

XXXVII. Tribal Organization in Ionia

CARL ROEBUCK

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper I plan to discuss, in preliminary fashion, the civic organization of the Ionian communities of western Asia Minor before they were taken over by the Persians in the mid-sixth century. Such a study raises, but hardly resolves, some difficult questions of early Greek history. At the outset, we are confronted with the Ionian migration and, through it, with the communal organization of metropolitan Greece in the Dark Ages and Mycenaean period. For example, some of the Ionian communities shared the four ethnic tribes of the Ionian people with pre-Cleisthenean Athens: the Geleontes, Hopletes, Aegicoreis and Argadeis. Is this indicative of filiation to Asiatic Ionia from Dark Age Attica, from Mycenaean Attica, from metropolitan Greece of the Mycenaean period, or, the reverse, from Ionia westward across the Aegean to Attica? These same Ionian communities, however, had two other tribes, the Boreis and Oenopes, which were not found on the west side of the Aegean Sea. Other cities of Ionia had a different set of tribes but were members of the Ionian League and called themselves Ionians. Evidently the process of organization was very complex. In general, however, all the Ionian communities seem to have had a tribal organization, which was typically Greek in its gentile and exclusive character, well before 700 B.C. Some of them, such as Miletus, maintained this into the fifth century, while others, such as Ephesus, modified their original structure to a territorial basis to allow the growth of a more politically integrated community. We can see the traces of adjustments made to include groups of Greek metics and of Anatolian natives in response to the pressures of urbanization as Ionia changed from an agrarian to a mixed economy. Our evidence is scanty and all of it later than the event, but, when the scraps of information are pieced together, they seem to reflect

the process of growth in Ionia which I have reconstructed in previous studies.¹ For convenience I summarize it briefly.

There does not seem to have been large-scale migration to the west coast of Asia Minor by Mycenaean Greeks,² although some descendants of such settlers may have survived at Miletus, Colophon and elsewhere until the time of the Ionian migration in the eleventh century. This migration was made by a cohesive group of Greeks from Attica and Boeotia over a relatively short period of time. The migrants settled around the Gulfs of Ephesus and Miletus to develop the primary towns of Samos, Miletus, Myus, Priene, Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedus, and Teos. A conscious recognition of their ethnic affiliation led to the establishment of a common religious center for the worship of Poseidon Heliconius at the Panionium in Mycale. Some cooperation in war was achieved under the leadership of the king of Ephesus. In the tenth and ninth centuries other migrants came from Greece and the Aegean islands to settle in this new Ionia and northwards along the coast. Some Ionians and Aeolians also moved within the new land to find better homes. For example, Clazomenae was colonized by Colophon and, presumably, individual Ionians from the primary settlements began to infiltrate beyond the Gulf of Smyrna into northern Ionia. In that region, however, the towns of Old Smyrna, Phocaea, Chios and, perhaps, Erythrae were probably established originally by non-Ionians. Their traditions of early settlement indicate a strong Aeolian element and, as discussed below, their tribal organization differed from that of the primary settlements. The dominant political group on the coast, however, was the Ionian League around the Panionium. By *ca.* 800 B.C. the League had extended north to include the northern towns as members. Old Smyrna, however, predominantly Aeolian at first, was refused admission to the League, although captured by Colophonian exiles.³ Perhaps the last steps in the League's expansion were the inclusion of Phocaea, the northernmost town, and of Chios, which is said to have joined the League under its king, Hector.

¹ Carl Roebuck, "The Early Ionian League," *CP* 50 (1955) 26-40; *idem*, *Ionian Trade and Colonization* (New York 1959) 24-41.

² For discussion of recent views of the Mycenaean settlement in Ionia and of the dating and character of the Ionian migration, see J. M. Cook, "Greek Archaeology in Western Asia Minor," *JHS* 78 (1958) 39-40. For the evidence from Old Smyrna, *idem*, "Old Smyrna, 1948-51," *BSA* 53-54 (1958-59) 10-14.

³ Cook (above, note 2, *BSA*) 13-14.

II. THE EARLY ORGANIZATION OF THE PRIMARY IONIAN TOWNS

Among the primary settlements there is information about only Miletus, Ephesus, Samos, and Teos,⁴ all of which seem to have had six tribes: the four Ionian ethnic tribes, Geleontes, Hopletes, Aegicoreis, Argadeis and the two Asiatic Ionian tribes, Boreis and Oenopes. These are attested, wholly or in part, by evidence from the cities themselves and from colonies in the Propontis and Black Sea, where the tribes were established presumably at the time of foundation. Their presence in Cyzicus reasonably, if indirectly, provides a *terminus ante quem* of ca. 700 B.C. for their existence in the mother-city, Miletus, and in Perinthus of ca. 600 B.C. for their existence in Samos. None of these tribes is attested for the northern towns of the Ionian League, although tradition and, for Phocaea, at least, archaeological evidence indicate that they, too, were founded in the Dark Ages. Evidently their original non-Ionian character was sufficiently well established and the Ionian expansion of such a nature, as discussed below, that the tribal organization of the primary towns was not introduced. Its absence, however, hardly demonstrates that the six tribes did not originally exist in the primary towns, and we can reasonably assume that the co-existence of the four ethnic tribes in Ionia and in Attica (Her. 5.66,69) has some significance for the character of the Ionian migration and would reflect the organization of the first few generations of settlement in southern Ionia.

⁴ Miletus: the Hopletes, Oenopes and Boreis are named in SIG³ 57, lines 1-3 (450/49 B.C.) and the Argadeis in an inscription of the early fifth century (*SBBerl* [1904] 85). All six tribes are named in inscriptions from Cyzicus (F. Bilabel, "Die ionische Kolonisation," *Philologus, Supp.* 14 [1920] 120-21), while the Oenopes, Argadeis, and Aegicoreis are known from Tomis (Bilabel, *op. cit.*, 123-24) and the Aegicoreis from Istrus (Bilabel, *op. cit.*, 123-24). For the foundation date of Cyzicus see Roebuck (above, note 1, *Ionian Trade*) 112-13.

Ephesus: the Geleontes, Argadeis, Oenopes, and Boreis are known as subdivisions (*chiliastyes*) of a tribe, Ephesians (J. Keil, *JOAI* 16 [1913] 245-48; *idem, Forschungen in Ephesos* 4.284, Nos. 31-32). The Ephesians and other tribes are mentioned by Ephorus (*FGrH* 70, F 116; Steph. Byz., s.v. "Benna"), which affords a *terminus ante quem* in the mid-fourth century for the reorganization (see below, 504).

Samos: the Geleontes, Aegicoreis, and Boreis are named, along with four local Thracian tribes, in an inscription of Perinthus. It was reported by Cyriac of Ancona (Bilabel, *op. cit.* [above, note 4] 173-76). Perinthus was founded ca. 600 B.C. (see Roebuck [above, note 1, *Ionian Trade*] 111). For the tribal reorganization in Samos see below, note 22.

Teos: only the tribe, Geleontes, is known (W. Ruge, *RE* 5² (1934) 553; *CIG* 3078-79).

The co-existence of the tribes on both sides of the Aegean has been considered usually to indicate filiation from Attica, which implies the existence of *Ionians* there before the migration.⁵ Despite recent attempts at revision by Sakellariou and Cassola, this standard view still seems preferable. Sakellariou, who has minimized the Athenian element among the settlers of Ionia, has argued⁶ that the four ethnic tribes were common to Greece in Mycenaean times. Their presence in Ionia would reflect migration from various parts of Greece in that period. Aside from the difficulty of finding archaeological evidence of extensive Mycenaean settlement in Ionia, the Linear B tablets of Pylus and Cnossus do not mention the names of the four tribes. Further, there seems to have been no survival of the names except in Athens, the primary towns of Ionia and in Delos.⁷ The presence of the tribes on the latter island may be explained by early migration from Attica or as later Athenian political influence. If the tribes were Mycenaean Greek in origin, they were apparently confined to Attica, and their survival to be explained as part of the cultural continuity attested by the pottery from the Ceramicus cemetery and the tradition of indigenous origin cherished by the Athenians. Cassola, however, who prefers to link the origin of the tribes with the development of the communities in Asiatic Ionia itself, has revived the theory that the tribes were transferred from Ionia to Attica.⁸ It is difficult to envisage the transfer of such basic social institutions without considerable emigration from Ionia into Attica and even more difficult to conjecture the historical circumstances which would cause such migration. The traditions of settlement in Ionia and of continuous habitation in Attica point in the opposite direction. It is also pertinent to ask why the Boreis and Oenopes were not transferred.

The names of the tribes can scarcely clarify their character at the time of the migration and later. The standard identification⁹ as

⁵ Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* 1.120; 2.768–70; K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* 1.2².98–100.

⁶ M. B. Sakellariou, *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Athens 1958) 47, 255. M. P. Nilsson considers that the four tribes existed in Pylus, whence they were taken to Athens ("Das frühe Griechenland, von innen gesehen," *Historia* 3 [1954–55] 264).

⁷ Argadeis: Szanto, *SBWien* 144 (1901) 47; F. Cassola, *La Ionia nel mondo miceneo* (Naples 1957) 249.

⁸ F. Cassola (above, note 7) 246–56; for criticism, see Sakellariou (above, note 6) 502–3 and Beloch (above, note 5) 99.

⁹ Busolt-Swoboda (above, note 5) 2.769.

original social classes is plausible: nobles (Geleontes), warriors (Hopletes), shepherds (Aegicoreis) and farmers (Argadeis). Yet, in both Attica and Ionia the tribes seem to be associated primarily with kinship groups, and there is no perceptible difference of status among them. The festival of the Apaturia, associated with the phratries, was common to Attica and Ionia, except, in the time of Herodotus, at Ephesus and Colophon (Her. 1.147), and, we may suspect, in the northern towns. At an earlier date tribes and phratries were linked, as Nestor's exhortation to Agamemnon before Troy indicates (*Il.* 2.362-63). The tribes, of course, may have represented social divisions in the early years of Ionian settlement in Attica, but lost their coherence in the development of a palace-centered economy in the Mycenaean period. The names could survive and the tribes acquire their new character of kinship groups in the troubled conditions of the early Dark Ages. The migration to Ionia and the difficulties of early settlement would emphasize the usefulness of closely knit groups, such as the household, clan, and phratry, for survival. These considerations, however, are part of the larger question of the origin of Greek tribal institutions and lead us far from Ionia. While the origin of the four ethnic tribes is obscure, it is at least probable that the Boreis and Oenopes were formed in Asiatic Ionia. They, too, seem to have existed in the Ionian mother-cities before the foundation of colonies in the Propontis and before the incorporation of the northern towns into the Ionian League.¹⁰ They would, then, have been made up of one or more of the following elements: descendants of the Mycenaean settlers, Greeks of non-Ionian origin who came to Ionia in the tenth and ninth centuries, or, from Anatolian natives. On the whole, it seems probable that they represent the inclusion of the second element, the early Greek metics.

It is likely that the Ionian colonists made no discrimination between the descendants of the Mycenaean settlers and the Anatolian natives, but took the land and subordinated its owners where they could. Where they could not, we might expect intermarriage and the survival of strong pre-Ionian family groups. The latter adjustment is perhaps indicated by the names in the *pyrgoi* list of Teos, while subordination of the natives is revealed by

¹⁰ Cassola (above, note 7) 255; see above, note 4.

the evidence of a serf population in some of the Ionian towns.¹¹ On the other hand, new Greek settlers, who came after the Ionian migration to make their home in the new settlements, would have strengthened the Ionians. Devices could be found, when the number of metics justified it, to incorporate them into the communities. While the barriers of kinship in the four ethnic tribes could not be breached, the creation of new tribes was a characteristic Greek device. The names, Boreis and Oenopes, seem artificial, for they can be connected with heroes, Borus and Oenopion, whose legends may be localized to Thessaly, Boeotia and Crete. These connections should mark the tribes as Greek, although Sakellariou regards the Oenopes as native Anatolians, dark-complexioned men.¹² With the incorporation of these non-Ionian (by ethnos) groups, we may begin to speak of Ionians and Ionia with a political connotation, rather than with the purely ethnic designation which would apply to the four older tribes.

III. THE EARLY ORGANIZATION OF THE NORTHERN TOWNS

Although the evidence is very scanty, it is apparent that the northern Ionian communities had a different organization from that of the primary towns. Clazomenae, about which there is no information, may well have had some or all of the six Ionian tribes, for it was a colony of Colophon; but Phocaea, Erythrae and Chios apparently were communities in their own right before becoming members of the League. The case of Phocaea is clearest. It was founded at least as early as the Dark Ages, for Protogeometric pottery is reported.¹³ There were three tribes: the Pericleidae, Teutheadae and Abarneis, whose existence in the

¹¹ On the *pyrgoi* inscription, see Hunt, *JHS* 67 (1947) 71, 76; for serfs, see below, note 29.

¹² Boreis: there seems to be general agreement that this name indicates a Thessalian (Aeolian) element and that the tribe was formed in Ionia of non-Ionian Greeks (Busolt-Swoboda [above, note 5] 1.118, note 8; Sakellariou [above, note 6] 74; Cassola [above, note 7] 250).

Oenopes: there is dispute about the meaning of the name. It has been explained as indicating a link to Bocotia or to Crete (Busolt-Swoboda [above, note 5] 1.118, note 8), but Sakellariou ([above, note 6] 67–8) insists on the meaning, “dark-complexioned.” The Oenopes would have been the “blacks” at first and, then, a tribe of native origin. Cassola (above, note 7) 250 tentatively suggests a Bacchic connection. Neither view seems particularly cogent and the onus of proof lies on those rejecting the obvious connections with metropolitan Greece.

¹³ J. M. Cook, *JHS* 78 (1958) 41; see Pausanias 7.3.10.

Phocaeen colony of Lampsacus provides a *terminus ante quem* of ca. 615 B.C. for their existence in the mother city.¹⁴ The name, Pericleidae, has the ring of a Greek *genos* and may well have been made up of the followers of Pericles, the first Ionian king of Phocaea, and their descendants. In origin, then, the Pericleidae were a relatively small gentile group, not a tribe of the type found in the primary Ionian towns. The names, Teutheadae and Abarneis seem non-Ionian, perhaps non-Greek, although they are sometimes connected with King Deoetes and King Abartus, who were said to have come from Teos and Erythrae respectively. Perhaps tradition gave an Ionian origin to the "founders" of these groups after Phocaea had become a member of the Ionian League. The names may well indicate that the non-Ionian founders of Phocaea were too strong to be denied social recognition when the town became politically Ionian. If these conjectures are correct, we may have a clue to the manner in which Phocaea was taken into the League and why the six old Ionian tribes were not introduced into it. To judge from the case of Old Smyrna, there was a steady increase of Ionian influence in the area north of the Gulf of Smyrna in the tenth and ninth centuries. This is marked primarily, of course, by the Ionicizing of pottery decoration and shapes, but reflects the effects of trade, infiltration of individual Ionians from the south and the attraction exercised by the politically dominant power of the coast, the Ionian League. Ionian political affiliation, however, would have been the product of successful military attack or the eventual fruit of an alliance sought by the northern towns. For example, Old Smyrna was captured by Colophonian exiles and Chios' own king, Hector, brought his state into the League. In the case of Phocaea, we might conjecture that an Ionian chieftain, Pericles, made a successful raid and settled with his followers to rule the town. The new ruling group formed the gentile organization of the Pericleidae, in effect a new tribe, alongside the existing groups of the Teutheadae and the Abarneis. There would be no occasion or need to introduce the six Ionian tribes to Phocaea, for no regular

¹⁴ Pericleidae: *IGRR* 4.1326; 181 (Lampsacus); Teutheadae: *IGRR* 4.1325; Abarneis: Hesychius, s.v. Probably the colony, Abarnus, in the Hellespont owes its name to colonists of this tribe. Sakellariou (above, note 6) 411-12 considers that the tribal names, Abarneis and Teutheadae, may be Greek; and Keil connects them specifically with the names of the kings, Deoetes and Abartus, who were sent to Phocaea from Teos and Erythrae (*RE* 20 (1950) 444; Pausanias 7.3.10).

colonization nor any joint action by the members of the League as a whole had been involved. Pericles, by virtue of his Ionian origin, could bring his newly acquired town into the League. In the Dark Ages, of course, warfare was essentially raiding by clan chieftains, and political ties a matter of their personal relationships. This reconstruction is, of course, frankly conjectural and, unfortunately, there is no information about the circumstances of the adherence of Chios and Erythrae to the League to amplify the picture. We do, however, know a little about their tribal organization.

Erythrae, like Phocaea, had three tribes. Pausanias records that one was called Chalcis.¹⁵ The name may indicate a group of colonists from Euboea who retained their coherence in a synoecism of Erythrae, but when they came, or whether this synoecism was early, we do not know.

The tribes of Chios are obscure. Although the so-called "Constitution of Chios," now dated 575–50 B.C.,¹⁶ shows that a tribal organization was basic and presumably pre-existent to the "constitution," it does not give the names or the number of the tribes. Beloch has suggested that the tribe, Oenopes, was present, for Oenopion from Crete was the traditional founder of Chios.¹⁷ If so, this may point to early, non-Ionian, Greek migration as in the case of the primary towns.

These early tribes of all the Ionian towns seem to have been Hellenic in character, representing a predominantly Greek element, an aristocracy of landowners and a lower class of free farmers with a few craftsmen. But the Greek settlements were made in well-populated, native areas and, at the outset, a cultural fusion began which is apparent in the craft products and religious practices. We may ask how the political fusion was accomplished, for, in the course of time, the Greek tribal organization would have become an increasingly intolerable strait-jacket, preventing the extension of political participation to Anatolian natives and to later Greek metics. Inter-marriage would have accomplished

¹⁵ Pausanias 7.5.12. A locality, Chalcis, is attested epigraphically (*SGDI* 5610). It was on the isthmus connecting the Mimas peninsula to the territory of Clazomenae.

¹⁶ M. N. Tod, *GHI* 1².1; L. H. Jeffery, "The Courts of Justice in Archaic Chios," *BSA* 51 (1956) 157–67; J. H. Oliver, "Text of the So-Called Constitution of Chios from the First Half of the Sixth Century B.C.," *AJP* 80 (1959) 296–301.

¹⁷ Plutarch, *Theseus* 20 (from Ion of Chios); Theopompus (*FGH* 115, F 276); Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* 1.2².100.

something, for the union of Ionian men with native and metic women would have brought the children into the Ionian community, but the reverse would have set the child among the aliens. Perhaps this, along with the growing cultural fusion, established an environment conducive to ideas of political assimilation, but it is more likely that the first steps were taken to satisfy the needs of military defense. In Ionia the towns had not only to reckon with native groups on their own territory, as it grew, but to defend themselves from Anatolian and, at times, neighborly Greek pressure. In the warlike conditions of life in early Ionia, it is probable that all elements of the community were needed for military service, even if the brunt of the fighting fell on the nobles and their clansmen. For such a purpose it seems that a decadic organization of the population into nominal groups of 1,000, *chiliastyes*, and of 100, *hekatostyes*, was devised at an early date.

IV. THE CHILIASTYES

There is a hint in the *Iliad* of such decadic organization, probably as a means for military levy rather than as an actual battle order. Achilles' 50 ships and their crews were divided into 5 *stiches* under 5 separate leaders, each in command of 10 ships and 500 men (*Il.* 16.168-72). Combats, of course, were settled by individual heroes, but their following comprised nameless oarsmen and fighters, who swarmed like bees around their chieftains. The potential usefulness of such a system in Ionia is suggested by analogies in early Germany¹⁸ and England. In Germany the terms "hundred" and "thousand" were applied to the inhabitants of a locality who had hung together in migration and settlement and formed a military unit of the settled community. In England a "hundred" seems to have designated a group of householders forming an agricultural village. It may have served as a military levy, or as a fiscal unit paying one hundred lamb's hides. Ultimately it became a juridical district. In Ionia, as the communities developed into city-states, the military *chiliastys* would have acquired a traditional coherency which enabled it to become the means for political reorganization. We find it as a subdivision of new tribes in several Ionian communities, most clearly in Ephesus.

¹⁸ Busolt-Swoboda (above, note 5) 560-61.

At some time prior to the mid-fourth century, for our earliest notice is from the historian, Ephorus, the citizens of Ephesus were reorganized into 5 tribes; the Ephesians, Bennaei, or Bembinaei, Teans, Euonymi and Carenians.¹⁹ Each of these was subdivided into at least six *chiliastyes*, for that number is known for the tribe, Ephesians. They were the Boreis, Oenopes, Argadeis, Geleontes, Lebedii, and Salaminii. Evidently the older Ionian element in the population of Ephesus had been formed into a new tribe, most properly called Ephesians, and the former tribes demoted to make up its subdivisions. Greek metics from Lebedus and Salamis (which Salamis is unknown) were included. Names of the other tribes and of their *chiliastyes* have been identified as from Greek and native ethnic groups, *genê* and local toponyms.²⁰ At the time of the reorganization there was a very decided weakening of the older Ionian element and extension of political participation in the state to alien groups. For the change the *chiliastyes* were made the instrument. It is probable that they were pre-existent and not invented for the occasion.

Ephorus sets the reorganization in the legendary past of Ephesus, and the term, *chiliastys*, was widely used in Ionia and in the Ionian colonies.²¹ Although our notices are late, the institution

¹⁹ See above, note 4; for discussion, see Sakellariou (above, note 6) 132, note 7 on 133-34 and *Hellenika* 15 (1957) 220-31. The Ephesians are considered to be composed mainly of the Ionian element in the population, since the *chiliastyes* bear the names of the old Ionian tribes. The Bennaei or Bembinaei are identified as Anatolian natives resident in the territory of Ephesus. The Teans would have been originally refugees or migrants from Teos (at the time of the Persian conquest?). The Carenians are identified as migrants from the area of Carene on the coast of Asia Minor opposite to Lesbos, but it seems unlikely that there would have been a large enough number from this small place to make up a whole tribe. The Euonymi are sometimes connected with Athens because of the coincidence with an Attic deme name, but a Carian origin seems more plausible (e.g. Euonymia). Sakellariou allocates eight *chiliastyes* of 1,000 members each to each tribe and estimates the population of Ephesus at 40,000 citizens. It is reasonable to assume that the tribe, Ephesians, had eight *chiliastyes*, for the missing Argadeis and Hopletes should probably be included with the other Ionian tribes; but the population estimate can hardly be correct. If the *chiliastyes* were pre-existing territorial units, they must have long since lost their exact numerical significance. The number of 40,000 citizens implies a free population of about 120,000, which is very high for this period of the sixth century (see Roebuck [above, note 1, *Ionian Trade*] 21-23).

²⁰ Sakellariou (above, note 6) 132-37 discusses the difficult problems of identification. A list of the *chiliastyes* is given by J. Keil, *JOAI* 16 (1913) 245-48.

²¹ See, in addition to the instances noted above, *CIG* 3641b (Lampsacus); Aeneas Tacticus 11.10 (Heraclea Pontica); *SGDI* 3059 (Byzantium); *SGDI* 276-78 (Methymna on Lesbos). A similar decadic arrangement was used on Cos where it was gentilic in character and linked with the three Doric tribes (Busolt-Swoboda [above, note 5] 258).

should be prior to the founding of the colonies. Perhaps we should recognize in the *chilioi* of Colophon, whom Xenophanes criticized (Frag. 3, Diehl), an aristocratic *chiliastys*. Samos, too, experienced a tribal reorganization,²² dated by Beloch to the time of Polycrates, in which two, or perhaps three, new tribes were established and the older Ionian tribes subordinated into *chiliastyes*: a new tribe, the Astypalaeans, was made up of the older Ionian inhabitants of the city of Samos, while the Chesians were formed from the Carian town of Chesia in west Samos; a third tribe, Aeschrionia, is dubious. It is mentioned only by Herodotus and, if it existed at all, may have been short-lived.²³ The old Ionian tribe, Oenopes, became a *chiliastys* of the new tribe, the Chesians.²⁴ In Miletus, however, there was no similar reorganization, for inscriptions of the first half of the fifth century reveal that the six, old Ionian tribes were still basic for the government. Yet, significantly, a *chiliastys* of the tribe, Argadeis, designated as the first, *prôtê*, is identified.²⁵

²² Two tribes are known for the second century B.C. from an inscription regulating the distribution of grain (*SIG*³ 976, line 40). Their names are given by Themistagoras of Ephesus (*FHG* 4, page 512, No. 1; *Et. Mag.*, s.v. "Astypalaea") as the Astypalaeans and the Chesians. Since Astypalaea was the name of the Samian acropolis (Polyaenus, *Strat.* 1.23) and Chesia the name of a Carian town, the tribal names probably reflect an organization in which Greeks and Carians were given equal place in the state. The time is controversial, but the view of Beloch (*Gr. Gesch.* 1.1².375) seems most acceptable, that it was the work of Polycrates; if not of Polycrates himself, perhaps in the troubled years following his death. Themistagoras had related it to the early years of settlement as the work of the kings, Procles and Tembrion, which was accepted by Wilamowitz (*SBBerl* [1904] 931), but should be rejected because of the evidence of the existence of the Ionian tribes (above, note 4). Büchner's view (*RE* 1² [1920] 2214) that the coup of the leaders of the expedition sent to defend Perinthus against the Megarians in the early sixth century was made the occasion to establish the new tribes, seems most unlikely. The Samian generals utilized the Megarians to unseat the oligarchical government in Samos (Plutarch, *Moralia* 303e–304c), but the struggle is best regarded as a quarrel between factions of the Samian *geomoroi*. A *terminus ante quem* for the *chiliastyes* and the *hekatostyes* is afforded by references in late fourth century inscriptions (*SIG*³ 312, line 30; *SEG* 1.362, lines 19–20).

²³ Herodotus (3.26) casually mentions a Samian tribe, Aeschrionia, as furnishing the settlers for the city of Oasis in Libya. This has been considered as an inexact reference to a smaller gentile group (Busolt-Swoboda [above, note 5] 260, note 2). The derogatory name (?) perhaps refers to a new tribe of slaves, some members of which later emigrated for military service in Egypt. Many Samians were killed at the time of Syloson's tyranny (Her. 3.149; Duris [*FGrH* 76, F 66]) and slaves were enfranchised.

²⁴ *SEG* 1.362, line 35.

²⁵ See above, note 4; for the *chiliastys*, *SBBerl* (1904) 85 and Bilabel (above, note 4) 123.

V. POLITICAL REORGANIZATION IN IONIA

It is probable that these political reorganizations, the traces of which are visible in the new function of the *chiliastys*, are to be connected with the activity of the tyrants and the stasis of the sixth century. By that time, the economic growth of Ionia, fostered by its trade and colonizing, had brought new economic groups into existence in many Ionian cities and produced a high level of prosperity in which metics and Anatolians, as well as Ionian Greeks, shared. In a recent discussion of the tribes of Ephesus, Sakellariou has argued that their reorganization was a gradual process beginning in the first half of the sixth century under the tyrant, Pythagoras.²⁶ This seems very plausible, if we can trust the traditions of the tyranny. They stress the bitter enmity of the tyrants, Pythagoras and Pindarus, to the Basilidae, the descendants of the Ionian kings, and to the other men of standing and power in the city. Perhaps the tyrants sought support among the Anatolians and Greek metics and paid for it by the creation of new tribes which converted their *chiliastyes* into political units. If so, this recognition of the Anatolian element may well be reflected in the acceptance of their goddess, Artemis, as the patron deity of the city. The earliest altar basis of the Artemisium is now dated *ca.* 600 B.C.,²⁷ coincident with the tyranny of Pythagoras. The monumental building of the temple was partly subsidized by Croesus in the middle of the century. At the time of his attack on Ephesus the citizens dedicated their city as a suppliant to Artemis by attaching it to the Artemisium with a rope (Her. 1.26). In effect, the city gave itself to the native goddess. Perhaps the old Ionian festival of the Apaturia was discarded shortly after this time.²⁸

In Miletus, however, despite the civil strife of the early sixth century, the old tribes were retained. The tyranny of Thrasybulus and his would-be successors was followed by stasis between the two groups described as the *Ploutis* and the *Cheiromacha* (Plutarch, *Moralia* 298c) who were ridiculed by the name, Gergithes.²⁹

²⁶ For Pythagoras see Baton of Sinope *FHG* 4, page 348, No. 2; for Pindarus, Aelian, *Var. hist.* 3.26.

²⁷ P. Jacobsthal, "The Date of the Ephesian Foundation-Deposit," *JHS* 71 (1951) 85-95.

²⁸ Her. 1.147; Sakellariou (above, note 6) 278, note 1.

²⁹ Heracleides Ponticus in Athenaeus 524A. In this context the term is applicable to all those opposed to the wealthy, and indicates contempt, but Gergithes has

Were not these "hand-fighters" the troops of the lower-class military *chiliastyes*, while the wealthy landowners supplied the hoplites and the ship captains? This stasis was arbitrated by Parian judges (Her. 5.28–29), who placed the government in the hands of the landowners, those with well-kept fields as Herodotus put it. Presumably a moderate oligarchy was established which restricted citizenship to the wealthy and middle groups in the state, who were members of the six, old Ionian tribes.

Unfortunately the evidence for Chios is obscure. The "constitution" does reveal a new council with 50 members selected from each tribe, thus giving more power to the *dêmos*, but we do not know whether the circle of citizenship was enlarged.

This background of Ionian political development in the sixth century at least makes it easier to understand the sophisticated proposal of Thales for centralization of the Ionian League (Her. 1.170.3), which seems so far in advance of his time. As some of its member states became more fully integrated communities, he envisaged an Ionian League with a plenary council, to which members would send representatives, while the states themselves sank into the position of demes,³⁰ somewhat like the *chiliastyes* of the tribes. Herodotus drew his analogy from the Athenian reorganization made by Cleisthenes, but, before Cleisthenes, there lay almost a century of Ionian experience in political integration.

evidently been borrowed from the name of some group in Miletus. The Gergithes are usually identified as serfs formed from the pre-Ionian population. Perhaps, as the state urbanized, the name was extended to ridicule all the lower classes. The Gergithes may have been Anatolian natives, for the name was used also for the remnants of the Teuceri in the Troad and Aeolis (Her. 5.122; 7.43; Strabo 589 [13.1.19]). Miletus, however, is very far from the Troad.

In Priene the former serfs were called *Pedieis*, "Plainsmen," (*OGIS* 11; C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, Nos. 6, 8). They are mentioned in Hellenistic inscriptions as former dependents and, their freedom obtained, foes of the state. The name, "plainsmen," is probably to be explained by their residence in the plain of the Maeander River between Mycale and Latmus, where they would have worked the land of the Prienians until winning their freedom.

³⁰ Roebuck (above, note 1, *Ionian League*) 29.