

STEPHEN D. LAMBERT

TWO NOTES ON ATTIC *LEGES SACRAE*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 130 (2000) 71–80

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



TWO NOTES ON ATTIC *LEGES SACRAE*<sup>1</sup>1. *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 255 and Marathon

*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 255 is a fragmentary *lex sacra* of c. 430, detailing offerings and their recipients on Face A (probably in calendar order), priestly perquisites on Face B. It was found in Chalkis on Euboea, but, following Wilhelm, most scholars, including Jameson in his exemplary edition for *IG* i<sup>3</sup>, have recognised it as an Attic *pierre errante*.<sup>2</sup> It is fairly clearly the product of a local group rather than the central state, and, since Ziehen, the tendency has been to suspect that the group was based in the area of Attica closest to Euboea, the Marathon plain. Xouthos ([Χσ]όθοι, recipient of cult at A13) was father of Ion and founder of the Marathonian Tetrapolis;<sup>3</sup> and Apollo Pythios ([Ἄ]πόλλωνι Πυθίοι, A15) had a sanctuary in the Tetrapolis deme Oinoe, at which sacrifices and divination took place in connection with *theoriai* to Delphi.<sup>4</sup> Jameson, however, is cautious: “sane nescimus quo ex loco Atticae titulus originem duxerit et caveamus ne ad Marathonem temere relegemus.”

Such hesitation arises above all perhaps from A11, where, since Wilhelm, the recipient of an offering has been taken to be [Διὶ] Τροπαίοι ἐν Κυνο[σούραι -]. As Jameson observes, while Kynosoura here might be the promontory at the north-east end of Marathon bay, known from Hesychius to have had this name in antiquity, the trophy commemorating the battle of Marathon was not situated on that promontory, nor is any cult of Zeus Tropaios attested there.<sup>5</sup> Salamis, on the other hand, not only boasts a trophy suitably sited on a promontory (admittedly not known to have been called Kynosoura in anti-

<sup>1</sup> This is a companion piece to *Tetrapolis Calendar* (cf. n. 1 of that paper). Thanks are again due to the staff of the Epigraphical Museum, the British School at Athens and the Cotton Foundation for support in 1998/9, and to Michael Jameson for invaluable comments on a draft; on this occasion also to Merle Langdon and John Traill for helpful discussion of specific points. I alone am responsible for any remaining flaws. In addition to the abbreviations in *Tetrapolis Calendar*, the following are used:

Daux: G. Daux, *BCH* 87 (1963), 603–34 (ph.); corrigenda at *BCH* 88 (1964), 676–77;

Dow: S. Dow, *BCH* 89 (1965), 180–213;

Jameson: M. H. Jameson, *BCH* 89 (1965), 154–72;

Meisterhans–Schwyzer: K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* (3rd edn., revised E. Schwyzer, Berlin, 1900);

Papabasileiou: G. A. Papabasileiou, *Eph. Arch.* 1902, 29–40 (ph.). Cf. 1903, 127–30; 1905, 28–36; 1911, 85–90;

*Phratries*: S. D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (2nd edn., Ann Arbor, 1998);

*Tetrapolis Calendar*: S. D. Lambert, *ZPE* 130 (2000) 43–69;

Wilhelm: A. Wilhelm, *Eph. Arch.* 1902, 135–42. Cf. 1904, 103–10;

Ziehen: L. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* II (Leipzig, 1906), 40–45 no. 10.

<sup>2</sup> The hand is identifiable as that of an Attic cutter. To the bibliography in *IG* i<sup>3</sup> add now H.B. Mattingly, *ZPE* 83 (1990), 110–19 (on the cutter); M.H. Jameson in ed. R. Hägg, *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (Stockholm, 1994), 35–57 (on *Theoxenia*). The following notes on readings arise from autopsy of the stone in the Chalkis museum in 1999: A10–11. Before oi in 10, uncertain trace of right side of Y or O. On these lines see further below. A12. In τoι the iota is damaged; only the lower section is visible. See further n. 19. A14–15, 17–18 and 18–19. I confirm all three paragraphs. A19. [Νό]μοφαις καὶ [Ἄ]χ]ε[λό]οι *IG* i<sup>3</sup>. The upper diagonals of the Y are visible. Of the E, Γ is visible. B1. δ *IG* i<sup>3</sup>. Very unclear. Possibly upper section of A? B4. νιστερ[.]οφορ *IG* i<sup>3</sup>. The shape and extent of vacant space to the left at start of line dictates pi. After the first rho, iota is faint but certain. Upper half of following O clear. Confirms the suggestion of Sokolowski, no. 11, δεῖπνιστερίο. B8. Final tau severely damaged. B9. I can not confirm initial α. B10. Initial τ, might alternatively be top right corner of pi. B14. In τεν, both verticals of the nu are clear, the right extending slightly higher and not to bottom of stoichos. B23. -]ΕΛ[. . ]Τ[.] *IG* i<sup>3</sup>. Can not confirm ΕΛ (but the surface in this area is now obscured by paint from the display base). Τ, alternatively perhaps top right of pi? Upper half of rho follows.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo 8.7.1, p. 383. The name is restored, but there would seem to be no plausible alternative cult figure in -othos or -outhos.

<sup>4</sup> Similar observations for *theoriai* to Delos took place at the Delion at Marathon. Soph. *OC* 1047–48 with Σ; FGH 328 Philochoros F 75.

<sup>5</sup> For the trophy, located a little inland from the bay, E. Vanderpool, *Hesp.* 35 (1966), 93–106.

quity), but also demonstrable cult of Zeus Tropaios.<sup>6</sup> Cult on Salamis would certainly be surprising for a Marathon-based group.

I suspect, however, that Zeus Tropaios is irrelevant here. A more likely restoration is indicated by the 4th century sacrificial calendar of the Tetrapolis, in which, on a date early in Hekatombaion, a goat worth 12 drachmas was to be offered [Ἐπόλλωνι? ἢ Ἀπ]οτροπαίωι (*Tetrapolis Calendar*, A1, 26). The structure of this column of the Tetrapolis calendar text lends confirmation. A1, 26 belongs to the second of three sets of sacrifices, marked off by quarter rubrics (in our case, πρώτης τριμήνου) set in from the normal column edge (20–22; 23–31; 32–37). I have argued in *Tetrapolis Calendar* that these three sections correspond to three locations of inscribed sources of authority specified in 13–19. The second of these locations is ἐν Κυνοσοῦραι (18). I suggest, therefore, that lines A10–11 of *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 255 should be restored:

10 [ . . . ]οι Ποσιδέοις τ[- - Ἐπόλλωνι]  
[Ἐπο]τροπαίοι ἐν Κυνο[σοῦραι -<sup>7</sup>

Both here and in the 4th century calendar the deity should be Apollo, who alone is attested as *Apotropaios* in Attica;<sup>8</sup> he had a strong presence in the Tetrapolis, connecting, as we have seen, with Delphi and Delos; and one also thinks immediately of the temple of Apollo (epithet unknown) at another coastal site further south at Prasiai, which, with its associated tomb of Erysichthon, also connected with Delos.<sup>9</sup> On a promontory, indeed, “*Apotropaios*” may have looked specifically to perils of marine origin; perhaps it is not coincidental that one of the two offerings recorded in our calendars was in the middle of the sailing season, in the summer month Hekatombaion, the other apparently at or around the time of the sea god’s festival Posideia, in the winter month Posideon.<sup>10</sup>

Of the other cult figures mentioned, both Poseidon (A18) and Artemis (her priestess at B16, cf. 20) would be at home in a coastal region;<sup>11</sup> and if -αῖς in B11 was Athena or Hera, both deities occur in the

<sup>6</sup> See P. W. Wallace, *AJA* 73 (1969), 299–302.

<sup>7</sup> On the excellent photograph in Papabasileiou’s *editio princeps*, 29–30, what might be interpreted as the right section of an omicron appears to the left of the tau in 11. However, at autopsy it is apparent that this represents not an inscribed mark, but the line along which the stone has broken away. It is too far to the right to be likely to be a break along the path of a letter stroke, at least along its exact path.

<sup>8</sup> See *Tetrapolis Calendar*, note on A1, 23–26.

<sup>9</sup> Apollo temple and tomb of Erysichthon: Paus. 1.31.2. Perhaps the priesthood of the Prasiai temple was held by the genos Erysichthonidai, which, in the Augustan period, (also?) held the priesthood of Apollo on Delos (for which see Parker, 289–90).

<sup>10</sup> Where on the 2.3 km. long Kynosoura promontory an Apollo cult site might have been situated is an interesting question. It is steep, rocky and inhospitable and, except for some fortification walls of uncertain date, few signs of ancient activity remain (see J. R. McCredie, *Hesp. Suppl.* 11 [1966], 41–46). One possibility might be the highest peak, McCredie’s point F, where, on the steep east and west slopes immediately down from the summit, he records loose rubble (no worked stones) from structures and sherds, some of them classical/early hellenistic. These (mostly coarse) sherds (including roof tiles) were confirmed when I walked the promontory in early spring 1999 with Michael Dixon and Victoria Buck. We also noted what may be a mooring point (with a few associated sherds) on the west (bay) coast, below this summit a little to the south. There is at present nothing to indicate, however, that this summit site was of a religious rather than a military character. (It is, however, too steep/inhospitable for ordinary domestic habitation to be plausible). Other possibilities for the Apollo site might be the area at the seaward end of the promontory, where there are remains of structures ancient and modern (none apparently of a religious nature; McCredie, p. 45); or, as Jameson suggests *per ep.*, the hill immediately landward of the base of the promontory, at one time enclosed by walls, where, however, no sherds were noted by McCredie (pp. 44–45). It may not be necessary to envisage the Apollo site as consisting of more than an altar; A1, 18 of the 4th century calendar might be restored ἐν τῷ βῶμ]ῳ ἐν Κυνοσοῦραι. The closest Attic parallel may be *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 5009, an altar of Apollo Apotropaios from caves (the “Serangeion”) close to the shore in Piraeus (cf. R. Garland, *The Piraeus* [1987], 159). The cave entrance to the east side of Kynosoura towards the shore might profitably be investigated.

<sup>11</sup> Other Attic cult sites of Artemis on or near the east coast of Attica were at Halai (Artemis Tauropolis), Brauron (Artemis Brauronia) and Myrrhinous (Artemis Kolainis). Parker, 25, sees coastal locations as appropriate to the wildness of this deity. For Artemis in this area cf. also *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 5001; 13196; B. Kallipolitis, *Arch. Delt.* 19 (1964) B1, 74.

4th century Tetrapolis calendar.<sup>12</sup> Minor cult figures did not always confine themselves within political and institutional boundaries, and the nautical hero Glaukos (A14), associated with neighbouring Boeotia and Euboea, as well as Delos,<sup>13</sup> would be no surprise in the Marathon area, nor cult of Apollo under two epithets, Pythios and Apotropaios, which also occur (among others) in the sacrificial calendar of Erchia, south and inland from the Tetrapolis.<sup>14</sup> For two other configurations, Aphrodite(?)–Eros–Hippolytos (A4–7)<sup>15</sup> and the Nymphs and Acheloos (A19),<sup>16</sup> the closest known parallels are in the city; but it is not implausible that there were separate Marathonian cult centres mirroring the city ones (a very common feature in Attica); alternatively, the observances here mentioned might actually have taken place in the city cult locations.<sup>17</sup>

There is one remaining problem case, Herakles ἐν τοῖ Ἐλαίῃ (A11–12), also known (as Herakles ὁ ἐν Ἐλα(ι)εῖ) from the Parthenon accounts.<sup>18</sup> The small deme Elaious (boul. quota 1) was of uncertain location in, probably, the coastal or inland trittys of Hippothontis, a tribe to which none of the Tetrapolis demes belonged.<sup>19</sup> If the Herakles of our inscription was located in this deme, therefore, *prima facie* he was not in the Tetrapolis area; indeed Vanderpool’s tentative suggestion<sup>20</sup> (followed by Traill) that the settlement site c. 4 km north of Eleusis (in a Hippothontid area, therefore) “in the midst of an extensive olive grove” might be identified as Elaious is not unattractive. Some of the architectural remains discovered there might belong to a Heraklean shrine, with which a dedication of thiasotai found in the area might also be connected.<sup>21</sup>

Nevertheless, a Herakles cult in Elaious, so located, might not be inconsistent with a base for our

<sup>12</sup> Athena Hellotis, A2, 35, 41 etc.; Hera, A2, 55.

<sup>13</sup> Strabo 9.2.13, p. 405; Paus. 9.22.6; Athen. 7.296a–c.

<sup>14</sup> SEG 21.541 (discussed further below, sect. 2). Pythios, 4 Thargelion; Apotropaios, 8 Gamelion.

<sup>15</sup> Aphrodite is attested in or close to this region notably at Plotheia (IG i<sup>3</sup> 258, 5; ii<sup>2</sup> 4607) and now also, as Aphrodite Hegemone, at Rhamnous (SEG 41.90 and 91; 43.64). Eros and Hippolytos are more distinctive, their cult attested in the archaic and classical periods only in the city. See O. Broneer, *Hesp.* 1 (1932), 31–55 (SEG 10.27; cf. SEG 38.259); FGH 323 Cleidemus F15; Paus. 1.30.1 (with Frazer’s note); Plut. *Sol.* 1.4; W.S. Barrett, *Euripides, Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), 4–6; J. D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton, 1975), 16–18.

<sup>16</sup> City cult of Nymphs and Acheloos by Ilissos: Plato *Phaedr.* 230b, 279b with J. Travlos, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Athen* (Tübingen, 1971), 289. The findspots of two inscriptions joining Acheloos and the Nymphs are uncertain: IG i<sup>3</sup> 1061 and W. Peek, *AM* 1942 [1951], 55 no. 89. Another, grouping the Nymphs and Acheloos with others, IG ii<sup>2</sup> 4547, 5, is from Phaleron. It may not be coincidental that, outside the city, the closest parallel is again at Erchia (SEG 21.541) where, on 27 Boedromion, there were sacrifices to the Nymphs, Acheloos, Alochos, Hermes and Ge.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. e.g. the calendar of Erchia (SEG 21.541), in which there are a number of sacrifices ἐν ἄσται.

<sup>18</sup> IG i<sup>3</sup> 343, 6; 344, 21; 346, 57 etc.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Traill, 138. The definite article in our text is odd. Almost universal Attic epigraphic usage is that demes lack the article (Piraeus sometimes has it, e.g. IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1225, 8, but in no 5th cent. inscription; cf. Meisterhans–Schwyzer, 227, in need of revision). With a name of adjectival form (cf. Piraeus) an article would not be impossible. As Langdon reminds me, “. . . Κύπρος, Αἴγυπτος, . . . aber, weil ursprünglich adjektivisch: ἡ Ἀττική, ἡ Ἑλλάς . . .” (Meisterhans–Schwyzer, 225–26); but, given the absence of the article with this place-name in the Parthenon accounts, it also seems possible that ἐν and τοῖ have been inverted in error in our text and that we should read (τοῖ ἐν). On the deme name, Ἐλαιοῦς or Ἐλαιεύς (normal demotic Ἐλαίουσιος), see Thraette I, 281 with 279. *Pace* Thraette, ἐχς Ἐλαίας, since it used as a demotic in a formal context at IG i<sup>3</sup> 472, 10, must, I think, relate to the same place, unless this is a unique reference to a second formal Attic deme in Ἐλαί-, later abolished. This demotic form may have arisen from confusion with the Aeolian town Ἐλαία (normal ethnic Ἐλαίτης), often mentioned in the tribute lists. (Whether Φίλων Ἐλαιεύς on the funerary monument SEG 17.97 was a citizen of this town or, as thought hitherto, an Athenian from Elaious, is unclear. Note, however, that the other individual mentioned on this monument was a Plataian; and for another Athenian gravestone of an Elaian from Aeolis, see SEG 26.318.)

<sup>20</sup> *Arch. Delt.* 23 (1968) A, 6–7.

<sup>21</sup> = SEG 24.223. Citizen cult of Herakles was characteristically organised in groups of “thiasotai”, which perhaps included family members who would normally have been excluded from the phratry (stepchildren, illegitimate children, etc.), cf. S. D. Lambert, *ZPE* 125 (1999), 125–28. In this case the number of non-citizen/slave names is perhaps rather high for it to be such a thiasos. It was fairly common, however, for separate groups, some including non-citizens, to use the same shrine (a notable feature, for example, of the sanctuary of Pankrates, Herakles and Palaimon in Athens, as will become apparent when the inscriptions there have been fully published; cf. SEG 41.247).

group in the Tetrapolis area. The sacrifice might have been extra-territorial, like for example that to Zeus Epakrios on Hymettos by the Erchians or that to Poseidon at Sounion by the Thorikians;<sup>22</sup> though admittedly such extra-territorial cult observances (other than in the city) are rare in most of the Attic sacrificial calendars; and there would not be the close proximity to the base of the group that existed in the case of Hymettos and Erchia or Sounion and Thorikos. Alternatively, the group may have been genuinely multi-local, like the genos Salaminioi, which had cult-locations down at Sounion (e.g. Herakles at Porthmos) and in the Phaleron area (Athena Skiras) as well as in the city (Eurysakes);<sup>23</sup> our inscription is too fragmentary to rule out the possibility that some of the group's other cults might also have been located in north-west Attica.

Another possibility is that deme and Herakles cult-site had the same or a similar name, but were not identical. The theory may not be the most economical; only one place with a name in Elai- is certainly attested on the Attic mainland.<sup>24</sup> But generally names in Elai- were common enough; there was an Aeolian town Elaia, for example, and, as Traill reminds me, among several islands called Elaioussa *vel sim.* there was a small one off the south-west coast of Attica (Strabo 9.1.21, p. 398).

Alternatively, the deme Elaious may after all have been located in or around the Tetrapolis area. It is an understandable temptation in *Demenforschung* to match anonymous settlement sites with unallocated deme names; but caution is appropriate. Attica was full of settlements that were not independent demes; if my calculations based on the *Rationes Centesimarum* are of the right order, in the second half of the 4th century there were still around 70 territorial units known as *komai*, many of them apparently semi-independent sub-communities in the territory of large demes such as Aphidna.<sup>25</sup> It is quite possible that Vanderpool's settlement site was the location of a *kome* in the territory of Eleusis. If not, it may have been one of the several other unlocated demes of Hippothontis. In fact, there were Hippothontid demes immediately to the west of the Tetrapolis: Dekeleia, Oion Dekeleikon and Anakaia at least. Perhaps Elaious was also located in the vicinity of these demes, in an area that might plausibly have been within the cultic ambit of an institution based in the Marathon area.<sup>26</sup>

In any case, the Herakleion in Elaious would probably not, I think, be identical with *the* Marathonian Herakleion, site of the Athenian position at the battle of Marathon, which was apparently at the southern end of the Marathon plain in what seems to have been Probalinthian territory.<sup>27</sup>

I suggest that my new restoration of lines A10–11 strengthens the case for believing that the group responsible for *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 255 was based wholly or mainly in the Marathon area; and cult of Herakles ἐν Ἐλαίῃ can also be explained consistently with that hypothesis. The possibilities as to the group's institutional identity remain frustratingly wide. -]α τριττύι : ἄπο in A9 raises the possibility that it was a

<sup>22</sup> Thorikians: *SEG* 33.147, 19–20; Erchians: see below, sect. 2. Cf. also *Tetrapolis Calendar*, Postscript.

<sup>23</sup> See most recently *Salaminioi* and Lambert (n. 21). It is important to bear in mind that Attic corporate groups (not excluding demes, but even more so groups of pre-Cleisthenic origin) were in the first place groups of people, not tracts of territory. That their cult activities were not always confined within a single bounded area of territory, therefore, should not surprise us.

<sup>24</sup> On Attic "Elaia" cf. n. 19.

<sup>25</sup> *Rationes*, 220–21, 253–55. On the *komai* see also P. Roussel, *Rev. Arch.* 18 (1941), 226–31, and recently H. Lauter, *Attische Landgemeinden* (Marburg, 1993), 136–38.

<sup>26</sup> For indications that the Tetrapolis may have had a presence outside the areas of its equivalent Cleisthenic demes cf. *Tetrapolis Calendar*, n. 6 with Postscript. The position of Elaious in *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1927 (a list observing a geographical order, cf. Traill, 115–16) after Oinoe but before Dekeleia would be consistent with a location in the area of either of those demes. A case can also be made for locating another Hippothontid deme, Azenia, in the Tetrapolis area, since the name Meidylos (an offering to Chloe apparently by his property, παρὰ τὰ Μειδύλου, is at *Tetrapolis Calendar*, A2, 49) is otherwise attested only in that deme (though as Humphreys points out to me, the commoner Μειδυλίδης is fairly widespread; see *LGPN* II). Incidentally, the location of yet another Hippothontid deme, Auridai, might perhaps be sought in the (suitably breezy) area of Eleutherai, since in the late 2nd cent. two brothers, members of that deme, were also members of the genos Bakchiadai, which, I have argued, was responsible for the cult of Dionysos Eleuthereus; see *Historia* 42 (1998), 394–403.

<sup>27</sup> Thus E. Vanderpool, *AJA* 70 (1966), 319–23; J. Travlos, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Attika* (Tübingen, 1988), 219. For a different view on the location of the Marathonian Herakleion, see Photiou.

trittys, whether Cleisthenic or Ionian, but in the dative it scarcely proves it. It might be the Tetrapolis itself, or to judge from other groups known to have produced inscriptions of comparable content, a deme or a *genos*.<sup>28</sup>

## 2. Erchiana

Though the letters are smallish and in places rather worn, the five-column sacrificial calendar from Erchia (c. 375–50), with its enigmatic heading *δημαρχία ἡ μέζον*,<sup>29</sup> can mostly be read from the stone without undue difficulty. Where readings at first seem doubtful, careful consideration almost invariably vindicates Daux’s fine *editio princeps*,<sup>30</sup> and my own autopsy in 1999 yielded only minor adjustments.<sup>31</sup>

Only at the ends of columns A, Γ and E, where the break of the stone has taken short sections of text with it, is there any scope for conjecture. As Daux noted, however, A lacks only the figure for the total cost of the sacrifices in the column, 111 dr. [HΔΓ] (cf. 108 dr. in B, 110 in Δ). The total cost of the 11 fully preserved sacrifices in Γ is 103 dr; comparison with the totals in other columns suggests that just one sacrifice is missing,<sup>32</sup> of which tantalising traces remain.<sup>33</sup> Similar reasoning suggests that, at the end of column E, two sacrifices are probably missing.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>28</sup> The Archegetes of B8 may have been an official (thus Papabasileiou), or perhaps rather an object of cult (thus Ziehen), i.e. the group’s eponym or founder (cf. in this area of Attica the “Archegetes” at Rhamnous, *SEG* 43.6 and 51, 44.78; *Tetrapolis Calendar*, Postscript). That, however, does not help determine the type of group. Cf. Parker, 120–21.

<sup>29</sup> In my view the only plausible explanation of it proposed hitherto is that of Parker: *δημαρχία* refers to the period of office of a demarch (i.e. one year) and this one was ‘greater’ in that it contained more sacrifices than the ‘lesser demarchy’, with which it can be presumed to have alternated in sequence. See D. Whitehead, *AW* 14 (1986), 57–64.

<sup>30</sup> Daux. Some minor textual points (from ph. and squeezes only) were made by Dow, especially 185–87. Jameson also had some textual implications. Cf. *SEG* 21.541 and 22.131.

<sup>31</sup> On the paragraphi see Daux, 611. I can not confirm those shown by him above A, lines 40, 55 and 60 (the horizontal rather to the right, i.e. above the left side of the theta, in 55 is a casual mark), which would in any case be unexpected in the middle of a description of a sacrifice; nor those marked at the start of each column (the mark above A1 is probably casual). There is a paragraphus before Γ65. There is punctuation (:) before the figures in A27 and between the two words in E51, and possibly before the figure in A51. I tend to agree with Dow’s rejection of the first punctuation read by Daux in Γ30. Daux often shows the initial letter of month names in square brackets. From the stone I read these letters clearly in lines Γ1, 13, 26, 31, 42, 48, 54, 59, dotted at A52. The following letters, square bracketed by Daux, I would read undotted: [δ] B2, [‘E] B8; dotted: [ς] A35, [ν] A55, [α] E37, [α] E60, [η] E62. In E52 τ requires no dot. A19–20. Dow hesitates, but, lit from various directions at autopsy, ἐ/ν looked certain, not ἐ/μ. B28. Ἡροσσοῦρῖοις. At first sight, when lit from the left, the initial letter appeared more like pi, but on closer examination, especially when lit from the right, eta seemed correct. B31. The final Γ “est très légèrement gravé sur la ligne même de séparation des colonnes” (Daux, 611). I believe rather that the figure is inscribed just above the previous one, slightly to the right. The mu in A53 and possibly the alpha at the end of E14 (though at the latter point the surface is worn) were never inscribed. The second letter in A65 is a clear iota, in the centre of the stoichos, confirming Daux’s ἀν/[τ]ῖβους and ruling out Sokolowski’s (in any case highly implausible) ἀν(α)[β]εβ οὐδ(α) (Sokolowski, no. 18, p. 43). On Γ66–67 see n. 33.

<sup>32</sup> Daux, 632; cf. Dow, 187.

<sup>33</sup> The beginning of the description, as read by Daux (*BCH* 1964; I adjust slightly his printed text), runs (the month is Skirophorion):

65 ἔκτε[ι ἐ]πὶ δέ-  
κα [. . .<sup>6</sup>. . .] . . .  
[. . .<sup>9</sup>. . .].

For the last letter of 66 Daux detected a vertical to the left of the stoichos, e.g. of a K or P, preceded by “une lettre occupant un carré (E, H, K, Γ par exemple)”; at the end of 67 a vertical and possibly the upper diagonal of K. I have nothing to add on 67. In 66, after the alpha, there is what might be the bottom of a vertical, slightly to the right of centre. At the top of the space (but perhaps too high to be likely to be letter strokes) are marks like the left and, less clearly, right tip of Y, i.e. perhaps I, T, Y, Φ, or Ψ. In the next stoichos a left vertical appears in some lights, very uncertain, perhaps of an eta. At the end of the line, I detected what may be the diagonals of K, in addition to the vertical, and in the previous stoichos perhaps the top section of Γ/Ε/Π. Daux prudently observed that “aucune restitution ne peut ni ne doit être tirée de ces données fragmentaires et incertaines”; though on 16th of a month one might think of Artemis-Hekate (FGH 328 Philochoros F86 with Jacoby’s commentary; cf. B6–13).

<sup>34</sup> Dow, 187. The total cost of the sacrifices down to E64 was 89 or 90 dr, including the unpreserved cost of a lamb in

One aspect of the Erchia calendar which, though partially treated in earlier papers by Vanderpool<sup>35</sup> and Bicknell,<sup>36</sup> has not been fully explored, is its relationship to other evidence for Erchian topography, cults and institutions. It is to discussion of this subject that I wish to contribute here.<sup>37</sup>

The *horos* IG ii<sup>2</sup> 2609 from Spata shows that there was a temenos of Herakles in the area of Erchia (cf. n. 52). Herakles does not appear in the “greater demarchy” calendar (though the Herakleidai do). Perhaps he was in that of the “lesser demarchy”; or perhaps, in characteristic Attic fashion, this cult of Herakles was not the responsibility of the deme, but of a dedicated thiasos of Herakles.<sup>38</sup>

In Isaeus 12 Euphiletos, ejected from the deme Erchia apparently at the *diapsephismos* (deme scrutiny) of 346/5, seeks to overturn the decision in court. The deme, of course, features in the speech. We learn that the case had previously been decided in Euphiletos’ favour by two arbitrators and that the demarch then in office had since died (sects. 11–12; for the Erchian demarch in our calendar cf. the heading and E 52–58); and there is reference in conventional terms to Euphiletos’ introduction to a phratry as supporting his claim to citizenship (sect. 3, cf. 8). But unfortunately the twelve chapters of this speech preserved for us by Dionysius of Halicarnassus contain none of the vivid local colour which is a feature of the other surviving speech challenging the ejection of someone from his deme at this scrutiny, Demosthenes 57 (for Euxitheos of Halimous). We learn nothing, for example, about the extent to which membership of the deme Erchia and Euphiletos’ phratry overlapped; and there is just one, oblique, connection with the calendar. At sect. 9 the speaker (Euphiletos’ half-brother) states that Euphiletos’ mother had been willing to swear an oath before the arbitrator at the Delphinion (ἐπὶ τοῦ διαίτη-τοῦ . . . ἐπὶ Δελφινίῳ) that Euphiletos was a child of herself and “our father”. The Delphinion intended here, in a case before an Athenian jury, must be the one in Athens, referred to in a precisely similar context, involving an oath before an arbitrator by a woman on a question of legitimacy, at Dem. 40.11. It is interesting, however, that there were in fact local Delphinia both at Thorikos, the deme of Dem. 40,<sup>39</sup> and, as we learn from our calendar, Erchia. Why these oaths were located at the (city) Delphinion, otherwise known as the place where cases of justifiable homicide were tried, has not been easy to elucidate. It has been suggested either that this was where the arbitrators in these two cases (i.e. the panels for Akamantis and Aegeis) happened to sit; or that, for some reason, it was thought an appropriate place for oaths of affiliation.<sup>40</sup> The fact, however, that at Erchia it was a sacrifice to the ancient Attic maternal deity Kourotrophos, “nourisher of *kouroi*”, that was explicitly located in the Delphinion,<sup>41</sup> would seem to support the second of these explanations.<sup>42</sup> Kourotrophos is a common recipient of sacrifices in the

64, probably 7 or 8 dr. Discussion of possible restorations can be traced via S. Scullion, *ZPE* 121 (1998), 119–21.

<sup>35</sup> *BCH* 89 (1965), 21–26, on the locations of the deme centre of Erchia and the Erchian *polis* and *pagos* referred to in the calendar, and on the Vourva settlement site.

<sup>36</sup> *REG* 89 (1976), 599–603. Note also Dow, 180–182, on the deme, its size (more than averagely large), bouleutic quota (6; 10 after 307/6) and population (perhaps around 500 adult males).

<sup>37</sup> For completeness, I mention here two items of written evidence which I shall not discuss further: (a) among a number of comic plays with deme-names in their titles, there appears to have been one called Ἐρχιεῖς, from the period of New Comedy. Nothing is known about it. See *SEG* 25.194, 81; Whitehead, 338; (b) Petrakos has now shown that IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1181, mentioning an Erchian, is neither a deme decree of Erchia, nor of Sounium (where it was mistakenly recorded as having been found), but belongs to a monument from Rhamnous set up by the ephebes of Aegeis of 331/0 and their *sophronistes*, the Erchian. See G. R. Stanton, *ABSA* 91 (1996), 344–45.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Lambert (n. 21); A. P. Matthaiou, *Horos* 7 (1989), 12..

<sup>39</sup> See *SEG* 33.147.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. A. L. Boegehold, *The Athenian Agora*. Vol. XXVIII. *The Lawcourts at Athens* (Princeton, 1995), 135–39; W. Wyse, *The Speeches of Isaeus* (Cambridge, 1904), 720–721.

<sup>41</sup> It took place on 7 Gamelion ἐν Δελφινίῳ/ῶι Ἐρχ and consisted of a piglet (A, 23–27). On the same day there were sacrifices of sheep to Apollo Delphinios (A, 28–30) and to Apollo Lykeios (E, 31–38), the latter Πυθαί/σταῖς παρα/δόσιμος. M.H. Jameson, *Archaiognosia* 1 (1980), 227–28, plausibly associates these sacrifices in a group with those to Apollo Apotropaïos and Apollo Nymphagetes with the Nymphs on the following day.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Wyse (n. 40): “It might be suggested that the legendary connexion of the Dephinium with Aegeus and Theseus made it a fit place for oaths of affiliation.” On the Aegeus/Theseus connection see the testimonia conveniently collected by

Attic calendars jointly with other individual deities or groups with a connotation of family or rearing of the young, e.g. elsewhere in the Erchia calendar with Artemis/Artemis Hekate, strongly associated with the upbringing of girls; the siblings Hera, Zeus Teleios and Poseidon; and another group including Athena Polias, Zeus Polieus, Poseidon and, in addition, the daughter-figure(s) Aglauros and possibly Pandrosos. Here, Kourotrophos is grouped on the same day not only with Apollo Delphinios but appropriately also with Apollo Lykeios, a deity apparently associated with passage of men into adult military and civic participation.<sup>43</sup>

On 16 Thargelion the Erchians sacrificed to Zeus Epakrios on Hymettos (E 59–64). It is one of the calendar's more remarkable entries, for though Erchia was not far from the eastern slopes of Hymettos, another deme, Paiania, intervened. This sacrifice was not, therefore, in deme territory; nor was it, like most extra-territorial observances in the Attic sacrificial calendars, including several in ours, in the city.<sup>44</sup> It may be this cult site that the poet of Old Comedy, Polyzelos, had in mind in a fragment of his play *Mouson gonai* preserved by the lexicographers: ἱερῶι γὰρ ἐντετύχηκας Ἐπακρίου Διός (F8 K–A), for no other site of Zeus with this epithet is securely attested in Attica;<sup>45</sup> and it may also be identifiable with the summit sanctuary on Hymettos published by Langdon, with its extensive deposits of archaic votive sherds, some inscribed with the name of Zeus.<sup>46</sup> In any case it is notable that we also know of a group of (probably phratric) orgeones<sup>47</sup> who were connected in some way with this deity; most likely

---

Boegehold (especially perhaps Paus. 1.19.1?).

<sup>43</sup> See Jameson (n. 41).

<sup>44</sup> Comparable is the sacrifice by the Thorikians to Poseidon at Sounion, *SEG* 33.147, 19–20. Cf. also sect. 1 above on Herakles in Elaious; and *Tetrapolis Calendar*, Postscript. M. H. Jameson in C. R. Whittaker, *Pastoral Economics in Classical Antiquity* (PCPS Suppl. 14, 1988), 103, suggests a link between our sacrifice and the opening of summer pastures.

<sup>45</sup> Et. Mag. s.v. Ἐπάκριος Ζεύς states that altars of Zeus were placed on summits of mountains, οἶον τοῦ Ὑμηττίου, τοῦ Παρνηθίου, but it does not state that all such altars (i.e. on Parnes as well as Hymettos) were specifically of Zeus Epakrios and indeed this is doubtful, since this passage is related, directly or indirectly, to Pausanias' discussion of mountain-top sanctuaries of Zeus on Hymettos and Parnes at 1.32.2, in all of which Pausanias gives Zeus epithets other than Ἐπάκριος. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1294 was found κατὰ τὴν Πλάκα ἐν ὁδοῦ κείμενον (Ziebarth, *Rh. Mus.* 55 [1900], 502 no. 3), but (*pace* R. E. Wycherley, *GRBS* 5 [1964], 176 and n. 7, cf. Langdon [n. 48]) it is questionable whether we can infer from this a precinct of Zeus Epakrios "at some high point in the city". For another inscription supposedly found "in the Plaka", but actually originating in Anthedon, Boeotia, cf. P. Roesch, *Études Béotiennes* (Paris, 1982), 112–17, no. ii (= *SEG* 32.454; S. D. Lambert, *ABSA* 95 [forthcoming, 2000], E16). There are many ways that an inscription might end up "lying in the street", euphemistically or otherwise, in this market district of central Athens.

<sup>46</sup> *Hesp. Suppl.* 16 (1976). In favour of Langdon's site being of Zeus Epakrios can be adduced: (a) the particular suitability of the mountain-top location for Zeus with this epithet; (b) the attraction of identifying a cult-site attested archaeologically as active from the 12th to the 6th centuries B.C. with one associated with phratric orgeones, which perhaps possessed land sold off in the Lykourgan public land-sale programme (cf. *Rationes*, 237), may have been referred to in Old Comedy, and was the location of an unusual extra-territorial deme sacrifice by the Erchians; (c) the ceramic graffito no. 42 in Langdon's catalogue, probably to be restored [Λαμ]πρέο[ς], and the fact that the Epigonos mentioned on *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1294 was from the deme Lamptrai, south-east of Hymettos. Against an association with Zeus Epakrios, Langdon notes (p. 99) that "the Erchia inscription belongs to the 4th century B.C., when the altar of Zeus on the summit lay unused". But our 4th century calendar will represent sacrificial practices of much older origin; and the absence of inscribed ceramic votive deposits datable to the classical period may rather be evidence for a change in votive practices (e.g. because writing was no longer a sort of magical novelty), or (as Langdon himself suggests to me) that the votives from the classical period were deposited at another, undiscovered, location, than for the disuse of the site in the classical period. Langdon also points out to me the absence of apparent easy access to the site from the east; but many Erchians may have had residences in the city (cf. Dow, 181–82 and the sacrifices in our calendar in the city), and in any case ancient standards of ease of access were perhaps less stringent than ours (cf. e.g. above n. 10). Pausanias refers to a cult of Zeus Ombrios on Hymettos (identified by Langdon, *Hesp. Suppl.* 16, with his site). One suspects (as Jameson suggests to me) that different individuals/groups might have worshipped Zeus there under different epithets. Certainly, ceramic graffito no. 42 is for neither Epakrios nor Ombrios, but Σημιτοῖ Δί (an epithet of Zeus mentioned by Pausanias in connection with Parnes, but not Hymettos). It may be that epithets also changed over time (a possible implication of the texts discussed above, n. 45). To my mind "Ombrios", of Zeus, has a post-classical flavour. Cf. the evidence for Zeus with this epithet discussed by A. B. Cook, *Zeus* iii (1) (Cambridge, 1940), 525–27, none of it pre-Hellenistic, and A. E. Raubitschek, *Hesp.* 12 (1943), 72–73 nos. 19–21 (3 altars of Zeus Ombrios from the Agora, c. 100 A.D.).

<sup>47</sup> On orgeones in general see *Phratries*, 74–77; Parker, 109–11.

perhaps they were responsible for the Hymettos shrine. The very fragmentary *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1294* mentions them in the nominative, an Epigonos son of Endios (from Lamptrai, a deme neighbouring Hymettos) in the dative and Zeus Epakrios in the genitive in the surviving portions of lines 1, 2 and 3 respectively, in a context which, from line 4, looks financial (a lease?);<sup>48</sup> and a group which may be these same orgeones sold an *eschatía* in the great Lykourgan public land sale programme.<sup>49</sup> It might be tempting to interpret them as an Erchia-based group, possibly even as a subgroup of Euphiletos' phratry; but there is no firm evidence of a link with Erchia. Epigonos was from Lamptrai, the property sold in the Lykourgan programme was at Phlya and the agent of the selling group was from Athmonon. Perhaps therefore this is another case of a cult site being shared by more than one group.<sup>50</sup>

“. . . crown and apparel (στέρφανον καὶ κόσμον) . . . / . . . the altars and wood (τοὺς βωμοὺς καὶ ξύλα) . . . / . . . (females) in office (ταῖς ἀρχούσαις) . . . / . . . from the trikomoi (παρὰ τῶν τρικώμων) . . . / . . . six drachmas of silver (ἀργυρίου ΓϜ δραχμ-) . . . / . . . the trikomarch (τὸν τρικώμαρχ[ον]) . . . / . . . the *demos* (τὸν δῆμον).” (*IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1213*). The stone is alleged to have been found in the Bala area, to the west of modern Spata; Milchhöfer was not permitted to study it properly and it has apparently not been seen since.<sup>51</sup> It was just to the south of Spata, at Pousiri, that our sacrificial calendar was found, a location perhaps identifiable, therefore, as site of ancient Erchia.<sup>52</sup> However, in the absence (it has been thought) of other evidence for a *trikomía* in this area, Schlaifer's suggestion<sup>53</sup> that this hand-sized fragment may have wandered from the area of the *trikomía* of Eupyridai west of Acharnai, attested by Stephanus of Byzantium, has been found attractive by many scholars, including recently Parker.<sup>54</sup> That this is not very satisfactory is due not so much to the distance between Eupyridai and Spata (stones could of course wander further than this, cf. *IG i<sup>3</sup> 255*, discussed in sect. 1 above); nor to the fact that, since there may, in the 4th century, have been around 70 *komai* in Attica, most as yet unattested, it is not unlikely that there was more than one set which was arranged in a group of three.<sup>55</sup> It is more that one is reminded by the striking feminine, ταῖς ἀρχούσαις (3), of all those priestesses who loom so large in the Erchia calendar.<sup>56</sup> More importantly, one is reminded of a mid-5th century inscription from Spata (ἑγγὺς κτήματος Καμπᾶ<sup>57</sup>), *IG i<sup>3</sup> 247*. The text is too fragmentary for continuous sense to be made; it may have related in some way to institutional property.<sup>58</sup> There are just three lines, however, which particularly interest us, 1, 9 and 10. The Corpus text and relevant commentary is as follows:

<sup>48</sup> Fundamental on this inscription is now the careful treatment of M. Langdon, *AJA* 77 (1973), 195–96 (ph.; not yet in *SEG*). In the light of the Lamptrai connection, and the absence of plausible alternative, the restoration Διὸς τοῦ Ἐπα[κ]ρίου -] (3–4) seems secure. From my autopsy I note: 4, διων]ομηῖ Langdon. I see the right vertical and most of the diagonal of the nu; 6, before Langdon's -] τε I detect an iota (cf. Meritt ap. W. S. Ferguson, *HTR* 37 [1944], 93 no. 11) preceded by some uncertain marks (right end of bottom horizontal adjoining at right start of an upward stroke?). There are some uncertain traces of a seventh line, including perhaps a mark as of top of left diagonal of Y under the O in 6 (may alternatively be a casual mark).

<sup>49</sup> *Rationes*, F11A, 1–4 with pp. 157–58 and 197.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. n. 21 above. Perhaps the orgeones owned the shrine (cf. the orgeones of Egretes, Parker, 109–10) and the deme were “guest” users. For the possibility that orgeones might have quasi-public cult functions cf. Parker, 110–111.

<sup>51</sup> *AM* 12 (1887), 87 no. 27.

<sup>52</sup> Thus Vanderpool (n. 35). The findspot of the Tetrapolis calendar, however, apparently in situ outside the Marathon plain at Kukunari (cf. *Tetrapolis Calendar*, n. 6), casts a slight shadow of doubt on Vanderpool's inference.

<sup>53</sup> *HSCP* 54 (1943), 45 n. 39.

<sup>54</sup> p. 330. Similarly H. Lauter (n. 25), 137 (on this point, as on some others, too categorical). Recently only Bicknell (n. 36) has argued fully for an Erchian *trikomía* (but see also P. Siewert, *Die Trittyen Attikas* [Munich, 1982], 173).

<sup>55</sup> Cf. n. 25.

<sup>56</sup> Priestesses are mentioned 5 times in the calendar, priests not at all. The reason for their explicit mention seems to be that, in each of these cases, they are to receive the hide of the sacrificial victim. Roussel (n. 25), 230–31, however, associates ταῖς ἀρχούσαις with the Thesmophoria.

<sup>57</sup> M. Mitsos, *Eph. Arch.* 1965, 137–38.

<sup>58</sup> Some of the vocabulary can be paralleled in *SEG* 24.151, in which the deme Teithras, tightening up on its finances, inscribes details of leases of deme land.



A second candidate can be identified in our calendar itself. Two sacrifices in the Erchia calendar take place at Erchia ἐς Σωτιδῶν.<sup>64</sup> Daux comments (624) that this “doit représenter un téménos consacré par une famille locale, les Sotidai.” I tend to think rather of those properties in the *Rationes Centesimarum* sold at Aphidna ἐν Πετολιδῶν etc., i.e. in the *komai* of which Petalidai was one of several in the Aphidna area.<sup>65</sup>

A third candidate for status as an Erchian *kome* is the Dekadistai. Long known as lenders (of 130 dr.) on the security marker from Spata, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2701,<sup>66</sup> Parker, 335, lists them among those “dining and drinking clubs” who were named for the day of the month on which they met, like the Noumeniastai or the Tetradistai. However, the case of the Eikadeis (see *Rationes*, 199–201) shows that groups named for days in this way could be formal and permanent (the Eikadeis may have been a *genos vel sim.*); and the Dekadistai are good candidates for restoration as a “territorial” group in Aigeis (i.e. a deme or, since we know they were not such, a *kome*), selling two or more properties on the new F1 of the *Rationes Centesimarum*.<sup>67</sup> Admittedly, no other Attic *kome* certainly has a name in -istai;<sup>68</sup> and unlike Sotidai this name does not appear in the Erchian deme calendar (nor does -(n?)tidai). Sotidai, though *ex hypothesi* a *kome*, could still be described in the calendar as ‘in Erchia’, however, just as the properties in the *Rationes Centesimarum* were ‘in Aphidna in Petalidai’; so it would perhaps be possible that some of the other locations described in the calendar as ‘in Erchia’ were also in fact in one of the Erchian *komai*.

We have three candidate names, therefore, for components of an Erchian *trikomia*: -(n?)tidai, Sotidai and Dekadistai. We need not choose more than two of them, for Erchia itself would perhaps have been the chief member, like Marathon in the Tetrapolis, or Eupyrilai in the *trikomia* of Eupyrilai.<sup>69</sup> One of the Erchian *komai* might have been located at Vourva, the settlement site north-east of Spata identified by Vanderpool<sup>70</sup> and currently nameless following Traill’s shifting of Myrrhinoutta to Nea Makri.<sup>71</sup>

British School at Athens  
University of Liverpool

Stephen D. Lambert

<sup>64</sup> Γ4–5 and 8–9. As Daux, 624, noted, there is assimilation of the final nu of ἐν. Cf. Threatte I, 634.

<sup>65</sup> E.g. *Rationes* F7B, 24, with p. 233 n. 69. Cf. e.g. *SEG* 33.147, 25–26. It may be that ἐν Δημοσιωνιδῶν at *Phratries* T3, 21, should also be interpreted in this sense; i.e. that Demotionidai, as well as a phratric group, was also a toponym.

<sup>66</sup> Co-creditors were a certain Hieromnemon of Halai, “according to the agreement lodged with Lysistratos”, and a group of eranistai led by Theopeithes of Ikaria.

<sup>67</sup> *Rationes* F1, 13; p. 184.

<sup>68</sup> Note, however, the Dipoliastai (*Rationes*, 197) and the Sabaziastai (Parker, 335), both apparently formal, permanent groups.

<sup>69</sup> Alternatively three small *komai*, none of them called “Erchia”, might together have made up “Erchia”; but there would seem to be no certain Attic parallel for such an arrangement, unless perhaps Aphidna was like that (but not quite all the properties in Aphidna in *Rationes* were located by *kome*. One, sold by the Aphidnaean *kome* Hyporeia, was at Aphidna ὑπὸ τῷ Φανερώϊ [F7B, 16], which might suggest that it was not within any *kome*); or Acharnai (for an apparent *kome* there see *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 3104, omitted in error from the list of *komai* at *Rationes*, 220–21, n. 15; cf. Roussel [n. 25], 228).

<sup>70</sup> (n. 35), 24–26. The suggestion that Vourva might have been site of an Erchian *kome* has also been made by Siewert (n. 54), 173.

<sup>71</sup> Vanderpool suggested that the site was of one of the demes Kydantidai, Ionidai, Erikeia or Myrrhinoutta; J. S. Traill, *Hesp. Suppl.* 14 (1975), 40–41, inclined towards Myrrhinoutta, but in *Demos and Trittys*, 147, he switched Myrrhinoutta to the Nea Makri site, with all Vanderpool’s other candidates also allocated to sites other than Vourva (127–28). I take this opportunity to note that, as Sean Byrne points out to me, it seems from newly discovered funerary monuments that the deme Oe was not, as previously thought, in the area of other Oineis demes in north-western Attica, but was an Oineis enclave to the south-west of Spata, just north of Koropi. See O. Kakavogiannis, Ζ’ Επιστημονική Συνάντηση Νοτιοανατολικής Αττικής, Κορωπί 19–22 Ὀκτωβρίου 1995 (Koropi, 1998), 68–84 (where, however, the funerary monuments, which have demotics ΟΗΘΕΝ, are incorrectly interpreted as evidence for the location of Oa). Cf. R. Étienne, *BCH* 99 (1975), 379–84. This is not the place to explore the implications of this relocation of Oe, including for the interpretation of Soph. *OC* 1061 (Οἰάτιδος ἐκ νομοῦ. To do with Oion Dekeleikon?) and for the phenomenon of out-of-phyle deme enclaves.