

## IG II<sup>2</sup> 2490, THE EPAKREIS AND THE PRE-CLEISTHENIC TRITTYES<sup>1</sup>

### 1. THE INSCRIPTION

0	unintelligible traces of letters?	non-stoichedon
1	[ _____ ]αι Μονιχιώνι μ[ηνί _____] [ _____ μ]ηδενός : · : ὅπως δ' [ἄν _____] [ _____ ἀργ]ύριον στήσαι τὸς εἰ[ _____] [ _____ κ]ατατιθέντας τὸ ἀργύ[ριον _____]	
5	[ _____ εἰ]καστος αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χω[ρίον _____] [ _____ ]α ἐφ' ὅτο ἄν τὸ ἀργύριον λα[ _____] [ _____ ]χοι, τεθηκότας τὰ ἐπιδέκ[ατα. vac. ?] vac. Ἐπακρέων τριττύο[s. vac. ?] vacat	

### Description

Fragment of a stele of white (Pentelic) marble broken on all sides, found on the Athenian Acropolis (εἰς τὸ ἀνατολικὸν τῶν Προπυλαίων, according to Pittakes). The preserved thickness is not the original. Eight lines of inscribed text are preserved on the stone. There is a 0.205 m high uninscribed surface stretching from the bottom of line 8 down to the bottom of the stone. The larger letter size in line 8 is due to the fact that it contained the 'signature' of the issuing body. In the same line, the left end of the letter *epsilon* is 0.085m. away from the preserved edge of the stone. If the title Ἐπακρέων τριττύο[s] was placed in the centre of the line, then we should estimate at least 0.085 m of uninscribed space to the right of the missing *sigma*. This would give us a minimum width for the stone of 0.085 m + 0.22 m (length of text preserved in line 8) + 0.01 m (estimated width of *sigma*) + 0.085 m = 0.40m, though the initial width was almost certainly larger.<sup>2</sup> Dimensions: height: 0.35 m; width: 0.28 m; thickness: 0.11 m; letter height: 0.005 m (except line 8: 0.006 m).

### Editions

L. Ross, *Die Deme von Attika* (Halle, 1846), vi; K. Pittakes, *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική* (1853), 884–5, no. 1410; A. R. Rangabé, *Antiquités Helléniques* (Athens, 1855), 136–7, no. 448; IG II 1053; IG II<sup>2</sup> 2490.

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank the personnel of the Epigraphical Museum, especially Mr. Kritzas, Mrs Karapa-Molisani and Mrs Choremi, for permission to study IG II<sup>2</sup> 2490 (inventory number EM 8693) and for all their assistance. Many thanks are also due to C. Crowther (who gave me access to a squeeze kept in CSAD), A. Matthaiou (for fruitful suggestions), P. Liddel, R. Parker, P. J. Rhodes and P. Thonemann for reading drafts of the present paper, and for the useful comments made by CQ's anonymous referee. Any fallacies or errors are, of course, mine.

<sup>2</sup> On the basis of this hypothesis, more text is missing from the right rather than from the left part of the inscription. This pattern is assumed in my restorations below.



*Epigraphical notes*

0. On the upper edge of the stone, roughly above the letter sequence *XIΩ*, I could discern some traces that may belong to letters, but may well be random fractures on the surface of the stone || 3. *σῆσαι*, [*σ*]τῆσαι *IG*. Part of the upper stroke of *sigma* is visible. || 5. [*ε*]καστος, [*ε*]καστος *IG*. The lower diagonal of *kappa* is partly preserved. *καὶ* is clear on the stone; *καὶ* *IG* || 6. Before *ἐφ' ὅτο* the trace of a stroke slanting downwards and to the right can be discerned (seen also in Köhler's majuscule text in *IG* II 1053). It could belong to any of the letters *A*, *K*, *Λ*, or *X*, but textually it can only be an *alpha*, hence my transcription. || 7. [ \_ ]ρχοι *Traill*, but on inspection of the stone I could see no traces of *rho* at all; [*τ*]εθη[κ]ότας *IG*, τεθηκότας *Traill*. My autopsy of the inscription confirms *Traill*'s epigraphic observations on this point.<sup>3</sup>

*Commentary*

The inscription's fragmentary condition has discouraged scholars from a thorough analysis, but the preserved text has been unanimously considered as a leasing contract.<sup>4</sup> The reasons for this can be briefly summarized as follows: (1) most importantly, the word *χωρίον* (plot of land) is partly, but safely, restored in line 5; (2) thrice, a mention is made of *ἀργύριον* (lines 3, 4 and 6), presumably income raised from leasing of lands; (3) the reference to the month *Mounichion* in line 1 suggests a dating formula for the payment of some monetary sum (presumably rent). It is in fact from this last point that I will commence my treatment of the document.

**Line 1:** If this line involves, indeed, some sort of dating rubric, one is tempted to restore *[νουμηνίαι, [ἐν]η καὶ νέ]αι* or a similar dative, but this should have been accompanied by a (partitive) genitive of time, not a dative. The dative without preposition is unusual,<sup>5</sup> but something like *[τὴν μίσθωσιν ἀποδιδόν]αι Μονιχιῶνι μ[ηνί]* should render the spirit of the text. The odd interpunct in line 2 (two vertical dots, a single centred dot, and two further vertical dots) marks, in all likelihood, the end of a clause. I take the preceding pronoun *[μ]ηδενός* to refer to an utter prohibition on any potential obstructors of the fulfilment of the contract. I can think of no better restoration than *[μὴ κωλύοντος μ]ηδενός*, but the phrasing is admittedly unusual and with no real parallels.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> J. S. *Traill*, *Demos and Trittys: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica* (Toronto, 1986), 107, provided new readings of lines 7–8 of the text under examination (not in *SEG*).

<sup>4</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 is described as *pactionis instrumentum* in the corpus and as 'record of a property-lease' by *Traill* (n. 3); see also M. Guarducci, 'Intorno ad una iscrizione del demo attico di Plotheia', *Historia. Studi per l' antichità classica* 9 (1935), 213; D. Behrend, *Attische Pachturkunden. Ein Beitrag zur Beschreibung der μίσθωσις nach der griechischen Inschriften* (Munich, 1970), 100; and in particular M. B. Walbank, 'Leases of public land', in *Agora XIX* (Princeton, 1991), 156, who notes: 'Documents issued at about this time by political bodies include a decree of the trittys of Epakreis ... the fragmentary nature of the document makes restoration impossible.'

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2498.13–15, *τὴν μίσθω[σιν] καταθήσουσι τῇμ μὲν ἡμίσ|εαν ἐν τῷ Ἐκατομβαιῶνι, τὴν δὲ ἡμίσεαν ἐν τῷ Ποσιδε|ῶνι*.

<sup>6</sup> *IRhannous* 179.16–18, *ἐξεῖναι Ζήνωνι ∩ Αντιοχεί [λιτουρ] | γείν τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς ἐν Ῥαμνοῦν[ι καθάπερ ἀ]πὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ [μ]ηδ[ενός] κωλυ[ομένωι]*, is both very late (83/2 B.C.) and not an exact parallel. For clauses protecting the lessees' rights see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2492.29–31, *ἐὰν δέ τις εἴπει ἢ ἐπιψηφίσει παρὰ τὰςδε τὰς συνθήκας, πρὶν τὰ ἔτη ἐξελεθεῖν τὰ τεττάρκοντα, εἴν | αι ὑπόδικον τοῖς μισθωταῖς τῆς βλάβης*, and *SEG XXXVII* 77.24–8,



**Lines 2–4:** The clause in line 2 is formulaic, demands a subjunctive and something along the lines of ὅπως δ' [ἂν εἰδῶσιν Ἐπακρεῖς τὰ ἐαυτῶν χρήματα] could be envisaged,<sup>7</sup> but any restoration should take line 3 into account. The word ἀργύριον should probably be taken together with the preceding clause, a comma should be inserted thereafter, and another object should be sought for the infinitive στήσαι. The subject of στήσαι should be the adjacent masculine accusative. One possibility is to restore τὸς ἐ[πιμελητάς], this ubiquitous office (τὸς Ἐ[πακρέας] is a less likely restoration). We still lack the object of the infinitive. In Attic inscriptions what officials are ordered to στήσαι is almost without exception a stele. The problem is how to connect such a promulgation with the succeeding wording. The expression [κ]ατατιθέντας τὸ ἀργύριον, 'those paying down the money', is reminiscent of payment formulae found in inscribed leases where they refer to lessees.<sup>8</sup> In the lease document of the deme Teithras one reads: στήλην δὲ στήσαι ἐν τῷ Κορε[ίῳ καὶ ἀναγράψαι τοὺς μεμισθωμένους τὰ χωρία κατάπαξ καὶ [τὰς] μισ[θ]ώσεις ὅπου εἰσκασι[οι μ]ε[μ]ίσ[θ]ω[ν]ται.<sup>9</sup> To the best of my knowledge, this is the closest parallel to our text one can find. In this light a plausible and epigraphically tenable restoration of lines 2–4 could be: ὅπως δ' [ἂν καὶ εἰδῶσιν Ἐπακρεῖς ἀπαν|τες τὸ ἐαυτῶν ἀργ]ύριον, στήσαι τὸς ἐ[πιμελητάς] στήλην ἐμ πόλει καὶ | ἀναγράψειν τὸς κ]ατατιθέντας τὸ ἀργύριον.<sup>10</sup> Note that in contrast to the finite act of setting up a stele the recording of the lessees appears to be envisaged as an ongoing procedure, to judge from the present participle [κ]ατατιθέντας, something that necessitates the restoration of the present infinitive [ἀναγρά|φειν]. The supplement [ἐμ πόλει], that is 'on the Acropolis', is based on the find-spot of the inscription, for which see the penultimate paragraph of this article.

**Lines 5–7:** I can see no satisfactory way of restoring line 5. Thus, [ἐ]κάστος αὐτῶν could be a masculine accusative plural referring to [τὸς κ]ατατιθέντας τὸ ἀργύριον, i.e. the lessees, but no possible phrasing springs to mind, so it should be better transcribed as [ἐ]κάστος αὐτῶν, that is a nominative singular functioning as the subject of a now missing relative clause like the one we encountered in the decree of Teithras above. The latter could again be used to illuminate the meaning of our text. In all likelihood, the officials of the Epakreis were asked to inscribe on a stele the names of the lessees, the money paid by them as well as the property that each of them rented (the χωρίον of line 5, whether in the genitive or in the accusative).<sup>11</sup> In this light, the latter could be seen as the antecedent of the relative clause introduced by ἐφ' ὅτο. However, a slightly more tempting solution is to see here a chronological

ἐπειδὴ δ' ἀναλάβη | Σωκλῆς τὴν ἐργασίαν, [μηκέτι Ἀθηναίων]|ἐξέστω μηδεν[ὶ μ]ήτε ἐ[πείν μήτε ἐπιψη]|φίσαι ὥς δεῖ ἀφ[ε]λέσθαι | Σωκλεῖ τὴν ἐργ[α]σίαν ἢ διακωλύσαι [ἐργαζόμενον], where the pronominal adjective μηδεὶς does appear, although the context of the lease is not agricultural.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1165.17–18, ὅπως ἂν [Ἐρεχ]θεῖ|δαι εἰδῶ[σιν ἅπ]αντες τὰ ἐαυτῶν κτήματα; *SEG* XXIV 151.2–4, ὅπως ἂν σὰ ἡι τοῖς δημόταις τὰ κοινὰ καὶ εἰδῶσι Τειθράσιοι τὰ ὑπάρχ[ο]ντα καὶ τὰ προσιόντα.

<sup>8</sup> *IRhamnous* 180.13–14, τὴμ μίσθωσιν καταθήσε[ι]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2498.13, τὴν μίσθω[σιν] καταθήσουσι.

<sup>9</sup> *SEG* XXIV 151.21–4 (the text I provide here is slightly improved after autopsy of the stone).

<sup>10</sup> For a similar structure see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1184.18–22, ὅπως δ' ἂν γ[ι]γ[ν]ηται ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Χολαργέων κατὰ τὰ γράμματα εἰσστόν ἀπαντα χρόνον, στήσαι στήλην καὶ ἀν[α]γράψαι τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα.

<sup>11</sup> If τὸ χωρίον is not the direct object of ἀναγράφειν in the accusative, then it might be a partitive genitive (for example, τὸ χωρίον τὴν μίσθωσιν); cf. Köhler in *IG* II 1053.



designation of the archonship in which the transactions in question would have taken place restoring [τὸν ἄρχοντα] ἐφ' ὅτο. At any rate, the relative clause's verb, plausibly restored as λα[μβάνουσιν] (unlike most previous editors I prefer a present, not an aorist, subjunctive in compliance with the present participle [κ]ατατιθέντας),<sup>12</sup> could have the masculine noun ending in -χοι (line 7) as its subject. Köhler tentatively suggested [τριττύα]ροι, but, given the participation of demes like Plotheia and Semachidai in the religious association of Epakreis, [δήμαρ]ροι is equally plausible, if not better.<sup>13</sup> In this respect, the demarchs would have acted as collectors of rentals due to the trittys. Such a role for demarchs with regard to their own demes' leased property is known from both epigraphic and literary sources.<sup>14</sup> Given the experience that demarchs would have acquired as a result, it seems conceivable that they would have been the demes' financial representatives in the cultic association of Epakreis.<sup>15</sup> The penultimate line of the document makes a mention of τὰ ἐπιδέκατα. The term ἐπιδέκατον usually designates the one-tenth of fines or confiscated properties set aside for gods—in Athens mainly for Athena—as a tithe, but nothing in our text suggests penalties of any kind.<sup>16</sup> As an adjective, often substantivized, ἐπιδέκατον can also have the meaning of 'one-tenth', received as interest-rate.<sup>17</sup> However, this would presuppose loans and there are no grounds for envisaging lending activities in our text. Finally, ἐπιδέκατον can equal the simple δέκατον, merely a tenth fraction.<sup>18</sup> Probably the lessees were obliged to pay in advance 10 per cent of the rent or

<sup>12</sup> Let it be noted here that Ross in his 1846 *editio princeps* favoured a present subjunctive as well.

<sup>13</sup> Of course this restoration is subject to my interpretation of the text as a document of the religious group Epakreis, for which see below. The supplement [δήμαρ]ροι was first suggested by U. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristoteles und Athen II* (Berlin, 1893), 154, but his suggestion has passed unnoticed. The restoration [τριττύα]ροι encounters the further difficulty of being in the plural, for why should a single group have had more than one archon? Note, however, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1241 where two φρατρίαροι are acting on behalf of the Dyaleis; cf. S. D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica*<sup>2</sup> (Ann Arbor, 1998), 109.

<sup>14</sup> See D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica. 508/7–ca. 250 B.C.* (Princeton, 1986), 125–7.

<sup>15</sup> This interpretation receives further corroboration from the famous decree of the deme Plotheia IG I<sup>3</sup> 258.28–33, καὶ ἐς τὰλλα ἱερά, ὅποι ἂν δέ[ημι] | Πλωθέας ἅπαντας τελέν ἄργυρο[ν] ἐς | ἱερά, ἢ ἐς Πλωθέας ἢ ἐς Ἐπακρέα[ς] ἢ ἐς | Ἀθηναίους, ἐκ τοῦ κοινὸ τοῦ ἀρχο[ν]τας, | οἱ δ' ἂν ἄρχωσι τὸ ἀργυρίο τὸ ἐς τῇ[ν] ἀτ[έ]λειαν, τελέν ὑπὲρ τῶν δημοσίων, where the Plotheian *archontes* in charge of the so-called 'immunity fund' are instructed to contribute amongst other things to the sacrifices of the Epakreis. But of course these *archontes* are most probably the—presumably annual—demarchs of Plotheia. For another famous instance of fifth-century B.C. demarchs being called *archontes* see *IRhamnous* 182, lines 15–16; 20–1; 27–8.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. IG I<sup>3</sup> 21.30, δραχμὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιδεκάτο[ν]; IG I<sup>3</sup> 40.34–6, καὶ | τὸ Διὸς τὸ Ὀλυμπίῳ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον ἱερὸν ἔστο τὸν χρεμάτων; Andoc. 1.96, καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ δημόσια ἔστω, καὶ τῆς θεοῦ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον; Dem. 43.71, ὀφείλειν ἑκάτον δραχμὰς τῷ δημοσίῳ τῆς ἐλάας ἐκάστης, τὸ δὲ ἐπιδέκατον τούτου τῆς θεοῦ εἶναι; *ICos* 145 (with *BE* [1995], no. 448) lines 80–2: τὰ πίπτοντα ἀπὸ μνηρὸς Βαδρομίῳ τοῦ ἐπὶ Με[νοι]οῦ[ν] [ἐξ] ἀστυνόμων καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀγορανόμων χώρι τῶν | — ὅρκων, παραβολίων καὶ ἐπιδεκάτων.

<sup>17</sup> ἐπιδέκατον as interest rate: IG I<sup>3</sup> 402 (= *ML* 62) line 12, ἐδάνεισαν ΠΤΤΤΤΤΔΔ : ἐπιδεκάτοις τόκοις πέντε ἔτη; *IOropos* 303.12–15, τοὺς δὲ | δανείσαντας τῇ πόλει εἰς τὸν τειχισμόν | μέχρι ταλάντου καὶ τοῦ πλέονος τόκων | τῶν ἐπιδεκάτων (cf. L. Migeotte, *L' emprunt public dans les cités Grecques* [Paris, 1984], 40); Arist. *Rh.* 1411a.17–18, ἐκείνον μὲν γὰρ ἐπιτρίτῳ τόκων πονηρεῦσθαι, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπιδεκάτων; Arist. [*Oec.*] 1346b.32, ἐτέλουν αὐτοῖς τόκους ἐπιδεκάτους, τοῖς δ' ὠνούμενοις τι ἔταξαν χωρὶς τῆς τιμῆς διδόναι τὸ ἐπιδέκατον (cf. B. A. Van Groningen, *Aristotele: le second livre de l' Économique* [Leiden, 1933], 64).

<sup>18</sup> Harp. s.v. ἐπιδέκατον: τὸ δέκατον Ἰσαῖος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἑλπαγόρου.



one-tenth on top of that.<sup>19</sup> Whether that was a deposit or a tax and where exactly it had to be paid cannot be inferred.<sup>20</sup> In order to keep roughly on a par with the line length suggested above I would tentatively restore lines 6–7 as follows: [καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντ]α ἐφ’ ὅτο ἂν τὸ ἀργύριον λα[μβάνωσιν οἱ αἰεὶ δημαρχόντες δῆμαρ]χοι, τεθηκότας τὰ ἐπιδέκ[ατα. vac. ?].<sup>21</sup>

No internal information is offered by the text such as would enable us to date the inscription. The editor of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> simply noted *ante med s. IV a.* This chronology is apparently based on the lettering. Indeed, *sigma* has its upper and bottom strokes slanting. The right and left strokes of *mu* are also slanting. The central horizontal of *epsilon* is shorter than the upper and bottom ones. The same date is confirmed by the rare interpunct found in line 2.<sup>22</sup> From a grammatical point of view an interesting feature is the persistent use of *O* instead of the diphthong *OY* throughout the text, and more precisely, in the article *τός*, the relative pronoun *ὅτο* and the word *Μονιχιῶνι*.<sup>23</sup> The last of these especially, with its inherited long diphthong being represented by an *omicron*, would pinpoint an early date. Taken together these traits suggest a higher rather than a lower chronology within the first half of the fourth century B.C.: c. 375 B.C. looks like a reasonable *terminus ante quem*.

It goes without saying that the restorations above are merely offered *exempli gratia* and cannot be used as a guide to determine the full length of the missing text, since this is dependent on the exact phrasing which cannot be established.<sup>24</sup> I have decided to restrict my various supplements to the line-by-line commentary and not to incorporate them in the main epigraphical text, so as to let the reader follow my interpretation of the document without imposing it upon him or her. In any case, although *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 is a financial document, it is not a lease of a particular landholding to a specific individual. The generic terms in which the financial transactions are phrased and the anonymity of the lessees suggest an overall handling of the trittys’ landed property. In this sense it stands close to texts like *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2498, a lease of various *temene* in the Piraeus. Strictly speaking, it could be classified as a decree, especially in view of the *ὅπως δ’* [ἄν] final clause.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>19</sup> I understand the subject of the perfect participle *τεθηκότας* to be [τός κ]ατατιθέντας of line 4.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the *δεκάτη* offered from the annual produce of the *temenos* founded by Xenophon near Olympia (Xen. *An.* 5.3.13, with Behrend [n. 4], 61–2), and the *ἐπιδέκατον* from land-sales subsidizing the Theoxenia in Karthaia (*IG* XII (5) 544 B1, lines 2–3, with R. Osborne, ‘Land use and settlement in Hellenistic Keos: the epigraphic evidence’, in J. F. Cherry, J. L. Davis and E. Mantzourani [edd.], *Landscape Archaeology as Long-Term History: Northern Keos in the Cycladic Islands from Earliest Settlement until Modern Times* [Los Angeles, 1991], 320–1).

<sup>21</sup> For the restoration cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 80.13–14: οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις | [οἱ αἰεὶ πρυτ]ανεύοντες προσαγόντων; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1187.22–3: νέμειν δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ μερίδα ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν καθάπερ Ἐλευσινίοις τὸν δῆμαρχον | τὸν αἰεὶ δημαρχοῦντα. Alternatively one could supplement ἐφ’ ὅτο ἂν τὸ ἀργύριον λα[μβάνωσιν οἱ ἂν ὧσιν] ἐκάστοτε δῆμαρ]χοι, for which cf. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 110.19–20: καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα τὸν ἐν Σκιθάθωι ὃς ἂν ᾗ ἐκάστοτε.

<sup>22</sup> All the relevant examples have been conveniently collected by L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions: Volume 1. Phonology* (Berlin, 1980), 75; most date to the first quarter of the fourth century B.C. and none after c. 350 B.C.

<sup>23</sup> And possibly, but not certainly, τὸ χω[ρίο] in line 5 (cf. n. 11 above). See in general Threatte (n. 22), 238–57, 350–2; id., *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions: Volume 2. Morphology* (Berlin, 1996), 336.

<sup>24</sup> Self-evidently the whole effort is further impeded by the absence of a *stoichedon* pattern.

<sup>25</sup> So already Pittakes in *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική* (1853).



## II. THE IDENTITY OF THE TRITTYS OF THE EPAKREIS

IG II<sup>2</sup> 2490 has long been considered as a leasing document of the Epakreis, or, to be more precise, of a Cleisthenic trittys that bore this name, by virtue of the concluding words of the inscription (Ἐπακρέων τριττύ[ς]).<sup>26</sup> However, we know that an enigmatic religious association called Epakreis was also active during the fifth and fourth centuries.<sup>27</sup> That this cultic group and the homonymous Cleisthenic trittys were not one and the same unit, even though some loose connection between them might have existed, has been suggested on the grounds that the Cleisthenic trittyes had no recognized religious functions, and this, in principle, seems correct. Nevertheless, it has not been noticed that the trittyes had no financial functions either, since their first and foremost *raison d'être* was the military organization of the citizens within the framework of the tribal system.<sup>28</sup> In the light of this it seems implausible that a Cleisthenic trittys would have been owner of landed property or that it would have been involved in financial transactions of the kind implied in IG II<sup>2</sup> 2490 (see commentary above). On the contrary, the land-leasing mechanism underlying our document is well attested for religious associations such as *orgeones* or *gene*, the most famous example being the sacrificial calendar of the Salaminioi.<sup>29</sup> The aim of such leases was to raise money for cultic activity. The most likely inference is that the Ἐπακρέων τριττύς of the inscription under consideration was the religious association known from other sources rather than the Cleisthenic tribal sub-unit.

This should hardly come as a surprise. That the old pre-Cleisthenic trittyes as well as the four old Ionian tribes kept operating on the sacred level even after their alleged abolition that resulted from the reforms of 508/7 is known from the official Athenian *fasti*. There, the τριττύς Λευκοταϊνίων, along with the Ionian tribe G(e)leontis, are attested as receiving from the state a sacrificial sheep on the fifteenth of Hekatombaion.<sup>30</sup> The adduced *testimonium* is important because it demonstrates that

<sup>26</sup> Thus Kirchner in IG ('De Ἐπακρέων trittye Aegeidis tribus, quae videlicet erat τῆς Μεσογείου etc.'): C. W. J. Eliot, *The Coastal Demes of Attica: A Study of the Policy of Kleisthenes*, Phoenix suppl. 5 (1962), 148; D. M. Lewis, 'Cleisthenes and Attica', *Historia* 12 (1963), 27; Traill (n. 3), 107; N. F. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study* (Philadelphia, 1987), 60–1; Walbank (n. 4), 156; R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford, 1996), 103, n. 4. The only exception has been P. Siewert, *Die Trittyen Attikas und die Heeresreform des Kleisthenes* (Munich, 1982), 15, n. 67, who identified, hesitatingly and without elaborating, the Ἐπακρέων τριττύς as a pre-Cleisthenic trittys. His suggestion, hidden in a footnote, has passed almost unnoticed (except for G. R. Stanton, 'The Trittyes of Kleisthenes', *Chiron* 24 [1994], 203, n. 156) and, ironically, was based on a misinterpretation of W. E. Thompson, 'Kleisthenes and Aigeis', *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969), 137–52, who had not made such an identification himself!

<sup>27</sup> IG I<sup>3</sup> 258 (see n. 15 above); SEG XXXII 144. See Thompson (n. 26), 150–2; Parker (n. 26), 330.

<sup>28</sup> Only much later, in the Hellenistic period, are τριττύαρχοι attested as disbursing money for the erection of decrees or statues (e.g. IG II<sup>2</sup> 641.29–32, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀνταγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τὸν ἑξαεστήν καὶ τοὺς τριττυάρχους ὁ ΔΔ ὁ δραχμάς; also IG II<sup>2</sup> 646.44–7; IG II<sup>2</sup> 648.5–6). However, this function looks like a late invention and, in any case, does not affect my point, since it does not relate to the trittyes as such. For the organizational importance of the trittyes with regard to the navy and the infantry see Siewert (n. 26), 141–5.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. the lease of the *orgeones* of Egretes (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2499) and that of the *orgeones* of Hypodektes (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2501); *genos* Salaminioi: P. J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 B.C.* (Oxford, 2003), no. 37.

<sup>30</sup> See the text edited by S. D. Lambert, 'The sacrificial calendar of Athens', *BSA* 97 (2002), 353–99, F3.31–7, Ἐκατομβαιῶνος | πέμπτη ἐπὶ δέκα | ἐκ τῶν φυλοβασιλικῶν | Γλεόντων φυλῇ | Λευκοταϊνίων | τριττύϊ οἶν | λειπογνώμονα; cf. Siewert (n. 26), 1 with n. 4; Parker (n. 26), 112–13.



the term *trittys* could be used in its older sense even in the classical period, when, strictly speaking, the word denoted a group of demes that roughly constituted one-third of a given tribe.<sup>31</sup> Clearly, this terminological inconsistency should account for the confusion of modern scholars who have almost unquestioningly taken the *Ἐπακρέων τριττύς* of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 as referring to the Cleisthenic tribal sub-unit. Instead, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 should be interpreted as a document issued by the religious association *Ἐπακρέων τριττύς* that aimed at raising revenues for whatever religious activities the group was engaged in. It is self-evident that this reinterpretation of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 allows us to classify precisely the cult-group Epakreis: they were not just a local cult association, they were one of the surviving old, pre-Cleisthenic *trittyes*.

Yet, if my identification of the *Ἐπακρέων τριττύς* of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 is sound, there are some unexpected implications for our knowledge of Athenian political organization. As it happens, there is now no firm proof that a Cleisthenic *trittys* called Epakreis ever existed. In fact, it was a series of erroneous assumptions and readings of the epigraphic and literary sources that misled historians into believing that a *trittys* called Epakreis did exist in classical Athens and made them try to place this *trittys* in its appropriate tribe.<sup>32</sup> However, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1128 has now been dissociated from the alleged *trittys* Epakreis.<sup>33</sup> Similarly, another badly preserved boundary stone, where the name Epakreis was heavily restored, has now been edited without any mention of that name; but, of course, the restoration had been made by virtue of the supposed existence of a Cleisthenic *trittys* called Epakreis.<sup>34</sup> Cleisthenic *trittyes* are one of the least attested institutions of ancient Athens and we are far from knowing all thirty names of them.<sup>35</sup> Therefore, one cannot entirely dismiss the possibility that the pre-Cleisthenic *trittys* Epakreis did, after all, lend its name to a newly created Cleisthenic *trittys*, even to the extent that the two groups might have partly overlapped, but this can only be a speculation. It is worth noting, however, that there is no evidence that the other attested pre-Cleisthenic *trittys*, that of the Leukotainioi, ever gave its name to a Cleisthenic one. In sum, unless some future epigraphic find reveals otherwise, we must for the time being consider the Cleisthenic *trittys* Epakreis as a modern scholarly invention and exclude it from any discussion regarding Athenian tribal substructure.

The study of the Epakreis can be pursued further. There was never any doubt that the deme Plotheia was member of the cultic association *Ἐπακρεῖς*, now *Ἐπακρέων τριττύς*.<sup>36</sup> The deme's location south of the modern village Stamata, in north-eastern Attica, is certain owing to epigraphic finds.<sup>37</sup> On the basis of a fragment of

<sup>31</sup> *Λευκοταῖνιοι* and the old *trittyes*: W. S. Ferguson, 'The Athenian law code and the old Attic *trittyes*', in *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps* (Princeton, 1936), 151–8; Lambert (n. 13), 256–9 (but see the penultimate paragraph of this article).

<sup>32</sup> See, for instance, Lewis (n. 26), 27 with n. 53; J. S. Traill, 'Diakris, the inland *trittys* of Leontis', *Hesperia* 47 (1978), 94–6; Traill (n. 3), 105–6; M. H. Hansen, 'Asty, Mesogeios and Paralia: in defence of Arist. ATH. POL. 21.4', *C&M* 41 (1990), 52.

<sup>33</sup> Previously the name Epakreis appeared in *IG* I suppl. p. 121, 517b by virtue of a wrong reading made by Dittenberger. The restoration was, interestingly, based on *IG* II 1053, the predecessor of our inscription. The error was repeated in *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 898 and was finally eliminated in *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1128.

<sup>34</sup> The wrongly restored text is to be found in Traill (n. 3), 103–6, no. 14 (*SEG* XXXVI 37). But see now *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1130.

<sup>35</sup> Lewis (n. 26), 27–30. The best monograph on the Cleisthenic *trittyes* is still that by Siewert (n. 26), despite the criticism of D. M. Lewis, *Gnomon* 55 (1983), 431–6.

<sup>36</sup> See n. 15 above.

<sup>37</sup> J. S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica: A Study of the Demes, Trittyes, and Phylai, and their Representation in the Athenian Council*, *Hesperia* suppl. 14 (1975), 41.



Philochorus *apud* Stephanus Byzantius, some historians have hesitatingly suggested that the deme Semachidai was also a participant in the same group.<sup>38</sup> This has now to be accepted as unquestionably true. Scholarly reticence in endorsing this identification derived partly from the aforementioned confusion about the alleged Cleisthenic trittys and partly from the fact that Philochorus mentioned an *Ἐπακρία*, rather than the *Ἐπακρεῖς* (or the *Ἐπακρέων τριττύς*).<sup>39</sup> This should never have been a problem, for, in similar fashion, the pre-Cleisthenic cultic association *Τετραπολεῖς* could also designate themselves by the geographical term *Τετράπολις*.<sup>40</sup> Incidentally, the term *Ἐπακρία* occurs in another passage of Philochorus cited by Strabo.<sup>41</sup> According to that, the mythological king Cecrops was the first to settle the population of Attica in twelve poleis, i.e. the following . . . eleven: *Κεκροπία, Τετράπολις, Ἐπακρία, Δεκέλεια, Ἐλευσίς, Ἀφιδνα, Θόρικος, Βραυρών, Κύθηρος, Σφηττός, Κηφισιά*. Jacoby following Loeper supplemented <*Τετράκωμοι*> after *Τετράπολις* and his suggestion has generally been endorsed.<sup>42</sup> The supplement seemed to create no problems considering the order of the cited poleis, since no geographical pattern could be recognized.<sup>43</sup> This is not entirely true. Leaving Jacoby's supplement aside for the moment, we can identify at least two clusters of adjacent Cecropian poleis, namely *Τετράπολις, Ἐπακρία, Δεκέλεια* in north-eastern Attica, and *Θόρικος, Βραυρών, Κύθηρος, Σφηττός* in the south-east/east. This does not necessarily prove Jacoby wrong. The assumed palaeographical error could have occurred even if the word *Τετράκωμοι* preceded, rather than followed, the word *Τετράπολις*.<sup>44</sup>

Having established that the cultic association *Ἐπακρεῖς/Ἐπακρέων τριττύς* had its centre in north-eastern Attica, we can resume our investigation of the group's composition. Lexicographical lore implies that Cecrops' *Ἐπακρία* consisted of three poleis. However, the relevant accounts are clearly very confused and corrupt, for they imply that it was three of the aforementioned twelve poleis that composed the area called *Ἐπακρία*, whereas the latter stands for just one of them in Philochorus.<sup>45</sup> There are, however, two significant reasons for retaining the number *three*. First, whereas in the case of the two Tetrapoleis the figure *four* could easily have been invented by means of the obvious etymology, there is nothing intrinsic in the name

<sup>38</sup> *FGrH* 328 F206; Steph. Byz. s.v. *Σημαχίδαι* δῆμος Ἀττικῆς ἀπὸ Σημάχου, ὡι καὶ ταῖς θυγατράσιν ἐπεξενώθη Διόνυσος, ἀφ' ὧν αἱ ἱέρειαι αὐτοῦ. ἔστι δὲ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος φυλῆς. Φιλόχορος δὲ τῆς Ἐπακρίας φησὶ τὸν δῆμον.

<sup>39</sup> E.g. R. Löper, 'Die Trittyen und demen Attikas', *MDAI (A)* 17 (1892), 358; Thompson (n. 26), 151–2 (who felt he had to choose between a Cleisthenic unit and an archaic religious association without identifying the latter as a pre-Cleisthenic trittys). More recently S. C. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of Gods: Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion* (Oxford, 2004), 229, assigned Semachidai to the Epakreis, but only after diffidently identifying the latter as a phratry.

<sup>40</sup> Parker (n. 26), 331–2.

<sup>41</sup> *FGrH* 328 F94 = Strabo 9.1.20.

<sup>42</sup> Jacoby in *FGrH* 328 F94 following Löper (n. 39).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. R. J. Hopper, '“Plain”, “shore” and “hill” in early Athens', *BSA* 56 (1961), 217.

<sup>44</sup> This order would neatly comply with Phot. *Lexicon*. s.v. *Ἐπακρία* ὄνομα χώρας πλησίον *Τετραπόλεως* κειμένης.

<sup>45</sup> *Et. Gen.* p. 118; *Etym. Magn.* p. 352, 53 (Suda s.v. *Ἐπακτρία χώρα*) *Ἐπακρία χώρα Ἀθηναίους πάλαι κομῆδὸν οἰκούντας πρῶτος Κέκροψ συναγαγὼν κατώικισεν εἰς πόλεις (φυλὰς) δυοκαίδεκα, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἡπολιτῶν οἰκονομίαντ' ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ Κεκροπίαν προσηγόρευσεν. δύο δὲ Τετραπόλεις ἐκάλεσεν ἐκ τεσσάρων πόλεων ἐκατέραν μοῖραν καταστήσας, τρεῖς δὲ τὰς λοιπὰς Ἐπακρίας ὠνόμασε, καὶ ἡ προσεχὴς χώρα ταύταις ταῖς τρισὶν ὁμωνύμως Ἐπακρία ἐκαλεῖτο. See Jacoby's commentary in *FGrH*, IIIb (Suppl.) vol. 1: Text (Leiden, 1954), 392–3, and vol. 2: Notes (Leiden, 1954), 289.*



Epakria to suggest the figure *three*, and, presumably, the source of the entries was following a genuine tradition.<sup>46</sup> Second, it has long been recognized that the term *trittys* initially designated a tripartite unit and only later came to acquire the meaning 'a third of'.<sup>47</sup> It is, therefore, a reasonable guess that the cultic association 'Επακρεῖς/Ἐπακρέων τριττύς consisted of three members.<sup>48</sup> But given that Plotheia and Semachidai were the first two, which was the third participant deme? There are three serious candidates. The Plotheians participated in the festival of Anakia and it is tempting to see the deme of Anakaia as the missing member of the Epakreis, but, unfortunately, the deme's location is unknown and the connection cannot be otherwise sustained.<sup>49</sup> Then there is Ikarion, which definitely satisfies the geographical criterion.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, Ikarion is linked to Semachidai via the mythological tradition about Dionysus and his reception in Attica.<sup>51</sup> The problem is that none of our sources indicates Dionysiac cult practised by the Epakreis.<sup>52</sup> The final candidate deme is Hekale, the centre of a cultic association where the neighbouring demes used to gather to honour Hekaleian Zeus.<sup>53</sup> Neither the exact name of the association nor those of the participating demes have survived, but one wonders whether it is the Epakreis who underlie this tradition.<sup>54</sup> Hekale was located in north-eastern Attica, near Plotheia. It has traditionally been placed in Mygdaleza and, indeed, the most recent document of the Epakreis was discovered in a Byzantine church in that region, but owing to lack of firm evidence the topographical question has to remain open.<sup>55</sup>

Two further points are worth commenting upon. First, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 was discovered on the Acropolis and, despite the notorious tendency of stones to move around, it is hard to see how an inscription from north-eastern Attica would have found its way to Athens. Apparently the inscription was set up on the Acropolis or somewhere nearby.<sup>56</sup> The reason must have been that the Epakreis performed some religious

<sup>46</sup> Jacoby (n. 45) accepted that the source of the lexicographer on that point might have followed a source enumerating the component parts of the Tetrapolis and the Tetrakomoi and this could well have applied to the Epakria too. I believe that his analysis is unnecessarily complicated and has to be disallowed.

<sup>47</sup> *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v. *τριττύς*; cf. Lambert (n. 13), 256, n. 50 with the earlier bibliography.

<sup>48</sup> So already Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (n. 13), 154 with n. 23.

<sup>49</sup> In fact, the deme Anakaia has been placed in Mygdaleza by virtue of its conjectured connection to Plotheia and the Epakreis, but this begs the question; see for this circular argument Traill (n. 3), 137. Plotheians and Anakia: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 258.6, with Humphreys (n. 39), 152–3, and R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford, 2005), 457.

<sup>50</sup> For the archaeology of Ikarion (located in modern Dionysos) see W. R. Biers and T. D. Boyd, 'Ikarion in Attica: 1888–1981', *Hesperia* 51 (1982), 1–18.

<sup>51</sup> Steph. Byz. s.v. *Σημαχίδα* (see n. 35 above); cf. Guarducci (n. 4), 212, Hopper (n. 43), 218, and Humphreys (n. 39), 229, whose identification of the Epakreis as a phratry I obviously reject.

<sup>52</sup> Unless Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (n. 13) was right to restore *ἐς Διονύσια* in *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 258.38, but even then the Dionysiac connection might refer exclusively to the Plotheians and not to the Epakreis; cf. Guarducci (n. 4), 214–15.

<sup>53</sup> Parker (n. 26), 111.

<sup>54</sup> R. Baladié, *Strabon: Géographie*, tome 6 (Paris, 1996), 253, now takes this identification for a proven fact, but that is far from true; S. D. Lambert, *Rationes Centesimarum: Sales of Public Land in Lykourgan Athens* (Amsterdam, 1997), 220, n. 15, simply raises the possibility.

<sup>55</sup> E. Tsophopoulou Gkine, 'Παλαιοχριστιανική βασιλική στή θέση «Μυγδαλέζα» Ἀττικής', *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.* (1980) [1982], 94–5. Traill (n. 37), 46, located Hekale at Mygdaleza, but idem (n. 3), 131, moved it to Koukounari, but only after he identified Mygdaleza as the site of Anakaia for which see n. 49 above.

<sup>56</sup> See my restoration [*ἐμ πόλει*] in lines 2–4 of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 in the Commentary above; for the importance of the Acropolis as a place where inscribed documents were displayed see P. Liddel, 'The places of publication of Athenian state decrees from the fifth century BC to the third century AD', *ZPE* 143 (2003), 79–81.



function within the framework of the polis. Unfortunately little is known about their communal rites, apart from their celebration of the relatively obscure Apollonia.<sup>57</sup> However, it is worth noting that this festival was probably non-annual (penteteric),<sup>58</sup> as was the trieteric sacrifice offered by the trittys of the Leukotainioi.<sup>59</sup> With the latter I come to my second point. Back in the 1930s the publication of the fragment of the Athenian *fasti* that referred to the Leukotainioi shook various scholarly certainties. The trittys' name, the 'White-Ribboned' or 'White-Fillet Men', appeared to contradict an antiquarian tradition that went back to the Atthidographers and according to which the old trittyes had some form of local basis.<sup>60</sup> On the contrary, Ferguson argued and almost every single historian concurred, old trittyes were not local units and were probably named after whatever religious or military functions they performed.<sup>61</sup> In that respect my identification of the Epakreis as one of the pre-Cleisthenic trittyes appears to reinstate early scholarly theories about the territoriality of these associations given the obvious geographical connotations of the name Epakreis (roughly 'the Hill-Dwellers'). Moreover, it entitles us to revisit and question Ferguson's etymological interpretation of the term *Λευκοταίνιοι*. As it happens, the word *ταυρία*, far from denoting exclusively a ribbon, has also the meaning of 'a strip or tongue of land'.<sup>62</sup> It surely makes much more sense to understand the Leukotainioi as 'the Dwellers of the Strip of White Land',<sup>63</sup> and render back to them their long overdue territoriality.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Parker (n. 49), 461.

<sup>58</sup> Guarducci (n. 4), 211; R. Parker, 'Festivals of the Attic demes', in T. Linders and G. Nordquist (edd.), *Gifts to the Gods*, Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985 (Uppsala, 1987), 140; id. (n. 26), 330 (but read 'penteteric' for 'trieteric').

<sup>59</sup> Ferguson (n. 31), 154; Lambert (n. 30), 376. As a matter of fact, it is not impossible that IG II<sup>2</sup> 2490 was generated by the new situation that arose from Nicomachus' revision of the Athenian sacrificial calendar (for which see Parker [n. 26], 43–5, 218–20, and S. C. Todd, 'Lysias against Nikomakhos', in L. Foxhall and A. D. E. Lewis (edd.), *Greek Law in its Political Setting: Justification not Justice* [Oxford, 1996], 101–31); the lettering certainly does not exclude such a connection.

<sup>60</sup> Territoriality of old trittyes: G. Gilbert, *The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens* (London 1895), 105; G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* (Munich 1926<sup>3</sup>), 2.770; *RE* 2nd ser. VII.A (1939), s.v. Trittyes, 332–5 (H. Hommel). [Arist.], *Ath. Pol.* 8.3, 21.2–3, fr.3 (Kenyon) certainly thought that the old trittyes had some form of local basis.

<sup>61</sup> Ferguson (n. 31), 151–3; F. R. Wüst, 'Zu den *πρυτάνεις* τῶν ναυκράρων und zu den alten attischen Trittyen', *Historia* 6 (1957), 188; P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenian Politeia* (Oxford, 1993), 68; Parker (n. 26), 112–13 (agnostic about the exact undertones of the name 'the White-Fillet Men'); Lambert (n. 13), 256–7 (name alluding to military functions).

<sup>62</sup> *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v. *ταυρία* II (see also P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots, avec un Supplément* [Paris, 1999], s.v. *ταυρία*); cf. the cognate adjective *ὑποταίνιος* (defined as 'forming a long narrow strip of land' in *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v.).

<sup>63</sup> Or the 'Whitelanders' as opposed to the 'Highlanders' (i.e. the Epakreis).

<sup>64</sup> Both *ταυρία* and *ὑποταίνιος* very often designated areas near water (mainly by the sea). The 'Strip of White Land' might then have been a headland (perhaps a sandy cape?). There is a famous case of another archaic association, the *genos/Naucrary* Kolieis (see Parker [n. 26], 304–5), that derived its name from a promontory (arguably the group's territorial basis), although Lambert (n. 54), 192–3 now advocates caution regarding the connection of the Kolieis with the Cape Kolias. But there is a further interesting approach to the name Leukotainioi, which was brought to my attention by Robert Parker: French structuralists have pointed out the significance of white clay as a ritualistic disguise that emphasizes marginality (Parker [n. 49], 216 with n. 108 broaches the issue, providing the relevant modern bibliography). Could it be then that the Leukotainioi were such a 'marginal' religious group and that clay was the white element of their strip of land? The patently 'marginal' connotations of the name Epakreis would appear to tally well with this interpretation.



To recapitulate, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 is a financial document of the tripartite pre-Cleisthenic trittys of the Epakreis, and not of a homonymous Cleisthenic association. Such an association never existed. The trittys of the Epakreis is none other than the Epakria of Philochorus' fragments and the Epakreis of the fifth-century Plotheian decree *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 258. Both this document and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2490 attest to the Epakreis and/or their constituent parts using a combination of income-generating lending and rentals to subsidize their manifold cultic activity. The paradigm of the Leukotainioi and common logic suggest that the Epakreis would have featured at some point in the official Athenian sacrificial calendar, just as the paradigm of the Epakreis, common logic, and cautious etymology suggest that the Leukotainioi (and possibly all pre-Cleisthenic trittyes) had a territorial character. But already in the early fourth century B.C. both groups—and no doubt the other old trittyes—had become parochial, and probably withered and eventually vanished in the late classical period.

*St Hilda's College, Oxford*

NIKOLAOS PAPAARKADAS  
 nikolaos.papazarkadas@classics.ox.ac.uk