

THE CIVIC ORGANIZATION OF CORINTH*

NICHOLAS F. JONES

University of Pittsburgh

Through much of Greek and Roman antiquity Corinth figures conspicuously in our record as a center of great commercial and political importance. By contrast, our understanding of the internal arrangements of the city is appallingly slight. Nowhere is this more true than in the case of the organization of phylai, or “tribes,” and their subdivisions. Before the inception of the American excavations in 1896, our only sources were two brief notices in the *Suda* and Hesychios; and even now, after decades of exploration, only a handful of inscriptions pertaining directly to the organization have come to light. Under these circumstances, accordingly, one might well wonder how an attempt to offer a new interpretation of so small

*Criticism of the present paper by others is gratefully acknowledged. Ronald Stroud, under whom my work on the topic began, generously commented on successive drafts of the study. Further valuable assistance was provided by Sterling Dow, whose detailed scrutiny of the more recent drafts has resulted in many improvements in both presentation and substance. Others, Gregory Nagy, John Salmon, James Wiseman, William Wyatt, and two colleagues in Pittsburgh, Harry Avery and Edwin Floyd, offered helpful information or suggestions at various stages of my research. Responsibility for all views expressed is, of course, entirely my own.

A much abbreviated version of the paper was presented at the annual meeting of the APA on December 29, 1978. Final revision was undertaken with the assistance of a Faculty Research Grant from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Pittsburgh.

References are made throughout by author's last name (and, where necessary, date of publication) to the following studies: Calligas = P. Calligas, “An Inscribed Lead Plaque from Korkyra,” *ABSA* 66 (1971) 79–94; Dow = S. Dow, “Corinthiaca,” *HSCP* 53 (1942) 89–119, esp. 90–106 (II. “A List of Names under Rubrics”); Robert 1948 = L. Robert, “Un Décret dorien trouvé à Délos,” *Hellenica* 5 (1948) 5–15; Robert 1960 = L. Robert, “Décret dorien trouvé à Délos,” *Hellenica* 12 (1960) 562–69; Stroud = R. S. Stroud, “Tribal Boundary Markers from Corinth,” *CSCA* 1 (1968) 233–42.

a body of evidence could even be considered. The answer lies in the discovery of a new source, an honorary decree of unstated authorship found on Delos that, I believe, can be shown to be of Corinthian origin. Following a survey of the previously acknowledged Corinthian material, we shall set out our case for the decree's authorship in detail. Next, the decree's content will be applied to the reinterpretation of the texts from Corinth, resulting in an entirely new understanding of the tribal organization's components, disposition, and functions. Once, finally, the consequences of the reconstruction have been fully worked out, the paper will conclude with a reassessment of the historical development of the organization.

THE CORINTHIAN EVIDENCE

Our knowledge of the general disposition of the Corinthian tribal organization depends entirely upon a problematic notice in the *Suda*, s.v. πάντα ὀκτώ... οἱ δέ, ὅτι > Αλήτης κατὰ χρησμόν τοὺς Κορινθίους συνοικίζων ὀκτὼ φυλὰς ἐποίησε τοὺς πολίτας καὶ ὀκτὼ μέρη τὴν πόλιν (Π 225 Adler). "All Things in Eights"—evidently a proverbial expression attached to Corinth—some explained as arising from the fact that "Aletes, when synoecizing the Corinthians in accordance with an oracle, made the *politai* into eight phylai and the *polis* into eight parts."¹ The passage is problematic because, in the first place, by attributing the creation of the organization to Aletes it gives rise (as we shall see) to a serious historical difficulty. Secondly, with regard to the reconstruction of the organization, it fails to define unambiguously the relation of the phylai to the "parts." Were the latter the same as, or different from, the phylai? With these doubts in mind, we may now turn to a brief survey of the actual documents from the site of Corinth, giving some attention to the history of their publication and to the theories based on them.²

¹ The notice also records the opinion that the saying pertained to Katana in Sicily, where the grave monument of Stesichoros has "eight columns, eight steps, and eight corners."

² For the sake of completeness I mention here two additional sources in which phylai are named, or appear to have been named: B. D. Meritt, *Corinth* VIII i, no. 222, line 4 (?), late third or early second century B.C.:---]/ ρας φυλᾶς (?) ----; and J. R. Wiseman, *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 33–38, no. 25, third century A.D. The former text is too fragmentary to permit any inferences; the latter is dealt with below, p. 15.

Discovered in 1915, a fragment of a *list of names*, broken at top, bottom, and right, was initially published, with minimal commentary, by B. D. Meritt: *Corinth Inventory I 734* (= *Corinth VIII i* [Princeton 1931] no. 11). Meritt dated the inscription by letter forms to the latter half of the fourth century B.C. Later, the text was the subject of an extensive analysis by Sterling Dow 90–106 (*SEG* 11.60, 25.329). Among other important findings, Dow showed beyond any reasonable doubt that the list is of casualties. For our present purposes, the feature to be noted is the series of rubrics, which head the individual registers and which consist of two letters, a dash, and a single third letter: ΣΙ-Π, ΑΕ-Ε, ΑΕ-Π, ΚΥ-*F* (lines 6, 15, 20, 26).³

The years following the appearance of Dow's study saw the publication of three inscribed *markers* discovered in the vicinity of the eastern city circuit wall. One marker, discovered in 1934, was first published by J. H. Kent, *Corinth VIII iii* (Princeton 1966) no. 8; the two others, discovered in 1960 and 1965, were published by R. S. Stroud 234–35 (= *SEG* 25.331a and b), who, at the same time, provided a corrected reading of Kent's inscription (= *SEG* 25.332). On the basis of the script Stroud dated all three inscriptions to about the middle of the fifth century B.C. Stroud's texts are reproduced here:

SEG 25.331a

ΑΕΠ

hEN

SEG 25.331b

ΣΠΠ

hEN

SEG 25.332

ΣΥ*F*

ΔΥΟ

If we may postpone for the moment consideration of the numerals εἷς and δύο, it is clear, as Stroud saw, that the first lines are comparable to the rubrics of the casualty list. Formally, they differ only in the absence of the dash before the third letter. There are, furthermore, two letter-for-letter correspondences between marker (*SEG* 25.331a and b) and list (lines 20, 6); while in the case of the remaining marker (*SEG* 25.332) the third letter, *digamma*, appears in ΚΥ-*F* (line 26). A combined interpretation is clearly warranted.

According to the usual view, the rubrics of the list and the first lines of the markers refer to the eight phylai attested in the *Suda* (viz., ΣΙ, ΑΕ, ΚΥ, ΣΥ,...) and to some subdivision (viz., Π, Ε, *F*,...),

³ The text followed here differs from that printed by Dow (p. 94) in the omission of the conjecturally restored lines 1–2 and 29–33, in the reading of dotted *sigma* in line 6 (Dow 93,95), and in the retention of the *digamma* in line 26 (discussed below).

which might, depending on the exact interpretation, be identified with the *Suda*'s *μέρη*. The initial breakthrough we owe to F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 52 (1932) 362, who, in reviewing Meritt's *editio princeps* of the list, noted a possible correspondence between the rubric KY (line 26) and the name *Κυνόφαλοι*, glossed as *Κορίνθιοι φυλή* by Hesychios, s.v. (K 4620 Latte). The analysis of the list as a tribal document was subsequently undertaken by Dow, and later extended to the markers by Stroud. On this interpretation, the list would join the many other such catalogues of dead arranged *κατὰ φυλάς* (e.g., at Athens, Megara, Epidauros, and Argos); while for the markers could be cited with Stroud a parallel series of tribal boundary stones from Peiraieus (*IG* I² 897–901) and the Agora (*IG* I² 885, *SEG* 10. 371–74, 21.108–13) —to mention only the most conspicuous examples. Both elegant in its use of Hesychios and more than amply supported by the contemporary practices of other, nearby states, Hiller's identification of the two-letter elements as phylai could hardly be questioned on grounds of general probability.

Scholarly opinion has differed, however, with regard to the identity of the subdivision. Hiller himself offered no suggestion about the specific nature of the "Unterabteilungen." Dow, writing before the publication of any of the markers, suggested on the basis of the evidence available that the eight phylai fell into two groups, designated E and Π. KY-*F* (line 26) he proposed be read KY- $\langle E \rangle$ on the supposition that the stonemason had inadvertently omitted the lowest stroke of the *epsilon*: such errors, in some cases involving important letters, are not uncommon, even in the most neatly-cut inscriptions (Dow 91). The two single letters, he suggested further (p. 103), might refer to Corinth within (cf. *ἐντός*, *ἐντότεροι*) and outside (cf. *πέρα*) the city wall. Stroud, however, in republishing *SEG* 25.332, argued that the certain *digamma* in line 1, ΣΥ*F*, made highly likely, if it did not guarantee, the *digamma* in line 26 of the list. Stroud then went on to speculate, on the assumption that the single letters totaled three, viz., E, *F*, and Π, that the territory of Corinth had been partitioned into three geographical regions, possibly comprising the Polis, land North, and land South, of the Isthmos. Each of the eight territorial phylai would consist, analogously to the Kleisthenic tribal organization of Attika, of one "trittys" from each of the three regions. With the "trittyes," furthermore, could be associated the "parts" attested in the *Suda*: the notice might refer to those eight (of a total of twenty-four) "parts" that comprised the Polis region. Hence KY-*F*, for example, would designate phyle Kynophaloi, "trittys" (i.e., *μέρος*) *F*.

Such speculations as these, based as they are on only a scattering of testimony, are hardly capable of either confirmation or refutation. Only Dow's reading KY-<E>, reasonable in its own time but now rendered unlikely by the subsequent appearance of new evidence, seems definitely eliminated. Otherwise, on internal grounds, Hiller's proposal that the list and so, by extension, the markers reflect a simple system of eight phylai and some (perhaps not certainly identified) subdivision appears secure. Nevertheless, other evidence is available that, I shall argue, is decisive against the *rapprochement* with Hesychios—and against all theories based on it. I refer to an honorary decree of unstated authorship found on Delos. The relevance of this decree to Corinthian affairs has previously been suspected (see below) but never demonstrated. If it can be shown to be of Corinthian origin, there can be little doubt that the symbols under discussion denote, not the eight phylai and some subdivision, but quite different components of the Corinthian civic organization.

THE DELIAN DECREE

Discovered in the French excavations of 1908 and briefly reported by M. Holleaux in *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1909) 416, the decree has more recently been the subject of two studies by L. Robert (see introductory note). I reproduce Robert's text here, with a few alternative readings suggested by his photograph (1948, p. 6, Planche I 2).⁴

C. 325–275 B.C. (G. Daux, *AE* [1953–54] 250, note 5). Non-STOIXHΔON.

Θεός

[Ἐπ]ὶ γραμματιστᾶ Εὐθέα· vac
[Γ]αμλίου· ἔδοξε τᾷ ἐκκλησί-
[α]ι· ἐπειδὲ Ξενοκλῆς καὶ Πανσί-

⁴ In line 11 for Δημοκλείους read Δημοκλέους (Stroud); in line 19 for εὐ[ερ]- read ἐνερ- (Stroud); in line 23 for φράτραν read φάτραν; and in line 26, consequently, restore, not [φρ]άτρας but [φ]άτρας. In lines 24–26 I have supplied ν (vacat) where necessary. Lines 24 and 25 are re-punctuated in accordance with the interpretation offered below. For the last word in line 26 there is no evidence known to me for the initial breathing.

- 5 μαχος Ἀθηναῖοι ἐμ παντὶ
 καιρῷ διατελοῦντι εὖνοοι ὄν-
 τες τᾷ πόλει καὶ τοῖς παραγε-
 νομένοις τῶν πολιτᾶν εἰς Ἀ-
 θήνας· ἔδοξε τᾷ ἐκκλησί-
 10 αι· Ξενοκλῇ Ἀγνοθέον καὶ
 Πανσίμαχον Δημοκλέους Ἀ-
 θηναίους προξένους εἶμεν
 καὶ εὐεργέτας τᾶς πόλιος
 αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκγόνους· εἶμεν δὲ
 15 αὐτοῖς καὶ πολιτείαν καὶ γᾶς
 καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτησιν καὶ ἄστυ-
 λίαν καὶ πολέμον καὶ εἰράνας
 καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τίμια ὅσα καὶ το[ῖς]
 λοιποῖς προξένοις καὶ εὐερ-
 20 γέταις τᾶς πόλιος· τὰν δὲ
 βουλὰν διακλαρῶσαι εἰς
 ἡμιόγδοον καὶ τριακάδα
 καὶ φυλὰν καὶ φάτρην· Διεκλα-
 ρώθην· ἡμιογδόον νν ΑΣ νν F
 25 [ἀ]ρχαίας νν φυλᾶς νν Ἀορέων·
 [φ]άτρας νν Ομακχιάδας.

Realizing the central importance of the question of the identity of the issuing authority, Robert examined in detail a wide range of evidence bearing positively and negatively upon possible candidates for attribution. Considerations of dialect (the decree is in the Doric *koinē*), constitutional content, and proper names, to cite the main categories of evidence, led to the elimination of a great many states. Robert's own choice was Phleious, even though it could be supported by only a single article of positive testimony. At the close of the sortition formulas reference is made to a φυλὰ Ἀορέων (line 25). With this name Robert associated Aoris, a legendary early king of Phleious (Paus. 2.12.5; Robert 1948, pp. 13–15). No other link, of any nature, could be found to reinforce the attribution.

In opposition to Robert's candidate may now be set the evidence for Corinthian authorship.⁵ Surprisingly, much of it has already been

⁵ Throughout the following discussion my silence can be taken to indicate the absence of significant positive or negative evidence for attribution. Thus no mention, for example, is made of Phleious in the discussion of the decree's preamble because no

aired, but without being given the scrutiny—or weight—that it merits. Robert himself drew attention (1948, p. 8) to what seems a most telling indication, namely that the formula *ἔδοξε τῷ ἐκκλησίῳ* (lines 3–4, 9–10), or its equivalent, is attested for only two city-states in which the Doric dialect was in use, viz., Corinth (O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* [Berlin 1900] no. 42, line 10; whence the restorations in *Corinth* VIII i, nos. 2, lines 6–7; and 3, lines 4–5; and now *SEG* 25.325, lines 6–7; cf. Dow 109–13), and Ithaka (Kern, *op. cit.*, no. 36, line 13)—the latter, significantly perhaps, the site of an early Corinthian settlement. Robert failed to note further, however, that Ithakan authorship can be ruled out, for the very same decree of the *ekklesia* that he cited is dated not, as in the Delian decree, by the *grammatistas* (line 2) but by the *damiourgoi* (lines 1–2). Even were there no other indications, this possible link might by itself be taken as strongly suggestive of Corinthian authorship.

Less striking, though of cumulative significance, are the other points of contact noted by Robert. The Delian decree is dated [*Ἐπὶ γραμματιστῷ Εὐθέῳ*] (line 2). For Corinth, the identity of the eponymous official has not been established, though, as Robert observed, in one decree, *Corinth* VIII i, no. 8, line 1, nothing precludes the restoration [*Ἐπὶ γρ[αμμα]τιστῷ---*] (Robert 1960, p. 568, note 3; but cf. Dow 109–12). It may be added that the form *γραμματεὺς* is nowhere attested for Corinth; and that, wherever it has been restored, the less common form of the Delian decree could just as well stand in its place: *Corinth* VIII i, no. 4 (*SEG* 11.56), line 9; no. 7, line 1; no. 8, line 1. Similarly tantalizing in connection with the *triakas* (line 22), is the presence, not at Corinth, but at Akrai, a colony of Corinthian Syracuse, of *triakadarchoi* (*IG* XIV 209, 211, 212); the *triakas*, however, occurs also at Sparta, Athens, Peiraieus, and Kos (Robert 1948, pp. 10–12). Robert also observes that the month Gamilios (line 3) is exemplified elsewhere only in Epeiros, a region in which Corinthian influence was of course considerable (1948, pp. 8–10; 1960, p. 568, note 3).

The case for Phleious rests solely upon the *rapprochement* with the early king Aoris, and so must depend for its strength on the failure of this name to occur elsewhere. Since Robert's second publication, however, new evidence has appeared. A series of lead plaques dated c. 500 B.C. attests the presence at Kerkyra, a Corinthian colony, of a large political or social division, probably to be identified as a phyle,

Phleiasian decree survives that could permit a judgment one way or the other.

named (in the genitive case) *Ἀφορῶν* (Calligas 81, nos. 3, 4, 5, 8). Calligas correctly hesitated to connect the Kerkyraian *Ἀφορῶν* directly with the Delian *Ἀορέων* on the ground that the Doric dialect does not normally permit contraction of *-έων* to *-ῶν* (p. 89). Presumably the Kerkyraian word is either first declension, *Ἀφοραί*, or second declension, *Ἀφοροί*, the Delian, third declension, *Ἀορεῦς*, pl. *Ἀορεῖς* (cf. Hylleus, Hylleis). Yet even so one could hardly exclude the possibility that the two names share a common origin. The hypothesis that the Delian decree is Corinthian would permit such a reconstruction. I shall argue below that both the Corinthian and Kerkyraian reformed tribal organizations—to which our two names would necessarily belong—were created under the Kypselid tyranny, that is no earlier than c. 658 B.C.⁶ Thus a personal name such as **Ἀφορός* (cf. J. Chadwick, J. T. Killen, J.-P. Olivier, *The Knossos Tablets* [Cambridge 19714] no. B [5] 800.3:]a-wo-ro, a man's name) or, for that matter, **Ἀφορις* could easily have been transmitted from mother-city to colony either at the time of or in the early years following the foundation c. 733 B.C. The only difficulty here is the absence of such a name in the extant Corinthian tradition, though it need not be assumed with Robert (1960, p. 568, note 1) that the eponym be a founder or a king—whose failure to appear anywhere in our sources would be harder to explain.⁷ At all events, the certain presence of an Aoris at nearby Phleious is an encouraging sign.

More problematic are the associations of the name of the phratry that occurs in the last line of the decree. The text reads *ΟΜΑΚΧΙΑΔΑΣ* (misprinted in Calligas 88), evidently masculine nominative singular in loose agreement with the subject of the plural verb *διεκλαρώθην* (lines 23–24).⁸ Robert offered no parallel for the

⁶ For a lucid discussion of the disputed Kypselid chronology see R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek States ca. 700–338 B.C.* (Berkeley 1976) 53–55 with note 5. The beginning date for the tyranny that I have given represents of course the “high” chronology, which is accepted by most historians and which I follow throughout.

⁷ Of the eponyms of the ten Kleisthenic phylai, for example, only four (Kekrops, Aigeus, Pandion, and Erechtheus) were kings. Of the original 100 names submitted to the oracle at Delphi (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 21.6) many must have been of relatively minor significance.

⁸ There are actually two anomalies. For the use of the nominative in apposition to the subject of the verb compare *IG IV 748* (with addendum) from Troizen, line 23: [ἐλ]αχε φυλάς Σχελιάδας with Szanto's interpretation, *Die griechischen Phylen, SB Wien* 144, no. 5, p. 17 (= *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen* [Tübingen 1906] 231). As Szanto notes, similar constructions occur in certain Ephesian formulas of sortition. For the use of the singular instead of the expected plural, it is easiest to assume an error by a

name; Calligas, however, suggested, but did not develop, a connection with the Kerkyraian *Μαχχίδα* (*IG IX 1*, no. 695, line 2) and the *Μαχιάδαι* of the Kerkyraian foundation Apollonia (E. Derenne, *Albania* 3 [1928] 40–41, no. 61; Robert 1960, p. 563, note 1; Calligas 87 with note 43).⁹ To be sure, no obvious line of development is at hand. What the three appear to have in common is a stem **μαχ-*, which, either unaltered (Apollonia) or with hypocoristic (?) gemination (Corinth; and, with the doubled aspirate, Kerkyra), would account in part for the attested forms. But the real difficulty is posed by the initial syllable of the Delian spelling, *omikron* (whether with or without the *spiritus asper* cannot be determined). If, on the one hand, **μαχ-* is original, while a prothetic vowel appears eliminated as a possibility (see W. F. Wyatt, *The Greek Prothetic Vowel*, APA Monograph 21 [1972] 9, 18–27), it might well be, as Gregory Nagy has suggested to me, that *ὀ-*, representing the *alpha athroistikon*, is an innovation, giving the sense “companion in battle” *vel sim.*¹⁰ If, on the other hand, an original **ομαχ-* is assumed, the shortened stems might be explained as due to a kind of aphaeresis, admittedly rare in the ancient language but common in Modern Greek (see M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien* [Paris 1972] 223, section 230), with the loss of the *omikron* possibly abetted by the use of the masculine article with the name through a process similar to “haplology.” On either explanation, the hypothesis that the degree is Corinthian would find some additional support.

Though both proper names present difficulties, we must not lose sight of the fact that, with the exception of the Phleiasian Aoris, the only available parallels come from Corinth or Corinthian colonies. This circumstance, no less than the likelihood of links of some kind with the cited Corinthian material, contributes much to the case for Corinthian authorship.

stonemason accustomed to texts in which there was only a single honorand.

⁹ The text reads in lines 1 and 2: Ἀνδρίωνα Ποδᾶ / Μαχιαδᾶν. Robert, *loc. cit.*, took Ποδαμαχιαδᾶν as a single word, comparing the abbreviation ΠΟ in line 6 of the Apollonian text discussed below, p. 176 with notes 13–14. But the reading both runs counter to the arrangement of the words on the stone and leaves Andrión (and his brothers, the dedicators, in lines 3 and 4) without a patronymic, and is therefore less likely.

¹⁰ For discussion and examples of the form in *omikron* see E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* I (Munich 1953) 433, section 4. The presence at Corinth of the vowel-gradation is supported by the form γροφεύς: see C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago 1955), section 253.2.

The *triakas* (line 22) and the *triakadarchoi* of Akrai were mentioned above. Still another point of contact, not hitherto noticed, is observable in its companion term *hēmiogdoōn*, or “half-eighth” (lines 22, 24). Attested in a constitutional sense nowhere else, this highly distinctive word demands an explanation. And in fact there could be no better home for it than Corinth, of which people said “All Things in Eights.” To my knowledge only one other city-state of the Greek period, Elis, is recorded as having had a civic organization of eight principal divisions (Paus. 5.9.6). The specific significance of the term for Corinth will be discussed in due course.

To the occurrence of the phratry no particular importance would be attached were it not for the unusual form of the word, *φάτρα* (lines 23 and [26]), misread by Robert as *φράτρα*. The dissimilated spelling also occurs at Argos (*SEG* 11.319, line 13), in Arkadia (*IG* V 2, nos. 446, lines 7–8, and 510, line 5), on Kos (*SGDI* 3674–76 = Schwyzler 250, line 2), and Tenos (*IG* XII 5[2], no. 798, line 23), to cite readily accessible examples. Arkadia and Tenos are eliminated by dialect; Argos and Kos were ruled out by Robert on other grounds (1948, pp. 6, 8; 1960, pp. 562–69). No form of the word is attested for either Phleious or Corinth.

Διακλαρώ for the usual *ἐπικλαρώ* is quite rare, the one other example known to me being from Dyme in Achaia: *SIG*³ 531 (= *SGDI* 1614 = *SEG* 13.273), line 29. The same text reveals the existence of a unique Dymaean tribal organization.

Abbreviations for names of civic units, like that in line 24, are comparatively infrequent in Greek documents, in all periods. Examples from Dorian states known to me include Apollonia, a secondary Corinthian colony, Herakleia in Lucania (*IG* XIV 645), Kalymna (M. Segre, *ASAA* 22–23 [1944–45] 124–44, nos. 85–96 *passim*), Kos (*SGDI* 3654), Rhodes (e.g., *IG* XII 1, no. 10) and Lokroi Epizephyrioi (A. DeFranciscis, *Klearchos* 3 [1961], 4 [1962], 6 [1964], 7 [1965], 9 [1967]). The Apollonian examples, though relevant to our discussion (see below), differ from the Delian instance in that they are as a rule only two letters in length. At Herakleia the relevant documents are dated not by a secretary, but by a pair of ephors (e.g., *IG*, *loc. cit.*, line 1 95). Both the Kalymnian and Koan abbreviations refer to the three Dorian phylai; Kalymna’s decreeing authority, in any event, is the Boule and Demos (see, for example, *SGDI* 3555, line 1), and Kos, again, was disposed of by Robert, as was Rhodes (1948, pp. 6, 8, note 2). The Lokrian temple accounts are authorized by the Boule and the Demos, or simply by the Boule. Thus the only remaining parallels—and indeed the only precise parallels in any

case—are those offered by the Corinthian list and markers. They differ only in the (to the ancient reader, insignificant) matter of the disposition of the three letters: two spaces after the second letter (Delos), a dash after the second letter (the list), neither spaces nor dash (the markers).

Finally, note should be taken of the fact that the formulas of the decree, though on the whole not distinctive, can at least be paralleled in the extant Corinthian record. With lines 5–7 compare *Corinth* VIII i, no. 2, lines 3–4 (first half second century B.C.): [ἐν παν]τὶ καιρῶν διατελεῖ εὖνους ἐ-/[ὼν κοι]νᾷ τε τᾷ πόλει ...; with lines 9–14 compare *SEG* 25.325 (= *Corinth* VIII iii, no. 37), lines 6–10 (end of third century B.C.): Ἐδοξε τᾷ[ἐκ]-/[κλησίαι Παντα]λέοντα Φύλακ-[ος] / [Καλυδώνιον πρό]ξενον εἶμεν κ[αὶ] / [εὐεργέταν τᾷ πόλ]ι[ος] αὐτὸν κ[αὶ] / [ἐκγό]νους ---; with lines 12–20 compare *Corinth* VIII i, no. 3, lines 6–11 (first half second century B.C.): . . . πρόξενον / [εἶ]μεν κ[αὶ] εὐεργέταν τᾷ / [πό]λι[ος] τῶν Κορινθίων αὐ-/[τόν] τε κ[αὶ] ἐκγό]νους· ὑπάρ-/[χειν] δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ λοιπ[ὰ] φι-/[λάνθρ]ωπα καὶ τίμια πά[ντα] / κτλ. Taken together, the passages show that the decree's phraseology as well as its specific content would have been quite at home in third or second century B.C. Corinth.

These connections with the Corinthian record, which virtually exhaust the form and substance of the decree, are cumulatively of very impressive weight. No other state covered in Robert's survey can make anything like a comparable claim. In view of the total absence, accordingly, of any negative indications, we should hardly be reluctant to infer, pending the appearance of new evidence, that Corinth, not Phleious or any other state is the issuing authority. The inference is made particularly attractive, it may be noted, by the definite elimination of all of Corinth's colonies for which sufficient comparative material is available (see especially Robert 1948, p. 6)—besides Phleious, the only serious rival candidates. The case would be made if the circumstances of the decree's formulation and display could be recovered. Unfortunately, only very slight headway seems possible at present.

The decree honors two Athenians, Xenokles Hagnotheou and Pausimachos Demokleous, but to my knowledge only one certain recurrence of either name-and-patronymic combination—one previously unnoticed—is to be found. In an inscription from Delos, *BCH* 29 (1905) 221–22, no. 78, the Athenian Boule in the archonship of Zaleukos, viz., 151/0 B.C.? (for the year see B. D. Meritt, *Historia* 26 [1977] 183), honors one Pausimachos Demokleous of Kolonos

(=Kirchner, *PA* no. 11741; J. Sundwall, *Nachträge zur Prosopographia Attica* [Helsinki 1910] 42), ἐπιμελητὴν γενόμενον Δήλου (lines 1–3). The name Pausimachos is relatively rare, and this fact, in combination with the presence of the honorand on Delos, makes identification attractive. We possibly have the same man in the Pausimachos from Kolonos in *IG* II², 2452, line 28, dated by its editor to c. 125 B.C. The difficulty is that the dates for both these inscriptions are probably too low to permit the equation. For the Delian decree G. Daux proposed, on the basis of the lettering, a date c. 325–275, most likely c. 325–315 B.C. (*AE* [1953–54] 250, note 5). We must deal with the possibility, therefore, that our Pausimachos is the grandfather or an even more distant ancestor of his namesake(s). Possibly he is the Πανσιμαχος ἐκ Κολ(ωνοῦ) in *IG* II², 791, d, line 8, dated by the archonship of Diomedon, i.e., 247/6 B.C. (Meritt, *op. cit.*, p. 176).

Why Corinth should have honored Athenians at either time, and have set up the decree on Delos, is not clear. On the lower chronology just discussed, it could be imagined that Pausimachos at least, in his capacity as *epimelêtês* of Delos, had somehow benefited Corinth, possibly in connection with Corinthian traders at the free port (?), although it will be remembered that the decree cites his and Xenokles' goodwill to "those of the citizens who had come to Athens" (lines 7–9). But this is no more than a guess. One is further discouraged by the absence in the copious Delian epigraphic record of any assured example of a document of Corinthian authorship.¹¹ For the time being it must be conceded that the circumstances of our document's origin are beyond recovery.

A NEW INTERPRETATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS

If the Delian decree is in fact Corinthian, we are justified in applying its content to the interpretation of the Corinthian list and markers. Both Robert and Calligas, although they accepted the Phleiasian provenience, attempted such an analysis, but, as will become apparent, neither succeeded in understanding the precise implications of the relevant lines of the decree. In particular, their

¹¹ Cities mentioned in Delian inscriptions are listed by F. Dürrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos* (Paris 1921) 283–86. Corinth does not occur, but neither, for that matter, does Phleious. In view of the large number of inscriptions surveyed in Dürrbach's list, one is obliged to conclude that, if the decree is Corinthian, its display on Delos was due to unusual circumstances.

analyses fail to account adequately for the substance and interrelationships of the terms *hēmiogdoōn* and *triakas*.

The Delian Decree. Inspection of the text reveals the actual state of affairs. The reader will note, first of all, the neat symmetry between the sortition injunction (lines 20–23) and its result (lines 24–26). Both begin with a reference to the *hēmiogdoōn*. The injunction, moreover, contains four terms, of which *phyla* and *phatra* are the third and fourth; in the result we find these again, at the end and in the same order. It should follow that to the words *ἡμιόγδοον καὶ τριακάδα* in line 22 corresponds *ἡμιογδόου ΑΣ F* in line 24. If, furthermore, the formulas are precisely parallel—as they give every appearance of being—the symbols *ΑΣ F* must designate not only the *hēmiogdoōn*, which is named in the text, but also the *triakas*, which is not. Accordingly, in view of the conspicuous gap on the stone—two full letter spaces—between *ΑΣ* and *F*, there can be little doubt that *ΑΣ* and *F* denote the *hēmiogdoōn* and *triakas* respectively.¹²

Alternative readings are conceivable but are subject to grave objections. It might be supposed, for instance, that *ΑΣ F* is the *hēmiogdoōn*, and that the *triakas* is (for reasons unknown) not named at all. But this would be a most unexpected occurrence in these formulas that are so detailed and explicit in every other respect. Why cite the *triakas* in the injunction if it is not to be answered in the result? To the further proposal that the *hēmiogdoōn* is *ΑΣ F*, and [*ἀ*]ρ*χαίας* (sc. *τριακάδος*) the *triakas* it can be objected that such an ellipsis would be difficult in view of the fact that [*ἀ*]ρ*χαίας* immediately precedes a noun, *φυλᾶς*, with which it agrees grammatically; and, besides, whereas a rare letter like *digamma* could by itself signal the proper context, our adjective, lacking any modification, is unlikely to have possessed such specificity. Finally, the possibility that the *hēmiogdoōn* is *ΑΣ* and the *triakas* is *F* [*ἀ*]ρ*χαίας*, though more attractive than the preceding, is, again, rendered improbable by the proximity to the adjective of *φυλᾶς*. All these difficulties disappear, however, if line 24 ends in a half-stop, and [*ἀ*]ρ*χαίας* is taken with *φυλᾶς* and, naturally enough, with [*φ*]άτ*ρας* in line 26.

¹² A total of four other two-letter-space gaps occur in the sortition result, indeed at every word-division not at the end of a line. Evidently the letterer wanted to end the text with a full line of letters and so distributed the excess space evenly throughout. The fact that these four gaps occur at the ends of words suggests strongly that the gap between *ΑΣ* and *F* is likewise significant.

Still, the failure of the word *triakas* to occur in the sortition result remains and calls for comment. Evidently the reader of the text was expected to know—or to be able to infer from line 24—that *F* stood for the *triakas*. His task will have been easier, it may be suggested, if it was generally understood that one of the groups constituted a subdivision of the other; that the one belonged to, and so invariably attended, the other. Which, then, contained the other? Two considerations point to the *hēmiogdoön*. From a formal standpoint, one would expect there to be, on the evidence of similar documents from other states, some logical order in the sequence of the four groups. The fact that *phyla* precedes *phatra* shows that it was not a simple ascending order; nor, since *triakas* (“Thirty”) precedes *phyla*, was it a descending order. Rather, as the traditional phyle precedes its smaller, traditional counterpart, the phratry, so, it may be inferred, the larger, numerically-designated *hēmiogdoön* precedes its smaller, numerically-designated subdivision, the *triakas*. Secondly, as I shall argue below on independent grounds, the *hēmiogdoön* probably represented one-half a phyle, of which the *triakas* could only have been a smaller part.

The quite different analysis offered by Robert (1948, p. 12) fails in general to do justice to the express wording and implications of the text. ΑΣ *F*, in the first place, he takes to designate the *hēmiogdoön* alone. This conclusion is justified only by the contention that the *hēmiogdoön* represents the smallest of the several divisions, which permits the assumption that membership in a given *hēmiogdoön* automatically entailed inclusion in a certain (larger) *triakas*. The contention, in turn, is supported by the observation that the *hēmiogdoön* commences the enumeration of the groups. But this observation, though true, is really without value, since, again, the four groups are not listed in ascending order. The alleged absence of a reference to the *triakas* in the sortition result, accordingly, is left without an explanation. A second difficulty arises from Robert’s further contention that the first word of line 25, [ἀ]ρχαίας, modifies ἡμιογδόον ΑΣ *F* in the preceding line and implies a division of that body into “old” and “new” sections. But ἡμιογδόον, best taken as neuter, is in any case not feminine; and not only grammar but also the arrangement of the text on the stone demand that [ἀ]ρχαίας be taken with φυλᾶς. If, further, the *hēmiogdoön* is already smaller than the “Thirty,” how small must the “old section” of ΑΣ *F* have been?

Calligas, in a very brief discussion (p. 89), improved on Robert’s reading by correctly seeing in ΑΣ and *F* the *hēmiogdoön* and *triakas*. Yet, without argument, he then labeled the *triakas* the “major”

division, the *hêmiogdoön* the “minor” division, thus reversing their actual relationship.

Translate: “And let the Boule allot them into *hêmiogdoön* and *triakas* and phyle and phratry. They were allotted: *hêmiogdoön* ΑΣ, *triakas* F, ‘old’ phyle Aoreis, ‘old’ phratry (H)omakchiadai” (lines 20–26).

The Corinthian Texts. It is evident that these results are at variance with current interpretations of the Corinthian inscriptions. In place of the phylai and some major subdivision, we have in the two-letter elements ΑΣ, KY, ΑΕ, ΣΙ, and ΣΥ designations for five *hêmiogdoä*, and in the single letters Ε, F, and Ι designations for (some of?) their constituent *triakades*.

An objection to our conclusion might be made on the basis of an inscription of the third century A.D. cited above (note 2): J. R. Wiseman, *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 33–38, no. 25. Inscribed on four sides, only Face A of the block offers a substantial text, and was read by Wiseman as follows: ΦΥΛΗΣΑΦ (= Ι?). Two possible groupings of the letters were considered, viz., φυλῆς ΑΦ (or ΑΙ) and φυλῆ ΣΑΦ (or ΣΑΙ), the latter being preferred on the (hardly decisive) grounds that after 146 B.C. no Corinthian (Roman) phyle-name is abbreviated in fewer than three letters. If this reading were correct, it might be taken as proof that the symbols on our list and markers denote the phyle (ΣΑ) and a subdivision (F [or Ι]). Dow, however, observes (*per litt.*) that the alternative word division is guaranteed by the fact that the last two letters are larger, and less deeply cut, than the preceding; and that the final letter of the text is to be read not *digamma* or *iota*, but as dotted *gamma*, or just possibly dotted *upsilon*. The new reading thus makes possible, he continues, either φυλῆς 'ΑΙ (ρυππίας) or 'ΑΥ (ρηλίας), both of which are attested phylai of the Corinthian Roman Imperial organization. Still another possibility has been suggested by Wiseman himself (“Corinth and Rome I: 228 B.C.–A.D.267,” *ANRW* II 7.1 [1979] 497, note 221 [498]), who adds that the (otherwise apparently meaningless) texts of Faces C, ΑΦ, and D, ΦΑ, which appear deliberate and complete (but cf. his earlier remarks at *Hesperia* 41 [1972] 36 with note 82), could be taken as favoring the word division Φυλῆς Α-. Reading the final letter as *iota*, Wiseman now considers the possibility of a hypothetical phyle Ae(lia), created during the reign of Hadrian. In view of the possibility of such interpretations, the suggestion of a link with the Classical Greek list and markers appears scarcely tenable.

Above, citations were made of a number of uses of abbreviations for civic units among the Dorian states. None, as noted, bears any

striking formal resemblance to the present instances; and, in any event, only one of these states was found to be related to Corinth in such a way that we might expect a comparable usage to be significant, namely Apollonia, the colony of Kerkyra. A dedication to Aphrodite of the second century B.C., sorely in need of restudy, E. Homann-Wedeking, *AA* 57 (1942) 371 (with a photograph, p. 380 fig. 43), records the names of six *hieromnamones* (including the secretary). Each name is followed by an abbreviation: ΔΙ or ΛΙ, ΠΙΟ, ΑΡ, ΙΙΟΑΟ, ΙΙΙ, ΑΕ (lines 5–10).¹³ Presumably the abbreviations (each can begin a Greek word) refer to some civic unit, but its identity is unclear. If, however, all the units are represented, the relatively small number would favor phylai. If so, Apollonian usage did not strictly parallel Corinthian, but then again one would not expect the colony necessarily to possess a civic organization identical with that of its large and populous mother-city. For this reason, too, the agreement, noted by Robert (1960, p. 563, note 1), between ΑΕ in line 10 and the Corinthian list (lines 15, 20) and the marker *SEG* 25.331a is to be ascribed to chance.¹⁴ The identification suggested below for the Corinthian abbreviation would preclude a *rapprochement* in any case. At best, the abbreviations serve merely to illustrate a general similarity of institutions within the Corinthian sphere.

Finally, KY, identified here as a *hēmiogdoön*, can no longer be explicated by reference to Hesychios' identification of Κυνόφαλοι as a phyle. Are we prepared to give up what has been since Hiller's review the starting point for all work on the problem? Certainly, in the first place, no one would deny the possibility that both a phyle and a *hēmiogdoön* bore names beginning Κν-. Alternatively, one could attack the authority of Hesychios. Before the discovery of the casualty list earlier scholars expressed doubts concerning the status of the "Wearers of Dogskin Helmets." Instead of being a constitutional unit, the Kynophaloi, judged by their name, looked much more like a

¹³ J. and L. Robert, *REG* 57 (1944) 213, no. 119b, publish a text from Homann-Wedeking's photograph. At line 6 they print "ΠΙΟ ou ΠΙω." My own impression from the photograph is that the former reading is the more likely; the "iota" appears to be merely a slight scar on the stone, not a deliberate stroke. If ΠΙΟ is read, the second syllable of ΙΙΟΑΟ (line 8) may have been added to prevent ambiguity. The abbreviations, that is, were regularly two letters in length.

¹⁴ The Roberts, *loc. cit.*, suggest the further possibility of a connection between line 5 (ΔΙ or ΣΙ) and the Corinthian list, line 6. For the latter text they refer to the *editio princeps*, *Corinth* VIII i, no. 11, where Meritt prints ΔΙ-ΠΙ. This reading was corrected by Dow 93, 95, with the final comment: "Delta is barely admissible."

class of dependent peasantry, or even slaves, with which one could compare the *κατωνακοφόροι* or "Wearers of Sheepskin Jackets" (Theopompos, *FGrH* 115 F 176) and *κορυνηφόροι* or "Club-Bearers" (?) (Pollux 3.83) at Sikyon, and the *κονίποδες* or "Dusty-Feet" at Epidauros (Plut. *Greek Questions* 1, 291e).¹⁵ These are slang terms applied informally to socially, not constitutionally, defined groups.¹⁶ Hesychios' use of "phyle" might, then, be non-technical, a very real possibility that, if fact, would alleviate our discomfort altogether. My own inclination, however, is to continue to accept Kynophaloi as a phyle and to ascribe to coincidence the existence of a *hêmiogdoôn* denoted KY.

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ORGANIZATION

Greek civic groups may be broadly classed as either hereditary or territorial; that is, membership might be determined by kinship (real or supposed) or (at least initially) by place of habitation. We must make this determination for each of our four units before we can hope to understand how they fit together into a unified civic organization.

The eight *phylai* have always been regarded as territorial in disposition, correctly I think, but not entirely for the right reasons. In particular, scholars have been content to cite the notice from the *Suda* introduced at the beginning of our discussion.¹⁷ On the usual reading, the "eight phylai of the politai" and the "eight 'parts' of the polis" appear to be taken as a paratactic expression denoting two aspects of the same entity, viz., a geographical division of the Corinthia into phylai. But this is only one, and by no means the most obvious, of at least three possible interpretations of the text. Two others, not contradicted by any available evidence, would permit the assumption of hereditary groups. Conceivably, on the one hand, the eight phylai and the eight "parts" represent two qualitatively different, overlapping sets of units, each territorial division ("of the polis") embracing members of all eight phylai ("of the politai"), which, *ex*

¹⁵ For earlier scholarly opinion see E. Wilisch, *Beiträge zur inneren Geschichte des alten Korinth* (Zittau 1887) 10–11.

¹⁶ A counter-example to be kept in mind is the Leukotainioi, an Old Attic trittys: *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 5–32, no. 2, line 36.

¹⁷ E.g., Dow 102 (citing Szanto); Stroud 241–42; C. A. Roebuck, *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 114–16, 126.

hypothesi, would be hereditary. Alternatively, and with greater likelihood, the *καί* linking the two clauses is epexegetic: i.e., "Aletes ... made the citizens into eight phylai, that is, (he made) the city into eight divisions." Given the late date of the source, what is essentially a gloss on the meaning of "phylai" would not be out of place. Of course here the phylai might still be territorial, yet even ambiguity poses difficulty for the traditional interpretation, since it rests on this evidence alone. No less ambiguous, it may be added, is the testimony of the two recorded tribal names. For Aoreis either an hereditary or territorial disposition is possible.¹⁸ Even more troublesome is Kynophaloi, or "Wearers of Dogskin Helmets," for it is difficult to imagine under what circumstances all such people, and only such people, might have inhabited a single place, though one should hesitate, in view of the known peculiarities of Greek place-names, to issue a dogmatic judgment. Thus the specifically Corinthian testimony does not, to say the least, speak clearly.

What, instead, decides the question in favor of a territorial disposition is the certainty that the system of eight phylai was the product of a sweeping reform. Corinth had earlier observed the traditional Dorian tripartite division, which was hereditary, and which in certain other states survived either intact or with the addition of one, or two, new phylai at most. Nowhere are these three phylai found within an organization of phylai numbering so many as eight. This was a wholesale reorganization that in all probability brought with it not only a different number of phylai with new names but also a fundamentally different type of arrangement. At Athens and elsewhere the institution of new phylai spelled the general decline of affiliation by kinship in favor of regionalism as the principle of civic organization. For reasons shortly to be discussed in detail, it is quite possible that at Corinth, too, conditions favored the creation of a new arrangement in which, at least at the level of the phylai, the citizenry was classed according to place of residence.¹⁹

Of the *phatrai* we have two names, (H)omakchiadai and, from Pindar, *Ol.* 13.97, the Oligaitheidai, which the scholiast (on lines 136 and 137) identifies, with sufficient likelihood but on what authority

¹⁸ For examples of both kinship and territorial names in -εύς, plural -εῖς, see E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* I (Munich 1953) 476–78.

¹⁹ On the change from hereditary to local phylai see Dow 104, note 21 with references. Examples of territorial civic units are collected and discussed by G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* I (Munich 1920) 262–72.

we do not know, as a *phratia*. Phratries, strongly gentilical in character, are apt to have remained unaffected by the alteration of the tribal system. At Athens, it will be remembered, Kleisthenes "allowed all to keep their *genê* and *phratiriai* and priesthoods *κατὰ τὰ πατέρα*" (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 21.6; but cf. *Politics* 6.2.11).

For the *hêmiogdoā* a valuable clue is provided by the name of the division itself. "Half-eighths," in the absence of any other indication, should be interpreted as one-half divisions of the eight phylai. There would accordingly be sixteen *hêmiogdoā* all told. If, furthermore, the phylai were territorial, so should be their exact subdivisions. *Hêmiogdoōn*, in any event, hardly looks like a label appropriate to a kinship group.²⁰ Positive support for the inference is happily furnished by the evidence of the five attested symbols: ΑΣ, ΚΥ, ΑΕ, ΣΙ, and ΣΥ. Since all five, including the newly added ΑΣ, can begin a Greek word, we are entitled to regard them as abbreviations. Of what? ΚΥ(νόφαλοι) has been shown to be questionable; and names of gods, heroes, or kinship groups with Corinthian associations are not readily forthcoming. But one suggestion considered in passing by Dow (p. 100, note 16) is perhaps worthy of further consideration. ΑΕ and ΣΙ, he suggested (on the assumption of course that the abbreviations were of phylai), might be filled out as the town names ΑΕ-(χαιον) and ΣΙ(δοῦς). To these can now be added ΑΣ(αῖ), precise location unknown but described by Theopompos, *Philippika* Book 32 (*FGrH* 115 F 173), as "large and populous."²¹ Less compelling is ΣΥ(κουσία), a place mentioned in the well-known third century B.C. document recording the arbitration by Megara of a boundary dispute between Corinth and Epidauros, *IG* IV² 1, no. 71 (= *SEG* 11.402; 13.251, 281; 23.193), lines 26 and 27. Sykousia may not have been a town; on the other hand, there is no real reason to suppose that, if some (territorial) *hêmiogdoā* were named after towns, they all were.²² Ironically, no attested town or place begins Κν-. Even so, the availability of acceptable names for four of the five encourages speculation that the Corinthia had been partitioned into sixteen

²⁰ *Hêmiogdoōn*, according to LSJ⁹, occurs elsewhere only in Hesychios, s.v. (H 506 Latte) as a unit of measure. The proverb *πάντα ὀκτώ* indicates that there were other "Eights" at Corinth, but only one other of a constitutional nature is known to me: the *oktades* instituted by the demos after the fall of the tyranny (Nikolaos of Damaskos, *FGrH* 90 F 60; and see below, p. 185 with note 28.).

²¹ For possible locations of Asai see now James Wiseman, *The Land of the Ancient Corinthians* (Göteborg 1978) 102.

²² On the location and status of Sykousia see Wiseman (above, note 21) 138.

districts called *hēmiogdoā*, two to each (territorial) phyle. The rationale for such an apparently otiose civic unit will be considered shortly.

The term *triakas* was shown by Robert (1948, pp. 11–12) to mean not “a thirtieth part,” but “a group of thirty.” The known “Thirties” are designated in our documents, E, F, and Π. Of unclear meaning, various possibilities were considered by Dow (pp. 97–98), of which, since we are now committed to *digamma*, only the numerals five (Ε), six (F), and eighty (Π) remain possible readings, though (as Dow saw) without any obvious point. Stroud, again, believes that the symbols designate “trittytes,” but suggests no interpretation for their specific meanings; for this reason (among others) his theory must be regarded as conjectural. A third possibility, suggested by contemporary tribal (?) divisions on Kerkyra (Calligas, nos. 1, 2, 3a, 5), would be to interpret the letters as ordinal adjectives, possibly feminine singular modifying *τριακάς* understood, e.g., *F(έκτα)*. But a second letter would be required to distinguish *prōta* from *pempta*, and *trita* from *tetarta*; and, equally seriously, no ordinal lower than >Ε(νάτα) is available for *epsilon*—an improbably high number (see below). Perhaps more attractive would be designation of function: W. P. Wallace, *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 119, note 14, thought of >Ε(πίλεκτοι) and Π(ελασταί), to which I should add *F(ίλοι) (*vel sim.*) with original *digamma*, i.e., the cavalry. But, attractive as they will appear for our discussion, these identifications, too, fail to be supported by any independent testimony.

What else, if anything, can be said about the *triakades*? Specifically, what is their relation to the *hēmiogdoā*? What of the number of *triakades* within the organization?

The Delian decree's formulas of sortition were seen to imply that the “Thirties” constituted subdivisions of the *hēmiogdoā*. Further light on the relationship is shed by a tabulation of the distribution of the three attested *triakas*-symbols among the five attested *hēmiogdoā*:

	E	F	Π
AΣ	_____	decree, line 24	_____
KY	_____	list, line 26	_____
AE	list, line 15	_____	list, line 20; SEG 25.331a
ΣΙ	_____	_____	list, line 6; SEG 25.331b
ΣΥ	_____	SEG 25.332	_____

It is a reasonable, though not a certain, inference that the same set of symbols served to designate the several *triakades* of each *hēmiogdoön*. Thus each territorial *hēmiogdoön* comprised a presumably uniform

number of groups of thirty individuals. What this number was, however, cannot fairly be said to be known. When the list was first studied (Dow) the evidence was taken to indicate a division into two groups, E and Π. But when the marker proved the existence of the *digamma* division (Stroud), the possibility was opened up that the subdivisions totaled three. Is the latter assumption any more justifiable? Given the very small body of our evidence, and above all in view of the single occurrence of *epsilon* (list, line 15), one could hardly exclude, it seems to me, the possibility of a fourth, unattested symbol. In this connection, it will be noted that the *pi* in *SEG* 25.331a, line 1, is dotted, with Stroud's reading representing only one of several possibilities (Stroud 234–35). At the same time, the number of unattested symbols, if any, is probably not large, since the list preserves the entire register of ΑΕ, with only two divisions, *epsilon* and *pi*, occurring. That the *digamma* division is not present might be explained on the assumption that in it there was no casualty (so Dow); but if as many as five casualties could occur in one division, with additional room left for still another three names (viz., ΣΙ-Π lines 7–14), it is unlikely that in many others, still unattested, no losses at all were sustained.²³ It could be, therefore, that there were only three subdivisions, yet the possibility of a fourth (at least) must be left open. “Ninths”—or anything like them—are, on the other hand, highly improbable. At the most we can say that the number of *triakades* to the *hēmioḡdoōn*, at least three, was small. For the entire organization, the total will have ranged from 16 (*hēmioḡdoa*) x 3 (*triakades*) = 48 to 16 x 4 = 64 or, conceivably, to some higher multiple of sixteen.

The *triakas*, or “Thirty,” is to be regarded as the smallest unit of the organization. Neither the Delian decree, which gives the appearance of a complete listing of the civic divisions, nor the casualty list indicates any further subdivision. For this reason the numerals “One” and “Two” that stand on the markers probably have some function unconnected with the organization of the citizen-body. At all events, documents from Chios (see W. G. Forrest, *ABSA* 55 [1960] 172–89, with 174, note 6), Kerkyra (Calligas, *passim*), Kos (*SGDI* 3636 = *SIG*³ 1025 = Schwyzer 251, line 6), Miletos (Th. Wiegand,

²³ The fact that in each register space was left for the insertion of three additional names (Dow 92) might lead one to expect to find rubrics for all the units, even in cases in which no casualty at all was initially reported. But this was not done. Were such rubrics (and names), if any, appended elsewhere on the stone?

SB Berlin 1904, p. 85; G. Dunst, *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 35 [1961] 272–73), and Sicily (e.g., *IG XIV*, 2407.1–26) would lead us to expect ordinal numerals in the case of a constitutional unit.²⁴ More likely, then, the words “One” and “Two” have something to do with the particular uses of the monuments on which they happen to stand (see below).

The reconstruction also brings with it certain consequences that bear directly upon its validity.

First, if the basic unit is assumed to be a literal Thirty, and if there were, as I have argued, a minimum of 48 such units, it follows that their combined membership totaled 1,440. The addition of a fourth, or other, *triakas*-symbol would add ($16 \times 30 =$) 480 to this number; whereby the assumption of (say) six different symbols—probably too high a figure—would increase the membership to 2,880. At first glance these estimates appear much too low. Even on the assumption (to be argued below) that the Thirties represented the military organization alone rather than the general citizen population, they are well under what we should expect. Herodotos (9.28.3) puts the Corinthian hoplite contingent at Plataia at 5,000, around which level Beloch calculated from a scattering of evidence, chiefly that of Thucydides, the levy continued to stand through most of the century, with a decline to 3,000 by the time of the Battle of the Nemea River in 394 B.C. (Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.17). A reasonable extrapolation would set the total citizen population at 10,000 to 12,000.²⁵

What remedy, if any, is available? Since the number of *hêmiogdoai* will hardly admit of adjustment and in the absence of a satisfactory alternative calculation for the number of *triakades* within each *hêmiogdoön*, we are left with the *triakas* itself as a potential variable. Must it have been a literal “Thirty”? Perhaps not. Since the statistics just cited are from the fifth century B.C., whereas at least the eight phylai

²⁴ Additional evidence for the application of ordinal numerals to civic divisions, some of it disputed, is assembled in my article, “The Order of the Dorian Phylai,” *Classical Philology* 75 (1980) 197–215. No such use of a cardinal number is known to me.

²⁵ K. Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Leipzig 1886) 120–21. The figure in Herodotos was once questioned as too high, but in the final analysis it must simply be admitted that there is no satisfactory independent evidence on which to base such an objection. The 3,000 hoplites attested by Xenophon (*loc.cit.*) may reflect a decline in population as a result of military losses in the previous century. For a modern discussion of the Herodotean evidence see C. Hignett, *Xerxes’ Invasion of Greece* (Oxford 1963) 435–38; and for a recent statement on the problem of Corinth’s population as a whole, Wiseman (above, note 21) 10, 12.

and possibly their components were created under the Kypselid tyranny (as will be shown), it could be that the *triakades* were actual Thirties at the time of their constitution but with growth of population, perhaps also under the extreme and unusual conditions of the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars (hence the data of Herodotos and Thucydides), expanded beyond their nominal enrollments. Such expansion would certainly have been a simpler expedient than the creation of wholly new units. What is admittedly a mere possibility is happily given some support by the already-cited third or second century B.C. texts from the secondary colony of Corinth, Akrai, *IG XIV*, 211 and 212 (cf. 209), which show that there the *triakadarchoi*, and so presumably the *triakades* that they represented, numbered only nine. No one could believe that this city's soldiers, much less the general population, totaled no more than 270.²⁶ It may well be, therefore, that the true significance of the term *triakas* escapes us. In any event, estimates of population based on suppositions of the term's meaning cannot be permitted to decide the acceptability of the proposed reconstruction.

Secondly, it goes without saying that any reconstruction must be consistent with what we know, or may assume to be true, of the documents on which it is based.

To take the markers first, each will represent a single *triakas*, e.g., *hēmiogdoōn* ΣΙ, *triakas* Π (*SEG* 25.331b), and so on. Presumably there were also markers for the many other *triakades*, which, again, on our calculations numbered at least forty-eight. If, further, each *triakas* was represented by both a "One" and a "Two" marker, the number of monuments would have to be doubled. The supposition of nearly a hundred (or more?) such objects might be thought to bear on their function. Since all three known markers were found in the vicinity of the eastern city circuit wall, it is highly probable, as Stroud argues (p. 240), that they were connected somehow with Corinth's system of fortifications. Would our own reconstruction allow a more precise determination of this function?

²⁶ Although no explicit testimony on the population of Akrai is available, the substantial remains on the site reported in the archaeological literature show that the town was not small: see L. Bernabò Brea, *Akrai* (Catania 1956); and, for a convenient summary, G. Voza, "Akrai," *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton 1976). The theatre as reconstructed by Bernabò Brea, tavola A, could, on my calculation, seat at least 500; the citizen population, of course, may have far exceeded this number.

Broneer proposed (*apud* Stroud 240) that the numerals indicated distances in stades along the walls for which the designated divisions were responsible. This speculation may be carried further. If it is assumed that there were both a “One” and a “Two” marker for each *triakas*, our minimum figure for the total number of *triakades*, forty-eight, would imply walls ninety-six stades in length. Remarkably, this is in fact the actual estimated length of Corinth’s fortifications (including, in addition to the city circuit, the Akrokorinth and Lechaion walls): see R. Carpenter, *Corinth* III ii, p. 80. Since of course not all the walls would be manned simultaneously for defense, we should presumably be dealing with either guard-duty or maintenance. Each *triakas* would be permanently responsible for its designated section of the wall as indicated by the marker. A like procedure is attested by Aeneas Tacticus, 11.10a–11, for Herakleia-on-Pontos about 370 B.C.: subdivisions of the phylai, the *hekatostyes*, sixty in number, were made to serve εἰς τὰς φυλακάς. The parallel strengthens what is in any case a perfectly natural and expected function for the civic organization, which is rendered conjectural only by the obviously fragmentary (and possibly misleading) state of our record.²⁷

Concerning the list, if each rubric names a *triakas*, the preserved text must constitute only a small fraction of the original document. By chance, the surviving rubrics happen to coincide in two instances with the known *triakas*-markers. Whether or not, however, the intact inscription could have accommodated as many registers as implied by our reconstruction cannot be determined. Forty-eight *triakades* represent the minimum, and the appearance of a fourth (or other) *triakas*-symbol would increase this figure by sixteen, although, again, a certain number will have been without casualties. But we have no precise idea of the stele’s original size (but, for an estimate, see Dow 93, 103), and, even if we did, there would remain uncertainty whether or not the preserved fragment is representative of the entire document—with only three complete registers, which vary between one and five names, any extrapolation would obviously be risky. Nor can we be sure that there was not a second, or other, contiguous stele standing to the right of the known slab (on the “anathyrosis”

²⁷ For the sake of completeness it should also be noted that the third century A.D. inscribed block discussed above (p. 175) reads, on Face B, Θ[---] δυο / [---]ου. It is conceivable that the word “Two” is somehow related to the markers, but the likelihood that Face A and possibly Faces C and D refer to the Roman Imperial tribal system makes this very improbable.

on the left side, see Dow 92–93); multiple stelai, some bearing tribal lists, are well-attested at Athens (see, for examples, D. W. Bradeen, *Agora* XVII, nos. 1, 15, 17, 22, 23 and 25). Given such uncertainties, it is evident that the list has little to tell us about the reconstruction's validity.

Despite a few uncertainties, the organization emerges clearly in its main lines. The Corinthia had been partitioned into eight territorial phylai, which in turn comprised two *hêmiogdoai* each. Of the latter only four (?), all centering on outlying towns or places, are known by name; the others will have included the ἄστυ of Corinth as well. At least some, possibly the whole, of the citizen population continued to belong to the traditional *phatrai*; these in some instances, as in Attika, doubtless cut across the lines of the regional divisions. The *hêmiogdoai*, finally, fell into an uncertain but small number of *triakades*, or "Thirties," presumably equal in number in each *hêmiogdoön*.

FUNCTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION

Phylai, *phatrai*, *hêmiogdoai*, and *triakades* might well appear to some a plethora of civic divisions, but the Delian decree assures us of their existence. What is needed, therefore, is an account of the system's functions that will make comprehensible the simultaneous operation of the four groups.

Attention has already been drawn to the peculiar arrangement of the terms in the Delian decree's formulas of sortition: the numerically-designated *hêmiogdoön* and *triakas* are paired off against the traditional phyle and phratry. The arrangement is significant in two respects. First, it is generally agreed that the list (Dow 97) and the markers (Stroud 239–40) are of a military character, from which it should follow that the *hêmiogdoai* and *triakades*, which alone appear on these documents, are also essentially military in nature. Of the phylai and phratries, however, nothing is known except for the information, which we owe to Nikolaos of Damaskos, *FGrH* 90 F 60, that immediately following the fall of the Kypselid tyranny the demos established a new Boule based on a unit called the *oktas*, presumably connected in some way with the eight-fold system.²⁸ These data are

²⁸ ... (2) αὐτὸς (sc., ὁ δῆμος) δὲ παραχρῆμα † ἐστρατεύσατο πολιτείαν τοιάνδε· μίαν μὲν ὀκτάδα προβούλων ἐποίησεν, ἐκ δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν βουλὴν κατέλεξεν ἀνδρῶν † θ'.
(Jacoby)

consistent with the suggestion that the *hēmiogdoā* and *triakades*, which we might label “regiments” and “squads,” did not duplicate but rather complemented the bouleutic (and other unattested civilian?) functions of the traditional units. Secondly, if the numerically-designated groups were exclusively military, they will have included only Corinthians liable for military service—in contrast to the *phylai* (and possibly the *phratries*), which must have embraced the larger citizen population. These differences in purpose and membership suggest that we are in fact dealing with two essentially separate organizations.

Such speculation is encouraged by the use in the Delian decree of the adjective [ἀ]ρχαίαις to describe the phyle and very likely also the phratry; not, however, in contrast to other *phylai* (and *phratries*) since, so far as we know, no others existed, but rather in contrast to the previously-mentioned numerically-designated divisions. While it is just possible, of course, that the point of the adjective is that the traditional groups *qua* civic divisions, were older than the innovating *hēmiogdoā* and *triakades*, it is far more likely, since this historical fact was known to everybody, that the adjective points to the relatively earlier institution of the particular phyle and phratry Aoreis and (H)omakchiadai. In the same vein, the very word *hēmiogdoōn* should presuppose the prior existence of the *eight* *phylai* at the time of its institution; at all events, it clearly could not have been earlier. Together these two points provide a chronological basis for the hypothesis that the *hēmiogdoā* and *triakades* represent separate creations of a fundamentally different nature. Let us now attempt to see how such an innovation might fit into the larger historical development of the Corinthian tribal organization.

κατεστήσατο vel ἐπραγματεύσατο Müller ἡὐτρεπίσατο Piccolos
 ὁ vel <ῥ>Θ Müller

The passage is of doubtful interpretation. Useful are the discussions of Wilisch (above, note 15) 16–17; and of E. Will, *Korinthiaka* (Paris 1955) 612–15. Most commentators emend the numeral *theta* on the perfectly good ground that a Boule of nine is inconceivable. But another approach, that of L. Whibley, *Greek Oligarchies: Their Character and Organization* (Cambridge 1896) 164, note 2, seems to me preferable. Μίαν μὲν ὀκτάδα is answered, not by τῶν λοιπῶν (as others assume), but by the numeral; ἀνδρῶν, obviously jejeune in the context, has somehow replaced the original word ὀκτάδων. Read <ὀκτάδων> Θ and translate: “And the demos at once instituted the following constitution: it created one *oktas* of *probouloi*, and from the remaining (citizens) it selected a Boule of nine *oktades*.” That is, each of the eight *phylai* provided one *proboulos* and nine *bouleutai*; the eight *probouloi* constituted one *oktas*, the *bouleutai*, taken one at a time from the eight *phylai*, the other nine. Together, *probouloi* and *bouleutai* comprised a Council of Eighty.

HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

The enlarged, eight-fold system just described was not the original tribal organization of Corinth. It had been preceded by the traditional tripartite division common to many—probably originally to all—Dorian states: Dymanes, Hylleis, and Pamphyloi. For these phylai we have no specifically Corinthian testimony, but their existence at Corinth may be inferred with certainty from their probable early presence at Syracuse (W. Hütl, *Verfassungsgeschichte von Syrakus* [Prague 1929] 32–34, 37, 80, 129, note 5) and Kerkyra (Calligas 87), and from their documented appearance later at the Syracusan foundation Issa (*SIG*³ 141 = *SEG* 17.312, 19.435). Whether or not, as some scholars have suggested, a fourth phyle was added, as at Argos, Troizen, and elsewhere, to contain the non-Dorian population cannot be determined. The eight phylai mark the first attested innovation; and it is on the circumstances under which this change occurred that we now focus our attention.

According to the *Suda*, the reform attended the “synoecism” of Corinth by Aletes, the legendary oikist of the Dorian state and first king. But association of the tribal reform with Aletes leaves little, if any, room for the Dorian phylai; and it is difficult in any event to reconcile the presence of an expanded tribal organization with the evident small-scale and fragmented condition of the state at the time of, and during the century and a half following, the arrival of the Dorians c. 900 B.C. If we put Aletes to the side, however, the mention of a “synoecism” may be taken more seriously. C. A. Roebuck, in an important paper, “Some Aspects of the Urbanization in Corinth,” *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 96–127, advanced the hypothesis (pp. 114–16, 126) that the change to the eight phylai occurred under the Bakchiad aristocracy in the latter part of the eighth century B.C. At this time, among other major concurrent changes, the state was undertaking expansion to both the North and South, and colonies were being sent out to Magna Graecia and the Northwest. The consequent redrawing of boundaries, distribution of lands, and shifts of population could well have ended, according to Roebuck, in the reorganization of the polis of Corinth; that is, in the “synoecism” of the Corinthia as a consolidated political entity, formalized in the institution of the eight-fold tribal system.

Roebuck's reconstruction is attractive insofar as it focuses on a period of unquestioned growth and change. In particular, the expansion and colonization under the aristocracy provide a perfectly suitable setting for the creation of an organization on a territorial basis. Yet at the same time there is a grave difficulty inherent in the suggestion that the Bakchiadai brought about the extinction of the Dorian phylai. Known in the later tradition as "Herakleidai," these Dorians were notoriously jealous of their prerogatives, and it strains belief to imagine that they would have voluntarily consented to relinquish the very system that surely in no small part served as an instrument for their control of affairs, in favor of a new organization that, if the tribal names Kynophaloi and Aoreis are any indication (see below), extended the privileges of tribal membership to a great many individuals outside the ruling circle. It is easier to believe that, however great may have been the upheavals during these times, they were accommodated within the existing hereditary arrangement. This was in any event, it will also be remembered, the organization instituted in the Bakchiad colonies of Syracuse and Kerkyra.

The difficulty does not arise if the reorganization is attributed not to the aristocracy, but to the tyranny of the Kypselids, which succeeded it. In truth, there is really little alternative, since the one other candidate proposed in the scholarly literature, the oligarchic government that followed the tyranny,²⁹ appears to be eliminated, as Roebuck suggested, by the fact that our one source for the new constitution, Nikolaos of Damaskos, *FGrH* 90 F 60 (discussed above, p. 185 with note 28), implies that the eight phylai were already in existence.³⁰ Be that as it may, the case for the tyranny, never before fully evaluated, is I think impressive.³¹

²⁹ E.g., by Busolt (above, note 19) 363, note 4.

³⁰ Roebuck 114 argues that the term *oktas* is used by Nikolaos in such a way as to imply that an eight-fold division was already in existence at the time of the constitutional reform. It is possible of course that our text telescopes a much fuller account that ascribed the creation of the entire tribal organization *ab initio* to the oligarchy, but there is available no additional evidence that would support such a belief. In any event my case for the tyranny is based on positive evidence and in no way depends upon the conclusive elimination of other candidates.

³¹ The suggestion has previously been made by D. E. W. Wormell, *Hermathena* 66 (1945) 4–5; T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford 1948) 55; Will (above, note 28) 612, note 2; H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Munich 1967) 18, 26, 523–24; Calligas 88. None of these scholars, however, considers in detail the specific features of the new civic organization.

Our discussion has suggested that the reform attested by the *Suda* had two principal aspects: the institution of new phylai and the adoption of the territorial arrangement. These features are best considered separately since, although possibly effecting largely overlapping or even identical sectors of the population, they may well reflect entirely different motives on the part of the founders.

With regard to the institution of new phylai, it is widely, and no doubt correctly, held that the tyranny championed the interests of the non-Dorian population.³² Perhaps we should say "non-Bakchiad," so including some disgruntled Dorian aristocrats, but these were in all likelihood not the tyrants' only supporters. Kypselos' ancestry on his father's side was traced by Herodotos (5.92β) to the (of course, mythical) Kaineus, of the Lapithai, a pre-Hellenic Thessalian race. According to Pausanias (2.4.4, 5.18.7–8), another ancestor, Melas, son of Antasos, from Gonoussa "above Sikyon," "joined the Dorians in the expedition against Corinth;" that is, belonging to a nearby indigenous settlement, he was not Dorian himself. Finally, Kypselos' father, Aetion, son of Echekrates, of the demos Petra, took in marriage Labda, a lame Bakchiad whom, according to Herodotos (*ibid.*), none of the clan was willing to marry. We are not to see here induction into the aristocracy with the conferral of Bakchiad rights: Herodotos' statement that the clan upheld a rule of endogamy suggests rather that Labda, clearly undesirable as a spouse, had been abandoned. Kypselos remained an outsider, presumably supported by the sorts of non-Dorian groups detectable in his genealogy.³³

Such groups, with the eventual establishment of the tyranny, could well have been the beneficiaries of a reorganization of the tribal structure aimed at breaking the Bakchiad monopoly of government. Kynophaloi, or "Wearers of Dogskin Helmets," a name consciously non-aristocratic in that it contains no allusion to birth, is one perfectly suitable candidate. As Dow showed (pp. 98–101), there is no reason to regard the name as derisive: it might even have been honorific, like the Hysminatai, or "Warriors," at Epidauros, also, as I

³² The *communis opinio* has been opposed, however, by E. Will, *Doriens et Ioniens* (Paris 1956) 37–38, but I believe, on insufficient grounds. The evidence of Herodotos, in particular, though perhaps (as Will claims) containing novelistic elements, should reflect at the same time more substantial facts of Kypselos' political orientation.

³³ For a contrasting interpretation see S. I. Oost, "Cypselus the Bacchiad," *CP* 67 (1972) 10–30, at 12–13. Oost maintains that "female Bacchiads could transmit Bacchiad rights." But there is no independent evidence that this was so; and the argument minimizes the manifest connection between the fact that no Bakchiad would marry Labda and her eventual marriage to a person outside the clan.

shall attempt to show elsewhere, the creation of a tyrant. Concerning the Aoreis, the occurrence of Aoris as a pre-Dorian king at nearby Phleious strongly suggests that the similarly-named Corinthian phyle has something to do with the non-Dorian population, although as a territorial division it is unlikely to have been restricted in membership to non-Dorians alone; probably the name, as those of many other phylai all over Greece derived from names of gods, heroes, kings, etc., merely commemorates the eponym without implying common descent and/or ties of blood among the membership. Thus both attested names, in different ways, reflect a challenge to the basis for the Bakchiad ascendancy.

By the inauguration of the territorial principle the aristocrat's claim to rule by right of birth could be further undermined: place of residence, not pedigree, would (at least initially) determine one's place within the political organization. Another, different sort of objective might have been the organization and promotion of the outlying districts of the Corinthia, which could not have been accomplished as effectively through an hereditary organization in which the membership of a given unit might be scattered over the entire polis. Mention has been made of Kypselos' associations with the places Gonoussa³⁴ and Petra.³⁵ Is more substantial evidence available for attributing such a policy to the tyrants?

Periander is said by Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F 179, and Aristotle, *Constitution of the Corinthians*, 516 Rose (cf. 611.20 Rose), "not to have allowed those who wished to live in the *astu*."³⁶ By itself, this isolated detail tells us little of the tyrant's attitude towards the inhabitants of the *chôra* since any of a number of underlying motives, some beneficial, others deleterious, to the parties concerned could be imagined. But a probable reconstruction of the policy is suggested by Aristotle's discussion of measures taken by Peisistratos in his administration of the Attic countryside. Loans were advanced to the poor such as would make them self-sufficient as farmers; as a result state revenues increased through the tithe exacted while the

³⁴ Though presumably within the Sikyonia, Gonoussa's exact location remains, to the best of my knowledge, undetermined: see Bölte, "Gonoussa 1)," *RE* 7.2 (1912) 1587.

³⁵ Petra, too, remains unplaced: see Wiseman (above, note 21) 100, 138, with notes. The Petra mentioned in the arbitration document cited earlier, *IG* IV 1, no. 71, line 23, may be a physical feature. For our purposes, it suffices that the town lay outside the *astu*.

³⁶ Diogenes Laertius 1.98: ... καὶ οὐκ εἶα ἐν ἄστει ζῆν τοὺς βουλομένους, καθά φησιν Ἐφορος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης.

chôra was under cultivation. But the *purpose* ascribed to Peisistratos by Aristotle was otherwise: "in order that they not live in the *astu* but scattered over the *chôra*; and that, moderately prosperous and occupied with their own business, they neither desire nor have the leisure to take an interest in *ta koina*." At the same time the tyrant established *dikastai κατὰ δῆμους* and himself often made rounds in the country "in order that they not come into town and neglect their work" (*Ath. Pol.* 16.1–5).³⁷ Such a policy is easily imaginable for the Kypselids, and of course need not conflict with the view that it was these same (existing or prospective) inhabitants of the *chôra* that had brought Kypselos to power. But the autocracy may have become, or have been perceived as, repressive outside the *astu*; and perhaps it was under such circumstances that Periander's son Lykophron, at the instigation of Prokles, tyrant of Epidauros, attempted to establish a *tyrannis* in opposition to his father *παρὰ τοῖς περιοίκοις* (Nikolaos of Damaskos, *FGrH* 90 F 59 [1]).³⁸ The *chôra*, in other words, remained the natural, perhaps the only, constituency for tyranny at Corinth. If so, it is attractive to view the new phylai as territorial and to ascribe them to the tyranny, with greatest likelihood to the founder of the dynasty himself.³⁹

The eight phylai at some later time, as we have seen, provided the basis for the institution of the sixteen *hêmiogdoai*, themselves subdivided by units called *triakades*. These new units may or may not have been the work of the tyrants, for the *terminus ante quem* furnished by the markers, c. 450 B.C., allows a full century for subsequent developments. But at least something of the purpose behind the new units appears reasonably clear: they offered in the place of the presumed earlier (eight) phyle-regiments a more highly articulated apparatus for the organization of the army. Perhaps the regiments, with an increase

³⁷ The phenomenon is also discussed by Aristotle in general terms at *Politics* 5.8.7, where the tyrant's expulsion of the *ochlos* from the *astu* is ascribed to an absence of trust. Elsewhere in the same work it is a feature of the "best" democracy, namely that based on the agricultural community, that the people are either so busy that they cannot meet often in the *ekklesia* and find more pleasure in work than in politics and holding office (4.5.3, 6.2.1); or, because they are scattered over the *chôra*, do not participate in the *ekklesia*—nor even have the desire to do so (6.2.7–8).

³⁸ No mention of Lykophron's tyranny is made in the account of Herodotos 3.50–53. Yet Lykophron does visit Prokles, from whom he learns that his mother had been slain by Periander. The hostility that he subsequently shows towards his father upon his return to Corinth might cloak the more serious development attested by Nikolaos.

³⁹ Most likely Kypselos because it is difficult to see the tyranny waiting over thirty years to enfranchise its following (so Berve [above, note 31] 18; but, for a different view, see Oost [above, note 33] *loc. cit.*).

in population, had proved unwieldy. If, at the same time, the change to a territorial arrangement had already been effected through the creation of the eight phylai, it was now carried further: members of a given *hēmiogdoōn*-regiment would live closer together, which would facilitate call-ups and make for a kind of *esprit de corps* impossible among the sometimes far-flung memberships of quasi- (or even genuine) hereditary groups. The result, in sum, was more numerous units organized on a more tightly-knit territorial basis.

A Kypselid reform of the Corinthian civic organization would also make possible an attractive reconstruction of similar developments on Kerkyra. Following Calligas, I have suggested that, if the Delian decree is Corinthian, the Kerkyraian names *Ἀφοπαί/οί* and *Μαχχίδαί* could be understood as borrowings from the mother-city. The date at which the groups bearing these names came into existence must fall, furthermore, at some appreciable interval after the Bakchiad foundation c. 733 B.C., when the Dorian tripartite division was instituted, but before the appearance of our evidence for the new system, viz., the lead plaques studied by Calligas and dated by him c. 500 B.C. We are thus at liberty to assign the change to the one period in earlier Kerkyraian history during which Corinth exerted decisive control over the island's affairs, namely the Kypselid tyranny, in particular to Periander, who governed Kerkyra through his son Nikolaos, later through his grandson Psammetikos (Herodotos 3.48–49; Nikolaos of Damaskos, *FGrH* 90 F 59). Further support for the reconstruction is provided by the fact that the larger groups, as at Corinth, fell into subdivisions (of undetermined nature and extent) denoted by numerical labels, in this case ordinal adjectives of feminine gender: *δευτέρα*, *πέμπτα*, *ἑκτα*, and so forth (Calligas 79–81), although, again, we are not compelled to see here the work of the tyrants.

Concerning Apollonia, the foundation of Periander, the presence of the *Μαχιάδαι* and of the abbreviations in the document studied earlier suggests but cannot prove that in this colony, also, the Kypselids inaugurated a tribal system similar to their own at home. In any event, there is no trace of any previous, or other, arrangement.

For the later history of the Corinthian organization we remain entirely dependent upon the sources under review. Nikolaos of Damaskos testifies, as we saw, that the demos, upon the fall of the tyrants, constituted a new Boule representing through the *oktades* the presumably already-existing eight phylai. Later, the military units are shown to have been in use c. 450 B.C. by the markers, and c. 350–300 B.C. by the list of casualties. At the end of the fourth, or the beginning of the third, century B.C. the Delian decree reveals the simultaneous

functioning of the entire organization. What changes, if any, occurred between this time and the sack of the city by Mummius in 146 B.C. are entirely unknown.

The intensive analysis to which we have subjected the evidence has resulted in a new perception of both the structure and history of the Corinthian civic organization. Viewed as a static entity, the reformed organization seems to be without precise parallel: eight territorial phylai cut across by the hereditary phratries, and overlapped by the "artificial" military units, the *hêmiogdoai* and *triakades*. From a historical standpoint, the innovations embodied in this system have been found to be largely, if not entirely, the work of the Kypselid tyranny. This conclusion, too, is at variance with a widely-held belief, namely that the earlier Greek tyrannies were generally marked by a strong constitutional conservatism. But in both cases, as I intend to show in a future synoptic study of Greek civic organization, the idiosyncracies are only illusory. In fact, the tribal system that was so distinctive that it contributed to the rise of a proverb was, I shall show, fundamentally similar to arrangements instituted at about the same time in other states, in as many cases as not by the tyrants.