the role of fictive common ancestors. These eponyms were already, or soon thereafter became, the objects of formal cults organized around a shrine, thereby providing potential foci of religious activity. Although each phyle fell into three quite disparate segments, each segment was extensive enough to embrace a great many already existing familial or associational units in toto. That is to say, many of the new symphyetai found themselves already related to each other in a number of different ways. And as a consequence of the usage imposed by Kleisthenes upon the demes, membership in the phylai, of which the demes were components, was to be transmitted hereditarily from father to son irrespective of the place of domicile. Thus the conditions were from a very early date ripe for the emergence of an association of the phyletai, quite apart from any reformer's intentions. But that this would happen was by no means certain; internally organized public units are rather infrequently attested among the 200 or so city-states for which some trace of a public organization has survived.¹⁶⁰ The development of an association depended upon the presence of certain needs to which the resulting organization would constitute the response. What some of these needs were in the case of Athens can, I think, be deduced from the record of the organizations just reviewed.

Plainly, to begin with a negative point, the explanation is not to be found in any administrative demands placed upon the phylai by the central government. We saw that

lines 24–25 and col. II, lines 17–19, belongs to a liturgical family (*APF* 9688, IX, pp. 378–379); Pandaites, son of Pasikles (I), of Potamos, ephebic lochagos, honored by Leontis, *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i, col. I, line 23 and col. II, lines 16–17, belongs to the family of a syntrierarch and councillor (*APF* 11572; see 643, with corrected stemma on p. 24); [Δημοκλής Φιλ]ιστιωνος Ἀφιδ[ναῖος] (*PA* 3496), ephebic taxiarch, honored by Ptolemais(?), *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 14–15, no. 13, "belonged to a family prominent over many years." (I omit the half dozen or so certain or probable cases in which an honorand or his relative is merely known to have served as councillor.)

¹⁵⁸ Where the text is preserved reasonably intact, not a single decree honoring any of the non-phyletic officers or liturgists under review here fails to indicate in some fashion his service to the phyle.

¹⁵⁹ See note 79 above.

¹⁶⁰ For a convenient synopsis of the record, see Jones 1987, Index III, pp. 396–403.

there are few indications that state business of any significance was conducted in the phyletic agorai and that, in particular, there is little to favor the suggestion that the sortitions of the councillors (or of the guards), or of any government officials, were actually conducted in meetings (special or otherwise) of the "tribal assemblies". By no means could these associations be imagined to have been sustained by the bureaucratic requirements of the central government.

Nor, equally clearly (and leaving the central government out of it), did they develop in response to a need for an organization characterized by close ties of solidarity. Of course, the integration of the phyletai of City, Coast, and Inland was perhaps never a viable possibility. Still, tribesmen of a single regional block of demes might have formed a cohesive group had conditions been right. That of the three blocks the one (*viz.* the urban trittys) for which we might expect the evidence to preserve traces of such a development evidently did not is probably to be ascribed to a surfeit of competition from other organizational entities, beginning with the state itself and extending down through the trittys and deme, the phratry, the genos and other religious associations, clubs of various kinds, and the family in its conjugal and more extended forms. What need was there, in other words, for still another focus of allegiance or activity? An alternative and far more likely suggestion is that a need was felt by some for a relatively small-scale forum for political activity, leadership, and achievement. At the level of the central government, the opportunities to hold a significant (*i.e.*, for the most part, elective) office, to make a speech before the Assembly or Council, or to receive public honors were few and far between, being reserved for those of exceptional talent, ambition, and courage. How much better one's chances would be in an organization only one-tenth that size! But this factor too, however well founded, explains only part of the record. It fails, first, to explain why the phylai were headquartered in the town, when the same organizational ends could be achieved equally well in either the coastal or inland regions. It fails, too, to account for the most striking feature of the record, the pronounced tendency to bestow honors not upon the most natural candidates, the associational officers, but upon holders of statewide posts whose context of operations was outside the phyle in the city of Athens.

To account for these facts we must entertain still another variety of need. I have in mind the need felt by ambitious individuals to facilitate their entry into, or continuing success within, the politics of the city and, at a grass roots level, a need on the part of the membership as a whole to maximize their influence within the central government, at least insofar as the acts of the central government affected their own lives. To meet these needs, however, an important condition had to be satisfied: the seat or headquarters, and above all the place of the meetings, of the phyle had to be situated in the urban center. The mover of an honorary decree who hoped, by means of an eloquent or persuasive laudatory speech, to obtain political support among his phyletai would obviously prefer to speak to urbanites likely to vote in city elections or plebiscites. Such men will have seen to it that the phyle's seat be established, or remain, in or near the Akropolis or Agora. But the rank-and-file membership certainly had its own agenda as well. They might utilize the resources of the organization to subsidize the bestowal of honors upon those of their number whose official position provided an opportunity to represent their (the membership's) interests in the arena of Athenian public life. Again, the urban setting was essential. It was in the town that the preponderance of politically active phyletai, my hypothetical attendees and voters in the

phyle's agora, were likely to reside (those residing far from the urban center were less likely to be so active). It was in the town also that the choregoi, ephebic officers, prytaneis, and thesmothetai, among others, were frequently and of necessity present in order to carry out some or all of their official duties. Thus the holding of the phyle's meetings in the town would bring together the interested parties among the membership and those individuals, the state officers and liturgists selected from their phyle, whom those interested parties hoped to influence by holding out the prospect of the bestowal of coveted or valuable honors.¹⁶¹

Hence the phyle organizations, as we find them in our admittedly fragmentary evidence, do appear to have ended up, whatever intent may have prompted their creation, serving as instruments of *representation*. Some scholars have denied the existence of representative government in ancient Greece,¹⁶² but I think there can be little doubt that these state officials and liturgists, all known to have been selected "by phylai", were given strong incentives to regard the phyle from which they had been selected as a kind of constituency and to represent the interests of that constituency in the various fora of Athenian city life.¹⁶³ An organization

¹⁶¹ If in fact, as I am suggesting, urbanites tended in proportionately greater numbers to engage in the associational life of the phylai, we might expect to find some trace of the tendency in the preserved deme affiliations of the personnel just reviewed. But the data for the officers, first, are rendered valueless by the fact that nearly all of those known by name are demonstrably or probably epimeletai, who were normally drawn one from each of the three trittyes of the phyle (see p. 521 above with note 69). The sole exceptions are confined to the members of Aigeis named in *IG II² 2824*: for the treasurer from Ikarion (Inland trittys), see note 98 above; for the board of three of uncertain identification but certainly not epimeletai, at least two (and possibly all three) of whom belong to Halai Araphenides (Coastal trittys), see p. 527 above. Second, the figures for the honorands (including those whose crowns are attested by dedications) are more meaningful, although some of the epimeletai, with their mandatory regional distribution, are numbered among them. My count is City, 15; Coast, 23; Inland, 21. For the proposers, finally, the distribution of recorded demotics is City, 4; Coast, 6; and Inland, 6. Obviously, these figures do not reveal the disproportionate imbalance in favor of the town demes that, on my theory, one might have been led to expect. But two alternatives remain open. (1) The fairly even distribution among trittyes might be taken to mean that the extra-urban demotai in question in fact were residing in the town. (2) If the honorands and speakers did not reside in the town but in the demes of their affiliations, they (and perhaps the officers as well, including the Coastal and Inland epimeletai) might be assumed to have been willing to traverse the sometimes considerable distances from home to urban meeting place. Certainly there was no lack of rewards: for the honorands, the public bestowal of praise and crown; for the movers of decrees, as I have argued, an opportunity to address a potentially important audience; for the officers, the inducements and payoffs that I have discussed at length above. For parallel explorations of the problem of participation in city politics by citizens residing outside the town, see Harding 1981, pp. 41–50 and Hansen 1983, pp. 227–238. Both favor, as do I, the notion that citizens from outlying areas would travel considerable distances in order to partake in the public life of the city.

¹⁶² Thus Finley 1983, p. 74 with note 16, with reference to the Council of 500. Whitehead's position against representation, however, is far more sweeping: "The democratic *politeia* neither consisted of nor even anywhere contained a body or bodies of mandated delegates; it was, nonetheless, a *politeia* designed to reflect—and so 'represent' in that sense—the entirety of the citizen body" (Whitehead 1986, p. 265). See also note 151 above for his interpretation (in fact, I believe, misinterpretation) of one of the few possible explicit documentary illustrations of my position, the decree of the deme of Teithras honoring its bouleutai: *Agora XV*, no. 45.

¹⁶³ This formulation may be evaluated in the light of the generalizing statement with which J. A. O. Larsen commenced his exploration of "representative government" in the Greek and Roman worlds: "Representative government, for the purposes of the present study, can be defined as government in which the ultimate decisions on important questions are made by representatives acting for their constituents and having authority to make such decisions according to their own best judgment." These citizens, he continues, are "true representatives and not messengers merely recording the will of their constituents" (Larsen 1955, p. 1). In the present case,

as large and heterogeneous as an Athenian phyle was likely to cater to a multitude of purposes and concerns, but it is in the need for *representation* of the membership in the life of the city that we can identify perhaps the principal driving force.¹⁶⁴

APPENDIX

As in the previous list (see note 5 above), I include only texts that recognizably represent acts of the phyle *qua* association. Thus a mere roster of ephebes arranged under the name of their phyle would not, in the absence of an indication of official action taken by the phyle, merit inclusion. For the prytany (and other bouleutic) inscriptions of the phylai, see note 43 above.

I Erechtheis. Decrees: *IG II²* 1146 (*ante med. s. IV*; *SEG XXXV* 246, *XXXIX* 144); 1147 (*ante med. s. IV*); 1150 (= Traill 1986, p. 83, no. 4; *med. s. IV*); 1165 (*ca.* 300–250; *SEG XXXIX* 146).

II Aigeis. Decrees: *Hesperia* 56, 1987, pp. 47–58 (*ca.* 330; joint decree with Aiantis; *SEG XXXVII* 100, *XXXIX* 145, *XL* 125); *Agora XV*, no. 69 (= *IG II²* 656+; Dow 1937, no. 2 [284/3; reference to phyle in line 10 wholly restored]); *Hesperia* 29, 1960, pp. 78–80, no. 155 (but see C. Habicht, *AM* 76, 1961, pp. 141–143; *ca.* 160). Herm dedicated by the phyle: Andokides 1.62; Aischines 1.125; cf. Plutarch, *Alkibiades* 21.3 (415 or earlier). For the dedication, *IG II²* 2824 (313/12), once thought to be in the names of the epimeletai (as well as of the *tamias*) of the phyle, see Traill 1986, pp. 90–92, no. 8.

III Pandionis. Decrees: *IG II²* 1138 and 1139 (partial copy of 1138) + *Hesperia* 22, 1953, p. 177, no. 1 + *IG II²* 2812 (fragment of still another copy of 1138: see Lewis 1955, p. 17; *ca.* 390–380); *IG II²* 1140 (386/5); 1144 (*init. s. IV*); 1148 (*ante med. s. IV*); *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 41, no. 42 (= Traill 1986, pp. 85–87, no. 6; 332/1, 327/6, or 324/3); *IG II²* 1152 (= *II²* 596; Traill 1986, pp. 87–88, no. 7; *ante fin. s. IV*); 1157 (326/5); 1159 (303/2); 1160 (*ca.* 300); 1167 (*s. III*). Dedications: *Hesperia* 11, 1942, pp. 341–343, no. 1 (*fin. s. V*; by the phyle); *IG II²* 2812? (but the pertinence of this text to epimeletai was denied by Lewis [1955, pp. 17–18]; *init. s. IV*); 2828 (by priest of Pandion and phyletai; *med. s. IV*); cf. *Hesperia* 4, 1935, p. 55, no. 17 (dedicator? *ca.* 350–300).

IV Leontis. Decrees: *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 59–66, no. 8: i, of Leontis; ii, of lochagoi of Leontis (333/2); *Hesperia* 15, 1946, p. 189, no. 35 (= *Hesperia* 3, 1934, pp. 43–44, no. 32; *ca.* 325)? Dedication: *IG II²* 2818 (= Traill 1986, pp. 81–82, no. 2; by epimeletai; 357/6). A literary reference to a decree moved by one Skironides “among the phyletai” is preserved in a speech attributed to Demosthenes (57 *Against Theokrines*, §17).

V Akamantis. Decrees: *ΑρχΕφ* 1965, pp. 131–136 (but see Dow 1976, pp. 81–84): i (361/0) and ii (334/3 or soon thereafter [Dow]); *Hesperia* 17, 1948, pp. 114–136, no. 68 (303/2; but see Woodhead 1981, pp. 357–367); *IG II²* 1166 (*ca.* 300–250). Dedication: *Hesperia* 28, 1959, pp. 121–126 (by taxiarch and lochagoi? 334/3–307/6).

VI Oineis. Tombstone: *Hesperia* 11, 1942, pp. 240–241, no. 45 (of eponymous hero? *s. IV*).

VII Kekropis. Decrees: *IG II²* 1141 (= *Hesperia* 10, 1941, pp. 263–265, no. 67 (376/5); 1143 (*init. s. IV*); 1145 (of Kekropis? *post* 353/2?); 1155, lines 7–14 + 16 (339/8); 1156, lines 26–35 + 64 (334/3); 1158 (of Kekropis? *post med. s. IV*); *SEG II* 8 (two decrees, the latter of Kekropis? *s. IV*). Dedication: *IG II²* 2837 (by thesmothete; 329/8). Mortgage stone: *IG II²* 2670 (*s. IV*).

VIII Hippothontis. Decrees: *IG II²* 1149 (*ante med. s. IV*); 1153 (*med. s. IV*); 1163 (*ca.* 288/7).

while the evidence is not such as to allow us to decide whether we are dealing with representatives independently exercising their own judgment or (as is far more often the case in modern democracies) passive message carriers, the simple fact of the existence of representation of some kind is, I believe, beyond doubt.

¹⁶⁴ My thesis may help to explain two otherwise puzzling and seemingly unrelated silences in the ancient Greek writers on government, above all Aristotle, namely, on the one hand, concerning the internally organized phylai (as well as the trittyes and demes) and, on the other, concerning the phenomenon of representation. In fact, the two silences may be organically related. Because the writers did not care to notice the phyle (or trittys or deme) in its role as an association, they consequently failed to observe the operation of representation as it functioned within that association.

IX Aiantis. Decrees: *IG II²* 1151 (= Traill 1986, pp. 84–85, no. 5; *med. s. IV*); 1250 (of lampadephoroi; *post med. s. IV*; *SEG XL* 124); *Hesperia* 56, 1987, pp. 47–58 (*ca.* 330; joint decree with Aigeis; *SEG XXXVII* 100, XXXIX 145, XL 125); *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 94–96, no. 15 (327/6); *Hesperia* 15, 1946, p. 189, no. 35 (= *Hesperia* 3, 1934, pp. 43–44, no. 32; *ca.* 325)?

X Antiochis. Decrees: Δελατ 8, 1923, pp. 98–100, no. 4 (of hippeis of phyle; *ca.* 330); pp. 89–96, no. 2 (of elder epilektoi of phyle; *ca.* 330); pp. 85–89, no. 1 (of phyle; 303/2) (= *SEG III* 115–117; no. 1 = *SEG XXII* 115).

Antigonis. One of the two completely preserved (of an original total of six?) crowns in the dedication *IG II²* 2861 contains the name of an epimelete of Ikarion. If Kirchner's date "s. III a." is correct, the dedication belongs to the period, *viz.* 307/6 to 201/0, when Ikarion was a deme of Antigonis (see Traill 1975, p. 110).

Demetrias. The other preserved crown in the dedication just mentioned contains the name of an epimelete of Poros, which continuously belonged to Demetrias from 307/6 to 201/0 (see Traill 1975, p. 112).

Ptolemais. Decree: *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 14–15, no. 13 (*init. s. II*)?

Attalis. Honorary inscription: *IG II²* 1170 (of Attalis? *s. II*). Dedication: 2890 (by phyletai? *aet. Rom.*).

Identity of phyle unknown. Decrees: *IG II²* 1142 (*init. s. IV*); *Hesperia* 51, 1982, pp. 46–47, no. 5 (*ca.* 375–350)? *IG II²* 1154 (*med. s. IV*)? *Hesperia* 4, 1935, pp. 41–42, no. 9 (*fin. s. IV*); *IG II²* 1161 (*fin. s. IV*); 1162 (*fin. s. IV*); *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 111–112, no. 21 (*init. s. III*); *IG II²* 1164 (*init. s. III*); 1168 (*s. III?*); 1169 (*s. III*); 1171 (= 1124: see A. S. Henry, *ZPE* 38, 1980, pp. 92–93, no. 3: *SEG XXX* 90; *s. II p.*). Dedications: *IG II²* 2842 (by epimeletai; 321/0 or 318/17); 2843 (by thesmothete plus line 4 [the phyle in crown]; 319/18). Lease: cf. *IG II²* 1168 (*s. III?*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agora = *The Athenian Agora, Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Princeton

III = R. E. Wycherley, *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*, 1957

XIV = H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Center*, 1972

XV = B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*, 1974

APF = J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971

Busolt, G., and H. Swoboda. 1920–1926. *Griechische Staatskunde*, Munich

Davies, J. K. 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*, New York

Dow, S. 1937. *Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors* (*Hesperia* Supplement I), Princeton

———. 1976. "Companionable Associates in the Athenian Government," in *In Memoriam Otto J. Brendel, Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities*, L. Bonfante and H. von Heintze, eds., Mainz, pp. 69–84

Finley, M. I. 1983. *Politics in the Ancient World*, Cambridge

Gilbert, G. 1895. *The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens*, E. J. Brooks and T. Nicklin, trans., London/New York

Hansen, M. H. 1983. "Political Activity and the Organization of Attica in the Fourth Century B.C.," *GRBS* 24, pp. 227–238

Harding, P. 1981. "In Search of a Polypragmatist," in *Classical Contributions: Studies in Honour of M. F. McGregor*, G. S. Shrimpton and D. J. McCargar, eds., New York, pp. 41–50

Harrison, E. B. 1979. "The Iconography of the Eponymous Heroes on the Parthenon and in the Agora," in *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology. Essays in Honor of Margaret Thompson*, O. Mørkholm and N. M. Waggoner, eds., Wetteren, pp. 71–85

Haussoullier, B. 1883. *La vie municipale en Attique: Essai sur l'organisation des dèmes au quatrième siècle*, Paris

Inscriptiones Creticae I–IV = Inscriptiones Creticae, M. Guarducci, ed., Rome 1935–1950

Jones, N. F. 1987. *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 176), Philadelphia

Koehler, U. 1879. "Der Rundaltar am Dipylon," *AM* 4, p. 288

Kron, U. 1976. *Die Zehn attischen Phylenheroen: Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellungen*, Berlin

Langdon, M. K. 1987. "An Attic Decree Concerning Oropos," *Hesperia* 56, pp. 47–58

Larsen, J. A. O. 1955. *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, Berkeley/Los Angeles

- Latte, K., *RE* XX, 1941, cols. 994–1011 (Phyle)
- Lécrivain, C., *DarSag*, IV, i, Paris 1877–[1919], pp. 450–454 (Phylè)
- Lewis, D. M. 1955. “Notes on Attic Inscriptions, II (Notes 23–29),” *BSA* 50, 1955, pp. 1–36
- Lolling, H. G. 1886. “Das Heroon des Aigeus,” *AM* 11, pp. 322–323
- McCleod, W. E. 1959. “An Ephebic Dedication from Rhamnous,” *Hesperia* 28, pp. 121–126
- Michel = *Recueil d’inscriptions grecques*, C. Michel, ed., Brussels 1900
- Mikalson, J. D. 1975. *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*, Princeton
- Oehler, J., *RE* VI, 1907, cols. 162–171 (Epimeletai)
- Osborne, R. 1985. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Athens*, Cambridge
- PA = J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, 2 vols., Berlin 1901–1903
- Pritchett, W. K. 1941. “Greek Inscriptions: A Decree of Citizenship,” *Hesperia* 10, pp. 262–283
- . 1942. “Greek Inscriptions: Fifth Century Proxeny Decree,” *Hesperia* 11, pp. 230–249
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford
- Rotroff, S. I. 1978. “An Anonymous Hero in the Athenian Agora,” *Hesperia* 47, pp. 196–209
- Roussel, D. 1976. *Tribu et cité*, Paris
- Shear, T. L., Jr. 1970. “The Monument of the Eponymous Heroes in the Athenian Agora,” *Hesperia* 39, pp. 145–222
- Sinclair, R. K. 1988. *Democracy and Participation in Athens*, Cambridge
- Sommerstein, A. H. 1987. *Aristophanes: Birds (The Comedies of Aristophanes VI)*, Warminster
- Szanto, E. 1901. *Die griechischen Phylen (SBWien 144, no. 5) (= Ausgewählte Abhandlungen, Tübingen 1906, pp. 216–288, 419)*
- Traill, J. S. 1975. *The Political Organization of Attica: A Study of the Demes, Trittyes, and Phylai, and Their Representation in the Athenian Council (Hesperia Supplement XIV)*, Princeton
- . 1986. *Demos and Trittyes: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica*, Toronto
- Walbank, M. B. 1990. “The Property of Aiantis and Aigeis,” *ZPE* 84, pp. 95–99
- Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca. 250 B.C. A Political and Social Study*, Princeton
- Woodhead, A. G. 1981. “Athens and Demetrios Poliorketes at the End of the Fourth Century B.C.,” in *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, Thessaloniki, pp. 357–367
- Wycheley, R. E. 1978. *The Stones of Athens*, Princeton

NICHOLAS F. JONES

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
 Department of Classics
 Pittsburgh, PA 15260