

NICHOLAS F. JONES

THE ORGANIZATION OF CORINTH AGAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 120 (1998) 49–56

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE ORGANIZATION OF CORINTH AGAIN

Despite the general dearth of contemporary evidence for the government of Greek Corinth, the segmentary division of the city's territory and population has steadily come into sharper focus thanks to the discovery of a small number of highly suggestive inscriptions. But the undoubted progress made possible by these texts has, I shall argue here, been compromised by lines of interpretation not fully or convincingly supported by the Corinthian evidence and, in more than one respect, at variance with well-established practice elsewhere in Greece. A review of the recent literature on the subject will serve to demonstrate this characterization and to point the way to a more securely grounded reconstruction.¹

The only existing comprehensive treatment of the subject is presented in my own synoptic account of what I called the "public organizations" of ancient Greece.² This treatment condensed the findings of an article on the pre-Roman organization published several years earlier in 1980.³ My analysis was based upon two long appreciated lexicographical notices: one, Suda, s.v. πάντα ὀκτώ, reporting that Aletes, when synoecizing the Corinthians, "made the *politai* into eight phylai and the *polis* into eight parts"; the other, Hesychios, s.v. Κυνόφαλοι, glossing this seeming proper name meaning something like "Wearers of Dogskin Caps" as "Corinthians, a phyle". To the framework of principal units indicated by these sources could be related a list of names dated epigraphically to the latter half of the fourth century originally published as *Corinth* VIII 1, no. 11 and subsequently re-examined by Dow. According to Dow's study, the names are of casualties and are arranged under rubrics consisting of two letters, a dash, and a single third letter: ΣΙ-Π, ΛΕ-Ε, ΛΕ-Π, ΚΥ-Φ (lines 6, 15, 20, 26).⁴ Already, however, long before Dow wrote Hiller von Gaertringen had provided the crucial link between the lexicographical and epigraphic evidence when he associated Hesychios' phyle Kynophaloi with the rubric in line 26 of the list, ΚΥ-Φ.⁵ Thus each two-letter element would seem to have denoted a phyle. Following Dow's publication, moreover, three inscribed markers discovered in the vicinity of the eastern city circuit wall added new examples of the rubrics: one, discovered in 1934, was first published in 1966 as *Corinth* VIII 3, no. 8; the two others, discovered in 1960 and 1965, were edited by Stroud, who also provided a corrected reading of the earlier marker.⁶ Stroud's texts, dated epigraphically by him to about the middle of the fifth century, read as follows: ΛΕΠ / hEN (*SEG* 25.331a), ΣΙΠ / hEN (*SEG* 25.331b), and ΣΥΦ / ΔΥΟ (*SEG* 25.332). Finally, a late inscription from Roman Corinth seemingly naming a phyle was subsequently published by Wiseman: ΦΥΛΗΣΑΦ (face a; with additional letters inscribed on faces b, c, and d); the editor suggested that the letters be divided after φυλή, thereby adding still another abbreviated element associated with a phyle.⁷

¹ The literature in question, to which reference will be made throughout, is Ronald S. Stroud, Tribal Boundary Markers from Corinth, *CSCA* 1 (1968) 233–242; J. B. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth. A History of the City to 338 B.C.*, Oxford 1984, Appendix I. The Corinthian Local Tribes, pp. 413–419; and G. R. Stanton, The Territorial Tribes of Korinth and Phleious, *CSCA* 5 (1986) 139–153.

² Nicholas F. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 176, Philadelphia 1987, pp. 97–103.

³ Nicholas F. Jones, The Civic Organization of Corinth, *TAPA* 110 (1980) 161–193.

⁴ S. Dow, *Corinthiaca*, *HSCP* 53 (1942) 89–119, especially 90–106. For the reading of dotted sigma in line 6 and the retention of digamma in line 26, see Jones 1980 (note 3) 163 with note 3.

⁵ F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 52 (1932) 362.

⁶ See above, note 1.

⁷ James Wiseman, *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 33–38, no. 25, with additional comment at *ANRW* II 7.1 (1979) 497, note 221. For the reading of the final letter as (undotted) digamma, and for the most recent analysis of all four inscribed faces, see Stanton 1986 (above, note 1) 141–142.

Together, this evidence seemed to yield at the minimum a reformed system of eight phylai (Suda) of which one was named Kynophaloi (Hesychios) and of which several, including Kynophaloi, are named in abbreviated form by the initial two letters preceding the dash of the rubrics on the list of casualties: viz. KY, ΛΕ, and ΣΙ. To these could be added by analogy, despite the absence of a dash, the two letters ΣΥ from *SEG* 25.332 and, conjecturally (as we shall see), ΣΑ from Wiseman's Roman inscription. Furthermore, as Dow had realized, the single third letter following the dashes on the list indicated that these phylai were subdivided, although his two subdivisions, Ε and Π, were subsequently increased to three by Stroud, who reasoned that the digamma preserved on the marker *SEG* 25.332 confirmed the digamma of line 26 of the list, which Dow had emended to epsilon. Thus, on Stroud's argument, three "subdivisions", Ε, F, and Π, would be attested by the inscriptions. Beyond this point, however, additional solid progress did not appear likely barring the discovery of new evidence.

But a new line of approach was opened up by my analysis of an early Hellenistic decree found on Delos and twice studied in depth by Robert.⁸ In the absence of explicit internal evidence, Robert argued for assignment of the decree to Phleious on the basis of a single positive datum, Pausanias' mention at 2.12.4–5 of one Aoris (the son of the autochthonous founder of Phleious), with whom the "ancient phyle" Aoreis named in the decree at line 25 could be associated.⁹ However, my own examination of the decree, addressing all aspects of the text, lexical, formulaic, and substantive, left little doubt but that the issuing authority was not Phleious but Corinth.¹⁰ Where the public organization is concerned, all matters of relevance are contained within the closing lines recording the injunction to allot the two Athenian honorands into the units of the decreeing party's organization and, immediately following, the results of the allotment. They read according to the corrected text (lines 20–26):

20	τὰν δὲ	
		βουλὰν διακλαρῶσαι εἰς
		ἡμιόδοον καὶ τριακάδα
		καὶ φυλὰν καὶ φάτραν· Διεκλα-
		ρῶθην· ἡμιογδῶου νν ΑΣ νν F
25		[ἀ]ρχαίας νν φυλᾶς νν Ἀορέων
		[φ]άτρας νν Ομακχιάδας.

At the conclusion of the analysis, I summed up the interpretation with a translation: "And let the Boule allot them into *hēmiogdoōn* and *triakas* and phyle and phratry. They were allotted: *hēmiogdoōn* ΑΣ, *triakas* F; 'old' phyle Aoreis, 'old' phratry (H)omakchiadai."¹¹ Given the correctness (and pertinence to Corinth) of this reading, the rubrics of the list of names studied by Dow, ΣΙ-Π, ΛΕ-Ε, etc., and the first line of the two-line markers interpreted by Stroud, e.g. ΛΕΠ, would refer not, as they thought, to phylai and an (unnamed) subdivision, but rather to the *hemiogdoon* and *triakas*. So much seemed implied by the evident word-for-word correspondence between allotment injunction and allotment result (notwithstanding the at first glance puzzling absence of the latter term in the allotment result).

Read in its larger historical context, the Delian text suggests the existence in early Hellenistic times of essentially two parallel organizations. The one, the earlier in origin, is the eightfold system attested by Suda and represented here by one of the eight "old" phylai, Aoreis, (and perhaps by one of the similarly "old" phratries, (H)omakchiadai). But why "old", if, as was almost certainly the case, the eightfold system had been preceded by the inherited Dorian tripartite division, the Dymanes, Hylleis, and

⁸ L. Robert, Un décret dorien trouvé à Délos, *Hellenica* 5 (1948) 5–15 and Décret dorien trouvé à Delos, *Hellenica* 12 (1960) 562–569.

⁹ Robert 1948 (note 8) 13–15; 1960 (note 8) 568.

¹⁰ Jones 1980 (note 3) 165–172.

¹¹ Jones 1980 (note 3) 175.

Pamphyloï?¹² The answer is simply that, if the eight phylai were the creation of the archaic Kypselid tyranny,¹³ these units will truly have been “old” at the time of the decree’s engraving ca. 325–275. Additionally, they will have been “old” with respect to the later, innovating Half-Eighths (subdividing the already-existing eight phylai into sixteen segments) and the Thirties.¹⁴ With this second organization, too, considerable progress could be made. The two-letter abbreviations linked with the *hemiogdoia* were identified (following a suggestion of Dow’s) as the towns ΛΕ(χαίον) and ΣΙ(δοῦς); and to these I added ἈΣ(αί) and perhaps ΣΥ(κουσία).¹⁵ As for the third, single letters, Ε, Φ and Π, Wallace had suggested Ἐ(πίλεκτοι) and Π(ελτασταί) for the two examples recognized at that time by Dow,¹⁶ and to these I added Φ(ίλας), i.e. cavalry, for the third, yielding three contingents of military personnel belonging to each Half-Eighth.¹⁷ A military function for the Thirties not only fits the list of names, if interpreted with Dow as a list of casualties, but also, as I argued, prompts an attractive interpretation of the three markers. These stones, again, were found, though possibly not in situ, along the line of the (eastern) city circuit wall.¹⁸ Since each of the markers gives, following the three-letter first line, a second line reading *hen* or *duo*, and since the total number of *triakades* was presumably (on present evidence) forty-eight (sixteen *hemiogdoia* x three *triakades*), then, if to each *triakas* were apportioned just two units (a “one” and a “two”), there would have been ninety-six units in the entire system. This number agrees precisely with the length of the city fortifications expressed in stades calculated by Carpenter.¹⁹ Each Thirty may have been responsible for the maintenance, guarding, etc. of two stades of wall marked at intervals as “one” and “two.”

Since the completion of my work quite different reconstructions have been published by Salmon²⁰ and Stanton²¹ (both of whom were addressing my 1980 article prior to the appearance of *Public Organization*). Although neither study adds new significant primary evidence, they both raise many points of difference, especially with regard to the several components and the overall disposition of the Corinthian organization. Above all, particular attention must be accorded to Stroud’s 1968 publication of the two, then-recently discovered boundary markers, for it was he who first ventured the hypothesis that our documents could be interpreted to show that the Corinthian territories had been organized according to a system of *trittyes* resembling the well-known Kleisthenic partition of Attica – an hypothesis subsequently adopted and elaborated by both Salmon and Stanton. But any such reconstruction is, as I now hope to demonstrate, both ill-founded with respect to the Corinthian epigraphic record and, more generally considered, unlikely when assessed against the background of public organizations across Greece as a whole.

¹² The question is raised by Salmon at 1984 (note 1) 415–416.

¹³ Jones 1980 (note 3) 187–193.

¹⁴ Jones 1980 (note 3) 192–193. Admittedly, our only real clues regarding the chronology of the creation of the numerically named units are provided by the dates assigned to the relevant texts by their editors.

¹⁵ Jones 1980 (note 3) 179. More recently, K. Adshead, *Politics of the Archaic Peloponnese* (Aldershot 1986) 43, has proposed as additional possibilities *Kynocephalaion* (sic), i.e. ΚΥ(νοκεφάλαιον)?, a supposed toponym that I find nowhere in the standard accounts of the Corinthia, and *Sybota*, i.e. ΣΥ(βοτα), evidently with reference to the well known group of islands off the southern tip of (Corinthian) Kerkyra. Neither suggestion has anything to recommend it. More cogently, Stroud, in support of Robert’s attribution of the Delian decree not to Corinth, but to Phleious, suggested to Stanton that ΑΣ be resolved ἈΣ(ωπίς) from Asopos, a prominent hero of Phleious: see Stanton 1986 (above, note 1) 152–153.

¹⁶ W. P. Wallace, *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 119, note 14.

¹⁷ Jones 1980 (note 3) 180. Salmon objected (1984, note 1, 418) that according to Thucydides (4.44.1) Corinth had no cavalry in 425 B.C., but it is questionable whether this single datum can be generalized to embrace earlier and later periods.

¹⁸ For the specifics, see Stanton 1986 (above, note 1) 146.

¹⁹ Jones 1980 (note 3) 184, citing R. Carpenter, *Corinth* III 2, p. 80. The association of the numbers “one” and “two” with distances measured in stades was first suggested by Oscar Broneer: see Stroud 1968 (note 1) 240, note 21.

²⁰ See above, note 1.

²¹ See above, note 1.

Writing prior to the entry of the decree from Delos into the discussion, Stroud, understandably taking the two-letter abbreviations to designate some of the eight phylai, had speculated that the single letters epsilon, digamma, and pi denoted three classes of *trittyes*, and that each phyle contained one *trittys* from each category. Possibly, he went on to suggest, the *trittyes* were grouped according to a three-fold division of the Corinthia into the *polis*, region north of the Isthmos, and region south of the Isthmos.²² Salmon and Stanton, with their adoption of the hypothesis, were able, independently, to provide topographically appropriate names for the three “*trittys*”-symbols, viz. F(άστυ), ’E(ντὸς τοῦ Ἴσθμοῦ), and Π(έρα(ν) τοῦ Ἴσθμοῦ) (Salmon);²³ and F(αστικοί), Π(άραλοι), and, conjecturally, some unknown word formed on the root ἐνδο- (e.g. ἔνδοθεν) (Stanton).²⁴ Both sets of terms had been prefigured by Dow’s association of his two subdivisions (the third, digamma, having been removed by emendation to epsilon), E and Π, with ἐντός or ἐντότερος and περί.²⁵ Both, in different ways, endorsed Stroud’s fundamental bifurcation of town and country – the very sort of conditions that, at Athens, had made possible, indeed provided the motivation for, the institution of an intermediate distribution of units through the grouping of regionally distinct *trittyes* of demes within single phylai.

But obstructing any such approach were, following the publication of my 1980 article, the manifest implications of the decree from Delos, for it indicates an organization of *hemiogdoas* and *triakades*, *phylai* and *phatrai*, with no discernible trace of a “*trittys*” or anything like it. Still, it might be countered, not every unit of an organization need appear in the enrollment formulas pertaining to that organization; at Athens, to cite the one truly relevant example, the *trittys* is not to be found alongside the phyle, deme, and phratry, although it might well have notwithstanding, given the determination of the deme, the resulting redundancy, since the phyle, which is no less redundant, is in fact included. Be that as it may, the point was moot for Stanton, who returned to Robert’s assignment of the decree to Phleious (even though, while doing so, he neither added to Robert’s weak case for that assignment nor seriously challenged my case for Corinth).²⁶ Salmon’s approach to the problem, however, had been different. Accepting the decree from Delos as Corinthian, he set about the reinterpretation of the vital allotment injunction and result quoted above. To cite only the result of his subtle discussion, Salmon concluded that the allotment result (lines 24–26) records allocations to “the local *hemiogdoon* F of the tribe AΣ”, and to “the ancient kinship groups Aoreis and (H)Omacchiadae”.²⁷ The chain of reasoning leading to this conclusion is perhaps less important for our understanding of Salmon’s position than the motivation seemingly driving it – to reconcile the text of the decree with Stroud’s analysis of the list and markers. That is, if ΛE-Π, for example, refers (with Stroud) to phyle ΛE, *trittys* Π, then AΣ F of the decree can refer to a phyle and a *trittys* only if, of course, AΣ is a phyle, but also only if F, which must be a *hemiogdoon* in order to account for the text of line 24 of the decree, is *also* a *trittys*. But this conclusion entails the obvious difficulty involved in squaring the term “Half-Eighth” with the *tripartite* division implied by the term *trittys* and argued on textual and other grounds by Stroud and (later) Stanton.

My objections to the *trittys*-hypothesis, as presented severally by Stroud, Salmon, and Stanton, can most conveniently and comprehensibly be set out as a series of individual points:

²² Stroud 1968 (note 1) 242.

²³ Salmon 1984 (note 1) 417.

²⁴ Stanton 1986 (note 1) 144.

²⁵ Dow 1942 (note 4) 103.

²⁶ Stanton 1986 (note 1) 149–150. I agree entirely that there is difficulty in reconciling the bipartite division of the phylai indicated by the term *hemiogdoon* with the (putative) “tripartite division of the tribes at Korinth” (149), but rather than resort to returning the Delian decree to Phleious (an untenable maneuver in any event), it seems far preferable simply to reassert my position that the three (or more?) *triakades* indicated by the symbols epsilon, pi, and digamma signify a subdivision not of the phylai (so Stanton) but of the *hemiogdoon*. If the situation is viewed this way, the alleged “difficulty” vanishes into thin air.

²⁷ Salmon 1984 (note 1) 415–417, with 416 for the quotations.

1. Fundamentally, the hypothesis lacks any positive, explicit evidential support, early or late, being based as it is on the perhaps accidental preservation of just three “subdivision” abbreviations in combination with their resolutions conjecturally suggested by Dow, Salmon, and Stanton. Stroud had found an “echo” of the division of the “city” (as opposed to his regions north and south of the Isthmos) into eight *trittyes* in Suda’s statement that Aletes ἐποίησε . . . καὶ ὀκτὼ μέρη τὴν πόλιν.²⁸ Apart from the fact that it would be odd to specify only one of three regions while characterizing the synoecism of the *whole* of the Corinthia, if Suda had meant the urbanized center in contrast to the countryside, the expected term would be *astu* (in implied contrast with its customary opposing term, *chora*).²⁹ I maintain that the lexicographer means the entire expanse of the state’s territory, town and country together, with reference to a simple eightfold partition.

2. As already suggested, if (as Salmon would have it) ΑΣ is the “tribe” and F its constituent *hemiogdoon*, then that constituent, by definition one-half of one (of eight) “tribes”, cannot be *one-third* of that “tribe”. It was to be primarily because of this difficulty, as noted, that Stanton was later to reaffirm the alleged Phleisian origins of the decree from Delos. Salmon’s suggestion that the two extra-urban regions had been grouped together over against the *astu*, thereby creating for each tribe two *hemiogdoas*, one from its block in the city, the other from its blocks within and beyond the Isthmos³⁰ is not only utterly without evidential support but is also at odds with the very supposition of the creation of the two extra-urban regions in the first place. Why have two such regions if they are only to be recombined into a single larger unit?

3. Salmon’s reading of the decree calls for allotment of the honorands into both the “old” (or “ancient”) phyle Aoreis (possibly a fourth unit added to the inherited Dorian triad, as he suggests) and his later phyle ΑΣ, of which the *hemiogdoon* F, on his reconstruction, is a component.³¹ Thus two different phylai, belonging to two different organizations, are in question. But no parallel for the simultaneous operation of two sets of phylai (or other units) *in the same sphere of activity* can be adduced from anywhere in Greece. The vestigial survival of an obsolete organization is documented at Athens, Kerkyra, and Miletos, but in none of these cases can a duplication of function be demonstrated and, to the present point, in none have we enrollment formulas calling for induction into *both* organizations.³² No Athenian is ever encountered in a significant context as a member of both Geleontes and Erechtheis, for example. Such a duplication would be inconsistent with the very idea of a reform whereby the later organization was created. New organizations are created in order to appropriate, not merely to duplicate, the functions of their predecessors. In the case of Corinth, it is far easier to conclude that the letters ΑΣ do not in fact name the phyle, but rather refer to an entirely different tier of organization, viz. the *hemiogdoas*. Besides, Aoreis may, as I argued, itself be one of the eight phylai, thereby reducing the active phylai to only one organization.

4. Salmon’s assignments of symbols to units, since they require on the ancient reader’s part previous knowledge of the interrelations of three tiers of organization (*phyla*, *hemiogdoon*, and *triakas*) in relation to an earlier organization (“ancient” *phyla* and *phatra*) would scarcely be intelligible to Corinthians at Corinth. To suppose that they would have been intelligible to Athenians on Delos – to non-citizens in a distant foreign place – flies in the face of probability. And leaving Athenians and Delos out of it, nowhere in Greece at any time is obscurity of the dimensions proposed by Salmon exemplified. There is not a single instance to be found where knowledge of the segmental (or other) relation of units with each

²⁸ Stroud 1968 (note 1) 242.

²⁹ For the *astu* of Corinth, see Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F 179, and Aristotle, frag. 516 Rose, both reported by Diogenes Laertius 1.98, where the tyrant Periander is said not to have allowed those who so wished to live ἐν ἄστει.

³⁰ Salmon 1984 (note 1) 418.

³¹ Salmon 1984 (note 1) 415–416.

³² For the sources and discussions, see Jones 1987 (note 2) 27–72 (Athens, with the pre-Kleisthenic organization at 28–31), 159–161 (Kerkyra), and 320–327 (Miletos).

other must be assumed in order to comprehend an enrollment injunction or its result.³³ My reading, by contrast, merely requires that one symbol in the enrollment result, the F in the constellation ΑΣ F, be understood in parallel with the corresponding term in the preceding enrollment injunction.

5. The only article of explicit documentary evidence that can be marshalled in favor of the *trittys*-hypothesis is the block bearing the inscription of the Roman period published by Wiseman. The text of face a, as most recently established by Stanton, reads ΦΥΛΗΣΑΦ. Stanton divided the letters to yield φυλή· Σα(----) F(----),³⁴ an interpretation that, if this evidence were subject to no objection, would strongly support his reconstruction. We would then have straightforward evidence that the symbols ΑΣ F from line 24 of the Delian decree in fact designate a phyle and a subdivision denoted by one of the three single-letter sigla from the Corinthian documents. But Wiseman dated the text by its lettering with likelihood to the third century A.D.³⁵ – i.e. to much later than the destruction in 146 B.C. and refoundation a century later as a Roman colony – sufficient indication that the text has nothing to do with contemporary arrangements, since Roman Corinth knew a system of *tribus* with Roman proper names.³⁶ It seems certain that the cutter is simply reproducing the text of a much earlier inscription, but, if so, the copy remains evidence for the state of affairs reflected in its exemplar. The problem is where to place the division of words. Perhaps it is germane to note that no commentator writing since the publication of my 1980 article has disputed Dow's reasons for the division of the letters as φυλής plus a two-letter abbreviation – viz. that the last two letters are larger, and less deeply cut, than the preceding.³⁷ The possibility that this phyle, if with Dow abbreviated AF, is the “ancient” phyle Aoreis of the decree from Delos is hard to resist.³⁸ Acceptance of this conclusion would effectively remove the last remaining prop supporting the Stroud/Salmon/Stanton thesis.

6. While it is true that the validity of the “*trittys*-hypothesis” does not depend upon the actual use of the term *trittys* at Corinth, it is appropriate to underscore the fact that the word is not found in Corinthian contexts. Rather it is of course on account of the example of Athens that the term *trittys* has come to enjoy such wide currency. Were it not for the well-established presence and disposition of the *trittys* in the post-Kleisthenic organization, it is fair to say that the hypothesis under scrutiny here with respect to Corinth would probably never have been formulated, by Stroud or by anyone else.³⁹

Elsewhere, the term has only two certain occurrences as a civic unit: at Delos, where no entity corresponding to the Attic deme is known and where the relation of the *triktys* to the phyle is quite

³³ The formulas are collected and analyzed in Nicholas F. Jones, Enrollment Clauses in Greek Citizenship Decrees, *ZPE* 87 (1991) 79–102. Since this publication, new examples have been published, including ones from a number of states not previously represented, but in no instance is an exception to my generalization to be found.

³⁴ Stanton 1986 (note 1) 141. So also Salmon 1984 (above, note 1) 414–415.

³⁵ Wiseman 1972 (note 7) 37. Stanton's reappraisal (1986, note 1, 141–142) widens the span to “the first three centuries A.D.”, but the point remains that even on this potentially higher chronology the classical city was no longer in existence.

³⁶ Jones 1987 (note 2) 102–103.

³⁷ Jones 1980 (note 3) 175, with Dow's observations supplied *per litt*. The differing depth of the final two letters (but not the point about differing size) is acknowledged by Salmon (1984, note 1, 414, note 8), but without attempt at explanation. Admittedly, Wiseman's photograph (1972, note 7, Plate 10c) does not support the suggestion that the letters in question differ in size. The matter of depth, in the absence of an appropriate statement by those who have examined the stone, could only be settled by some form of measurement.

³⁸ For the digamma, see Jones 1980 (note 3) 167–168 and 1987 (note 2) 159–161 (on the evidence for the Ἀφοροί/οί at Kerkyra).

³⁹ To his credit, Salmon (1984, note 1, 418) acknowledges that (on his reconstruction) he would have expected *tritogdoon* (rather than *hemiogdoon*) as the term denoting a third part of a Corinthian phyle. Similarly, with respect to Stroud's use of *trittys*, he ventures that, had there been four rather than three single-letter sigla, one would look for *tetartys* (rather than *trittys*) as the word employed to designate them. But on the whole scholarly discussion has for the most part been conducted against the background of, and in the light of expectations awakened by, Kleisthenic Athens.

uncertain;⁴⁰ and the federal state of Keos, where the territories of the three principal cities may have been apportioned into equal numbers of *trittyes*, with a phyle consisting of three *trittyes*, one from each city.⁴¹ Besides these explicit cases, intermediate distributions of units have been tentatively suggested for Eretria, Kyrene, and Kameiros, but with varying degrees of probability and in no case with certainty: at Eretria, I have suggested that each territorial phyle may have consisted of demes drawn from each of the intermediate regional groupings called *choroi*;⁴² at Kyrene, Jeffery long ago proposed, on the basis of Herodotos' well known text, that each of three phylai comprised a part of each of three *moirai*, the *moirai* consisting of the regionally defined "landmannschaftliche" groups making up the expanded citizen body, a theory which, after its rejection by myself, has been given new life by Hölkeskamp;⁴³ and at Kameiros it is likely that each of the three principal units (undoubtedly to be identified as phylai) comprised demes from all three of the city's geographical regions, Rhodes proper, the Peraia, and the dependent islands.⁴⁴ So, although these positive cases are few given the existence of the more than 200 organizations documented in *Public Organization*, it does seem that the phenomenon of "intermediate distribution" is to be found in states outside Athens. But this acknowledgment does not settle the question in favor of Corinth, for account must still be taken of a striking feature of these *trittys*-style organizations: the strong Ionian bias. Dorian Kyrene's case is far too problematic, not to mention the social rather than territorial character of the arrangement suggested by Jeffery, for it to bear positively or negatively on this discussion; and, for all we know, the organization of the Rhodian cities may reflect influence of Athens imparted during their time as members of the Delian League. Consequently, if the actual occurrences of the word *trittys* (and its byforms) and of *trittys*-style organizations were to be our guide, on present evidence the "intermediate distribution of units" would appear to be a characteristically Athenian institution subsequently exported to Ionian neighbors or dependents – Delos, Keos, perhaps Eretria, and possibly Kameiros under Athenian domination.

Even so, notwithstanding the dearth of appropriate parallel evidence, Stanton proposes not only (following Stroud) that Dorian Corinth had *trittyes* (or *trittys*-like units) but that the Corinthian organization gave the Athenian Kleisthenes the idea for the city, coastal, and inland regions.⁴⁵ But decisive against this hypothesis is the *AthPol*'s ascription of units at Athens called *trittyes* to the time before Solon;⁴⁶ clearly, the Alcmeonid reformer here as elsewhere was building on the Athenian predecessor organization, not on a foreign model. Accordingly, no support for the Stroud/Salmon/Stanton hypothe-

⁴⁰ See Jones 1987 (note 2) 211–212. For the most recent comprehensive examination of the Delian organization, see C. Vial, *Délos indépendante (314–167 avant J.-C.). Étude d'une communauté civique et de ses institutions*, BCH Suppl. X, Athens 1984.

⁴¹ See Jones 1987 (note 2) 203–204. P. Brun, L'île de Kéos et ses cités au IV^e siècle av. J.C., *ZPE* 76 (1989) 121–138 at 131–132, endorses Lewis' union of Ioulis, Karthaia, and Koresia, with the omission of Poiessa, and acknowledges the operation of the phylai, *trittyes*, and *choroi* in the federal constitution, but does not reopen the question of an intermediate distribution of the units within the system.

⁴² Jones 1987 (note 2) 73–77 at 76. My findings regarding the Eretrian *demoi* and *choroi* were simultaneously arrived at by F. Cairns, IG XII 9, 244 and the Demes and Districts of Eretria, *ZPE* 54 (1984) 156–164 at 163–164. In a later article, IG XII Suppl. 555, Reinmuth No. 15 and the Demes and Tribes of Eretria, *ZPE* 64 (1986) 149–158 at 155–157, Cairns independently arrived at the conclusion that the "tribes" were possibly made up of from demes of all five *choroi*. Still more recently, the "intermediate distribution" thesis has been favorably evaluated, with allowance for the possibility of conflicting future discoveries, by D. Knoepfler, Du nouveau sur les demes et les tribus d'Érétrie, *REG* 108 (1995) xxxv–xl, esp. xxxix–xl. See also H.-J. Gehrke, Eretria und sein Territorium, *Boreas* 11 (1988) 15–42.

⁴³ L. H. Jeffery, The Pact of the First Settlers at Cyrene, *Historia* 10 (1961) 139–147 at 142–144. For my discussion, see Jones 1987 (note 2) 216–219. Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp's views will be found in his article: Demonax und die Neuordnung der Bürgerschaft von Kyrene, *Hermes* 121 (1993) 404–421 at 409.

⁴⁴ Jones 1987 (note 2) 245–248 at 245. My contention goes unchallenged in the most recent discussion, V. Gabrielsen, Subdivisions of the State and Their Decrees in Hellenistic Rhodes, *C&M* 45 (1994) 117–135, where comment is confined to the internal affairs of the associations in question.

⁴⁵ Stanton 1986 (note 1) 145.

⁴⁶ 8.3, with Jones 1987 (note 2) 28–31.

sis, direct or indirect, is to be won from the later arrangements at Athens on the grounds that they somehow reflect a Corinthian exemplar.

7. Athens and other cities apart, the strong impression left by the decree from Delos is that it presents a complete roster of an already highly complex organization of units – an organization in which the additionally complicating presence of an intermediate distribution based on a regional division, whether involving the term *trittys* or not, is unlikely to have found a comfortable place. That it was as complex as it appears to us seems to be due to the co-existence of what were (as I have said) essentially two organizations – viz. the “ancient” *phylai* and *phatrai*, and the innovating *hemiogdoai* and *triakades* – which probably came into existence at different times and to which fundamentally differing functions, respectively civilian and military, had come to be assigned.⁴⁷

In conclusion, I propose a return to a more straightforward arrangement such as that argued in 1980: that eight territorial *phylai* were each bisected into two *hemiogdoai* (these being centered in a few probable known cases on towns of the Corinthia), with each embracing an unknown, but small, number of units with military functions called *triakades*; and that cutting across this territorial organization were the “ancient” *phylai* and *phatrai*, both personally disposed provided that, following Salmon’s attractive suggestion, we identify the *Aoreis* of the Delian decree as a fourth unit alongside the inherited Dorian triad *Dymanes*, *Hylleis*, and *Pamphyloi*. This way, to the suggested variation in functions would correspond a complementary variation in principle of organization, and an otherwise at first glance excessively elaborate array of units would become more intelligible.

University of Pittsburgh

Nicholas F. Jones

⁴⁷ So Jones 1980 (note 3) 185–186. A civilian function for the markers (and thus a corresponding orientation for my *hemiogdoai* and *triakades*) is suggested by Stanton (1986, note 1, 146–148), who argues that they, or at least the two published by Stroud, were used to demarcate a space for “political meetings”. But even if this conjecture should prove to be valid, it would still remain true that no overlap of function can be demonstrated between the two sets of units.